

# ORBITAL STABILITY OF UNDERCOMPRESSIVE VISCOUS SHOCK WAVES UNDER $L^1 \cap H^4$ PERTURBATION

ZHAO YANG AND KEVIN ZUMBRUN

ABSTRACT. By the use of a new vertical estimate introduced by the authors in the context of relaxation shocks for shallow water flow, we both simplify and extend the basic  $L^1 \cap H^3$  stability results of Mascia and Zumbrun for viscous shock waves, in particular extending their results for Lax waves to the undercompressive case.

*Keywords:* viscous shock stability, undercompressive shock.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Main results	2
1.2. Discussion and open problems	3
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Nonlinear perturbation equations	4
2.2. Linearized estimates	5
2.3. Auxiliary estimates	6
2.4. Nonlinear damping estimate	8
3. Nonlinear stability of Lax or undercompressive profiles	8
References	14

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this note, we establish by a single argument orbital stability under  $L^1 \cap H^4$  perturbation of arbitrary amplitude viscous Lax or undercompressive shock waves of partially symmetric hyperbolic-parabolic systems of conservation laws as defined in [Z1], under the assumption of spectral, Evans function stability. These include in particular spectrally stable viscous shock solutions of systems of classical Kawashima type [K]. This (partially) extends previous phase-asymptotic orbital stability analyses [ZH, HZ, RZ, HRZ] based on pointwise estimates requiring much stronger localization ( $\sim (1 + |x|)^{-3/2}$ ) of the initial data. At the same time, it extends the simpler  $L^1 \cap H^3$  orbital stability analyses of [MZ1, MZ2] for Lax waves to the undercompressive case.

Consider the degenerate parabolic conservation laws

$$(1.1) \quad F^0(U)_t + F^1(U)_x = (B(U)U_x)_x, \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} U^I \\ U^{II} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix},$$

$x, t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $U, F^0, F^1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $U^{II} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ , with viscous shock profiles, or (without loss of generality) standing wave solutions  $\bar{U}(x)$ ,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \bar{U}(x) = \bar{U}_{\pm}$  satisfying

---

*Date:* February 3, 2025.

Research of Z.Y. was partially supported by the IU College of Arts and Sciences Dissertation Year Fellowship and by TODO (mention Urbana and CAS support, excellent 100, etc.)

Research of K.Z. was partially supported under NSF grants no. DMS-1700279, DMS-2154387, and DMS-2206105.

- (A1)  $dF^1(\bar{U}_\pm)$ ,  $dF_{11}^1$ ,  $dF^0$  are symmetric,  $dF^0 > 0$ ,  
(A2) no eigenvector of  $dF^1(dF^0)^{-1}(\bar{U}_\pm)$  lies in the kernel of  $B(dF^0)^{-1}(\bar{U}_\pm)$ ,  
(A3)  $b > 0$ .

Following [ZH, MZ1, Z1], we denote as asymptotic hyperbolic characteristics the eigenvalues  $a_j^\pm$  of limiting matrices  $A_\pm := dF^1(dF^0)^{-1}(\bar{U}_\pm)$ , ordered by

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} a_1^+ &< a_2^+ < \cdots < a_{i_+}^+ < 0 < a_{i_++1}^+ < \cdots < a_n^+, \\ a_1^- &< a_2^- < \cdots < a_{i_-}^- < 0 < a_{i_-+1}^- < \cdots < a_n^-. \end{aligned}$$

The shock is called hyperbolic Lax type if  $i_+ = i_- + 1$  (Lax  $i_+$ -shock), undercompressive type if  $i_+ \leq i_-$ , and overcompressive type if  $i_+ \geq i_- + 2$ . If it is of hyperbolic Lax or undercompressive type, then it is called [MZ1, Z1] “pure” viscous Lax or undercompressive type if also  $\bar{U}$  is, up to translation, the unique traveling-wave profile connecting  $\bar{U}_\pm$ .

From here on, we restrict discussion to the Lax or undercompressive case, assuming

$$(H1) \quad \bar{U} \text{ is unique up to translation,}$$

and refer to waves simply as Lax or undercompressive type, omitting the descriptor “pure”.

As discussed in [MZ1, Z1], given a viscous shock profile, one may define an *Evans function*  $D(\cdot)$  associated with the linearized operator  $L$  about the profile (given in (2.4) below), with the properties that  $D$  is analytic in the closed right half-plane, with nonzero roots  $\lambda$  agreeing in location and multiplicity with the nonzero eigenvalues of  $L$ . (Under our assumptions,  $L$  has no essential spectrum in the closed right half-plane except at  $\lambda = 0$  [MZ1, Z1].)

In the Lax or overcompressive case considered here, this allows a particularly concise characterization of linearized stability in the form of the *Evans function condition* [MZ1, Z1]:

( $\mathcal{D}$ ) There exists precisely one zero of  $D(\cdot)$  in the nonstable half-plane  $\{\lambda : \Re \lambda \geq 0\}$ , necessarily at the origin.

This condition, necessary and sufficient for  $L^1 \rightarrow L^p$  linearized stability [MZ1, Z1] is a generalized spectral stability criterion encoding both stability of usual point spectra, and the behavior of the resolvent in the vicinity of the  $\lambda = 0$  embedded in (the boundary of) the essential spectrum of  $L$ .

**1.1. Main results.** Our main result extends to pure undercompressive profiles the nonlinear orbital stability result obtained for pure Lax profiles in [MZ1, MZ2].

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\bar{U}$  be a viscous shock profile of Lax or undercompressive type, satisfying (A1)–(A3) and (H1). And, assume that  $\bar{U}$  is spectrally stable in the sense of the Evans function condition ( $\mathcal{D}$ ). Then,  $\bar{U}$  is nonlinearly orbitally stable with respect to initial perturbations  $u_0$  of sufficiently small norm in  $L^1 \cap H^s$ ,  $s \geq 4$ . That is, for perturbation  $|u_0|_{L^1 \cap H^s} \leq \varepsilon$  and initial data  $\tilde{U}_0 := \bar{U}_0 + u_0$ , there exists a global solution  $\tilde{U}$  of (1.1) and constant  $C > 0$  satisfying for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ :*

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tilde{U}(\cdot + \delta(t), t) - \bar{U}(\cdot)|_{H^s} &\leq C\varepsilon(1+t)^{-1/4}, \\ |\tilde{U}(\cdot + \delta(t), t) - \bar{U}(\cdot)|_{L^p} &\leq C\varepsilon(1+t)^{-(1/2)(1-1/p)}, \\ |\tilde{U}_x(\cdot + \delta(t), t) - \bar{U}_x(\cdot)|_{L^p} &\leq C\varepsilon(1+t)^{-(1/2)(1-1/p)}, \\ |\dot{\delta}(t)| &\leq C\varepsilon(1+t)^{-(1/2)}, \\ |\delta(t)| &\leq C\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the phase shift  $\delta(t)$  defined in (3.1) is the approximate shock location of  $\tilde{U}$ . Moreover, for each fixed  $x$  there holds the vertical estimate

$$(1.4) \quad \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1/2} |\tilde{U}(x + \delta(s), s) - \bar{U}(x)| ds \leq C\varepsilon.$$

*Remark 1.2.* The conclusions of Theorem 1.1 hold also in the strictly parabolic case  $F^0 = \text{Id}$ ,  $\Re \text{Spec}(B) > 0$ , with (A1)-(A3) replaced by hydrodynamic, or “Majda-Pego” stability of endstates [MP]. Indeed, one may in this case reduce the regularity requirement to  $H^1$  on initial data. For, in this case one obtains (stronger versions of) the same linearized estimates as in Proposition 2.1- see [ZH, HZ]- while the nonlinear damping estimate of Proposition 2.4 follows trivially from standard parabolic energy estimates using Lyapunov’s lemma.

**1.2. Discussion and open problems.** Theorem 1.1 together with Remark 1.2 recovers all previous orbital stability results for pure Lax or undercompressive shocks, with only  $L^1$  localization assumed on the data. It does not recover “phase-asymptotic” orbital stability, in which the phase shift  $\delta(t)$  is shown to converge to a limiting value as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , which up to now requires perturbations localized as  $(1 + |x|)^{-3/2}$  [HZ, RZ, HRZ], yielding convergence at rate  $t^{-1/2}$ . However, it makes up for this in simplicity/transparency, avoiding the delicate pointwise nonlinear estimates of [HZ, RZ, HRZ]. Moreover, the  $L^1$  requirement substantially reduces the localization required on the initial perturbation. And, as noted in [MZ1, MZ2], it is easy to see that there can be no *uniform rate of phase convergence* for  $L^1$  perturbations, by considering a sequence of identical compactly supported perturbations centered at  $x = n$ , with  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  going out to infinity, and noticing that these take arbitrarily long to affect the shock, but eventually do cause a nonzero shift in phase.

Theorem 1.1 was proven in the Lax case in [MZ1, MZ2] by the use of “refined” linear estimates valid in the Lax and overcompressive but not the undercompressive case. The proof of these refined estimates required considerable extra effort beyond the proof of basic pointwise Green function bounds. And, it was not at all clear from that analysis whether the conclusions could hold in the undercompressive case; see Remark 2.2. Thus, the present analysis both simplifies the treatment of [MZ1, MZ2] in the Lax case, and *answers the 20-year open problem of nonlinear orbital stability with respect to  $L^1$  perturbations in the undercompressive case.*

What replaces the refined linear estimates in our analysis here is the “vertical estimate” (1.4) of Theorem 1.1. This in turn follows from the Strichartz-type estimates (2.13)–(2.15) of Proposition 2.3 below. These Strichartz estimates include a small amount of geometric information involving transversality of Gaussian propagator elements, without entering the full pointwise analysis of [HZ, RZ, HRZ], and this minimal treatment allows us to close the nonlinear stability arguments with initial perturbation merely  $L^1$  data, rather than the algebraic localization  $\sim (1 + |x|)^{-3/2}$  of the pointwise references.

Such estimates were introduced in [YZ] in the context of stability of discontinuous shock profiles of the Saint-Venant equations for inclined shallow water flow, a relaxation system with scalar equilibrium system, hence of *essentially scalar* type, with principal linear modes propagated inward toward the shock along equilibrium characteristics. The current analysis shows that these ideas are relevant also in a genuinely system case, for which signals are propagated also away from the shock, along outgoing characteristic directions. Specifically, we find it necessary to use vertical estimates in the proof of the key Lemma 3.1 not only to bound phase shift  $\delta(s)$  as in [YZ], but already in the estimate of the interior perturbation  $w(\cdot, s)$ : precisely in order to handle new terms coming from outgoing characteristic modes. (See the italicized comment in the proof of Lemma 3.1.) Thus, we must include the vertical estimate already in the main iteration yielding orbital stability, rather than as a bootstrap argument as in [YZ]. The latter innovations we believe to be

the key to showing nonlinear orbital stability also for discontinuous shock profiles of general relaxation systems, with *nonscalar* equilibrium equations, resolving the key new difficulty of outgoing equilibrium characteristic modes.

In [YZ], we obtained the further result of phase-asymptotic orbital stability, with nonuniform rate depending on the decay of the tail of the initial perturbation. This was done with the help of an additional “approximate incoming characteristic estimate,” which however, relied much on the scalar property that all equilibrium characteristics propagated inward toward the shock. It is a very interesting open problem whether one could recover phase-asymptotic orbital stability at the same tail rate also for undercompressive shocks, in the (necessarily, since they otherwise do not exist) system case, perhaps by further elaboration of the approximate characteristic estimates of [YZ]. Likewise, both  $L^1 \cap H^s$  orbital and phase-asymptotic orbital stability are important open problems for overcompressive shock waves, and for discontinuous shock profiles of any type for relaxation systems with nonscalar equilibrium equations.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We begin by recalling, essentially verbatim, some basic ingredients established in [MZ1, MZ2] and [Z1], along with a key new Strichartz estimate of a type introduced in [YZ].

**2.1. Nonlinear perturbation equations.** We introduce now the equation

$$(2.1) \quad W_t + \tilde{F}(W)_x = (\tilde{B}(W)W_x)_x$$

where  $W := F^0(U)$ ,  $\tilde{F}(W) := F^1((F^0)^{-1}(W))$ , and

$$\tilde{B}(W) := B((F^0)^{-1}(W))(dF^0)^{-1}(W) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & b_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denote the profile in  $W$  coordinates by  $\bar{W} := F^0(\bar{U})$ .

Under the assumption (H1), following [MZ2], we may conveniently work with the “centered” perturbation variable

$$(2.2) \quad w(x, t) := F^0(\tilde{U}(x + \delta(t), t)) - F^0(\bar{U}(x)),$$

which satisfies

$$(2.3) \quad w_t - Lw = Q(w, w_x)_x + \dot{\delta}(t)(\bar{W}_x + w_x),$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad Lw := -(Aw)_x + (\tilde{B}(\bar{W})w_x)_x, \quad Aw := d\tilde{F}(\bar{W})w - (d\tilde{B}(\bar{W})w)\bar{W}_x,$$

is the linearized operator about the wave and

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(w, w_x) &= \mathcal{O}(|w|^2 + |w||w_x|), \\ Q(w, w_x)_x &= \mathcal{O}(|w||w_x| + |w_x|^2 + |w||w_{xx}|) \end{aligned}$$

so long as  $|w|$ ,  $|w_x|$  and  $|w_{xx}|$  remain bounded. See [MZ2] for further details.

**2.1.1. Green function representation.** Let  $G$  be the Green function associated with the operator  $L$  defined in (2.4). Recalling the standard fact that  $\bar{W}' = dF^0(\bar{U})\bar{U}'$  is a stationary solution of the linearized equations for (2.1), so that  $L\bar{W}' = 0$ , or

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x, t; y)\bar{W}'(y)dy = e^{Lt}\bar{W}'(x) = \bar{W}'(x),$$

we have by Duhamel's principle:

$$(2.6) \quad w(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x, t; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_y(x, t-s; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, s) dy ds + \delta(t) \overline{W}'(x).$$

**2.2. Linearized estimates.** We recall from [MZ1, RZ] the following linearized estimates.<sup>1</sup>

**Proposition 2.1** ([MZ1, RZ]). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the Green function  $G(x, t; y)$  may be decomposed as  $G = H + E + \tilde{G}$ , where, for  $y \leq 0$ ,*

$$(2.7) \quad H(x, t; y) := \sum_{j=1}^J a_j^{*-1}(x) a_j^*(y) \mathcal{R}_j^*(x) \zeta_j^*(y, t) \delta(x - y - \bar{a}_j^* t) \mathcal{L}_j^{*t}(y),$$

where  $a_j^*(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J \leq (n-r)$ , denote the eigenvalues of  $A_* \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times (n-r)}$  with multiplicity  $m_j^*$  where

$$(2.8) \quad A_* := A_{11} - A_{12} b_2^{-1} b_1, \quad \text{with } A =: \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B}(\overline{W}) =: \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & b_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

the averaged convection rates  $\bar{a}_j^*(x, t)$  denote the time-averages over  $[0, t]$  of  $a_j^*(z)$  along backward characteristic path  $z_j^* = z_j^*(x, t)$  defined by  $dz_j^*/dt = a_j^*(z_j^*)$ ,  $z_j^*(t) = x$ , the eigenmodes  $\mathcal{L}_j^*$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_j^*$  are defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_j^* := \begin{bmatrix} L_j^* \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{R}_j^* := \begin{bmatrix} R_j^* \\ -b_2^{-1} b_1 R_j^* \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $L_j^*$ ,  $R_j^*$  are  $(n-r) \times m_j^*$  blocks of left and right eigenvectors of  $A_*$  associated to  $a_j^*$  satisfying the dynamical normalizing  $L_j^{*t} \partial_x R_j^* \equiv 0$  along with the usual static normalization  $L_j^{*t} R_j^* \equiv \text{Id}_{m_j^*}$ , the dissipation matrix  $\zeta_j^*(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_j^* \times m_j^*}$  is defined by the dissipative flow  $d\zeta_j^*/dt = L_j^{*t} D_* R_j^*(z_j^*) \zeta_j^*$ ,  $\zeta_j^*(0) = I_{m_j^*}$  where

$$D_*(x) := A_{12} b_2^{-1} [A_{21} - A_{22} b_2^{-1} b_1 + A^* b_2^{-1} b_1 + b_2 \partial_x (b_2^{-1} b_1)](x),$$

and  $\delta$  denotes Dirac mass,

$$(2.9) \quad E(x, t; y) := \overline{W}'(x) e(y, t),$$

$$e(y, t) := \chi_{t \geq 1} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} \left( \text{erfn} \left( \frac{y + a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) - \text{erfn} \left( \frac{y - a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) \right) l_i^-(y),$$

where  $\text{erfn}(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^z e^{-\xi^2} d\xi$  denotes the error function,  $a_i^\pm$  as ordered in (1.2) are eigenvalues of  $A_\pm = d\tilde{F}(\overline{W}_\pm) = dF^1(dF^0)^{-1}(\overline{U}_\pm)$  and  $l_i^\pm(x)/r_i^\pm(x)$  are left/right eigenvectors of  $d\tilde{F}(\overline{W}(x))$  associated with eigenvalues  $a_j(x)$  for  $x \gtrless 0$  ( $a_j(x) \rightarrow a_j^\pm$  as  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ ), satisfying

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |r_i^\pm(x)| &\leq C, & |(\partial/\partial x)r_i^\pm(x)| &\leq C\gamma e^{-\eta|x|}, & |r_i^\pm(x) - r_i^\pm(\pm\infty)| &\leq C\gamma e^{-\eta|x|}, \\ |l_i^\pm(x)| &\leq C, & |(\partial/\partial x)l_i^\pm(x)| &\leq C\gamma e^{-\eta|x|}, & |l_i^\pm(x) - l_i^\pm(\pm\infty)| &\leq C\gamma e^{-\eta|x|}, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>Though the bounds of [MZ1] are stated only in the Lax and overcompressive cases, the main part of the proof applies equally well in the undercompressive case to yield the degraded bounds ( $\gamma = 1$ ) stated here. It is only the "refined estimates"  $\gamma = 0$  of the Lax and overcompressive cases that do not apply here.

$\beta_k^\pm > 0$  are time-asymptotic scalar diffusion rates  $\beta_k^\pm := (l_k \tilde{B} r_k)^\pm$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{x,y}^\alpha \tilde{G}(x, t; y) \\
&= (t^{-|\alpha_x|/2} + |\alpha_x| e^{-\eta|x|}) (t^{-|\alpha_y|/2} + |\alpha_y| \gamma e^{-\eta|y|}) \\
&\quad \times \left( \sum_{k=1}^n r_k^-(x) l_k^-(y) e^{-\eta x^+} \mathcal{O}(t^{-1/2} e^{-(x-y-a_k^- t)^2/(Mt)}) \right. \\
(2.11) \quad &+ \sum_{a_j^- < 0, a_k^- > 0} \chi_{\{|a_k^- t| \geq |y|\}} r_j^-(x) l_k^-(y) e^{-\eta x^+} \mathcal{O}(t^{-1/2} e^{-(x-a_j^-(t-|y/a_k^-|))^2/(Mt)}) \\
&+ \sum_{a_j^+ > 0, a_k^- > 0} \chi_{\{|a_k^- t| \geq |y|\}} r_j^+(x) l_k^-(y) e^{-\eta x^-} \mathcal{O}(t^{-1/2} e^{-(x-a_j^+(t-|y/a_k^-|))^2/(Mt)}) \left. \right) \\
&+ \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta(|x-y|+t)}),
\end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2$ ,  $0 \leq |\alpha_y| \leq 1$ , some  $\eta, C, M > 0$ , where  $x^\pm$  denotes the positive/negative part of  $x$ ,  $\gamma$  is 1 for undercompressive profiles and 0 otherwise. Symmetric estimates hold for  $y \geq 0$ .

*Remark 2.2.* The difference between undercompressive and Lax estimates, alluded to in Section 1.2, is precisely the term  $|\alpha_y| e^{-\eta|y|}$  appearing in (2.11) for undercompressive ( $\gamma = 1$ ) but not Lax ( $\gamma = 0$ ) type shocks. One may check that this leads to nonlinear interaction terms not compatible with the argument of [MZ2].

From (2.9) and (2.10), we obtain by straightforward calculation (see [MZ1]) the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
|e(y, t)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} \left( \operatorname{erfnc} \left( \frac{y + a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) - \operatorname{erfnc} \left( \frac{y - a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) \right), \\
|e(y, t) - e(y, +\infty)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} \operatorname{erfnc} \left( \frac{|y| - at}{M\sqrt{t}} \right), \quad \text{for some } a > 0, \\
|\partial_t e(y, t)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} t^{-1/2} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^- t|^2/(Mt)}, \\
|\partial_y e(y, t)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} t^{-1/2} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^- t|^2/(Mt)} \\
(2.12) \quad &+ C \chi_{t \geq 1} \gamma e^{-\eta|y|} \left( \operatorname{erfnc} \left( \frac{y + a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) - \operatorname{erfnc} \left( \frac{y - a_i^- t}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^- t}} \right) \right), \\
|\partial_y e(y, t) - \partial_y e(y, +\infty)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} t^{-1/2} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^- t|^2/(Mt)} \\
|\partial_{yt} e(y, t)| &\leq C \chi_{t \geq 1} (t^{-1} + \gamma t^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|}) \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^- t|^2/(Mt)}
\end{aligned}$$

for  $y \leq 0$ , and symmetrically for  $y \geq 0$ , where  $\gamma$  as above is 1 for undercompressive profiles and zero otherwise.

**2.3. Auxiliary estimates.** To prove the key vertical estimate (1.4), we shall need the following ‘‘Strichartz-type’’ bounds similar to those established in [YZ, Lemma 8.8].

**Proposition 2.3** (Auxiliary integral bounds). *For  $\tilde{G}$  and  $H$  terms, there hold:*

$$(2.13) \quad \int_0^t \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (\tilde{G} + H)(x, s; y) f(y) dy \right| ds \leq C |f|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty},$$

$$(2.14) \quad \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1/2} \left| \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{G}_y(x, s-\tau; y) f(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right| ds \leq C \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1/2+\varepsilon} |f(\cdot, s)|_{L^2} ds,$$

and

$$(2.15) \quad \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1/2} \left| \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} H(x, s-\tau; y) f(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right| ds \leq C \int_0^t (1+s)^{-1/2} |f(\cdot, s)|_{L^\infty} ds,$$

for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \geq 0$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and some  $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ .

*Proof.* For the part contributed by  $\tilde{G}$  in the estimate (2.13), changing the order of integration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{G}(x, s; y) f(y) dy \right| ds &\leq \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\tilde{G}(x, s; y)| |f(y)| dy ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |f(y)| \int_0^t |\tilde{G}(x, s; y)| ds dy \leq C |f|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the bound  $\int_0^t |\tilde{G}(x, s; y)| ds \leq C$  may be verified as in [YZ, Lemma 8.8], by integrating a sum  $\theta := \sum_j \theta_j$  of Gaussian kernels

$$(2.16) \quad \theta_j(z, s) := (s)^{-1/2} e^{-(z-a_j s)^2/b_j s}$$

moving with nonzero speeds  $a_j \neq 0$ .<sup>2</sup> The estimate of the part contributed by  $H$  can be seen by using

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} H(x, s; y) f(y) dy \right| \leq e^{-\eta s} |f|_{L^\infty},$$

and then integrating in time. For the bound (2.14), based on the estimate

$$(2.17) \quad \left| \int_1^t s^{-1-\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{(as-|y|)^2}{bs}} ds \right|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad \text{for } a \neq 0, C = C(\varepsilon) \text{ independent of } t,$$

obtained in [YZ, (8.25)] and the estimate  $\tilde{G}_y = \theta(x-y, t) \mathcal{O}(t^{-1/2} + e^{-\eta|y|})$ , the lefthand side of (2.14) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &C \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+s)^{-1/2} (s-\tau)^{-1/2} \theta(x-y, s-\tau) |f(y, \tau)| dy d\tau ds \\ &+ C \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+s)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x-y, s-\tau) |f(y, \tau)| dy d\tau ds \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>In [YZ] there was only a single Gaussian kernel, but the same estimates hold, by superposition, for the sum.

where the first term can be bounded by the right hand side of (2.14) as in [YZ, Lemma 8.8], and the second term can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& C \int_0^t \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+s)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x-y, s-\tau) |f(y, \tau)| dy d\tau ds \\
&= C \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} |f(y, \tau)| \int_{\tau}^t (1+s)^{-1/2} \theta(x-y, s-\tau) ds dy d\tau \\
&\leq C \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} |f(y, \tau)| (1+\tau)^{-1/2} \int_{\tau}^t \theta(x-y, s-\tau) ds dy d\tau \\
&\leq C \int_0^t (1+\tau)^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} |f(y, \tau)| dy d\tau \leq C \int_0^t (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |f(y, \tau)|_{L^2} d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the bound (2.15) can be shown by the same calculation as in [YZ, (8.24)].  $\square$

**2.4. Nonlinear damping estimate.** We recall, finally, the following estimate established in [Z1].

**Proposition 2.4** (Nonlinear damping estimate [Z1]). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 let  $w_0 \in H^s$ ,  $s \geq 4$ , and suppose that, for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , both the supremum of  $|\dot{\delta}|$  and the  $W^{s-1, \infty}$  norm of the solution  $w$  of (2.3) remain sufficiently small. Then, for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , and some  $\nu > 0$ ,*

$$(2.18) \quad |w(t)|_{H^s}^2 \leq C |w_0|_{H^s}^2 e^{-\nu t} + C \int_0^t e^{-\nu(t-\tau)} (|w|_{L^2}^2 + |\dot{\delta}|^2)(\tau) d\tau.$$

### 3. NONLINEAR STABILITY OF LAX OR UNDERCOMPRESSIVE PROFILES

We are now ready to carry out our nonlinear stability analysis. Defining

$$(3.1) \quad \delta(t) = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(y, t) w_0(y) dy + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_y(y, t-s) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta} w)(y, s) dy ds,$$

following [ZH], [Z1], [MZ1]–[MZ2], where  $e$  is defined as in (2.9) (that is,  $e = \sum_i e_i$ ), and recalling the decomposition  $G = H + E + \tilde{G}$ , we obtain finally the *reduced equations*:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} w(x, t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}(x, t; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_y(x, t-s; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta} w)(y, s) dy ds \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, t; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, t-s; y) (Q_y(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta} w_y)(y, s) dy ds \end{aligned}$$

and, differentiating (3.1) with respect to  $t$ , and observing that  $e_y(y, s) \rightarrow 0$  as  $s \rightarrow 0$ , as the difference of approaching heat kernels:

$$(3.3) \quad \dot{\delta}(t) = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e_t(y, t) w_0(y) dy + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_{yt}(y, t-s) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta} w)(y, s) dy ds.$$

Define

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta(t) &:= \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t, 2 \leq p \leq \infty} \left( (|w(\cdot, s)|_{L^p} + |w_x(\cdot, s)|_{L^p}) (1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\delta(s)| + |\dot{\delta}(s)| (1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_0^s (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |w(y, \tau)| d\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following key estimate, from which nonlinear stability readily follows.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For all  $t \geq 0$  for which a solution  $w$  exists with  $\zeta(t)$  uniformly bounded by some fixed, sufficiently small constant, there holds*

$$(3.5) \quad \zeta(t) \leq C (|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4} + \zeta(t)^2).$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show, for  $0 \leq s \leq t$

$$\begin{aligned} & (|w(\cdot, s)|_{L^p} + |w_x(\cdot, s)|_{L^p})(1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} + |\delta(s)| + |\dot{\delta}(s)|(1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_0^s (1+\tau)^{-1/2}|w(y, \tau)|d\tau \\ & \leq C(|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4} + \zeta(t)^2). \end{aligned}$$

( $|\delta|$  bound.) By (3.1), we have that  $\delta(s)$  may be split into

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad \delta(s) &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(y, s)w_0(y) dy + \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_y(y, s-\tau)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau)dyd\tau \\ &=: \delta_1(s) + \delta_2(s). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.12)[i], we readily see  $|\delta_1(s)| \leq |w_0|_{L^1}$ . To bound  $|\delta_2(s)|$ , splitting the integral in  $y$  as  $\int_{-\infty}^0 + \int_0^{+\infty}$  and by (2.12)[iv], the integral on  $y < 0$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (3.7) \quad & \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 \left| e_y(y, s-\tau)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 C(s-\tau)^{-1/2} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & + \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 C e^{-\eta|y|} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} \left( \operatorname{erfnc}\left(\frac{y+a_i^-(s-\tau)}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^-(s-\tau)}}\right) - \operatorname{erfnc}\left(\frac{y-a_i^-(s-\tau)}{\sqrt{4\beta_i^-(s-\tau)}}\right) \right) \\ & \quad \times \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the first integral can be bounded by

$$C \int_0^s (s-\tau)^{-1/4}(1+\tau)^{-3/4}\zeta(t)^2 d\tau \leq C\zeta(t)^2.$$

Switching the order of integration, the second integral can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (3.8) \quad & \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 C e^{-\eta|y|} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^s C e^{-\eta|y|} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| d\tau dy \\ & \leq \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^s C e^{-\eta|y|} (1+\tau)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w(y, \tau)| d\tau dy \leq \int_{-\infty}^0 C e^{-\eta|y|} \zeta(t)^2 dy \leq C\zeta(t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\int_0^s (1+\tau)^{-1/2}|w(y, \tau)|d\tau < \zeta(t)$ .

( $|\dot{\delta}|$  bound.) By (3.3), we have that  $\dot{\delta}(s)$  may be split into

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\delta}(s) &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e_t(y, s)w_0(y) dy + \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_{yt}(y, s-\tau)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \\ &=: \dot{\delta}_1(s) + \dot{\delta}_2(s). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.12)[iii], we readily see  $(1+s)^{1/2}|\dot{\delta}_1(s)| \leq C|w_0|_{L^1 \cap L^\infty}$ . To bound  $|\dot{\delta}_2(s)|$ , splitting the integral in  $y$  as  $\int_{-\infty}^0 + \int_0^{+\infty}$  and by (2.12)[vi], the integral on  $y < 0$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 \left| e_{yt}(y, s-\tau)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 C(s-\tau)^{-1} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 C(s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} \sum_{a_i^- > 0} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the first integral can be bounded by

$$C \int_0^s (s-\tau)^{-3/4} (1+\tau)^{-3/4} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \leq C(1+s)^{-1/2} \zeta(t)^2.$$

To bound the second integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.9) \quad & \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^0 (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & = \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{-a_i^-(s-\tau)/2} (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_0^s \int_{-a_i^-(s-\tau)/2}^0 (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^s e^{-\eta a_i^-(s-\tau)/2} \int_{-\infty}^{-a_i^-(s-\tau)/2} (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-|y+a_i^-(s-\tau)|^2/(M(s-\tau))} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_0^s \int_{-a_i^-(s-\tau)/2}^0 (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-\eta|y|} e^{-(a_i^-)^2(s-\tau)/(4M)} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) \right| dy d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^s C e^{-\eta a_i^-(s-\tau)/2} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(\cdot, \tau) \right|_{L^\infty} d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_0^s C (s-\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-(a_i^-)^2(s-\tau)/(4M)} \left| (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(\cdot, \tau) \right|_{L^\infty} d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^s C e^{-\bar{\eta}(s-\tau)} (1+\tau)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau + \int_0^s C e^{-\bar{\eta}(s-\tau)} (s-\tau)^{-1/2} (1+\tau)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \\ & \leq C(1+s)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 + \int_0^s C (s-\tau)^{-3/4} (1+\tau)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \leq C(1+s)^{-1/2} \zeta(t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The integral on  $y > 0$  can be similarly estimated. Hence  $(1+s)^{1/2}|\dot{\delta}(s)| \leq C(|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^s} + \zeta(t)^2)$ .

( $|w|_{L^p}$  bound.) To shorten the writing, we will use  $\theta := \sum_j \theta_j$  as in (2.16) to denote a sum of Gaussian kernels  $\theta_j$  moving with nonzero speeds  $a_j$ .

The equation (3.2) of  $w$  may be split into

$$\begin{aligned} (3.10) \quad w(x, s) & = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}(x, s; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_y(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, s; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, s-\tau; y) (Q_y(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w_y)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \\ & =: w_1(x, s) + w_2(x, s) + w_3(x, s) + w_4(x, s). \end{aligned}$$

The  $L^p$ -norm of the  $w_1$  term can be bounded by

$$(3.11) \quad |w_1(\cdot, s)|_{L^p} \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{G}(\cdot, s; y)|_{L^p} |w_0(y)| dy \leq C(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} |w_0|_{L^1}.$$

The  $L^p$ -norm of the  $w_2$  term can be split and bounded by

$$(3.12) \quad |w_2(\cdot, s)|_{L^p} \leq \int_0^s C(s-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} |(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^2} d\tau \\ + \left| \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} C e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p}$$

where the first term can be bounded by  $\int_0^s C(s-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} (1+\tau)^{-\frac{3}{4}} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \leq C(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2$  and the second term can be bounded by the sum of

$$C \left| \int_{s/2}^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\ \leq C \int_{s/2}^s \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy \right|_{L^p} d\tau \\ \leq C \int_{s/2}^s |\theta(\cdot, s-\tau)|_{L^p} |e^{-\eta|\cdot|}|_{L^1} |(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^\infty} d\tau \\ \leq C \int_{s/2}^s C(s-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} (1+\tau)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \leq C(1+s/2)^{-1} \zeta(t)^2 \int_{s/2}^s (s-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} d\tau \\ \leq C(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2$$

and

$$C \left| \int_0^{s/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \theta(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\ = C \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \int_0^{s/2} \theta(x, s-\tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) d\tau dy \right|_{L^p} \\ \leq C \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \int_0^{s/2} (s-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} (|w(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^\infty} + |w_x(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^\infty} + |\dot{\delta}|(\tau)) |w(y, \tau)| d\tau dy \\ \leq C s^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\eta|y|} \int_0^{s/2} (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |w(y, \tau)| d\tau dy \\ \leq C(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2.$$

Note that we have used here in a crucial way the vertical estimate  $\int_0^{s/2} (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |w(y, \tau)| d\tau \leq C\zeta(s)$  to deal with outgoing characteristic modes  $\theta$ . (In the case, as in [YZ], that all modes  $\theta$  move inward toward the shock, the contribution of the second term is time-exponentially small, and may be neglected.) In the case  $s \leq 1$ , the second term in (3.12) is majorized by (a multiple of) the first term in (3.12), and so may be estimated in the same way to obtain a bound of  $C\zeta(t)^2$ ; thus, we may replace the last bound,  $C(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2$ , by  $C(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2$ , as required, removing the apparent singularity as  $s \rightarrow 0$ . The  $L^p$ -norm of the  $w_3$  term can be bounded by

$$(3.13) \quad \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(\cdot, s; y) w_0(y) dy \right|_{L^p} \leq e^{-\eta s} |w_0|_{L^p}.$$

The  $L^p$ -norm of the  $w_4$  term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad & \left| \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, s - \tau; y) (Q_y(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w_y)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\
& \leq C \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} |Q_y(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w_y(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^p} d\tau \\
& \leq C \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} \left( (1 + \tau)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w_y|_{L^p} + |w_{yy}|_{L^\infty} |w|_{L^p} \right) d\tau
\end{aligned}$$

where, by definition (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.15) \quad & \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} (1 + \tau)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w_y|_{L^p} d\tau \leq \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2 d\tau \\
& \leq (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2
\end{aligned}$$

and by the estimate (3.20),

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.16) \quad & \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} |w_{yy}|_{L^\infty} |w|_{L^p} d\tau \\
& \leq C \int_0^s e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} (|w_0|_{H^3} + \zeta(t)) (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t) d\tau \\
& \leq C |w_0|_{H^3} \zeta(t) (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} + C \zeta(t)^2 (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} \\
& \leq C |w_0|_{H^3}^2 (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} + C \zeta(t)^2 (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} \\
& \leq C |w_0|_{H^3} (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} + C \zeta(t)^2 (1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})}.
\end{aligned}$$

( $|w_x|_{L^p}$  bound.) By (3.2), we have that  $w_x$  may be split into

$$\begin{aligned}
w_x(x, s) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_x(x, s; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_{xy}(x, s - \tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \\
&+ \partial_x \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, s; y) w_0(y) dy - \int_0^s \partial_x \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(x, s - \tau; y) (Q_y(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w_y)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \\
&=: w_{1x}(x, s) + w_{2x}(x, s) + w_{3x}(x, s) + w_{4x}(x, s).
\end{aligned}$$

Following a similar estimate as (3.11), the  $L^p$ -norm of  $w_{1x}$  can be bounded by

$$C(1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} |w_0|_{L^1 \cap L^p}.$$

To bound the  $L^p$ -norm of  $w_{2x}$ , we split the time integral as  $\int_0^s = \int_0^{s-1} + \int_{s-1}^s$ . And, note that for  $s - \tau \geq 1$ ,  $\tilde{G}_{xy}$  satisfies bounds at least as good as those for  $\tilde{G}_y$ . Hence,

$$\left| \int_0^{s-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_{xy}(x, s - \tau; y) (Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \leq C(1 + s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2.$$

The remaining integral on  $\int_{s-1}^s$ , by Young's convolution inequality and triangular inequality, can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{s-1}^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_{xy}(x, s-\tau; y)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\
&= \left| \int_{s-1}^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_x(x, s-\tau; y)(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)_y(y, \tau) dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\
&\leq \int_{s-1}^s |(s-\tau)^{-1/2} \theta(\cdot, s-\tau)|_{L^1} |(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)_y(\cdot, \tau)|_{L^p} d\tau \\
&\quad + \left| e^{-\eta|\cdot|} \int_{s-1}^s \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \theta(\cdot - y, s-\tau) |(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)_y(y, \tau)| dy d\tau \right|_{L^p} \\
&\leq C \int_{s-1}^s (s-\tau)^{-1/2} (1+\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} (|w_0|_{H^3} + \zeta(t)^2) d\tau + \int_{s-1}^s |(Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w)_y|_{L^\infty} d\tau \\
&\leq C(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} (|w_0|_{H^3} + \zeta(t)^2)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Sobolev bound  $|w|_{W^{2,\infty}} \leq C|w|_{H^3}$  and estimate (3.20).

The  $L^p$  norm of  $w_{3x}$  can be bounded by  $e^{-\eta s}|w_0|_{W^{1,p}}$  and hence by  $e^{-\eta s}|w_0|_{H^s}$ ,  $s \geq 2$ . The  $L^p$  norm of  $w_{4x}$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
|w_{4x}(\cdot, s)|_{L^p} &\leq \int_0^s C e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} \left( |\dot{\delta}w_{xx}|_{L^p} + |w_x w_x|_{L^p} + |w w_{xx}|_{L^p} + |w_x w_{xx}|_{L^p} + |w w_{xxx}|_{L^p} \right) d\tau \\
&\leq \int_0^s C e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} \left( (1+\tau)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w|_{H^4} + (1+\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2 \right) d\tau \\
&\leq \int_0^s C e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} \left( (1+\tau)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w|_{H^4} + (1+\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2 \right) d\tau \\
&\leq \int_0^s C e^{-\eta(s-\tau)} \left( (1+\tau)^{-3/4} \zeta(t) (|w_0|_{H^4} + \zeta(t)) + (1+\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\frac{1}{p})} \zeta(t)^2 \right) d\tau \\
&\leq (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} C (|w_0|_{H^4} + \zeta(t)^2).
\end{aligned}$$

(*Vertical estimate.*) To control integral  $\int_0^s (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |w(y, \tau)| d\tau$ , by the decomposition of  $w$  (3.2), we use the auxiliary estimates (2.13)-(2.15) of Proposition 2.3. Applying these estimates together with the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.17) \quad & \left| Q(w, w_x) + \dot{\delta}w \right|_{L^2} \leq C(1+s)^{-1/2} \zeta(t) |w|_{L^2} \leq C(1+s)^{-3/4} \zeta(t)^2, \\
& |Q(w, w_x)_y + \dot{\delta}(t)w_y|_{L^\infty} \leq C (|w w_x|_{L^\infty} + |w_x|_{L^\infty}^2 + |w w_{xx}|_{L^\infty}) \\
& \leq C(\zeta(t)^2 (1+s)^{-\frac{3}{4}} + \zeta(t) (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |w_0|_{H^3} e^{-\theta s})
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain the vertical estimate

$$\int_0^s (1+\tau)^{-1/2} |w(y, \tau)| d\tau \leq C(|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^s} + \zeta^2(t)).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* . By the assumption on  $dF^0 > 0$  in (A1), it is equivalent to prove (1.3) with  $w$  in the place of  $\tilde{U}(\cdot + \delta(t), t) - \bar{U}(\cdot)$ . From Lemma 3.1, it follows by continuous induction that, provided  $|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4} < 1/(4C^2)$ , there holds

$$(3.18) \quad \zeta(t) \leq 2C|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4}$$

for all  $t \geq 0$  such that  $\zeta$  remains small. For, by standard short-time existence theory [K] there exists a solution  $w(\cdot, t) \in H^4$  on the open time-interval for which  $|w|_{H^4}$  remains bounded and sufficiently small, and thus  $\zeta$  is well-defined and continuous. Now, let  $[0, T)$  be the maximal interval on which  $|w|_{H^4}$  remains strictly bounded by some fixed sufficiently small constant  $c > 0$ .

Combined with (3.4), the damping estimate (2.18) yields

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} |w(t)|_{H^s}^2 &\leq C|w_0|_{H^s}^2 e^{-\nu t} + C\zeta(t)^2 \int_0^t e^{-\nu(t-\tau)}(1+\tau)^{-1/2} d\tau \\ &\leq C|w_0|_{H^s}^2 e^{-\nu t} + C\zeta(t)^2(1+t)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

giving

$$(3.20) \quad |w(t)|_{H^s} \leq C|w_0|_{H^s} e^{-\nu t} + C\zeta(t)(1+t)^{-1/4} \leq C(|w_0|_{H^s} + \zeta(t))(1+t)^{-1/4},$$

for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ . Hence, taking  $s = 4$ , we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad |w(t)|_{H^4} \leq C|w_0|_{H^4} e^{-\nu t} + C\zeta(t)(1+t)^{-1/4} \leq C|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4} (1+t)^{-1/4},$$

and so the solution continues so long as  $|w_0|_{L^1 \cap H^4}$  is taken sufficiently small.

This yields global existence and the claimed bound on  $|w|_{H^s}$ . Meanwhile, the bound (3.18) at once yields the claimed bounds on  $|w|_{L^p}$ ,  $|w_x|_{L^p}$ ,  $|\dot{\delta}|$ , and  $|\delta|$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [HRZ] P. Howard, M. Raoofi, and K. Zumbrun, *Sharp pointwise bounds for perturbed viscous shock waves*, J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ. 3 (2006), no. 2, 297–373.
- [HZ] P. Howard and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of undercompressive shock profiles*, J. Differential Equations 225 (2006), no. 1, 308–360.
- [K] S. Kawashima, *Systems of a hyperbolic–parabolic composite type, with applications to the equations of magneto-hydrodynamics*, thesis, Kyoto University (1983).
- [MP] A. Majda and R. Pego, *Stable viscosity matrices for systems of conservation laws*, J. Diff. Eqs. 56 (1985) 229–262.
- [MZ1] C. Mascia and K. Zumbrun, *Pointwise Green function bounds for shock profiles of systems with real viscosity*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 169 (2003), no. 3, 177–263.
- [MZ2] C. Mascia and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of large-amplitude viscous shock profiles of hyperbolic–parabolic systems*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 172 (2004), no.1, 93–131.
- [RZ] M. Raoofi and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of undercompressive viscous shock profiles of hyperbolic-parabolic systems*, J. Differential Equations 246 (2009), no. 4, 1539–1567.
- [YZ] Z. Yang and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of hydraulic shock profiles*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 235 (2020), no. 1, 195–285.
- [ZH] K. Zumbrun and P. Howard, *Pointwise semigroup methods and stability of viscous shock waves*. Indiana Mathematics Journal V47 (1998), 741–871; Errata, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 51 (2002), no. 4, 1017–1021.
- [Z1] K. Zumbrun, *Stability of large-amplitude shock waves of compressible Navier-Stokes equations*, With an appendix by Helge Kristian Jenssen and Gregory Lyng. Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics. Vol. III, 311–533, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (2004).

ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190 CHINA.  
*Email address:* yangzhao@amss.ac.cn

INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405  
*Email address:* kzumbrun@iu.edu