

INVISCID LIMIT ON L^p -BASED SOBOLEV CONORMAL SPACES FOR THE 3D NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS WITH THE NAVIER BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

MUSTAFA SENCER AYDIN

ABSTRACT. We establish uniform bounds and the inviscid limit in L^p -based Sobolev conormal spaces for the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations with the Navier boundary conditions in the half-space. We extend the vanishing viscosity results of [BdVC1] and [AK1] by weakening the normal and the conormal regularity assumptions, respectively. We require the initial data to be Lipschitz with three integrable conormal derivatives. We also assume that the initial normal derivative has one or two integrable conormal derivative depending on the sign of the friction coefficient. Finally, we establish the existence and uniqueness of the Euler equations with a bounded normal derivative, two bounded conormal derivatives, and three integrable conormal derivatives.

1. INTRODUCTION

The inviscid limit is the study of the limiting behavior of the solutions to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$\partial_t u^\nu - \nu \Delta u^\nu + u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu + \nabla p^\nu = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u^\nu = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ as $\nu \rightarrow 0$. Assuming that $\{u^\nu\}_\nu$ is convergent, one may expect to recover a solution u for the incompressible Euler equations

$$u_t + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.2)$$

This problem has been open to various extents depending on the geometry and the dimension of the physical domain Ω , the regularity imposed on the solutions, and the notion of convergence. When $\partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, the Euler equations (1.2) are coupled with the slip boundary condition

$$u \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (1.3)$$

that models the tangential movement of the fluid particles along the boundary. For the Navier-Stokes equations, one possibility is to impose the no-slip boundary condition

$$u^\nu = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.4)$$

which prevents the movement of the fluid particles at the boundary. Therefore, one may expect a formation of boundary layers or accumulation of vorticity for regimes with low viscosity (or high Reynolds number). In fact, Kelliher proved in [Ke] that the inviscid limit (in the energy norm) is equivalent to the formation of a vortex sheet on the boundary. Although being open to a large extent, the limiting behavior of u^ν can be mathematically described under certain functional settings when (1.4) is imposed; see, for example, [CLNV, DN, KVW, M, SC1, SC2, TW, K3] and the references in [MM].

One may also couple (1.1) with the Navier-boundary conditions

$$u^\nu \cdot n = 0, \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} (\nabla u^\nu + \nabla^T u^\nu) \cdot n \right)_\tau = -\mu u^\nu_\tau \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant, n is the outward unit normal vector, and $v_\tau = v - (v \cdot n)n$ is the tangential part of v . Allowing tangential movement, the Navier-boundary conditions assert that the viscous stress is proportional to the tangential velocity by a friction coefficient. Mathematically, this condition implies that the normal derivative can be written as a sum of tangential derivatives and lower order terms on the boundary. Therefore, one may expect the formation of a so-called ‘‘weak’’ boundary layer. We refer the reader to [GK, IS] for the mathematical description of such boundary layers and the corresponding inviscid limit results.

The vanishing viscosity limit in the energy norm was first studied Ifimie and Planas in [IP], where the authors establish the convergence of strong Navier-Stokes solutions in the energy norm to the strong Euler solution. Later, this problem has been studied in [BS1, BS2, CQ, NP, WXZ, X, XX1, XX2]. We remark two common grounds of these

results. First is that their functional setting is L^2 -based, and second is that their assumptions on the initial data yield a strong solution for both (1.1) and (1.2).

Regarding the Lebesgue exponent, the authors in [BdVC1] are the first to consider an L^p with $p \neq 2$ functional setting in three dimensions with the Navier boundary condition. On the periodic channel, they assumed that the initial datum belongs to $W^{3,p}$, for $p > 3/2$, and established that

$$u^\nu \rightarrow u \text{ in } C([0, T]; W^{s,p}(\Omega)) \text{ and } u^\nu \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T, W^{3,p}(\Omega)) \text{ weak}^*,$$

for $s < 3$ and $T > 0$. Later, in [BdVC2], the authors extended this result to integer derivatives $k \geq 3$ upon considering $p \geq 2$. These results need not hold in curved domains; see [BdVC3, BdVC4] for the negative results on the three-dimensional sphere.

Regarding the Euler solutions, Masmoudi and Rousset in [MR1] presented a functional framework allowing only a single normal derivative. In particular, for initial data satisfying

$$(u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} \in H_{\text{co}}^7(\Omega) \times (H_{\text{co}}^6(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{1,\infty}(\Omega)),$$

(see the definitions Sobolev conormal spaces in (2.3) and (2.4) below), they established the uniform convergence of u^ν to u , which also shows that the Euler equations are well-posed for this class of initial data. Later, in [AK1], we weakened the assumptions required on the initial data to establish uniform bounds on solutions and the uniform convergence in the vanishing viscosity limit. Namely, we assumed

$$\begin{aligned} (u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} &\in H_{\text{co}}^5(\Omega) \times (H_{\text{co}}^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), & \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} &\in (H_{\text{co}}^4(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty}(\Omega)) \times (H_{\text{co}}^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), & \mu \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and established the inviscid limit in $L^\infty((0, T) \times \Omega) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. We discuss in Section 2 the difference between the regularity required on the initial data depending on the sign of μ .

Our aim in the current work is to unify the L^p and Sobolev conormal settings initiated by [BdVC1] and [MR1], respectively, for the study of the inviscid limit under the Navier-boundary conditions. In particular, for $\delta > 0$, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} (u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} &\in (L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{3,6+2\delta}(\Omega)) \times (W_{\text{co}}^{2,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), & \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} &\in (L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{6,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty}(\Omega)) \times (W_{\text{co}}^{1,6}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), & \mu \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

and establish the inviscid limit in $L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{R}_+^3))$, for $p \in [2, \infty]$; see Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to establish the well-posedness of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations in L^p -based Sobolev conormal spaces. In addition, our vanishing viscosity result extends the one presented in [BdVC1] since we require only boundedness of one normal derivative. Next, we also improve upon the results in [AK1] and [MR1] by reducing the conormal differentiability requirements on the initial data.

A large part of this work is devoted to obtaining uniform-in- ν estimates when propagating (1.6). The uniform bounds established in [BdVC1] in the L^p -based Sobolev setting, rely on the symmetries of the Navier-Stokes equation. Such symmetries are unavailable to us since our functional setting is anisotropic and the commutator terms resulting from the conormal derivatives are not zero. In the L^2 -based setting, we utilized energy methods to establish uniform bounds; see [AK1, Proposition 2.2]. The main challenge was the analysis of the commutator terms resulting from the diffusive or the advective part of the equation. In the current work, we rely on the energy method to estimate the conormal derivatives of u , ∇u , and ∇p . However, unlike in the L^2 case, energy estimates on $Z^\alpha u$ do not yield a control over the term $\nu \|\nabla Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p$, where Z^α is a conormal derivative of order $|\alpha|$. Indeed, in Proposition 3.1, we establish an estimate of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z^\alpha u(t)\|_{L^p}^p + c_0 \nu \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\int_0^t \int_\Omega (|\nabla Z^\alpha u|^2 |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \right) \\ \lesssim \|Z^\alpha u_0\|_{L^p}^p + \int_0^t I(s) ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\partial_z Z^\beta u(s)\|_{L^p}^p ds, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

where Z^β is a conormal derivative of order $|\alpha| - 1$ and I consists of the terms to be propagated by the Gronwall inequality. Upon letting $p = 2$, it is possible to control the normal derivative term on the right-hand side by an induction argument; see [AK1, Proposition 3.1]. However, when $p > 2$, this is not possible. Therefore, we cannot utilize the dissipative nature of the Laplacian term using energy methods.

In (1.7), the term involving $\partial_z Z^\beta u$ is multiplied by a power of ν . Motivated by this, we rely on the maximal regularity properties of the heat equation to estimate this and many other higher order terms that result from energy

estimates. However, the maximal regularity estimates introduce new challenges. Broadly speaking, one requires initial data in $W^{1-\frac{2}{p},p}$ to gain a derivative in $L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))$. Therefore, we need to quantify by ν the approximation of the initial datum; see Section 10. The second challenge arises from the unfavorable sign of the friction coefficient μ . When μ is non-negative, (1.5) becomes a homogenous Robin boundary condition. Hence, we do not run into boundary terms when we utilize maximum regularity estimates. However, this is not the case when $\mu < 0$ because estimates result in a boundary term involving mixed fractional space-time derivatives. We handle this term by establishing a trace-type inequality; see Lemma 8.2. Lastly, since $\partial\Omega \neq 0$, the maximal regularity estimates require a compatible initial datum. In 2D, it is possible to approximate a non-compatible initial data with a sequence of smooth compatible ones, see [CMR, LNP], but it is unclear whether this is possible in 3D. Nevertheless, the inviscid limit problem with no-slip conditions and non-compatible initial data has been considered in [ACS, GKLMN].

Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 have an implication in addition to the inviscid limit. Namely, they also establish the well-posedness of the Euler equations for the class of initial data given by (1.6). In Theorem 2.3, we further weaken the assumptions (1.6) and prove that the Euler equations has a unique solution. Before discussing Theorem 2.3, we briefly summarize the previous works on the well-posedness of the strong solutions for the three-dimensional Euler equations. The literature dates back to the work of Lichtenstein in [L], where he considered u_0 in $C^{k,\alpha}$. Regarding the Sobolev spaces, in [K1] and [K2], Kato studied this problem for $u_0 \in H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)$, for $m \geq 3$, and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$, for $s > \frac{5}{2}$, respectively. Then, Kato and Ponce in [KP] extended this result to the L^p -based Sobolev spaces $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for $s > \frac{d}{p} + 1$. These results have counterparts in bounded domains such as [BB, KL, Te]. In addition, well-posedness of the Euler equations has been studied in other functional settings such as Besov or Triebel-Lizorkin spaces. We refer the reader to [CW, GL, GLY, PP, C1–C3] and the references therein. These results consider isotropic spaces and require integrability of at least two derivatives in the normal direction, whereas the inviscid limit type constructions in [AK1, MR1] do not. Apart from the inviscid limit approach, the authors in [BILN] established the well-posedness of the Euler equations in the conormal spaces. Namely, they considered the class of initial data satisfying

$$(u, \nabla u, \operatorname{curl} u)|_{t=0} \in H_{\text{co}}^4(\Omega) \times H_{\text{co}}^3(\Omega) \times W_{\text{co}}^{1,\infty}(\Omega),$$

for general domains. Later, in [AK2], we extended this result by assuming

$$(u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} \in H_{\text{co}}^4(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega),$$

in the half-space. The improvement in [AK2] is that we did not require any bounded or integrable conormal derivatives on ∇u . In our current work, we further decrease the conormal differentiability requirement on u_0 and prove the existence and uniqueness for the Euler equations in the half-space with initial data in

$$(u, \nabla u)|_{t=0} \in (W_{\text{co}}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty}(\Omega)) \times L^\infty(\Omega),$$

for $\delta > 0$; see Theorem 2.3. The construction here is follows by the a priori estimates and approximation by smooth solutions.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND THE MAIN RESULTS

Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^3$, and denote $x = (x_h, z) = (x_1, x_2, z) \in \Omega = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Rewriting (1.1) and (1.5) for the half-space, we have

$$\partial_t u^\nu - \nu \Delta u^\nu + u^\nu \cdot \nabla u^\nu + \nabla p^\nu = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot u^\nu = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$, and

$$u_3^\nu = 0, \quad \partial_z u_h^\nu = 2\mu u_h^\nu, \quad (2.2)$$

for $(x, t) \in \{z = 0\} \times (0, T)$ where $u_h = (u_1, u_2)$. Now, we denote $\varphi(z) = z/(1+z)$ and write $Z_1 = \partial_1$, $Z_2 = \partial_2$, and $Z_3 = \varphi \partial_z$. Next, we define the Sobolev conormal spaces

$$W_{\text{co}}^{m,p} = W_{\text{co}}^{m,p}(\Omega) = \{f \in L^p(\Omega) : Z^\alpha f \in L^p(\Omega), \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3, 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq m\}, \quad (2.3)$$

for $p \in [1, \infty]$. We note that these are Banach spaces when equipped with the norms defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{W_{\text{co}}^{m,p}(\Omega)}^2 &= \|f\|_{m,p}^p = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|Z^\alpha f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty \\ \|f\|_{W_{\text{co}}^{m,\infty}(\Omega)} &= \|f\|_{m,\infty} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|Z^\alpha f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

We denote by $\|f\|_{L^2}$ the L^2 norm and by $\|f\|_{L^\infty}$ the L^∞ norm of f . Next, we fix a sufficiently small constant $\bar{\nu} > 0$ and an arbitrary $\delta > 0$. Moreover, for the rest of this work, we assume that $T \leq 1$. Now, we state our first main result.

Theorem 2.1 (existence, uniqueness, and inviscid limit). *Assume that $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,6+2\delta}(\Omega)$, with $\nabla u_0 \in W_{co}^{2,3+\delta}(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$ be such that $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ on Ω and $u_0 \cdot n = 0$ and $\partial_z(u_0)_h = 2\mu(u_0)_h$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then, there exists a sequence of smooth divergence-free initial data u_0^ν such that $u_0^\nu \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and the following holds.*

- i. (Existence and Uniqueness) *There exists $T > 0$ independent of ν and a unique solution $u^\nu \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,6+2\delta}(\Omega))$ of (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$ with the initial data u_0^ν . Moreover, there is $M > 0$ depending only on the size of u_0 such that*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} (\|u^\nu(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u^\nu(t)\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u^\nu(t)\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\nabla u^\nu(t)\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\nabla u^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty}) \leq M. \quad (2.5)$$

- ii. (Inviscid Limit) *There exists a unique solution $u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,6+2\delta}(\Omega))$ with $\nabla u \in L^\infty(0, T; W_{co}^{2,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega))$ to the Euler equations (1.2) such that*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|u^\nu - u\|_{L^p} \leq \bar{M} \nu^{\frac{3+p}{5p}}, \quad p \in [2, \infty], \quad (2.6)$$

where $\bar{M} > 0$ is independent of ν .

Assuming that $\mu \geq 0$, we establish the existence, uniqueness, and the inviscid limit with one less conormal derivative on ∇u .

Theorem 2.2 (A sharper result for non-negative friction). *Assume that $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$ and $\mu \geq 0$. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,6}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ be divergence-free with vanishing normal component on $\partial\Omega$, and $\nabla u_0 \in W_{co}^{1,6}(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy $\partial_z(u_0)_h = 2\mu(u_0)_h$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then, there exists a sequence of smooth divergence-free initial data u_0^ν such that $u_0^\nu \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and the following holds.*

- i. (Existence and Uniqueness) *There exists $T > 0$ independent of ν and a unique solution $u^\nu \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{1,6}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W_{co}^{3,6}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{2,\infty}(\Omega))$ to (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$ with initial data u_0^ν . Moreover, there exists $M > 0$ depending only on the size of u_0 such that*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} (\|u^\nu(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u^\nu(t)\|_{3,6}^6 + \|u^\nu(t)\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\nabla u^\nu(t)\|_{1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\nabla u^\nu(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2) \leq M.$$

- ii. (Inviscid Limit) *There exists a unique solution $u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,6}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{2,\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\nabla u \in L^\infty(0, T; W_{co}^{1,6}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega))$ to the Euler equations (1.2) such that (2.6) holds.*

Theorem 2.2 establishes the inviscid limit under weaker assumptions on the initial data. Indeed, when $f, \nabla f \in W_{co}^{2,3+\delta}$, we have the inequality

$$\|f\|_{2,\infty} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{2,3+\delta} + \|f\|_{2,3+\delta};$$

see [MR2]. Therefore, the class of initial data considered in Theorem 2.1 contains $W_{co}^{2,\infty}$. Theorem 2.2 holds under weaker assumptions due to the favorable sign of the friction coefficient μ . When $\mu \neq 0$, the Navier boundary condition is a Robin-type boundary condition and when $\mu < 0$, it is more challenging to close the estimates. In fact, assuming that $\mu \geq 0$, [AK1, Proposition 6.1] propagates $\|u\|_{2,\infty}$ uniformly in time and viscosity, even in the presence of the Laplacian. However, it is unclear whether the same result holds when $\mu < 0$.

In our inviscid limit results, we impose conormal differentiability on ∇u_0 to control the boundary or commutator terms resulting from the Laplacian. However, when we only consider the Euler equations, it is possible to improve upon the assumptions on u_0 and construct unique solutions.

Theorem 2.3 (Well-posedness of the Euler equations in Sobolev conormal spaces). *Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, with $\nabla u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, be such that $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ and $u_0 \cdot n = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. For some $T > 0$, there exists a unique solution $u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{2,\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\nabla u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega) \times (0, T))$ to the Euler equations (1.2)*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} (\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(t)\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u(t)\|_{2,\infty} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^\infty}) \leq M,$$

where $M > 0$ depends on the norms of the initial data.

We note that in Theorems 2.1–2.3 we can replace ∇u_0 by $\text{curl } u_0$. In addition, when we restrict attention to bounded flat domains, we may omit $L^{3+\delta}$ -based conormal differentiability assumptions on u_0 in Theorem 2.1 as well as L^2 integrability assumptions in all of the results.

When we consider conormal derivatives, we distinguish between Z_h and Z_3 upon letting

$$Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k, \quad \alpha = (\tilde{\alpha}, k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \times \mathbb{N}_0.$$

In addition, we compute the commutator of Z_3 and ∂_z by using the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be a smooth function. Then there exist $\{c_{j,\varphi}^k\}_{j=0}^k$ and $\{\tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k\}_{j=0}^k$ smooth, bounded functions of z , for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, depending on φ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad Z_3^k \partial_z f &= \sum_{j=0}^k c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_z Z_3^j f = \partial_z Z_3^k f + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_z Z_3^j f, \\ (ii) \quad \partial_z Z_3^k f &= \sum_{j=0}^k \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k Z_3^j \partial_z f = Z_3^k \partial_z f + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k Z_3^j \partial_z f, \\ (iii) \quad Z_3^k \partial_{zz} f &= \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^j \left(c_{l,\varphi}^j c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_{zz} Z_3^l f + (c_{l,\varphi}^j)' c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_z Z_3^l f \right), \\ (iv) \quad \partial_{zz} Z_3^k f &= \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^j \tilde{c}_{l,\varphi}^j \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k Z_3^l \partial_{zz} f + \sum_{j=0}^k (\tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k)' Z_3^j \partial_z f, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where $\tilde{c}_{k,\varphi}^k = 1 = c_{k,\varphi}^k$, and the prime indicates the derivative with respect to the variable z .

We also utilize an interpolation type inequality for conormal derivatives.

Lemma 2.2 (An interpolation inequality for Sobolev conormal spaces). *Let $2 \leq p < \infty$ and assume that $f, g \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_{co}^{k,p}(\Omega)$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\|Z^\alpha f Z^\beta g\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{k,p} + \|f\|_{k,p} \|g\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{2.8}$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| + |\beta| = k$.

The proof of (2.8) follows from a Gagliardo-Nirenberg type inequality

$$\|f\|_{|\alpha|, \frac{kp}{|\alpha|}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{|\beta|}{k}} \|f\|_{k,p}^{\frac{|\alpha|}{k}}, \tag{2.9}$$

on \mathbb{R}^3 employed with an even extension along the vertical variable; see [Gu]. Next, since $u_3 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, the Hardy inequality and the incompressibility condition imply

$$\left\| \frac{u_3^\nu}{\varphi} \right\|_{k,p} \lesssim \|Z_h u_h^\nu\|_{k,p}, \tag{2.10}$$

for all $p \in [1, \infty]$.

Now, we fix $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, and denote by (u, p) , instead of (u^ν, p^ν) , the smooth solution to the Navier Stokes system with the viscosity ν . Also, we write

$$\begin{aligned} P &= P(\|u\|_{L^2}, \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}, \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}, \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}, \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}) \\ Q &= Q(\|u\|_{L^2}, \|u\|_{3,6}, \|\eta\|_{1,6}, \|u\|_{2,\infty}, \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}) \\ R &= R(\|u\|_{L^2}, \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}, \|u\|_{2,\infty}, \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

for polynomials that may change from line to line, and we write $(P, Q, R)|_{t=0} = (P_0, Q_0, R_0)$. We also define

$$\mathcal{M}_{0,j,p}(u_0) = \mathcal{M}_{0,j,p} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha u_0]_{1-\frac{2}{p}, p, x, \Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u_0\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha u_0\|_{L^p} \right),$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{0,j,p}(\eta_0) = \mathcal{N}_{0,j,p} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha \eta_0]_{1-\frac{2}{p}, p, x, \Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta_0\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha \eta_0\|_{L^p} \right),$$

for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $p > 2$; see Section 7 for the definitions of the seminorms $[\cdot]_{s,p,x,\Omega}$. In the rest of this work, we refer to the solutions of the Euler equations with slip boundary conditions as the solutions u of (2.1)–(2.2) with $\nu = 0$. Now, we state the a priori estimates.

Proposition 2.3 (A priori estimates). *Let $\nu \in [0, \bar{\nu}]$, $\omega = \text{curl } u$, and $\eta = \omega_h - 2\mu u_h^\perp$ (see (4.1)). Then, any smooth solution u to (2.1)–(2.2) defined on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 , satisfies the following:*

i. If $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \leq C \left(P_0 + \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \mathcal{N}_{0,1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \int_0^t P \, ds \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

ii. If $\mu \geq 0$ and $\nu > 0$, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{1,6}^6 + \|\eta\|_{1,6}^6 + \|u\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C \left(Q_0 + \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6}^6 + \mathcal{N}_{0,0,6}^6 + \int_0^t Q \, ds \right), \quad (2.13)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

iii. If $\nu = 0$, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \left(R_0 + \int_0^t R \, ds \right), \quad (2.14)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

To establish the a priori bounds, we prove estimates for the conormal derivatives of u , ∇u , and ∇p in Sections 3, 4, and 5, respectively. Next, we establish L^∞ bounds for u and ∇u in Section 6. Following this, we present maximum regularity and trace estimates in Sections 7 and 8, respectively. In Section 9, we conclude the proof of the a priori bounds. Finally, in Section 10, we prove Theorems 2.1–2.3.

3. CONORMAL DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES

In this section, we present the conormal derivative estimates for u . We recall the convention that the solutions of (2.1) and (2.2) with $\nu = 0$ refer to the solutions for the Euler equations (1.2) and (1.3).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in [0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that u is a smooth solution of (2.1) and (2.2) on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 . Then we have the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^p + c_0 \nu \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \left(\int_0^t \int_\Omega (|\nabla Z^\alpha u|^2 |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) \, dx \, ds \right) \\ & \lesssim \|u_0\|_{3,p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{3,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) + \|u\|_{3,p}^{p-1} \|\nabla p\|_{3,p} \right) \, ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{2,p}^p \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $c_0 > 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We establish (3.1) by induction on the order of conormal differentiability. The base case is the standard L^p estimate given by

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p}^p + \nu \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 |u|^{p-2} \, dx + 4\nu \frac{p-2}{p^2} \int_\Omega |\nabla |u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 \, dx = -2\mu\nu \|u_h\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p - \int_\Omega \nabla p u |u|^{p-2} \, dx, \quad (3.2)$$

where we have used (2.2) to get

$$\nu \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_i u_i u_j |u|^{p-2} n_i = \nu \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_z u_h \cdot u_h |u_h|^{p-2} = -2\mu\nu \|u_h\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p.$$

When $\mu < 0$, we estimate this boundary term by writing

$$|\mu\nu| \|u_h\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p \leq \mu\nu \| |u_h|^{\frac{p}{2}} \|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \mu\nu \|\nabla |u_h|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2} \| |u_h|^{\frac{p}{2}} \|_{L^2},$$

from where we invoke Young's inequality and obtain

$$|\mu\nu| \|u_h\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p \leq \epsilon\nu \|\nabla |u_h|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon \| |u_h|^{\frac{p}{2}} \|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Combining (3.2) and (3.3) and letting $t \in [0, T]$ yields

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^p}^p + c_0 \nu \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 |u|^{p-2} + |\nabla |u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^p}^p + \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^p}^{p-1} (\|u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^p}) ds,$$

and this concludes the base step of the induction. For the remaining part, we only present the final step. Therefore, for $|\alpha'| \leq 2$, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Z^{\alpha'} u(t)\|_{L^p}^p + c_0 \nu \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla Z^{\alpha'} u|^2 |Z^{\alpha'} u|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^{\alpha'} u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \\ & \lesssim \|u_0\|_{2,p}^p + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{2,p}^p (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|u\|_{2,\infty} + 1) + \|u\|_{2,p}^{p-1} \|\nabla p\|_{2,p}) ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{2,p}^p ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

and aim to establish (3.1).

Let Z^α be a conormal derivative of order three, i.e., $|\alpha| = 3$, and first assume that $Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}$. This corresponds to the case where all derivatives are horizontal. Recalling that Z_h commutes with ∂_i , for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we apply $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ to (2.1) and write

$$\partial_t Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - \nu \Delta Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u + u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u + \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p = u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}(u \cdot \nabla u).$$

Testing this with $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u\|_{L^p}^p + \nu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^2 |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} dx + 4\nu \frac{p-2}{p^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx \\ & = -2\mu\nu \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u_h\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p + \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}(u \cdot \nabla u)) Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla p, Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where we have used (2.2). Now, we repeat the steps leading to (3.3) for $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u_h$ and obtain

$$|\mu|\nu \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p \leq \epsilon\nu \|\nabla |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{3,p}^p,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Next, we use Hölder inequality to estimate the remaining terms on the right-hand side of (3.5). It follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla p Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} dx \lesssim \|\nabla p\|_{3,p} \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u\|_{L^p}^{p-1},$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}(u \cdot \nabla u)) Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} dx \lesssim \|u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}(u \cdot \nabla u)\|_{L^p} \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u\|_{L^p}^{p-1}. \quad (3.6)$$

We expand the first term on the right-hand side of (3.6) as

$$u \cdot \nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u - Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}(u \cdot \nabla u) = - \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\beta}| \leq 3} \binom{\tilde{\alpha}}{\tilde{\beta}} (Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} u_h \cdot \nabla_h Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u + Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} u_3 \partial_z Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u).$$

Note that

$$\|Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} u_h \cdot \nabla_h Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|u\|_{3,p}, \quad 1 \leq |\tilde{\beta}| \leq 3, \quad (3.7)$$

Proceeding to the term involving ∂_z , we insert $\varphi \frac{1}{\varphi}$, obtaining

$$\left\| Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} \frac{u_3}{\varphi} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u \right\|_{L^p} \lesssim \begin{cases} \|Z_h^{\frac{u_3}{\varphi}}\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{3,p} \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|u\|_{3,p}, & |\tilde{\beta}| = 1 \\ \|Z_h^{\frac{u_3}{\varphi}}\|_{1,p} \|Z_h Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p} \|u\|_{2,\infty}, & |\tilde{\beta}| = 2, \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

using Hardy's inequality and the divergence-free condition. To conclude, note that

$$\|Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} u_3 \partial_z Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p} \|\partial_z u\|_{L^\infty}, \quad |\tilde{\beta}| = 3. \quad (3.9)$$

Now, we collect (3.5)–(3.9) and integrate in time so that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^p + c_0 \nu \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \left((\nabla |Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{\frac{p}{2}})^2 + |\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^2 |\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^{p-2} \right) dx ds \\ & \lesssim \|u_0\|_{3,p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{3,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) + \|u\|_{3,p}^{p-1} \|\nabla p\|_{3,p} \right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

Now, let $Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k$ where $1 \leq k \leq 3$. It follows that $Z^\alpha u$ solves

$$Z^\alpha u_t - \nu \Delta Z^\alpha u + u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u = u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla u) - Z^\alpha \nabla p + \nu Z^\alpha \Delta u - \nu \Delta Z^\alpha u. \quad (3.10)$$

We multiply this equation by $Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2}$, the left-hand side of (3.10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p + \nu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla Z^\alpha u|^2 |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx + 4\nu \frac{p-2}{p^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx \\ & = \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla u)) Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx - \int_{\Omega} Z^\alpha \nabla p Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx \\ & \quad + \nu \int_{\Omega} (Z^\alpha \Delta u - \Delta Z^\alpha u) Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We note that (3.11) does not have a boundary term since $Z_3 = \varphi \partial_z = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Now, we rewrite the quadratic commutator term as

$$\begin{aligned} u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla u) &= u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u - u \cdot Z^\alpha \nabla u - \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} Z^\beta u \cdot Z^{\alpha-\beta} \nabla u \\ &= u_3 \partial_z Z^\alpha u - u_3 Z^\alpha \partial_z u - \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} Z^\beta u \cdot Z^{\alpha-\beta} \nabla u \\ &= - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k u_3 \partial_z Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^j u - \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} Z^\beta u \cdot Z^{\alpha-\beta} \nabla u = I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned}$$

recalling that $|\alpha| = 3$. Next, we multiply I_1 by $\varphi \frac{1}{\varphi}$ and write

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\| \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^k \frac{u_3}{\varphi} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^{j+1} u \right\|_{L^p} \lesssim \left\| \frac{u_3}{\varphi} \right\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{3,p} \lesssim \|u\|_{1,\infty} \|u\|_{3,p}, \quad (3.12)$$

where we have used (2.10). Proceeding to I_2 , we have

$$I_2 = - \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\alpha|} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (Z^\beta u_h \cdot \nabla_h Z^{\alpha-\beta} u + Z^\beta u_3 Z^{\alpha-\beta} \partial_z u) = I_{21} + I_{22}.$$

We estimate I_{21} by utilizing the bounds in (3.7), while for I_{22} , we employ (3.9) when $|\beta| = 3$ and Lemma 2.1(i) otherwise. For the commutator terms resulting from (2.7)₁, we note that

$$\frac{Z_3 u_3}{\varphi} = \nabla_h \cdot u_h \text{ and } \frac{1}{\varphi} Z_h = Z_h \frac{1}{\varphi},$$

so that we may proceed as in (3.8). It follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha u - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla u)) Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}). \quad (3.13)$$

Recalling (3.10), we now bound the pressure term by writing

$$\int_{\Omega} Z^\alpha \nabla p Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx \lesssim \|\nabla p\|_{3,p} \|u\|_{3,p}^{p-1}. \quad (3.14)$$

It only remains to estimate the commutator term involving the Laplacian. Employing Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu Z^\alpha \Delta u - \nu \Delta Z^\alpha u &= \nu Z^\alpha \partial_{zz} u - \nu \partial_{zz} Z^\alpha u = \nu Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} (Z_3^k \partial_{zz} u - \partial_{zz} Z_3^k u) \\
&= \nu \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{l=0}^j \left(c_{l,\varphi}^j c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_{zz} Z_3^l Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u + (c_{l,\varphi}^j)' c_{j,\varphi}^k \partial_z Z_3^l Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u \right) \\
&\quad + \nu \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left(c_{l,\varphi}^k \partial_{zz} Z_3^l Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u + (c_{l,\varphi}^k)' \partial_z Z_3^l Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

We first consider the term

$$2\nu c_{k-1,\varphi}^k \partial_{zz} Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u = 2\nu \frac{c_{k-1,\varphi}^k}{\varphi} \partial_z Z^\alpha u - 2\nu \frac{c_{k-1,\varphi}^{k'}}{\varphi} \partial_z Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u,$$

which corresponds to $(j, l) = (k-1, j)$ in the first sum and $l = k-1$ in the second sum. Multiplying by $Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{4\nu}{p} \int_\Omega \frac{c_{k-1,\varphi}^k}{\varphi} |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}} \partial_z |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}} dx - 2\nu \int_\Omega c_{k-1,\varphi}^{k'} \varphi' |\partial_z Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u|^2 |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx \\
&\leq \epsilon \nu \|\partial_z |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon \|Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p + C\nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\partial_z Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} u\|_{L^p}^p,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $C_\epsilon > 0$. We may replicate (3.16) for the terms in (3.15) and obtain

$$\int_\Omega (\nu Z^\alpha \Delta u - \nu \Delta Z^\alpha u) Z^\alpha u |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} dx \leq \epsilon \nu \|\partial_z |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{3,p}^p + C\nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\partial_z u\|_{2,p}^p. \tag{3.17}$$

Therefore, collecting (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), (3.13), (3.14), and (3.17), absorbing all the factors of $\epsilon \nu \|\partial_z |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2$, and integrating in time, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|Z^\alpha u(t)\|_{L^p}^p + c_0 \nu \int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla Z^\alpha u|^2 |Z^\alpha u|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^\alpha u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 \right) dx ds \\
&\lesssim \|u_0\|_{3,p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{3,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) + \|u\|_{3,p}^{p-1} \|\nabla p\|_{3,p} \right) ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{2,p}^p ds,
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Now, we sum over α using (3.4) and conclude (3.1). \square

4. NORMAL DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES

In this section, we present the conormal derivative bounds for ∇u . We note that these estimates are only required when $\nu > 0$, i.e., for (2.12) and (2.13).

Rather than analyzing the evolution of $\partial_z u$, we define

$$\eta = \omega_h - 2\mu u_h^\perp, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\omega = \text{curl } u$ and $u_h^\perp = (-u_2, u_1)^T$. As in [AK1, MR1], η solves

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_t - \nu \Delta \eta + u \cdot \nabla \eta &= \omega \cdot \nabla u_h + 2\mu \nabla_h^\perp p \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\eta &= 0, \quad z = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_h^\perp p = (-\partial_2, \partial_1)^T$. Unlike ω and $\partial_z u$, we have that η vanishes on the boundary, and

$$\|\partial_z u\|_{m,p} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{m,p} + \|u\|_{m+1,p}, \quad \|\partial_z u\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{1,\infty}, \tag{4.2}$$

implying that $\partial_z u$ is bounded by the conormal derivatives of u and η . As a further consequence, we also have

$$\|\omega_h\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega_h\|_{m,p} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{m,p} + \|u\|_{m,p}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and

$$\|\omega_3\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|u\|_{1,\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega_3\|_{m,p} \lesssim \|u\|_{m+1,p}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{4.3}$$

since $\omega_3 = \partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1$.

The following proposition is the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that u is a smooth solution of (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 . Then we have the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta(t)\|_{1,p}^2 + c_0 \nu \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 1} \left(\int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta|^2 |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^\alpha \eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \right) \\ & \lesssim \|\eta_0\|_{1,p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|\eta\|_{1,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + \|\eta\|_{1,p}^{p-1} \|u\|_{2,p} (\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{2,\infty}) \right) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \|\eta\|_{1,p}^{p-1} \|p\|_{2,p} ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\partial_z \eta\|_{L^p}^p ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where $c_0 > 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, for $|\alpha| = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Z^\alpha \eta(t)\|_{L^p}^2 + c_0 \nu \sum_{\alpha} \left(\int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta|^2 |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2} + |\nabla |Z^\alpha \eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \right) \\ & \lesssim \|Z^\alpha \eta_0\|_{2,p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|\eta\|_{2,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + \|\eta\|_{2,p}^{p-1} \|u\|_{3,2p} (\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{2,\infty}) \right) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \|\eta\|_{2,p}^{p-1} \|p\|_{3,p} ds + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^t \|\partial_z \eta\|_{1,p}^p ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We start with L^p estimates obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta(t)\|_{L^p}^p + \nu \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla \eta|^2 |\eta|^{p-2} + |\nabla |\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2) dx ds \\ & \lesssim \|\eta_0\|_{L^p}^p + \int_0^t \left(\|\eta\|_{L^p}^p (\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{1,\infty}) + \|\eta\|_{L^p}^{p-1} (\|u\|_{1,p} \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{1,p} \|u\|_{1,\infty} + \|p\|_{1,p}) \right) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where we have used (4.2)–(4.3) to write

$$\|\omega \cdot \nabla u_h\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_h\|_{L^p} \lesssim (\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{1,\infty}) (\|\eta\|_{L^p} + \|u\|_{1,p}). \quad (4.7)$$

Now, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$, $Z^\alpha \eta$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \nu \Delta + u \cdot \nabla) Z^\alpha \eta &= Z^\alpha (\omega \cdot \nabla u_h) + 2\mu Z^\alpha \nabla_h^\perp p + (u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha \eta - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla \eta)) + \nu (Z^\alpha \Delta \eta - \Delta Z^\alpha \eta) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

with $Z^\alpha \eta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Upon testing with $Z^\alpha \eta |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|Z^\alpha \eta\|_{L^p}^p + \nu \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta|^2 |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2} + 4 \frac{p-2}{p^2} |\nabla |Z^\alpha \eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 \right) dx = \sum_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}, Z^\alpha \eta |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2}).$$

First, we consider a single horizontal derivative, i.e., $\alpha = (\alpha_h, 0)$ where $|\alpha_h| = 1$. When this is the case, we have $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4} = 0$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 (\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}, Z^\alpha \eta |Z^\alpha \eta|^{p-2}) \lesssim \|\eta\|_{1,p}^{p-1} (\|Z^\alpha (\omega \cdot \nabla u_h)\|_{L^p} + \|p\|_{2,p} + \|u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha \eta - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla \eta)\|_{L^p}). \quad (4.9)$$

Expanding $Z^\alpha (\omega \cdot \nabla u)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z^\alpha (\omega \cdot \nabla u_h)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|Z^\alpha \omega_h \cdot \nabla_h u_h\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha \omega_3 \partial_z u_h\|_{L^p} + \|\omega_h \cdot Z^\alpha \nabla_h u_h\|_{L^p} + \|\omega_3 Z^\alpha \partial_z u_h\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \|\eta\|_{1,p} \|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{2,p} + \|u\|_{2,p} \|u\|_{2,\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where we have used (4.2)–(4.3). Next, we rewrite the commutator term on the right-hand side of (4.9) and employ (2.10) to obtain

$$\|u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha \eta - Z^\alpha (u \cdot \nabla \eta)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|Z^\alpha u_h \cdot \nabla_h \eta\|_{L^p} + \left\| Z^\alpha \frac{u_3}{\varphi} \cdot Z_3 \eta \right\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|\eta\|_{1,p}, \quad (4.11)$$

recalling that $|\alpha| = 1$ and Z_h commutes with ∂_z . Now, we consider $Z^\alpha = Z^3$ and estimate $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ by repeating (4.9)–(4.11). We note in passing that when we redo (4.11), we commute ∂_z and Z_3 using Lemma 2.1 and obtain $C\|u\eta\|_{L^p}$ which is a lower order term. Therefore, it only remains to estimate $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4}$, which we expand as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4} = -\nu(2\varphi'\partial_{zz}\eta + \varphi''\partial_z\eta) = -2\nu\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi}\partial_z Z_3\eta + \nu\left(\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} - \varphi''\right)\partial_z\eta.$$

Recalling that $Z^\alpha = Z_3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4}, Z^\alpha\eta|Z^\alpha\eta|^{p-2}) &= -\frac{4\nu}{p}\int_\Omega\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi}|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}\partial_z|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}dx + \nu\int_\Omega(\varphi' - \varphi\varphi'')|\partial_z\eta|^2|Z^\alpha\eta|^{p-2}dx \\ &\leq \epsilon\nu\|\partial_z|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon\|Z^\alpha\eta\|_{L^p}^p + C\nu^{\frac{p}{2}}\|\partial_z\eta\|_{L^p}^p, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $C_\epsilon > 0$. Now, we collect (4.7)–(4.12), absorb $\epsilon\nu\|\partial_z|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2$, integrate in time and combine with (4.6), concluding the proof of (4.4).

We proceed to establishing (4.5), and first, consider $\alpha = (\alpha_h, 0)$ with $|\alpha| = 2$. Similarly to (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^3(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}, Z^\alpha\eta|Z^\alpha\eta|^{p-2}) \lesssim \|\eta\|_{2,p}^{p-1}(\|Z^\alpha(\omega \cdot \nabla u_h)\|_{L^p} + \|p\|_{3,p} + \|u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha\eta - Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla\eta)\|_{L^p}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z^\alpha(\omega \cdot \nabla u_h)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|Z^\alpha\omega \cdot \nabla u_h\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\beta\omega_h \cdot Z^{\alpha-\beta}\nabla_h u_h\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\beta\omega_3 Z^{\alpha-\beta}\partial_z u_h\|_{L^p} + \|\omega \cdot Z^\alpha\nabla u_h\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim (\|\eta\|_{2,p} + \|u\|_{3,p})(\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{2,\infty}), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\beta| = 1$. We note that

$$\|Z^\beta\omega_3 Z^{\alpha-\beta}\partial_z u_h\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\omega_3\|_{L^\infty}\|\partial_z u_h\|_{2,p} + \|\omega_3\|_{2,p}\|\partial_z u_h\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (\|\eta\|_{2,p} + \|u\|_{3,p})(\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{2,\infty}),$$

by Lemma 2.2 and (4.2)–(4.3). Next, we estimate the commutator term $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,3}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \cdot \nabla Z^\alpha\eta - Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla\eta)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|Z^\alpha u_3 \partial_z \eta\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\beta u_3 Z^{\alpha-\beta} \partial_z \eta\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha u_h \cdot \nabla_h \eta\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\beta u_h Z^{\alpha-\beta} \nabla_h \eta\|_{L^p} \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4, \quad |\beta| = 1, \end{aligned}$$

For I_3 and I_4 , we have

$$I_3 + I_4 \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty}\|\eta\|_{2,p},$$

while for I_2 we conormalize and write

$$I_2 = \left\| Z^\beta \frac{u_3}{\varphi} Z^{\alpha-\beta} Z_3 \eta \right\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty}\|\eta\|_{2,p}.$$

Finally, for I_1 , we employ (2.9) to obtain

$$I_1 \lesssim \left\| Z^\alpha \frac{u_3}{\varphi} \right\|_{L^{2p}} \|Z_3 \eta\|_{L^{2p}} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,2p}\|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta\|_{2,p}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

concluding the estimate on $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,3}$.

We still need to consider Z^α where $\alpha = (\alpha_h, k)$ and $k = 1, 2$. Recalling (4.8), we note that $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are treated as in the previous paragraph upon employing Lemma 2.1 and introducing low-order terms. Therefore, we only analyze $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4}$. We expand this term as

$$\nu Z^\alpha \Delta \eta - \nu \Delta Z^\alpha \eta = \begin{cases} -\nu(2\varphi'\partial_{zz}Z_h\eta + \varphi''\partial_z Z_h\eta), & k = 1 \\ -\nu(4\varphi'\partial_{zz}Z_3\eta - 4(\varphi')^2\partial_{zz}\eta + 4\varphi''\partial_z Z_3\eta - 5\varphi'\varphi''\partial_z\eta + \varphi'''\eta), & k = 2, \end{cases}$$

and write

$$2\nu c_{k-1,\varphi}^k \partial_{zz} Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\bar{\alpha}} \eta = 2\nu \frac{c_{k-1,\varphi}^k}{\varphi} \partial_z Z^\alpha \eta - 2\nu \frac{c_{k-1,\varphi}^k \varphi'}{\varphi} \partial_z Z_3^{k-1} Z_h^{\bar{\alpha}} \eta,$$

from where we obtain that

$$(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,4}, Z^\alpha\eta|Z^\alpha\eta|^{p-2}) \leq \epsilon\nu\|\partial_z|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_\epsilon\|Z^\alpha\eta\|_{2,p}^p + C\nu^{\frac{p}{2}}\|\partial_z\eta\|_{1,p}^p,$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $C_\epsilon > 0$. Upon collecting the estimates for $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha,i}$, absorbing $\epsilon\nu\|\partial_z|Z^\alpha\eta|^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2$, and integrating in time, we conclude (4.5). \square

5. PRESSURE ESTIMATES

In this section, we establish bounds on the pressure term using the normal and conormal derivatives of u . To achieve this, we use (2.1) and (2.2) and note that p solves the elliptic Neumann problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta p &= \partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \nabla p \cdot n &= -2\mu\nu \nabla_h \cdot u_h, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Applying $Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k$ to this system, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta Z^\alpha p &= Z^\alpha (\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i) + Z^\alpha \Delta p - \Delta Z^\alpha p, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \nabla Z^\alpha p \cdot n &= -2\mu\nu \tilde{c}_{0,\varphi}^{k+1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla_h \cdot u_h, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where we have used $Z_3 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and

$$\nabla Z^\alpha p \cdot n = -\partial_z Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^{k+1} p = -Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \sum_{j=0}^k \tilde{c}_{j,\varphi}^{k+1} Z_3^j \partial_z p = -\tilde{c}_{0,\varphi}^{k+1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \partial_z p = -2\mu\nu \tilde{c}_{0,\varphi}^{k+1} Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla_h \cdot u_h.$$

In the following proposition, we estimate $Z^\alpha p$ for $|\alpha| \leq 2$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in [0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$. Then we have the inequality*

$$\|D^2 p(t)\|_{j,p} + \|\nabla p(t)\|_{j,p} \lesssim \|u(t)\|_{j+1,p} (\|u(t)\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq j+1} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (5.3)$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

First, we estimate $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p$ for $|\tilde{\alpha}| \leq 2$, and then we inductively estimate $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k$ for $0 \leq k \leq 2$ and $|\tilde{\alpha}| + k \leq 2$.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the assumption of Proposition 5.1, we have the inequality*

$$\|D^2 Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u(t)\|_{3,p} (\|u(t)\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty}) + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq 3} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $0 \leq |\tilde{\alpha}| \leq 2$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We consider (5.2) with $Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ and $0 \leq |\tilde{\alpha}| \leq 2$. Employing the $W^{2,p}$ elliptic estimate for the Neumann problem and the trace theorem, it follows that

$$\|D^2 Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} p\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} (\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i)\|_{L^p} + 2|\mu|\nu \|u\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla_h u\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (5.5)$$

To bound the quadratic term on (5.5), we only consider $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} (Z_h u_h Z_h u_h)$ and $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} (Z_h u_3 \partial_z u_h)$ since

$$(\partial_z u_3)^2 = (\nabla_h \cdot u_h)^2.$$

Now, utilizing (2.8), we get

$$\|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} (Z_h u_h Z_h u_h)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p} \|u\|_{1,\infty}, \quad (5.6)$$

while for the term involving $\partial_z u$, we conormalize when necessary and obtain

$$\|Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} Z_h u_3 \partial_z Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} u_h\|_{L^p} \lesssim \begin{cases} \|Z_h \frac{u_3}{\varphi}\|_{L^\infty} \|Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}-\tilde{\beta}} Z_3 u\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|u\|_{3,p}, & |\tilde{\beta}| = 0 \\ \|Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} Z_h \frac{u_3}{\varphi}\|_{L^p} \|Z_h Z_3 u\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p} \|u\|_{2,\infty}, & |\tilde{\beta}| = 1 \\ \|u\|_{3,p} \|\partial_z u\|_{L^\infty}, & |\tilde{\beta}| = 2, \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

where we have used (2.10). Recalling (4.2), we conclude (5.4). \square

Now, we prove Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. We only give details for the terms $\|D^2 Z^\alpha p\|_{L^p}$ and $\|\nabla Z^\alpha p\|_{L^p}$ with $|\alpha| = 2$, utilizing induction on $0 \leq k \leq 3$ such that $k + |\tilde{\alpha}| = 2$. The base step, i.e., $k = 0$ is a consequence of Lemma 5.2. Now, the induction assumption is

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} Z_3^k p\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\beta}} Z_3^k p\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|u\|_3 (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) \\ &\quad + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq |\tilde{\beta}|+1} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad |\tilde{\beta}| + k = 2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

and we need to establish

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2 Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^{k+1} p\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^{k+1} p\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|u\|_3 (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) \\ &\quad + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq |\tilde{\alpha}|+1} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad |\tilde{\alpha}| + k + 1 = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Let $Z^\alpha = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^{k+1}$ and employ the elliptic estimates for (5.2) obtaining

$$\|D^2 Z^\alpha p\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla Z^\alpha p\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|Z^\alpha (\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i)\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha \Delta p - \Delta Z^\alpha p\|_{L^p} + \nu \|u\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} \nabla_h u\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (5.10)$$

using that μ is a constant. For the quadratic term in (5.10) we proceed as in (5.6) and (5.7) to obtain

$$\|Z^\alpha (\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{3,p} (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}), \quad (5.11)$$

upon introducing lower-order terms. Now, we rewrite the commutator term for the pressure as

$$Z^\alpha \Delta p - \Delta Z^\alpha p = \begin{cases} -(2\varphi' Z_h \partial_{zz} p + \varphi'' Z_h \partial_z p), & k = 1 \\ -(2\varphi' Z_3 \partial_{zz} p + 2(\varphi')^2 \partial_{zz} p + 2\varphi'' Z_3 \partial_z p + 3\varphi' \varphi'' \partial_z p + \varphi''' Z_3 p), & k = 2. \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

Using (5.1), we arrive at

$$Z \partial_{zz} p = -Z \Delta_h p - Z (\partial_i u_j \partial_j u_i), \quad Z = Z_h, Z_3. \quad (5.13)$$

We may estimate the quadratic term in (5.13) as in (5.6) and (5.7), while for the pressure term we have

$$\|Z \Delta_h p\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|D^2 Z p\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_3 (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq 3-k} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

employing the induction assumption (5.8). We may estimate the remaining lower orders terms in (5.12) and write

$$\|Z^\alpha \Delta p - \Delta Z^\alpha p\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_4 (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1) + \nu \sum_{1 \leq |\tilde{\theta}| \leq 3} \|u(t)\|_{3,p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_h^{\tilde{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Finally, combining (5.10), (5.11), and (5.14), we conclude (5.9) and the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

6. L^∞ ESTIMATES

In this section, we establish a control over $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty}$, and $\|u\|_{2,\infty}$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in [0, \bar{\nu}]$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 . Then we have the following inequalities.*

i. *If $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\|\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\eta_0\|_{L^\infty} + \int_0^t \left((\|u\|_{1,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty})^2 + \|Z_h p\|_{L^\infty} \right) ds \quad (6.1)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

ii. *If $\mu \geq 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u(t)\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\eta_0\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \int_0^t \left((\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1)^3 + \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty} \right) ds \\ &\quad + \nu \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{1,\infty}^2 ds, \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

iii. If $\nu = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(t)\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\omega(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ & \lesssim \|u_0\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\omega_0\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \int_0^t \left((\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 1)^3 + \|u\|_{2,\infty} \|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty} \right) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

We note that Proposition 6.1(i) is needed for (2.13). Therefore, we rely on the $W^{1,3+\delta} \subset L^\infty$ embedding rather than propagate u in $L^\infty(0, T; W^{2,\infty})$. When either $\mu \geq 0$ or $\nu = 0$, we do not assume that $\partial_z u$ is twice conormal differentiable. Hence, we estimate $\|u\|_{2,\infty}$ directly to establish (2.13) and (2.14).

We note that the proof of Proposition 6.1 is almost identical to the proofs of [AK1, Proposition 6.1] and [AK2, Proposition 3.3]. The main idea is to perform L^q estimates and send $q \rightarrow \infty$. The only difference is that we estimate $\nu \|\partial_z u\|_{2,\infty}$ in Section 7 and $\|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty}$ in Section 9.

7. MAXIMAL PARABOLIC REGULARITY ESTIMATES

In this section, we estimate the higher order normal and conormal derivatives of $\partial_z u$, e.g., $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_z u \in L^p W_{\text{co}}^{2,p}$ or $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_z \eta \in L^p W_{\text{co}}^{1,p}$. Such terms either result from trace inequalities or commuting Z_3 with Δ . Therefore, we need the maximal regularity properties of the heat equation. To present them, let $t \in [0, T]$. Denoting $\Omega_t = (0, t) \times \Omega$ and $\partial\Omega_t = (0, t) \times \partial\Omega$, we introduce the space-time anisotropic Sobolev spaces

$$W_{t,x}^{m,p}(\Omega_t) = W^{m,p}(\Omega_t) = \{f \in L^p(\Omega_t) : \partial_t^r D_x^\alpha f \in L^p(\Omega_t), (r, \alpha) \in \mathbb{N}_0^4, 2r + |\alpha| \leq m\}, \quad (7.1)$$

with the norms

$$\|f\|_{W^{m,p}(\Omega_t)} = \sum_{2r+|\alpha| \leq m} \|\partial_t^r D_x^\alpha f\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)},$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. When $s > 0$ and non-integer, let $W^{s,p}(\Omega_t)$ be the space of functions with a finite norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega_t)} &= \sum_{2r+|\alpha| < s} \|\partial_t^r D_x^\alpha f\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \sum_{2r+|\alpha| = [s]} [\partial_t^r D_x^\alpha f]_{s-[s],x,p,\Omega_t} \\ &+ \sum_{0 < s-2r-|\alpha| < 2} [\partial_t^r D_x^\alpha f]_{\frac{s-2r-|\alpha|}{2},t,p,\Omega_t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the seminorms $[f]_{s',x,p,\Omega_t}$ and $[f]_{s',t,p,\Omega_t}$ are given by

$$[f]_{s',x,p,\Omega_t} = \left(\int_0^t \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{|f(x,t) - f(y,t)|^p}{|x-y|^{3+ps'}} dx dy dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (7.2)$$

and

$$[f]_{s',t,p,\Omega_t} = \left(\int_{(0,t)^2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(x,t) - f(x,\tau)|^p}{|t-\tau|^{1+ps'}} dx dy dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (7.3)$$

Finally, we note that the spaces $W^{k,p}(\partial\Omega_t)$ and $W^{s,p}(\partial\Omega_t)$ are defined upon replacing Ω_t with $\partial\Omega_t$ in (7.1)–(7.3) and $3 + ps'$ with $2 + ps'$ in (7.2). Now, we state certain maximal regularity estimates for the heat equation.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $T, \nu > 0$, $\mu \geq 0$, $t \in (0, T)$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that v is a smooth solution of the heat equation*

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \nu \Delta)v &= f, & \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ v(0) &= v_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with either the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$v = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t,$$

the Neumann boundary condition

$$\partial_z v = g, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t,$$

or the Robin boundary condition

$$\partial_z v - 2\mu v = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t,$$

where f , g , and v_0 are given smooth functions. Then, we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_x^2 v\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{-1} (\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\partial_t v\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}) \\ & \lesssim \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{p}} [\nabla v_0]_{1-\frac{2}{p}, p, x, \Omega} + \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^p} + \nu^{-1} \|v_0\|_{L^p} + I_{\partial\Omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

where $I_{\partial\Omega}$ equals zero for the Dirichlet and Robin boundary conditions and

$$I_{\partial\Omega} = [g]_{1-\frac{1}{p}, x, p, \partial\Omega_t} + \nu^{\frac{1-p}{2p}} ([g]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p}, t, p, \partial\Omega_t} + \|g\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_t)}),$$

for the Neumann boundary condition.

We note that $[f]_{s', x, p, \Omega}$ stands for the spatial Gagliardo-Nirenberg seminorm of f . In addition, we note that Lemma 7.1 implicitly assumes the compatibility conditions on the initial data

$$v_0 = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

for the Dirichlet boundary condition,

$$\partial_z v_0 = g(0), \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

for the Neumann boundary condition, and

$$\partial_z v_0 - 2\mu v_0 = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

for the Robin boundary condition. When $\mu < 0$, we apply Lemma 7.1 with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions to the smooth solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. In this case, we write $g = 2\mu u_h$. When $\mu \geq 0$, we employ the same lemma with the Dirichlet and Robin boundary conditions. In both cases, the compatibility conditions for utilizing Lemma 7.1 read as in the last two equations in (10.1). For the rest of this section, we assume that (10.1) holds, and we justify these assumptions by an approximation argument in Section 10.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let $0 < t \leq T$, $\nu > 0$ and $\mu \geq 0$ be fixed. Rescaling v , f , g and v_0 as

$$\bar{v}(x, s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} v(\sqrt{\nu}x, s), \quad \bar{f}(x, s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} f(\sqrt{\nu}x, s), \quad \bar{v}_0(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu}} v_0(\sqrt{\nu}x), \quad \bar{g}(x_h, s) = g(\sqrt{\nu}x_h, s).$$

The function \bar{v} solves

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \Delta)\bar{v} &= \bar{f}, & \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ \bar{v}(0) &= \bar{v}_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

either with the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\bar{v} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t,$$

or with the Neumann boundary condition

$$\partial_z \bar{v} = \bar{g}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t.$$

or with the Robin boundary condition

$$\partial_z \bar{v} - \frac{2\mu}{\sqrt{\nu}} \bar{v} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_t.$$

Using the explicit representation of \bar{v} , we arrive at

$$\|\bar{v}\|_{W_{t,x}^{2,p}(\Omega_t)} \lesssim \|\bar{f}\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\bar{v}_0\|_{W^{2-\frac{2}{p}, 6}(\Omega)} + \|\bar{g}\|_{W^{1-\frac{1}{p}}(\partial\Omega)}, \quad (7.5)$$

where the implicit constant is independent of ν and $\bar{g} = 0$ for the Dirichlet and Robin boundary conditions. We refer the reader to [LSU, Chapter IV] as well as [DHP, KM] for the proof of (7.5). Now, we may explicitly compute the norms in (7.5), concluding (7.4). \square

In the rest of this section, we estimate each term having ν as a factor on the right-hand sides of (3.1), (4.4), (4.5), (5.3), and (6.2). First, we consider the terms involving u .

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1), (2.2) on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 . Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \right) \lesssim \mathcal{M}_{j,p} + \mathcal{M}_{0,j,p} + \mathcal{M}_{\mu,j,p} \\ & = \left(\int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{j+1,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) + \|\nabla p\|_{j,p}^p \right) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha u(0)]_{1-\frac{2}{p},p,x,\Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u(0)\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha u(0)\|_{L^p} \right) \\ & \quad + \mu(\operatorname{sgn}(\mu) - 1) \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu [Z^\alpha u]_{1-\frac{1}{p},x,p,\partial\Omega_t} + \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \left([Z^\alpha u]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p},t,p,\partial\Omega_t} + \|Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_t)} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

We use Lemma 7.2 with $j = 2$ for the conormal derivative and the pressure estimates, while the case $j = 1$ is needed for the L^∞ estimates when $\mu \geq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. We only present the estimates when $j = 2$. We recall that $Z^\alpha u_i$ solves

$$(\partial_t - \nu \Delta) Z^\alpha u_i = -Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla u_i) - Z^\alpha \partial_i p + \nu(Z^\alpha \Delta - \Delta Z^\alpha) u_i,$$

with the boundary conditions depending on $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$. Now, we consider $Z^\alpha u_i = Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k u_i$ for either $i = 3$ and $|\alpha| \leq 2$, or $i = 1, 2$, $|\alpha| \leq 2$ and $1 \leq k \leq 2$. Invoking Lemma 7.1 with the Dirichlet boundary condition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\ & \lesssim \|Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla u_i)\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|Z^\alpha \partial_i p\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu \|(Z^\alpha \Delta - \Delta Z^\alpha) u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha u_i(0)]_{1-\frac{2}{p},p,x,\Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u_i(0)\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha u_i(0)\|_{L^p}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Next, we consider $Z_h^{\tilde{\alpha}} Z_3^k u_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, $k = 0$ and $|\tilde{\alpha}| \leq 2$. Employing Lemma 7.1 with Neumann and Robin boundary conditions when μ is negative and non-negative, respectively, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\ & \lesssim \|Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla u_i)\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \|Z^\alpha \partial_i p\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha u_i(0)]_{1-\frac{2}{p},p,x,\Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u_i(0)\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha u_i(0)\|_{L^p} \\ & \quad + \mu(\operatorname{sgn}(\mu) - 1) \left(\nu [Z^\alpha u_i]_{1-\frac{1}{p},x,p,\partial\Omega_t} + \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \left([Z^\alpha u_i]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p},t,p,\partial\Omega_t} + \|Z^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_t)} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. We now estimate the advection term and the commutator for the Laplacian. Upon conormalizing when necessary, we have

$$\|Z^\alpha(u \cdot \nabla u_i)\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \lesssim \left(\int_0^t \|u\|_{3,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

for $|\alpha| \leq 2$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$, and

$$\nu \|(Z^\alpha \Delta - \Delta Z^\alpha) u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \lesssim \begin{cases} \nu \|D_x^2 u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu \|\nabla u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}, & k = 1, |\alpha| = 1 \\ \nu \|D_x^2 Z_h u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu \|\nabla Z_h u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}, & k = 1, |\alpha| = 2 \\ \nu \|D_x^2 Z_3 u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu \|\nabla Z_3 u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \\ \quad + \nu \|D_x^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}, & k = 2, |\alpha| = 2, \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, we may control the commutator for the Laplacian term by the right-hand sides of (7.6) and (7.7) by employing an induction argument on $|\alpha|$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 7.2. \square

Now, we present the maximum regularity properties of η .

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1), (2.2) on $[0, T]$ with a smooth initial datum u_0 . Then, for η defined in (4.1), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha \eta\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)} \right) &\lesssim \mathcal{N}_{j,p} + \mathcal{N}_{0,j,p} \\ &= \left(\int_0^t \left((\|\eta\|_{j+1,p}^p + \|u\|_{j+1,p}^p) (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) + \|p\|_{j+1,p}^p \right) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} [\nabla Z^\alpha \eta(0)]_{1-\frac{2}{p},p,x,\Omega} + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta(0)\|_{L^p} + \|Z^\alpha \eta(0)\|_{L^p} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 0, 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Recalling that $Z^\alpha \eta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, the proof of Lemma 7.3 follows by employing Lemma 7.1 for the Dirichlet boundary condition and repeating the proof of Lemma 7.2. We also note that we need Lemma 7.3 with $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ for $\mu \geq 0$ and $\mu < 0$, respectively. Lastly, since we assume that $T \leq 1$, the implicit constant in Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3 does not depend on T .

8. TRACE ESTIMATES

In the current section, we estimate the boundary terms from Lemma 7.2 that appear only when $\mu < 0$. For the terms involving spatial derivatives, we have the standard trace inequality.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (2, \infty)$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1), (2.2) on $[0, T]$. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu [Z^\alpha u]_{1-\frac{1}{p},x,p,\partial\Omega_t} + \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \|Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_t)} \right) \lesssim \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\int_0^t \|Z^\alpha u\|_{W^{1,p}}^p ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

We treat the term involving a fractional derivative in time by employing the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, $p \in (5, \infty)$, and assume that (u, p) is a smooth solution of (2.1), (2.2) on $[0, T]$. Then, we have*

$$\nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} [Z^\alpha u]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p},t,p,\partial\Omega_t} \lesssim \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2p}} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \|\partial_z Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^{\frac{p-1}{p}}, \quad (8.1)$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof of Lemma 8.2. For $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ with $|\alpha| \leq 2$ given, we let $f = Z^\alpha u_h$, and employing a density argument, we assume that f has an extension $\hat{f} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-t, 2t))$. Then, we consider $\theta, \tau \in (0, t)$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x_h, 0, \theta) - f(x_h, 0, \tau)|^p &\lesssim \int_0^z |\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta)| |\hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta) - \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \tau)|^{p-1} d\zeta \\ &\quad + \int_0^z |\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \tau)| |\hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta) - \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \tau)|^{p-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

We denote $s = 1/2 - 1/(2p)$ and multiply both sides of (8.2) by $|\theta - \tau|^{-1-ps}$. Then, we utilize the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus again, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|f(x_h, 0, \theta) - f(x_h, 0, \tau)|^p}{|\theta - \tau|^{1+ps}} &\lesssim \int_0^z \frac{|\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta)|}{|t - \tau|^{1+ps}} \left| \int_\tau^\theta \partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s) ds \right|^{p-1} d\zeta \\ &\quad + \int_0^z \frac{|\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \tau)|}{|\theta - \tau|^{1+ps}} \left| \int_\tau^\theta \partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s) ds \right|^{p-1} d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

Upon integrating, we arrive at

$$[f]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p},t,p,\partial\Omega_t}^p \lesssim \int_{(-t,2t)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta)|}{|\theta - \tau|^{1+ps}} \left| \int_\tau^\theta \partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s) ds \right|^{p-1} d\zeta dx_h d\theta d\tau.$$

Now, we employ Hölder's inequality in the ζ variable and write

$$[f]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p}, t, p, \partial\Omega_t}^p \lesssim \int_{(-t, 2t)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, \theta)|^p d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{1}{|\theta - \tau|^{1+ps}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{\tau}^{\theta} \partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s) ds \right|^p d\zeta \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} dx_h d\theta d\tau,$$

from where we utilize Hölder's inequality in x_h , t and τ variables to obtain

$$[f]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p}, t, p, \partial\Omega_t}^p \lesssim \|\partial_z \hat{f}\|_{L^p((-t, 2t)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \int_{(-t, 2t)^2} \frac{1}{|\theta - \tau|^{\frac{(1+ps)p}{p-1}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left| \int_{\tau}^{\theta} \partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s) ds \right|^p d\zeta dx_h d\theta d\tau.$$

Finally, we apply Hölder's inequality in the s variable and write

$$[f]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p}, t, p, \partial\Omega_t}^p \lesssim \|\partial_z \hat{f}\|_{L^p((-t, 2t)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \left(\int_{(-t, 2t)^2} \frac{|\theta - \tau|^{p-1}}{|\theta - \tau|^{\frac{(1+ps)p}{p-1}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{-t}^{2t} |\partial_s \hat{f}(x_h, \zeta, s)|^p ds d\zeta dx_h d\theta d\tau \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}.$$

Recalling that $t \leq T \leq 1$, $p > 5$, and $s < 1$, it follows that the term involving $|\theta - \tau|$ is bounded. Therefore, we conclude

$$[f]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p}, t, p, \partial\Omega_t}^p \lesssim \|\partial_z \hat{f}\|_{L^p((-t, 2t)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \|\partial_t \hat{f}\|_{L^p((-t, 2t)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3)}^{p-1},$$

from where (8.1) follows by approximation and the continuity of the extension operator. \square

9. CONCLUDING THE A PRIORI ESTIMATES

We first refine the pressure estimates utilizing Lemma 7.2. Employing Young's inequality for the last term in (5.3), we obtain

$$\nu \sum_{1 \leq |\bar{\theta}| \leq 3} \|u(t)\|_{3, p}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla Z_{\bar{\theta}} u(t)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \nu^p \|\nabla Z u(t)\|_{2, p} + \|u(t)\|_{3, p},$$

from where, applying the L^p norm in time and Lemma 7.2, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t (\|D^2 p\|_{2, p}^p + \|\nabla p\|_{2, p}^p) ds &\lesssim \nu^{p(p-1)} \int_0^t \|\nabla p\|_{2, p}^p ds + \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{3, p}^p (\|u\|_{2, \infty}^p + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{0, 2, p}^p + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{\mu, 2, p}^p, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling that $\nu \leq \bar{\nu}$, we may choose $\bar{\nu}$ sufficiently small and absorb the pressure term to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t (\|D^2 p\|_{2, p}^p + \|\nabla p\|_{2, p}^p) ds &\lesssim \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{3, p}^p (\|u\|_{2, \infty}^p + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{0, 2, p}^p + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{\mu, 2, p}^p, \end{aligned} \tag{9.1}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. The same reasoning also yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t (\|D^2 p\|_{1, p}^p + \|\nabla p\|_{1, p}^p) ds &\lesssim \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{2, p}^p (\|u\|_{2, \infty}^p + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{0, 1, p}^p + \nu^{p(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_{\mu, 1, p}^p, \end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Now, we use (9.1) and (9.2) to refine the maximal regularity estimates given by Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3. For u , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^p \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p \right) \\ \lesssim \int_0^t \|u\|_{j+1, p}^p (\|u\|_{2, \infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) ds + \mathcal{M}_{0, j, p}^p + \mathcal{M}_{\mu, j, p}^p, \end{aligned} \tag{9.3}$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Next, for η , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^p \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha \eta\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p + \nu^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha \eta\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p \right) \\ & \lesssim \int_0^t (\|\eta\|_{j+1,p}^p + \|u\|_{j+1,p}^p) (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) ds + \mathcal{N}_{0,j,p}^p, \end{aligned} \quad (9.4)$$

for $j = 0, 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Next using Lemmas 8.1 and 8.2, we further refine (9.3) for the case $\mu < 0$. In particular, these two lemmas with Young's inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu^p \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu^p [Z^\alpha u]_{1-\frac{1}{p},x,p,\partial\Omega_t}^p + \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2}} \left([Z^\alpha u]_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2p},t,p,\partial\Omega_t}^p + \|Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_t)}^p \right) \right) \\ & \lesssim \int_0^t \|u\|_{2,p}^p ds + \nu^{\frac{1+p}{2}} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \int_0^t (\|\nabla Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p}^p + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p}) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (9.5)$$

for $j = 1, 2, p > 5$, and $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling that $\nu \leq \bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{\nu}$ is sufficiently small, (9.3) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j} \left(\nu \|D_x^2 Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p + \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p + \|\partial_t Z^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\Omega_t)}^p \right) \\ & \lesssim \int_0^t \|u\|_{j+1,p}^p (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^p + 1) ds + \mathcal{M}_{0,j,p}^p, \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

for $j = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, T]$.

Now, we proceed to establish (2.12). Recalling P from (2.11), we let $p = 3 + \delta$ and employ (3.1), (4.4), and (4.5). Then, we take $p = 6 + 2\delta$ and utilize (3.1) again. Finally, we add the resulting inequalities with (6.1) obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \lesssim P_0 + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{2,\infty} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + 1) P ds + \int_0^t (\|\nabla p\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\nabla p\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|Z_h p\|_{L^\infty}) ds \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}} \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\partial_z \eta\|_{1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta}) ds + \nu^{3+\delta} \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (9.7)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. To estimate the pressure terms in (9.7), we use the embedding $\|Z_h p\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\nabla p\|_{1,3+\delta}$, the inequality

$$\|\nabla p\|_{3,3+\delta} \lesssim \|\nabla p\|_{L^{3+\delta}} + \|D_x^2 p\|_{2,6+2\delta},$$

Lemma 5.2 with $(j, p) = (0, 3 + \delta)$, and the pressure estimates (9.1) with $p = 6 + 2\delta$, and $T \leq 1$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \lesssim P_0 + \nu^{(6+2\delta)(5+2\delta)} \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \nu^{(6+2\delta)(5+2\delta)} \mathcal{M}_{\mu,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^{6+2\delta} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{6+2\delta} + 1) P ds \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}} \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\partial_z \eta\|_{1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta}) ds + \nu^{3+\delta} \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} ds, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling $\mathcal{M}_{\mu,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta}$ from Lemma 7.2, we estimate it employing (9.5) and write

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \lesssim P_0 + \nu^{(6+2\delta)(5+2\delta)} \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^{6+2\delta} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{6+2\delta} + 1) P ds \\ & \quad + \nu^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}} \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\partial_z \eta\|_{1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta}) ds + \nu^{3+\delta} \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\partial_t u\|_{2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta}) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $(6 + 2\delta)(5 + 2\delta) > 3 + \delta$. Before invoking the maximal regularity estimates, we use (4.2) obtaining

$$\int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} ds \lesssim \int_0^t \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} ds \lesssim \int_0^t P ds.$$

Now, we employ (9.6) for $(p, j) = (6 + 2\delta, 2)$ and (9.4) for $(p, j) = (3 + \delta, 1)$, from where it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \lesssim P_0 + \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \mathcal{N}_{0,1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \int_0^t (\|u\|_{2,\infty}^{6+2\delta} + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^{6+2\delta} + 1) P ds. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing (4.2) for the Lipschitz norm of u and the inequality

$$\|u\|_{2,\infty} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{2,3+\delta} + \|u\|_{2,3+\delta} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,3+\delta},$$

we arrive at

$$\|u\|_{3,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|u\|_{3,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \|\eta\|_{2,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim P_0 + \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta} + \mathcal{N}_{0,1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta} + \int_0^t P ds.$$

Finally, the L^2 estimates follow from standard considerations. Indeed, we may use incompressibility to eliminate the pressure term vanishes and the trace and Young's inequality to absorb the boundary term, and (2.12) follows.

Next, we establish (2.13). To achieve this, we employ (3.1), and (4.4) for $p = 6$. Recalling Q from (2.11), we utilize (6.2) and add the resulting inequalities obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{3,6}^6 + \|\eta\|_{1,6}^6 + \|u\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 & \lesssim Q_0 + \int_0^t Q ds + \int_0^t (\|\nabla p\|_{3,6}^6 + \|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty}^2) ds \\ & \quad + \nu^3 \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,6}^6 + \|\partial_z \eta\|_{L^6}^6) ds + \nu \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{1,\infty}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. We note that

$$\|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty} \lesssim \|D^2 p\|_{2,6} + \|\nabla p\|_{2,6},$$

from where, using the pressure estimates (9.1), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{3,6}^6 + \|\eta\|_{1,6}^6 + \|u\|_{2,\infty}^2 + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ & \lesssim Q_0 + \int_0^t Q ds + \nu^3 \int_0^t (\|\partial_z u\|_{2,6}^6 + \|\partial_z \eta\|_{L^6}^6) ds + \nu \int_0^t \|\partial_z u\|_{1,\infty}^2 ds + \nu^{30} \mathcal{M}_{0,2,6}^6, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mu,j,p}$ from Lemma 7.2, we note that no boundary terms appear when $\text{sgn}(\mu) = 1$. Now, for the terms involving $\partial_z u$ we have

$$\nu^3 \|\partial_z u\|_{2,6} \lesssim \nu^3 (\|\eta\|_{2,6} + \|u\|_{3,6}),$$

and

$$\nu \|\partial_z u\|_{1,\infty}^2 \lesssim \nu \|D_x^2 u\|_{1,6} \|\nabla u\|_{1,6} \lesssim \nu^2 \|D_x^2 u\|_{1,6}^2 + Q.$$

We conclude (2.13) upon employing L^2 estimates, the refined maximal regularity estimates (9.3) for $(p, j) = (6, 2)$ and (6, 1) and (9.4) for $(p, j) = (6, 0)$, as well as using that $\nu \leq \bar{\nu}$ sufficiently small and $T \leq 1$.

Finally, (2.14) follows by performing L^2 estimates, employing (3.1) and (5.3) for $p = 3 + \delta$ and $\nu = 0$, as well as (6.3) and the inequality

$$\|\nabla p\|_{2,\infty} \lesssim \|D^2 p\|_{2,3+\delta} + \|\nabla p\|_{2,3+\delta},$$

which concludes the proof of Proposition 2.3.

10. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2.1, 2.2, AND 2.3

In this section, we only present proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 as we may establish Theorem 2.2 by adjusting the regularity of the initial datum u_0 . To start, we assume that u_0 satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 2.1 is given, and we consider the heat equation

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \Delta)v &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \bar{\nu}], \\ v_3 &= 0, \text{ and } \partial_z v_h = 2\mu v_h, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \bar{\nu}], \\ v(0) &= u_0, \end{aligned}$$

which has a unique solution that is smooth in positive time. Moreover, upon letting $u_0^\nu(x) = v(\nu^3, x)$, we obtain the compatibility conditions

$$\nabla \cdot u_0^\nu = 0, \quad (u_0^\nu)_3|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \text{and } \partial_z(u_0^\nu)_h|_{\partial\Omega} = 2\mu(u_0^\nu)_h|_{\partial\Omega}, \quad (10.1)$$

as well as the bounds

$$\sup_{\nu} (\|u_0^\nu\|_{W^{3,6+2\delta} \cap W^{3,3+\delta}} + \|\nabla u_0^\nu\|_{W^{2,3+\delta} \cap L^\infty}) \leq C(\|u_0\|_{W^{3,6+2\delta} \cap W^{3,3+\delta}} + \|\nabla u_0\|_{W^{2,3+\delta} \cap L^\infty}), \quad (10.2)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{0,2,6+2\delta}^{6+2\delta}(u_0^\nu) + \mathcal{N}_{0,1,3+\delta}^{3+\delta}(\eta_0^\nu) \leq C\nu,$$

and the convergence

$$\|u_0^\nu - u_0\|_{L^2} \leq C\nu^2.$$

Indeed, u_0^ν converges to u_0 in a stronger space. However, the L^2 convergence suffices to establish the inviscid limit. Now, under standard considerations, (2.1) and (2.2) with the initial datum u_0^ν has a sufficiently smooth unique solution for which (2.12) holds. Therefore, employing the bounds (10.2) and the Gronwall inequality, we conclude that (2.5) holds on a time interval $[0, T]$ that is independent of ν . Finally, to obtain a limit, we need a compactness result.

Proposition 10.1 (Compactness of $\{u^\nu\}_\nu$). *Let $\nu \in (0, \bar{\nu}]$, and assume that $u^\nu \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\Omega) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega))$ is a sequence of solutions to (2.1)–(2.2) on $[0, T]$ with the initial data $u_0^\nu \in L^2$ satisfying $\|u_0^{\nu_1} - u_0^{\nu_2}\|_{L^2} \leq \nu_1 - \nu_2$. Then, $\{u^\nu\}_\nu$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ with*

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|u^{\nu_1} - u^{\nu_2}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \nu_1 + \nu_2,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of ν_1 and ν_2 .

Proposition 10.1 follows upon performing L^2 estimates on $u^{\nu_1} - u^{\nu_2}$. We note that [AK1] has a similar result which requires $\nu D_x^2 u^\nu \in L^2(0, T; L^2)$. However, we do not need this assumption since we may justify integration-by-parts in the distributional sense. In addition, $u^\nu \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1 \cap W^{1,\infty})$ follows from the interpolation inequality

$$\|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u^\nu\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{5}} \|\nabla u^\nu\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{5}} + \|u^\nu\|_{L^2}.$$

Now, we may utilize the strong convergence given by Proposition 10.1 and the weak and weak* convergences by (2.5). Upon passing to a subsequence, we obtain a solution u for the Euler equations. Moreover, since we have Lipschitz regularity, this solution is unique. Finally, (2.6) follows from

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|u^\nu - u\|_{L^p} \lesssim \sup_{[0, T]} (\|u^\nu - u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2p+6}{5p}} \|\nabla u^\nu - \nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{3p-6}{5p}} + \|u^\nu - u\|_{L^2}) \lesssim \nu^{\frac{p+3}{5p}},$$

concluding the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Next, the proof of Theorem 2.3 follows closely to the one presented in [AK2]. We consider u_0 as in Theorem 2.3, and we let $\{u_0^r\}_{r>0} \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ be a sequence of divergence-free smooth functions that are tangential on the boundary. In particular, we may assume that $u_0^r \in H^5$ and

$$u_0^r \rightarrow u_0 \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{3,3+\delta}(\Omega),$$

$$u_0^r \rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ weakly-* in } W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty}(\Omega),$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, there is a unique $u^r \in C([0, T]; H^5(\Omega))$ that solves (1.2) and (1.3) with the initial datum u_0^r , where $T > 0$. We note that T is independent of r , and this is due to the control on the Lipschitz norm established by a priori estimates. Indeed, we may continue the solutions u^r as long as ∇u^r stays in $L^1(0, T; L^\infty)$. Employing the a priori estimates, we conclude that $u^r \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^2 \cap W_{\text{co}}^{3,3+\delta} \cap W^{1,\infty} \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty})$ are bounded independent of r . Next, following the arguments in [AK2], we may prove that $u^r \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^2(\Omega))$ is a Cauchy sequence. Finally, by passing to a subsequence, we may conclude that there exists $u \in L^\infty(0, T_0; L^2 \cap W_{\text{co}}^{3,3+\delta} \cap W^{1,\infty} \cap W_{\text{co}}^{2,\infty})$, a solution for (1.2) and (1.3). In addition, this solution is unique since it is Lipschitz continuous.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author was supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-2205493 and is grateful to Igor Kukavica for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [ACS] A. Argenziano, M. Cannone, and M. Sammartino, *Navier-Stokes equations in the half space with non compatible data*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **26** (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 32, 40.
- [AK1] M.S. Aydın, and I. Kukavica, *Uniform bounds and the inviscid limit for the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier boundary conditions*, arXiv:2404.17111.
- [AK2] M.S. Aydın, and I. Kukavica, *Euler Equations in Sobolev conormal spaces*, arXiv:2407.18149.
- [BB] J. P. Bourguignon, and H. Brezis, *Remarks on the Euler equation*, J. Functional Analysis, **15** (1974), 341–363.
- [BdVC1] H. Beirão da Veiga, and F. Crispo, *Sharp inviscid limit results under Navier type boundary conditions. An L^p theory*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **12** (2010), no. 3, 397–411.
- [BdVC2] H. Beirão da Veiga, and F. Crispo, *Concerning the $W^{k,p}$ -inviscid limit for 3-D flows under a slip boundary condition*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **13** (2011), no. 1, 117–135.
- [BdVC3] H. Beirão da Veiga, and F. Crispo, *A missed persistence property for the Euler equations and its effect on inviscid limits*, Nonlinearity, **25** (2012), no. 6, 1661–1669.
- [BdVC4] H. Beirão da Veiga, and F. Crispo, *The 3-D inviscid limit result under slip boundary conditions. A negative answer*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **14** (2012), no. 1, 55–59.
- [BILN] A.V. Busuioc, D. Iftimie, M.C. Lopes Filho, and H.J. Nussenzveig Lopes, *Uniform time of existence for the alpha Euler equations*, J. Funct. Anal. **271** (2016), no. 5, 1341–1375.
- [BS1] L.C. Berselli, and S. Spirito, *On the vanishing viscosity limit of 3D Navier-Stokes equations under slip boundary conditions in general domains*, Comm. Math. Phys., **316** (2012), no. 1, 171–198.
- [BS2] L.C. Berselli, and S. Spirito, *An elementary approach to the inviscid limits for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations with slip boundary conditions and applications to the 3D Boussinesq equations*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., **21** (2014), no. 2, 149–166.
- [C1] D. Chae, *On the well-posedness of the Euler equations in the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **55**, no. 5, (2002), 654–678.
- [C2] D. Chae, *On the Euler equations in the critical Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **170**, no. 3, (2003), 185–210.
- [C3] D. Chae, *Local existence and blow-up criterion for the Euler equations in the Besov spaces*, Asymptot. Anal., **38**, no. 3-4, (2004), 339–358.
- [CMR] T. Clopeau, A. Mikelić, and R. Robert, *On the vanishing viscosity limit for the 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with the friction type boundary conditions*, Nonlinearity **11** (1998), no. 6, 1625–1636.
- [CLNV] P. Constantin, M.C. Lopes Filho, H.J. Nussenzveig Lopes, and V. Vicol, *Vorticity measures and the inviscid limit*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **234** (2019), no. 2, 575–593.
- [CQ] G.Q. Chen, and Z. Qian, *A study of the Navier-Stokes equations with the kinematic and Navier boundary conditions*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **59** (2010), no. 2, 721–760.
- [CW] D. Chae, and J. Wolf, *The Euler equations in a critical case of the generalized Campanato space*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire, **38**, no. 2, (2021), 201–241.
- [DHP] R. Denk, M. Hieber, and J.Prüss, *Optimal L^p - L^q -estimates for parabolic boundary value problems with inhomogeneous data*, Math. Z. **257** (2007), no. 1, 193–224.
- [DN] T.D. Drivas, and H.Q. Nguyen, *Remarks on the emergence of weak Euler solutions in the vanishing viscosity limit*, J. Nonlinear Sci., **29** (2019), no. 2, 709–721.
- [FTZ] M. Fei, T. Tao, and Z. Zhang, *On the zero-viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}_+^3 without analyticity*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **112** (2018), 170–229.
- [Gu] O. Guès, *Problème mixte hyperbolique quasi-linéaire caractéristique*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **15** (1990), no. 5, 595–645.
- [GK] G.M. Gie, and J.P. Kelliher, *Boundary layer analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations with generalized Navier boundary conditions*, J. Differential Equations **253** (2012), no. 6, 1862–1892.
- [GKLMN] G.-M. Gie, J.P. Kelliher, M.C. Lopes Filho, A.L. Mazzucato, and H.J. Nussenzveig Lopes, *The vanishing viscosity limit for some symmetric flows*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **36** (2019), no. 5, 1237–1280.
- [GL] Z. Guo, and J. Li, *Remarks on the well-posedness of the Euler equations in the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., **27**, no. 2, (2021), Paper No. 29, 24.
- [GLY] Z. Guo, J. Li, and Z. Yin, *Local well-posedness of the incompressible Euler equations in $B_{\infty,1}^1$ and the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Funct. Anal., **276**, no. 9, (2019), 2821–2830.
- [IP] D. Iftimie, and G. Planas, *Inviscid limits for the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier friction boundary conditions*, Nonlinearity, **19** (2006), no. 4, 899–918.
- [IS] D. Iftimie, and F. Sueur, *Viscous boundary layers for the Navier-Stokes equations with the Navier slip conditions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **199** (2011), no. 1, 145–175.
- [K1] T. Kato, *Nonstationary flows of viscous and ideal fluids in \mathbb{R}^3* , J. Functional Analysis, **9**, (1972), 296–305.

- [K2] T. Kato, *Quasi-linear equations of evolution, with applications to partial differential equations*, Spectral theory and differential equations (Proc. Sympos., Dundee, 1974; dedicated to Konrad Jörgens), Lecture Notes in Math., **Vol. 448**, Springer, Berlin-New York (1975), 25–70.
- [K3] T. Kato, *Remarks on zero viscosity limit for nonstationary Navier-Stokes flows with boundary*, Seminar on nonlinear partial differential equations (Berkeley, Calif., 1983), Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 2, Springer, New York, 1984, pp. 85–98.
- [Ke] J.P. Kelliher, *Vanishing viscosity and the accumulation of vorticity on the boundary*, Commun. Math. Sci. **6** (2008), no. 4, 869–880.
- [KL] T. Kato, and C.Y. Lai, *Nonlinear evolution equations and the Euler flow*, J. Funct. Anal., **56**, (1984), 15–28.
- [KM] N. Kajiwara, and A.Matsui, *Maximal regularity for the heat equation with various boundary conditions in an infinite layer*, SUT journal of mathematics **59** (2023), no. 2, 73–90.
- [KP] T. Kato, and G. Ponce, *Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **41**, no. 7, (1988), 891–907.
- [KVV] I. Kukavica, V. Vicol, and F. Wang, *The inviscid limit for the Navier-Stokes equations with data analytic only near the boundary*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **237** (2020), no. 2, 779–827.
- [L] L. Lichtenstein, *Über einige Existenzprobleme der Hydrodynamik homogener, unzusammendrückbarer, reibungsloser Flüssigkeiten und die Helmholtzschen Wirbelsätze*, Math. Z., **23** (1925), no. 1, 89–154.
- [LNP] M.C. Lopes Filho, H.J. Nussenzweig Lopes, and G. Planas, *On the inviscid limit for two-dimensional incompressible flow with Navier friction condition*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **36** (2005), no. 4, 1130–1141.
- [LSU] O.A. Ladyženskaja, V.A. Solonnikov, and N.N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **Vol. 23**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1968).
- [M] Y. Maekawa, *On the inviscid limit problem of the vorticity equations for viscous incompressible flows in the half-plane*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **67** (2014), no. 7, 1045–1128.
- [MM] Y. Maekawa and A. Mazzucato, *The inviscid limit and boundary layers for Navier-Stokes flows*, Handbook of mathematical analysis in mechanics of viscous fluids, Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 781–828.
- [MR1] N. Masmoudi, and F. Rousset, *Uniform Regularity for the Navier–Stokes Equation with Navier Boundary Condition*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **203** (2012), no. 2, 529–575.
- [MR2] N. Masmoudi, and F. Rousset, *Uniform regularity and vanishing viscosity limit for the free surface Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **223** (2017), no. 1, 301–417.
- [NP] J. Neustupa, and P. Penel, *Approximation of a solution to the Euler equation by solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **15** (2013), no. 1, 179–196.
- [PP] H.C. Pak, and Y.J. Park, *Existence of solution for the Euler equations in a critical Besov space $B^1_{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$* , Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **29**, no. 7-8, (2004), 1149–1166.
- [SC1] M. Sammartino and R.E. Caffisch, *Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions, of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. I. Existence for Euler and Prandtl equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **192** (1998), no. 2, 433–461.
- [SC2] M. Sammartino and R.E. Caffisch, *Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. II. Construction of the Navier-Stokes solution*, Comm. Math. Phys. **192** (1998), no. 2, 463–491.
- [Te] R. Temam, *On the Euler equations of incompressible perfect fluids*, J. Functional Analysis, **20**, no. 1, (1975), 32–43.
- [TW] R. Temam and X. Wang, *On the behavior of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations at vanishing viscosity*, vol. 25, 1997, Dedicated to Ennio De Giorgi, pp. 807–828.
- [WXZ] L. Wang, Z. Xin, and A. Zang, *Vanishing viscous limits for 3D Navier-Stokes equations with a Navier-slip boundary condition*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., **14** (2012), no. 4, 791–825.
- [X] Z. Xin, *Vanishing viscosity limits for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations with a slip boundary condition*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **145** (2017), no. 4, 1615–1628.
- [XX1] Y. Xiao, and Z. Xin, *A new boundary condition for the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation and the vanishing viscosity limit*, J. Math. Phys., **53** (2012), no. 11, 115617, 15.
- [XX2] Y. Xiao, and Z. Xin, *On the inviscid limit of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations with generalized Navier-slip boundary conditions*, Commun. Math. Stat., **1** (2013), no. 3, 259–279.