

Vanishing viscosity limit for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with non-linear density dependent viscosities

Luca Bisconti¹ Matteo Caggio^{2*} Filippo Dell’Oro³

1. Università degli Studi di Firenze - Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica “U. Dini”

Viale Morgagni 67/a, I-50134 Firenze, Italy

2. Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

Žitná 25, 11567 Praha 1, Czech Republic

3. Politecnico di Milano - Dipartimento di Matematica

Via Bonardi 9, 20133 Milano, Italy

* corresponding author: caggio@math.cas.cz

Abstract

In a three-dimensional bounded domain Ω we consider the compressible Navier-Stokes equations for a barotropic fluid with general non-linear density dependent viscosities and no-slip boundary conditions. A nonlinear drag term is added to the momentum equation. We establish two conditional Kato-type criteria for the convergence of the weak solutions to such a system towards the strong solution of the compressible Euler system when the viscosity coefficient and the drag term parameter tend to zero.

Keywords: compressible Navier-Stokes equations, density dependent viscosities, vanishing viscosity limit, boundary layer.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 35Q30, 35Q35, 76N10

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, and let $T > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. We consider the compressible Navier-Stokes equations describing the motion of a barotropic fluid with density dependent viscosities that may vanish on vacuum

$$\partial_t \varrho + \operatorname{div}(\varrho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\partial_t(\varrho \mathbf{u}) + \operatorname{div}(\varrho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla p(\varrho) - \varepsilon[\operatorname{div}(2\mu(\varrho)\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})) + \nabla(\lambda(\varrho)\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u})] + r_1\varrho|\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where ε and r_1 are positive parameters. The unknown variables

$$\varrho : (0, T) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u} : (0, T) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3,$$

with $\varrho = \varrho(t, x)$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t, x)$, represent the density and the velocity vector field, respectively. The term $p = p(\varrho)$ represent the pressure of the fluid and is given by a standard power law

$$p(\varrho) = \varrho^\gamma, \quad \gamma > 1.$$

Moreover $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla^\top \mathbf{u})$ is the symmetric part of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$. The density dependent viscosity coefficients $\mu(\varrho)$ and $\lambda(\varrho)$ satisfy the following algebraic relation

$$\lambda(\varrho) = 2(\varrho\mu'(\varrho) - \mu(\varrho)) \tag{1.3}$$

and further structural assumptions specified later. The last term in the momentum equation (1.2) corresponds to a turbulent drag force (see, e.g. [5]).

The system is supplemented with the no-slip boundary condition

$$\varrho \mathbf{u}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Moreover, as in [5], we prescribe the additional boundary condition

$$\mu(\varrho) \nabla s(\varrho) \times \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit vector normal to $\partial\Omega$, and $s'(\varrho) = \mu'(\varrho)/\varrho$. The latter expresses the fact that the density should be constant on the connected components of $\partial\Omega$ (see [5]). Finally, the initial state of the system is prescribed

$$\varrho(0, \cdot) = \varrho_0, \quad \varrho \mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \varrho_0 \mathbf{u}_0.$$

Formally, letting $\varepsilon, r_1 \rightarrow 0$, one obtains the compressible Euler system

$$\partial_t \varrho^E + \operatorname{div}(\varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E) = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\partial_t(\varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E) + \operatorname{div}(\varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E \otimes \mathbf{u}^E) + \nabla p(\varrho^E) = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

with the boundary condition

$$\mathbf{u}^E \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \tag{1.8}$$

and the initial conditions

$$\varrho^E(0) = \varrho_0^E, \quad \varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E(0) = \varrho_0^E \mathbf{u}_0^E.$$

As is well-known, a rigorous justification of such a singular limit on domains with non-empty boundary is a challenging problem, due to the appearance of boundary layers. A remarkable approach was introduced in the seminal paper of Kato [22], where the author studied the vanishing viscosity limit (also called inviscid limit) of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with no-slip boundary conditions. He proved that, if the energy dissipation rate of the viscous flow in a boundary layer of width proportional to the viscosity vanishes, then the solutions of the

incompressible Navier–Stokes equations converge to the solutions of the incompressible Euler equations. The analysis requires the construction of an artificial “fake” boundary layer, needed to compensate the discrepancy between the boundary conditions of the original system and the boundary conditions of the target one. The result of [22] has been improved and generalized by several authors. Without any claim of completeness, we mention [23, 29] among many others. We also mention the work of Constantin et al. [14] where the inviscid limit has been performed under the so-called Oleinik condition of no back-flow in the trace of the Euler flow and a lower bound for the Navier-Stokes vorticity in a Kato-like boundary layer.

For the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with no-slip boundary conditions and constant viscosity coefficients, that is, when the viscous term

$$-\varepsilon[\operatorname{div}(2\mu(\varrho)\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})) + \nabla(\lambda(\varrho)\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u})]$$

is replaced by $-\varepsilon \operatorname{div}\mathbb{S}(\nabla\mathbf{u})$, where

$$\mathbb{S}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) = \mu\left(\nabla\mathbf{u} + \nabla^\top\mathbf{u} - \frac{2}{3}(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u})\mathbb{I}\right) + \eta(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u})\mathbb{I},$$

for some constants $\mu > 0$ and $\eta \geq 0$, some results have been obtained (without the presence of the drag term in the momentum equation) by Sueur [27]. He established the following sufficient condition for the vanishing viscosity limit to hold:

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\varepsilon \frac{\varrho|\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} + \varepsilon \frac{\varrho^2(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2}{d_\Omega^2} + \varepsilon |\mathbb{S}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \right) dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.9)$$

Here and in the sequel, we denote by $d_\Omega = d_\Omega(x) = d(x, \partial\Omega)$ the distance of $x \in \Omega$ to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and by

$$\Gamma_{c\varepsilon} = \{x \in \Omega : d_\Omega(x) < c\varepsilon\},$$

for a constant $c > 0$ (in the case of (1.9), the constant $c > 0$ is arbitrarily fixed). Condition (1.9) can be regarded as a generalization of the result of Kato in the context of compressible fluids. Indeed, in the light of the Hardy inequality, when the density is constant (1.9) is implied by

$$\varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} |\nabla\mathbf{u}|^2 dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

which is exactly the condition employed by Kato in [22]. Subsequently, Bardos and Nguyen [2] proved the convergence to the so-called dissipative solutions of the compressible Euler equations under the alternative condition

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\varrho^\gamma + \varepsilon \frac{\varrho|\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} + \varepsilon |\nabla\mathbf{u}|^2 \right) dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.10)$$

The achievements of [27] have been somehow improved by Wang and Zhu [30], where the authors assumed sufficient conditions only on the tangential or the normal component of velocity, at the

cost of increasing the width of the boundary layer. See also the recent article [31] which can be regarded as the analogous of [14] for compressible fluids.

We now come to the literature concerning the vanishing viscosity limit for the compressible Navier-Stokes system with density dependent viscosity coefficients. In the three-dimensional torus, the convergence has been analyzed by Bresch et. al. [7] employing the so-called “augmented version” of the compressible Navier-Stokes system. Further results have been obtained by Geng et al. [20, 21] in the whole space \mathbb{R}^3 and for viscosity coefficients of the form ϱ^β with $\beta > 1$. We also mention the articles [12, 15] which study the case when the viscosity coefficients obey a lower order power law of the density, namely, ϱ^β with $0 < \beta \leq 1$. The case of bounded domains with non-empty boundary has been recently treated in [4] for the particular choice

$$\mu(\varrho) = \varrho \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(\varrho) = 0,$$

namely, for linear density dependent viscosity coefficients. In this article, the passage to the limit has been performed under the assumption:

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} \right) dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Note that, compared to (1.9) and (1.10), relation (1.11) requires a decay rate for the L^γ -norm, $\gamma > 1$, of the density and a stronger condition on the kinetic energy term. But notably, no assumptions on the viscous terms are imposed. The strategy adopted in [4] relies on the so-called relative energy estimates and, in particular, on the introduction of a relative energy functional “measuring” the distance between a weak solution of the compressible Navier-Stokes system and a strong solution of the compressible Euler system. A relative energy inequality satisfied by the weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations has been derived, which however involves some test functions that must satisfy the no-slip boundary conditions. For this reason, as done in the previous contributions mentioned above, a “correction” based on a Kato-type “fake” boundary layer was needed. Still, different from the standard construction of Feireisl et al. [18, 19], the relative energy inequality constructed in [4] is derived from the aforementioned “augmented version” of the compressible Navier-Stokes system, in the same spirit of Bresch et al. [6, 7] through the use of the Bresch-Desjardins entropy inequality (see also [8, 9, 11, 13] for recent applications).

Description of our results

The aim of the present paper is twofold, and can be summarized in the following points.

- We extend the results of [4] to more general and possibly non-linear density dependent viscosity coefficients $\mu(\varrho)$ and $\lambda(\varrho)$. Actually, we also weaken the second assumption in (1.11) by replacing the factor $\varepsilon^{(\gamma-1)/\gamma}$ with ε . See the forthcoming Theorem 3.1.
- We establish a new conditional criterion analogous to (1.9) for the validity of the vanishing viscosity limit in the context of compressible fluids with density dependent viscosities. See Theorem 3.2 below.

In the same spirit of [4], we employ the relative energy inequality approach and the construction of the “fake” boundary layer. However, unlike [4], we completely avoid the use of the “augmented version” of the compressible Navier-Stokes system as well as the use of the Bresch-Desjardins entropy inequality, following instead the construction of Feireisl et al. [18, 19].

Plan of the paper

In the next Section 2, we introduce the assumptions satisfied by the viscosity coefficients and the weak formulation of the compressible Navier-Stokes system. Moreover, we discuss the strong solution of the compressible Euler system. In the subsequent Section 3, we state our main results Theorems 3.1-3.2, while in Section 4 we derive the relative energy inequality. The remaining Sections 5-8 are devoted to the vanishing viscosity limit and the proofs of Theorems 3.1-3.2.

2 Notation and preliminaries

We denote by $C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 1$, the space compactly supported smooth functions with values in \mathbb{R}^d , and by $L^p(\Omega)$, $p \geq 1$, the standard Lebesgue spaces. Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$, $k \geq 1$, consist of functions in $L^p(\Omega)$ with weak derivatives of order k that still belong to $L^p(\Omega)$. The Bochner evolution spaces, for time-dependent functions with values in Banach spaces X are denoted by $L^p(0, T; X)$ and $W^{k,p}(0, T; X)$. Also, $C_w(0, T; X)$ denotes the space of weakly continuous functions.

2.1 Assumptions on viscosity coefficients μ and λ

In the same spirit of [5, 24], and recalling that $\gamma > 1$, in addition to the key relation (1.3) we assume that there exists a positive constant

$$\nu \in \left[\frac{1}{3\gamma - 2}, 1 \right), \quad (2.1)$$

such that the following conditions on the viscosity coefficients are satisfied:

$$\mu'(\varrho) \geq \nu, \quad \mu(0) \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

$$|\lambda'(\varrho)| \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \mu'(\varrho), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\nu \mu(\varrho) \leq 2\mu(\varrho) + 3\lambda(\varrho) \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \mu(\varrho). \quad (2.4)$$

When $\gamma \geq 3$, we also require that

$$\liminf_{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(\varrho)}{\varrho^{\gamma/3+\vartheta}} > 0 \quad (2.5)$$

for some small $\vartheta > 0$. As remarked in [5, 24], hypothesis (1.3) and (2.4) yield the bounds

$$\begin{cases} \mu(\varrho) \leq c_1 \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\nu}{3}\right)}, & \text{if } \varrho \leq 1, \\ \mu(\varrho) \leq c_1 \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}\right)}, & \text{if } \varrho \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for some $c_1 > 0$. Moreover, it follows from (2.4) that

$$|\lambda(\varrho)| \leq c_2 \mu(\varrho), \quad (2.7)$$

for all $\varrho > 0$ and some $c_2 > 0$.

Remark 2.1. *The functions $\mu(\varrho) = \varrho$ and $\lambda(\varrho) = 0$ satisfy all the assumptions stated above, including (1.3), provided that $\gamma \geq 4/3$.*

2.2 Weak solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes system

We introduce the definition of the weak solution to system (1.1)–(1.2). As is well-known, the degenerate viscosities prevent \mathbf{u} to be defined on the vacuum region (see e.g. [24]). As a consequence, not \mathbf{u} nor $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ are defined almost everywhere. On the other hand, the quantities $\sqrt{\varrho}$ and $\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}$ turn out to be well-defined (see e.g. [24]). Consequently, the density $\varrho \geq 0$ (thought as $(\sqrt{\varrho})^2$) and the momentum $\varrho \mathbf{u}$ (thought as $\sqrt{\varrho} \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}$) are also well-defined. Accordingly, the correct way to interpret the viscous term is to think it as

$$\operatorname{div}(2\mu(\varrho)\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})) + \nabla(\lambda(\varrho)\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}) = 2 \operatorname{div}\left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)}\mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)}\operatorname{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)}\mathbb{S}_\mu)\mathbb{I}\right),$$

where the matrix-valued function \mathbb{S}_μ is the symmetric part of the matrix-valued function \mathbb{T}_μ defined through the identity (see e.g. [10])

$$\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)}\mathbb{T}_\mu = \nabla\left(\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} \frac{\mu(\varrho)}{\sqrt{\varrho}}\right) - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} \otimes \sqrt{\varrho}\nabla s(\varrho), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'((0, T) \times \Omega), \quad (2.8)$$

with $s'(\varrho) = \mu'(\varrho)/\varrho$.

Remark 2.2. *In the sequel, especially in providing sufficient conditions for the vanishing viscosity limit (in the spirit of (1.9)-to-(1.11)), as a matter of notation, we write $\varrho|\mathbf{u}|^2$ in place of $|\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}|^2$.*

Definition 2.1. *Let $T > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. We say that (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) with $\varrho \geq 0$ is a weak solution of (1.1)-(1.2) with boundary conditions (1.4)-(1.5) on the time interval $[0, T]$ if the following hold.*

(1) *Regularity properties*

$$\varrho \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\gamma(\Omega)), \quad \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}, \sqrt{\varrho}\nabla s(\varrho), \mu(\varrho)/\sqrt{\varrho} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega)).$$

(2) The continuity equation (1.1) is satisfied in the following sense

$$-\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho \partial_t \phi \, dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dt = \int_\Omega \varrho(0, \cdot) \phi(0, \cdot) \, dx - \int_\Omega \varrho(\tau, \cdot) \phi(\tau, \cdot) \, dx$$

for all $\tau \in [0, T]$ and every $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$.

(3) The momentum equation (1.2) is satisfied in the following sense

$$\begin{aligned} & -\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \otimes \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\varrho) \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dx dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \operatorname{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi} \right] \, dx dt + r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dx dt \\ & = \int_\Omega (\varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi})(0, \cdot) \, dx - \int_\Omega (\varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi})(\tau, \cdot) \, dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in [0, T]$ and every $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, where the matrix-valued function \mathbb{S}_μ is the symmetric part of the matrix-valued function \mathbb{T}_μ defined in (2.8).

(4) The following energy inequality is satisfied

$$\int_\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \right] (\tau, \cdot) \, dx + \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dx dt \leq \int_\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0|^2 + \frac{\varrho_0^\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \right] \, dx \quad (2.9)$$

for all $\tau \in [0, T]$, where ν is the same parameter appearing in (2.1)-(2.4).

Remark 2.3. A discussion concerning the derivation of (2.9) is presented in the Appendix. In this regard, note that $\mu(\varrho)$ is a positive quantity, while $\lambda(\varrho)$ could be negative for $\varrho > 0$. Again, in obtaining (2.9), the viscous term involving $\lambda(\varrho)$ is directly controlled making use of the other viscous term, i.e. the one about $\mu(\varrho)$ by exploiting the elementary estimate $|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 \leq 3|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2$. Through this last estimate, a minor part of information related to the considered system is lost, effectively determining an “energy inequality”. However, relation (2.9) contains the most significant part of the energy contribution, and such an information is enough for our purposes.

The following existence result has been proved by Bresch, Desjardins and Gérard-Varet [5].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $T > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. Let also the initial data $(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0)$ for the compressible Navier-Stokes system (1.1)-(1.2) be such that*

$$\varrho_0 \geq 0, \quad \varrho_0 \in L^\gamma(\Omega), \quad \sqrt{\varrho_0} \nabla s(\varrho_0) \in L^2(\Omega), \quad \varrho_0 \mathbf{u}_0 = 0 \text{ if } \varrho_0 = 0, \quad |\varrho_0 \mathbf{u}_0|^2 / \varrho_0 \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r_1 > 0$, there exists at least a weak solution (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) to system (1.1)-(1.2) on the time interval $[0, T]$ with boundary conditions (1.4)-(1.5).

The existence of weak solutions for system (1.1)-(1.2) without the drag term $r_1 \varrho |\mathbf{u}| \mathbf{u}$ has been shown by Bresch, Vasseur and Yu [10] on the three-dimensional torus. In such a paper, the authors extended the previous result by Vasseur and Yu [28] to non-linear density dependent viscosity coefficients.

2.3 Strong solution to the compressible Euler system

We recall the classical result concerning the local existence of strong solutions for the compressible Euler system (see [1, 3, 16, 17, 26]).

Theorem 2.2. *Let $(\varrho_0^E, \mathbf{u}_0^E) \in C^{1+\delta}(\Omega)$ with $\delta > 0$ be some compatible initial data satisfying*

$$\inf_{\Omega} \varrho_0^E > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\Omega} \varrho_0^E < \infty.$$

Then, there exists a time $T^E > 0$ depending on $(\varrho_0^E, \mathbf{u}_0^E)$ and a unique strong solution of (1.6)-(1.8) on the time interval $[0, T^E]$ satisfying

$$(\varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E) \in C_w(0, T^E; C^{1+\delta}(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T^E] \times \bar{\Omega}) \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\inf_{[0, T^E] \times \Omega} \varrho^E > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{[0, T^E] \times \Omega} \varrho^E < \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

In the statement above “compatible” refers to some conditions satisfied by the initial data on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ which are necessary for the existence of strong solutions (see [25, 26, 27]).

3 Statement of the main results

We are now in a position to state the main results of the paper. From now on, we suppose that the drag term parameter $r_1 > 0$ appearing in (1.2) is a function of the viscosity parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $r_1 = r_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This allows us to eliminate the dependence on r_1 of the weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes system (1.1)-(1.2).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\varrho_0^E, \mathbf{u}_0^E)$ be as in Theorem 2.2 and let $(\varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)$ be the corresponding strong solution of the compressible Euler system (1.6)-(1.8) on the time interval $[0, T^E]$. Let also $c > 0$ and $0 < T \leq T^E$ be arbitrarily fixed. Moreover, let $\varrho_0 = \varrho_{0,\varepsilon}$ and $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{u}_{0,\varepsilon}$ be as in Theorem 2.1 and assume that*

$$\|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^E|^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Finally, let $\varrho = \varrho_\varepsilon$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ be a weak solution on the time interval $[0, T]$ of the compressible Navier-Stokes system (1.1)-(1.2) with boundary conditions (1.4)-(1.5) corresponding to $(\varrho_{0,\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u}_{0,\varepsilon})$. Assume that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} \right) dx dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Then, it follows that

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} (\|\varrho - \varrho^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + \|\varrho \mathbf{u} - \varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E\|_{L^1(\Omega)}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Theorem 3.2. Let $(\varrho_0^E, \mathbf{u}_0^E)$ be as in Theorem 2.2 and let $(\varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)$ be the corresponding strong solution of the compressible Euler system (1.6)-(1.8) on the time interval $[0, T^E]$. Let also $c > 0$ and $0 < T \leq T^E$ be arbitrarily fixed. Moreover, let $\varrho_0 = \varrho_{0,\varepsilon}$ and $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{u}_{0,\varepsilon}$ be as in Theorem 2.1 and assume that

$$\|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^E|^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Finally, let $\varrho = \varrho_\varepsilon$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ be a weak solution on the time interval $[0, T]$ of the compressible Navier-Stokes system (1.1)-(1.2) with boundary conditions (1.4)-(1.5) corresponding to $(\varrho_{0,\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u}_{0,\varepsilon})$. Assume that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\varepsilon \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} + \varepsilon \frac{\varrho^2 (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2}{d_\Omega^2} + \varepsilon \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{1-\nu}{3\nu} \right) \right) |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \right) dx dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{1-\nu}{3\nu} \right) = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu} \right)$ (see (2.1) and (2.6)), and $\varrho^2 (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2$ is meant as $\varrho (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2$. Then, it follows that

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} (\|\varrho - \varrho^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + \|\varrho \mathbf{u} - \varrho^E \mathbf{u}^E\|_{L^1(\Omega)}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Corollary 3.1. Assume that $\mu(\varrho) = \varrho$ and $\lambda(\varrho) = 0$. Let all the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 be valid except the third assumption in (3.5) which is replaced by

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dx dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Then the conclusions of Theorem 3.2 hold true.

The remaining of the paper is devoted to the proofs of Theorems 3.1-3.2. Corollary 3.1 does not follow directly from Theorem 3.2, but rather from its proof. See Remark 8.1 for details.

Remark 3.1. In the same spirit of [4], one can replace the first two assumptions in (3.5) with the sole condition

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} dx dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.7)$$

See Remark 8.2 for details.

4 Relative energy inequality

In this section, we derive a relative energy inequality satisfied by the weak solution (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) . Here and in the sequel, we denote by

$$H(\varrho) = \frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\gamma - 1}.$$

For $\tau \in [0, T]$ we introduce the relative energy functional (see e.g. [19])

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | r, \mathbf{U})(\tau) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U}|^2(\tau) dx + \int_{\Omega} H(\varrho|r)(\tau) dx, \quad (4.1)$$

where (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) is a weak solution to (1.1)-(1.2) while (r, \mathbf{U}) is a pair of smooth test functions such that $\mathbf{U}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and $r > 0$. Moreover

$$H(\varrho|r) = H(\varrho) - H(r) - H'(r)(\varrho - r). \quad (4.2)$$

Note that $H(\varrho|r)$ is non-negative and strictly convex. In addition, it is equal to zero when $\varrho = r$ and it grows at infinity as ϱ^γ . Consequently, for any compact set $K \subset (0, \infty)$ there exist two constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that for every $\varrho \geq 0$ and every $r \in K$

$$c_3 (|\varrho - r|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\varrho - r| < 1\}} + |\varrho - r|^\gamma \mathbf{1}_{\{|\varrho - r| \geq 1\}}) \leq H(\varrho|r) \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$H(\varrho|r) \leq c_4 (|\varrho - r|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\varrho - r| < 1\}} + |\varrho - r|^\gamma \mathbf{1}_{\{|\varrho - r| \geq 1\}}) \quad (4.4)$$

(see e.g. [18] and [27, Section 2.1]). Moreover, being Ω a bounded domain, for any compact set $K \subset (0, \infty)$ there exists a constant $c_5 > 0$ such that for every $\varrho : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $r : \Omega \rightarrow K$

$$\|\varrho - r\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma \leq c_5 \left(\int_{\Omega} H(\varrho|r) dx \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} + c_5 \int_{\Omega} H(\varrho|r) dx, \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} H(\varrho|r) dx \leq c_5 \|\varrho - r\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + c_5 \|\varrho - r\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^2 \quad (4.6)$$

(see again [27, Section 2.1]). Thanks to the energy inequality (2.9), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | r, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{U}|^2 - \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} \right) (s, \cdot) dx \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} - \int_{\Omega} (H(r) + H'(r)(\varrho - r)) (s, \cdot) dx \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we test the continuity equation by $\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{U}|^2$ and the momentum equation by \mathbf{U} , to get

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho \partial_t |\mathbf{U}|^2 dx dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{U}|^2 dx dt = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{U}|^2 (s, \cdot) dx \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{U} dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \otimes \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}) : \nabla \mathbf{U} dx dt - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} p(\varrho) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} dx dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \operatorname{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dx dt + r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dx dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= - \int_{\Omega} (\varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U})(s, \cdot) dx \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau}.$$

Then, testing the continuity equation by $H'(r)$ and noticing that $H'(r)r - H(r) = p(r)$, after some straightforward computation, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (H(r) + H'(r)(\varrho - r))(s, \cdot) dx \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} = \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [\partial_t(H'(r))(\varrho - r) + \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(H'(r))] dx dt.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | r, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} &\leq \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho \partial_t |\mathbf{U}|^2 dx dt + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{U}|^2 dx dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{U} dx dt - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \otimes \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}) : \nabla \mathbf{U} dx dt \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_{\mu} + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_{\mu}) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dx dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [\partial_t(H'(r))(\varrho - r) + \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(H'(r)) + p(\varrho) \text{div} \mathbf{U}] dx dt \\ &\quad + r_1 \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dx dt - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{S}_{\mu}|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider $(\varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)$ the strong solution of the Euler system (1.6)–(1.7). Rearranging the relative entropy inequality above with $r = \varrho^E$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} &\leq \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [\partial_t \mathbf{U} \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dx dt \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_{\mu} + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_{\mu}) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dx dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [\partial_t(H'(\varrho^E))(\varrho - \varrho^E) + \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) + p(\varrho) \text{div} \mathbf{U}] dx dt \\ &\quad + r_1 \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dx dt - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\mathbb{S}_{\mu}|^2 dx dt, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

having set $(\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^3 (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})_i \partial_i(\cdot)$. We now multiply (1.6) by $H'(\varrho^E)$. Performing integration by parts, we find

$$\int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [H'(\varrho^E) \partial_t \varrho^E - \varrho^E \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) \cdot \mathbf{u}^E] dx dt = 0.$$

From $p(\varrho^E) = H'(\varrho^E) \varrho^E - H(\varrho^E)$, we also infer that $\varrho^E \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) = \nabla p(\varrho^E)$. Accordingly, performing again integration by parts, we obtain

$$\int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} H'(\varrho^E) \partial_t \varrho^E dx dt + \int_0^{\tau} \int_{\Omega} p(\varrho^E) \text{div} \mathbf{u}^E dx dt = 0.$$

Back to (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} &\leq \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t \mathbf{U} \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dxdt \\
&+ \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dxdt \\
&- \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t (H'(\varrho^E)) (\varrho - \varrho^E) + \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) + p(\varrho) \text{div} \mathbf{U}] dxdt \\
&+ \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H'(\varrho^E) \partial_t \varrho^E dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\varrho^E) \text{div} \mathbf{u}^E dxdt \\
&+ r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dxdt - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, from (1.7) and the continuity equation (1.6), we easily deduce that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}^E \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{\varrho^E} \nabla p(\varrho^E) \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) = 0.$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} &\leq \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t \mathbf{U} \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dxdt \\
&- \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}^E \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dxdt \\
&- \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\varrho^E} \nabla p(\varrho^E) \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) dxdt \\
&+ \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dxdt \quad (4.8) \\
&- \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t (H'(\varrho^E)) (\varrho - \varrho^E) + \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) + p(\varrho) \text{div} \mathbf{U}] dxdt \\
&+ \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H'(\varrho^E) \partial_t \varrho^E dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\varrho^E) \text{div} \mathbf{u}^E dxdt \\
&+ r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dxdt - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since using again (1.6)

$$\partial_t (H'(\varrho^E)) = -p'(\varrho^E) \text{div} \mathbf{u}^E - \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) \cdot \mathbf{u}^E,$$

we see that

$$- \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\varrho^E} \nabla p(\varrho^E) \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) dxdt - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \partial_t (H'(\varrho^E)) (\varrho - \varrho^E) dxdt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H'(\varrho^E) \partial_t \varrho^E dxdt \\
& = \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^E dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{u}^E - \varrho \mathbf{U}) dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the identity above into (4.8), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} & \leq \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t \mathbf{U} \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dxdt \quad (4.9) \\
& - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [\partial_t \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{U} - \varrho \mathbf{u}) + (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}^E \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u})] dxdt \\
& + \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \operatorname{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] dxdt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [p(\varrho^E) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^E - p(\varrho) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{U} + p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^E] dxdt \\
& + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) \cdot (\varrho \mathbf{u}^E - \varrho \mathbf{U}) dxdt \\
& + r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} dxdt - \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

5 “Fake” boundary layer and uniform bounds

Following [22, 27], we introduce a Kato-type “fake” boundary layer defined as

$$\mathbf{v}_{bl} = \mathbf{v}_{bl}(\varepsilon) = \xi \left(\frac{d_\Omega(x)}{c\varepsilon} \right) \mathbf{u}^E, \quad (5.1)$$

where $c > 0$ is the constant in the statements of Theorems 3.1-3.2, while $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\xi(0) = 1$, $\xi(r) = 0$ for $r \geq 1$ and satisfying

$$\|\xi\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)} < \infty, \quad \|\xi'\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)} < \infty.$$

Note that $\mathbf{v}_{bl} = \mathbf{u}^E$ on $[0, T] \times \partial\Omega$ and it has support in $[0, T] \times \Gamma_{c\varepsilon}$. Choosing from now on

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}^E - \mathbf{v}_{bl} \quad (5.2)$$

and noticing that

$$\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega p(\varrho^E) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl} dxdt = - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho^E \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot \nabla(H'(\varrho^E)) dxdt,$$

we get from (4.9) the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(s) \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} + \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \leq \mathcal{R}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{R}_7, \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_1 &= \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left(((\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E) \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E \right) \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}) \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_2 &= - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^E (p(\varrho) - p(\varrho^E) - p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E)) \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_3 &= - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\varrho^E - \varrho) \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_4 &= \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) (p(\varrho) - p(\varrho^E)) \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_5 &= r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_6 &= - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\sqrt{\varrho}\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl} + (\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}_{bl}) \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}) \, dxdt, \\
\mathcal{R}_7 &= \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left[2 \left(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu + \frac{\lambda(\varrho)}{2\mu(\varrho)} \operatorname{Tr}(\sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu) \mathbb{I} \right) : \nabla \mathbf{U} \right] \, dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we denote by $C > 0$ a generic structural constant possibly depending on the initial data and $T > 0$, but independent of ε , and by $\eta(\varepsilon)$ a generic function such that $\eta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Our next goal is to show that under the assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, the terms \mathcal{R}_i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$, can be controlled as follows

$$|\mathcal{R}_i| \leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) \, dt + \eta(\varepsilon), \quad i = 1, \dots, 6, \quad (5.4)$$

$$|\mathcal{R}_7| \leq \frac{\varepsilon \mathcal{V}}{2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (5.5)$$

5.1 Uniform bounds on the weak solutions and the boundary layer

From (2.9) and (3.1)-(3.4), it is readily seen that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$\|\varrho\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\gamma(\Omega))} \leq C, \quad \|\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq C, \quad \|\mathbb{S}_\mu\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}}. \quad (5.6)$$

In addition, the “fake” boundary layer \mathbf{v}_{bl} constructed above satisfies the following properties for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small (see [2, 27]):

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \leq C, \quad (5.7) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^p(\Omega))} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad (5.11)$$

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \quad (5.8) \quad \|\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^p(\Omega))} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad (5.12)$$

$$\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \leq C, \quad (5.9) \quad \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^p(\Omega))} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad (5.13)$$

$$\|d_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad (5.10) \quad \|d_\Omega^2 \nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \leq C\varepsilon. \quad (5.14)$$

As a direct consequence of (5.2) and (5.7), we have the further bound

$$\|\mathbf{U}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \leq C. \quad (5.15)$$

6 Estimating the terms \mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_5

The treatment of \mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_4 is basically the same as in Sueur [27], although here we have not used the same names for these terms as in the latter reference. Also, the term \mathcal{R}_5 can be easily handled (see below). In what follows, it is understood that we work with $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small in a way that all the uniform bounds on the weak solutions and on the boundary layer are valid.

6.1 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_1

The term \mathcal{R}_1 can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1 = & - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega ((\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E) \otimes (\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E)) : \nabla \mathbf{u}^E \, dxdt \\ & - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (((\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E) \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E) \cdot \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{v}_{bl} \, dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, thanks to (5.6) and (5.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_1| & \leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt + \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho |\mathbf{v}_{bl}|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt + C \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{2\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))} \\ & \leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt + C \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2} \varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Exploiting Young's inequality, we finally get

$$|\mathcal{R}_1| \leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt + C\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) \, dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (6.1)$$

6.2 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}_4

Now, consider the pressure terms \mathcal{R}_2 - \mathcal{R}_4 . For \mathcal{R}_2 , the following relation (see (4.2)) holds true

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_2| & = |(\gamma - 1) \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^E) H(\varrho | \varrho^E) \, dxdt| \\ & \leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho | \varrho^E) \, dxdt \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) dt.$$

Concerning \mathcal{R}_3 , we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_3 &= - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| < 1\}} (\varrho^E - \varrho) \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) dx dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| \geq 1\}} (\varrho^E - \varrho) \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot \nabla (H'(\varrho^E)) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, invoking (4.3) and (5.11) together with the Young inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_3| &\leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt + C \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}^2 + C \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))}^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)} \\ &\leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt + \eta(\varepsilon) \\ &\leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we decompose \mathcal{R}_4 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_4 &= \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) (p(\varrho) - p(\varrho^E) - p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E)) dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| < 1\}} (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| \geq 1\}} (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) dx dt \\ &= (\gamma - 1) \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| < 1\}} (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\varrho - \varrho^E| \geq 1\}} (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}) p'(\varrho^E)(\varrho - \varrho^E) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as before, making use of (4.3), (5.9), (5.13) and the Young inequality, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_4| &\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt + C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt \\ &\quad + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}^2 + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))}^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)} \\ &\leq C \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega H(\varrho \mid \varrho^E) dx dt + \eta(\varepsilon) \\ &\leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} \mid \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

6.3 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_5

Recalling that $r_1 = r_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and exploiting (5.6) together with (5.15), the term \mathcal{R}_5 can be handled easily as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}| \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{U} \, dxdt \leq \eta(\varepsilon).$$

7 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let us start with a preliminary observation. Under the assumption (3.2), we have in particular

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\varepsilon} \, dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

and it follows immediately, for every $0 < \ell \leq \gamma$, that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho^\ell}{\varepsilon} \, dxdt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.1)$$

Indeed, since $|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon$, it is readily seen that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho^\ell}{\varepsilon} \, dxdt \leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho^\gamma}{\varepsilon} \, dxdt \right)^{\frac{\ell}{\gamma}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

7.1 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_6

As in [27], we decompose the term \mathcal{R}_6 into the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_6 &= \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \sqrt{\varrho} \partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}^E) \, dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho (\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{bl}) \, dxdt \\ &\quad - \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega ((\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}_{bl}) \cdot \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{U} \, dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \otimes \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}) : \nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl} \, dxdt \\ &= \mathcal{R}_6^{(a)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(b)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(c)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$|\mathcal{R}_6^{(a)}| \leq \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}^E|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho |\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl}|^2 \, dxdt \right)^{1/2}$$

and arguing as in the estimate of \mathcal{R}_1 , but using (5.12) instead of (5.11), we obtain (see (4.1)) that

$$|\mathcal{R}_6^{(a)}| \leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) \, dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.2)$$

Moreover, in the light of (5.6), together with (5.7) and (5.12), it is readily seen that

$$|\mathcal{R}_6^{(b)}| \leq C \|\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))} \leq \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.3)$$

Next, following [27], we introduce the auxiliary scalar functions

$$z(x) = \xi \left(\frac{d_\Omega(x)}{c\varepsilon} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{z}(x) = \frac{d_\Omega(x)}{c\varepsilon} \xi' \left(\frac{d_\Omega(x)}{c\varepsilon} \right).$$

Accordingly, we can rewrite $\mathcal{R}_6^{(c)}$ in the form

$$\mathcal{R}_6^{(c)} = - \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \sqrt{\varrho} z \mathbf{U} \cdot (\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^E dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}}{d_\Omega} \tilde{z} (\mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{u}^E) dxdt = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_6 + \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6.$$

Being $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$, owing to (5.6) and (5.15) we get

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq C \|z\|_{L^{2\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Gamma_{c\varepsilon})} \leq C |\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}|^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2\gamma}} \leq \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.4)$$

Moreover, since $\|\tilde{z}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$, invoking again (5.6) and (5.15) we find

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq C \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \frac{\varrho}{\varepsilon} dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} dxdt \right]^{1/2}.$$

The first term in the right-hand side above goes to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to (7.1), while the second term goes to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to our assumption (3.2). In summary $|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq \eta(\varepsilon)$, yielding in turn

$$|\mathcal{R}_6^{(c)}| \leq \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.5)$$

Finally, the term $\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}$ can be handled as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}| &= \left| \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}}{d_\Omega} \otimes \frac{\sqrt{\varrho} \mathbf{u}}{d_\Omega} \right) : d_\Omega^2 \nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl} dxdt \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|d_\Omega^2 \nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C([0,T] \times \bar{\Omega})} \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} dxdt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the light of (5.14), and using once more our assumption (3.2), the right-hand side above goes to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that

$$|\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}| \leq \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.6)$$

Collecting (7.2)-(7.6) we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{R}_6| \leq C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t) dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.7)$$

7.2 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_7

Regarding the viscous term \mathcal{R}_7 , thanks to (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_7| &\leq C\varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left| \sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu \right| |\nabla \mathbf{U}| \, dxdt \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left| \sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu \right| |\nabla \mathbf{u}^E| \, dxdt + C\varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \left| \sqrt{\mu(\varrho)} \mathbb{S}_\mu \right| |\nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}| \, dxdt = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_7 + \hat{\mathcal{R}}_7. \end{aligned}$$

In light of (2.6) and (2.1) (which ensures that $2/3 + 1/3\nu \leq \gamma$), together with (5.6), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_7 &\leq C\varepsilon \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &= C\varepsilon \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{\varrho < 1\}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{\varrho \geq 1\}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{\varrho < 1\}} \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\nu}{3}\right)} \, dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega \cap \{\varrho \geq 1\}} \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}\right)} \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \left[C + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho^\gamma \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_7 \leq C\varepsilon \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon\nu}{2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt + \eta(\varepsilon), \quad (7.8)$$

where the first term can be absorbed in the left-hand side of (5.3). Concerning the term $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_7$, due to (5.8) and (5.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_7 &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{L^\infty([0, \tau] \times \Omega)} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As before, exploiting (2.6), we write

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon} \cap \{\varrho < 1\}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon} \cap \{\varrho \geq 1\}} \mu(\varrho) \, dxdt$$

$$\leq C \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{\nu}{3}\right)}}{\varepsilon} \right] dxdt + C \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}\right)}}{\varepsilon} \right] dxdt.$$

Since $0 < 2/3 + \nu/3 < \gamma$ and $0 < 2/3 + 1/3\nu \leq \gamma$, appealing to (7.1) we infer that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7 \leq \eta(\varepsilon)$. Taking into account (7.8), we end up with

$$|\mathcal{R}_7| \leq \frac{\varepsilon\nu}{2} \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.9)$$

7.3 Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 3.1

So far, we have proved the validity of (5.4)-(5.5). Accordingly, from (5.3), we find

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(\tau) \leq \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(0) + C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t)dt + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.10)$$

Thanks to (5.6) and (5.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{u}^E)(t)dt &\leq 2 \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(t)dt + \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho |\mathbf{v}_{bl}|^2 dxdt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(t)dt + C \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{2\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(t)dt + C\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we infer from (7.10) that

$$\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(\tau) \leq \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(0) + \eta(\varepsilon) + C \int_0^\tau \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(t)dt,$$

and applying the Gronwall lemma we get

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0,T]} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(\tau) \leq C\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(0) + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (7.11)$$

Next, invoking (4.6) and (5.11), it is readily seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(0) &\leq C \int_\Omega \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^E|^2 dx + C \int_\Omega \varrho_0 |\mathbf{v}_{bl}(0)|^2 dx \\ &\quad + C \|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + C \|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq C \int_\Omega \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^E|^2 dx + C \|\varrho_0\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0,T;L^{2\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))}^2 \\ &\quad + C \|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + C \|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C \int_{\Omega} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0^E|^2 dx + C\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \|\varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + C\|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + C\|\varrho_0 - \varrho_0^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, due to (3.1), we have $\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(0) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. At this point, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (7.11), we obtain

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u} | \varrho^E, \mathbf{U})(\tau) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In the light of (4.5), the latter yields

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} \|\varrho - \varrho^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (7.12)$$

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} \|\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.13)$$

Finally, noting that

$$\varrho\mathbf{u} - \varrho^E\mathbf{u}^E = (\varrho - \varrho^E)\mathbf{u}^E + \sqrt{\varrho}(\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U}) - \varrho\mathbf{v}_{bl},$$

we estimate with the help of (5.6) and (5.11)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varrho\mathbf{u} - \varrho^E\mathbf{u}^E\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &\leq C\|\varrho - \varrho^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + C\|\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\|\mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{C(0, T; L^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq C\|\varrho - \varrho^E\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)} + C\|\sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{u} - \sqrt{\varrho}\mathbf{U}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking (7.12)-(7.13), we reach immediately the desired thesis (3.3). \square

8 Proof of Theorem 3.2

8.1 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_6

As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we write $\mathcal{R}_6 = \mathcal{R}_6^{(a)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(b)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(c)} + \mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}$. The terms $\mathcal{R}_6^{(a)}$ and $\mathcal{R}_6^{(b)}$ can be handled exactly as before (see estimates (7.2)-(7.3)). In order to control the term $\mathcal{R}_6^{(c)}$, we split it again into the sum $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6 + \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_6$. Noting that $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_6$ satisfies (7.4) we are left to deal with the term $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6$. To this end, following [27] and exploiting (5.15), we estimate

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{1/2}} \|\tilde{z}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{c\varepsilon})} \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \frac{\varrho^2(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2}{d_\Omega^2} dx dt \right]^{1/2}.$$

It is readily seen that

$$\|\tilde{z}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{c\varepsilon})} \leq C|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}|^{1/2} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Thanks to our assumption (3.5), we conclude that $|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq \eta(\varepsilon)$, and we arrive at (7.5). Finally, we observe that the remaining term $\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}$ can be controlled exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, making use again of assumption (3.5). In summary, we have proved that (7.7) holds true.

8.2 Estimate of \mathcal{R}_7

Arguing exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have $|\mathcal{R}_7| \leq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_7 + \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_7$ is controlled as in (7.8). Concerning $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7$, an exploitation of (5.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7 &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega)} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking (2.6) and recalling that $|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon$, we obtain

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt = \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon} \cap \{\varrho < 1\}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon} \cap \{\varrho \geq 1\}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt \leq C\varepsilon + \int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}\right)} dxdt.$$

Using again $|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon$, it follows from (5.6) that

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varrho^{\left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}\right)} dxdt \leq C\varepsilon^{(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}))}.$$

Consequently (there is no harm in assuming $\varepsilon \leq 1$), we have

$$\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \mu(\varrho) dxdt \leq C\varepsilon^{(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3\nu}))} = C\varepsilon^{\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma}(\frac{1-\nu}{3\nu})\right)}.$$

Thanks to assumption (3.5), we end up with

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7 \leq C \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma}(\frac{1-\nu}{3\nu})\right)} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \right]^{1/2} = \eta(\varepsilon).$$

In summary, estimate (7.9) holds true once again.

8.3 Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 3.2

As before, collecting all the bounds on the terms \mathcal{R}_1 - \mathcal{R}_7 we obtain (7.10). The remaining part of the proof is identical to the one of Theorem 3.1. \square

Remark 8.1. *In order to prove Corollary 3.1, one follows all the steps in the proof of Theorem 3.2 except the estimate of the term $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7$ which, this time, can be controlled as*

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7 &\leq C\varepsilon \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_{bl}\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega)} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varrho dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^\tau \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} |\mathbb{S}_\mu|^2 dxdt \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is a consequence of (5.8) together with $|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon$ and (5.6). Again, we infer that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_7 \leq \eta(\varepsilon)$ due to assumption (3.6), and the thesis follows as before.

Remark 8.2. *The first two assumptions in (3.5) have been used only to control $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6$ and $\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}$. We now show that these two terms can be handled under the sole condition (3.7). First we observe that, as a consequence of (5.6) and $|\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon$, one has*

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varrho \, dxdt \leq C.$$

Accordingly, due to $\|\tilde{z}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$ together with (5.6) and (5.15), we infer that

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_6| \leq C \left[\varepsilon^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varrho \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{c\varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \frac{\varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2}{d_\Omega^2} \, dxdt \right]^{1/2} \leq \eta(\varepsilon),$$

where the second inequality follows from (3.7). The term $\mathcal{R}_6^{(d)}$ can be controlled exactly as in the proofs of Theorems 3.1-3.2: just note that (3.7) implies the first assumption in (3.5).

Acknowledgment

L. Bisconti and F. Dell’Oro are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). M. Caggio has been supported by the Praemium Academiae of Š. Nečasová, and by the Czech Science Foundation under the grant GAČR 22-01591S. The Institute of Mathematics CAS is supported by RVO:67985840.

Appendix

We discuss briefly the derivation of the energy inequality (2.9). To this end, let us consider smooth solutions (ϱ, \mathbf{u}) with $\varrho > 0$. Multiplying the momentum equation (1.2) by \mathbf{u} and after a standard computation, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2(\tau) + H(\varrho)(\tau) \right] dx + \varepsilon \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega [2\mu(\varrho) |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2 + \lambda(\varrho) |\operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u}|^2] \, dxdt \\ + r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_\Omega \varrho |\mathbf{u}|^3 \, dxdt = \int_\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0|^2 + H(\varrho_0) \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (8.1)$$

We claim that

$$2\mu(\varrho) |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2 + \lambda(\varrho) |\operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u}|^2 \geq \nu \mu(\varrho) |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2 \quad (8.2)$$

where $\nu > 0$ is the parameter appearing in assumption (2.2)-(2.4). This estimate is trivial when $\lambda(\varrho) \geq 0$. On the other hand, when $\lambda(\varrho) < 0$, we use the elementary inequality $|\operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u}|^2 \leq 3|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2$. Accordingly

$$2\mu(\varrho) |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2 + \lambda(\varrho) |\operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{u}|^2 \geq [2\mu(\varrho) + 3\lambda(\varrho)] |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2$$

and the conclusion follow from (2.4). Next, using (8.2) into (8.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho |\mathbf{u}|^2(\tau) + H(\varrho)(\tau) \right] dx + \varepsilon \nu \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \mu(\varrho) |\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u})|^2 dx dt + r_1 \int_0^\tau \int_{\Omega} \varrho |\mathbf{u}|^3 dx dt \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho_0 |\mathbf{u}_0|^2 + H(\varrho_0) \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

Consider now a sequence of smooth solutions $(\varrho_n, \mathbf{u}_n)$ with $\varrho_n > 0$ satisfying (8.3) and such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} \varrho_{0n} |\mathbf{u}_{0n}|^2 + H(\varrho_{0n}) \right] \leq E_0$$

with E_0 independent on n . From (8.3), it follows that for all $\tau \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(0, \tau; L^2(\Omega))} &\leq C(E_0), \\ \|\varrho_n\|_{L^\infty(0, \tau; L^\gamma(\Omega))} &\leq C(E_0), \\ \|\sqrt{\mu(\varrho_n)} \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}_n)\|_{L^2((0, \tau) \times \Omega)} &\leq C(\varepsilon, \nu, E_0), \\ \|\sqrt[3]{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n\|_{L^3((0, \tau) \times \Omega)} &\leq C(r_1, E_0). \end{aligned}$$

These bounds, combined with some further bounds coming from the Bresch-Desjardins entropy inequality, have been used to prove the stability of weak solutions and the existence result obtained in [5] (see also [24] for the whole space and the periodic case). In particular, the drag term provides the last bound in $L^3((0, \tau) \times \Omega)$ of the term $\sqrt[3]{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n$ which replaces the bound on $\sqrt{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n$ obtained in [24] by the use of the multiplier $(1 + \ln(1 + |\mathbf{u}|^2)) \mathbf{u}$ in the momentum equation. As is well-known, this control on the term $\sqrt[3]{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n$ is sufficient to obtain enough compactness on $\sqrt{\varrho_n} \mathbf{u}_n$ in order to pass to the limit. Consequently, with the same arguments of [5, 24], we are able to pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, getting the energy inequality (2.9).

References

- [1] Agemi, R., The initial-boundary value problem for inviscid barotropic fluid motion, *Hokkaido Math. J.* **10**, 156-182, 1981.
- [2] Bardos, C., Nguyen, T.T., Remarks on the inviscid limit for the compressible flows, *Contemp. Math.* **666**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.
- [3] Beirão da Veiga, H., On the barotropic motion of compressible perfect fluids, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **8**, 317-351, 1981.
- [4] Bisconti, L., Caggio, M., Inviscid limit for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density dependent viscosity, *J. Differential Equations* **390**, 370-425, 2024.
- [5] Bresch, D., Desjardins, B., Gérard-Varet, D., On compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density dependent viscosities in bounded domains. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **87**, 227-235, 2007.

- [6] Bresch, D., Pascal, N., Vila, J.-P., Relative entropy for compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosities and applications, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **354**, 45-49, 2016.
- [7] Bresch, D., Pascal, N., Vila, J.-P., Relative entropy for compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density dependent viscosities and various applications, *ESAIM Proc. Surveys* **58**, EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, 2017.
- [8] Bresch, D., Desjardins, B., Zatorska, E., Two-velocity hydrodynamics in fluid mechanics: Part II. Existence of global κ -entropy solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes systems with degenerate viscosities, *J. Math. Pure. Appl.* **104**, 801-836, 2015.
- [9] Bresch, D., Gisclon, M., Lacroix-Violet, I., On Navier-Stokes-Korteweg and Euler-Korteweg Systems: Application to Quantum Fluids Models, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **233**, 975-1025, 2019.
- [10] Bresch, D., Vasseur, A., Yu, C., Global existence of entropy-weak solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with non-linear density dependent viscosities, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **24**, 1791–1837, 2022.
- [11] Caggio, M., Donatelli, D., High Mach number limit for Korteweg fluids with density dependent viscosity, *J. Differential Equations* **277**, 1–37, 2021.
- [12] Chen, G., Chen, G.-Q.G., Zhu, S., Vanishing viscosity limit of the three-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate viscosities and far-field vacuum, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **39**, 121-170, 2022.
- [13] Cianfarani Carnevale, G., Lattanzio, C., High friction limit for Euler-Korteweg and Navier-Stokes-Korteweg models via relative entropy approach, *J. Differential Equations* **269**, 10495-10526, 2020.
- [14] Constantin, P., Kukavica, I., Vicol, V., On the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143**, 3075-3090, 2015.
- [15] Ding, M., Zhu, S., Vanishing viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equations to the Euler equations for compressible fluid flow with far field vacuum, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **107**, 288–314, 2017.
- [16] Ebin, D.G., The initial-boundary value problem for subsonic fluid motion, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **32**, 1-19, 1979.
- [17] Ebin, D.G., Motion of slightly compressible fluids in a bounded domain. I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **35**, 451-485, 1982.
- [18] Feireisl, E., Novotný, A., Sun, Y., Suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible viscous fluids, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **60**, 611-631, 2011

- [19] Feireisl, E., Jin, B.J., Novotný, A., Relative entropies, suitable weak solutions, and weak-strong uniqueness for the compressible Navier-Stokes system, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **14**, 717-730, 2012.
- [20] Geng, Y., Li, Y., Zhu, S., Vanishing viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equations to the Euler equations for compressible fluid flow with vacuum, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **234**, 727-775, 2019.
- [21] Geng, Y., Li, Y., Zhu, S., On the global-in-time inviscid limit of the 3D degenerate compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **179**, 337-390, 2023.
- [22] Kato, T., Remarks on zero viscosity limit for nonstationary Navier-Stokes flows with boundary, *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.* **2**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [23] Kelliher, J.P., On Kato's conditions for vanishing viscosity, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **56**, 1711-1721, 2007.
- [24] Mellet, A., Vasseur, A., On the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **32**, 431-452, 2007.
- [25] Rauch, J., Massey, F., Differentiability of solutions to hyperbolic initial-boundary value problems, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **189**, 303-318, 1974.
- [26] Schochet, S., The compressible Euler equations in a bounded domain: existence of solutions and the incompressible limit. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104**, 49-75, 1986.
- [27] Sueur, F., On the inviscid limit for the compressible Navier-Stokes system in an impermeable bounded domain, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **16**, 163-178, 2014.
- [28] Vasseur, A., Yu, C., Existence of global weak solutions for 3D degenerate compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.* **206**, 935-974, 2016.
- [29] Wang, X., A Kato type theorem on zero viscosity limit of Navier-Stokes flows, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **50**, 223-241, 2001.
- [30] Wang, Y-G., Zhu, S-Y., On the inviscid limit for the compressible Navier-Stokes system with no-slip boundary condition, *Quart. Appl. Math.*, **76**, 499-514, 2018.
- [31] Zou, Y., Xu, X., A Kato-type criterion for the inviscid limit of the compressible Navier-Stokes system. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **25**, Paper No. 45, 16 pp., 2023.