

THE JET PROBLEM FOR THREE-DIMENSIONAL AXIALLY SYMMETRIC FULL COMPRESSIBLE SUBSONIC FLOWS WITH NONZERO VORTICITY

YAN LI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we show that for given Bernoulli function and entropy function at the upstream, if the incoming mass flux is within a suitable range, then there exists a unique outer pressure such that smooth subsonic three-dimensional axially symmetric jet flows for steady full Euler system with nonzero vorticity exist and have certain far fields behavior. A key observation is that we can transform the jet problem for three-dimensional axially symmetric steady full Euler system with nonzero vorticity into a variational problem in terms of the stream function. Moreover, using uniform estimates of the stream function and the iteration method, we exclude the singularity of the jet flows near the symmetry axis.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. Background and motivation. The free boundary problems, such as jets and cavities, are important topics in mathematics and hydrodynamics due to their theoretical and practical significance. The earlier mathematical theory of free boundary problems relied on complex analysis and hodograph transformations, which were applicable to two-dimensional flows but had no effective analogues in three-dimensional case ([9, 28]). A significant contribution to three-dimensional flows with free boundary was the existence of axially symmetric incompressible cavity flows given by Garabedian, Lewy and Schiffer ([27]), where the idea was based on the principle of minimum virtual mass. Later, Alt, Caffarelli and Friedman used a variational method to deal with the Bernoulli type free boundary problems ([1, 4]), and developed a general framework to investigate jets and cavities in both two-dimensional and three-dimensional cases ([2, 3, 7]). In particular, the existence and uniqueness of three-dimensional axially symmetric irrotational subsonic jet flows were established in [7]. In addition, some interesting three-dimensional axially symmetric jet problems were studied in [14, 16, 21]. More relevant results about free boundary problems see [26, 5, 6, 35, 36, 15] and references therein.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q31, 35R35, 35J20, 35J70, 35M32, 76N10.

Key words and phrases. axially symmetric flows, free boundary, steady Euler system, subsonic jet, vorticity.

A recent advance of the free boundary problems is the well-posedness of two-dimensional compressible subsonic jet flows with general vorticity ([33]). This result is based on an observation that the stream function formulation for two-dimensional compressible steady Euler system enjoys a variational structure, even when the flows have nontrivial vorticity. Then the jet problem can be reformulated as a domain variation problem, which fits to the framework developed in the irrotational case (cf. [7]). An important question is whether one can establish the well-posedness of three-dimensional compressible jet flows with general vorticity. As a first step, we study three-dimensional axially symmetric compressible subsonic jet flows with nonzero vorticity.

Before stating the main results of the paper, we briefly introduce some researches on the compressible flows in fixed infinitely long nozzles, which are closely related to the jet problem. The existence and uniqueness of irrotational subsonic flows in infinitely long nozzles were established in [37, 39, 23], which give a positive answer to the problem posed by Bers in [8]. By using the stream function formulation, the well-posedness of two-dimensional subsonic flows with nonzero vorticity in infinitely long nozzles was obtained in [38]. This result was extended to three-dimensional axially symmetric cases ([18, 24, 17]). More generalizations about rotational subsonic flows in infinitely long nozzles cf. [10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 25, 22].

1.2. The problem and main results. Three-dimensional steady ideal flows are governed by the following full Euler system

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla p = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} E + p \mathbf{u}) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ denotes the flow velocity, ρ is the density, p is the pressure, and E is the total energy of the flow. For the polytropic gas, one has

$$E = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho},$$

where the constant $\gamma > 1$ is called the adiabatic exponent. The local sound speed and the Mach number of the flow are defined as

$$(1.2) \quad c = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p}{\rho}} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|}{c},$$

respectively. The flow is called subsonic if $M < 1$, sonic if $M = 1$, and supersonic if $M > 1$, respectively.

We specialize to axially symmetric compressible flows and take the symmetry axis to be the x_1 -axis. Denote $x = x_1$ and $y = \sqrt{x_2^2 + x_3^2}$. For simplicity we assume the

swirl velocity of the flow is zero. Let u and v be the axial velocity and the radial velocity of the flow, respectively. Then

$$\begin{cases} u_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = u(x, y), \\ u_2(x_1, x_2, x_3) = v(x, y) \frac{x_2}{y}, \\ u_3(x_1, x_2, x_3) = v(x, y) \frac{x_3}{y}. \end{cases}$$

Hence in cylindrical coordinates, the full Euler system (1.1) can be rewritten as

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (y\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot (y\rho\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + y\nabla p = 0, \\ \nabla \cdot (y(\rho E + p)\mathbf{u}) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ and $\nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y)$. If the flow is away from vacuum, it follows from (1.3) that

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla B = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla S = 0,$$

where B is the Bernoulli function defined by

$$(1.5) \quad B = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho},$$

and S is the entropy function defined by

$$(1.6) \quad S = \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho^\gamma}.$$

Now given an axially symmetric nozzle in \mathbb{R}^3 with the symmetry axis and the upper solid boundary of the nozzle expressed as

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{N}_0 := \{(x, 0) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N} := \{(x, y) : x = N(y), y \in [1, \bar{H}]\},$$

respectively, where $\bar{H} > 1$, $N \in C^{1, \bar{\alpha}}([1, \bar{H}])$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ and it satisfies

$$(1.8) \quad N(1) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow \bar{H}^-} N(y) = -\infty.$$

The main goal of this paper is to study the following jet problem.

Problem 1. *Given the mass flux Q , the Bernoulli function $\bar{B}(y)$, and the entropy function $\bar{S}(y)$ of the flow at the upstream, find (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) , the free boundary Γ , and the outer pressure p which we assume to be constant, such that the following statements hold.*

- (1) *The free boundary Γ joins the nozzle boundary \mathcal{N} as a continuous surface and tends asymptotically horizontal at downstream as $x \rightarrow +\infty$.*

(2) The solution (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) solves the Euler system (1.3) in the flow region \mathcal{O} bounded by \mathcal{N}_0 , \mathcal{N} , and Γ . It takes the incoming data at the upstream, i.e.,

$$(1.9) \quad \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho} \rightarrow \bar{B}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)\rho^\gamma} \rightarrow \bar{S}(y), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow -\infty,$$

and

$$(1.10) \quad \int_0^1 y(\rho u)(0, y) dy = Q.$$

Furthermore, it satisfies the boundary conditions

$$p = \underline{p} \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma,$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit normal along $\mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma$.

The main results in this paper can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let the nozzle boundary \mathcal{N} defined in (1.7) satisfy (1.8). Given the Bernoulli function and the entropy function $(\bar{B}, \bar{S}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ and mass flux $Q > 0$ at the upstream. Suppose that*

$$(1.11) \quad B_* := \inf_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{B}(y) > 0, \quad S_* := \inf_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{S}(y) > 0,$$

and

$$(1.12) \quad \bar{B}'(0) = 0, \quad \bar{B}'(\bar{H}) \geq 0, \quad \bar{S}'(0) = \bar{S}'(\bar{H}) = 0.$$

There exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) \in (0, 1)$, such that if

$$(1.13) \quad \|y^{-2} \bar{B}''(y)\|_{L^\infty((0, \bar{H}))} + \|y^{-2} \bar{S}''(y)\|_{L^\infty((0, \bar{H}))} \leq \kappa,$$

then there exist $Q_* = \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}}$ and $Q_m = Q_m(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) > Q_*$, such that for any $Q \in (Q_*, Q_m)$, there are functions $\rho, \mathbf{u}, p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathcal{O}) \cap C^0(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ (for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$) where \mathcal{O} is the flow region, the free boundary Γ , and the outer pressure \underline{p} , such that $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p, \Gamma, \underline{p})$ solves Problem 1. Furthermore, the following properties hold.

- (i) (Smooth fit) The free boundary Γ joins the nozzle boundary \mathcal{N} as a C^1 surface.
- (ii) The free boundary Γ is given by a graph $x = \Upsilon(y)$, $y \in (\bar{H}, 1]$, where Υ is a $C^{2,\alpha}$ function, $\bar{H} \in (0, 1)$, and $\lim_{y \rightarrow \bar{H}^+} \Upsilon(y) = \infty$. For x sufficiently large, the free boundary can also be written as $y = f(x)$ for some $C^{2,\alpha}$ function f which satisfies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \bar{H} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f'(x) = 0.$$

- (iii) The flow is globally uniformly subsonic and has negative radial velocity in the flow region \mathcal{O} , i.e.,

$$\sup_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}} (|\mathbf{u}|^2 - c^2) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v < 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}.$$

(iv) (*Upstream and downstream asymptotics*) The flow satisfies the asymptotic behavior

$$(1.14) \quad \|(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p)(x, \cdot) - (\bar{\rho}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot), 0, \bar{p})\|_{C^{1,\alpha}((0, \bar{H}))} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow -\infty$$

and

$$(1.15) \quad \|(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p)(x, \cdot) - (\underline{\rho}(\cdot), \underline{u}(\cdot), 0, \underline{p})\|_{C^{1,\alpha}((0, \underline{H}))} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow +\infty,$$

where \bar{p} is a positive constant, $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ and $(\underline{\rho}, \underline{u}) \in (C^{1,\alpha}((0, \underline{H})))^2$ are positive functions. Moreover, the upstream asymptotics $\bar{\rho}$, \bar{u} , \bar{p} , and the downstream asymptotics $\underline{\rho}$, \underline{u} , \underline{H} are uniquely determined by \bar{B} , \bar{S} , Q , γ , \bar{H} , and \underline{p} .

(v) (*Uniqueness of the outer pressure*) The outer pressure \underline{p} such that the solution $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, p, \Gamma)$ satisfies the properties (i)-(iv) is uniquely determined by \bar{B} , \bar{S} , Q , γ , and \bar{H} .

Remark 1.1. Suppose the flow satisfies the far field conditions with high order compatibility at the upstream, i.e.,

$$(\rho(x, y), u(x, y), v(x, y), p(x, y)) \rightarrow (\bar{\rho}(y), \bar{u}(y), \bar{v}(y), \bar{p}(y))$$

and

$$\nabla(\rho(x, y), u(x, y), v(x, y), p(x, y)) \rightarrow \nabla(\bar{\rho}(y), \bar{u}(y), \bar{v}(y), \bar{p}(y))$$

for some smooth functions $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{p})$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. It follows from the Euler system (1.3) that

$$(1.16) \quad (y\bar{\rho}\bar{v})' = 0, \quad (y\bar{\rho}\bar{u}\bar{v})' = 0, \quad (y\bar{\rho}\bar{v}^2)' + y\bar{p}' = 0, \quad (y\bar{\rho}\bar{v}\bar{B})' = 0.$$

The first equation in (1.16) shows that $y\bar{\rho}\bar{v} \equiv C$ for some constant C . Since $y\bar{\rho}\bar{v} = 0$ on the x -axis implies $C = 0$ and since the solution is supposed to satisfy $\bar{\rho} > 0$, one has $\bar{v} = 0$. Then it follows from the third equation in (1.16) that $y\bar{p}' = 0$. Hence the pressure \bar{p} is a constant. Thus in view of (1.6), for non-isentropic Euler flows the density $\bar{\rho}$ is a function. Same arguments hold for the downstream flow states.

Remark 1.2. For the convenience of stating the main results, we give the Bernoulli function, the entropy function, and the mass flux of the flow at the upstream. If we give suitable density, axial velocity, and pressure of the flow at the upstream, we can also prove the existence of the subsonic jet flows.

Remark 1.3. In this paper, we study jet flows without swirl to avoid the technicality. It makes sense since the swirl velocity of the flow will be always zero throughout the flow region if we assume the swirl is zero at the upstream and the streamlines have a simple topological structure (which can be guaranteed by $v < 0$ in the flow region), cf.

[19]. *Three-dimensional axially symmetric jet flows with swirl will be discussed in our future work.*

In order to prove Theorem 1, we follow the procedure in [33], where two-dimensional subsonic jet flows for steady Euler system with general vorticity were investigated. We first reformulate three-dimensional axially symmetric full Euler system in terms of the Bernoulli function, the entropy function and the vorticity (cf. Proposition 2.3). Then further reduce the full Euler system into a second order quasilinear equation of the stream function, which is elliptic if and only if the flow is subsonic (cf. Lemma 2.5). A key observation is that as in the two-dimensional isentropic case, this quasilinear elliptic equation of the stream function enjoys a variational structure in the subsonic state (cf. Lemma 3.1). Thus Problem 1 can be translated into a variational problem, and we can apply the techniques developed in [7, 33] to study the existence and regularity of the solution.

The main difficulties of three-dimensional axially symmetric jet problem with nonzero vorticity come from the appearance of $1/y$ in the stream function formulation, for which we introduce the condition (1.13). One of the difficulties is that the solution may be singular near the symmetry axis. As we study the variational problems in a series of truncated domains at first, we give appropriate conditions on the boundaries of the truncated domains, so that we can obtain a uniform decay estimate of the solutions to the domain truncated problems near the symmetry axis (cf. Lemma 5.2). This is sufficient to exclude the singularity of the solution near the symmetry axis (cf. Proposition 7.3). Actually we show that the stream function is $C^{2,\alpha}$ up to the symmetry axis by iteration (cf. Appendix A). Besides, the specific boundary conditions of the domain truncated problems are also used to show the positive lower bound of the free boundary (cf. Proposition 5.7). Another difficulty is that the presence of $1/y$ in the equation makes the shifting argument in y -direction not applicable, which is crucial for the proof of the asymptotic behavior of the jet flow in two-dimensional case, cf. [33, Proposition 7.4]. Here we use the energy estimates as in [18] to obtain the asymptotic behavior of the solution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we reformulate the Euler system and the jet problem in terms of the stream function. In Section 3, we give the variational formulation for the jet problem after the subsonic and domain truncations. The existence and regularity of solutions for the truncated free boundary problems are established in Section 4. Fine properties of solutions for the truncated problems such as the monotonicity property and some uniform estimates are obtained in Section 5. The continuous fit and smooth fit of the free boundary are established in Section 6. In Section 7, we remove the domain and subsonic truncations, and then get the far

fields behavior of solutions. This completes the proof for the existence of solutions to the jet problem. In Section 8, we show the uniqueness of the outer pressure for the subsonic jet problem. The regularity of the stream function up to the symmetry axis is discussed in the appendix.

In the rest of the paper, (∂_1, ∂_2) represents (∂_x, ∂_y) , and for convention the repeated indices mean the summation.

2. STREAM FUNCTION FORMULATION AND SUBSONIC TRUNCATION

In this section, we use the stream function to reduce the full Euler system (1.3) into a second order quasilinear equation, which is elliptic in the subsonic region and becomes singular at the sonic state. To deal with the possible degeneracy near the sonic state, we introduce a subsonic truncation so that the modified equation is always uniformly elliptic.

2.1. The equation for the stream function. We start by determining the incoming flow density, axial velocity and pressure $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{p})$ with the given Bernoulli function \bar{B} , entropy function \bar{S} , and mass flux Q at the upstream. Suppose the flow satisfies the upstream asymptotic behavior (1.14) with some functions $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ and a constant $\bar{p} > 0$. In view of (1.5) and (1.6) one has

$$(2.1) \quad B = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \left(\frac{\gamma p}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} S^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

so that

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{B}(y) = \frac{\bar{u}^2(y)}{2} + \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y).$$

Denote $\bar{D} := (\bar{B} \bar{S}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}})$. Then the upstream speed \bar{u} satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad \bar{u}(y) = \sqrt{2 \bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\bar{D}(y) - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)}.$$

For any positive constant d , let

$$(2.4) \quad p_c(d) := \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{2d}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad p^*(d) := \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}.$$

By straightforward calculations, the flow is subsonic at the upstream if and only if $\bar{p} \in (p_c(D^*), p^*(D_*))$, where

$$(2.5) \quad D_* := \inf_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{D}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad D^* := \sup_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{D}(y).$$

Note that

$$(2.6) \quad 0 < B_*(S^*)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq D_* \leq B_* S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq D^* \leq B^* S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

where B_* and S_* are defined in (1.11), and

$$(2.7) \quad B^* := \sup_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{B}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad S^* := \sup_{y \in [0, \bar{H}]} \bar{S}(y).$$

Moreover, the conditions (1.12) and (1.13) imply

$$(2.8) \quad B^* \leq B_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4 \quad \text{and} \quad S^* \leq S_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4.$$

Thus if κ is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ , then $D^* \leq (\gamma + 1)D_*/2$, consequently $p_c(D^*) \leq p^*(D_*)$.

The incoming data $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{p})$ can be determined as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $(\bar{B}, \bar{S}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ be the Bernoulli function and the entropy function at the upstream which satisfy (1.11)-(1.13). Let $Q > 0$ be the mass flux. Suppose that the flow satisfies the upstream asymptotic behavior (1.14) for some positive functions $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ and some constant $\bar{p} > 0$. There exists a constant $\bar{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$ sufficiently small, such that if κ defined in (1.13) satisfies $\kappa \in (0, \bar{\kappa})$ and $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$ where $Q_* = \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}}$ and $Q^* = Q^*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > Q_*$, then the upstream state $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{p})$ in (1.14) is uniquely determined by \bar{B} , \bar{S} , Q , and γ , and $\bar{p} \rightarrow p_c(D^*)$ as $Q \rightarrow Q^*$, where D^* is defined in (2.5). Furthermore,*

$$(2.9) \quad C^{-1} \leq \bar{\rho} \leq C, \quad \bar{\rho}'(0) = \bar{\rho}'(\bar{H}) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{\rho}'\|_{L^\infty([0, \bar{H}])} \leq C\kappa,$$

and

$$(2.10) \quad C^{-1}\kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}} \leq \bar{u} \leq C, \quad \bar{u}'(0) = 0, \quad \bar{u}'(\bar{H}) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{u}'\|_{L^\infty([0, \bar{H}])} \leq C\kappa^{1-\frac{1}{4\gamma}},$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$.

Proof. Since the flow satisfies the asymptotic behavior (1.14), it follows from (2.3) that

$$(2.11) \quad Q(\bar{p}) = \int_0^{\bar{H}} y \bar{\rho}(y; \bar{p}) \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\bar{D}(y) - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} dy,$$

where

$$(2.12) \quad \bar{\rho}(y; \bar{p}) = \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{(\gamma - 1) \bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}.$$

Since

$$\frac{d}{d\bar{p}} Q(\bar{p}) < 0 \quad \text{for } \bar{p} \in (p_c(D^*), p^*(D_*))$$

with D^* and D_* as in (2.5), the mapping $\bar{p} \mapsto Q(\bar{p})$ is strictly monotone decreasing in $(p_c(D^*), p^*(D_*))$. This means that as long as $Q \in (Q(p^*(D_*)), Q(p_c(D^*)))$, there

exists a unique $\bar{p} \in (p_c(D^*), p^*(D_*))$ satisfying (2.11); accordingly, $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$ is uniquely determined by (2.12) and (2.3). Furthermore, let $Q^* := Q(p_c(D^*))$, then $\bar{p} \rightarrow p_c(D^*)$ if $Q \rightarrow Q^*$.

It follows from the expression for $\bar{\rho}$ in (2.12) and (2.8) that

$$\left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{(\gamma - 1)(S_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq \bar{\rho} \leq \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{(\gamma - 1)S_*} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\rho}'(y) = -\frac{\bar{\rho}(y)}{\gamma \bar{S}(y)} \bar{S}'(y).$$

Since $\bar{p} \in (p_c(D^*), p^*(D_*))$ where $D_* \leq B_* S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq D^*$ (cf. (2.6)), using (1.11)-(1.13) one gets (2.9), provided $0 < \kappa \leq 1$.

To derive the lower bound for \bar{u} in (2.10), we find a suitable $Q_* \in (Q(p^*(D_*)), Q^*)$ firstly. In view of (2.11) and (2.4), one has

$$\begin{aligned} Q(p^*(D_*)) &= \int_0^{\bar{H}} y \left(\frac{\gamma p^*(D_*)}{(\gamma - 1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\bar{D}(y) - \left(\frac{\gamma p^*(D_*)}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} dy \\ &= \int_0^{\bar{H}} y D_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \bar{S}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) (\bar{D}(y) - D_*)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.6) and (2.8) gives

$$(2.13) \quad 0 \leq (S^*)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} (D^* - D_*) \leq (S_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} (B_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4) S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} - B_* \leq C_0 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$$

for some $C_0 = C_0(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$, provided $0 < \kappa \leq 1$. Thus

$$Q(p^*(D_*)) \leq \bar{H}^2 B_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \sqrt{2C_0 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \leq \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}},$$

provided $0 < \kappa \leq \min \left\{ 1, (2\bar{H}^4 (B_*/S_*)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} C_0)^{-2\gamma} \right\}$. Similarly, one also deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} Q^* &= \int_0^{\bar{H}} y \left(\frac{\gamma p_c(D^*)}{(\gamma - 1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\bar{D}(y) - \left(\frac{\gamma p_c(D^*)}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} dy \\ &\geq \int_{\frac{\bar{H}}{2}}^{\bar{H}} y \left(\frac{2D^*}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \bar{S}^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma + 1} \bar{D}(y) + \frac{2}{\gamma + 1} (\bar{D}(y) - D^*) \right)} dy \\ &\geq \frac{\bar{H}^2}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} B_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (S^*)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \sqrt{\frac{2(\gamma - 1)}{\gamma + 1} B_* - \frac{4}{\gamma + 1} (S^*)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} (D^* - D_*)} \\ &\geq \frac{\bar{H}^2}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} B_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (S_* + \bar{H})^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma + 1} B_*}, \end{aligned}$$

provided $0 < \kappa \leq \min \{ 1, ((\gamma - 1)B_*/(4C_0))^{\gamma} \}$. Hence there exists a constant $\tilde{\kappa} = \tilde{\kappa}(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$ such that $Q^* > \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}}$ for any $\kappa \in [0, \tilde{\kappa}]$. Let $Q_* := \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}}$.

Now we prove the estimate (2.10) for $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$. Using (2.11)-(2.13) yields

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int_0^{\bar{H}} y \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{2\bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \left(\bar{D}(y) - D_* + D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} dy \\ &\leq \int_0^{\bar{H}} y \left(\frac{\gamma p^*(D_*)}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \sqrt{2C_0 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + 2(S^*)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} dy \\ &\leq \bar{H}^2 B_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \sqrt{2C_0 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + 2(S^*)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$C_0 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + (S^*)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right) \geq \frac{Q^2}{2\bar{H}^4} B_*^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} S_*^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \geq \frac{\kappa^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}}}{2\bar{H}^4} B_*^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} S_*^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Note that $S^* \leq S_* + \kappa \bar{H}^4$ and $D_* \leq B_* S_*^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$. Therefore there exists a constant $\bar{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) \in (0, \tilde{\kappa})$ such that if $0 < \kappa < \bar{\kappa}$, then

$$S_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right) \geq C_1 \kappa^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}}$$

for some $C_1 = C_1(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$. This implies \bar{u} given by (2.3) satisfies

$$(2.14) \quad \sqrt{2C_1 \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}}} \leq \sqrt{2S_*^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(D_* - \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{\gamma-1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right)} \leq \bar{u} \leq \sqrt{2B_*}.$$

Furthermore, in view of (2.2), a straightforward computation gives

$$\bar{u}'(y) = \left(\bar{B}'(y) - \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{\gamma \bar{p}}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \bar{S}'(y) \right) \bar{u}^{-1}(y).$$

Then with the help of (1.12), (1.13) and (2.14), one obtains $\bar{u}'(0) = 0$, $\bar{u}'(\bar{H}) \geq 0$, and the L^∞ -bound for \bar{u}' in (2.10). This finishes the proof. \square

From now on, we always assume that at the upstream the Bernoulli function \bar{B} and the entropy function \bar{S} , which belong to $C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}])$, satisfy (1.11)-(1.13) with κ in (1.13) sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , γ , and \bar{H} . Moreover, we let the mass flux $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$, where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1.

It follows from the continuity equation (1.3)₁ that there is a stream function ψ satisfying

$$(2.15) \quad \nabla \psi(x, y) = (-y\rho v, y\rho u).$$

Note that (1.4) implies the Bernoulli function B and the entropy function S are constants along each streamline. With Proposition 2.1 at hand, we show that B and S can be expressed as functions of the stream function ψ under suitable assumptions.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{p})$ be the incoming density, axial velocity and pressure of the flow determined in Proposition 2.1. Suppose that (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) is a solution to the full Euler system (1.3) and each streamline is globally well-defined in the flow region. Then there exist two $C^{1,1}$ functions $\mathcal{B} : [0, Q] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{S} : [0, Q] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(2.16) \quad (B, S)(x, y) = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S})(\psi(x, y))$$

and

$$(2.17) \quad \mathcal{B}(\psi) = \frac{|\nabla\psi|^2}{2y^2\rho^2} + \rho^{\gamma-1}\mathcal{S}(\psi).$$

Moreover,

$$(2.18) \quad \kappa_0 := \|\mathcal{B}'\|_{C^{0,1}((0,Q])} + \|\mathcal{S}'\|_{C^{0,1}((0,Q])} \leq C\kappa^{1-\frac{1}{2\gamma}},$$

where κ is the same constant as in (1.13) and $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$.

Proof. Since the Bernoulli function B and the entropy function S are conserved along each streamline, which is globally well-defined in the flow region, then B and S are uniquely determined by their values at the upstream. Let $\mathfrak{h}(z) : [0, Q] \rightarrow [0, \bar{H}]$ be the position of the streamline at the upstream where the stream function takes the value $\psi = z$, i.e.

$$(2.19) \quad z = \int_0^{\mathfrak{h}(z)} y(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(y)dy.$$

The function \mathfrak{h} is well-defined as $\bar{\rho}\bar{u} > 0$. Then one has

$$(2.20) \quad (B, S)(x, y) = (\bar{B}, \bar{S})(\mathfrak{h}(\psi(x, y))) = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S})(\psi(x, y)),$$

where \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S} are defined as

$$(2.21) \quad \mathcal{B}(z) := \bar{B}(\mathfrak{h}(z)) = \frac{\bar{u}^2(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{2} + \frac{\gamma\bar{p}}{(\gamma-1)\bar{\rho}(\mathfrak{h}(z))}$$

and

$$(2.22) \quad \mathcal{S}(z) := \bar{S}(\mathfrak{h}(z)) = \frac{\gamma\bar{p}}{(\gamma-1)\bar{\rho}^\gamma(\mathfrak{h}(z))}$$

for $z \in [0, Q]$, respectively. Therefore (2.16) follows. In addition, since by (2.15) the flow velocity $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ satisfies $|\mathbf{u}|^2 = |\nabla\psi/(y\rho)|^2$, using the definitions of the Bernoulli function in (1.5) and the entropy function in (1.6) as well as (2.16) yields (2.17).

To show (2.18), differentiating (2.19) with respect to z gives

$$\mathfrak{h}'(z) = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{h}(z)(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(\mathfrak{h}(z))},$$

so that differentiating (2.21) and (2.22) one has

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}'(z) &= \frac{\bar{B}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\mathfrak{h}(z)(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(\mathfrak{h}(z))}, \quad \mathcal{S}'(z) = \frac{\bar{S}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\mathfrak{h}(z)(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(\mathfrak{h}(z))}, \\ \mathcal{B}''(z) &= \frac{1}{\mathfrak{h}^2(z)(\bar{\rho}^2\bar{u}^2)(\mathfrak{h}(z))} \left(\bar{B}''(\mathfrak{h}(z)) - \bar{B}'(\mathfrak{h}(z)) \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\bar{\rho}(\mathfrak{h}(z))} + \frac{\bar{u}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\bar{u}(\mathfrak{h}(z))} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{h}(z)} \right) \right), \\ \mathcal{S}''(z) &= \frac{1}{\mathfrak{h}^2(z)(\bar{\rho}^2\bar{u}^2)(\mathfrak{h}(z))} \left(\bar{S}''(\mathfrak{h}(z)) - \bar{S}'(\mathfrak{h}(z)) \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\bar{\rho}(\mathfrak{h}(z))} + \frac{\bar{u}'(\mathfrak{h}(z))}{\bar{u}(\mathfrak{h}(z))} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{h}(z)} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equalities with (1.13), (2.9), and (2.10) together yields (2.18). \square

For later purpose, we extend the Bernoulli function \mathcal{B} and the entropy function \mathcal{S} from $[0, Q]$ to \mathbb{R} as follows: First, in view of (1.12), \bar{B} and \bar{S} can be extended to $C^{1,1}$ functions defined on \mathbb{R} , which is still denoted by \bar{B} and \bar{S} respectively, such that

$$\bar{B}'(y) = \bar{S}'(y) = 0 \text{ on } (-\infty, 0], \quad \bar{B}'(y) \geq 0, \quad \bar{S}'(y) = 0 \text{ on } [\bar{H}, \infty).$$

Besides, the extensions can be made such that

$$(2.24) \quad B_* = \inf_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{B} \leq B^* \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{B} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad S_* = \inf_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{S} \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{S} = S^*$$

and

$$(2.25) \quad \|\bar{B}'\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|\bar{B}'\|_{C^{0,1}([0, \bar{H}])} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{S}'\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R})} = \|\bar{S}'\|_{C^{0,1}([0, \bar{H}])},$$

where B_* and S_* are defined in (1.11), B^* and S^* are defined in (2.7), and $\sup_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{B}$ depends on B_* and $\|\bar{B}\|_{C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}])}$. Furthermore, the upstream density $\bar{\rho}$ and axial velocity \bar{u} can be extended to $C^{1,1}$ functions in \mathbb{R} such that (2.12) and (2.3) always hold. Consequently, by (2.21) and (2.22) one gets extensions of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S} to $C^{1,1}$ functions in \mathbb{R} (still denoted by \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S}), which satisfy

$$(2.26) \quad \mathcal{B}'(z) = \mathcal{S}'(z) = 0 \text{ on } (-\infty, 0], \quad \mathcal{B}'(z) \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{S}'(z) = 0 \text{ on } [Q, \infty).$$

In view of (2.24), (2.25), and (2.8), one has

$$(2.27) \quad 0 < B_* \leq \mathcal{B}(z) \leq B_* + C\kappa \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < S_* \leq \mathcal{S}(z) \leq S_* + C\kappa, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, it follows from (2.23) that

$$(2.28) \quad \|\mathcal{B}'\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|\bar{B}'\|_{C^{0,1}([0, Q])} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{S}'\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R})} = \|\bar{S}'\|_{C^{0,1}([0, Q])},$$

where the constant C depends on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ .

Now we deduce the relation between $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S})$ and the vorticity $\omega := \partial_x v - \partial_y u$. Differentiating (2.1) and noting that

$$\rho = \left(\frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)S} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

one gets

$$(2.29) \quad \partial_x B = u \partial_x u + v \partial_x v + \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \partial_x S + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_y B = u \partial_y u + v \partial_y v + \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \partial_y S + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho}.$$

These together with

$$(2.30) \quad u \partial_x u + v \partial_y u + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u \partial_x v + v \partial_y v + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho} = 0,$$

which are obtained from the first three equations in (1.3), give

$$(2.31) \quad \partial_x B - \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \partial_x S = v \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_y B - \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \partial_y S = -u \omega.$$

Since it follows from (2.15) and (2.16) that

$$(2.32) \quad (\partial_x B, \partial_y B) = y \rho \mathcal{B}'(\psi)(-v, u) \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_x S, \partial_y S) = y \rho \mathcal{S}'(\psi)(-v, u),$$

substituting (2.32) into (2.31) yields

$$(2.33) \quad \omega = -y \rho \mathcal{B}'(\psi) + \frac{y \rho^\gamma}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(\psi)$$

provided $|\mathbf{u}| \neq 0$. Thus the smooth solution of the full Euler system (1.3) satisfies a system consisting of the continuity equation (1.3)₁, (1.4) and (2.33). Actually, the following proposition shows that the two systems are equivalent under appropriate conditions.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the domain bounded by two streamlines \mathcal{N}_0 (the x -axis) and*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} := \{(x, y) : x = \tilde{N}(y), \underline{h} < y < \bar{H}\},$$

where $0 < \underline{h} < \bar{H} < \infty$ and $\tilde{N} : (\underline{h}, \bar{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 function with

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \bar{H}^-} \tilde{N}(y) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow \underline{h}^+} \tilde{N}(y) = +\infty.$$

Let $\rho : \bar{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $\mathbf{u} = (u, v) : \bar{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ and $p : \bar{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be $C^{1,1}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ and continuous up to $\partial \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ except finitely many points. Suppose \mathbf{u} satisfies the slip boundary condition $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ on $\partial \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) satisfies the upstream asymptotic behavior (1.14), and

$$(2.34) \quad v < 0 \quad \text{in } \tilde{\mathcal{O}}.$$

Then (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) solves the full Euler system (1.3) in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ if and only if (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) solves the system consisting of (1.3)₁, (1.4) and (2.33).

Proof. In view of (2.34), through each point in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ there is one and only one streamline which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{ds} = u(x(s), y(s)) \\ \frac{dy}{ds} = v(x(s), y(s)) \end{cases}$$

and can be defined globally in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. Furthermore, any streamline through some point in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ cannot touch $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. To show this, without loss of generality, we assume that there exists a streamline through $(-x_0, y_0)$ (with $x_0 > 0$ sufficiently large) in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ passing through $(\tilde{x}, 0)$. By the continuity equation (1.3)₁ and the slip boundary condition along each streamline, one has

$$0 = \int_0^{y_0} s(\rho u)(-x_0, s) ds.$$

This contradicts the asymptotic behavior (1.14). As each streamline is globally well-defined in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, from Proposition 2.2 and previous analysis, it suffices to derive the full Euler system (1.3) from the system consisting of (1.3)₁, (1.4) and (2.33).

Combining the equalities (2.33) and (2.15) gives

$$y\rho\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\omega}{y\rho} - \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(\psi) \right) = 0.$$

With the help of the definition of the entropy function in (1.6) and the expression of its gradient in (2.32), one can check that the above equality is equivalent to

$$(2.35) \quad y\rho\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\omega}{y\rho} \right) + \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\partial_y p}{\rho}, -\frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} \right) = 0.$$

Since the continuity equation (1.3)₁ implies

$$y\rho\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\omega}{y\rho} \right) = \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \omega - \omega \frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(y\rho)}{y\rho} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \omega + \omega \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$$

where $\omega = \partial_x v - \partial_y u$, it follows from (2.35) that

$$\partial_x \left(u\partial_x v + v\partial_y v + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho} \right) - \partial_y \left(u\partial_x u + v\partial_y u + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} \right) = 0.$$

Therefore there exists a function Φ such that

$$\partial_x \Phi = u\partial_x u + v\partial_y u + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_y \Phi = u\partial_x v + v\partial_y v + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho}.$$

Moreover, using (1.4) and (2.29) one has

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \left(u\partial_x u + v\partial_y u + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho}, u\partial_x v + v\partial_y v + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho} \right) = 0,$$

that is,

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0.$$

This means Φ is a constant along each streamline, in particular, along \mathcal{N}_0 and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. Besides, the asymptotic behavior (1.14) yields $\partial_y \Phi \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$, so that $\Phi \rightarrow C$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Thus the function $\Phi \equiv C$ in the whole domain $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. This implies that $\partial_x \Phi = \partial_y \Phi \equiv 0$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, i.e., (2.30) holds globally in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$.

Combining the continuity equation (1.3)₁, (1.4) and (2.30) together gives the full Euler system (1.3). This finishes the proof of the proposition. \square

Let us digress for the study on the subsonic states. It follows from the definitions of the Bernoulli function (1.5) and the entropy function (1.6) as well as (2.16) that, for given value z , the flow density ρ and the flow speed q satisfy

$$\mathcal{B}(z) = \frac{q^2}{2} + \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(z),$$

and

$$(2.36) \quad q = \mathbf{q}(\rho, z) = \sqrt{2(\mathcal{B}(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(z))}.$$

Moreover, using (1.6) and the definition of the sound speed (1.2) one has

$$c = \sqrt{(\gamma - 1) \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(z)}.$$

Let

$$(2.37) \quad \varrho_c(z) := \left(\frac{2\mathcal{B}(z)}{(\gamma + 1)\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho_m(z) := \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}(z)}{\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}$$

be the critical density and maximum density respectively. The flow speed $q = \mathbf{q}(\rho, z)$ is well-defined if and only if $\rho \leq \varrho_m(z)$. The flow is subsonic, i.e., $q \in [0, c)$, if and only if $q \in [0, \mathbf{q}(\varrho_c(z), z))$, or equivalently $\rho \in (\varrho_c(z), \varrho_m(z)]$. Denote the square of the momentum and the square of the critical momentum by

$$(2.38) \quad \mathbf{t}(\rho, z) := \rho^2 \mathbf{q}^2(\rho, z) = 2\rho^2(\mathcal{B}(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(z))$$

and

$$(2.39) \quad \mathbf{t}_c(z) := \mathbf{t}(\varrho_c(z), z) = (\gamma - 1) \left(\frac{2\mathcal{B}(z)}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}} \mathcal{S}^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}(z),$$

respectively. In view of (2.27), there exist positive constants C , t_* , and t^* , which depend on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ , such that

$$(2.40) \quad 0 < C \leq \varrho_c(z) < \varrho_m(z) \leq C^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < t_* \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) \leq t^*, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose the density function ρ and the stream function ψ satisfy (2.17). Then the following statements hold.*

(i) The density function ρ can be expressed as a function of $|\nabla\psi/y|^2$ and ψ in the subsonic region, i.e.,

$$(2.41) \quad \rho = \frac{1}{g(|\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}|^2, \psi)}, \quad \text{if } \rho \in (\varrho_c(\psi), \varrho_m(\psi)],$$

where ϱ_c and ϱ_m are functions defined in (2.37), and

$$g : \{(t, z) : 0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}_c(z), z \in \mathbb{R}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a function smooth in t and $C^{1,1}$ in z with \mathbf{t}_c defined in (2.39). Furthermore,

$$(2.42) \quad \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \varrho_m(z) \right)^{-1} =: g_* \leq g(t, z) \leq g^* := \left(\inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \varrho_c(z) \right)^{-1}.$$

(ii) The function g satisfies the identity

$$(2.43) \quad \partial_z g(t, z) = -2\partial_t g(t, z) \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z) - g^{1-\gamma}(t, z)\mathcal{S}'(z)}{g^2(t, z)}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \mathbf{t}_c(z)), z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. (i) From the expression (2.38), the straightforward computations give

$$(2.44) \quad \partial_\rho \mathbf{t}(\rho, z) = 2\rho (2\mathcal{B}(z) - (\gamma + 1)\rho^{\gamma-1}\mathcal{S}(z)).$$

Now one can see that with ϱ_c and ϱ_m defined in (2.37), the following statements hold:

- (a) $\rho \mapsto \mathbf{t}(\rho, z)$ achieves its maximum $\mathbf{t}_c(z)$ at $\rho = \varrho_c(z)$;
- (b) $\partial_\rho \mathbf{t}(\rho, z) < 0$ when $\varrho_c(z) < \rho \leq \varrho_m(z)$.

Thus by the inverse function theorem, if $\rho \in (\varrho_c(z), \varrho_m(z)]$, ρ can be expressed as a function of $t := \mathbf{t}(\rho, z) \in [0, \mathbf{t}_c(z))$ and z , that is, $\rho = \rho(t, z)$. Let

$$(2.45) \quad g(t, z) = \frac{1}{\rho(t, z)}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \mathbf{t}_c(z)).$$

The function g is smooth in t by the inverse function theorem and $C^{1,1}$ in z by the $C^{1,1}$ regularity of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S} . This together with (2.17) completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Differentiating (2.38) with respect to $t := \mathbf{t}(\rho, z)$ gives

$$(2.46) \quad \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\partial_t \rho}{\rho} (t - (\gamma - 1)\rho^{\gamma+1}\mathcal{S}(z)),$$

and differentiating (2.38) with respect to z gives

$$(2.47) \quad \frac{\partial_z \rho}{\rho} (t - (\gamma - 1)\rho^{\gamma+1}\mathcal{S}(z)) = -\rho^2(\mathcal{B}'(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1}\mathcal{S}'(z)).$$

Combining (2.46) and (2.47) together one has

$$\partial_z \rho = -2\rho^2 \partial_t \rho (\mathcal{B}'(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1}\mathcal{S}'(z)).$$

In view of (2.45) one has (2.43). □

Lemma 2.5. *Let (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) be a solution to the system consisting of (1.3)₁, (1.4), and (2.33). Assume (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) satisfies the assumptions in Proposition 2.3. Then in the subsonic region $|\nabla\psi/y|^2 < \mathbf{t}_c(\psi)$, the stream function ψ solves*

$$(2.48) \quad \nabla \cdot \left(g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right) = \frac{y\mathcal{B}'(\psi)}{g(|\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}|^2, \psi)} - \frac{y\mathcal{S}'(\psi)}{\gamma g^\gamma(|\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}|^2, \psi)},$$

where g is defined in (2.41), \mathcal{B} is the Bernoulli function and \mathcal{S} is the entropy function as in Proposition 2.2. Moreover, the equation (2.48) is elliptic if and only if $|\nabla\psi/y|^2 < \mathbf{t}_c(\psi)$.

Proof. Expressing the vorticity ω in terms of the stream function ψ and using (2.33) one has

$$-\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla\psi}{y\rho} \right) = \omega = -y\rho\mathcal{B}'(\psi) + \frac{y\rho^\gamma}{\gamma}\mathcal{S}'(\psi).$$

In view of (2.41) the above equation can be rewritten into (2.48).

The equation (2.48) can be written in the nondivergence form as follows

$$\mathbf{a}^{ij} \left(\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}, \psi \right) \partial_{ij}\psi + \mathbf{b} \left(\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}, \psi \right) = \frac{y^2\mathcal{B}'(\psi)}{g(|\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}|^2, \psi)} - \frac{y^2\mathcal{S}'(\psi)}{\gamma g^\gamma(|\frac{\nabla\psi}{y}|^2, \psi)},$$

where the matrix

$$(\mathbf{a}^{ij}) = g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) I_2 + 2\partial_t g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \otimes \frac{\nabla\psi}{y}$$

is symmetric with the eigenvalues

$$\beta_0 = g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1 = g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + 2\partial_t g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2,$$

and

$$\mathbf{b} = \partial_z g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) |\nabla\psi|^2 - \frac{\partial_y\psi}{y} \left[g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + 2\partial_t g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2 \right].$$

Besides, differentiating the identity $t = \mathbf{t}(\frac{1}{g(t,z)}, z)$ gives

$$(2.49) \quad \partial_t g(t, z) = -\frac{g^2(t, z)}{\partial_\rho \mathbf{t}(\frac{1}{g(t,z)}, z)} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \mathbf{t}_c(z)).$$

This implies

$$\partial_t g(t, z) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \mathbf{t}_c(z)^-} \partial_t g(t, z) = +\infty.$$

Thus β_0 has uniform upper and lower bounds depending only on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ , and β_1 has a uniform lower bound but blows up when $|\nabla\psi/y|^2$ approaches $\mathbf{t}_c(\psi)$. Therefore, the equation (2.48) is elliptic as long as $|\nabla\psi/y|^2 < \mathbf{t}_c(\psi)$, and is singular when $|\nabla\psi/y|^2 = \mathbf{t}_c(\psi)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

2.2. Reformulation for the jet flows in terms of the stream function. Let

$$(2.50) \quad \Lambda := \rho_0 \sqrt{2\bar{B}(\bar{H}) - 2\rho_0^{\gamma-1}\bar{S}(\bar{H})} \quad \text{with} \quad \rho_0 := \left(\frac{\gamma \underline{p}}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(\bar{H})} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$$

be the constant momentum on the free boundary, where \underline{p} is the outer pressure on the free boundary as in Problem 1. From the previous analysis, Problem 1 can be solved as long as the following problem in terms of the stream function ψ is solved.

Problem 2. Let $(\bar{B}, \bar{S}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ be the Bernoulli function and the entropy function at the upstream satisfying (1.11)-(1.13). Let $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$ be the mass flux where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1. One looks for a triple $(\psi, \Gamma_\psi, \Lambda)$ satisfying $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\{\psi < Q\}) \cap C^1(\overline{\{\psi < Q\}})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\partial_x \psi > 0$ in $\{0 < \psi < Q\}$ and

$$(2.51) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) = \frac{y \mathcal{B}'(\psi)}{g(|\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}|^2, \psi)} - \frac{y \mathcal{S}'(\psi)}{\gamma g^\gamma(|\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}|^2, \psi)} & \text{in } \{0 < \psi < Q\}, \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{N}_0, \\ \psi = Q & \text{on } \mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma_\psi, \\ \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right| = \Lambda & \text{on } \Gamma_\psi, \end{cases}$$

where the free boundary $\Gamma_\psi := \partial\{\psi < Q\} \setminus \mathcal{N}$. Furthermore, the free boundary Γ_ψ and the flow

$$(2.52) \quad (\rho, \mathbf{u}, p) = \left(\frac{1}{g(|\nabla \psi/y|^2, \psi)}, \frac{g(|\nabla \psi/y|^2, \psi) \nabla^\perp \psi}{y}, \frac{(\gamma-1)\mathcal{S}(\psi)}{\gamma g^\gamma(|\nabla \psi/y|^2, \psi)} \right)$$

are expected to have the following properties.

- (1) The free boundary Γ_ψ is given by a graph $x = \Upsilon(y)$, $y \in (\underline{H}, 1]$ for some $C^{2,\alpha}$ function Υ and some $\underline{H} \in (0, 1)$.
- (2) The free boundary Γ_ψ fits the nozzle at $A = (0, 1)$ continuously differentiable, i.e., $\Upsilon(1) = N(1)$ and $\Upsilon'(1) = N'(1)$.
- (3) For x sufficiently large, the free boundary is also an x -graph, i.e., it can be written as $y = f(x)$ for some $C^{2,\alpha}$ function f . Furthermore, one has

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = \underline{H} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f'(x) = 0.$$

- (4) The flow is subsonic in the flow region, i.e., $|\nabla \psi/y|^2 < \mathfrak{t}_c(\psi)$ in $\{\psi < Q\}$, where \mathfrak{t}_c is defined in (2.39).

- (5) *At the upstream the flow satisfies the asymptotic behavior (1.14), where the upstream states $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \bar{p})$ are determined in Proposition 2.1. At the downstream the flow satisfies*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} (\rho, \mathbf{u}, p) = (\underline{\rho}, \underline{u}, 0, \underline{p})$$

for some functions $\rho = \rho(y)$ and $\underline{u} = \underline{u}(y)$, and some positive constant \underline{p} .

Remark 2.6. *In fact, the conditions (1.12) and (1.13) imply the vorticity of the flow is small. It follows from (2.18) that the right-hand side of the equation in (2.51) is small.*

The following proposition shows that once we obtain a solution ψ to Problem 2, then ρ , \mathbf{u} , and p defined in (2.52) solve the Euler system (1.3), even if ρ , \mathbf{u} , and p may not be $C^{1,1}$ as required in Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 2.7. *Assume that a function $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\{\psi < Q\}) \cap C^1(\overline{\{\psi < Q\}})$ is a subsonic solution of (2.51), where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then the flow (ρ, \mathbf{u}, p) defined in (2.52) solves the Euler system (1.3) in the flow region $\{0 < \psi < Q\}$.*

Proof. Due to the regularity of the function ψ , the functions ρ , $\mathbf{u} := (u, v)$, and p defined in (2.52) belong to $C^{1,\alpha}(\{\psi < Q\}) \cap C^0(\overline{\{\psi < Q\}})$. Since ρ and \mathbf{u} satisfy (2.15), it follows from the definition of the function g in Lemma 2.4 (i) that the density $\rho = 1/g$ satisfies

$$\frac{u^2 + v^2}{2} + \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(\psi) = \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{2y^2 \rho^2} + \rho^{\gamma-1} \mathcal{S}(\psi) = \mathcal{B}(\psi)$$

in the flow region. Differentiating the above equality with respect to x and y , respectively, one gets

$$(2.53) \quad u \partial_x u + v \partial_x v + \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(\psi) \partial_x \psi + \frac{\partial_x p}{\rho} = \mathcal{B}'(\psi) \partial_x \psi,$$

and

$$(2.54) \quad u \partial_y u + v \partial_y v + \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(\psi) \partial_y \psi + \frac{\partial_y p}{\rho} = \mathcal{B}'(\psi) \partial_y \psi.$$

Note that by the quasilinear equation in (2.51) one has

$$\mathcal{B}'(\psi) - \frac{\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(\psi) = -\frac{\partial_x v - \partial_y u}{y\rho}.$$

Thus the equalities (2.53) and (2.54) together with (2.15) yield (2.30). Note that ρ and \mathbf{u} satisfy the continuity equation (the first equation in (1.3)). Then the Euler system (1.3) follows from the continuity equation, (2.30), and the equality $y\rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{B}(\psi) = 0$ where $\mathcal{B}(\psi)$ satisfies (2.17). This finishes the proof of the proposition. \square

2.3. Subsonic truncation. One of the major difficulties to solve Problem 2 is that the equation (2.48) becomes degenerate as the flows approach the sonic state. Hence we use a subsonic truncation so that after the truncation the equation (2.48) is always uniformly elliptic.

Let $\varpi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth nonincreasing function such that

$$\varpi(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \leq -1, \\ 0 & \text{if } s \leq -\frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad |\varpi'| + |\varpi''| \leq 8.$$

For $\epsilon \in (0, \min\{t_*, 1\}/4)$ with t_* as in (2.40), let $\varpi_\epsilon(s) := \varpi(s/\epsilon)$. We define

$$(2.55) \quad g_\epsilon(t, z) = g(t, z)\varpi_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) + (1 - \varpi_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)))g^*,$$

where $\mathbf{t}_c(z)$ is defined in (2.39) and g^* is the upper bound for g in (2.42). The properties of g_ϵ are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *Let g be the function determined in Lemma 2.4, and let g_ϵ be the subsonic truncation of g defined in (2.55). Then the function $g_\epsilon(t, z)$ is smooth in t and $C^{1,1}$ in z . Furthermore, there exist constants C_* , $C^* > 0$ depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ such that for all $(t, z) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ one has*

$$(2.56) \quad C_* \leq g_\epsilon(t, z) \leq C^*,$$

$$(2.57) \quad C_* \leq g_\epsilon(t, z) + 2\partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z)t \leq C^* \epsilon^{-1},$$

$$(2.58) \quad |\partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z)| \leq C^* \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0, \quad |t \partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z)| \leq C^* \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.4 and the definition of ϖ_ϵ that g_ϵ is smooth with respect to t and $C^{1,1}$ with respect to z .

(i). Clearly (2.56) follows directly from the definition of g_ϵ in (2.55), (2.42), and (2.40).

(ii). To show (2.57), we first claim that if $0 \leq t \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ then

$$(2.59) \quad 0 < \partial_t g(t, z) \leq \epsilon^{-1} g(t, z).$$

In view of the expression of $\partial_t g(t, z)$ in (2.49), it suffices to estimate $\partial_\rho \mathbf{t}(\rho, z)$ at $\rho = \rho(t, z)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. In fact, for $0 \leq t \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, since $\rho > \varrho_c(t, z)$ and $\mathbf{t}_c(z) = (\gamma - 1)\varrho_c^{\gamma+1}(z)\mathcal{S}(z)$, it follows from (2.44) and (2.38) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho \mathbf{t}(\rho, z) &= \frac{2}{\rho} (\mathbf{t}(\rho, z) - (\gamma - 1)\rho^{\gamma+1}\mathcal{S}(z)) \leq \frac{2}{\rho} (\mathbf{t}(\rho, z) - (\gamma - 1)\varrho_c^{\gamma+1}(z)\mathcal{S}(z)) \\ &= \frac{2}{\rho} (\mathbf{t}(\rho, z) - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using (2.45) and (2.49) one has (2.59).

A straightforward computation gives

$$(2.60) \quad \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z) = \partial_t g(t, z) \varpi_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) + (g(t, z) - g^*) \varpi'_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)).$$

Combining (2.59), (2.42) and the definition of ϖ_ϵ together gives

$$(2.61) \quad 0 < \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z) \leq C\epsilon^{-1}$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$. Note that $\partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z)$ is supported in $\{(t, z) : 0 \leq t \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \epsilon/2, z \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The estimate (2.57) follows directly from (2.56) and (2.61).

(iii). Direct computations yield

$$(2.62) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z) &= \partial_z g(t, z) \varpi_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) + (g^* - g(t, z)) \varpi'_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \mathbf{t}'_c(z) \\ &\stackrel{(2.43)}{=} -2\partial_t g(t, z) \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z) - g^{1-\gamma}(t, z) \mathcal{S}'(z)}{g^2(t, z)} \varpi_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \\ &\quad + (g^* - g(t, z)) \varpi'_\epsilon(t - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \mathbf{t}'_c(z), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.63) \quad \mathbf{t}'_c(z) = \left(\frac{2}{\gamma+1} \right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}} \left((\gamma+1) \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}(z)}{\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \mathcal{B}'(z) - 2 \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}(z)}{\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}} \mathcal{S}'(z) \right)$$

by the definition of \mathbf{t}_c in (2.39). Thus using the expression of $\partial_t g_\epsilon$ in (2.60), the boundedness of $g(t, z)$ in (2.42), the definition of κ_0 in (2.18), and (2.28) one has

$$(2.64) \quad |\partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z)| \leq C(|\mathcal{B}'(z)| + |\mathcal{S}'(z)|) \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z) \leq C\kappa_0 \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z)$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$. This together with (2.61) gives the first estimate in (2.58). Furthermore, noting that $\partial_z g_\epsilon = 0$ for $t \geq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and that $\mathbf{t}_c(z) \leq t^*$ (cf. (2.40)), using (2.64) and (2.61) again one has

$$|t \partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z)| \leq t^* C \kappa_0 \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z) \leq C^* \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0.$$

This finishes the proof for (2.58). \square

3. VARIATIONAL FORMULATION FOR THE FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM

In this section, we show that the quasilinear equation (2.48) is an Euler-Lagrange equation for an energy functional, so that the jet problem can be characterized by a variational problem.

Let Ω be the domain bounded by \mathcal{N}_0 and $\mathcal{N} \cup ([0, \infty) \times \{1\})$. Notice that Ω is unbounded, so we make an approximation by considering the problems in a series of truncated domains $\Omega_{\mu, R} := \Omega \cap \{-\mu < x < R\}$, where μ and R are positive numbers. To define the functional, we set

$$(3.1) \quad G_\epsilon(t, z) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t g_\epsilon(s, z) ds + \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} (g_\epsilon^{-\gamma}(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z) - g_\epsilon^{-\gamma}(0, Q) \mathcal{S}(Q)),$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad \Phi_\epsilon(t, z) := -G_\epsilon(t, z) + 2\partial_t G_\epsilon(t, z)t.$$

In view of the elliptic condition (2.57), straightforward computations yield

$$(3.3) \quad 0 < \frac{1}{2}C_* \leq \partial_t \Phi_\epsilon(t, z) = \frac{1}{2}g_\epsilon(t, z) + \partial_t g_\epsilon(t, z)t \leq \frac{1}{2}C^* \epsilon^{-1}.$$

Since $\Phi_\epsilon(0, Q) = -G_\epsilon(0, Q) = 0$, one has $\Phi_\epsilon(t, Q) > 0$ for $t > 0$.

Given a function $\psi_{\mu, R}^\# \in C(\partial\Omega_{\mu, R}) \cap H^1(\Omega_{\mu, R})$ with $0 \leq \psi_{\mu, R}^\# \leq Q$. We consider the following minimization problem:

$$(3.4) \quad \text{find } \psi \in K_{\psi_{\mu, R}^\#} \text{ s.t. } J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\psi) = \inf_{\phi \in K_{\psi_{\mu, R}^\#}} J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\phi),$$

where the functional

$$(3.5) \quad J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\phi) := \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y} \right|^2, \phi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\phi < Q\}} \right] dX, \quad \lambda_\epsilon := \sqrt{\Phi_\epsilon(\Lambda^2, Q)}$$

with Λ given by (2.50), and the admissible set

$$(3.6) \quad K_{\psi_{\mu, R}^\#} := \{\phi \in H^1(\Omega_{\mu, R}) : \phi = \psi_{\mu, R}^\# \text{ on } \partial\Omega_{\mu, R}\}.$$

The existence and the Hölder regularity of minimizers for (3.4) will be shown in Lemmas 4.2 and 4.7, respectively. Assuming the existence and continuity of a minimizer ψ firstly, we derive the Euler-Lagrange equation for the minimization problem (3.4) in the open set $\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let ψ be a minimizer of the minimization problem (3.4). Assume that $\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ is open. Then ψ is a solution to*

$$(3.7) \quad \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) = y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}.$$

Furthermore, if $|\nabla \psi / y|^2 \leq \mathfrak{t}_c(\psi) - \epsilon$, it holds that

$$(3.8) \quad \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) = \frac{\mathcal{B}'(\psi)}{g(|\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}|^2, \psi)} - \frac{\mathcal{S}'(\psi)}{\gamma g^\gamma(|\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}|^2, \psi)}.$$

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q\})$. Direct computations give

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\psi + \tau\eta) \Big|_{\tau=0} = \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} 2\partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \cdot \nabla \eta + y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \eta.$$

By the definition of G_ϵ in (3.1), minimizers of (3.4) satisfy the equation (3.7).

Next, by the definitions of G_ϵ in (3.1) and g_ϵ in (2.55) one has

$$\partial_z G_\epsilon(t, z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \partial_z g(s, z) ds - (\gamma - 1) g^{-\gamma-1}(0, z) \partial_z g(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} g^{-\gamma}(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z)$$

in $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon := \{(t, z) : 0 \leq t \leq t_c(z) - \epsilon, z \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Using (2.43) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \partial_z g(s, z) ds &= - \int_0^t \partial_t g(s, z) \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z) - g^{1-\gamma}(s, z) \mathcal{S}'(z)}{g^2(s, z)} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \partial_t \rho(s, z) \mathcal{B}'(z) ds - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^t \partial_t \rho^\gamma(s, z) \mathcal{S}'(z) ds \\ &= \mathcal{B}'(z) (\rho(t, z) - \rho(0, z)) - \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{S}'(z) (\rho^\gamma(t, z) - \rho^\gamma(0, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $t = 0$ in (2.47) gives

$$\partial_z \rho(0, z) = \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1}(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z)}{(\gamma - 1) \rho^{\gamma-2}(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z)},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} -(\gamma - 1) g^{-\gamma-1}(0, z) \partial_z g(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z) &= (\gamma - 1) \rho^{\gamma-1}(0, z) \partial_z \rho(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z) \\ (3.9) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \rho(0, z) (\mathcal{B}'(z) - \rho^{\gamma-1}(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it holds

$$\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} g^{-\gamma}(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z) = \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \rho^\gamma(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z).$$

Combining the above equalities together gives

$$(3.10) \qquad \qquad \partial_z G_\epsilon(t, z) = \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z)}{g(t, z)} - \frac{\mathcal{S}'(z)}{\gamma g^\gamma(t, z)} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}_\epsilon.$$

This finishes the proof for the lemma. \square

The following lemma shows that minimizers of (3.4) satisfy the free boundary condition in a weak sense.

Lemma 3.2. *Let ψ be a minimizer of the minimization problem (3.4). Assume that $\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ is open. Then*

$$\Phi_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) = \lambda_\epsilon^2 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\psi := \Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \partial\{\psi < Q\}$$

in the sense that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial\{\psi < Q-s\}} y \left[\Phi_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) - \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] (\eta \cdot \nu) d\mathcal{H}^1 = 0 \quad \text{for any } \eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{\mu, R}; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

where \mathcal{H}^1 is the one-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Remark 3.3 (Relation between λ_ϵ and Λ). *If the free boundary Γ_ψ is smooth and ψ is smooth near Γ_ψ , then it follows from the monotonicity of $t \mapsto \Phi_\epsilon(t, z)$ for each z and the definition of λ_ϵ in (3.5) that $|\nabla\psi/y| = \Lambda$ on Γ_ψ . Moreover, since*

$$\lambda_\epsilon^2 = \Phi_\epsilon(\Lambda^2, Q) = \Phi_\epsilon(0, Q) + \int_0^{\Lambda^2} \partial_t \Phi_\epsilon(s, Q) ds,$$

then in view of (3.3) and $\Phi_\epsilon(0, Q) = 0$ one has

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{1}{2}C_*\Lambda^2 \leq \lambda_\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}C^*\epsilon^{-1}\Lambda^2,$$

where C_* and C^* are the same constants as in (2.57).

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{\mu, R}; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\eta_\tau(X) := X + \tau\eta(X)$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. If $|\tau|$ is sufficiently small, then η_τ is a diffeomorphism of $\Omega_{\mu, R}$. Define $\psi_\tau(X) := \psi(\eta_\tau^{-1}(X))$. Since $\psi_\tau \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi_\mu, R}^\#$ and ψ is a minimizer, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\psi_\tau) - J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon(\psi) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} (y + \tau\eta_2) \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi(\nabla\eta_\tau)^{-1}}{y + \tau\eta_2} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \det(\nabla\eta_\tau) \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \\ &= \tau \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \nabla \cdot \eta \\ &\quad + \tau \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi(\nabla\eta_\tau)^{-1}}{y + \tau\eta_2} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \eta_2 \\ &\quad - 2\tau \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \left(\frac{\eta_2 I}{y + \tau\eta_2} + \nabla\eta \right) \frac{(\nabla\psi)^T}{y} + o(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Hence dividing τ on both sides of the above equality and letting $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \nabla \cdot \eta \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \eta_2 \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R}} y \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla\psi}{y} \left(\frac{\eta_2 I}{y} + \nabla\eta \right) \frac{(\nabla\psi)^T}{y}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] \nabla \cdot \eta \\
 &= \nabla \cdot \left\{ y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] \eta \right\} - 2y \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \eta \\
 &\quad - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \nabla \psi \cdot \eta - \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] \eta_2
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \eta + \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \nabla \eta \frac{(\nabla \psi)^T}{y} = \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \cdot \eta \right) + \frac{1}{y^3} (\eta_1 \partial_x \psi \partial_y \psi - \eta_2 (\partial_x \psi)^2).$$

Using the divergence theorem and (3.7) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q-s\}} \left\{ y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] \nabla \cdot \eta + \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] \eta_2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - 2 \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 \eta_2 - 2y \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \nabla \eta \frac{(\nabla \psi)^T}{y} \right\} \\
 &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial\{\psi < Q-s\}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) - 2 \partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] (\eta \cdot \nu) \\
 &\quad + \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{\psi < Q-s\}} \left[2 \nabla \cdot \left(\partial_t G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \right] \nabla \psi \cdot \eta \\
 &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial\{\psi < Q-s\}} y \left[-\Phi_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \right] (\eta \cdot \nu).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

4. THE EXISTENCE AND REGULARITY FOR THE FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM

In this section, we study the existence and regularity of minimizers for the minimization problem (3.4), as well as the regularity of the free boundary away from the nozzle.

4.1. Existence of minimizers. For the ease of notations in the rest of this section, let

(4.1)

$$\mathcal{D} := \Omega_{\mu, R} = \Omega \cap \{-\mu < x < R\}, \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) := G_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z), \quad \mathcal{J} := J_{\mu, R, \Lambda}^\epsilon, \quad \lambda := \lambda_\epsilon.$$

Then \mathcal{D} is a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^2 and is contained in the infinite strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \bar{H}]$, $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth in \mathbf{p} and $C^{1,1}$ in z , and λ is a positive constant. The problem (3.4) can be rewritten as

$$(4.2) \quad \text{find } \psi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\sharp} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{J}(\psi) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\sharp}} \mathcal{J}(\phi)$$

with

$$\mathcal{J}(\phi) := \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\phi < Q\}} \right] dX,$$

and the admissible set

$$\mathcal{K}_{\psi^\sharp} := \{\phi \in H^1(\mathcal{D}) : \phi = \psi^\sharp \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{D}\}.$$

Here $\psi^\sharp : \bar{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given, $\psi^\sharp \in H^1(\mathcal{D}) \cap C(\partial\mathcal{D})$, and $0 \leq \psi^\sharp \leq Q$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}$.

The properties of \mathcal{G} are summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let G_ϵ be defined in (3.1) and \mathcal{G} be defined in (4.1). Then the following properties hold.*

- (i) *There exist two positive constants $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{b}_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$ and $\mathbf{b}^* = \mathbf{b}^*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ such that*

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbf{b}_* |\mathbf{p}|^2 \leq p_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) \leq \mathbf{b}_*^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|^2,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbf{b}_* |\xi|^2 \leq \xi_i \partial_{p_i p_j} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) \xi_j \leq \mathbf{b}^* |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

- (ii) *One has*

$$(4.5) \quad \partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, 0], \quad \partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) \geq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times [Q, \infty).$$

- (iii) *There exists a constant*

$$(4.6) \quad \delta := C\epsilon^{-1}\kappa_0(\kappa_0 + 1) \leq C_\delta,$$

where κ_0 is defined in (2.18), $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$, and $C_\delta = C_\delta(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$, such that

$$(4.7) \quad \epsilon^{-1} |\partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| + |\mathbf{p} \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| + |\partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| + |\partial_{zz} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| \leq \delta,$$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, Q) = 0, \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) \geq \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2} |\mathbf{p}|^2 - \delta \min\{Q, (Q - z)_+\}.$$

Proof. (i). In view of the definition of G_ϵ in (3.1), straightforward computations yield

$$p_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) = g_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) |\mathbf{p}|^2,$$

$$\partial_{p_i p_j} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) = g_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) \delta_{ij} + 2\partial_t g_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) p_i p_j.$$

Thus one gets (4.3) and (4.4) from (2.56) and (2.57).

(ii). Note that

$$g_\epsilon(t, z) = g(t, z) \quad \text{in } \{(t, z) : 0 \leq t \leq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \epsilon, z \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

By the definition of \mathcal{G} one has

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \partial_z g_\epsilon(\tau, z) d\tau - (\gamma - 1) g^{-\gamma-1}(0, z) \partial_z g(0, z) \mathcal{S}(z) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} g^{-\gamma}(0, z) \mathcal{S}'(z) \\ &\stackrel{(3.9)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \partial_z g_\epsilon(\tau, z) d\tau + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z)}{g(0, z)} - \frac{\mathcal{S}'(z)}{\gamma g^\gamma(0, z)}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with the explicit expression for $\partial_z g_\epsilon$ in (2.62) and an integration by parts yields that

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) &= - \int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(z)}{g(\tau, z)} - \frac{\mathcal{S}'(z)}{\gamma g(\tau, z)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} (g^* - g(\tau, z)) \mathbf{t}'_c(z) \right) \varpi'_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) d\tau \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(z)}{g(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z)} - \frac{\mathcal{S}'(z)}{\gamma g(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z)^\gamma} \right) \varpi_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2 - \mathbf{t}_c(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{B}'(z) = \mathcal{S}'(z) = 0$ on $(-\infty, 0]$ and $\mathcal{B}'(z) \geq 0$, $\mathcal{S}'(z) = 0$ on $[Q, \infty)$, cf. (2.26). If we can show

$$(4.11) \quad g(\tau, z)(g^* - g(\tau, z)) \left(\frac{2\mathcal{B}(z)}{(\gamma + 1)\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \leq 1$$

in the set $\mathcal{R} := \{(\tau, z) : \tau \in [0, \mathbf{t}_c(z)], z \in (-\infty, 0] \cup [Q, \infty)\}$, then it follows from the expression of \mathbf{t}'_c in (2.63), $\varpi'_\epsilon \leq 0$, $\varpi_\epsilon \geq 0$, and $g \geq 0$ that $\partial_z \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)$ is a positive multiple of $\mathcal{B}'(z)$ in \mathcal{R} . In view of (2.26), we consequently conclude that (4.5) holds true. Now it remains to prove (4.11). In fact, by (2.42) and (2.37) one has

$$(4.12) \quad 0 \leq 4g(\tau, z)(g^* - g(\tau, z)) \leq (g^*)^2 = \left(\inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{2\mathcal{B}(z)}{(\gamma + 1)\mathcal{S}(z)} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Since the constant κ in (1.13) can be sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ , using (4.12) and the bounds of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S} in (2.27), one obtains (4.11). This finishes the proof of (ii).

(iii). It follows from the upper bound of κ_0 in (2.18) (where κ is sufficiently small) that the constant δ defined in (4.6) satisfies $\delta \leq C_\delta$ for some $C_\delta = C_\delta(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$.

Proof for (4.7). Combining the expression of $\partial_z \mathcal{G}$ in (4.9), the inequality (2.64), the estimate for g_ϵ in (2.56), and the definition of κ_0 in (2.18) together yields the estimate for the first term in (4.7).

A direct differentiation of $\partial_z \mathcal{G}$ gives

$$\partial_{p_i z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) = p_i \partial_z g_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z).$$

Note that $\partial_z g_\epsilon(t, z) = 0$ for $t \geq \mathbf{t}_c(z) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus using (2.58) one has

$$|\mathbf{p} \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| + |\partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)| \leq C^* \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0 (t^* + \sqrt{t^*}) \leq C \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0,$$

where t^* is the upper bound of $\mathbf{t}_c(z)$ in (2.40) and $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$. This gives the estimate for the second and third terms in (4.7).

In the end, by the expression for $\partial_z \mathcal{G}$ in (4.9) one has

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{zz} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \partial_{zz} g_\epsilon(\tau, z) d\tau + \frac{\mathcal{B}''(z)}{g(0, z)} - \frac{\mathcal{B}'(z)}{g^2(0, z)} \partial_z g(0, z) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mathcal{S}''(z)}{\gamma g^\gamma(0, z)} + \frac{\mathcal{S}'(z)}{g^{\gamma+1}(0, z)} \partial_z g(0, z). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term, we infer from (2.62) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{zz} g_\epsilon(\tau, z) &= 2 \left(\mathcal{B}''(z) \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{g(\tau, z)} \right) + \mathcal{B}'(z) \partial_{zt} \left(\frac{1}{g(\tau, z)} \right) \right) \varpi_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{\gamma} \left(\mathcal{S}''(z) \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{g^\gamma(\tau, z)} \right) + \mathcal{S}'(z) \partial_{zt} \left(\frac{1}{g^\gamma(\tau, z)} \right) \right) \varpi_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) \\ &\quad + 2 \partial_z g(\tau, z) \frac{d}{dz} \varpi(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) + (g(\tau, z) - g^*) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} \varpi(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We plug it into the expression of $\partial_{zz} \mathcal{G}$. For the term involving $\partial_{zt} \left(\frac{1}{g(\tau, z)} \right)$, an integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \partial_{zt} \left(\frac{1}{g(\tau, z)} \right) \varpi_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) d\tau \\ &= - \frac{\partial_z g}{g^2}(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) \varpi_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2 - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) + \frac{\partial_z g}{g^2}(0, z) + \int_0^{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \frac{\partial_z g}{g^2}(\tau, z) \varpi'_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

The term involving $\partial_{zt} \left(\frac{1}{g^\gamma(\tau, z)} \right)$ can be estimated similarly as above. Note that

$$|\varpi''_\epsilon(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z))| \leq 8\epsilon^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{supp}(\varpi''(\tau - \mathbf{t}_c(z)))| \leq \epsilon.$$

Thus we infer (2.18), (2.58) and (2.42) that

$$|\partial_{zz} \mathcal{G}| \leq C \epsilon^{-1} \kappa_0 (\kappa_0 + 1),$$

where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$. Thus we obtain the estimate for the last term in (4.7).

Proof for (4.8). In view of (3.1), one has $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, Q) = 0$. The second inequality in (4.8) follows directly from the strong convexity in \mathbf{p} and the estimates of derivatives

in z . More precisely, the strong convexity property (4.4) gives that

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) \geq \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z) + \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2} |\mathbf{p}|^2,$$

where we have also used that $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z) = 0$ (since $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) = 2\mathbf{p} \partial_t g_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z)$). To estimate $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z)$ we use a first order Taylor expansion at $z = Q$ together with the estimate of $|\partial_z \mathcal{G}|$ in (4.7). Note that $\epsilon < 1/4$. Then for $z \in [0, Q]$, one has

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z) \geq -\delta(Q - z).$$

Moreover, in view of (4.5), one has

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \geq -\delta Q \quad \text{for } z < 0, \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, z) \geq \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{0}, Q) = 0 \quad \text{for } z > Q.$$

Combining the above estimates together we obtain the second inequality of (4.8). This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

With Proposition 4.1 at hand, the existence of minimizers for the minimization problem (4.2) follows from standard theory for calculus of variations.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume \mathcal{G} satisfies (4.4) and (4.8). Then the minimization problem (4.2) has a minimizer.*

Proof. Obviously, there exists a function $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\#}$ such that $\mathcal{J}(\tilde{\psi}) < \infty$. In view of (4.8), one can find a minimizing sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(\psi_n) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\#}} \mathcal{J}(\phi)$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2\bar{H}} \int_{\mathcal{D}} |\nabla \psi_n|^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2} \int_{\mathcal{D}} \frac{|\nabla \psi_n|^2}{y} \leq \mathcal{J}(\psi_n) + \delta Q \bar{H} |\mathcal{D}|.$$

Then it follows from the Poincaré inequality that $\psi_n - \psi^\#$ is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{D})$. Thus there exist a subsequence (relabelled) and a function $\psi \in H^1(\mathcal{D})$ such that

$$\psi_n \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{D}) \cap L^2(\partial\mathcal{D}), \quad \psi_n \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \psi_n \rightharpoonup \nabla \psi \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{D}).$$

Note that \mathcal{G} is convex with respect to \mathbf{p} . Using Fatou's lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\psi) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}} \right] \\ (4.14) \quad &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi_n}{y}, \psi_n \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi_n < Q\}} \right] \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}(\psi_n), \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\psi \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\#}$ is a minimizer. \square

4.2. L^∞ -estimate and Hölder regularity. In this subsection we establish the L^∞ -bound and the Hölder regularity for a minimizer. Firstly, one can show that a minimizer of the minimization problem (4.2) is a supersolution of the elliptic equation

$$(4.15) \quad \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) - y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) = 0.$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then ψ satisfies*

$$(4.16) \quad \int_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \partial_i \eta + y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \eta \right] \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } \eta \geq 0, \eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{D}).$$

Proof. For any $\tau > 0$, since $\{\psi + \tau\eta < Q\} \subset \{\psi < Q\}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{J}(\psi + \tau\eta) - \mathcal{J}(\psi)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla(\psi + \tau\eta)}{y}, \psi + \tau\eta \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla(\psi + \tau\eta)}{y}, \psi + \tau\eta \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi + \tau\eta \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi + \tau\eta \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yields (4.16). \square

Next, one has the following L^∞ -estimate for a minimizer ψ .

Lemma 4.4. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2), then*

$$0 \leq \psi \leq Q.$$

Proof. Set $\psi^\tau = \psi + \tau \min\{0, Q - \psi\}$ for $\tau > 0$. Since $\psi^\# \leq Q$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}$, one has $\psi^\tau = \psi^\#$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}$ and thus $\psi^\tau \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi^\#}$. Since $\{\psi^\tau < Q\} = \{\psi < Q\}$ and \mathcal{G} is convex with respect to \mathbf{p} , using the same arguments as in Lemma 4.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{J}(\psi^\tau) - \mathcal{J}(\psi)) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}} \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi^\tau \right) \partial_i (\min\{0, Q - \psi\}) + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathcal{D}} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi^\tau \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\tau \rightarrow 0$, by (4.5) and (4.3) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi > Q\}} -\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \partial_i \psi + \int_{\mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi > Q\}} y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) (Q - \psi) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi > Q\}} -\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \partial_i \psi \leq -\mathbf{b}_* \int_{\mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi > Q\}} \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{y}, \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\psi \leq Q$.

Similarly the lower bound can be obtained by setting $\tilde{\psi}^\tau = \psi - \tau \min(0, \psi)$ with $\tau > 0$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we prove a comparison principle for the associated elliptic equation (4.15).

Lemma 4.5. *Given a domain $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathbb{R} \times (a, a + \tilde{h})$ for some $a \in [0, \bar{H}]$ and $\tilde{h} > 0$. Let $\psi \in H^1(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ be a supersolution of the equation (4.15) in the sense of (4.16) and $\phi \in H^1(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ be a solution of (4.15) in the sense of*

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \partial_i \eta + y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \eta \right] = 0, \quad \text{for all } \eta \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}).$$

Assume that $\psi \geq \phi$ on $\partial \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Then $\psi \geq \phi$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ as long as $\tilde{h} \leq h_0$ for some constant $h_0 > 0$ depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and ϵ .

Proof. Take $\eta = (\phi - \psi)^+$ as the test function in (4.16) and (4.17), then

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \partial_i \eta + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} y \left[\partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \eta \leq 0.$$

Using the convexity of \mathcal{G} in (4.4) and the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \partial_i \eta \\ & \geq \mathfrak{b}_* \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \frac{|\nabla \eta|^2}{y} + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \partial_i \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last integral in the above inequality can be estimated from (4.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \partial_i \eta \\ & = \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \left[(\phi - \psi) \int_0^1 \partial_{p_{iz}} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, s\phi + (1-s)\psi \right) ds \right] \partial_i \eta \geq -\delta \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta| \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (4.7) and the triangle inequality yields

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} y \left[\partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) - \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right] \eta \geq -\delta \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} (|\nabla \eta| \eta + y \eta^2).$$

Combining the above estimates together gives

$$\mathfrak{b}_* \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \frac{|\nabla \eta|^2}{y} \leq 2\delta \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta| \eta + \delta \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} y \eta^2.$$

Since the domain $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is contained in the finite strip $\mathbb{R} \times (a, a + \tilde{h})$ where $a \in [0, \bar{H}]$ and $\tilde{h} > 0$, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Poincaré inequality to $\eta(x, \cdot)$

for each x , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta|^2 &\leq \frac{\bar{H} + \tilde{h}}{\mathbf{b}_*} \left[\frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2(\bar{H} + \tilde{h})} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \frac{2\delta^2(\bar{H} + \tilde{h})}{\mathbf{b}_*} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \eta^2 + \delta(\bar{H} + \tilde{h}) \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \eta^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta|^2 + C(\bar{H} + \tilde{h})^2 \left(\frac{2\delta}{\mathbf{b}_*} + 1 \right) \frac{\delta}{\mathbf{b}_*} \tilde{h}^2 \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} |\nabla \eta|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant. Note that $\delta/\mathbf{b}_* \leq C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ by the definitions of \mathbf{b}_* and δ in Proposition 4.1. Thus if $\tilde{h} \leq h_0$ for some $h_0 = h_0(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ sufficiently small, then $\nabla \eta = 0$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, which implies that $\eta = 0$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 4.6. *It follows from the proof of Lemma 4.5 that if the L^∞ -bounds of $|\partial_{\mathbf{p}z}\mathcal{G}|$ and $|\partial_{zz}\mathcal{G}|$ are sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and \tilde{h} , then the comparison principle still holds in the domain $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ even if the width \tilde{h} is large.*

Now we are in position to prove the Hölder regularity for minimizers. The proof follows from standard Morrey type estimates.

Lemma 4.7. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2), then $\psi \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\psi\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\mathcal{D}')} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_*, \delta, \mathcal{D}', Q, \lambda, \alpha) \quad \text{for any } \mathcal{D}' \Subset \mathcal{D}.$$

Proof. Given any $B_r \subset \mathcal{D}' \Subset \mathcal{D}$ with r sufficiently small such that the comparison principle (cf. Lemma 4.5) holds in B_r . Let $\phi \in H^1(B_r)$ be a minimizer for the energy functional $\int_{B_r} y \mathcal{G}(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi)$ among $\phi \in H^1(B_r)$ with boundary trace $\phi = \psi$ on ∂B_r . Then ϕ is a solution of the following problem

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) - y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) = 0 & \text{in } B_r \\ \phi = \psi & \text{on } \partial B_r. \end{cases}$$

By the comparison principle one has $0 \leq \phi \leq Q$ in B_r . Moreover, it follows from the interior regularity for elliptic PDE (cf. for example [30]) that

$$\|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(B_{\hat{r}})} \leq C \frac{\hat{r}}{r} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(B_r)} + Cr^2 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \hat{r} \leq r,$$

for some $C = C(\mathbf{b}_*, \delta, \mathcal{D}')$. Define

$$\tilde{\psi} := \begin{cases} \phi & \text{in } B_r, \\ \psi & \text{in } \mathcal{D} \setminus B_r. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\psi} \in H^1(\mathcal{D})$. Since ψ is a minimizer of (4.2), it holds

$$(4.19) \quad \int_{B_r} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \tilde{\psi}}{y}, \tilde{\psi} \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \right] \leq \lambda^2 \int_{B_r} y (\chi_{\{\phi < Q\}} - \chi_{\{\psi < Q\}}).$$

By the Taylor expansion, (4.4) and (4.7), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_r} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \right] \\ & \geq \int_{B_r} \left[\partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \partial_i (\psi - \phi) + y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) (\psi - \phi) \right] \\ & \quad + \int_{B_r} \frac{y}{2} \left(\mathfrak{b}_* \left| \frac{\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi}{y} \right|^2 - \delta \left| \frac{\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi}{y} \right| |\psi - \phi| - \delta |\psi - \phi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then using (4.18) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the right-hand side of the above inequality gives

$$(4.20) \quad \int_{B_r} y \left[\mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) - \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{y}, \phi \right) \right] \geq \frac{\mathfrak{b}_*}{4} \int_{B_r} \frac{|\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi|^2}{y} - C \int_{B_r} y |\psi - \phi|^2,$$

where $C = C(\mathfrak{b}_*, \delta)$. Combining (4.19) and (A.6) together, one has

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla \psi - \nabla \phi|^2 \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_*, \delta, \mathcal{D}') \int_{B_r} (|\psi - \phi|^2 + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi=Q\}}) \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_*, \delta, \mathcal{D}', Q, \lambda) r^2.$$

The desired Hölder regularity then follows from the standard Morrey type estimates (cf. [30, the proof for Theorem 3.8]). \square

4.3. Lipschitz regularity and nondegeneracy. In this subsection we establish the (optimal) Lipschitz regularity and the nondegeneracy property of minimizers, which play an important role to get the measure theoretic properties of the free boundary.

Consider the rescaled function

$$(4.21) \quad \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(X) := \frac{Q - \psi(\bar{X} + rX)}{r}, \quad \text{for } \bar{X} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

If ψ is a minimizer of (4.2), then $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ is a minimizer of

$$\mathcal{J}_{\bar{X},r}(\phi) := \int_{\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r}} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\phi > 0\}} \right] dX$$

over the admissible set

$$\mathcal{K}_{\bar{X},r,\psi^\sharp} := \{ \phi \in H^1(\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r}) : \phi(X) = (Q - \psi^\sharp(\bar{X} + rX))/r \text{ on } \partial \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r} \},$$

where

$$(4.22) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) := \mathcal{G}(-\mathbf{p}, Q - rz) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r} := \{(X - \bar{X})/r : X \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

Moreover, $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ satisfies

$$(4.23) \quad \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi_{\bar{X},r}^* \right) - (\bar{y} + ry) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi_{\bar{X},r}^* \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r},$$

and

$$(4.24) \quad \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi_{\bar{X},r}^* \right) - (\bar{y} + ry) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi_{\bar{X},r}^* \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r} \cap \{\psi_{\bar{X},r}^* > 0\}.$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that the function $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r$ satisfies the following properties:

$$(4.25) \quad \mathbf{b}_* |\mathbf{p}|^2 \leq p_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) \leq \mathbf{b}_*^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|^2,$$

$$(4.26) \quad \mathbf{b}_* |\xi|^2 \leq \xi_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) \xi_j \leq \mathbf{b}^* |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

$$(4.27) \quad \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times [Q/r, \infty), \quad \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) \leq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, 0],$$

$$(4.28) \quad \epsilon^{-1} |\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z)| + |\partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z)| \leq r\delta \leq rC_\delta, \quad |\partial_{zz} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z)| \leq r^2\delta,$$

$$(4.29) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(0, 0) = 0, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) \geq \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2} |\mathbf{p}|^2 - \delta r z_+,$$

where the constants $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{b}_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$, $\mathbf{b}^* = \mathbf{b}^*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$, δ , and $C_\delta = C_\delta(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ are the same as in Proposition 4.1. Besides, using $\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, 0) \leq 0$ and the second estimate in (4.28) one has

$$(4.30) \quad \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z) \leq r^2 \delta z_+.$$

Furthermore, similar arguments as in Lemma 4.5 (see also Remark 4.6) give that, there exists a constant

$$(4.31) \quad r^* := r^*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$$

such that solutions to the rescaled equation (4.24) enjoy the comparison principle in $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X},r} \cap B_4$ as well provided $r \leq r^*$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Let $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ satisfy $\text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi) \leq \bar{r} \min\{\lambda, 1\} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \partial\mathcal{D})$, where $\bar{r} = \bar{r}(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) \in (0, 1/4)$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$Q - \psi(\bar{X}) \leq C \lambda \bar{y} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi).$$

Proof. Let $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(X)$ be defined in (4.21) with $r := \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi) \in (0, \bar{r} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \partial\mathcal{D}))$, where $\bar{r} > 0$ is a small constant to be determined later. Then $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ satisfies (4.23)-(4.24). Suppose

$$(4.32) \quad m_0 := \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(0) \geq C_m \lambda \bar{y}$$

for a sufficiently large constant $C_m = C_m(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$. If we can derive a contradiction, then the desired conclusion follows. For notational convenience, we omit the subscript \bar{X} and r of $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ in the following proof.

Step 1. Construction of the barrier function. For any given $X_0 \in \Gamma_{\psi^*} \cap \bar{B}_1$, let ϕ be the solution of

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) - (\bar{y} + ry) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) = 0 & \text{in } B_2(X_0), \\ \phi = \psi^* & \text{on } \partial B_2(X_0). \end{cases}$$

In view of (4.23), the function $\phi \geq \psi^*$ in $B_2(X_0)$ provided $r \leq r^* \bar{y} / \bar{H} \leq r^*$, where r^* is given by (4.31). In particular, $\phi(0) \geq \psi^*(0) = m_0$. Thus it follows from (4.28), (4.32) and the Harnack inequality (cf. [29, Theorems 8.17 and 8.18]) that there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(4.34) \quad \phi(X) \geq C_0 m_0 \quad \text{for any } X \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0),$$

provided $r \leq r_1 \lambda \bar{y}$ for some $r_1 = r_1(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$. We claim that if $r \leq r_1 \bar{y}$ for a possibly smaller r_1 with the same parameter dependence, then there exists a constant $\bar{C} < 1/2$ such that

$$(4.35) \quad \phi(X) \geq \bar{C} C_0 m_0 (2 - |X - X_0|) \quad \text{for any } X \in B_2(X_0).$$

Indeed, by (4.34), it suffices to prove (4.35) in $B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0)$. For any fixed large constant $\tau > 4$, set

$$\Phi_0(X) := C_0 m_0 \left(e^{-\tau |X - X_0|^2} - e^{-4\tau} \right).$$

Then for $X \in B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0)$, it follows from (4.26), (4.28), and (4.30) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) - (\bar{y} + ry) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \\ &= \partial_{p_i p_j} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \frac{\partial_{ij} \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry} - r \partial_{p_i p_2} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \frac{\partial_i \Phi_0}{(\bar{y} + ry)^2} \\ & \quad + \partial_{p_i z} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \partial_i \Phi_0 - (\bar{y} + ry) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \\ & \geq C_0 m_0 e^{-\tau |X - X_0|^2} \left[\frac{2\tau \mathbf{b}_*}{\bar{y} + ry} (2\tau |X - X_0|^2 - 1) - \frac{2\tau r \mathbf{b}^*}{(\bar{y} + ry)^2} |X - X_0| \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2\tau r \delta |X - X_0| - r^2 \delta (\bar{y} + ry) \right] \\ & \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided r/\bar{y} is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and ϵ . Note that $\phi \geq \Phi_0$ on $\partial(B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0))$. Then it follows from the comparison principle that $\phi \geq \Phi_0$ in $B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0)$. Since one can find a positive constant $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(\tau) < 1/2$ such that

$$\Phi_0 \geq \bar{C} C_0 m_0 (2 - |X - X_0|) \quad \text{for any } X \in B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_0),$$

the claim (4.35) follows.

Step 2. Gradient estimate. We claim if $r \leq r_2 \bar{y}$ for some $r_2 = r_2(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$, then

$$(4.36) \quad \int_{B_2(X_0)} |\nabla(\phi - \psi^*)|^2 \leq C(\mathbf{b}_*) \lambda^2 \bar{y}^2 \int_{B_2(X_0)} \chi_{\{\psi^*=0\}}.$$

Indeed, the minimality of ψ^* yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_2(X_0)} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) \right] \\ & \leq \lambda^2 \int_{B_2(X_0)} (\bar{y} + ry) (\chi_{\{\phi > 0\}} - \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}}) \leq \lambda^2 \int_{B_2(X_0)} (\bar{y} + ry) \chi_{\{\psi^*=0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Taylor expansion, (4.33), (4.26) and (4.28), one has

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{B_2(X_0)} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_2(X_0)} (\bar{y} + ry) \left(\mathbf{b}_* \left| \frac{\nabla(\psi^* - \phi)}{\bar{y} + ry} \right|^2 - r\delta \left| \frac{\nabla(\psi^* - \phi)}{\bar{y} + ry} \right| |\psi^* - \phi| - r^2 \delta |\psi^* - \phi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities, the last two terms can be absorbed by the first term on the right-hand side of (4.37), provided $r \leq r_2 \bar{y}$ with r_2 sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and ϵ . Thus one has (4.36).

Step 3. Poincaré type estimate. We claim the following Poincaré type estimate

$$(4.38) \quad C_0 m_0 |\mathcal{D}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|\nabla(\phi - \psi^*)\|_{L^2(B_2(X_0))} \quad \text{with } \mathcal{D}_0 := \{X \in B_2(X_0) : \psi^*(X) = 0\},$$

provided $r \leq r_1 \min\{\lambda, 1\} \bar{y}$ where r_1 is the same as in Step 1. For $Z \in B_1(X_0)$, consider a transformation \mathcal{A}_Z from $B_2(X_0)$ to itself which fixes $\partial B_2(X_0)$ and maps Z to X_0 , for instance, $\mathcal{A}_Z^{-1}(X) = \frac{2-|X-X_0|}{2}(Z-X_0) + X$. Set $\psi_Z^*(X) := \psi^*(\mathcal{A}_Z^{-1}(X))$ and $\phi_Z(X) := \phi(\mathcal{A}_Z^{-1}(X))$. Given a direction $\xi \in \partial B_1$, define $r_\xi := \inf \mathcal{R}_\xi$ if

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi := \{s : 1/4 \leq s \leq 2, \psi_Z^*(X_0 + s\xi) = 0\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_Z(X_0 + r_\xi \xi) &= \int_2^{r_\xi} \frac{d}{ds} (\phi_Z - \psi_Z^*)(X_0 + s\xi) ds \leq \int_{r_\xi}^2 |\nabla(\phi_Z - \psi_Z^*)(X_0 + s\xi)| ds \\ &\leq \sqrt{2 - r_\xi} \left(\int_{r_\xi}^2 |\nabla(\phi_Z - \psi_Z^*)(X_0 + s\xi)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (4.35), one has

$$\phi_Z(X_0 + r_\xi \xi) \geq \bar{C} C_0 m_0 \left(2 - \left| \frac{2 - r_\xi}{2} (Z - X_0) + r_\xi \xi \right| \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{C} C_0 m_0 (2 - r_\xi).$$

Combining the above two inequalities together gives

$$(C_0 m_0)^2 (2 - r_\xi) \leq \frac{4}{\bar{C}^2} \int_{r_\xi}^2 |\nabla(\phi_Z - \psi_Z^*)(X_0 + s\xi)|^2 ds.$$

An integration of ξ over ∂B_1 yields

$$(4.39) \quad (C_0 m_0)^2 \int_{B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{1/2}(Z)} \chi_{\{\psi^*=0\}} \leq C \int_{B_2(X_0)} |\nabla(\phi - \psi^*)|^2.$$

More precisely, noting that $|\mathcal{A}_Z^{-1}(X) - Z| \geq 1/2$ implies $|X - X_0| \geq 1/4$, changing back to the original variables and using the polar coordinates one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{1/2}(Z)} \chi_{\{\psi^*=0\}} &\leq C \int_{B_2(X_0) \setminus B_{1/4}(X_0)} \chi_{\{\psi_Z^*=0\}} \\ &= C \int_{\partial B_1} \int_{1/4}^2 \chi_{\{\psi_Z^*=0\}} s \, ds d\xi \leq C \int_{\partial B_1} (2 - r_\xi) \, d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

For the right hand side of (4.39) we simply estimate

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \int_{r_\xi}^2 |\nabla(\phi_Z - \psi_Z^*)(X_0 + s\xi)|^2 ds d\xi \leq C \int_{B_2(X_0)} |\nabla(\phi - \psi^*)|^2 dX.$$

Thus (4.39) follows. A further integration over $Z \in B_1(X_0)$ yields

$$(C_0 m_0)^2 |\mathcal{D}_0| \leq C \int_{B_2(X_0)} |\nabla(\phi - \psi^*)|^2,$$

where C is a universal constant. This is the desired estimate (4.38).

Step 4. Decay estimate. Combining (4.38) and (4.36) gives

$$m_0 |\mathcal{D}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \lambda \bar{y} |\mathcal{D}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$, provided

$$r \leq \bar{r} \min\{\lambda, 1\} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \partial \mathcal{D}) \leq \bar{r} \min\{\lambda, 1\} \bar{y}$$

where $\bar{r} := \min\{r_1, r_2\}$. If $|\mathcal{D}_0| > 0$, then $m_0 \leq C \lambda \bar{y}$, which contradicts with (4.32) since the constant C_m is sufficiently large. Otherwise, $\psi^* = \phi$ a.e. in $B_2(X_0)$. By the interior regularity theory for elliptic equations (cf. [29]), ψ^* and ϕ are continuous. Thus $\psi^* = \phi$ pointwise in $B_2(X_0)$, which contradicts with the fact that X_0 is a free boundary point. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.8 together with the elliptic estimates away from the free boundary gives the Lipschitz regularity of minimizers.

Proposition 4.9. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2), then $\psi \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(\mathcal{D})$. Moreover, for any connected domain $\mathcal{D}' \Subset \mathcal{D}$ containing a free boundary point, the Lipschitz constant of ψ in \mathcal{D}' is estimated by $C\lambda$, where C depends on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , ϵ , \mathcal{D}' , and \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. (i) Let $\bar{X} \in \{\psi < Q\} \cap \mathcal{D}$. If $\text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi) > \bar{r} \min\{\lambda, 1\} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \partial\mathcal{D})$, where \bar{r} is given in Lemma 4.8, then the standard interior elliptic estimate gives $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}$. If $\text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi) \leq \bar{r} \min\{\lambda, 1\} \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \partial\mathcal{D})$, then let

$$\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(X) := \frac{Q - \psi(\bar{X} + rX)}{r}, \quad r := \text{dist}(\bar{X}, \Gamma_\psi).$$

By Lemma 4.8, there is a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(X) \leq C\lambda\bar{y} \quad \text{for any } X \in B_1.$$

Note that $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ satisfies (4.24) in B_1 . By virtue of (4.4), $\partial_x \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ (or $\partial_y \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$) solves a uniformly elliptic equation of divergence form and thus is $C^{0,\alpha}$ by the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser estimate (cf. [29]). Hence one has

$$|\nabla \psi(\bar{X})| = |\nabla \psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(0)| \leq C \left(\|\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \right) \leq C\lambda$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \bar{y})$, where the upper bound for $|\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r|$ in (4.28) has been used to get the last inequality. Combining the above two cases we conclude that $\psi \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(\mathcal{D})$. Furthermore, $|\nabla \psi(x)| \leq C\lambda$, where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \bar{y})$.

(ii) If $\mathcal{D}' \Subset \mathcal{D}$ is connected and \mathcal{D}' contains a free boundary point, then it follows from the Harnack inequality ([29, Theorem 8.17]), the connectedness of \mathcal{D}' , and Lemma 4.8 that

$$Q - \psi \leq C\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'$$

for some C depending on $B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \mathcal{D}'$, and \mathcal{D} . Thus similar arguments as in the second case of (i) give that $|\nabla \psi(x)| \leq C\lambda$. \square

Remark 4.10. *By the boundary estimate for the elliptic equation, ψ is Lipschitz up to the $C^{1,\alpha}$ portion $\Sigma \subset \partial\mathcal{D} \cap \{y > 0\}$ as long as the boundary data $\psi^\# \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{D} \cup \Sigma)$. Moreover, if \mathcal{D}' is a subset of $\bar{\mathcal{D}} \cap \{y > 0\}$ with $\mathcal{D}' \cap \partial\mathcal{D}$ being $C^{1,\alpha}$, $\mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{D}$ is connected, and \mathcal{D}' contains a free boundary point, then $|\nabla \psi| \leq C\lambda$ in \mathcal{D}' .*

The next lemma gives the nondegeneracy of minimizers, whose proof is also based on the minimality of the energy and suitable barrier functions as in Lemma 4.8.

Lemma 4.11. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then for any $\vartheta > 1$ and any $0 < a < 1$, there exist constants $c_a, r_* > 0$ depending on $B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta$, and a , such that for any $B_r(\bar{X}) \subset \mathcal{D}$ with $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $r \leq \min\{r_*\bar{y}, \frac{c_a\lambda}{\delta\epsilon}\}$, if*

$$(4.40) \quad \frac{1}{r} \left(\int_{B_r(\bar{X})} |Q - \psi|^\vartheta \right)^{\frac{1}{\vartheta}} \leq c_a\lambda\bar{y},$$

then $\psi = Q$ in $B_{ar}(\bar{X})$.

Proof. As in Lemma 4.8, let $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*(X)$ be defined in (4.21) for $r \in (0, r_*\bar{y})$, where $r_* > 0$ is a small constant to be determined later. Then $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ satisfies (4.23)-(4.24). Now we need to prove that if

$$\left(\int_{B_1} |\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*|^{\vartheta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\vartheta}} \leq c_a \lambda \bar{y},$$

then $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^* = 0$ in B_a . From now on, we drop the subscript \bar{X} and r of $\psi_{\bar{X},r}^*$ without ambiguity. By the L^∞ -estimate for the subsolution of the elliptic equation (4.24) (cf. [29, Theorem 8.17]) and the estimate (4.28), for any $a \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $c_* = c_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta, a) > 0$ such that

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{B_{\sqrt{a}}} \psi^* &\leq \frac{C_*}{4} (\|\psi^*\|_{L^\vartheta(B_1)} + \|(\bar{y} + ry)\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) \leq \frac{C_*}{2} (c_a \lambda \bar{y} + \bar{y} r \delta \epsilon) \\ &\leq c_* c_a \lambda \bar{y} := M_a, \end{aligned}$$

provided $r \leq \min\{\frac{\bar{y}}{4}, \frac{c_a \lambda}{\delta \epsilon}\}$. Thus it suffices to show that if c_a is sufficiently small depending on $B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta$, and a , then $\psi^* = 0$ in B_a . This is proved in three steps.

Step 1. Upper bound of the energy. Let c_* in (4.41) be sufficiently large. We claim that if $r \leq \min\{r_*\bar{y}, \frac{c_a \lambda}{\delta \epsilon}\}$ for some r_* sufficiently small depending on $B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon$, and a , then there exists $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, a) > 0$ such that

$$(4.42) \quad \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] \leq C \frac{M_a}{\bar{y}} \int_{\partial B_a} \psi^*,$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r$ is defined in (4.22). Let

$$\Phi_0(X) := \begin{cases} M_a \frac{e^{-\tau a^2} - e^{-\tau |X|^2}}{e^{-\tau a^2} - e^{-\tau a}} & \text{for } X \in B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a, \\ 0 & \text{for } X \in B_a. \end{cases}$$

Similar as the proof for Lemma 4.8, choose $\tau = \tau(a)$ sufficiently large and let $r \leq r_*\bar{y}$ for a sufficiently small $r_* = r_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, a) > 0$, then there exists $C_1 = C_1(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, a) > 0$ such that

$$(4.43) \quad \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \leq -C_1 \frac{M_a}{\bar{y} + ry} \quad \text{in } B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a.$$

Let $\phi := \min\{\psi^*, \Phi_0\}$. Note that $\phi = \psi^*$ on $\partial B_{\sqrt{a}}$, $\phi \equiv 0$ in B_a , and $\{X \in B_{\sqrt{a}} : \phi(X) > 0\} \subset \{X \in B_{\sqrt{a}} : \psi^*(X) > 0\}$. Since ψ^* is an energy minimizer, one has

$$(4.44) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] \\ &\leq \int_{B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the convexity of $\mathbf{p} \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r(\mathbf{p}, z)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.45) \quad & \int_{B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) - \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) \right] \\
& \leq \int_{B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a} -\partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\bar{y} + ry}, \phi \right) \partial_i (\psi^* - \phi) \\
& \quad + \int_{B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \int_0^1 (\phi - \psi^*) \partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, s\phi + (1-s)\psi^* \right) ds \\
& \leq \int_{(B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a) \cap \{\psi^* > \Phi_0\}} \left[-\partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \partial_i (\psi^* - \Phi_0) + r\delta(\bar{y} + ry)(\psi^* - \Phi_0) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the bound for $\partial_z \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r$ in (4.28). Multiplying (4.43) by $(\psi^* - \Phi_0)_+$ and integrating by parts (noting that $\psi^* - \Phi_0 = \psi^*$ on ∂B_a and $(\psi^* - \Phi_0)_+ = 0$ on $\partial B_{\sqrt{a}}$) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.46) \quad & \int_{(B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a) \cap \{\psi^* > \Phi_0\}} -\partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \partial_i (\psi^* - \Phi_0) \\
& \leq - \int_{\partial B_a} \psi^* \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \cdot \nu_i - \int_{(B_{\sqrt{a}} \setminus B_a) \cap \{\psi^* > \Phi_0\}} C_1 \frac{M_a}{\bar{y} + ry} (\psi^* - \Phi_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $r \leq \frac{c_a \lambda}{\delta \epsilon}$ and c_* in (4.41) is sufficiently large, the inequality (4.46) together with (4.44)-(4.45) yields that

$$\int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] \leq - \int_{\partial B_a} \psi^* \partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \cdot \nu_i.$$

In view of the expression for $|\nabla \Phi_0|$ on ∂B_a as well as (4.25), there is a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, a)$ such that

$$-\partial_{p_i} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \Phi_0}{\bar{y} + ry}, \Phi_0 \right) \cdot \nu_i \leq C \frac{M_a}{\bar{y}} \quad \text{on } \partial B_a.$$

Combining the above two estimates gives the desired estimate (4.42).

Step 2. Lower bound of the energy. We claim that there is a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta, a) > 0$ such that

$$(4.47) \quad \int_{\partial B_a} \psi^* \leq \frac{C(1 + c_a^2)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{M_a}{\lambda \bar{y}} + 1 \right) \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right],$$

provided $r \leq \min\{\frac{\bar{y}}{4}, \frac{c_a \lambda}{\delta \epsilon}\}$. Indeed, by the trace estimate there exists a constant $C = C(a) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial B_a} \psi^* \leq C \left(\int_{B_a} \psi^* + \int_{B_a} |\nabla \psi^*| \right).$$

Since $0 \leq \psi^* \leq M_a$ in B_a implies

$$\int_{B_a} \psi^* \leq M_a \int_{B_a} \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \leq \frac{M_a}{\bar{y}} \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}},$$

and since the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\int_{B_a} |\nabla \psi^*| \leq \int_{B_a} \frac{|\nabla \psi^*|^2}{\lambda(\bar{y} + ry)} + \int_{B_a} \lambda(\bar{y} + ry) \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}},$$

it follows from the above inequalities that

$$\int_{\partial B_a} \psi^* \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \left(\frac{M_a}{\lambda \bar{y}} + 1 \right) \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry} \right|^2 + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right).$$

By (4.29) and (4.41) one has

(4.48)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left| \frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry} \right|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{\mathfrak{b}_*} \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \delta r M_a \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] \\ &\leq C(1 + c_a^2) \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta, a)$. Combining all the above estimates together yields (4.47).

Step 3. Conclusion. From (4.42) and (4.47), if $r \leq \min\{r_* \bar{y}, \frac{c_a \lambda}{\delta \epsilon}\}$, there is a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta, a)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] \\ &\leq C(1 + c_a^2) \frac{M_a}{\lambda \bar{y}} \left(\frac{M_a}{\lambda \bar{y}} + 1 \right) \int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Take c_a in (4.41) sufficiently small such that $M_a/(\lambda \bar{y})$ is sufficiently small. Then

$$\int_{B_a} (\bar{y} + ry) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_r \left(\frac{\nabla \psi^*}{\bar{y} + ry}, \psi^* \right) + \lambda^2 \chi_{\{\psi^* > 0\}} \right] = 0.$$

This together with the inequality (4.48) yields $\psi^* \equiv 0$ in B_a . Hence the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

4.4. Measure theoretic properties and regularity of the free boundary. From the Lipschitz regularity (Proposition 4.9) and nondegeneracy property (Lemma 4.11) of a minimizer ψ , one has the following measure theoretic properties of the free boundary $\Gamma_\psi := \partial\{\psi < Q\} \cap \mathcal{D}$. The proof is the same as that for Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 3.2 in [4], so we omit the details here.

Proposition 4.12. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) $\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_\psi \cap \mathcal{D}') < \infty$ for any $\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{D}$.
(ii) There is a Borel measure ζ_ψ such that

$$\partial_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) - y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) = \zeta_\psi \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \Gamma_\psi.$$

- (iii) For any $\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{D}$, there exist positive constants C , c , and (small) r_0 depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , ϵ , λ , \mathcal{D}' , and \mathcal{D} , such that for any $B_r(X) \subset \mathcal{D}'$ with $X \in \Gamma_\psi$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$, one has

$$c \leq \frac{|B_r(X) \cap \{\psi < Q\}|}{|B_r(X)|} \leq C;$$

$$c \leq \zeta_\psi \leq C, \quad cr \leq \mathcal{H}^1(B_r(X) \cap \Gamma_\psi) \leq Cr.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.8, Lemma 4.11 and Remark 3.3 that $|\nabla \psi / y| = O(\Lambda)$ near the free boundary in a weak sense. In order to get the regularity of the free boundary, we derive the following strengthened estimates for $|\nabla \psi / y|$ near the free boundary.

Lemma 4.13. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then for any $\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{D}$, there exist $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $r_0 \in (0, 1)$, and $C > 0$ depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , ϵ , λ , \mathcal{D}' , and \mathcal{D} , such that for any ball $B_{2r}(\bar{X}) \subset \mathcal{D}'$ with $\bar{X} \in \Gamma_\psi$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$, one has*

$$\sup_{B_r(\bar{X})} \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 \leq \Lambda^2 + Cr^\alpha.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that for [33, Lemma 4.11]. It follows from the equation of ψ and the methods in [29, Chapter 15] that $w := |\nabla \psi / y|^2$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \partial_i (\mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_j w) - \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right) \partial_j \left(\frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right) + \partial_i \left(\mathbf{b}^{ij} \frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) - \mathbf{b}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) \\ & + \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) y w - \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \psi \partial_k \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) \frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{D} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$, where

$$(4.49) \quad \mathbf{a}^{ij} := \partial_{p_i p_j} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}^{ij} := \frac{1}{y^2} \mathbf{a}^{ik} (\partial_j \psi \delta_{k2} - \partial_k \psi \delta_{j2}) + \mathbf{c} \delta_{ij}$$

with

$$\mathbf{c} := \partial_{p_i z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \partial_i \psi - y \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right).$$

By Young's inequality it holds that

$$\left| \mathbf{b}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{b}_*} |\mathbf{b}^{ij}|^2 + \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{4} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \right|^2.$$

Moreover, by the definitions of \mathcal{G} in (4.1) and G_ϵ in (3.1) one derives

$$\partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij}(\mathbf{p}, z) = 2\partial_{tz} G_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) \delta_{ij} + 4\partial_{ttz} G_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) p_i p_j.$$

This combined with $2|\mathbf{p}|^2 \partial_{tz} G_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z) = \mathbf{p} \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) y w - \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \psi \partial_k \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) \frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \\ &= 2\partial_{tz} G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \cdot y \left(\partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_i \psi}{y} \right) \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 - \frac{\partial_i \psi}{y} \partial_k \left(\frac{\partial_i \psi}{y} \right) \frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right) \\ &= \nabla \psi \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \cdot \left(\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) - \frac{\nabla \psi}{|\nabla \psi|} \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \frac{(\nabla \psi)^T}{|\nabla \psi|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus using Young's inequality again yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) y w - \partial_z \mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \psi \partial_k \left(\frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \right) \frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{b}_*} \left| \nabla \psi \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right|^2 + \frac{\mathbf{b}_*}{2} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right) \partial_j \left(\frac{\partial_k \psi}{y} \right) \geq \mathbf{b}_* \left| \nabla \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) \right|^2,$$

which follows from the convexity of the functional, cf. (4.4), one concludes that w is a subsolution to the uniformly elliptic linear equation

$$\mathcal{L}w := \frac{1}{2} \partial_i (\mathbf{a}^{ij} \partial_j w) \geq -\partial_i \mathbf{g}^i - \mathbf{f},$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}^i := \mathbf{b}^{ij} \frac{\partial_j \psi}{y} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{f} := \frac{1}{\mathbf{b}_*} \left(|\mathbf{b}^{ij}|^2 + \left| \nabla \psi \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{p}z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \right|^2 \right).$$

Note that it follows from the definition of \mathbf{b}^{ij} in (4.49), (4.4), and (4.7) that

$$|\mathbf{b}^{ij}| \leq C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \mathcal{D}') (\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} + 1).$$

Thus there exists $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \mathcal{D}') > 0$ such that \mathbf{g}^i and \mathbf{f} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{g}^i\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} &\leq C \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} + 1), \\ \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} &\leq C \mathbf{b}_*^{-1} (\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')}^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Now for $\tau \geq 0$, let

$$W_\tau := \begin{cases} (|\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}|^2 - \Lambda^2 - \tau)^+ & \text{in } \{\psi < Q\}, \\ 0 & \text{in } \{\psi = Q\}. \end{cases}$$

Using the same arguments as in [4, Lemma 3.4] yields

$$\limsup_{X \rightarrow \bar{X}, \psi(X) < Q} \left| \frac{\nabla \psi(X)}{y} \right| = \Lambda,$$

thus combining this with the interior regularity of ψ together one has $W_\tau \in C^{0,1}(B_r(\bar{X}))$. Denote $W_\tau^*(r) := \sup_{B_r(\bar{X})} W_\tau$. Then $W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau) \leq \partial_i \mathbf{g}^i + \mathbf{f} & \text{in } B_{2r}(\bar{X}), \\ W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau = W_\tau^*(r) & \text{in } B_{2r}(\bar{X}) \cap \{\psi = Q\}. \end{cases}$$

In view of [29, Theorem 8.18] with $\vartheta \in [1, \infty)$ one has

$$r^{-\frac{2}{\vartheta}} \|W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau\|_{L^\vartheta(B_r(\bar{X}))} \leq C \left(\inf_{B_{r/2}(\bar{X})} (W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau) + k(r) \right),$$

where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \vartheta)$ and $k(r) = \mathfrak{b}_*^{-1}(r) \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')} + r^2 \sum_i \|\mathbf{g}^i\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D}')}$. From the positive density property of $B_r(\bar{X}) \cap \{\psi = Q\}$ (cf. Proposition 4.12 (iii)) we infer that

$$r^{-\frac{2}{\vartheta}} \|W_\tau^*(r) - W_\tau\|_{L^\vartheta(B_r(\bar{X}))} \geq c W_\tau^*(r)$$

for some $c = c(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \lambda, \mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D})$, provided $r \leq r_0$. Taking $\tau \rightarrow 0$ and a rearrangement of the above two inequalities yield

$$W_0^* \left(\frac{r}{2} \right) = \sup_{B_{r/2}(\bar{X})} W_0 \leq C_0 W_0^*(r) + k(r), \quad C_0 = 1 - \frac{c}{C} \in (0, 1).$$

It follows from the iteration lemma (cf. [29, Lemma 8.23]) that for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$

$$W_0^*(r) \leq C W_0^*(r_0) \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\alpha + k(r^\beta r_0^{1-\beta}),$$

where $C = C(C_0) > 0$ and $\alpha = \alpha(C_0, \beta) \in (0, 1)$. Recalling the Lipschitz bound for ψ in Proposition 4.9, one obtains the desired estimate. \square

Remark 4.14. In Lemma 4.13, if $B_{2r}(\bar{X}) \subset B_{2R}(\bar{X}) \subset \mathcal{D}'$ with $R \in (0, r_0)$, then there exists a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \lambda, \mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}) > 0$ such that

$$(4.50) \quad \sup_{B_r(\bar{X})} \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 \leq \Lambda^2 + C \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\alpha.$$

This follows from applying the proof of Lemma 4.13 to $\psi_{\bar{X}, R}(X) = \psi(\bar{X} + RX)/R$.

Similar arguments as in [33, Proposition 4.12] give the following gradient estimate.

Proposition 4.15. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then for any $B_{2r}(\bar{X}) \subset \mathcal{D}' \Subset \mathcal{D}$ with $\bar{X} \in \Gamma_\psi$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$, where r_0 is the same as in Lemma 4.13, one has*

$$\int_{B_r(\bar{X}) \cap \{\psi < Q\}} \left(\Lambda^2 - \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 \right)^+ \leq C |\ln r|^{-1},$$

where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, \lambda, \mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}) > 0$ is a constant.

Combining Proposition 4.15 and the arguments in [4, Corollary 4.4] together we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.16. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). Then every blow up limit of ψ at $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \Gamma_\psi \cap \mathcal{D}$ is a half plane solution with slope $\Lambda \bar{y}$ in a neighborhood of the origin.*

As in the two-dimensional case ([33]), now we can use the improvement of flatness arguments to show that the free boundary is locally a $C^{1,\alpha}$ graph for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (cf. [4]). Higher regularity of the free boundary follows from [31, Theorem 2]. For the completeness, we state the result here without proof.

Proposition 4.17. *Let ψ be a minimizer of (4.2). The free boundary Γ_ψ is locally $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ if $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)$ is $C^{k,\alpha}$ in its components ($k \geq 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$), and it is locally real analytic if $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)$ is real analytic.*

Remark 4.18. *In our case the function $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z)$ is $C^{1,1}$ in its components (cf. Section 4.1), thus the free boundary is locally $C^{2,\alpha}$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

5. FINE PROPERTIES FOR THE FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM

In this section, we obtain the uniqueness and monotonicity of the solution for the truncated problem (3.4) with given specific boundary conditions. The monotonicity of the solution is crucial to prove the graph property of the free boundary, as well as the equivalence between the Euler system and the stream function formulation.




Figure 1. The truncated domain $\Omega_{\mu,R}$.

To describe the boundary data on $\partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$, some notations are needed. Let $b_\mu \in (1, \bar{H})$ be such that $N(b_\mu) = -\mu$, where N is defined in (1.7). Choose a point $(-\mu, b'_\mu)$ with $0 < b_\mu - b'_\mu < (b_\mu - 1)/4$. Let $H_* := H_*(\Lambda)$ be such that $\Lambda H_*^2 e^{1-H_*} = Q$ if $\Lambda > Q$, and $H_* = 1$ if $\Lambda \leq Q$. Define

$$\psi^\dagger(y) := \begin{cases} \min(\Lambda y^2 e^{1-y}, Q) & \text{if } H_* < 1, \\ Q y^2 e^{1-y} & \text{if } H_* = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$ be a fixed constant. Set

$$(5.1) \quad \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(x, y) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = -\mu, 0 < y < b'_\mu, \\ Q \left(\frac{y - b'_\mu}{b_\mu - b'_\mu} \right)^s & \text{if } x = -\mu, b'_\mu \leq y \leq b_\mu, \\ Q & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{N} \cup ([0, R] \times \{1\}), \\ \psi^\dagger(y) & \text{if } x = R, 0 < y < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } -\mu \leq x \leq R, y = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp$ is continuous and it satisfies $0 \leq \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp \leq Q$.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that the constant κ in (1.13) is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . Then $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, \cdot)$ is a subsolution to (3.7) and $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, \cdot)$ is a supersolution to (3.7) in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$.*

Proof. Denote $\varphi(y) := Q \left(\frac{y - b'_\mu}{b_\mu - b'_\mu} \right)^s$. Straightforward computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\varphi'}{y} \right|^2, \varphi \right) \frac{\varphi'}{y} \right)' \\ &= \left(g_\epsilon + 2\partial_t g_\epsilon \left(\frac{\varphi'}{y} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\varphi''}{y} - \frac{\varphi'}{y^2} \right) + \partial_z g_\epsilon \frac{(\varphi')^2}{y} \\ &= \left(g_\epsilon + 2\partial_t g_\epsilon \left(\frac{\varphi'}{y} \right)^2 \right) \frac{Qs}{y(b_\mu - b'_\mu)^2} \left(\frac{y - b'_\mu}{b_\mu - b'_\mu} \right)^{s-2} \left(s - 2 + \frac{b'_\mu}{y} \right) + \partial_z g_\epsilon \frac{(\varphi')^2}{y}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the estimates (2.57), (2.64), and (4.7) give

$$g_\epsilon + 2\partial_t g_\epsilon \left(\frac{\varphi'}{y} \right)^2 \geq C > 0, \quad |\partial_z g_\epsilon| \leq C\kappa_0 \partial_t g_\epsilon, \quad |\partial_z G_\epsilon| \leq C\kappa_0(\kappa_0 + 1).$$

Moreover, since κ in (1.13) is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ , by (2.18) and Proposition 2.1 one has

$$(5.2) \quad \kappa_0 \leq C\kappa^{1-\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \leq C\kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}} \leq CQ,$$

where C depends on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . Therefore, the function φ satisfies

$$(5.3) \quad \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\varphi'}{y} \right|^2, \varphi \right) \frac{\varphi'}{y} \right)' - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\varphi'}{y} \right|^2, \varphi \right) > 0, \quad \text{on } (b'_\mu, b_\mu).$$

As 0 is a solution to (3.7), the function $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, \cdot)$ is a subsolution to (3.7).

Similarly one can show $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, \cdot)$ is a supersolution to (3.7), provided κ is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let ψ be a minimizer of the truncated problem (3.4) in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$ with the boundary value $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp$ constructed in (5.1). Assume that the constant κ in (1.13) is sufficiently small depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . Then*

$$(5.4) \quad \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, y) < \psi(x, y) \leq \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, y) \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in \Omega_{\mu,R}.$$

Proof. The proof is divided into two steps.

Step 1. Lower bound. Let $\mathcal{D}' := \Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{b'_\mu < y < b_\mu\}$. By Lemma 5.1, $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, \cdot) \leq \psi$ on $\partial\mathcal{D}'$. Furthermore, it follows from (5.3) that $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, \cdot)$ is a strict subsolution in \mathcal{D}' . Thus by the comparison principle and the strong maximum principle, $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, y) < \psi(x, y)$ in \mathcal{D}' . Since $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, y) \equiv 0$ if $y \in [0, b'_\mu]$, one has $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(-\mu, y) < \psi(x, y)$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$.

Step 2. Upper bound. The idea is the same as that in [7, Lemma 4.1]. We consider ψ as a limit of minimizers for the modified minimization problems. For any small $\iota > 0$, introduce the functional

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{J}_\iota(\phi) := \int_{\Omega_{\mu,R}} (y + \iota) \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y + \iota} \right|^2, \phi \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\phi < Q\}} \right] dX,$$

where λ_ϵ is the same as in (3.5). As in Section 4, one can prove that

- (a) there exists a minimizer ψ_ι for the functional \mathcal{J}_ι in the admissible set (3.6) with the boundary value $\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp$ constructed in (5.1);
- (b) the minimizer ψ_ι satisfies $0 \leq \psi_\iota \leq Q$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$ and $\psi_\iota \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(\Omega_{\mu,R})$;
- (c) the minimizer ψ_ι satisfies the elliptic equation $\mathcal{L}\psi_\iota = 0$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{0 < \psi_\iota < Q\}$, where

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{L}\phi := \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y + \iota} \right|^2, \phi \right) \frac{\nabla \phi}{y + \iota} \right) - (y + \iota) \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y + \iota} \right|^2, \phi \right).$$

Furthermore, there exists a sequence $\iota_k \rightarrow 0$, such that the corresponding sequence of minimizers ψ_{ι_k} converges to a minimizer ψ of the problem (3.4). Thus if we show that

$$(5.7) \quad \psi_\iota(x, y) \leq \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, y + \iota) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\mu,R}$$

for sufficiently small $\iota > 0$, then the upper bound for ψ follows.

Consider the function $\Psi^\tau(y) := \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, y + \iota) + \tau$ for $\tau > 0$. In view of the proof of Lemma 5.1, the function Ψ^τ is a subsolution to (5.6) if κ_0 is sufficiently small. Since ψ_ι is bounded, if τ is large enough then $\psi_\iota \leq \Psi^\tau$. Denote $\tau_* = \inf\{\tau : \psi_\iota \leq \Psi^\tau\}$. We claim $\tau_* = 0$. Suppose by contradiction that $\tau_* > 0$. Note that ψ_ι is continuous up to $\{y = 0\}$ and $\psi_\iota = \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp$ on $\partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$. Thus $\psi_\iota = \Psi^\tau$ cannot be achieved at $\partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$. Since $\mathcal{L}\psi_\iota = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}\Psi^\tau \leq 0$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{0 < \psi_\iota < Q\}$, the strong maximum principle implies that the functions ψ_ι and Ψ^τ must touch at a free boundary point $X_* = (x_*, y_*)$ with $0 < y_* < 1$. Then by the Hopf lemma

$$\Lambda = \left| \frac{\nabla\psi_\iota(X_*)}{y_* + \iota} \right| > \left| \frac{\nabla\Psi^{\tau_*}(X_*)}{y_* + \iota} \right| = \Lambda(2 - y_* - \iota)e^{1-y_*-\iota} > \Lambda,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\tau_* = 0$. This means that the inequality (5.7) holds.

Let $\iota \rightarrow 0$ one obtains $\psi(x, y) \leq \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, y)$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 5.3. Note that every function ψ_{ι_k} constructed in Lemma 5.2 is a solution to the elliptic equation (5.6) (with ι being replaced by ι_k) in $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{0 < \psi_{\iota_k} < Q\}$ with the boundary condition $\psi_{\iota_k} = \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp$ on $\partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$. By elliptic estimates $\psi_{\iota_k} \in C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi_{\iota_k} < Q\}) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi_{\iota_k} < Q\}})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then the limit ψ of $\{\psi_{\iota_k}\}$, which is a minimizer of the minimization problem (3.4), satisfies $\psi \in C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}})$.

With Lemma 5.2 at hand, we can prove the following proposition, which claims that the minimizer for the truncated problem (3.4) is unique and monotone increasing in the x -direction.

Proposition 5.4. Under the same assumption as in Lemma 5.2, ψ is the unique minimizer to (3.4). Furthermore, $\partial_x\psi \geq 0$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that in [7, Theorem 4.2]. For completeness we provide the details here.

Step 1. $\partial_x\psi \geq 0$. For $\tau > 0$ small, let

$$\psi^\tau(x, y) := \psi(x - \tau, y) \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \Omega_{\mu,R}^\tau := \{(x + \tau, y) : (x, y) \in \Omega_{\mu,R}\}.$$

Assume

$$\psi(x, y) = \psi(R, y) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\mu,R}^\tau \setminus \Omega_{\mu,R} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^\tau(x, y) = \psi(-\mu, y) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\mu,R} \setminus \Omega_{\mu,R}^\tau.$$

Since ψ is a minimizer for $J_{\mu,R,\Lambda}^\epsilon$ over $\mathcal{K}_{\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp}$, then ψ^τ is a minimizer for $J_{\mu,R,\Lambda}^{\epsilon,\tau}$ in $\mathcal{K}_{\psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp}^\tau$, where

$$J_{\mu,R,\Lambda}^{\epsilon,\tau}(\phi) := \int_{\Omega_{\mu,R}} y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\phi(x + \tau, y)}{y} \right|^2, \phi(x + \tau, y) \right) + \lambda_\epsilon^2 \chi_{\{\phi(x+\tau,y) < Q\}} \right] dX,$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_{\psi_{\mu,R}^\#}^\tau := \{\phi \in H^1(\Omega_{\mu,R}) : \phi(x + \tau, y) = \psi_{\mu,R}^\#(x, y) \text{ on } \partial\Omega_{\mu,R}\}.$$

For ease of notations, we denote

$$J := J_{\mu,R,\Lambda}^\epsilon, \quad J^\tau := J_{\mu,R,\Lambda}^{\epsilon,\tau}, \quad \mathcal{K} := \mathcal{K}_{\psi_{\mu,R}^\#}, \quad \mathcal{K}^\tau := \mathcal{K}_{\psi_{\mu,R}^\#}^\tau.$$

By Lemma 5.2 one has

$$\min\{\psi^\tau, \psi\} \in \mathcal{K}^\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\} \in \mathcal{K}.$$

Since the energy functional $J(\phi)$ depends only on $|\nabla\phi/y|^2$ and ϕ , one can verify that

$$J^\tau(\psi^\tau) + J(\psi) = J^\tau(\min\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}) + J(\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}).$$

This together with the minimality of ψ^τ and ψ , gives

$$(5.8) \quad J(\psi) = J(\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}).$$

We shall show that $\psi^\tau < \psi$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$. By Lemma 5.2 and the continuity of ψ , one has $\psi^\tau < \psi$ near $\{x = -\mu\} \cap \Omega_{\mu,R}$. If the strict inequality was not true in the connected component of $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ containing $\{x = -\mu\}$, then one would find a ball $B \Subset \Omega_{\mu,R}$ and $\bar{X} \in \partial B$ with $\psi(\bar{X}) > 0$ such that

$$\psi^\tau < \psi \quad \text{in } B, \quad \psi^\tau(\bar{X}) = \psi(\bar{X}).$$

By the Hopf lemma one has

$$\lim_{\substack{X \rightarrow \bar{X} \\ X \in B}} \frac{\partial(\psi^\tau - \psi)}{\partial\nu}(X) > 0,$$

where ν is the outer unit normal of ∂B at \bar{X} . Thus there exists a curve through \bar{X} such that along this curve $\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}$ is not C^1 at \bar{X} . On the other hand, since $\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}$ is a minimizer of J by (5.8), and $\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\}(\bar{X}) < Q$, then by the interior regularity for the minimizers, $\max\{\psi^\tau, \psi\} \in C^{1,\alpha}$ around \bar{X} . This is a contradiction. Since by the strong maximum principle every component $\{\psi < Q\}$ has to touch $\partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$, and moreover, by the construction of boundary value, $\{\psi < Q\} \cap \partial\Omega_{\mu,R}$ is a connect arc, then $\{\psi < Q\} \cap \Omega_{\mu,R}$ consists only one component. Consequently, $\psi^\tau < \psi$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$. Taking $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yields $\partial_x \psi \geq 0$.

Step 2. Uniqueness. Assume that ψ_1 and ψ_2 are two minimizers with the same boundary data. Let $\psi_1^\tau(x, y) = \psi_1(x - \tau, y)$. Same arguments as above give that $\psi_1^\tau \leq \psi_2$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$. Taking $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yields $\psi_1 \leq \psi_2$. Similarly $\psi_2 \leq \psi_1$. Thus $\psi_1 = \psi_2$. \square

Denote the free boundary points which lie strictly below $\{y = 1\}$ by

$$(5.9) \quad \Gamma_{\mu,R,\Lambda} := \partial\{\psi < Q\} \cap \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in (-\mu, R] \times (0, 1)\}.$$

Before proving that the free boundary is a graph, we first show the non-oscillation property of the free boundary.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{D}' \subset \{(x, y) : y \geq H_*\}$ be a domain in $\Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ bounded by two disjoint arcs Γ_1 and Γ'_1 of the free boundary and by $\{x = k_1\}$ and $\{x = k_2\}$. Suppose that Γ_1 (Γ'_1) lies in $\{k_1 < x < k_2\}$ with endpoints (k_1, l_1) and (k_2, l_2) ((k_1, l'_1) and (k_2, l'_2)). Suppose that $\text{dist}((0, 1), \mathcal{D}') \geq c_0$ for some $c_0 > 0$ and $|k_1 - k_2| \leq 1$. Then*

$$|k_1 - k_2| \leq C \max\{|l_1 - l'_1|, |l_2 - l'_2|\},$$

for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon, H_*, c_0, \Lambda)$.

Proof. Integrating the equation (3.7) in \mathcal{D}' yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma'_1} g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\partial_\nu \psi}{y} + \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}' \cap (\{x=k_1\} \cup \{x=k_2\})} g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\partial_\nu \psi}{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}'} y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_\nu \psi / y = \Lambda$ along Γ_1 and Γ'_1 and $g_\epsilon \geq C_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$ by (2.56), one has

$$\int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma'_1} g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\partial_\nu \psi}{y} \geq C_* \Lambda \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma'_1) \geq C_* \Lambda |k_1 - k_2|.$$

Applying the interior Lipschitz regularity (Proposition 4.9) and the boundary estimate for ψ (Remark 4.10) gives

$$\left| \int_{\partial \mathcal{D}' \cap (\{x=k_1\} \cup \{x=k_2\})} g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\partial_\nu \psi}{y} \right| \leq C \lambda \max\{|l_1 - l'_1|, |l_2 - l'_2|\},$$

where C depends on the B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , ϵ , H_* , and c_0 . Moreover, note that $|k_1 - k_2| \leq 1$. By (4.7) it holds

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{D}'} y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \right| \leq \delta \bar{H} |\mathcal{D}'| \leq \delta \bar{H} \max\{|l_1 - l'_1|, |l_2 - l'_2|\}.$$

Combining the above estimates and (3.11) together gives the desired inequality. \square

The next lemma gives the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem for the elliptic equation, which is crucial for the proof of the graph property of the free boundary.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \cap \{y > 0\}$ be a bounded connected piecewise $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let $\Sigma \subset \partial\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ be a nonempty open set. Let $\psi, \tilde{\psi} \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ be two solutions to the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_i \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) - y \mathcal{W} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \psi = Q, \quad \frac{1}{y} \partial_\nu \psi = \Lambda & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases}$$

where Q and Λ are constants. Assume that \mathcal{G} is uniformly elliptic, cf. (4.3)-(4.4), and that $\partial_{p_i p_j p_k} \mathcal{G}, \partial_{p_i p_j z} \mathcal{G}, \partial_{p_i z} \mathcal{G}, \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{W}, \partial_z \mathcal{W} \in L^\infty$. Then $\psi = \tilde{\psi}$.

Proof. The proof relies on the unique continuation for the uniformly elliptic equations with Lipschitz coefficients. First, it follows from the boundary regularity for the elliptic equation that $\psi, \tilde{\psi} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cup \Sigma)$. Let $\varphi := \tilde{\psi} - \psi$. Then φ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_i (\mathbf{a}_{ij} \partial_j \varphi) = -\partial_i (\mathbf{b}_i \varphi) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i \partial_i \varphi + \mathbf{c} \varphi & \text{in } \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \varphi = \frac{1}{y} \partial_\nu \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{ij} &:= \frac{1}{y} \int_0^1 \partial_{p_i p_j} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \tilde{\psi}_s}{y}, \tilde{\psi}_s \right) ds, & \mathbf{b}_i &:= \int_0^1 \partial_{p_i z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \tilde{\psi}_s}{y}, \tilde{\psi}_s \right) ds, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i &:= \int_0^1 \partial_{p_i} \mathcal{W} \left(\frac{\nabla \tilde{\psi}_s}{y}, \tilde{\psi}_s \right) ds, & \mathbf{c} &:= y \int_0^1 \partial_z \mathcal{W} \left(\frac{\nabla \tilde{\psi}_s}{y}, \tilde{\psi}_s \right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{\psi}_s = \tilde{\psi} + s(\psi - \tilde{\psi})$. The Cauchy data allow to extend φ into a solution in a neighborhood $U \supset \Sigma$ by setting $\varphi = 0$ outside of $U \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. It follows from the assumptions on \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{W} that $\mathbf{b}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i$ and $\mathbf{c} \in L^\infty$, and \mathbf{a}_{ij} is uniformly elliptic and $C^{1,\alpha}$. Thus by the unique continuation property, cf. for example [32, Theorem 1.1], one has $\varphi \equiv 0$ in $U \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. This means that $\psi = \tilde{\psi}$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is connected, using chain of balls argument one has $\psi = \tilde{\psi}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. \square

Now we are ready to prove the free boundary is a graph.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\Gamma_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ be defined in (5.9). If $\Gamma_{\mu,R,\Lambda} \neq \emptyset$, then it can be represented as a graph of a function of y , i.e., there exists a function $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ and $\underline{H}_{\mu,R,\Lambda} \in [H_*, 1)$ such that*

$$(5.10) \quad \Gamma_{\mu,R,\Lambda} = \{(x, y) : x = \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y), y \in (\underline{H}_{\mu,R,\Lambda}, 1)\}.$$

Furthermore, $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ is continuous, $-\mu < \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda} \leq R$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow 1^-} \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y)$ exists.

Proof. It follows from Proposition 5.4 that $\partial_x \psi \geq 0$. Hence there is a function $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y)$ with values in $[-\mu, R]$ such that for any $y \in (0, 1)$,

$$(5.11) \quad \psi(x, y) < Q \quad \text{if and only if } x < \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y).$$

Since $\psi(-\mu, y) = 0$ for $y \in [0, b'_\mu]$, then $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda} > -\mu$.

It follows from Lemma 5.2 that one has

$$\psi(x, y) \leq \psi_{\mu,R}^\sharp(R, y) < Q \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times [0, H_*).$$

This implies that there is no free boundary points in the strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, H_*)$. Thus there exists a constant $\underline{H}_{\mu,R,\Lambda} \geq H_*$ such that the free boundary is a graph $x = \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y)$ for $y \in (\underline{H}_{\mu,R,\Lambda}, 1)$.

Finally, one can show $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ is continuous. Clearly, by (5.11) the function $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ is lower semi-continuous. Suppose there is a jump point \bar{y} such that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \bar{y}} \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y) = \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(\bar{y}) + \tau$$

for some $\tau > 0$. Let $\bar{x} := \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(\bar{y})$. Since $\partial_x \psi \geq 0$, the line segment $[\bar{x}, \bar{x} + \tau] \times \{\bar{y}\}$ belongs to the free boundary. Therefore, one can find an upper or lower rectangular neighborhood U of $[\bar{x}, \bar{x} + \tau] \times \{\bar{y}\}$ such that ψ solves following system

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ \psi = Q, \quad \frac{1}{y} \partial_\nu \psi = \Lambda & \text{on } \partial U \cap \{y = \bar{y}\}, \end{cases}$$

which admits a one-dimensional solution $\psi_{1d}(y)$. Then by the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem (cf. Lemma 5.6), one has $\psi = \psi_{1d}$ in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$. This is however impossible. Thus $\Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ is continuous. The existence of $\lim_{y \rightarrow 1^-} \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y)$ follows from Lemma 5.5. \square

6. CONTINUOUS FIT AND SMOOTH FIT

In this section, we first establish the continuous fit between the free boundary and the nozzle. More precisely, for given Bernoulli function \bar{B} , entropy function \bar{S} and mass flux Q at the upstream as in Proposition 2.1, there exists a momentum $\Lambda > 0$ along the free boundary, such that the free boundary attaches the outlet of the nozzle. The continuous fit implies the smooth fit, that is, the free boundary joins the nozzle in a continuous differentiable fashion.

6.1. Continuous fit. In this subsection, μ , R and ϵ are fixed. To emphasize the dependence on the parameter Λ , we let $\psi_\Lambda := \psi_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$ denote the minimizer of the truncated problem (3.4) and let

$$\Gamma_\Lambda := \Gamma_{\mu,R,\Lambda} = \{(x, y) : x = \Upsilon_\Lambda(y) \text{ for } y \in (\underline{H}_\Lambda, 1)\}$$

denote the free boundary in (5.10), where $\Upsilon_\Lambda(y) := \Upsilon_{\mu,R,\Lambda}(y)$ and $\underline{H}_\Lambda := \underline{H}_{\mu,R,\Lambda}$.

The following lemma shows that ψ_Λ and Υ_Λ depend on Λ continuously, whose proof is basically the same as that in [33, Lemma 6.1] so we omit it here.

Lemma 6.1. *If $\Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda$, then $\psi_{\Lambda_n} \rightarrow \psi_\Lambda$ uniformly in $\Omega_{\mu,R}$ and $\Upsilon_{\Lambda_n}(y) \rightarrow \Upsilon_\Lambda(y)$ for each $y \in (l_\Lambda, 1]$.*

The continuous dependence of the solution on the parameter Λ together with the nondegeneracy of the minimizer (Lemma 4.11) gives the next lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *There exists a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ such that the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If $\Lambda \geq CQ$, then the free boundary Γ_Λ is nonempty and $\Upsilon_\Lambda(1) < 0$.*
- (ii) *If $\Lambda \leq C^{-1}Q$, then $\Upsilon_\Lambda(1) > 0$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that Γ_Λ is nonempty and $\Upsilon_\Lambda(1) \geq 0$. We claim that Λ/Q cannot be too large. Let $r_* = r_*(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ and $c_{1/2} = c_{1/2}(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ be the constants determined in Lemma 4.11 with $\vartheta = 2$ and $a = 1/2$. Since Γ_Λ connects $(\Upsilon_\Lambda(1), 1)$ to $(R, \underline{H}_\Lambda)$, there exist $X_* = (x_*, y_*) \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ (with $y_* > 1/4$) and $r \in (0, r_*/4)$ independent of Λ and Q such that $B_{ry_*}(X_*) \subset \Omega_{\mu,R} \cap \{y > 1/4\}$ or $B_{ry_*}(X_*) \subset \{x > 0, y > 1/4\}$. If $\frac{c_{1/2}\lambda}{\delta\epsilon} \leq r_*y_*$, then in view of the relation between λ and Λ in (3.11) the proof is finished (note that $\delta\epsilon \leq CQ$ for some $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma)$ by the definition of δ in (4.6), the upper bound of κ_0 in (2.18), and the lower bound of Q in Proposition 2.1). If $\frac{c_{1/2}\lambda}{\delta\epsilon} > r_*y_*$, then it follows from the nondegeneracy lemma (Lemma 4.11) and (3.11) that

$$\frac{Q}{ry_*} \geq \frac{1}{ry_*} \left(\int_{B_{ry_*}(X_*)} |Q - \psi|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq c_{1/2}\lambda y_* \geq C\Lambda y_*,$$

where $C > 0$ depends on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and ϵ . This leads to a contradiction if Λ/Q is large.

If the free boundary is empty, then one can get a contradiction by taking any $X_* = (x_*, 1)$ with $x_* > 0$ and using the linear nondegeneracy for nonnegative solutions along flat boundaries. This finishes the proof of (i).

(ii) Suppose that $\Upsilon_\Lambda \leq 0$. We show that Λ/Q cannot be too small. For $\tau > 0$ and $\bar{\sigma} > 0$ sufficiently small such that the comparison principle holds in $\mathbb{R} \times (0, 2\bar{\sigma})$ (cf. Lemma 4.5), denote

$$\eta_\tau(x) := \begin{cases} \tau \exp \left\{ \frac{(x - \frac{R}{2})^2}{(x - \frac{R}{2})^2 - \bar{\sigma}} \right\} & \text{if } \left| x - \frac{R}{2} \right| < \bar{\sigma}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Choose $\bar{\tau}$ such that $y = \eta_{\bar{\tau}}(x)$ touches the free boundary at some point $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ with $0 < \bar{x} < R$. Let $\mathcal{D}' = \Omega_{\mu, R} \cap \{(x, y) : y < \eta_{\bar{\tau}}(x)\}$ and ϕ be a solution to

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y} \right|^2, \phi \right) \frac{\nabla \phi}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y} \right|^2, \phi \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}', \\ \phi = Q & \text{on } \{y = \eta_{\tau_0}(x)\}, \quad \phi = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

It follows from the comparison principle that $\phi \geq \psi_\Lambda$ in \mathcal{D}' . Hence

$$\frac{1}{\bar{y}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \nu}(\bar{X}) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{y}} \frac{\partial \psi_\Lambda}{\partial \nu}(\bar{X}) = \Lambda.$$

On the other hand, using the linear asymptotics of ϕ at \bar{X} , which can be obtained by solving the problem for the blow up limit of ϕ/Q at \bar{X} , one has

$$\frac{1}{\bar{y}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \nu}(\bar{X}) \geq CQ$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of Λ . Then $\Lambda/Q \geq C$. This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 imply the following continuous fit property of the solution for the truncated problem.

Corollary 6.3. *There exists $\Lambda = \Lambda(\mu, R) > 0$ such that $\Upsilon_\Lambda(1) = 0$. Furthermore,*

$$C^{-1}Q \leq \Lambda(\mu, R) \leq CQ$$

for a positive constant C depending on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , γ , and ϵ , but independent of μ and R .

6.2. Smooth fit. With the continuous fit property at hand, one can argue along the same lines as [7, Theorem 6.1] to conclude that the free boundary Γ_ψ fits the outlet of the nozzle in a C^1 fashion.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\psi := \psi_{\mu, R, \Lambda}$ be the minimizer of the truncated problem (3.4) with Λ as in Corollary 6.3. Then $\mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma_\psi$ is C^1 in a neighborhood of the point $A = (0, 1)$, and $\nabla \psi$ is continuous in a $\{\psi < Q\}$ -neighborhood of A .*

Proof. Suppose that $\{X_n\}$ is a sequence of points in $\{\psi < Q\}$ which converges to A . Define the scaled functions

$$\psi_n(X) := Q - \frac{Q - \psi(X_n + rX)}{r}, \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

Then ψ_n satisfies the quasilinear equation

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi_n}{y_n + ry} \right|^2, Q - r(Q - \psi_n) \right) \frac{\nabla \psi_n}{y_n + ry} \right) \\ - r(y_n + ry) \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi_n}{y_n + ry} \right|^2, Q - r(Q - \psi_n) \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

in $\{\psi_n < Q\}$. Since $\partial_z G_\epsilon \in L^\infty$, then any blow up limit along a subsequence $\{\psi_n\}$ satisfies

$$(6.1) \quad \nabla \cdot (g_\epsilon(|\nabla \psi|^2, Q) \nabla \psi) = 0.$$

Note that (6.1) is the same as the governing equation for the irrotational flows. Thus with the scaling property at hand, one can use the compactness arguments as in [7, Theorem 6.1] together with the unique continuation property for the limiting equation (6.1) to conclude Proposition 6.4. \square

7. REMOVAL OF THE TRUNCATIONS AND THE FAR FIELDS BEHAVIOR

In this section, we first remove the domain and subsonic truncations, and then study the far fields behavior of the jet flows at the upstream and downstream. Consequently, we obtain the existence of subsonic jet flows which satisfy all properties in Problem 2.

7.1. Remove the domain truncations. In this subsection, we remove the truncations of the domain by letting $\mu, R \rightarrow \infty$ to get a limiting solution in Ω , which is bounded by \mathcal{N}_0 and $\mathcal{N} \cup ([0, \infty) \times \{1\})$. The limiting solution inherits the properties of solutions in the truncated domains, which are summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1. *Let the nozzle boundary \mathcal{N} defined in (1.7) satisfy (1.8). Given the Bernoulli function and the entropy function $(\bar{B}, \bar{S}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ at the upstream which satisfy (1.11)-(1.13), where the constant $\kappa = (B_*, S_*, \gamma, \bar{H})$ in (1.13) is sufficiently small. Given the mass flux $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$, where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1. Let $\psi_{\mu, R, \Lambda}$ be the minimizer of the problem (3.4) with $\psi_{\mu, R}^\sharp$ defined in (5.1). Then for any $\mu_j, R_j \rightarrow \infty$, there is a subsequence (still labeled by μ_j and R_j) such that $\Lambda_j := \Lambda(\mu_j, R_j) \rightarrow \Lambda_\infty$ for some $\Lambda_\infty \in (0, \infty)$ and $\psi_{\mu_j, R_j, \Lambda_j} \rightarrow \psi_\infty$ in $C_{\text{loc}}^{0, \alpha}(\Omega)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, the following properties hold.*

- (i) The function $\psi := \psi_\infty$ is a local minimizer for the energy functional, i.e., for any $D \Subset \Omega$, one has $J^\epsilon(\psi) \leq J^\epsilon(\phi)$ for any ϕ satisfying $\phi = \psi$ on ∂D , where

$$J^\epsilon(\phi) := \int_D y \left[G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \phi}{y} \right|^2, \phi \right) + \lambda_{\epsilon, \infty}^2 \chi_{\{\phi < Q\}} \right] dX, \quad \lambda_{\epsilon, \infty} := \sqrt{\Phi_\epsilon(\Lambda_\infty^2, Q)}.$$

In particular, ψ solves

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{N}_0, \\ \psi = Q & \text{on } \mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma_\psi, \\ \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right| = \Lambda_\infty & \text{on } \Gamma_\psi, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{O} := \Omega \cap \{\psi < Q\}$ is the flow region, $\Gamma_\psi := \partial\{\psi < Q\} \setminus \mathcal{N}$ is the free boundary, and $\partial_z G_\epsilon(|\nabla \psi/y|^2, \psi)$ satisfies (3.8) in the subsonic region $|\nabla \psi/y|^2 \leq \mathbf{t}_\epsilon(\psi) - \epsilon$.

- (ii) The function ψ is in $C^{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{O}) \cap C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$, and it satisfies $\partial_x \psi \geq 0$ in Ω .
- (iii) The free boundary Γ_ψ is given by the graph $x = \Upsilon(y)$, where Υ is a $C^{2,\alpha}$ function as long as it is finite.
- (iv) At the orifice $A = (0, 1)$ one has $\lim_{y \rightarrow 1^-} \Upsilon(y) = 0$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma_\psi$ is C^1 around A , in particular, $N'(1) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 1^-} \Upsilon'(y)$.
- (v) There is a constant $H \in (0, 1)$ such that $\Upsilon(y)$ is finite if and only if $y \in (H, 1]$, and $\lim_{y \rightarrow H^+} \Upsilon(y) = \infty$. Furthermore, there exists an R_0 sufficiently large, such that $\Gamma_\psi \cap \{x > R_0\} = \{(x, f(x)) : R_0 < x < \infty\}$ for some $C^{2,\alpha}$ function f and $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f'(x) = 0$.

The proof is similar to [33, Proposition 6.5], so we shall not repeat it here.

The next proposition shows the positivity of $\partial_x \psi_\infty$ in the region $\Omega \cap \{\psi < Q\}$, which plays an important role in the equivalence between the stream function formulation and the original Euler system.

Proposition 7.2. *The solution $\psi := \psi_\infty$ obtained in Proposition 7.1 satisfies $\partial_x \psi > 0$ in $\mathcal{O} := \Omega \cap \{\psi < Q\}$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 7.1 (ii) that $\partial_x \psi \geq 0$ in \mathcal{O} . The strict inequality can be proved by the strong maximum principle. Indeed, assume that $\partial_x \psi(X_0) = 0$ for some $X_0 \in \mathcal{O}$. Let $V := \partial_x \psi$. Then $V \geq 0$ in \mathcal{O} and it satisfies

$$\partial_i \left(\frac{1}{y} \mathbf{a}_{ij} \partial_j V + \mathbf{b}_i V \right) - \mathbf{b}_i \partial_i V - \mathbf{c} V = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O},$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}_{ij} := \partial_{p_i p_j} G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right), \quad \mathbf{b}_i := \partial_{p_i z} G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right), \quad \mathbf{c} := y \partial_{zz} G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2, \psi \right).$$

The strong maximum principle gives that $V = 0$ in \mathcal{O} , and hence all streamlines are horizontal. This leads to a contradiction. Hence $V > 0$ in \mathcal{O} and thus the proof of the proposition is complete. \square

7.2. Remove the subsonic truncation. In this subsection, we remove the subsonic truncation when the mass flux is sufficiently small. This means that for given suitable mass flux, the solution obtained in Proposition 7.1 is actually a solution of the problem (2.51).

Proposition 7.3. *Let $\psi := \psi_\infty$ be a solution obtained in Proposition 7.1 with $\Lambda := \Lambda_\infty$. Assume that the constant $\kappa = \kappa(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N})$ in (1.13) is sufficiently small. Then*

$$(7.2) \quad \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right|^2 \leq \mathfrak{t}_c(\psi) - \epsilon$$

as long as $Q \in (Q_*, Q_m)$ for some $Q_m = Q_m(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) \in (Q_*, Q^*)$ sufficiently small, where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1.

Remark 7.4. *In view of (2.40), $\mathfrak{t}_c(\psi)$ is uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant depending only on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . Thus one can fix a truncation parameter $\epsilon > 0$ small depending only on B_* , S_* , \bar{H} , and γ . For fixed $\epsilon > 0$, let ψ be a solution of the elliptic equation in (7.1) which satisfies the estimate (7.2). By the definition of g_ϵ in (2.55) and the expression of $\partial_z G_\epsilon$ in the subsonic region, cf. (3.8), the equation in (7.1) is exactly the equation in (2.51).*

Proof of Proposition 7.3. For fixed $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we claim that

$$(7.3) \quad \left| \frac{\nabla \psi}{y} \right| \leq CQ \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O} := \Omega \cap \{\psi < Q\}$$

for some constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) > 0$. There are two cases:

Case 1. Estimate of $|\nabla \psi / y|$ away from the symmetry axis \mathcal{N}_0 . Let $X_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{O} \cap \{y_0 > 1/4\}$. By elliptic estimates there exists a constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\nabla \psi(X_0)}{y_0} \right| \leq C(\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|\partial_z G_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}).$$

Then $|\nabla \psi(X_0) / y_0| \leq CQ$ follows from $0 \leq \psi \leq Q$, the bound of $|\partial_z G_\epsilon|$ in (4.7), and (5.2).

Case 2. Estimate of $|\nabla\psi/y|$ near the symmetry axis \mathcal{N}_0 . Let $X_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{O} \cap \{0 < y_0 \leq 1/4\}$. For any $X = (x, y) \in B_1$, define

$$\psi_0(X) = \frac{\psi(X_0 + rX)}{r^2}, \quad r = \frac{y_0}{2}.$$

The function ψ_0 satisfies

$$\nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi_0}{y+2} \right|^2, \frac{y_0^2}{4}\psi_0 \right) \frac{\nabla\psi_0}{y+2} \right) - \frac{y_0^2}{4}(y+2)\partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla\psi_0}{y+2} \right|^2, \frac{y_0^2}{4}\psi_0 \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Besides, since by Lemma 5.2

$$(7.4) \quad 0 < \psi(x, y) \leq \min\{\Lambda y^2 e^{1-y}, Q\}$$

and by Corollary 6.3 it holds $\Lambda \leq CQ$, one has

$$0 < \psi_0(X) \leq 4\Lambda e \left(1 + \frac{y}{2}\right)^2 \leq CQ \quad \text{in } B_1$$

where $C = C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) > 0$. Thus using elliptic estimates, (4.7), and (5.2) again yields

$$\left| \frac{\nabla\psi(X_0)}{y_0} \right| = \frac{1}{2} |\nabla\psi_0(0)| \leq C(\|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\partial_z G_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}) \leq CQ$$

for some constant $C = C(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) > 0$. Thus (7.3) holds true.

Note that $|\nabla\psi/y|$ is uniformly Hölder continuous up to the symmetry axis \mathcal{N}_0 (cf. Appendix A). Besides, by Corollary 6.3 one has $|\nabla\psi/y| = \Lambda \leq CQ$ on the free boundary $\Omega \cap \partial\{\psi < Q\}$. Thus in view of Remark 7.4, one can find a small constant $Q_m = Q_m(B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N}) \in (Q_*, Q^*)$, where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1, such that the estimate (7.2) holds true as long as the mass flux $Q \in (Q_*, Q_m)$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 7.3. \square

7.3. Far fields behavior of the jet flow. The next proposition gives the asymptotic behavior of the subsonic jet flows as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

Proposition 7.5. *Let $\psi := \psi_\infty$ be the solution obtained in Proposition 7.1 with $\Lambda := \Lambda_\infty$. Then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, as $x \rightarrow -\infty$,*

$$(7.5) \quad \psi(x, y) \rightarrow \bar{\psi}(y) := \int_0^y s(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(s)ds \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \bar{H})),$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ and \bar{u} are determined in Proposition 2.1; as $x \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(7.6) \quad \psi(x, y) \rightarrow \underline{\psi}(y) := \int_0^y s(\underline{\rho}\underline{u})(s)ds \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \underline{H})),$$

where $\underline{\rho}, \underline{u} \in C^{1,\alpha}((0, \underline{H}])$ are positive functions. Moreover, the density $\underline{\rho}$, axial velocity \underline{u} , and height \underline{H} of the flow at the downstream are uniquely determined by $\bar{B}, \bar{S}, \bar{H}, \gamma, Q$, and Λ .

Proof. (i) *Upstream asymptotic behavior.* Let $\psi^{(-n)}(x, y) := \psi(x - n, y)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since the nozzle is asymptotically horizontal with the height \bar{H} , there exists a subsequence $\psi^{(-n)}$ (reabeled) converges to a function $\hat{\psi}$ in $C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \bar{H}))$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, where $\hat{\psi}$ satisfies (7.2) and solves the Dirichlet problem in the infinite strip

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \hat{\psi}}{y} \right|^2, \hat{\psi} \right) \frac{\nabla \hat{\psi}}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \hat{\psi}}{y} \right|^2, \hat{\psi} \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, \bar{H}), \\ \hat{\psi} = Q & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{\bar{H}\}, \quad \hat{\psi} = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

and it satisfies $0 \leq \hat{\psi} \leq Q$ in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \bar{H}]$. On the other hand, it follows from the energy estimates (cf. [18, Proposition 4.1]) that the problem (7.7) has a unique solution. Since $\hat{\psi}$ satisfies (7.2) and the function $\bar{\psi}$ defined in (7.5) satisfies the equation in (2.51), by Remark 7.4 one has $\hat{\psi}(x, y) = \bar{\psi}(y)$ in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \bar{H}]$. This proves the asymptotic behavior of the flows in the upstream.

(ii) *Downstream asymptotic behavior.* Let $\psi^{(n)}(x, y) := \psi(x + n, y)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of the free boundary and the boundary regularity for elliptic equations, there exists a subsequence $\psi^{(n)}$ (reabeled) converging to a function $\underline{\psi}$ in $C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \underline{H}))$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, where $\underline{\psi}$ satisfies (7.2) and solves

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \left(g_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \underline{\psi}}{y} \right|^2, \underline{\psi} \right) \frac{\nabla \underline{\psi}}{y} \right) - y \partial_z G_\epsilon \left(\left| \frac{\nabla \underline{\psi}}{y} \right|^2, \underline{\psi} \right) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, \underline{H}), \\ \underline{\psi} = Q, \quad \frac{1}{y} \partial_y \underline{\psi} = \Lambda & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{\underline{H}\}, \\ \underline{\psi} = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

with $0 \leq \underline{\psi} \leq Q$ in $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \underline{H}]$. By Lemma 5.6, the solution to the above Cauchy problem is unique for given positive constants Q , Λ , and \underline{H} . Moreover, using the energy estimates ([18, Proposition 4.1]) one can conclude that $\partial_x \underline{\psi} = 0$, that is, $\underline{\psi}$ is a one-dimensional function. Therefore, by (2.15) the flow radial velocity $v \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$. In view of (2.52), the downstream density ρ , axial velocity \underline{u} , and pressure \underline{p} (which is a constant, cf. Remark 1.1) are determined by

$$(\rho, \underline{u}, \underline{p}) = \left(\frac{1}{g(|\underline{\psi}'/y|^2, \underline{\psi})}, \frac{g(|\underline{\psi}'/y|^2, \underline{\psi}) \underline{\psi}'}{y}, \frac{(\gamma - 1) \mathcal{S}(Q)}{\gamma g^\gamma(\Lambda^2, Q)} \right).$$

Consequently, $\underline{\psi}$ can be expressed as in (7.6). The regularity of ρ and \underline{u} follows from the regularity of $\underline{\psi}$.

It remains to show that the downstream axial velocity \underline{u} is positive and the downstream height \underline{H} is uniquely determined by \bar{B} , \bar{S} , \bar{H} , γ , Q , and Λ . For this we let $\theta(y)$ be the position at downstream if one follows along the streamline with asymptotic

height y at the upstream, i.e., $\theta : [0, \bar{H}] \rightarrow [0, \underline{H}]$ satisfies

$$(7.9) \quad \underline{\psi}(\theta(y)) = \bar{\psi}(y), \quad y \in [0, \bar{H}],$$

where $\bar{\psi}$ and $\underline{\psi}$ are defined in (7.5) and (7.6), respectively. Then the map θ satisfies

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{cases} \theta'(y) = \frac{y(\bar{\rho}\bar{u})(y)}{\theta(y)(\underline{\rho}\underline{u})(\theta(y))}, \\ \theta(0) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where by (1.6)

$$(7.11) \quad \underline{\rho}(\theta(y)) = \left(\frac{\gamma \underline{p}}{(\gamma - 1) \bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

and by (2.1) and (2.20)

$$(7.12) \quad \underline{u}(\theta(y)) = \sqrt{2 \left(\bar{B}(y) - \left(\frac{\gamma \underline{p}}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}} \bar{S}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}(y) \right)}.$$

Using same arguments as the proof for (2.14) in Proposition 2.1, one gets

$$C(B_*, S_*, \bar{H}, \gamma) \kappa^{\frac{1}{4\gamma}} \leq \underline{u}(\theta(y)) \leq \sqrt{2B^*}.$$

Thus substituting (7.11) and (7.12) into (7.10) gives that $\theta(y)$, in particular $\underline{H} = \theta(\bar{H})$, is uniquely determined. This finishes the proof of the proposition. \square

In view of Propositions 7.1-7.5, we have proved the existence of solutions to Problem 2 when the mass flux Q is in a suitable range. Then the existence of solutions to Problem 1 follows from Proposition 2.7.

8. UNIQUENESS OF THE OUTER PRESSURE

In this section, we show that for given Bernoulli function \bar{B} , entropy function \bar{S} , and mass flux Q at the upstream, there is a unique momentum Λ on the free boundary such that Problem 2 has a solution. In view of (2.50) and the proof of Lemma 2.4(i), the uniqueness of Λ implies the uniqueness of the outer pressure \underline{p} . More precisely, the constant ρ_0 in (2.50) is determined by $\rho_0 = 1/g(\Lambda^2, Q)$, where g is the function defined in Lemma 2.4(i), hence $\underline{p} = (\gamma - 1) \bar{S}(\bar{H}) \rho_0^\gamma / \gamma$ is uniquely determined.

Proposition 8.1. *Let the nozzle boundary \mathcal{N} defined in (1.7) satisfy (1.8). Given the Bernoulli function and the entropy function $(\bar{B}, \bar{S}) \in (C^{1,1}([0, \bar{H}]))^2$ at the upstream which satisfy (1.11)-(1.13), where the constant $\kappa = (B_*, S_*, \gamma, \mathcal{N})$ in (1.13) is sufficiently small. Given the mass flux $Q \in (Q_*, Q^*)$, where Q_* and Q^* are defined in Proposition 2.1. Suppose that $(\psi_i, \Gamma_i, \Lambda_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are two uniformly subsonic solutions to Problem 2, then $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2$.*

Proof. Let $(\rho_i, \underline{u}_i, p_i, \underline{H}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the associated downstream asymptotic states. Without loss of generality, assume that $\Lambda_1 < \Lambda_2$. By (2.17), along the free boundary Γ_1 and Γ_2 one has

$$\frac{\Lambda_1^2}{2\rho_1^2(\underline{H}_1)} + \rho_1^{\gamma-1}(\underline{H}_1)\bar{S}(\bar{H}) = \bar{B}(\bar{H}) = \frac{\Lambda_2^2}{2\rho_2^2(\underline{H}_2)} + \rho_2^{\gamma-1}(\underline{H}_2)\bar{S}(\bar{H}).$$

Since the solutions are subsonic and $\Lambda_1 < \Lambda_2$, it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.4(i) that $\rho_1(\underline{H}_1) > \rho_2(\underline{H}_2)$. Hence by (1.6) one has

$$p_1 = \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}\bar{S}(\bar{H})\rho_1^\gamma(\underline{H}_1) > \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}\bar{S}(\bar{H})\rho_2^\gamma(\underline{H}_2) = p_2.$$

Let $\theta_i(y)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the function defined in (7.10) associated with $(\rho_i, \underline{u}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then

$$\rho_1(\theta_1(y)) = \left(\frac{\gamma p_1}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} > \left(\frac{\gamma p_2}{(\gamma-1)\bar{S}(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} = \rho_2(\theta_2(y)).$$

Combining this inequality with

$$\frac{(\rho_1 \underline{u}_1)^2(\theta_1(y))}{2\rho_1^2(\theta_1(y))} + \rho_1^{\gamma-1}(\theta_1(y))\bar{S}(y) = \bar{B}(y) = \frac{(\rho_2 \underline{u}_2)^2(\theta_2(y))}{2\rho_2^2(\theta_2(y))} + \rho_2^{\gamma-1}(\theta_2(y))\bar{S}(y)$$

(which is obtained from (2.15) and (2.17)), and the proof of Lemma 2.4(i) together yields

$$(\rho_1 \underline{u}_1)(\theta_1(y)) < (\rho_2 \underline{u}_2)(\theta_2(y)).$$

Thus in view of (7.10) it follows

$$(8.1) \quad (\theta_1^2(y))' > (\theta_2^2(y))'.$$

Note that $\theta_1(0) = \theta_2(0)$. After an integration of (8.1) on $[0, \bar{H}]$ one gets

$$\underline{H}_1 = \theta_1(\bar{H}) > \theta_2(\bar{H}) = \underline{H}_2.$$

Let \mathcal{O}_i be the domain bounded by \mathcal{N}_0 , \mathcal{N} , and Γ_i . Since $\underline{H}_1 > \underline{H}_2$ and that $\mathcal{N} \cup \Gamma_i$ is a y -graph, one can find a $\tau \geq 0$ such that the domain $\mathcal{O}_1^\tau = \{(x, y) : (x - \tau, y) \in \mathcal{O}_1\}$ contains \mathcal{O}_2 . Let τ_* be the smallest number such that $\mathcal{O}_1^{\tau_*}$ contains \mathcal{O}_2 and they touch at some point $(x_*, y_*) \in \Gamma_2$. Define $\psi_1^{\tau_*}(x, y) := \psi_1(x - \tau_*, y)$. Now we prove $\psi_1^{\tau_*} \leq \psi_2$ in \mathcal{O}_2 . Suppose that there exists a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{O}_2$ such that $\psi_1^{\tau_*}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) > \psi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. Since $\psi_1^{\tau_*}$ and ψ_2 have the same asymptotic behavior as $x \rightarrow -\infty$, and $\psi_1^{\tau_*} \leq \psi_2$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$ by the comparison principle (cf. Lemma 4.5), one can find a domain $\mathcal{O}'_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_2$ containing (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) such that $\psi_1^{\tau_*} - \psi_2$ obtains its maximum in the interior of \mathcal{O}'_2 . This contradicts the strong maximum principle. Hence $\psi_1^{\tau_*} \leq \psi_2$ in \mathcal{O}_2 . Since at the touching point one has $\psi_1^{\tau_*}(x_*, y_*) = \psi_2(x_*, y_*)$, by the Hopf lemma it holds

$$\Lambda_1 = \frac{1}{y_*} \frac{\partial \psi_1^{\tau_*}}{\partial \nu}(x_*, y_*) > \frac{1}{y_*} \frac{\partial \psi_2}{\partial \nu}(x_*, y_*) = \Lambda_2.$$

This leads to a contradiction. Hence one has $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2$. \square

Combining all the results in previous sections, Theorem 1 is proved.

APPENDIX A.

In this appendix, we exclude the singularity of the solution ψ obtained in Proposition 7.1 near the symmetry axis. We refer to [34] for the study on elliptic equations with singularity at the boundary under different conditions.

The function ψ obtained in Proposition 7.1 is a solution of the elliptic equation (4.15) in $\mathcal{O} := \Omega \cap \{\psi < Q\}$, where $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}, z) := G_\epsilon(|\mathbf{p}|^2, z)$ satisfies all properties in Proposition 4.1. Besides, ψ satisfies the estimates (7.3) and $0 < \psi(x, y) \leq Cy^2$ (cf. (7.4)), provided κ in (1.13) is sufficiently small. We aim to show that $|\nabla\psi/y|$ is uniformly Hölder continuous up to $\{y = 0\}$.

For simplicity, we denote

$$(A.1) \quad \mathcal{L} := \mathbf{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij} - \frac{\mathbf{a}_{i2}}{y}\partial_i \quad (i, j = 1, 2)$$

as a linear elliptic operator, where the coefficients $\mathbf{a}_{ij} \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1])$ ($i, j = 1, 2$) satisfy

$$\mathbf{b}_*|\xi|^2 \leq \mathbf{a}_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \leq \mathbf{b}^*|\xi|^2, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

with $\mathbf{b}_*, \mathbf{b}^* > 0$; moreover, we denote

$$\mathcal{Q}_k := \left[-\frac{M}{2^k}, \frac{M}{2^k}\right] \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2^k}\right], \quad k \geq 0,$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant to be chosen later.

First, we give the following key lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\phi \in C_{\text{loc}}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1])$ be a solution of*

$$(A.2) \quad \mathcal{L}\phi = y^2\mathbf{f}(x, y) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, 1),$$

where \mathcal{L} is defined in (A.1) and $\mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1))$. Suppose that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1))} \leq F$ for some constant $F > 0$ sufficiently small depending on \mathbf{b}_* and \mathbf{b}^* . If $0 \leq \phi(x, y) \leq y^2$ in \mathcal{Q}_0 , then there exists a constant $\sigma = \sigma(\mathbf{b}_*, \mathbf{b}^*) \in (0, 1/8)$, such that

$$0 \leq \phi(x, y) \leq (1 - \sigma)y^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma y^2 \leq \phi(x, y) \leq y^2 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_1.$$

Proof. Since $0 \leq \phi(0, 1/2) \leq 1/4$, one has $\phi(0, 1/2) \geq 1/8$ or $\phi(0, 1/2) \leq 1/8$. Assume that $\phi(0, 1/2) \geq 1/8$ (otherwise we consider the function $y^2 - \phi$). Using the Harnack

inequality yields $\phi(x, y) \geq 2\sigma$ in $[-M + 1, M - 1] \times [1/8, 7/8]$, where $\sigma = \sigma(\mathbf{b}_*, \mathbf{b}^*) > 0$ can be sufficiently small. Define a function

$$P(x, y) := \sigma y^2 + \sigma y^3 - \frac{8\sigma}{M^2} |x|^2 y^2.$$

Direct computations give that

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi - P) = y^2 \mathbf{f}(x, y) + \frac{16\sigma}{M^2} \mathbf{a}_{11} y^2 + \frac{48\sigma}{M^2} \mathbf{a}_{12} x y - 3\sigma \mathbf{a}_{22} y.$$

Choose a sufficiently large $M = M(\mathbf{a}_{ij}) > 0$. Since $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0,1))}$ is sufficiently small, one can check that $\mathcal{L}(\phi - P) \leq 0$ in \mathcal{Q}_1 and $\phi \geq P$ on $\partial\mathcal{Q}_1$. By the comparison principle we conclude $\phi \geq P$ in \mathcal{Q}_1 . Thus $\phi(0, y) \geq P(0, y) \geq \sigma y^2$. Using a translation one gets $\phi(x, y) \geq \sigma y^2$ in \mathcal{Q}_1 . This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Without loss of generality we assume that $0 \leq \psi \leq y^2$. The elliptic equation in (4.15) can be rewritten as

$$(A.3) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \partial_{ij} \psi - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{i2}}{y} \partial_i \psi = y^2 \tilde{\mathbf{f}},$$

where

$$(A.4) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} := \partial_{p_i p_j} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}} := \partial_{p_i z} \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right) \frac{\partial_i \psi}{y} + \partial_z \mathcal{G} \left(\frac{\nabla \psi}{y}, \psi \right).$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{f}} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1))$, cf. (4.7) and (7.3). Let

$$(A.5) \quad \psi_1(x, y) := \frac{\psi(r_0 x, r_0 y)}{r_0^2}, \quad r_0 > 0.$$

Then the function ψ_1 satisfies an elliptic equation of the form

$$\mathcal{L}\psi_1 = y^2 \mathbf{f}_1(x, y) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{f}_1(x, y) := r_0^2 \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(r_0 x, r_0 y),$$

and $0 \leq \psi_1 \leq y^2$ in \mathcal{Q}_0 . In view of Lemma A.1, if we choose a sufficiently small $r_0 = r_0(\mathbf{b}^*, \mathbf{b}_*, \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0,1))})$ such that $\|\mathbf{f}_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times (0,1))} \leq F$, then

$$(A.6) \quad m_1 y^2 \leq \psi_1(x, y) \leq M_1 y^2 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_1,$$

where $m_1 \in \{0, \sigma\}$, $M_1 \in \{1 - \sigma, 1\}$, and $M_1 - m_1 = 1 - \sigma$. Define

$$\psi_2(x, y) := \frac{\psi_1 - m_1 y^2}{M_1 - m_1} \left(\frac{1}{2} x, \frac{1}{2} y \right).$$

Since ψ_2 also satisfies an elliptic equation of the form

$$(A.7) \quad \mathcal{L}\psi_2 = y^2 \mathbf{f}_2(x, y) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_0, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{f}_2(x, y) := \frac{\mathbf{f}_1 \left(\frac{x}{2}, \frac{y}{2} \right)}{2^4 (M_1 - m_1)}$$

and $0 \leq \psi_2(x, y) \leq y^2/4$ in \mathcal{Q}_0 . Applying Lemma A.1 again to $4\psi_2$ (note that $2^2(M_1 - m_1) \geq 1$ since $\sigma \leq 1/8$) one has

$$m_2 y^2 \leq \psi_2(x, y) \leq M_2 y^2 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_1,$$

where $m_2 \in \{0, \sigma/4\}$, $M_2 \in \{(1-\sigma)/4, 1/4\}$, and $M_2 - m_2 = (1-\sigma)/4$. Repeating the above arguments, for each integer $k > 0$, we have

$$\tilde{m}_k y^2 \leq \psi_1(x, y) \leq \tilde{M}_k y^2 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_k,$$

where $\tilde{m}_k, \tilde{M}_k \in [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{M}_k - \tilde{m}_k = (1-\sigma)^k$. In view of the definition of ψ_1 in (A.5), we get

$$|\psi(x, y) - \mathbf{c}(0)y^2| \leq C y^{2+\alpha} \quad \text{in } B_\sigma^+ := B_\sigma \cap \{y > 0\}$$

for some C^α ($\alpha \in (0, 1)$) function $\mathbf{c}(x)$ and constants $C > 0$, $0 < \sigma \ll 1$.

Now for any $(x_0, y_0) \in B_{\sigma/2}^+$, let $r = y_0/2$. Since (A.3) holds in $B_r(x_0, y_0)$, one has

$$|\psi(x_0 + x, y_0 + y) - \mathbf{c}(0)(y_0 + y)^2| \leq C(y_0 + y)^{2+\alpha} \leq C r^{2+\alpha} \quad \text{in } B_r.$$

Let

$$\varphi(x, y) := \frac{\psi(x_0 + rx, y_0 + ry) - \mathbf{c}(0)(y_0 + ry)^2}{r^2}.$$

Then φ satisfies

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij} \partial_{ij} \varphi - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{i2}}{2+y} \partial_i \varphi = \hat{\mathbf{f}} \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(x, y) := \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}(x_0 + rx, y_0 + ry), \quad \hat{\mathbf{f}}(x, y) := (y_0 + ry)^2 \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(x_0 + rx, y_0 + ry),$$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ are defined in (A.4). Thus by the interior regularity of elliptic equations one has

$$\left| \frac{\nabla \psi(x_0, y_0)}{y_0} - (0, 2\mathbf{c}(0)) \right| = \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \varphi(0)| \leq C(\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|\hat{\mathbf{f}}\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}) \leq C y_0^\alpha,$$

where $C = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{ij}) > 0$. Using a coordinate translation we conclude that $|\nabla \psi/y|$ is uniformly Hölder continuous up to $\{y = 0\}$. Actually we can further get $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathcal{O} \cup \{y = 0\})$ since now we know $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ is C^α .

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Professors Lihe Wang and Chunjing Xie for many helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli. Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 325:105–144, 1981.
- [2] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. Asymmetric jet flows. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 35(1):29–68, 1982.
- [3] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. Axially symmetric jet flows. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 81(2):97–149, 1983.
- [4] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. A free boundary problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 11(1):1–44, 1984.
- [5] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. Jets with two fluids. I. One free boundary. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 33(2):213–247, 1984.
- [6] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. Jets with two fluids. II. Two free boundaries. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 33(3):367–391, 1984.
- [7] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman. Compressible flows of jets and cavities. *J. Differential Equations*, 56(1):82–141, 1985.
- [8] L. Bers. *Mathematical aspects of subsonic and transonic gas dynamics*. Surveys in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 3. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York; Chapman & Hall, Ltd., London, 1958.
- [9] G. Birkhoff and E. H. Zarantonello. *Jets, wakes, and cavities*. Academic Press, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1957.
- [10] C. Chen and C. Xie. Existence of steady subsonic Euler flows through infinitely long periodic nozzles. *J. Differential Equations*, 252(7):4315–4331, 2012.
- [11] C. Chen and C. Xie. Three dimensional steady subsonic Euler flows in bounded nozzles. *J. Differential Equations*, 256(11):3684–3708, 2014.
- [12] G.-Q. Chen, X. Deng, and W. Xiang. Global steady subsonic flows through infinitely long nozzles for the full Euler equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 44(4):2888–2919, 2012.
- [13] G.-Q. Chen, F.-M. Huang, T.-Y. Wang, and W. Xiang. Steady Euler flows with large vorticity and characteristic discontinuities in arbitrary infinitely long nozzles. *Adv. Math.*, 346:946–1008, 2019.
- [14] J. Cheng, L. Du, and W. Xiang. Steady incompressible axially symmetric Réthy flows. *Nonlinearity*, 33(9):4627–4669, 2020.
- [15] J. Cheng, L. Du, and Z. Xin. Incompressible impinging jet flow with gravity. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(4):Paper No. 110, 51, 2023.
- [16] J. Cheng, L. Du, and Q. Zhang. Existence and uniqueness of axially symmetric compressible subsonic jet impinging on an infinite wall. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 23(1):1–58, 2021.
- [17] X. Deng, T.-Y. Wang, and W. Xiang. Three-dimensional full Euler flows with nontrivial swirl in axisymmetric nozzles. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50(3):2740–2772, 2018.
- [18] L. Du and B. Duan. Global subsonic Euler flows in an infinitely long axisymmetric nozzle. *J. Differential Equations*, 250(2):813–847, 2011.
- [19] L. Du and B. Duan. Note on the uniqueness of subsonic Euler flows in an axisymmetric nozzle. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 25(2):153–156, 2012.
- [20] L. Du and B. Duan. Subsonic Euler flows with large vorticity through an infinitely long axisymmetric nozzle. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 18(3):511–530, 2016.

- [21] L. Du and Y. Wang. Steady collision of two jets issuing from two axially symmetric channels. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(2):2523–2566, 2021.
- [22] L. Du and C. Xie. On subsonic Euler flows with stagnation points in two-dimensional nozzles. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 63(5):1499–1523, 2014.
- [23] L. Du, Z. Xin, and W. Yan. Subsonic flows in a multi-dimensional nozzle. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 201(3):965–1012, 2011.
- [24] B. Duan and Z. Luo. Three-dimensional full Euler flows in axisymmetric nozzles. *J. Differential Equations*, 254(7):2705–2731, 2013.
- [25] B. Duan and Z. Luo. Subsonic non-isentropic Euler flows with large vorticity in axisymmetric nozzles. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 430(2):1037–1057, 2015.
- [26] A. Friedman. *Variational principles and free-boundary problems*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1982.
- [27] P. R. Garabedian, H. Lewy, and M. Schiffer. Axially symmetric cavitation flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 56:560–602, 1952.
- [28] D. Gilbarg. *Jets and cavities*. Handbuch der Physik, Vol. 9, Part 3. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1960.
- [29] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [30] Q. Han and F. Lin. *Elliptic partial differential equations*, volume 1 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2011.
- [31] D. Kinderlehrer and L. Nirenberg. Regularity in free boundary problems. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 4(2):373–391, 1977.
- [32] H. Koch and D. Tataru. Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second-order elliptic equations with nonsmooth coefficients. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54(3):339–360, 2001.
- [33] Y. Li, W. Shi, L. Tang, and C. Xie. Variational structure and two-dimensional subsonic jet flows for compressible Euler system with general incoming flows, preprint, arXiv:2006.05672.
- [34] F. H. Lin and L. Wang. A class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations with singularity at the boundary. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 8(4):583–598, 1998.
- [35] C. Wang and Z. Xin. On a degenerate free boundary problem and continuous subsonic-sonic flows in a convergent nozzle. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 208(3):911–975, 2013.
- [36] C. Wang and Z. Xin. On an elliptic free boundary problem and subsonic jet flows for a given surrounding pressure. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(2):1014–1045, 2019.
- [37] C. Xie and Z. Xin. Global subsonic and subsonic-sonic flows through infinitely long nozzles. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(6):2991–3023, 2007.
- [38] C. Xie and Z. Xin. Existence of global steady subsonic Euler flows through infinitely long nozzles. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(2):751–784, 2010.
- [39] C. Xie and Z. Xin. Global subsonic and subsonic-sonic flows through infinitely long axially symmetric nozzles. *J. Differential Equations*, 248(11):2657–2683, 2010.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, 800 DONGCHUAN ROAD, SHANGHAI, 200240, CHINA

Email address: liyanly@sjtu.edu.cn