

Free boundary value problem for the radial symmetric compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity

Xiangdi Huang^a, Weili Meng^a, Anchun Ni^{a*}

a. Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Sciences
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, P.R.China;

*

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the study of free-boundary-value problem of the compressible Navier-Stokes system with density-dependent viscosities $\mu = \text{const} > 0, \lambda = \rho^\beta$ which was first introduced by Vaigant-Kazhikhov [23] in 1995. By assuming the end-point case $\beta = 1$ in the radially spherical symmetric setting, we prove the (a priori) expanding rate of the free boundary is algebraic for multi-dimensional flow, and particularly establish the global existence of strong solution of the two-dimensional system for any large initial data. This also improves the previous work of Li-Zhang [14] where they proved the similar result for $\beta > 1$. The main ingredients of this article is making full use of the geometric advantage of domain as well as the critical space dimension two.

Keywords: Compressible Navier-Stokes equations; Free boundary; Strong solutions.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): 76W15, 35Q30.

1 Introduction

We study the free-boundary-value problem of the following multi-dimensional compressible viscous fluids:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ (\rho \mathbf{u})_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S}, & \text{in } \Omega_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

**Email addresses: xdhuang@amss.ac.cn (X. Huang); mengweili@amss.ac.cn (W. Meng); varnothing@outlook.com (A. Ni);

with rheological assumption and the stress-free boundary condition:

$$\mathbb{S} = -P(\rho)\mathbb{I} + 2\mu\mathbb{D}\mathbf{u} + \lambda(\rho)\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\mathbb{I}, \quad (1.2)$$

$$P(\rho) = \rho^\gamma, \mu = \text{const}, \lambda(\rho) = \rho, \gamma > 1, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\mathbb{S} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, \text{ on } \Gamma_t, \quad (1.4)$$

where Γ_t is the free surface of domain $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^d (d = 2, 3)$. Here $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $P(\mathbf{x}, t)$ stand for the fluid density, velocity and pressure respectively, $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}(\rho, \mathbf{u})$ is the total stress tensor and μ, λ are the bulk and shear viscosity coefficients which may depend on the density.

The compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity $\mu = \mu(\rho)$, $\lambda = \lambda(\rho)$ have attracted a lot of attention due to the physical importance and rich phenomena, which can be derived from the fluid-dynamical approximation to the Boltzmann equation. A special case $\mu(\rho) = \rho, \lambda(\rho) = 0, \gamma = 2$ and $d = 2$ expresses exactly the viscous Saint-Venant system describing the motion for shallow water where ρ, \mathbf{u} represent the height and the average velocity, see [6, 16] for details. The system considered in this paper follows the model proposed by Vaigant-Kazhikhov [23] assuming that $\lambda(\rho) = \rho^\beta$ and μ is a positive constant.

The research on the well-posedness and long-time dynamic behavior of compressible viscous fluids with constant viscosity has significant progress in recent years: see [10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27]. We briefly recall some results about the strong solution in multi-dimensional cases: Matsumura-Nishida [17] establish the global well-posedness of classical solution in 3D when the initial regular data is close to a equilibrium state, and the case when the initial data with small energy but possible large oscillations and vacuum is proved by Huang-Li-Xin [11], the case when density is large is proved by Yu [27] and Huang-Li-Zhang [10]. When the sufficiently small or large assumptions fail, Xin [25] and later [21, 26] prove the finite-time blowup from strongly vanishing smooth data. Very recently, Merle-Raphaël-Rodnianski-Szeftel [19, 20] construct smooth implosions without vacuum for both Euler and Navier-Stokes equations in 2D and 3D cases, see [1, 4] for the later improvements.

As for the density-dependent viscosity flow $\mu = \mu(\rho)$, $\lambda = \lambda(\rho)$, the investigation becomes complicate due to the high nonlinearity and possible degeneracy. Vassuer-Yu [24], and Li-Xin [15] independently prove the global existence of the weak solution for the density-degenerate case, based on the significant estimates by Bresch-Desjardins [2] and Mellet-Vassuer [18], when the global well-posedness of classical solutions are still largely open.

Compared to the density-degenerate case, the regularity of the solution of system with $\lambda = \rho^\beta, \mu > 0$ is more expectable because of the uniform parabolicity. See [9, 23] for the global existence of classical solution in multidimensional cases and under the fixed boundary assumption, and [10] for the case $\beta > 1$ in the extra spherically symmetric setting and under the Dirichlet boundary condition.

When it comes to the free-boundary-value problem in our setting, many new challenges appear because of the influence of the vacuum state. The global regularity of three-dimensional system with small amplitude and non-vacuum in fluid region is established, under the stress-balanced boundary condition by surface tension and/or exterior pressure

[22, 28, 29]. Without the smallness assumption, the global existence is expectable in one-dimensional or spherically symmetric cases. See [7, 13] for more details.

In our paper, we consider the system in radially spherically symmetric setting:

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) = \rho(r, t), \quad \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = u(r, t) \frac{\mathbf{x}}{r}, \quad r = |\mathbf{x}|. \quad (1.5)$$

And then the stress-free boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.4) is changed to

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + (\rho u)_r + \frac{d-1}{r}(\rho u) = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + (\rho u^2)_r + \frac{d-1}{r}\rho u^2 + (\rho^\gamma)_r = \left((2\mu + \rho)(u_r + \frac{d-1}{r}u) \right)_r, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

with the initial data

$$\rho(r, 0) = \rho_0(r), \quad u(r, 0) = u_0(r), \quad 0 \leq r < a_0, \quad (1.7)$$

and the boundary condition:

$$u(0, t) = 0, \quad \left(\rho^\gamma - (2\mu + \rho)(u_r + \frac{d-1}{r}u) \right) (a(t), t) = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where $a(t)$ satisfies

$$a'(t) = u(a(t), t), \quad (1.9)$$

corresponding to the free surface of Ω_t , that is:

$$\Omega_t = \{(r, t) | 0 \leq r \leq a(t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}.$$

The well-posedness and Lagrangian structure to the spherically symmetric compressible flow with density-dependent viscosity and stress-free boundary has been studied in recent years. For the density-degenerate viscosity $\mu = \rho, \lambda = 0$, Guo-Li-Xin [8] prove the global existence of the entropy weak solution, and they prove also the non-formation of vacuum state in finite time and that the free surface expands at an algebraic rate. As for the case when μ is a positive constant and $\lambda = \rho^\beta, \beta > 1$, Li-Zhang [14] establish the global well-posedness of strong solution and the algebraic expanding rate.

Our goal is to establish the well-posedness result and analyze the dynamic behavior in the endpoint case $\beta = 1$, where the first result can be stated as following:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $d = 2$ or 3 , and (ρ, \mathbf{u}, a) is a global strong solution of the free-boundary-value problem (1.6)-(1.9), then the expanding rate of $a(t)$ is algebraic. Indeed, we have*

$$a(t) \geq \begin{cases} C(1+t)^{\frac{1}{d\gamma}}, & \gamma > 1 + \frac{1}{d}, \\ C \left(\frac{1+t}{1+\log(1+t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d\gamma}}, & \gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{d}. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, denote $a_M(t) = \sup_{s \in [0, t]} a(s)$, then

$$a_M(t) \geq \begin{cases} C(1+t)^{\frac{1}{d\gamma}}, & \gamma > 1 + \frac{1}{d}, \\ C \left(\frac{1+t}{1+\log(1+t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d\gamma}}, & \gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{d}, \\ C(1+t)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}, & \gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{1}{d}). \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

Remark 1.1. In [14], Li-Zhang proved an analogous result of Theorem 1.1 in 2D case. Following their ideas, the algebraic expanding rate can be also established for 3D flows.

Now we are ready to state our main theorem as follows:

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that $\gamma > 1, d = 2$. Assume that the initial data (ρ_0, \mathbf{u}_0) satisfy

$$\rho_0 \in L^1(\Omega_0) \cap W^{1,q}(\Omega_0), \quad \mathbf{u}_0 \in H^2(\Omega_0), \quad q > 2. \quad (1.12)$$

and

$$\rho_0(r) > 0 \quad \text{for } r \in [0, a_0), \quad \rho_0(a_0) \geq 0, \quad \text{and } \int_{\Omega_0} \rho_0 dx = 1. \quad (1.13)$$

Then for any $T > 0$, the free-boundary-value problem (1.6)-(1.9) has a unique global spherically symmetric strong solution (ρ, \mathbf{u}) satisfying

$$\rho \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega_t) \cap W^{1,q}(\Omega_t)), \quad \mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; H^2(\Omega_t)).$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \rho^\gamma \right) d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \leq C, \\ & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} F^2 d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \leq C, \\ & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \leq C, \\ & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega_t) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega_t)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega_t)} \right) + \int_0^T \left(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1(\Omega_t)}^2 \right) dt \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

where F denotes the effective viscous flux, which is given by

$$F =: (2\mu + \rho) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} - P(\rho).$$

Now we comment on the analysis of this paper.

Remark 1.2. In Kazhikhov's original paper [23], the L^p bound of the density is only established under the condition $\beta > 1$. This was also proved by Li-Zhang [14] for the free boundary value problem under the same assumption $\beta > 1$. Thus left an open problem whether the same result hold for the endpoint case $\beta = 1$, this is the main problem we shall address in this paper. Indeed, for the endpoint case $\beta = 1$, one of the main obstacles is to prove higher integrability of the density and velocities. This was achieved by using the special structure of radially symmetry, such as $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}$. see Lemma 4.1 and 4.2. Then the next crucial part is dedicated to the lower and upper bound of the density, i.e, to establish Gronwall's inequality for the density. Compared to Li-Zhang [14], we use $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}$ instead of $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty L^\infty}$ to bound $\int_{a(t)}^r \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we give some important observations and basic tools as preliminary; In Section 3, we prove the algebraic expanding rate of the free domain in Theorem 1.1; In Section 4, we establish the upper bound of the density in two-dimensional case, which is crucial to obtain the global regularity. In Section 5, we obtain the high order estimates and then finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2 Preliminary

In this section, we will recall some known facts and important lemmas that will be used to prove the main results.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ satisfies the radial setting and the boundary condition $\mathbf{u}(0, t) = 0$, then it holds that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} = \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(0, a(t))} \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}. \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. We observe for any $r \in [0, a(t)]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(r, t)|^2 &= 2 \int_0^r u \partial_r u(s, t) ds \leq 2 \int_0^{a(t)} |\partial_r u(s, t)| \left| \frac{u(s, t)}{s} \right| s ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{a(t)} \left(|\partial_r u|^2 s + \left| \frac{u}{s} \right|^2 s \right) ds \leq \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\partial_r u + \frac{u}{s} \right)^2 s ds \\ &= \int_{\Omega_t} |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 d\mathbf{x} = \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the fourth step we cancel the cross term using the following fact:

$$\int_0^{a(t)} 2u \partial_r u ds = \int_0^{a(t)} \partial_r (u^2) ds = u^2(a(t), t) \geq 0.$$

Combining together, we obtain the above. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, a(t))$ be a solution of free boundary system (1.6)-(1.9), then it satisfies the following mass conservation:*

$$\int_0^{a(t)} \rho r^{d-1} dr \equiv \int_0^{a_0} \rho_0 r^{d-1} dr = 1, \quad (2.2)$$

and the energy inequality:

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \rho^\gamma \right) d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \leq E_0, \quad (2.3)$$

where E_0 depends only on initial datas (ρ_0, u_0, a_0) .

Lemma 2.3. ([3]) *For any $2 < q < \infty$, there is a constant $C(q)$ such that for all $\nabla \mathbf{u} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, there holds*

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \log(e + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}) + C\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C$$

Lemma 2.4. ([5]) *Let $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, and let ρ be a non-negative function such that*

$$0 < M_1 \leq \int_{\Omega} \rho dx, \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho^\gamma dx \leq M_2$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain and $\gamma > 1$, $M_1 > 0$, $M_2 > 0$. Then there exist a constant C depending only on M_1, M_2 and Ω such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \left(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho |\mathbf{u}| dx \right)^2 \right).$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The upper bound of $a(t)$ is directly from the energy inequality (2.3) in the case $d = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= a_0 + \int_0^t a'(s) ds \leq a_0 + Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t |a'(s)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + t^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t u^2(a(s), s) ds \right) \leq C(1 + t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where in the last step

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t u^2(a(s), s) ds &= \int_0^t \int_0^{a(s)} 2uu_r dr ds \leq \int_0^t \int_0^{a(s)} \left(u_r + \frac{u}{r} \right)^2 r dr ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_s} |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} ds \leq E_0. \end{aligned}$$

Now we attempt to derive the lower bound for $a(t)$ by setting the potential energy as the mediate term. On the one hand, we can deduce from the mass conservation (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\equiv \int_0^{a(t)} \rho r^{d-1} dr = \int_0^{a(t)} r^{(d-1)\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \cdot \rho r^{\frac{d-1}{\gamma}} dr \\ &\leq C(a(t))^{\frac{d(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}} \left(\int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$(a(t))^{-d(\gamma-1)} \leq C \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr. \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depends only on E_0, γ , and d such that

$$a(t) \geq C. \quad (3.3)$$

On the other hand, to obtain the lower bound of $a(t)$, the key idea is to define a energy functional for the spherical symmetric solution as

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \int_0^{a(t)} (r - (1+t)u)^2 \rho r^{d-1} dr + 2(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \frac{\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} r^{d-1} dr \\ &= \int_0^{a(t)} \rho r^{d+1} dr - 2(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho u r^d dr \\ &\quad + (1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \rho u^2 r^{d-1} dr + 2(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \frac{\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} r^{d-1} dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

We can check directly that

$$\begin{aligned} H'(t) &= \int_0^{a(t)} (\rho_t r^2 - 2\rho u r) r^{d-1} dr + 2(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\rho u^2 + \frac{2\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} - (\rho u)_t r \right) r^{d-1} dr \\ &\quad + (1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\rho u^2 + \frac{2\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} \right)_t r^{d-1} dr \\ &\quad + \rho(a(t))^{d+1} u(a(t), t) - 2(1+t) \rho(a(t))^d u^2(a(t), t) + (1+t)^2 \rho(a(t))^{d-1} u^3(a(t), t) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} (1+t)^2 \rho^\gamma(a(t))^{d-1} u(a(t), t) \\ &:= I_0(t) + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_B(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Due to the stress-free boundary condition (1.8), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0(t) &= - \int_0^{a(t)} ((\rho u)_r r^2 + (d-1)\rho u r + 2\rho u r) r^{d-1} dr \\
&= - \int_0^{a(t)} (\rho u r^{d+1})_r dr = -\rho(a(t))^{d+1} u(a(t), t), \\
I_1(t) &= 2(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\rho u^2 + \frac{2\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} + \partial_r(\rho u^2) r + (d-1)\rho u^2 - \partial_r F r \right) r^{d-1} dr \\
&= 2(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\rho u^2 + \frac{2\rho^\gamma}{\gamma-1} - d\rho u^2 + (d-1)\rho u^2 + dF \right) r^{d-1} dr \\
&\quad + 2(1+t)\rho(a(t))^d u^2(a(t), t) \\
&= 2(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d \right) \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} + d(2\mu + \rho)(r^{d-1}u)_r \right) dr \\
&\quad + 2(1+t)\rho(a(t))^d u^2(a(t), t), \\
I_2(t) &= (1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \left(2u\partial_t(\rho u) - u^2\partial_t\rho + \frac{2}{\gamma-1}\partial_t(\rho^\gamma) \right) r^{d-1} dr \\
&= (1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} 2u(-\partial_r(\rho u^2) - \frac{d-1}{r}\rho u^2 + \partial_r F) r^{d-1} dr \\
&\quad + (1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \left(u^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1}\rho^{\gamma-1} \right) \left((\rho u)_r + \frac{d-1}{r}\rho u \right) r^{d-1} dr \\
&= -2(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} (2\mu + \rho) (r^{d-1}u)_r^2 \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} dr - (1+t)^2 \rho(a(t))^{d-1} u^3(a(t), t) \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{\gamma-1} (1+t)^2 \rho^\gamma(a(t))^{d-1} u(a(t), t).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows after substituting the above computations into (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned}
H'(t) &= 2\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d\right)(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr + 2d(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} (2\mu + \rho)(r^{d-1}u)_r dr \\
&\quad - 2(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} (2\mu + \rho) (r^{d-1}u)_r^2 \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} dr
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
H'(t) &\leq 2\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d\right)(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr + 4d\mu(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} (r^{d-1}u)_r dr \\
&\quad + 2d(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho(r^{d-1}u)_r dr - 2(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \rho (r^{d-1}u)_r^2 \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} dr \\
&\leq 2\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d\right)(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr + 4d\mu(1+t)r^{d-1}u(a(t),t) + \frac{d^2}{2} \int_0^{a(t)} \rho r^{d-1} dr \\
&\leq 2\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d\right)(1+t) \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr + 4\mu(1+t)\frac{d}{dt}(a^d(t)) + \frac{d^2}{2}M_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Here we used (1.9), (2.2) and the decomposition

$$2d(1+t)(r^{d-1}u)_r \leq 2(1+t)^2(r^{d-1}u)_r^2 \frac{1}{r^{d-1}} + \frac{d^2}{2}r^{d-1}. \tag{3.8}$$

For $\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - d \leq 0$, or equivalently $\gamma \geq 1 + \frac{2}{d}$, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
H'(t) &\leq C(1+t)\frac{d}{dt}(a^d(t)) + C \\
&\leq C\frac{d}{dt}((1+t)a^d(t)) - Ca^d(t) + C \\
&\leq C\frac{d}{dt}((1+t)a^d(t)) + C.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we integrate above with respect to t and obtain

$$H(t) \leq C(1+t)a^d(t) + Ct + C \leq C(1+t)a^d(t).$$

Together with (3.2) and (3.4), it leads to

$$(a(t))^{-d(\gamma-1)} \leq C \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \leq C(1+t)^{-1}a^d(t),$$

which derive the lower bound (1.10)₁. And in the case $\gamma \in [1 + \frac{1}{d}, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$, which implies

$$d(\gamma-1) - 1 \geq 0,$$

we can deduce from (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
((1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))}H(t))' &\leq C(1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))}((1+t)\frac{d}{dt}(a^d(t)) + \frac{d^2}{2}) \\
&\leq C\frac{d}{dt}((1+t)^{d(\gamma-1)-1}a^d(t)) + C(1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))} \\
&\quad - C(d(\gamma-1) - 1)(1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))}a^d(t) \\
&\leq C\frac{d}{dt}((1+t)^{d(\gamma-1)-1}a^d(t)) + C(1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then it comes for $\gamma \in (1 + \frac{1}{d}, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$:

$$\int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \leq C a^d(t) (1+t)^{-1} + C (1+t)^{-1} \leq C (1+t)^{-1} a^d(t), \quad (3.9)$$

and for $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{d}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr &\leq C a^d(t) (1+t)^{-1} + C (1+t)^{-1} \log(1+t) \\ &\leq C (1+t)^{-1} (1 + \log(1+t)) a^d(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Combining (3.2), (3.9) and (3.10), we arrive at (1.10) finally.

It remains to check the lower bound of $a_M(t)$. For $\gamma \geq 1 + \frac{2}{d}$, we deduce from (3.6), (3.8) and the mass conservation (2.2) that

$$H'(t) \leq \frac{d^2}{2} \int_0^{a(t)} (2\mu + \rho) r^{d-1} dr \leq C (1 + a^d(t)).$$

Integrating the above with respect to time, we get

$$(1+t)^2 \int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \leq C \left((1+t) + \int_0^t a^d(s) ds \right),$$

which together with (3.2) yields that

$$(a(t))^{-d(\gamma-1)} \leq C (1+t)^{-2} \left((1+t) + \int_0^t (a(s))^d ds \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Therefore, we claim (1.11) holds by a simple proof of contradiction.

As for $\gamma \in (1, 1 + \frac{2}{d})$, it can be estimated as

$$H'(t) \leq \frac{2 - d(\gamma - 1)}{(1+t)} H(t) + C (1 + a^d(t)).$$

Multiplying it with $(1+t)^{2-d(\gamma-1)}$, we have

$$(1+t)^{2-d(\gamma-1)} ((1+t)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))} H)' \leq C (a^d(t) + 1).$$

Consequently, for $\gamma \neq 1 + \frac{1}{d}$,

$$\int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \leq C (1+t)^{-1} + C (1+t)^{-d(\gamma-1)} \int_0^t (1+s)^{-(2-d(\gamma-1))} a^d(s) ds. \quad (3.12)$$

For $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{d}$,

$$\int_0^{a(t)} \rho^\gamma r^{d-1} dr \leq C (1+t)^{-1} \log(1+t) + C (1+t)^{-1} \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1} a^d(s) ds. \quad (3.13)$$

Together with (3.2), and proving by contradiction, we finally arrive at (1.11).

4 The a priori estimates

In this section, we will derive the main a priori estimates (4.4), (4.6) and (4.9), then obtain the bound (4.7) of the density along particle paths, which is crucial to establish the global existence of the strong solutions.

We define the effective viscous flux F and auxiliary function θ of the density as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F(r, t) &= (2\mu + \rho) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} - P, \\ \theta(r, t) &= 2\mu \ln \rho + \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (1.6) it satisfies that

$$\theta_t + u \partial_r \theta = -(2\mu + \rho) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = -F - P, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$(\rho u)_t + \partial_r (\rho u^2) + \frac{\rho u^2}{r} = \partial_r F. \quad (4.2)$$

Integrating (4.2) on $[a(t), r]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(r, t) &= F(a(t), t) + \int_{a(t)}^r (\rho u)_t ds + \int_{a(t)}^r \partial_r (\rho u^2) ds + \int_{a(t)}^r \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds \\ &= \partial_t \int_{a(t)}^r \rho u ds + u \partial_r \int_{a(t)}^r \rho u ds + \int_{a(t)}^r \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Substitute the above into (4.1), we can deduce the following structure

$$\partial_t (\theta + \xi) + u \partial_r (\theta + \xi) + \int_{a(t)}^r \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds + P(\rho) = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\xi(r, t) = \int_{a(t)}^r \rho u ds$.

Now we first show the higher integrability of the density in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $\gamma > 1$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depends on γ, T and initial data $(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, a_0)$, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} \leq C. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. We define $f = (\theta + \xi)_+$ and test the equation (4.3) with $\rho f^{2\gamma-1}$, then it comes

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma-1} (\partial_t + u \partial_r) (\theta + \xi) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\gamma} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho \frac{D}{Dt} f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{2\gamma} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

using the assumption (1.9). And so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\gamma} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} &\leq \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma-1} \left(\int_r^{a(t)} \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}} f\|_{L^{2\gamma}(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma-1} \left\| \int_r^{a(t)} \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds \right\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)}, \end{aligned}$$

and here

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_{a(t)}^r \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds \right\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)} &\leq \left\| \frac{\rho u^2}{r} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(2\gamma+1)}{2\gamma+3}}(\Omega_t)} \leq \|\rho u\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\ &\leq \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \leq C \left(1 + \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} d\mathbf{x} \right) \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2.$$

On the other hand, for some $C > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} d\mathbf{x} &\leq \int_{\Omega_t \cap \{\rho \leq C\}} \rho^{2\gamma+1} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_t \cap \{\rho \geq C\}} \rho(2\mu \ln \rho + \rho)^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho d\mathbf{x} + C \int_{\Omega_t \cap \{\rho \geq C\}} \rho(\theta + \xi)_+^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} + C \int_{\Omega_t \cap \{\rho \geq C\}} \rho |\xi|^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \quad (4.5) \\ &= C + C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} + C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\xi|^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\xi|^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} &\leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)} \|\xi\|_{L^{2(2\gamma+1)}(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma} \leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma} \\ &\leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)} \|\rho u\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma} \leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{\gamma+1}}(\Omega_t)} \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)}^\gamma \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega_t)} + \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)} \right) \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)}^\gamma \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{2\gamma} \\ &\leq C + C \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma+1}(\Omega_t)}^{\gamma+1} \leq C_\epsilon + \epsilon \int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

so we have that

$$\int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} d\mathbf{x} \leq C \left(1 + \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \right).$$

And we conclude:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \leq C \left(1 + \int_{\Omega_t} \rho f^{2\gamma} d\mathbf{x} \right) \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2$$

and so $\int_{\Omega_t} \rho^{2\gamma+1} d\mathbf{x} \leq C$. □

Based on previous lemma, we can show the higher integrability of the velocity as follows.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $\gamma > 1$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depends on γ, T and initial data $(\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, a_0)$, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^3 d\mathbf{x} \leq C. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Multiplying (1.1)₂ by $|\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}$ and integrating by parts over Ω_t implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^3 d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\mathbf{u}| \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_t} P(\rho) \operatorname{div} (|\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}}{|\mathbf{u}|} \cdot \nabla |\mathbf{u}| \right) |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} = - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) \left(u_r + \frac{1}{r} u \right) u_r |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) u_r^2 |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) \left(\frac{1}{r} u u_r \right) |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq - \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) u_r^2 |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 |\mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_t} P(\rho) \operatorname{div} (|\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} &\leq C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho^\gamma |\mathbf{u}| |\nabla \mathbf{u}| d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C \|\rho\|_{L^{2\gamma}(\Omega_t)}^\gamma \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining together, we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^3 d\mathbf{x} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2.$$

This yields a bound for $\int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\mathbf{u}|^3 d\mathbf{x}$. □

Having the above lemmas on hand, we come to the most important part of this paper, which gives the lower and upper bound of the density along the particle paths.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, a(t))$ be a strong solution of free-boundary value problem (1.6)-(1.9), then there exist a constant $C > 0$ depends on $\gamma, (\rho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, a_0)$ and time T , such that along the particle path $r = r_{x_0}(t)$ defined by*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}r_{x_0}(t) = u(r_{x_0}(t), t), \\ r_{x_0}(0) = r_0, x_0 = 1 - \int_{r_0}^{a_0} \rho_0(r)rdr, \end{cases}$$

we have upper bound and lower bound for density:

$$\rho_0(r_0)e^{-C} \leq \rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) \leq \rho_0(r_0)e^C. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. Consider the particle path $r = r_{x_0}(t)$ and (4.3), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\theta + \xi)(r_{x_0}(t), t) + P(\rho)(r_{x_0}(t), t) + \int_{a(t)}^{r_{x_0}(t)} \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds = 0,$$

which yields that:

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\mu \log \frac{\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t)}{\rho_0(r_0)} + \rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) - \rho_0(r_0) + \xi(r_{x_0}(t), t) - \xi(r_0) + \int_0^t P(\rho) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^t \left(\int_r^{a(\tau)} \frac{\rho u^2}{s} ds \right) d\tau \leq C \int_0^t \|\rho(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\tau)}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Next, by using Lemma 4.2 and the bound (3.1) of $a(t)$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi(r_{x_0}(t), t)| &\leq \int_0^{a(t)} |\rho u| dr \leq C \int_0^{a(t)} (\rho |u|^3 r)^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot \rho^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot \left(r^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} dr \\ &\leq C \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\int_0^{a(t)} \rho |u|^3 r dr \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\int_0^{a(t)} r^{-\frac{1}{2}} dr \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\leq C \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{2}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

If $\log \frac{\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t)}{\rho_0(r_0)} < 0$, then

$$\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) < \rho_0(r_0) \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}.$$

If $\log \frac{\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t)}{\rho_0(r_0)} \geq 0$, by using (4.8) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) &\leq C + \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{2}{3}} + C \int_0^t \|\rho(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\tau)}^2 d\tau \\ &\leq C + \frac{1}{2} \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} + C \int_0^t \|\rho(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\tau)}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, take supreme on the left hand, we get

$$\|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C + C \int_0^t \|\rho(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_\tau)}^2 d\tau.$$

Use the Grönwall inequality, we obtain that $\|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C$, and take supreme about $t \in [0, T]$, we get

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C$$

Together with (4.8), it comes that

$$2\mu \log \frac{\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t)}{\rho_0(r_0)} \leq C,$$

which implies

$$\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) \leq \rho_0(r_0) e^C.$$

Applying this bound to (4.8) again, we can obtain the lower bound

$$\rho(r_{x_0}(t), t) \geq \rho_0(r_0) e^{-C}.$$

The proof is now finished. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In fact, we can obtain the global existence of strong solutions through Lemma 4.3, and the higher-order estimates for ρ and u are the same as in [14]. But for the completeness of the article, we still follow the idea of [14] to obtain higher-order estimates.

We rewrite the equations (1.6) in Lagrangian mass coordinate:

$$x(r, t) = \int_0^r \rho s ds, \quad \tau(r, t) = t.$$

The transformation turns $[0, a(t)] \times [0, T]$ into $[0, 1] \times [0, T]$ and satisfies

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial r} = \rho r, \quad \frac{\partial x}{\partial t} = -\rho u r, \quad \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial r} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} = 1.$$

Then the free boundary problem (1.6)-(1.9) is transformed into the following fixed boundary problem:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_\tau + \rho^2 (ru)_x = 0, \\ \frac{1}{r} u_\tau + (\rho^\gamma - (2\mu + \rho)\rho(ru)_x)_x = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

which $(x, \tau) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$, with the initial data and boundary conditions

$$(\rho, u)(x, 0) = (\rho_0, u_0), \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

$$u(0, \tau) = 0, \quad (\rho^\gamma - (2\mu + \rho)\rho(ru)_x)(0, \tau) = 0, \quad \tau \in [0, T],$$

where $r = r(x, \tau)$ is defined by

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}r(x, \tau) = u(x, \tau), \quad x \in [0, 1], \tau \in [0, T].$$

The energy estimate in Lagrangian coordinate is that

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq T} \int_0^1 \left(|u|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \rho^{\gamma-1} \right) dx + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (2\mu + \rho)\rho |(ru)_x|^2 dx d\tau \leq E_0.$$

By Hölder inequality and the standard energy estimate, we get

$$1 = \int_{\Omega_t} \rho dx \leq \left(\int_{\Omega_t} \rho^\gamma dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} |\Omega_t|^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \leq C(\gamma-1)E_0 a(t)^{2-\frac{2}{\gamma}},$$

which implies there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ depending only on E_0 and γ such that $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $a(t) \geq 3\alpha$.

For the high-order estimation below, we need to introduce cut-off functions ζ and χ . Let $\zeta \in C^\infty$ be a smooth function of r satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1; \quad \zeta = 1, r \in [0, \alpha]; \quad \text{supp}(\zeta) \subset [0, 2\alpha]; \\ \zeta = 0, r \in [2\alpha, a(t)], \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad |\zeta'| \leq \frac{2}{\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad |\zeta''| \leq \frac{10}{\alpha^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 4.3, there exists a constant x_1 depending only on T, γ, E_0 such that

$$0 < x_1 \leq \int_0^\alpha \rho r dr < 1, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Also, we define a smooth function χ of Lagrangian coordinates x such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \chi \leq 1; \quad \chi = 1, x \in [x_1, 1]; \quad \text{supp}(\chi) \subset [x_0, 1]; \\ \chi = 0, x \in [0, x_0], \quad \forall \tau \in [0, T], \quad |\chi'| \leq \frac{2}{x_1 - x_0}, \end{aligned}$$

which $0 < x_0 < x_1 < 1$.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a constant C depending on γ, T, x_0 and initial data such that the following estimate holds:*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} F^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 dx dt \leq C, \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. We start with the boundary estimates in the Lagrangian coordinates. Multiplying (5.1)₂ by $ru_\tau\chi^2$ and integrating x over $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\int_0^1 u_\tau^2 \chi^2 dx + \int_0^1 F(ru_\tau)_x \chi^2 dx = -2 \int_0^1 F ru_\tau \chi' \chi dx. \quad (5.3)$$

Note that $F = (2\mu + \rho)\rho(ru)_x - \rho^\gamma$ and $(ru)_x = \frac{F + \rho^\gamma}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho}$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} (ru_\tau)_x &= (ru)_{\tau x} - 2uu_x \\ &= \frac{F_\tau}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} + \frac{(\rho^\gamma)_\tau}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} + \left(\frac{1}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \right)_\tau (F + \rho^\gamma) - 2uu_x. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above equality into (5.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 u_\tau^2 \chi^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\tau} \int_0^1 \frac{F^2}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \chi^2 dx \\ &= -2 \int_0^1 F ru_\tau \chi' \chi dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 F^2 \left(\frac{1}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \right)_\tau \chi^2 dx \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 F \left(\left(\frac{1}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \right)_\tau \rho^\gamma + \frac{(\rho^\gamma)_\tau}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \right) \chi^2 dx + 2 \int_0^1 F uu_x \chi^2 dx \\ &:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq C \|u_\tau \chi\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|F r \chi'\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|u_\tau \chi\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + C \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + C. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Next, by the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and (5.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq C \int_0^1 \frac{F^2}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x \chi^2 dx \\ &\leq C \|F\chi\|_{L^2(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|F\chi'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|F_x \chi\|_{L^2(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|u_\tau \chi\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + C \left(1 + \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Next, the Hölder inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &\leq C \int_0^1 \frac{|F|}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x \chi^2 dx \leq C \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\leq C \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + C. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Finally, note that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,a(t))} \leq \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} = \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_4| &\leq C \left| \int_0^1 \frac{1}{r} u(ru)_x F \chi^2 dx \right| + C \left| \int_0^1 \frac{r_x}{r} u^2 F \chi^2 dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)} + C \left| \int_0^1 u^2 \frac{1}{\rho r^2} F \chi^2 dx \right| \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)} + C \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where we used the simple fact that if $x \geq x_0$, then there exists a constant $r_0 > 0$ such that $r \geq r_0$.

Substituting the all above estimates (5.5)-(5.8) into (5.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 u_\tau^2 \chi^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\tau} \int_0^1 \frac{F^2}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \chi^2 dx \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \left\| \frac{F\chi}{\sqrt{(2\mu + \rho)\rho}} \right\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}(ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq T} \int_0^1 \frac{F^2}{(2\mu + \rho)\rho} \chi^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_0^1 u_\tau^2 \chi^2 dx d\tau \leq C. \tag{5.9}$$

Next, we deal with the interior estimates in Eulerian coordinates.

Multiplying the momentum equation (1.1)₂ by $\zeta^2 \dot{\mathbf{u}}$ and integrating the resulting equality over Ω_t , we have

$$\int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_t} \nabla F \cdot \zeta^2 \dot{\mathbf{u}} dx = - \int_{\Omega_t} F \operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_t} F \nabla(\zeta^2) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}} dx, \tag{5.10}$$

which we used the stress-free boundary condition (1.8). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}} &= \frac{D}{Dt} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} + |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 - 2\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 \\
&= \frac{D}{Dt} \left(\frac{F + P}{2\mu + \rho} \right) + |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}|^2 - 2\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2
\end{aligned}$$

Then substituting the above equality into (5.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{F^2}{2\mu + \rho} \zeta^2 dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_t} F^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \left(\rho \left(\frac{1}{2\mu + \rho} \right)' - \frac{1}{2\mu + \rho} \right) \zeta^2 dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega_t} F \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \left(\rho \left(\frac{\rho^\gamma}{2\mu + \rho} \right)' - \frac{\rho^\gamma}{2\mu + \rho} \right) \zeta^2 dx \\
&\quad - 2 \int_{\Omega_t} F \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 \zeta^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_t} F \zeta \nabla \zeta \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}} dx \\
&\leq C \int_{\Omega_t} F^2 |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}| \zeta^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega_t} |F| |\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}| \zeta^2 dx \\
&\quad + C \left| \int_{\Omega_t} F \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 \zeta^2 dx \right| + C \left| \int_{\Omega_t} F \zeta \nabla \zeta \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}} dx \right| \\
&:= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_1| &\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|F\zeta\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^2 \\
&\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|F\zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla(F\zeta)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \|F\zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \\
&\quad + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|F\zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|F\nabla \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|F\nabla \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq C$, it is because (5.9) and $\operatorname{supp}\{\nabla \zeta\} \subset B_{2\alpha} - B_\alpha$. Next, the Hölder inequality yields that

$$|J_2| \leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}.$$

Next, the third term can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_3| &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega_t} F \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega_t} F(\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2) \zeta^2 - \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F \zeta \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(1 - \zeta) \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\Omega_t} F \zeta \nabla \zeta \cdot x \frac{u^2}{r^2} dx \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Computing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F\zeta \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| &\leq C \|F\zeta\|_{BMO} \|\nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla(F\zeta)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \\
&\leq C (\|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + 1) (\|\zeta \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u} \nabla \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^4 + C \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \left(\left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right) + C,
\end{aligned}$$

which we used $\zeta + \chi \geq 1$ and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} F(1 - \zeta) \nabla(\zeta u_1) \cdot \nabla^\perp(\zeta u_2) dx \right| \\
&\leq C \int_{B_{2\alpha} - B_\alpha} |F| \left| \partial_r(\zeta u) \frac{\zeta u}{r} \right| dx \\
&\leq C \int_{B_{2\alpha} - B_\alpha} |F| \zeta u^2 dx + C \int_{B_{2\alpha} - B_\alpha} |F| \zeta^2 |u \partial_r u| dx \\
&\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \left(\left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_t} F\zeta \nabla \zeta \cdot x \frac{u^2}{r^2} dx \right| \leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2.$$

Thus

$$|J_3| \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + C \left(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right).$$

Then substituting the above equality into (5.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{F^2}{2\mu + \rho} \zeta^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx \\
&\leq C \left(\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{F\zeta}{\sqrt{2\mu + \rho}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + 1 \right) + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}} \nabla \zeta\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{F^2}{2\mu + \rho} \zeta^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx dt \leq C, \quad (5.12)$$

which together with (5.9) complete the proof. \square

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a constant C depending on γ, T, \mathbf{x}_0 and initial data such that the following estimate holds:*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \leq C. \quad (5.13)$$

Proof. Differentiating the equation (5.1)₂ with respect to τ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r} u_{\tau\tau} - \frac{1}{r^2} u_{\tau} u + (\rho^{\gamma} - (2\mu + \rho) \rho (ru)_x)_{x\tau} = 0$$

Multiplying the above equation by $ru_{\tau} \chi^2$ and integrating x over $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\tau} \int_0^1 u_{\tau}^2 \chi^2 dx + \int_0^1 ((2\mu + \rho) \rho (ru)_x - \rho^{\gamma})_{\tau} \chi^2 u_{x\tau} r dx \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{r} u_{\tau}^2 u \chi^2 dx - \int_0^1 ((2\mu + \rho) \rho (ru)_x - \rho^{\gamma})_{\tau} (2\chi \chi' u_{\tau} r + u_{\tau} \chi^2 r_x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Combining the following facts

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^{\infty}(0,1)} &\leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq C \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq C \\ \|\rho_{\tau}\|_{L^2(0,1)} &= \|\rho^2 (ru)_x\|_{L^2(0,1)} \leq C \\ \|u_{\tau} \chi\|_{L^{\infty}(0,1)} &\leq C \|u_{\tau} \chi\|_{L^1(0,1)} + C \|u_{\tau x} \chi + u_{\tau} \chi'\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\leq C \|u_{\tau}\|_{L^2(0,1)} + C \|\sqrt{\rho} u_{x\tau} \chi\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ \|F \chi\|_{L^{\infty}(0,1)} &\leq C \|F \chi\|_{L^1(0,1)} + C \|F_x \chi + F \chi'\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\leq C \|F\|_{L^2(0,1)} + C \|u_{\tau} \chi\|_{L^2((0,1))}, \end{aligned}$$

we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\tau} \int_0^1 (u_{\tau}^2 + \gamma \rho^{\gamma+1}) |(ru)_x|^2 \chi^2 dx + \int_0^1 (2\mu + \rho) \rho u_{x\tau}^2 r \chi^2 dx \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \|u_{\tau}\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|F\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq T} \int_0^1 (u_{\tau}^2 + \gamma \rho^{\gamma+1}) |(ru)_x|^2 \chi^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (2\mu + \rho) \rho u_{x\tau}^2 r \chi^2 dx d\tau \leq C. \quad (5.15)$$

Next, we deal with the interior estimate in Eulerian coordinates. Operating $\zeta^2 \dot{\mathbf{u}}_j [\partial/\partial_t + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{u}\cdot)]$ to both side of (1.1)₂ and integrating the resulted equations by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx \\ & \leq C + C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 + C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\zeta \operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \\ & \leq C + C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\zeta \operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 & \leq \|\nabla(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 + \|(1 - \zeta) \nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \zeta \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 \\ & \leq C + \|\operatorname{div}(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 + \|(1 - \zeta) F\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 \\ & \leq C + \|\zeta \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 \leq C + \|\zeta F\|_{L^4(\Omega_t)}^4 \\ & \leq C + \|\zeta F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \|\nabla(\zeta F)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \\ & \leq C + C \|\zeta \nabla F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^2 \leq C + C \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\Omega_t} \rho |\dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_t} (2\mu + \rho) |\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}|^2 \zeta^2 dx dt \leq C. \quad (5.16)$$

We complete the proof with (5.15) and (5.16). \square

In the final proposition, we will show the higher order derivative estimates of the density and velocity, which guarantee the local strong solution can be extended to a global one.

Proposition 5.3. *For any $p > 2$, There exists a constant C depending on γ, T, \mathbf{x}_0 and initial data such that the following estimate holds:*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega_t) \cap W^{1,p}(\Omega_t)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega_t)} \right) + \int_0^T \left(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1(\Omega_t)}^2 \right) dt \leq C. \quad (5.17)$$

Proof. Operating ∇ to the mass equation (1.1)₁, multiplying the resulting equation by $q|\nabla \rho|^{p-2} \nabla \rho$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (|\nabla \rho|^p)_t + \operatorname{div}(|\nabla \rho|^p \mathbf{u}) + (p-1) |\nabla \rho|^p \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} + p |\nabla \rho|^{p-2} \nabla \rho \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \rho) \\ & + p \rho |\nabla \rho|^{p-2} \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Note that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla \rho|^p dx = \int_{\Omega_t} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla \rho|^p \mathbf{u}) dx + \int_{\Omega_t} \partial_t(|\nabla \rho|^p) dx.$$

Integrating the equation (5.18) over Ω_t we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} &\leq C \left(\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \right) \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + C \|\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p-2}{2p-2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p}{2p-2}} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \right) \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + C \|\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p}{2p-2}} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \right) \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + C \|\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C \left(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \right) \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + C \|\rho \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)},
\end{aligned}$$

which we used Lemma 2.4 to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} &\leq C \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|\nabla \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \\
&\leq C (\|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) \\
&\leq C (1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, by standard L^p -estimate for elliptic system and Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} &\leq \|\nabla(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \zeta \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) \\
&\quad + C \|\operatorname{div}(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \log(e + \|\nabla^2(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}) + C \|\nabla(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) \\
&\quad + C(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)}) \log(e + \|\nabla \operatorname{div}(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}) + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) \\
&\quad + C \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p-2}{2p-2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p}{2p-2}} \right) \log(e + \|\nabla \operatorname{div}(\zeta \mathbf{u})\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}) + C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) + C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p}{2p-2}}) \log(e + \|\nabla F\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}) \\
&\leq C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} \dot{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}) \log(e + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}),
\end{aligned}$$

which we used

$$\|\nabla \zeta \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \leq C \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C \leq C$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1-\zeta)\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} &= \left\| (1-\zeta)\sqrt{(\partial_r u)^2 + \left(\frac{u}{r}\right)^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C + C\|(1-\zeta)(\partial_r u)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C + C\left\| (1-\zeta)\sqrt{\left(\partial_r u + \frac{u}{r}\right)^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \leq C + C\|(1-\zeta)F\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C + C\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p-2}{2p-2}} \|\nabla F\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p}{2p-2}} \leq C + C\|\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \leq C.$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} &\leq \|\nabla^2(\zeta\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|\nabla\zeta\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C \\
&\leq C\|\nabla\operatorname{div}(\zeta\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\left(1 + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}\right) \\
&\leq C + C\|\zeta\nabla\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\|\nabla(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\zeta)\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C,
\end{aligned}$$

which we used the fact

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(1-\zeta)\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C\|(1-\zeta)\partial_{rr}u\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\|(1-\zeta)\partial_r u\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\|(1-\zeta)u\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} \\
&\leq C\|(1-\zeta)\nabla(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\|(1-\zeta)\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C\|(1-\zeta)\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + C \\
&\leq C\left(1 + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|(1-\zeta)\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} + \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The remained procedure is standard: we can construct global approximate solutions to the stress-free boundary problem, and then show the convergence to a solution of the original system based on the above a priori estimates.

Here we give the key approximated scheme as follows: The approximation of Lagrangian system is constructed as

$$\begin{cases} \rho_\tau^{(k+1)} + (\rho^{(k+1)})^2 (r^{(k)}u^{(k)})_x = 0, \\ \frac{1}{r^{(k)}}u_\tau^{(k+1)} + ((\rho^{(k)})^\gamma - (2\mu + \rho^{(k)})\rho^{(k)}) (r^{(k)}u^{(k+1)})_x = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\frac{d}{d\tau}r^{(k)}(x, \tau) = u^{(k)}(x, \tau)$. Then we impose initial data

$$(\rho^{(k+1)}, u^{(k+1)})(x, 0) = (\rho_0^\epsilon, u_0^\epsilon) = \left(\frac{\rho_0 + \epsilon}{\int_0^{a_0} (\rho_0 + \epsilon)r dr}, \frac{\rho_0 u_0}{\rho_0 + \epsilon} \int_0^{a_0} (\rho_0 + \epsilon)r dr \right),$$

and the boundary condition

$$u^{(k+1)}(0, \tau) = 0, ((\rho^{(k)} - (2\mu + \rho^{(k)})\rho^{(k)} (r^{(k)}u^{(k+1)})_x)(1, \tau) = 0.$$

Using the contraction mapping theorem and energy estimates, we can prove the global existence of the solution of above approximated system. Since a priori estimates are uniform with respect to ϵ and k , we can show the convergence of the approximated solutions. It is direct to check the limit is exactly the unique global classic solution of the original system. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is finished.

Acknowledgments

X.-D. Huang is partially supported by CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research, Grant No. YSBR-031 and NNSFC Grant Nos. 11688101.

References

- [1] A. Biasi, Self-similar solutions to the compressible Euler equations and their instabilities, *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, 103, 106014 (2021).
- [2] D. Bresch, B. Desjardins, Existence of global weak solutions for a 2D viscous shallow water equations and convergence to the quasi-geostrophic model, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 238 (1-2), 211-223 (2003).
- [3] J. Beal, T. Kato, A. Majda, Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-D Euler equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* , 94, 61-66 (1984).
- [4] G. Cao-Labora, J. Gómez-Serrano, J. Shi, G. Staffilani, Non-radial implosion for compressible Euler and Navier-Stokes in \mathbb{T}^3 and \mathbb{R}^3 . Preprint.
- [5] E. Feireisl, *Dynamic of Viscous Compressible Flow*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [6] J. F. Gerbeau, B. Perthame, Derivation of viscous Saint-Venant system for laminar shallow water; numerical validation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 1(1), 89-102 (2001).
- [7] Z. Guo, Q. Jiu, Z. Xin, Spherically symmetric isentropic compressible flows with density-dependent viscosity coefficients, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 39(5), 1402-1427 (2008).

- [8] Z. Guo, H. L. Li, Z. Xin, Lagrange structure and dynamics for solutions to the spherically symmetric compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 309 (2), 371-412 (2012).
- [9] X. D. Huang, J. Li, Existence and blowup behavior of global strong solutions to the two-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes system with vacuum and large initial data, *J. Math. Pures. Appl.* 106(1), 123-154 (2016).
- [10] X. D. Huang, J. Li, R. Zhang, Global large strong solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosities, case I: isentropic flows. arXiv: [2408.04305v1](#).
- [11] X.D. Huang, J. Li, Z.P. Xin, Global well-posedness of classical solutions with large oscillations and vacuum to the three-dimensional isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 65(4), 549-585 (2012).
- [12] X. D. Huang, M. Su, W. Yan, R. Yu, Global large strong solutions to the radially symmetric compressible Navier-Stokes equations in 2D solid balls, *J. Differ. Equations*, 396(1), 393-429 (2024).
- [13] S. Jiang, Z. Xin, P. Zhang, Global weak solutions to 1D compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes with density-dependent viscosity. *Methods Appl. Anal.* 12(3), 239-252 (2005).
- [14] H. L. Li, X. Zhang, Global strong solutions to radial symmetric compressible Navier-Stokes equations with free boundary, *J. Differ. Equations*, 261(11), 6341-6367 (2016).
- [15] J. Li, Z. Xin, Global existence of weak solutions to the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes flows with degenerate viscosities. arXiv: [1504.06826v2](#).
- [16] F. Marche, Derivation of a new two-dimensional viscous shallow water model with varying topography, bottom friction and capillary effects, *Euro. J. Mech. B/Fluids*, 26, 49063 (2007).
- [17] A. Matsumura, T. Nishita, The initial value problem for the equations of motion of viscous and heat-conductive gases, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 20 (1), 67-104 (1980).
- [18] A. Mellet, A. Vasseur, On the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32 (1-3), 431-452 (2007).
- [19] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, J. Szeftel, On the implosion of a three dimensional fluid I: Smooth self-similar inviscid profiles, *Ann. of Math.*, 196 (2), 567-778 (2022).
- [20] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, J. Szeftel, On the implosion of a three dimensional fluid II: Singularity formation, *Ann. of Math.*, 196 (2), 779-889 (2022).

- [21] O. Rozanova, Blow up of smooth solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with the data highly decreasing at infinity, *J. Differential Equations*, 245, 1762-1774 (2008).
- [22] V.A. Solonnikov, A. Tani, Evolution free boundary problem for equations of motion of viscous compressible barotropic liquid, The Navier-Stokes equations II - theory and numerical methods (Oberwolfach, 1991), Lecture Notes in Math., 1530. Berlin: Springer, 30-55 (1992).
- [23] V.A. Vaigant, A.V. Kazhikhov, On existence of global solutions to the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations for a compressible viscous fluid, *Sib. Math. J.*, 36(6), 1283-1316 (1995).
- [24] A. F. Vasseur, C. Yu, Existence of global weak solutions for 3D degenerate compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.* 206 (3), 935-974 (2016).
- [25] Z. Xin, Blowup of smooth solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equation with compact density, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 51(3), 229-240 (1998).
- [26] Z. Xin, W. Yan, On blowup of classical solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 321(2), 529-541 (2013).
- [27] H. Yu, Global existence of strong solutions to the 3D isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosities, *Math Mech Appl Sci.*, 46, 1 0123-10136 (2023).
- [28] W.M. Zajaczkowski, On nonstationary motion of a compressible barotropic viscous fluid bounded by a free surface, *Dissert. Math.* 324, 101 (1993).
- [29] W. M. Zajaczkowski, On nonstationary motion of a compressible barotropic viscous capillary fluid bounded by a free surface, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 25(1), 1-84 (1994).