

ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 7

No. 6

2014

ANNE-LAURE DALIBARD AND CHRISTOPHE PRANGE

**WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE STOKES-CORIOLIS SYSTEM
IN THE HALF-SPACE OVER A ROUGH SURFACE**

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE STOKES–CORIOLIS SYSTEM IN THE HALF-SPACE OVER A ROUGH SURFACE

ANNE-LAURE DALIBARD AND CHRISTOPHE PRANGE

This paper is devoted to the well-posedness of the stationary 3D Stokes–Coriolis system set in a half-space with rough bottom and Dirichlet data which does not decrease at space infinity. Our system is a linearized version of the Ekman boundary layer system. We look for a solution of infinite energy in a space of Sobolev regularity. Following an idea of Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi, the general strategy is to reduce the problem to a bumpy channel bounded in the vertical direction thanks to a transparent boundary condition involving a Dirichlet to Neumann operator. Our analysis emphasizes some strong singularities of the Stokes–Coriolis operator at low tangential frequencies. One of the main features of our work lies in the definition of a Dirichlet to Neumann operator for the Stokes–Coriolis system with data in the Kato space $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}$.

1. Introduction

The goal of the present paper is to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Stokes–Coriolis system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + e_3 \times u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u|_{\Gamma} = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (1-1)$$

where

$$\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 > \omega(x_h)\}, \quad \Gamma = \partial\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = \omega(x_h)\}$$

and $\omega : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded function.

When ω has some structural properties, such as periodicity, existence and uniqueness of solutions are easy to prove: our aim is to prove well-posedness when the function ω is arbitrary, say $\omega \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and when the boundary data u_0 is not square integrable. More precisely, we wish to work with u_0 in a space of infinite energy of Sobolev regularity, such as Kato spaces. We refer to the end of this introduction for a definition of these uniformly locally Sobolev spaces L_{uloc}^2 , H_{uloc}^s .

The interest for such function spaces to study fluid systems goes back to [Lemarié-Rieusset 1999; 2002], in which existence is proved for weak solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}^3 with initial data in L_{uloc}^2 . These works fall into the analysis of fluid flows with infinite energy, which is a field of intense research. Without being exhaustive, let us mention that:

MSC2010: primary 35A22, 35C15, 35S99, 35A01; secondary 76U05, 35Q35, 35Q86.

Keywords: Stokes–Coriolis system, Ekman boundary layer, rough boundaries, Dirichlet to Neumann operator, Saint-Venant estimate, Kato spaces.

- Cannon and Knightly [1970], Giga, Inui, and Matsui [Giga et al. 1999], Solonnikov [2003], Bae and Jin [2012] (local solutions), and Giga, Matsui, and Sawada [Giga et al. 2001] (global solutions) studied the nonstationary Navier–Stokes system in the whole space or in the half-space with initial data in L^∞ or in BUC (bounded uniformly continuous).
- Basson [2006] and Maekawa and Terasawa [2006] studied local solutions of the nonstationary Navier–Stokes system in the whole space with initial data in L^p_{uloc} spaces.
- Giga and Miyakawa [1989], Taylor [1992] (global solutions), and Kato [1992] studied local solutions to the nonstationary Navier–Stokes system, and Gala [2005] studied global solutions to a quasigeostrophic equation with initial data in Morrey spaces.
- Gallagher and Planchon [2002] studied the nonstationary Navier–Stokes system in \mathbb{R}^2 with initial data in the homogeneous Besov space $\dot{B}^{2/r-1}_{r,q}$.
- Giga et al. [2007] studied the nonstationary Ekman system in \mathbb{R}^3_+ with initial data in the Besov space $\dot{B}^0_{\infty,1,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^2; L^p(\mathbb{R}_+))$ for $2 < p < \infty$; see also [Giga et al. 2006] (local solutions) and [Giga et al. 2008] (global solutions) on the Navier–Stokes–Coriolis system in \mathbb{R}^3 , and [Yoneda 2009] for initial data spaces containing almost-periodic functions.
- Konieczny and Yoneda [2011] studied the stationary Navier–Stokes system in Fourier–Besov spaces.
- David Gérard-Varet and Nader Masmoudi [2010] studied the 2D Stokes system in the half-plane above a rough surface with $H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}$ boundary data.
- Alazard, Burq, and Zuily [Alazard et al. 2013] studied the Cauchy problem for gravity water waves with data in H^s_{uloc} ; in particular, they studied the Dirichlet to Neumann operator associated with the Laplacian in a domain $\Omega = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : \eta^*(x) < y < \eta(x)\}$, with $H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}$ boundary data.

Despite this huge literature on initial value problems in fluid mechanics in spaces of infinite energy, we are not aware of any work concerning stationary systems and nonhomogeneous boundary value problems in \mathbb{R}^3_+ . Let us emphasize that the derivation of energy estimates in stationary and time dependent settings are rather different: indeed, in a time dependent setting, boundedness of the solution at time t follows from boundedness of the initial data and of the associated semigroup. In a stationary setting and in a domain with a boundary, to the best of our knowledge, the only way to derive estimates without assuming any structure on the function ω is based on the arguments of Ladyzhenskaya and Solonnikov [1980] (see also [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010] for the Stokes system in a bumped half-plane).

In the present case, our motivation comes from the asymptotic analysis of highly rotating fluids near a rough boundary. Indeed, consider the system

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon \Delta u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e_3 \times u^\varepsilon + \nabla p^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \\ \operatorname{div} u^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \\ u^\varepsilon|_{\Gamma^\varepsilon} = 0, \\ u^\varepsilon|_{x_3=1} = (V_h, 0), \end{cases} \tag{1-2}$$

where

$$\Omega^\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \varepsilon\omega(x_h/\varepsilon) < x_3 < 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^\varepsilon := \partial\Omega^\varepsilon \setminus \{x_3 = 1\}.$$

Then it is expected that u^ε is the sum of a two-dimensional interior flow $(u^{\text{int}}(x_h), 0)$ balancing the rotation with the pressure term and a boundary layer flow $u^{\text{BL}}(x/\varepsilon; x_h)$, located in the vicinity of the lower boundary. In this case, the equation satisfied by u^{BL} is precisely (1-1), with $u_0(y_h; x_h) = -(u^{\text{int}}(x_h), 0)$. Notice that x_h is the macroscopic variable and is a parameter in the equation on u^{BL} . The fact that the Dirichlet boundary condition is constant with respect to the fast variable y_h is the original motivation for study of the well-posedness of (1-1) in spaces of infinite energy, such as the Kato spaces H^s_{uloc} .

The system (1-2) models large-scale geophysical fluid flows in the linear regime. In order to get a physical insight into the physics of rotating fluids, we refer to the books [Greenspan 1980] (rotating fluids in general, including an extensive study of the linear regime) and [Pedlosky 1987] (focus on geophysical fluids). Ekman [1905] analyzed the effect of the interplay between viscous forces and the Coriolis acceleration on geophysical fluid flows.

For further remarks on the system (1-2), we refer to Section 7 in the book [Chemin et al. 2006] by Chemin, Desjardins, Gallagher, and Grenier, and to [Chemin et al. 2002], where a model with anisotropic viscosity is studied and an asymptotic expansion for u^ε is obtained.

Studying (1-1) with an arbitrary function ω is more realistic from a physical point of view, and also allows us to bring to light some bad behaviors of the system at low horizontal frequencies, which are masked in a periodic setting.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $\omega \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and let $u_{0,h} \in H^2_{\text{uloc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$, $u_{0,3} \in H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Assume that there exists $U_h \in H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$ such that*

$$u_{0,3} - \nabla_h \omega \cdot u_{0,h} = \nabla_h \cdot U_h. \tag{1-3}$$

Then there exists a unique solution u of (1-1) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|u\|_{H^1((l+[0,1]^2) \times (-1,a)) \cap \Omega} &< \infty \quad \text{for all } a > 0, \\ \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3 \\ |\alpha|=q}} \int_1^\infty \int_{l+[0,1]^2} |\nabla^\alpha u|^2 &< \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some integer q sufficiently large, which does not depend on ω or u_0 (say $q \geq 4$).

Remark 1.1. • Assumption (1-3) is a compatibility condition, which stems from singularities at low horizontal frequencies in the system. When the bottom is flat, it merely becomes $u_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot U_h$. Notice that this condition only bears on the normal component of the velocity at the boundary: in particular, if $u_0 \cdot n|_\Gamma = 0$, then (1-3) is satisfied. We also stress that (1-3) is satisfied in the framework of highly rotating fluids near a rough boundary, since in this case $u_{0,3} = 0$ and $u_{0,h}$ is constant with respect to the microscopic variable.

- The singularities at low horizontal frequencies also account for the possible lack of integrability of the gradient far from the rough boundary: we were not able to prove that

$$\sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_1^\infty \int_{l+[0,1]^2} |\nabla u|^2 < \infty,$$

although this estimate is true for the Stokes system. In fact, looking closely at our proof, it seems that nontrivial cancellations should occur for such a result to hold in the Stokes–Coriolis case.

- Concerning the regularity assumptions on ω and u_0 , it is classical to assume Lipschitz regularity on the boundary. The regularity required on u_0 , however, may not be optimal, and stems in the present context from an explicit lifting of the boundary condition. It is possible that the regularity could be lowered if a different type of lifting were used, in the spirit of [Alazard et al. 2013, Proposition 4.3]. Let us stress as well that if ω is constant, then $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}$ regularity is enough (cf. Corollary 2.17).

The same tools can be used to prove a similar result for the Stokes system in three dimensions (we recall that [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010] is concerned with the Stokes system in two dimensions). In fact, the treatment of the Stokes system is easier, because the associated kernel is homogeneous and has no singularity at low frequencies. The results proved in Section 2 can be obtained thanks to the Green function associated with the Stokes system in three dimensions; see [Galdi 1994]. On the other hand, the arguments of Sections 3 and 4 can be transposed as such to the Stokes system in three dimensions. The main novelties of these sections, which rely on careful energy estimates, are concerned with the higher dimensional space rather than with the presence of the rotation term (except for Lemma 3.2).

The statement of Theorem 1 is very close to one of the main results of the paper [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010], namely, the well-posedness of the Stokes system in a bumped half-plane with boundary data in $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$. Of course, it shares the main difficulties of [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]: spaces of functions of infinite energy, lack of a Poincar e inequality, irrelevancy of scalar tools (Harnack inequality, maximum principle) which do not apply to systems. But two additional problems are encountered when studying (1-1):

- (1) Equation (1-1) is set in three dimensions, whereas the study of [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010] took place in two dimensions. This complicates the derivation of energy estimates. Indeed, the latter are based on the truncation method by Ladyzhenskaya and Solonnikov [1980], which consists more or less in multiplying (1-1) by $\chi_k u$, where $\chi_k \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$ is a cut-off function in the horizontal variables such that $\text{Supp } \chi_k \subset B_{k+1}$ and $\chi_k \equiv 1$ on B_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $d = 2$, the size of the support of $\nabla \chi_k$ is bounded, while it is unbounded when $d = 3$. This has a direct impact on the treatment of some commutator terms.
- (2) Somewhat more importantly, the kernel associated with the Stokes–Coriolis operator has a more complicated expression than the one associated with the Stokes operator (see [Galdi 1994, Chapter IV] for the computation of the Green function associated to the Stokes system in the half-space). In the case of the Stokes–Coriolis operator, the kernel is not homogeneous, which prompts us to distinguish between high and low horizontal frequencies throughout the paper. Moreover, it exhibits strong singularities at low horizontal frequencies, which have repercussions on the whole proof and account for assumption (1-3).

The proof of [Theorem 1](#) follows the same general scheme used in [\[Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010\]](#) (this scheme has also been successfully applied in [\[Dalibard and Gérard-Varet 2011\]](#) in the case of a Navier slip boundary condition on the rough bottom): we first perform a thorough analysis of the Stokes–Coriolis system in \mathbb{R}_+^3 , and we define the associated Dirichlet to Neumann operator for boundary data in $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}$. In particular, we derive a representation formula for solutions of the Stokes–Coriolis system in \mathbb{R}_+^3 , based on a decomposition of the kernel which distinguishes high and low frequencies, and singular/regular terms. We also prove a similar representation formula for the Dirichlet to Neumann operator. Then we derive an equivalent system to (1-1), set in a domain which is bounded in x_3 and in which a transparent boundary condition is prescribed on the upper boundary. These two preliminary steps are performed in [Section 2](#). We then work with the equivalent system, for which we derive energy estimates in H_{uloc}^1 ; this allows us to prove existence in [Section 3](#). Eventually, we prove uniqueness in [Section 4](#). The appendices gathers several technical lemmas used throughout the paper.

Notation. We will be working with spaces of uniformly locally integrable functions, called Kato spaces, whose definition we now recall; see [\[Kato 1975\]](#). Let $\vartheta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\text{Supp } \vartheta \subset [-1, 1]^d$, $\vartheta \equiv 1$ on $[-1/4, 1/4]^d$, and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tau_k \vartheta(x) = 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1-4}$$

where τ_k is the translation operator defined by $\tau_k f(x) = f(x - k)$.

Then, for $s \geq 0$, $p \in [1, \infty)$,

$$L_{\text{uloc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^d) : \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|(\tau_k \vartheta)u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty \right\},$$

$$H_{\text{uloc}}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in H_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) : \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|(\tau_k \vartheta)u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty \right\}.$$

The space H_{uloc}^s is independent of the choice of the function ϑ ; see [\[Alazard et al. 2013, Lemma 3.1\]](#).

We will also work in the domain $\Omega^b := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \omega(x_h) < x_3 < 0\}$, assuming that ω takes values in $(-1, 0)$. With a slight abuse of notation, we will write

$$\|u\|_{L_{\text{uloc}}^p(\Omega^b)} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|(\tau_k \vartheta)u\|_{L^p(\Omega^b)},$$

$$\|u\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^s(\Omega^b)} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|(\tau_k \vartheta)u\|_{H^s(\Omega^b)},$$

where the function ϑ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and satisfies (1-4), $\text{Supp } \vartheta \subset [-1, 1]^2$, $\vartheta \equiv 1$ on $[-1/4, 1/4]^2$, and $H_{\text{uloc}}^s(\Omega^b) = \{u \in H_{\text{loc}}^s(\Omega^b) : \|u\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^s(\Omega^b)} < \infty\}$, $L_{\text{uloc}}^p(\Omega^b) = \{u \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\Omega^b) : \|u\|_{L_{\text{uloc}}^p(\Omega^b)} < \infty\}$.

Throughout the proof, we will often use the notation $|\nabla^q u|$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$, for the quantity

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d \\ |\alpha|=q}} |\nabla^\alpha u|,$$

where $d = 2$ or 3 , depending on the context.

2. Presentation of a reduced system and main tools

Following an idea of Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi [2010], the first step is to transform (1-1) so as to work in a domain bounded in the vertical direction (rather than a half-space). This allows us eventually to use Poincaré inequalities, which are paramount in the proof. To that end, we introduce an artificial flat boundary above the rough surface Γ , and we replace the Stokes–Coriolis system in the half-space above the artificial boundary by a transparent boundary condition, expressed in terms of a Dirichlet to Neumann operator.

In the rest of the article, without loss of generality, we assume that $\sup \omega =: \alpha < 0$ and $\inf \omega \geq -1$, and we place the artificial boundary at $x_3 = 0$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^b &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \omega(x_h) < x_3 < 0\}, \\ \Sigma &:= \{x_3 = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The Stokes–Coriolis system differs in several aspects from the Stokes system; in the present paper, the most crucial differences are the lack of an explicit Green function, and the bad behavior of the system at low horizontal frequencies. The main steps of the proof are as follows:

- (1) Prove existence and uniqueness of a solution of the Stokes–Coriolis system in a half-space with boundary data in $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.
- (2) Extend this well-posedness result to boundary data in $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.
- (3) Define the Dirichlet to Neumann operator for functions in $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and extend it to functions in $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.
- (4) Define an equivalent problem in Ω^b , with a transparent boundary condition at Σ , and prove the equivalence between the problem in Ω^b and the one in Ω .
- (5) Prove existence and uniqueness of solutions of the equivalent problem.

Items (1)–(4) will be proved in the current section, and (5) in Sections 3 and 4.

2A. The Stokes–Coriolis system in a half-space. The first step is to study the properties of the Stokes–Coriolis system in \mathbb{R}_+^3 , namely,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + e_3 \times u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ u|_{x_3=0} = v_0. \end{cases} \tag{2-1}$$

In order to prove the result of Theorem 1, we have to prove the existence and uniqueness of a solution u of the Stokes–Coriolis system in $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ such that, for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large,

$$\sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+(0,1)^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla^q u|^2 < \infty.$$

However, the Green function for the Stokes–Coriolis is far from being explicit, and its Fourier transform, for instance, is much less well-behaved than that of the Stokes system (which is merely the Poisson

kernel). Therefore such a result is not so easy to prove. In particular, because of the singularities of the Fourier transform of the Green function at low frequencies, we are not able to prove that

$$\sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+(0,1)^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla u|^2 < \infty.$$

- We start by solving the system when $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ be such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\xi|} |\hat{v}_{0,3}(\xi)|^2 d\xi < \infty. \tag{2-2}$$

Then the system (2-1) admits a unique solution $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3_+)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3_+} |\nabla u|^2 < \infty.$$

Remark 2.2. The condition (2-2) stems from a singularity at low frequencies of the Stokes–Coriolis system, which we will encounter several times in the proof. Notice that (2-2) is satisfied in particular when $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$ for some $V_h \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$, which is sufficient for further purposes.

Proof. Uniqueness. Consider a solution whose gradient is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3_+)$ and with zero boundary data on $x_3 = 0$. Then, using the Poincaré inequality, we infer that

$$\int_0^a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 \leq C_a \int_0^a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 < \infty,$$

and therefore we can take the Fourier transform of u in the horizontal variables. Denoting by $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the Fourier variable associated with x_h , we get

$$\begin{cases} (|\xi|^2 - \partial_3^2) \hat{u}_h + \hat{u}_h^\perp + i\xi \hat{p} = 0, \\ (|\xi|^2 - \partial_3^2) \hat{u}_3 + \partial_3 \hat{p} = 0, \\ i\xi \cdot \hat{u}_h + \partial_3 \hat{u}_3 = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2-3}$$

and

$$\hat{u}|_{x_3=0} = 0.$$

Eliminating the pressure, we obtain

$$(|\xi|^2 - \partial_3^2)^2 \hat{u}_3 - i\partial_3 \xi^\perp \cdot \hat{u}_h = 0.$$

Taking the scalar product of the first equation in (2-3) with $(\xi^\perp, 0)$ and using the divergence-free condition, we are led to

$$(|\xi|^2 - \partial_3^2)^3 \hat{u}_3 - \partial_3^2 \hat{u}_3 = 0. \tag{2-4}$$

Notice that the solutions of this equation have a slightly different nature when $\xi \neq 0$ or when $\xi = 0$ (if $\xi = 0$, the associated characteristic polynomial has a multiple root at zero). Therefore, as in [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010], we introduce a function $\varphi = \varphi(\xi) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that the support of φ does not contain zero. Then $\varphi \hat{u}_3$ satisfies the same equation as \hat{u}_3 , and vanishes in a neighborhood of $\xi = 0$.

For $\xi \neq 0$, the solutions of (2-4) are linear combinations of $\exp(-\lambda_k x_3)$ (with coefficients depending on ξ), where $(\lambda_k)_{1 \leq k \leq 6}$ are the complex valued solutions of the equation

$$(\lambda^2 - |\xi|^2)^3 + \lambda^2 = 0. \tag{2-5}$$

Notice that none of the roots of this equation are purely imaginary, and that if λ is a solution of (2-5), so are $-\lambda$, $\bar{\lambda}$ and $-\bar{\lambda}$. Additionally, (2-5) has exactly one real-valued positive solution. Therefore, without loss of generality, we assume that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ have strictly positive real part, while $\lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6$ have strictly negative real part, and $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_3$ with $\Im(\lambda_2) > 0, \Im(\lambda_3) < 0$.

On the other hand, the integrability condition on the gradient becomes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} (|\xi|^2 |\hat{u}(\xi, x_3)|^2 + |\partial_3 \hat{u}(\xi, x_3)|^2) d\xi dx_3 < \infty.$$

We infer immediately that $\varphi \hat{u}_3$ is a linear combination of $\exp(-\lambda_k x_3)$ for $1 \leq k \leq 3$: there exist

$$A_k : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, 3$$

such that

$$\varphi(\xi) \hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3) = \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi) x_3).$$

Going back to (2-3), we also infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\xi) \xi \cdot \hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3) &= -i \sum_{k=1}^3 \lambda_k(\xi) A_k(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi) x_3), \\ \varphi(\xi) \xi^\perp \cdot \hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3) &= i \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2}{\lambda_k} A_k(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi) x_3). \end{aligned} \tag{2-6}$$

Notice that, by (2-5),

$$\frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2}{\lambda_k} = \frac{\lambda_k}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, 3.$$

Thus the boundary condition $\hat{u}|_{x_3=0} = 0$ becomes

$$M(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} A_1(\xi) \\ A_2(\xi) \\ A_3(\xi) \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

where

$$M := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \\ \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_1^2)^2}{\lambda_1} & \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)^2}{\lambda_2} & \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2)^2}{\lambda_3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 2.3.

$$\det M = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)(|\xi| + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3).$$

Since the proof of the result is a mere calculation, we have postponed it to [Appendix A](#). It is then clear that M is invertible for all $\xi \neq 0$: indeed, it is easily checked that all the roots of (2-5) are simple, and we recall that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ have positive real part.

We conclude that $A_1 = A_2 = A_3 = 0$, and thus $\varphi(\xi)\hat{u}(\xi, x_3) = 0$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ supported far from $\xi = 0$. Since $\hat{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, a))^3$ for all $a > 0$, we infer that $\hat{u} = 0$.

Existence. Now, given $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we define u through its Fourier transform in the horizontal variable. It is enough to define the Fourier transform for $\xi \neq 0$, since it is square integrable in ξ . Following the calculations above, we define coefficients A_1, A_2, A_3 by the equation

$$M(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} A_1(\xi) \\ A_2(\xi) \\ A_3(\xi) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_{0,3} \\ i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} \\ -i\xi^\perp \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all } \xi \neq 0. \tag{2-7}$$

As stated in [Lemma 2.3](#), the matrix M is invertible, so that A_1, A_2, A_3 are well defined. We then set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3) &:= \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3), \\ \hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3) &:= \frac{i}{|\xi|^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(\xi) \left(-\lambda_k(\xi)\xi + \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2}{\lambda_k} \xi^\perp \right) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3). \end{aligned} \tag{2-8}$$

We have to check that the corresponding solution is sufficiently integrable, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} (|\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3)|^2 + |\partial_3 \hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3)|^2) d\xi dx_3 < \infty, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} (|\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2 + |\partial_3 \hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2) d\xi dx_3 < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2-9}$$

Notice that by construction, $\partial_3 \hat{u}_3 = -i\xi \cdot \hat{u}_h$ (divergence-free condition), so that we only have to check three conditions.

To that end, we need to investigate the behavior of λ_k, A_k for ξ close to zero and for $\xi \rightarrow \infty$. We gather the results in the following lemma, whose proof is once again postponed to [Appendix A](#):

Lemma 2.4. • As $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= |\xi| - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}), \\ \lambda_2 &= |\xi| - \frac{j^2}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}), \\ \lambda_3 &= |\xi| - \frac{j}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $j = \exp(2i\pi/3)$, so that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1(\xi) \\ A_2(\xi) \\ A_3(\xi) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & j & j^2 \\ 1 & j^2 & j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_{0,3} \\ -2|\xi|^{1/3}(i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} - |\xi|\hat{v}_{0,3}) + O(|\hat{v}_0|) \\ -|\xi|^{-1/3}i\xi^\perp \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} + O(|\hat{v}_0|) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2-10}$$

• As $\xi \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= |\xi|^3 + O(|\xi|^7), \\ \lambda_2 &= e^{i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2), \\ \lambda_3 &= e^{-i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for ξ close to zero,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\xi) &= \hat{v}_{0,3}(\xi) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}(i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} + i\xi^\perp \hat{v}_{0,h} + |\xi| \hat{v}_{0,3}) + O(|\xi|^2 |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|), \\ A_2(\xi) &= \frac{1}{2}(e^{-i\pi/4} i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} + e^{i\pi/4} (i\xi^\perp \hat{v}_{0,h} + |\xi| \hat{v}_{0,3})) + O(|\xi|^2 |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|), \\ A_3(\xi) &= \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\pi/4} i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} + e^{-i\pi/4} (i\xi^\perp \hat{v}_{0,h} + |\xi| \hat{v}_{0,3})) + O(|\xi|^2 |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|). \end{aligned} \tag{2-11}$$

• For all $a \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_a > 0$ such that

$$a^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq a \implies \begin{cases} |\lambda_k(\xi)| + |\Re(\lambda_k(\xi))|^{-1} \leq C_a, \\ |A(\xi)| \leq C_a |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|. \end{cases}$$

We then decompose each integral in (2-9) into three pieces, one on $\{|\xi| > a\}$, one on $\{|\xi| < a^{-1}\}$, and the last one on $\{|\xi| \in (a^{-1}, a)\}$. All the integrals on $\{a^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq a\}$ are bounded by

$$C_a \int_{a^{-1} < |\xi| < a} |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|^2 d\xi \leq C_a \|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2.$$

We thus focus on the two other pieces. We only treat the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} |\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2 d\xi dx_3,$$

since the two other terms can be evaluated using similar arguments.

▷ On the set $\{|\xi| > a\}$, the difficulty comes from the fact that the contributions of the three exponentials compensate one another; hence a rough estimate is not possible. To simplify the calculations, we set

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= A_1 + A_2 + A_3, \\ B_2 &= A_1 + j^2 A_2 + j A_3, \\ B_3 &= A_1 + j A_2 + j^2 A_3, \end{aligned} \tag{2-12}$$

so that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \\ A_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & j & j^2 \\ 1 & j^2 & j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence we have $A_k = (B_1 + \alpha_k B_2 + \alpha_k^2 B_3)/3$, where $\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = j, \alpha_3 = j^2$. Notice that $\alpha_k^3 = 1$ and $\sum_k \alpha_k = 0$. According to Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \hat{v}_{0,3}, \\ B_2 &= -2|\xi|^{\frac{1}{3}}(i\xi \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} - |\xi| \hat{v}_{0,3}) + O(|\hat{v}_0|), \\ B_3 &= -|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} i\xi^\perp \cdot \hat{v}_{0,h} + O(|\hat{v}_0|). \end{aligned}$$

For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $|\xi| > a$, we have

$$|\xi|^2 \int_0^\infty |\hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2 dx_3 = |\xi|^2 \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq 3} A_k \bar{A}_l \frac{1}{\lambda_k + \bar{\lambda}_l}.$$

Using the asymptotic expansions in Lemma 2.4, we infer that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_k + \bar{\lambda}_l} = \frac{1}{2|\xi|} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_k^2 + \bar{\alpha}_l^2}{2} |\xi|^{-4/3} + O(|\xi|^{-8/3}) \right).$$

Therefore, we obtain, for $|\xi| \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi|^2 \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq 3} A_k \bar{A}_l \frac{1}{\lambda_k + \bar{\lambda}_l} &= \frac{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq 3} A_k \bar{A}_l \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_k^2 + \bar{\alpha}_l^2}{2} |\xi|^{-4/3} + O(|\xi|^{-8/3}) \right) \\ &= \frac{|\xi|}{2} (|B_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(B_2 \bar{B}_1 + \bar{B}_2 B_1) |\xi|^{-4/3} + O(|\hat{v}_0|^2)) \\ &= O(|\xi| |\hat{v}_0|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we deduce that

$$\int_{|\xi| > a} \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_3|^2 dx_3 d\xi < +\infty.$$

▷ On the set $|\xi| \leq a$, we can use a crude estimate: we have

$$\int_{|\xi| \leq a} \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2 dx_3 d\xi \leq C \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{|\xi| \leq a} |\xi|^2 \frac{|A_k(\xi)|^2}{2\Re(\lambda_k(\xi))} d\xi.$$

Using the estimates of Lemma 2.4, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \leq a} \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3)|^2 dx_3 d\xi &\leq C \int_{|\xi| \leq a} |\xi|^2 \left((|\hat{v}_{0,3}(\xi)|^2 + |\xi|^2 |\hat{v}_{0,h}(\xi)|^2) \frac{1}{|\xi|^3} + |\xi|^2 |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|^2 \right) d\xi \\ &\leq C \int_{|\xi| \leq a} \left(\frac{|\hat{v}_{0,3}(\xi)|^2}{|\xi|} + |\xi| |\hat{v}_{0,h}(\xi)|^2 \right) d\xi < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the assumption (2-2) on $\hat{v}_{0,3}$. In a similar way, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \leq a} \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 |\hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3)|^2 dx_3 d\xi &\leq C \int_{|\xi| \leq a} \left(\frac{|\hat{v}_{0,3}(\xi)|^2}{|\xi|} + |\xi| |\hat{v}_{0,h}(\xi)|^2 \right) d\xi, \\ \int_{|\xi| \leq a} \int_0^\infty |\partial_3 \hat{u}_h(\xi, x_3)|^2 dx_3 d\xi &\leq C \int_{|\xi| \leq a} |\hat{v}_0|^2 d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering all the terms, we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\xi|^2 |\hat{u}(\xi, x_3)|^2 + |\partial_3 \hat{u}(\xi, x_3)|^2) d\xi dx_3 < \infty,$$

so that $\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. □

Remark 2.5. Notice that thanks to the exponential decay in Fourier space, for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that

$$\int_1^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla^p u|^2 \leq C_p \|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}}^2.$$

• We now extend the definition of a solution to boundary data in $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We introduce the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &:= \{u \in H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) : \exists U_h \in H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^2, u = \nabla_h \cdot U_h\}, \\ \mathbb{K} &:= \{u \in H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3 : u_3 \in \mathcal{H}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2-13}$$

In order to extend the definition of solutions to data which are only locally square integrable, we will first derive a representation formula for $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We will prove that the formula still makes sense when $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$, and this will allow us to define a solution with boundary data in \mathbb{K} .

To that end, let us introduce some notation. According to the proof of [Proposition 2.1](#), there exist $L_1, L_2, L_3 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_3(\mathbb{C})$ and $q_1, q_2, q_3 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}(\xi, x_3) &= \sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \hat{v}_0(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3), \\ \hat{p}(\xi, x_3) &= \sum_{k=1}^3 q_k(\xi) \cdot \hat{v}_0(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3). \end{aligned} \tag{2-14}$$

For further reference, we state the following lemma:

Lemma 2.6. *For all $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the following identities hold:*

$$(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)L_k + \begin{pmatrix} -L_{k,21} & -L_{k,22} & -L_{k,23} \\ L_{k,11} & L_{k,12} & L_{k,13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} i\xi_1 q_{k,1} & i\xi_1 q_{k,2} & i\xi_1 q_{k,3} \\ i\xi_2 q_{k,1} & i\xi_2 q_{k,2} & i\xi_2 q_{k,3} \\ -\lambda_k q_{k,1} & -\lambda_k q_{k,2} & -\lambda_k q_{k,3} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

and, for $j = 1, 2, 3, k = 1, 2, 3$,

$$i\xi_1 L_{k,1j} + i\xi_2 L_{k,2j} - \lambda_k L_{k,3j} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ be such that $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$ for some $V_h \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, according to [Proposition 2.1](#), the couple (u, p) defined by (2-14) is a solution of (2-1). Therefore it satisfies (2-3). Plugging the definition (2-14) into (2-3), we infer that, for all $x_3 > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \mathcal{A}_k(\xi) \hat{v}_0(\xi) d\xi = 0, \tag{2-15}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_k := (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)L_k + \begin{pmatrix} -L_{k,21} & -L_{k,22} & -L_{k,23} \\ L_{k,11} & L_{k,12} & L_{k,13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} i\xi_1 q_{k,1} & i\xi_1 q_{k,2} & i\xi_1 q_{k,3} \\ i\xi_2 q_{k,1} & i\xi_2 q_{k,2} & i\xi_2 q_{k,3} \\ -\lambda_k q_{k,1} & -\lambda_k q_{k,2} & -\lambda_k q_{k,3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since (2-15) holds for all v_0 , we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \mathcal{A}_k(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \text{ and } x_3,$$

and since $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are distinct for all $\xi \neq 0$, we deduce eventually that $\mathcal{A}_k(\xi) = 0$ for all ξ and k .

The second identity follows in a similar fashion from the divergence-free condition. □

Our goal is now to derive a representation formula for u , based on the formula satisfied by its Fourier transform, in such a way that the formula still makes sense when $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$. The crucial part is to understand the action of the operators $\text{Op}(L_k(\xi)\phi(\xi))$ on L^2_{uloc} functions, where $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^2)$. To that end, we will need to decompose $L_k(\xi)$ for ξ close to zero into several terms.

Lemma 2.4 provides asymptotic developments of L_1, L_2, L_3 and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ as $|\xi| \ll 1$ or $|\xi| \gg 1$. In particular, we have, for $|\xi| \ll 1$,

$$L_1(\xi) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & -\xi_2(\xi_2 + \xi_1) & -i\sqrt{2}\xi_2 \\ \xi_1(\xi_1 - \xi_2) & \xi_1(\xi_2 + \xi_1) & i\sqrt{2}\xi_1 \\ i|\xi|(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & -i|\xi|(\xi_2 + \xi_1) & \sqrt{2}|\xi| \end{pmatrix} + (O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|)), \tag{2-16}$$

$$L_2(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i & \frac{2i(-\xi_1 + \xi_2)}{|\xi|} \\ -i & 1 & \frac{-2i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)}{|\xi|} \\ i(\xi_1 e^{-i\pi/4} - \xi_2 e^{i\pi/4}) & i(\xi_2 e^{-i\pi/4} + i\xi_1 e^{i\pi/4}) & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix} + (O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|)),$$

$$L_3(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i & \frac{2i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)}{|\xi|} \\ i & 1 & \frac{-2i(\xi_1 - \xi_2)}{|\xi|} \\ i(\xi_1 e^{i\pi/4} - \xi_2 e^{-i\pi/4}) & i(\xi_2 e^{i\pi/4} + i\xi_1 e^{-i\pi/4}) & e^{-i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix} + (O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|^2) \quad O(|\xi|)).$$

The remainder terms are to be understood column-wise. Notice that the third column of L_k , that is, $L_k e_3$, always acts on $\hat{v}_{0,3} = i\xi \cdot \widehat{V}_h$. We thus introduce the following notation: for $k = 1, 2, 3$,

$$M_k := (L_k e_1 L_k e_2) \in \mathcal{M}_{3,2}(\mathbb{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad N_k := i L_k e_3 {}^t \xi \in \mathcal{M}_{3,2}(\mathbb{C}).$$

M_k^1 (respectively N_k^1) denotes the 3×2 matrix whose coefficients are the nonpolynomial and homogeneous terms of order one in M_k (respectively N_k) for ξ close to zero. For instance,

$$M_1^1 := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & -\xi_2(\xi_2 + \xi_1) \\ -\xi_1(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & \xi_1(\xi_2 + \xi_1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_1^1 := \frac{i}{|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} -\xi_2 \xi_1 & \xi_2^2 \\ \xi_1^2 & \xi_1 \xi_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also set $M_k^{\text{rem}} = M_k - M_k^1$, $N_k^{\text{rem}} := N_k - N_k^1$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for } \xi \text{ close to zero, } M_1^{\text{rem}} = O(|\xi|), \\ &\text{for } k = 2, 3, M_k^{\text{rem}} = O(1), \\ &\text{for all } k \in \{1, 2, 3\}, N_k^{\text{rem}} = O(|\xi|). \end{aligned}$$

There are polynomial terms of order one in M_1^{rem} and N_k^{rem} (respectively of order 0 and 1 in M_k^{rem} for $k = 2, 3$) which account for the fact that the remainder terms are not $O(|\xi|^2)$. However, these polynomial terms do not introduce any singularity when they are differentiated, and thus, using the results of [Appendix B](#), we get, for any integer $q \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla_\xi^q M_k^{\text{rem}}|, |\nabla_\xi^q N_k^{\text{rem}}| = O(|\xi|^{2-q} + 1) \quad \text{for } |\xi| \ll 1. \tag{2-17}$$

▷ Concerning the Fourier multipliers of order one M_k^1 and N_k^1 , we will rely on the following lemma, which is proved in [Appendix C](#):

Lemma 2.7. *There exists a constant C_I such that for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, for any function $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and for all $K > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Op}\left(\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|}\zeta(\xi)\right)g(x) \\ &= C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \left[\frac{\delta_{i,j}}{|x-y|^3} - 3 \frac{(x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j)}{|x-y|^5} \right] \times \{\rho * g(x) - \rho * g(y) - \nabla \rho * g(x) \cdot (x-y) \mathbf{1}_{|x-y| \leq K}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2-18}$$

where $\rho := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\zeta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Definition 2.8. If L is a homogeneous, nonpolynomial function of order one in \mathbb{R}^2 of the form

$$L(\xi) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} a_{ij} \frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|},$$

then we define, for $\varphi \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$\mathcal{J}[L]\varphi(x) := \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} a_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \gamma_{ij}(x-y) \{\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) - \nabla \varphi(x) \cdot (x-y) \mathbf{1}_{|x-y| \leq K}\},$$

where

$$\gamma_{i,j}(x) = C_I \left(\frac{\delta_{i,j}}{|x|^3} - 3 \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^5} \right).$$

Remark 2.9. The value of the number K in the formula (2-18) and in [Definition 2.8](#) is irrelevant, since, for all $\varphi \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and all $0 < K < K'$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \gamma_{ij}(x-y) \nabla \varphi(x) \cdot (x-y) \mathbf{1}_{K < |x-y| \leq K'} = 0$$

by symmetry arguments.

We then have the following bound:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\varphi \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$,*

$$\left\| \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \varphi \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty^{1/2} \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_\infty^{1/2}.$$

Remark 2.11. We will often apply the above Lemma with $\varphi = \rho * g$, where $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is such that ρ and $\nabla^2 \rho$ have bounded second order moments in L^2 , and $g \in L^2_{\text{uloc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_\infty &\leq C \|g\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \\ \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_\infty &\leq C \|g\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\nabla^2 \rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho * g\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{1 + |x - y|^4} |g(y)|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |x - y|^4) |\rho(x - y)|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The L^∞ norm of $\nabla^2 \varphi$ is estimated in exactly the same manner, simply replacing ρ by $\nabla^2 \rho$.

Proof of Lemma 2.10. We split the integral in (2-18) into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \varphi(x) &= \int_{|x-y| \leq K} dy \gamma_{ij}(x - y) \{ \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) - \nabla \varphi(x) \cdot (x - y) \} \\ &\quad + \int_{|x-y| \geq K} dy \gamma_{ij}(x - y) \varphi(x) - \int_{|x-y| \geq K} dy \gamma_{ij}(x - y) \varphi(y) \\ &= A(x) + B(x) + C(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2-19}$$

Concerning the first integral in (2-19), Taylor’s formula implies

$$|A(x)| \leq C \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \int_{|x-y| \leq K} \frac{dy}{|x - y|} \leq CK \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}.$$

For the second and third integrals in (2-19),

$$|B(x)| + |C(x)| \leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_{|x-y| \geq K} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^3} \leq CK^{-1} \|\varphi\|_\infty.$$

We infer that, for all $K > 0$,

$$\left\| \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \varphi \right\|_\infty \leq C(K \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_\infty + K^{-1} \|\varphi\|_\infty).$$

Optimizing in K (that is, choosing $K = \|\varphi\|_\infty^{1/2} / \|\nabla^2 \varphi\|_\infty^{1/2}$), we obtain the desired inequality. □

▷ For the remainder terms M_k^{rem} and N_k^{rem} as well as the high-frequency terms, we will use the following estimates:

Lemma 2.12 (kernel estimates). *Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{HF}}(x_h, x_3) &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 (1 - \phi)(\xi) L_k(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3) \right), \\ \psi_1(x_h, x_3) &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) M_k^{\text{rem}}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3) \right), \\ \psi_2(x_h, x_3) &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) N_k^{\text{rem}}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then the following estimates hold:

- For all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $c_{0,q} > 0$ such that, for all $\alpha, \beta > c_{0,q}$, there exists $C_{\alpha,\beta,q} > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^q \varphi_{\text{HF}}(x_h, x_3)| \leq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta,q}}{|x_h|^\alpha + |x_3|^\beta}.$$

- For all $\alpha \in (0, 2/3)$ and all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_{\alpha,q} > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^q \psi_1(x_h, x_3)| \leq \frac{C_{\alpha,q}}{|x_h|^{3+q} + |x_3|^{\alpha+q/3}}.$$

- For all $\alpha \in (0, 2/3)$ and all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_{\alpha,q} > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^q \psi_2(x_h, x_3)| \leq \frac{C_{\alpha,q}}{|x_h|^{3+q} + |x_3|^{\alpha+q/3}}.$$

Proof. • Let us first derive the estimate on φ_{HF} for $q = 0$. We seek to prove there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\text{for all } (\alpha, \beta) \in (c_0, \infty)^2, \quad \text{there exists } C_{\alpha,\beta} \text{ such that } |\varphi_{\text{HF}}(x_h, x_3)| \leq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{|x_h|^\alpha + |x_3|^\beta}. \quad (2-20)$$

To that end, it is enough to show that, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and $\beta > 0$ with $|\alpha|, \beta \geq c_0$,

$$\sup_{x_3 > 0} (|x_3|^\beta \|\widehat{\varphi_{\text{HF}}}(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla_\xi^\alpha \widehat{\varphi_{\text{HF}}}(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}) < \infty.$$

We recall that $\lambda_k(\xi) \sim |\xi|$ for $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, using the estimates of [Lemma 2.4](#), we infer that there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L_k(\xi) = O(|\xi|^\gamma)$ for $|\xi| \gg 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |x_3|^\beta |\widehat{\varphi_{\text{HF}}}(\xi, x_3)| &\leq C |1 - \phi(\xi)| |\xi|^\gamma \sum_{k=1}^3 |x_3|^\beta \exp(-\Re(\lambda_k)x_3) \\ &\leq C |1 - \phi(\xi)| |\xi|^{\gamma-\beta} \sum_{k=1}^3 |\Re(\lambda_k)x_3|^\beta \exp(-\Re(\lambda_k)x_3) \\ &\leq C_\beta |\xi|^{\gamma-\beta} \mathbf{1}_{|\xi| \geq 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for β large enough, for all $x_3 > 0$,

$$|x_3|^\beta \|\widehat{\varphi_{\text{HF}}}(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_\beta.$$

In a similar fashion, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $|\alpha| \geq 1$, we have, as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$ (see [Appendix B](#)),

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^\alpha L_k(\xi) &= O(|\xi|^{\gamma-|\alpha|}), \\ \nabla^\alpha(\exp(-\lambda_k x_3)) &= O((|\xi|^{1-|\alpha|} x_3 + |x_3|^{|\alpha|}) \exp(-\mathfrak{R}(\lambda_k) x_3)) = O(|\xi|^{-|\alpha|}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we recall that $\nabla(1 - \phi)$ is supported in a ring of the type $B_R \setminus B_1$ for some $R > 1$. As a consequence, we obtain, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $|\alpha| \geq 1$,

$$|\nabla^\alpha \widehat{\varphi}_{\text{HF}}(\xi, x_3)| \leq C_\alpha |\xi|^{\gamma-|\alpha|} \mathbf{1}_{|\xi| \geq 1},$$

so that

$$\|\nabla^\alpha \widehat{\varphi}_{\text{HF}}(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_\alpha.$$

Thus φ_{HF} satisfies (2-20) for $q = 0$. For $q \geq 1$, the proof is the same, changing L_k into $|\xi|^{q_1} |\lambda_k|^{q_2} L_k$ with $q_1 + q_2 = q$.

• The estimates on ψ_1, ψ_2 are similar. The main difference lies in the degeneracy of λ_1 near zero. For instance, in order to derive an L^∞ bound on $|x_3|^{\alpha+q/3} \nabla^q \psi_1$, we look for an $L^\infty(L^1_\xi(\mathbb{R}^2))$ bound on $|x_3|^{\alpha+q/3} |\xi|^q \widehat{\psi}_1(\xi, x_3)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |x_3|^{\alpha+q/3} |\xi|^q \phi(\xi) \sum_{k=1}^3 M_k^{\text{rem}} \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right| &\leq C |x_3|^{\alpha+q/3} |\xi|^q \sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\mathfrak{R}(\lambda_k) x_3) |M_k^{\text{rem}}| \mathbf{1}_{|\xi| \leq \mathbf{R}} \\ &\leq C |\xi|^q \sum_{k=1}^3 |\mathfrak{R} \lambda_k|^{-(\alpha+q/3)} |M_k^{\text{rem}}| \mathbf{1}_{|\xi| \leq \mathbf{R}} \\ &\leq C |\xi|^q (|\xi|^{1-3\alpha-q} + 1) \mathbf{1}_{|\xi| \leq \mathbf{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is in L^1 provided $\alpha < 2/3$. We infer that

$$\left| |x_3|^{\alpha+q/3} \nabla^q \psi_1(x) \right| \leq C_{\alpha,q} \quad \text{for all } x \text{ and all } \alpha \in (0, 2/3).$$

The other bound on ψ_1 is derived in a similar way, using the fact that

$$\nabla_\xi^q M_1^{\text{rem}} = O(|\xi|^{2-q} + 1)$$

for ξ in a neighborhood of zero. □

▷ We are now ready to state our representation formula:

Proposition 2.13 (representation formula). *Let $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ be such that $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$ for some $V_h \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and let u be the solution of (2-1). For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $B(x_h, 1)$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a cut-off function as in [Lemma 2.12](#), and let $\varphi_{\text{HF}}, \psi_1, \psi_2$ be the associated kernels. For $k = 1, 2, 3$, set*

$$f_k(\cdot, x_3) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\phi(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3)).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) (x) &+ \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[M_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) \\
 &+ \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[N_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x) + \varphi_{\text{HF}} * \left(\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h)} \right) (x) \\
 &+ \psi_1 * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) + \psi_2 * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for all $a > 0$, there exists a constant C_a such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{k+[0,1]^2} \int_0^a |u(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_3 dx_h \leq C_a (\|v_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|V_h\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2).$$

Moreover, there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{k+[0,1]^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla^q u(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_3 dx_h \leq C (\|v_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|V_h\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2).$$

Remark 2.14. The integer q in the above proposition is explicit and does not depend on v_0 . One can take $q = 4$ for instance.

Proof. The proposition follows quite easily from the preceding lemmas. We have, according to Proposition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) (x) \\
 + \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) (x).
 \end{aligned}$$

In the latter term, the cut-off function ϕ is introduced, writing simply $1 = 1 - \phi + \phi$. We have, for the high-frequency term,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 (1 - \phi(\xi)) L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\
 = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\widehat{\phi}_{\text{HF}}(\xi, x_3) \left(\widehat{\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h}} \right) \right) = \varphi_{\text{HF}}(\cdot, x_3) * \left(\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h)} \right) (\xi)
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\nabla_h \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h) = (1 - \chi)v_{0,3} - \nabla_h \chi \cdot V_h \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

In the low-frequency terms, we distinguish between the horizontal and the vertical components of v_0 . Let us deal with the vertical component, which is slightly more complicated. Since $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) L_k(\xi) e_3 \widehat{\nabla_h \cdot ((1-\chi)V_h)}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\ = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) L_k(\xi) e_3 i \xi \cdot (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We recall that $N_k = i L_k e_3 {}^t \xi$, so that

$$L_k(\xi) e_3 i \xi \cdot (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi) = N_k(\xi) (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi).$$

Then, by definition of ψ_2 and f_k ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) N_k(\xi) (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\ = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) N_k^1(\xi) (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\ \quad + \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) N_k^{\text{rem}}(\xi) (1-\chi) \widehat{V_h}(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\ = \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{J}[N_k^1] f_k * ((1-\chi) \cdot V_h) + \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\hat{\psi}_2(\xi, x_3) (1-\chi) \cdot V_h(\xi)) \\ = \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{J}[N_k^1] f_k * ((1-\chi) \cdot V_h) + \psi_2 * ((1-\chi) \cdot V_h). \end{aligned}$$

The representation formula follows.

There remains to bound every term occurring in the representation formula. In order to derive bounds on $(l + [0, 1]^2) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we use the representation formula with a function $\chi_l \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\chi_l \equiv 1$ on $l + [-1, 2]^2$, and we assume that the derivatives of χ_l are bounded uniformly in l (take for instance $\chi_l = \chi(\cdot + l)$ for some $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty$).

- According to [Proposition 2.1](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^a \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\frac{\widehat{\chi_l v_{0,h}}(\xi)}{\widehat{\nabla \cdot (\chi_l V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dx_3 \\ \leq C_a (\|\chi_l v_{0,h}\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 + \|\nabla \chi_l \cdot V_h\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 + \|\chi_l v_{0,3}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using the formula

$$\|f\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = \|f\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^2}{|x - y|^3} dx dy \quad \text{for all } f \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

it can be easily proved that

$$\|\chi u\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C \|\chi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \tag{2-21}$$

for all $\chi \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and for all $u \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where the constant C only depends on the dimension. Therefore,

$$\|\chi_l v_{0,h}\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|\chi_l \tau_k \vartheta v_{0,h}\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |k-l| \leq 1+3\sqrt{2}}} \|\chi_l \tau_k \vartheta v_{0,h}\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq C \|\chi_l\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|v_{0,h}\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}},$$

so that

$$\int_0^a \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi_l v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi_l V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dx_3 \leq C_a (\|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2 + \|V_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2).$$

Similarly,

$$\int_0^\infty \left\| \nabla \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi_l v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi_l V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dx_3 \leq C (\|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2 + \|V_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2).$$

Moreover, thanks to Remark 2.5, for any $q \geq 2$,

$$\int_1^\infty \left\| \nabla^q \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi_l v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi_l V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dx_3 \leq C_q (\|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2 + \|V_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}^2).$$

• We now address the bounds of the terms involving the kernels φ_{HF} , ψ_1 , ψ_2 . According to Lemma 2.12, we have for instance, for all $x_3 > 0$, for all $x_h \in l + [0, 1]^2$, for $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla^\sigma \varphi_{\text{HF}}(y_h, x_3) \left(\frac{(1 - \chi_l)v_{0,h}}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi_l)V_h)} \right) (x_h - y_h) dy_h \right| \\ & \leq C_{\alpha,\beta,|\sigma|} \int_{|y_h| \geq 1} |v_0(x_h - y_h)| \frac{1}{|y_h|^\alpha + x_3^\beta} dy_h + C_{\alpha,\beta,|\sigma|} \int_{1 \leq |y_h| \leq 2} |V_h(x_h - y_h)| \frac{1}{|y_h|^\alpha + x_3^\beta} dy_h \\ & \leq C \|V_h\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \frac{1}{1 + x_3^\beta} + C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|v_0(x_h - y_h)|^2}{1 + |y_h|^\gamma} dy_h \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|y_h| \geq 1} \frac{1 + |y_h|^\gamma}{(|y_h|^\alpha + x_3^\beta)^2} dy_h \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \|V_h\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \frac{1}{1 + x_3^\beta} + C \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \inf(1, x_3^{\beta((2+\gamma)/2\alpha-1)}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\gamma > 2$ and for $\alpha, \beta > c_0$ and sufficiently large. In particular the \dot{H}^q_{uloc} bound follows. The local bounds in L^2_{uloc} near $x_3 = 0$ are immediate, since the right-hand side is uniformly bounded in x_3 . The treatment of the terms with ψ_1, ψ_2 are analogous. Notice however that because of the slower decay of ψ_1, ψ_2 in x_3 , we only have a uniform bound in $\dot{H}^q((l + [0, 1]^2) \times (1, \infty))$ if q is large enough ($q \geq 2$ is sufficient).

• There remains to bound the terms involving $\mathcal{F}[M_k^1]$, $\mathcal{F}[N_k^1]$, using [Lemma 2.7](#) and [Remark 2.11](#). We have for instance, for all $x_3 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{F}[N_k^1]f_k * ((1 - \chi_l)V_h)\|_{L^2(I+[0,1]^2)} \\ & \leq C \|V_h\|_{L^2_{\text{loc}}} \left(\|(1 + |\cdot|^2)f_k(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\nabla_h^2 f_k(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the Plancherel formula, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)f_k(\cdot, x_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} & \leq C \|\phi(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq C \|\exp(-\lambda_k x_3)\|_{H^2(B_R)} + C \exp(-\mu x_3), \end{aligned}$$

where $R > 1$ is such that $\text{Supp } \phi \subset B_R$ and μ is a positive constant depending only on ϕ . We have, for $k = 1, 2, 3$,

$$|\nabla^2 \exp(-\lambda_k x_3)| \leq C(x_3 |\nabla_\xi^2 \lambda_k| + x_3^2 |\nabla_\xi \lambda_k|^2) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3).$$

The asymptotic expansions in [Lemma 2.4](#) together with the results of [Appendix B](#) imply that, for ξ in any neighborhood of zero,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 \lambda_1 &= O(|\xi|), & \nabla \lambda_1 &= O(|\xi|^2), \\ \nabla^2 \lambda_k &= O(1), & \nabla \lambda_k &= O(|\xi|) \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $k = 2, 3$, since λ_k is bounded away from zero in a neighborhood of zero,

$$\int_0^\infty dx_3 \|\exp(-\lambda_k x_3)\|_{H^2(B_R)}^2 < \infty.$$

On the other hand, the degeneracy of λ_1 near $\xi = 0$ prevents us from obtaining the same result. Notice however that

$$\int_0^a \|\exp(-\lambda_1 x_3)\|_{H^2(B_R)}^2 \leq C_a$$

for all $a > 0$, and

$$\int_0^\infty \||\xi|^q \nabla^2 \exp(-\lambda_1 x_3)\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 < \infty$$

for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough ($q \geq 4$). Hence the bound on $\nabla^q u$ follows. □

▷ The representation formula, together with its associated estimates, now allows us to extend the notion of solution to locally integrable boundary data. Before stating the corresponding result, let us prove a technical lemma about some nice properties of operators of the type $\mathcal{F}[\xi_i \xi_j / |\xi|]$, which we will use repeatedly.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, for all $g \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and all $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\nabla^\alpha \rho$ has bounded second order moments in L^2 for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \check{\rho} * \varphi, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \nabla \rho * g.$$

Remark 2.16. Notice that the second formula merely states that

$$\nabla \left(\mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g \right) = \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \nabla \rho * g$$

in the sense of distributions.

Proof. • The first formula is a consequence of Fubini’s theorem: indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} dx \, dy \, dt \, \gamma_{ij}(x - y) g(t) \varphi(x) \times \{ \rho(x - t) - \rho(y - t) - \nabla \rho(x - t) \cdot (x - y) \mathbf{1}_{|x-y| \leq 1} \} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^6}^{y'=x+t-y} dx \, dy' \, dt \, \gamma_{ij}(y' - t) g(t) \varphi(x) \times \{ \rho(x - t) - \rho(x - y') - \nabla \rho(x - t) \cdot (y' - t) \mathbf{1}_{|y'-t| \leq 1} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to x , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} dy' \, dt \, \gamma_{ij}(y' - t) g(t) \{ \varphi * \check{\rho}(t) - \varphi * \check{\rho}(y') - \varphi * \nabla \check{\rho}(t) \cdot (t - y') \mathbf{1}_{|y'-t| \leq 1} \} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dt \, g(t) \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \varphi * \check{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

• The second formula is then easily deduced from the first: using the fact that $\nabla \check{\rho}(x) = -\nabla \rho(-x) = -\widetilde{\nabla} \rho(x)$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \rho * g &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \check{\rho} * \nabla \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \nabla \check{\rho} * \varphi \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \widetilde{\nabla} \rho * \varphi = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \mathcal{F} \left[\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \right] \nabla \rho * g. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to state the main result of this section:

Corollary 2.17. Let $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ (recall that \mathbb{K} is defined in (2-13).) Then there exists a unique solution u of (2-1) such that $u|_{x_3=0} = v_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{for all } a > 0, \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{k+[0,1]^2} \int_0^a |u(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_3 dx_h < \infty, \\ & \text{there exists } q \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{k+[0,1]^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla^q u(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_3 dx_h < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2-22}$$

Remark 2.18. As in Proposition 2.13, the integer q in the two results above is explicit and does not depend on v_0 (one can take $q = 4$ for instance).

Proof of Corollary 2.17.

Uniqueness. Let u be a solution of (2-1) satisfying (2-22) and such that $u|_{x_3=0} = 0$. We use the same type of proof as in Proposition 2.1; see also [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]. Using a Poincaré inequality

near the boundary $x_3 = 0$, we have

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{k+[0,1]^2} \int_0^\infty |\nabla^q u(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_3 dx_h < \infty.$$

Hence $u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and we can take the Fourier transform of u with respect to the horizontal variable. The rest of the proof is identical to that of Proposition 2.1. The equations in (2-3) are meant in the sense of tempered distributions in x_h , and in the sense of distributions in x_3 , which is enough to perform all calculations.

Existence. For all $x_h \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $B(x_h, 1)$. Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} & \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\frac{\chi v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi V_h)}} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) (x) + \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[M_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[N_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x) + \varphi_{\text{HF}} * \left(\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h)} \right) (x) \\ & + \psi_1 * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) + \psi_2 * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2-23)$$

We first claim that this formula does not depend on the choice of the function χ : indeed, let $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\chi_i \equiv 1$ on $B(x_h, 1)$. Then, since $\chi_1 - \chi_2 = 0$ on $B(x_h, 1)$ and $\chi_1 - \chi_2$ is compactly supported, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[M_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)v_{0,h}) + \psi_1 * ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)v_{0,h}) \\ = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) M_k(\chi_1 - \chi_2) \widehat{v_{0,h}} \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{F}[N_k^1] f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)V_h) + \psi_2 * ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)V_h) \\ = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) N_k(\chi_1 - \chi_2) \widehat{V_h} \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \\ = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \phi(\xi) L_k e_3 \mathcal{F}(\nabla \cdot (\chi_1 - \chi_2)V_h) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\varphi_{\text{HF}} * \left(\frac{(\chi_1 - \chi_2)v_{0,h}}{\nabla \cdot ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)V_h)} \right) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 (1 - \phi(\xi)) L_k \left(\frac{(\chi_1 - \chi_2)v_{0,h}}{\nabla \cdot ((\chi_1 - \chi_2)V_h)} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right).$$

Gathering all the terms, we find that the two definitions coincide. Moreover, u satisfies (2-22) (we refer to the proof of Proposition 2.13 for the derivation of such estimates: notice that the proof of Proposition 2.13 only uses local integrability properties of v_0).

It remains to prove that u is a solution of the Stokes system, which is not completely trivial due to the complexity of the representation formula. We start by deriving a duality formula: we claim that, for all $\eta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ and all $x_3 > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u(x_h, x_3) \cdot \eta(x_h) dx_h = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{0,h}(x_h) \cdot \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 ({}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\eta}(\xi))_h \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_h(x_h) \cdot \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 i \xi ({}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\eta}(\xi))_3 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right). \tag{2-24}$$

To that end, in (2-23), we may choose a function $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on the set

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(x, \text{Supp } \eta) \leq 1\}.$$

We then transform every term in (2-23). We have, according to the Parseval formula,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 L_k(\xi) \left(\frac{\widehat{\chi v_{0,h}}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi V_h)(\xi)} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) \right) \cdot \eta \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 \widehat{\eta}(\xi) \cdot L_k(\xi) \left(\frac{\widehat{\chi v_{0,h}}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot (\chi V_h)(\xi)} \right) \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi v_{0,h} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 ({}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\eta}(\xi))_h \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi V_h \cdot \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 i \xi ({}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\eta}(\xi))_3 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using standard convolution results, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi_1 * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})\eta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - \chi)v_{0,h} {}^t \check{\psi}_1 * \eta.$$

The terms with ψ_2 and φ_{HF} are transformed using identical computations. Concerning the term with $\mathcal{F}[M_k^1]$, we use Lemma 2.15, from which we infer that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{F}[M_k^1] f_k * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})\eta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - \chi)v_{0,h} \mathcal{F}[{}^t M_k^1] \check{f}_k * \eta.$$

Notice also that, by the definition of M_k^1 , $\check{M}_k^1 = M_k^1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi_1 * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})\eta + \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{F}[M_k^1] f_k * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})\eta \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - \chi)v_{0,h} \cdot \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 {}^t (\check{L}_k e_1 \check{L}_k e_2) \hat{\eta} \check{\phi}(\xi) \exp(-\check{\lambda}_k x_3) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi_2 * ((1 - \chi)V_h)\eta + \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathcal{F}[N_k^1] f_k * ((1 - \chi)V_h)\eta \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - \chi)V_h \cdot \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \xi {}^t (i \check{L}_k e_3) \hat{\eta} \check{\phi}(\xi) \exp(-\check{\lambda}_k x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall that if $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathbb{K}$ is real-valued, so is the solution u of (2-1). Therefore, in Fourier space,

$$\overline{\hat{u}(\cdot, x_3)} = \check{\hat{u}}(\cdot, x_3) \quad \text{for all } x_3 > 0.$$

We infer in particular that

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \check{L}_k \exp(-\check{\lambda}_k x_3) = \sum_{k=1}^3 \bar{L}_k \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3).$$

Gathering all the terms, we obtain (2-24).

Now let $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty))^3$ such that $\nabla \cdot \zeta = 0$, and $\eta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty))$. We seek to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} u(-\Delta \zeta - e_3 \times \zeta) = 0 \tag{2-25}$$

as well as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} u \cdot \nabla \eta = 0. \tag{2-26}$$

Using (2-24), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} u(-\Delta \zeta - e_3 \times \zeta) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{0,h} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \overline{\mathcal{M}_k(\xi)} \hat{\zeta}(\xi) \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right) + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_h \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \overline{\mathcal{N}_k(\xi)} \hat{\zeta}(\xi) \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_k := (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2) {}^t M_k + {}^t M_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{N}_k := (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2) {}^t N_k + {}^t N_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to Lemma 2.6,

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \begin{pmatrix} i\xi_1 q_{k,1} & i\xi_2 q_{k,1} - \lambda_k q_{k,1} \\ i\xi_1 q_{k,2} & i\xi_2 q_{k,2} - \lambda_k q_{k,2} \end{pmatrix}$$

so that, since $i\xi \cdot \hat{\zeta}_h + \partial_3 \hat{\zeta}_3 = 0$,

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}_k(\xi)} \hat{\zeta}(\xi, x_3) = (\partial_3 \hat{\zeta}_3 - \bar{\lambda}_k \hat{\zeta}_3) \begin{pmatrix} \bar{q}_{k,1} \\ \bar{q}_{k,2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Integrating in x_3 , we find that

$$\int_0^\infty \overline{\mathcal{M}_k(\xi)} \hat{\zeta}(\xi, x_3) \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) dx_3 = 0.$$

Similar arguments lead to

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_h \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \overline{\mathcal{N}_k(\xi)} \hat{\zeta}(\xi, x_3) \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) \right) = 0$$

and to the divergence-free condition (2-26). □

2B. The Dirichlet to Neumann operator for the Stokes–Coriolis system. We now define the Dirichlet to Neumann operator for the Stokes–Coriolis system with boundary data in \mathbb{K} . We start by deriving its expression for boundary data $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (2-2), for which we consider the unique solution u of (2-1) in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. We recall that u is defined in Fourier space by (2-8). The corresponding pressure term is given by

$$\hat{p}(\xi, x_3) = \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(\xi) \frac{|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k(\xi)^2}{\lambda_k(\xi)} \exp(-\lambda_k(\xi)x_3).$$

The Dirichlet to Neumann operator is then defined by

$$\text{DN } v_0 := -\partial_3 u|_{x_3=0} + p|_{x_3=0} e_3.$$

Consequently, in Fourier space, the Dirichlet to Neumann operator is given by

$$\widehat{\text{DN } v_0}(\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|^2)(-\lambda_k^2 \xi + (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2 \xi^\perp) \\ |\xi|^2 / \lambda_k \end{pmatrix} =: M_{SC}(\xi) \hat{v}_0(\xi), \tag{2-27}$$

where $M_{SC} \in \mathcal{M}_{3,3}(\mathbb{C})$. Using the notations of the previous paragraph, we have

$$M_{SC} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \lambda_k L_k + e_3 {}^t q_k.$$

Let us first review a few useful properties of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator:

Proposition 2.19. • *Behavior at large frequencies: when $|\xi| \gg 1$,*

$$M_{SC}(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} |\xi| + \xi_1^2/|\xi| & \xi_1 \xi_2 / |\xi| & i \xi_1 \\ \xi_1 \xi_2 / |\xi| & |\xi| + \xi_2^2/|\xi| & i \xi_2 \\ -i \xi_1 & -i \xi_2 & 2|\xi| \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|^{1/3}).$$

• *Behavior at small frequencies: when $|\xi| \ll 1$,*

$$M_{SC}(\xi) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)/|\xi| \\ 1 & 1 & i(\xi_2 - \xi_1)/|\xi| \\ i(\xi_2 - \xi_1)/|\xi| & -i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)/|\xi| & \sqrt{2}/|\xi| - 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|).$$

• *The horizontal part of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, denoted by DN_h , maps $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into $H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

• *Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$. Then*

$$(1 - \phi(D)) \text{DN}_3 : H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$D\phi(D) \text{DN}_3, |D|\phi(D) \text{DN}_3 : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

where, classically, $a(D)$ denotes the operator defined in Fourier space by

$$\widehat{a(D)u} = a(\xi) \hat{u}(\xi)$$

for $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Remark 2.20. For $|\xi| \gg 1$, the Dirichlet to Neumann operator for the Stokes–Coriolis system has the same expression, at main order, as that of the Stokes system. This can be easily understood since, at large frequencies, the rotation term in the system (2-3) can be neglected in front of $|\xi|^2 \hat{u}$, and therefore the system behaves roughly as the Stokes system.

Proof. The first two points follow from the expression (2-27) together with the asymptotic expansions in Lemma 2.4. Since they are lengthy but straightforward calculations, we postpone them to Appendix A.

The horizontal part of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\text{DN}_h v_0}(\xi)| &= O(|\xi| |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|) \quad \text{for } |\xi| \gg 1, \\ |\widehat{\text{DN}_h v_0}(\xi)| &= O(|\hat{v}_0(\xi)|) \quad \text{for } |\xi| \ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2} |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|^2 d\xi < \infty$, we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-1/2} |\widehat{\text{DN}_h v_0}(\xi)|^2 d\xi < \infty.$$

Hence $\text{DN}_h : H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

In a similar way,

$$|\widehat{\text{DN}_3 v_0}(\xi)| = O(|\xi| |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|) \quad \text{for } |\xi| \gg 1,$$

so that if $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ for ξ in a neighborhood of zero, there exists a constant C such that

$$|(1 - \phi(\xi)) \widehat{\text{DN}_3 v_0}(\xi)| \leq C |\xi| |\hat{v}_0(\xi)| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Therefore $(1 - \phi(D)) \text{DN}_3 : H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

The vertical part of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, however, is singular at low frequencies. This is consistent with the singularity observed in $L_1(\xi)$ for ξ close to zero. More precisely, for ξ close to zero, we have

$$\widehat{\text{DN}_3 v_0}(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\xi|} \hat{v}_{0,3} + O(|\hat{v}_0(\xi)|).$$

Consequently, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$|\xi \phi(\xi) \widehat{\text{DN}_3 v_0}(\xi)| \leq C |\hat{v}_0(\xi)|. \quad \square$$

Following [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010], we now extend the definition of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator to functions which are not square integrable in \mathbb{R}^2 , but rather locally uniformly integrable. There are several differences with [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]: First, the Fourier multiplier associated with DN is not homogeneous, even at the main order. Therefore its kernel (the inverse Fourier transform of the multiplier) is not homogeneous either, and, in general, does not have the same decay as the kernel of Stokes system. Moreover, the singular part of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator for low frequencies prevents us from defining DN on $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}$. Hence we will define DN on \mathbb{K} only (see also Corollary 2.17).

Let us briefly recall the definition of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator for the Stokes system (see [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]), which we denote by DN_S ¹. The Fourier multiplier of DN_S is

$$M_S(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} |\xi| + \xi_1^2/|\xi| & \xi_1\xi_2/|\xi| & i\xi_1 \\ \xi_1\xi_2/|\xi| & |\xi| + \xi_2^2/|\xi| & i\xi_2 \\ -i\xi_1 & -i\xi_2 & 2|\xi| \end{pmatrix}.$$

The inverse Fourier transform of M_S in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is homogeneous of order -3, and consists of two parts:

- The first is the inverse Fourier transform of coefficients equal to $i\xi_1$ or $i\xi_2$. This part is singular, and is the derivative of a Dirac mass at point $t = 0$.
- The second is the kernel denoted by K_S , which satisfies

$$|K_S(t)| \leq \frac{C}{|t|^3}.$$

In particular, it is legitimate to say that

$$|\mathcal{F}^{-1}M_S(t)| \leq \frac{C}{|t|^3} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}).$$

Hence DN_S is defined on $H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}$ in the following way: for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on the set $\{t \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(t, \text{Supp } \varphi) \leq 1\}$. Then

$$\langle DN_S u, \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} := \langle \mathcal{F}^{-1}(M_S \widehat{\chi u}), \varphi \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_S * ((1 - \chi)u) \cdot \varphi.$$

The assumption on χ ensures that there is no singularity in the last integral, while the decay of K_S ensures its convergence. Notice also that the singular part (which is local in the physical space) is only present in the first term of the decomposition.

We wish to adopt a similar method here, but a few precautions must be taken because of the singularities at low frequencies, in the spirit of the representation formula (2-23). Hence, before defining the action of DN on \mathbb{K} , let us decompose the Fourier multiplier associated with DN. We have

$$M_{SC}(\xi) = M_S(\xi) + \phi(\xi)(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi) + (1 - \phi)(\xi)(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi).$$

Concerning the third term, we have the following result, which is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 2.19 and Appendix B:

Lemma 2.21. *As $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\nabla_\xi^\alpha (M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi) = O(|\xi|^{\frac{1}{3} - |\alpha|})$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2, 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3$.

¹Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi [2010] considered the Stokes system in \mathbb{R}_+^2 and not \mathbb{R}_+^3 , but this part of their proof does not depend on the dimension.

We deduce from Lemma 2.21 that $\nabla^\alpha[(1 - \phi(\xi))(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi)] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $|\alpha| = 3$, so that it follows from Lemma B.3 that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[(1 - \phi(\xi))(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi)](t)| \leq \frac{C}{|t|^3}.$$

It remains to decompose $\phi(\xi)(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi)$. As in Proposition 2.13, the multipliers which are homogeneous of order one near $\xi = 0$ are treated separately. Note that since the last column and the last line of M_{SC} act on horizontal divergences (see Proposition 2.22), we are interested in multipliers homogeneous of order zero in $M_{SC,3i}, M_{SC,i3}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and homogeneous of order -1 in $M_{SC,33}$. In the following, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_h &:= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \bar{M} &:= \begin{pmatrix} \bar{M}_h & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ V_1 &:= \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 + \xi_2 \\ \xi_1 - \xi_2 \end{pmatrix}, & V_2 &:= \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} -\xi_1 + \xi_2 \\ -\xi_1 - \xi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We decompose $M_{SC} - M_S$ near $\xi = 0$ as

$$\phi(\xi)(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi) = \bar{M} + \phi(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & V_1 \\ {}_tV_2 & |\xi|^{-1} \end{pmatrix} - (1 - \phi(\xi))\bar{M} + \phi(\xi)M^{\text{rem}},$$

where $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ only contains homogeneous and nonpolynomial terms of order one, and M_{ij}^{rem} contains either polynomial terms or remainder terms which are $o(|\xi|)$ for ξ close to zero if $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$. Looking closely at the expansions for λ_k in a neighborhood of zero (see (A-4)) and at the calculations in paragraph A.4.2, we infer that M_{ij}^{rem} contains either polynomial terms or remainder terms of order $O(|\xi|^2)$ if $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$. We emphasize that the precise expression of M^{rem} is not needed in the following, although it can be computed by pushing forward the expansions of Appendix A. In a similar fashion, $M_{i,3}^{\text{rem}}$ and $M_{3,i}^{\text{rem}}$ contain constant terms and remainder terms of order $O(|\xi|)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $M_{3,3}^{\text{rem}}$ contains remainder terms of order $O(1)$. As a consequence, if we define the low-frequency kernels

$$K_i^{\text{rem}} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C}) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq 4$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} K_1^{\text{rem}} &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\phi \begin{pmatrix} M_{11}^{\text{rem}} & M_{12}^{\text{rem}} \\ M_{21}^{\text{rem}} & M_{22}^{\text{rem}} \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ K_2^{\text{rem}} &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\phi \begin{pmatrix} M_{13}^{\text{rem}} \\ M_{23}^{\text{rem}} \end{pmatrix} i \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ K_3^{\text{rem}} &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(-i\phi(\xi)\xi \begin{pmatrix} M_{31}^{\text{rem}} & M_{32}^{\text{rem}} \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ K_4^{\text{rem}} &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\phi(\xi)M_{33}^{\text{rem}} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^2 & \xi_1\xi_2 \\ \xi_1\xi_2 & \xi_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have, for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ (see Lemmas B.1 and B.5),

$$|K_i^{\text{rem}}(x_h)| \leq \frac{C}{|x_h|^3} \quad \text{for all } x_h \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We also denote by $M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}$ the kernel part of

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(-(1 - \phi)\bar{M} + (1 - \phi)(M_{SC} - M_S)),$$

which satisfies

$$|M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}(x_h)| \leq \frac{C}{|x_h|^3} \quad \text{for all } x_h \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Notice that there is also a singular part in

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(-(1 - \phi)\bar{M}),$$

which in fact corresponds to $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(-\bar{M})$, and which is therefore a Dirac mass at $x_h = 0$.

It remains to define the kernels homogeneous of order one besides M_1 . We set

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &:= V_1 i(\xi_1 \ \xi_2), \\ M_3 &:= -i \xi \ ^t V_2, \\ M_4 &:= \frac{1}{|\xi|} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^2 & \xi_1 \xi_2 \\ \xi_1 \xi_2 & \xi_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

so that M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 are 2×2 real-valued matrices whose coefficients are linear combinations of $\xi_i \xi_j / |\xi|$. In the end, we will work with the following decomposition for the matrix M_{SC} , where the treatment of each of the terms has been explained above:

$$M_{SC} = M_S + \bar{M} + (1 - \phi)(M_{SC} - M_S - \bar{M}) + \phi \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & V_1 \\ ^t V_2 & |\xi|^{-1} \end{pmatrix} + \phi M^{\text{rem}}.$$

We are now ready to extend the definition of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator to functions in \mathbb{K} : in the spirit of Proposition 2.13–Corollary 2.17, we derive a representation formula for functions in $\mathbb{K} \cap H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$, which still makes sense for functions in \mathbb{K} :

Proposition 2.22. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ such that $\varphi_3 = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h$ for some $\Phi_h \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on the set*

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(x, \text{Supp } \varphi \cup \text{Supp } \Phi_h) \leq 1\}.$$

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\xi^2)$ be such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ if $|\xi| \leq 1$, and let $\rho := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\phi$.

- Let $v_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ be such that $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}', \mathfrak{D}} &= \langle \text{DN}_S(v_0), \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}', \mathfrak{D}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \cdot \bar{M} v_0 + \langle \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 - \phi)(M_{SC} - M_S - \bar{M})\widehat{\chi v_0}), \varphi \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} \\
 &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \cdot M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}} * ((1 - \chi)v_0) + \left\langle \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\phi \left(M^{\text{rem}} + \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & V_1 \\ {}^t V_2 & |\xi|^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right) \left(i \widehat{\xi} \cdot \widehat{\chi V_h} \right) \right), \varphi \right\rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} \\
 &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_1](\rho * (1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) + K_1^{\text{rem}} * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) \} \\
 &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_2](\rho * (1 - \chi)V_h) + K_2^{\text{rem}} * ((1 - \chi)V_h) \} \\
 &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi_h \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_3](\rho * (1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) + K_3^{\text{rem}} * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) \} \\
 &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi_h \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_4](\rho * (1 - \chi)V_h) + K_4^{\text{rem}} * ((1 - \chi)V_h) \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- The above formula still makes sense when $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$, which allows us to extend the definition of DN to \mathbb{K} .

Remark 2.23. Notice that if $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\varphi_3 = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h$, and if φ, Φ_h have compact support, then the right-hand side of the formula in Proposition 2.22 still makes sense. Therefore $\text{DN } v_0$ can be extended into a linear form on the set of functions in \mathbb{K} with compact support. In this case, we will denote it by

$$\langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi \rangle$$

without specifying the functional spaces.

The proof of the Proposition 2.22 is very close to those of Proposition 2.13 and Corollary 2.17, and therefore we leave it to the reader.

The goal is now to link the solution of the Stokes–Coriolis system in \mathbb{R}_+^3 with $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ and $\text{DN}(v_0)$. This is done through the following lemma:

Lemma 2.24. Let $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$, and let u be the unique solution of (2-1) with $u|_{x_3=0} = v_0$, given by Corollary 2.17.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^3)^3$ be such that $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi = \langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi|_{x_3=0} \rangle.$$

In particular, if $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ with $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$ and if v_0, V_h have compact support, then

$$\langle \text{DN}(v_0), v_0 \rangle \geq 0.$$

Remark 2.25. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^3})^3$ is such that $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$, then in particular

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{3|x_3=0}(x_h) &= - \int_0^\infty \partial_3 \varphi_3(x_h, z) dz \\ &= \int_0^\infty \nabla_h \cdot \varphi_h(x_h, z) = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h \end{aligned}$$

for $\Phi_h := \int_0^\infty \varphi_h(\cdot, z) dz \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In particular $\varphi|_{x_3=0}$ is a suitable test function for [Proposition 2.22](#).

Proof. The proof relies on two duality formulas in the spirit of [\(2-24\)](#), one for the Stokes–Coriolis system and the other for the Dirichlet to Neumann operator. We claim that if $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$, then, on the one hand

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1}({}^t \bar{M}_{SC}(\xi) \hat{\varphi}|_{x_3=0}(\xi)), \tag{2-28}$$

and on the other hand, for any $\eta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ such that $\eta_3 = \nabla_h \cdot \theta_h$ for some $\theta_h \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$,

$$\langle \text{DN}(v_0), \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1}({}^t \bar{M}_{SC}(\xi) \hat{\eta}(\xi)). \tag{2-29}$$

Applying formula [\(2-29\)](#) with $\eta = \varphi|_{x_3=0}$ then yields the desired result. Once again, the proofs of [\(2-28\)](#) and [\(2-29\)](#) are close to that of [\(2-24\)](#). From [\(2-24\)](#), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} u \cdot e_3 \times \varphi \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k e_3 \times \hat{\varphi} \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \hat{\varphi} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we deduce from the representation formula for u and from [Lemma 2.15](#) a representation formula for ∇u :

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla u(x) &= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\lambda_k x_3) L_k(\xi) \left(\widehat{\nabla \cdot (\chi v_{0,h})} \right) (i\xi_1 \ i\xi_2 \ -\lambda_k) \right) (x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{J}[M_k^1] \nabla f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) + \sum_{k=1}^3 \mathcal{J}[N_k^1] \nabla f_k(\cdot, x_3) * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla \varphi_{\text{HF}} * \left(\frac{(1 - \chi)v_{0,h}(\xi)}{\nabla \cdot ((1 - \chi)V_h)} \right) + \nabla \psi_1 * ((1 - \chi)v_{0,h})(x) + \nabla \psi_2 * ((1 - \chi)V_h)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, proceeding exactly as in the proof of [Corollary 2.17](#), we infer that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_0^\infty |\xi|^2 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\varphi}(\xi, x_3) dx_3 \right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}_k \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k \partial_3 \hat{\varphi}(\xi, x_3) dx_3 \right).$$

Integrating by parts in x_3 , we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k \partial_3 \hat{\varphi}(\xi, x_3) dx_3 = \bar{\lambda}_k \int_0^\infty \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\varphi}(\xi, x_3) dx_3 - {}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\varphi}|_{x_3=0}(\xi).$$

Gathering the terms, we infer

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^3 \exp(-\bar{\lambda}_k x_3) {}^t \bar{P}_k \hat{\varphi} \right) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \bar{\lambda}_k {}^t \bar{L}_k \hat{\varphi}|_{x_3=0} \right),$$

where

$$P_k := (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2) L_k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} L_k = - \begin{pmatrix} i \xi_1 \\ i \xi_2 \\ -\lambda_k \end{pmatrix} (q_{k,1} \ q_{k,2} \ q_{k,3})$$

according to [Lemma 2.6](#). Therefore, since φ is divergence-free, we have

$${}^t \bar{P}_k \hat{\varphi} = (-\partial_3 \hat{\varphi}_3 + \bar{\lambda}_k \hat{\varphi}_3) \begin{pmatrix} \bar{q}_{k,1} \\ \bar{q}_{k,2} \\ \bar{q}_{k,3} \end{pmatrix},$$

so that eventually, after integrating by parts once more in x_3 ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\left[\sum_{k=1}^3 \bar{\lambda}_k {}^t \bar{L}_k + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{q}_{k,1} \\ \bar{q}_{k,2} \\ \bar{q}_{k,3} \end{pmatrix} {}^t e_3 \right] \hat{\varphi}|_{x_3=0} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_0 \mathcal{F}^{-1} ({}^t \bar{M}_{SC} \hat{\varphi}|_{x_3=0}).$$

The derivation of (2-29) is very similar to that of (2-24) and therefore we skip its proof. □

We conclude this section with some estimates on the Dirichlet to Neumann operator:

Lemma 2.26. *There exists a positive constant C such that the following property holds. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ be such that $\varphi_3 = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h$ for some $\Phi_h \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and let $v_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ with $v_{0,3} = \nabla_h \cdot V_h$. Let $R \geq 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that*

$$\text{Supp } \varphi \cup \text{Supp } \Phi_h \subset B(x_0, R).$$

Then

$$|\langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}| \leq CR (\|\varphi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\Phi_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}) (\|v_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}} + \|V_h\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}}).$$

Moreover, if $v_0, V_h \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then

$$|\langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}| \leq C (\|\varphi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\Phi_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}) (\|v_0\|_{H^{1/2}} + \|V_h\|_{H^{1/2}}).$$

Proof. The second inequality is classical and follows from the Fourier definition of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator. We therefore focus on the first inequality, for which we use the representation formula of [Proposition 2.22](#).

We consider a truncation function χ such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $B(x_0, R + 1)$ and $\chi \equiv 0$ on $B(x_0, R + 2)^c$, and such that $\|\nabla^\alpha \chi\|_\infty \leq C_\alpha$, with C_α independent of R , for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. We must evaluate three different types of term:

▷ Terms of the type

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K * ((1 - \chi)v_0) \cdot \varphi,$$

where K is a matrix such that $|K(x)| \leq C|x|^{-3}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (of course, we include in the present discussion all the variants involving V_h and Φ_h). These terms are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|t|^3} |1 - \chi(x - t)| |v_0(x - t)| |\varphi(x)| dx dt \\ \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx |\varphi(x)| \left(\int_{|t| \geq 1} \frac{|v_0(x - t)|^2}{|t|^3} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|t| \geq 1} \frac{1}{|t|^3} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq C \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \\ \leq CR \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

▷ Terms of the type

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h \cdot \mathcal{F}[M]((1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) * \rho,$$

where M is a 2×2 matrix whose coefficients are linear combinations of $\xi_i \xi_j / |\xi|$. Using [Lemma 2.10](#) and [Remark 2.11](#), these terms are bounded by

$$C \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\rho\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\nabla^2 \rho\|_{L^2}^{1/2}.$$

Using Plancherel’s theorem, we have (up to a factor 2π)

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\rho\|_{L^2} &= \|(1 - \Delta)\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C, \\ \|(1 + |\cdot|^2)\nabla^2 \rho\|_{L^2} &= \|(1 - \Delta)|\cdot|^2 \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

so that eventually

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h \cdot \mathcal{F}[M]((1 - \chi)v_{0,h}) * \rho \right| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \leq CR \|v_0\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

▷ Terms of the type

$$\langle \mathcal{F}^{-1}(M(\xi) \widehat{\chi v_0}(\xi)), \varphi \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \cdot \bar{M} v_0,$$

where $M(\xi)$ is some kernel such that $\text{Op}(M) : H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and \bar{M} is a constant matrix.

All these terms are bounded by

$$C \|\chi v_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \|\varphi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

In fact, the trickiest part of the lemma is proving that

$$\|\chi v_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq CR \|v_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}}. \tag{2-30}$$

To that end, we recall that

$$\|\chi v_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = \|\chi v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|(\chi v_0)(x) - (\chi v_0)(y)|^2}{|x - y|^3} dx dy.$$

We consider a cut-off function ϑ satisfying (1-4), so that

$$\|\chi v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|(\tau_k \vartheta) \chi v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\chi\|_{\infty}^2 \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |k| \leq CR}} \|(\tau_k \vartheta) v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CR^2 \|\chi\|_{\infty}^2 \sup_k \|(\tau_k \vartheta) v_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Concerning the second term,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\chi v_0(x) - \chi v_0(y)|^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \tau_k \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x) - \tau_k \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y) \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k, l \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |k-l| \leq 3}} [\tau_k \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x) - \tau_k \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y)] [\tau_l \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x) - \tau_l \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{k, l \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |k-l| > 3}} [\tau_k \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x) - \tau_k \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y)] [\tau_l \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x) - \tau_l \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, according to the assumptions on ϑ , if $|k - l| > 3$, then $\tau_k \vartheta(x) \tau_l \vartheta(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, if $\tau_k(x) \tau_l(y) \neq 0$, then $|x - y| \geq |k - l| - 2$. Notice also that the first sum above contains $O(R^2)$ nonzero terms. Therefore, using the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|(\chi v_0)(x) - (\chi v_0)(y)|^2}{|x - y|^3} dx dy \\ & \leq CR^2 \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|(\tau_k \vartheta \chi v_0)(x) - (\tau_k \vartheta \chi v_0)(y)|^2}{|x - y|^3} dx dy \\ & \quad + \sum_{\substack{k, l \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |k-l| > 3}} \frac{1}{(|k - l| - 2)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} |\tau_k \vartheta(x) \chi(x) v_0(x)| |\tau_l \vartheta(y) \chi(y) v_0(y)| dx dy \end{aligned}$$

Using (2-21), the first term is bounded by

$$CR^2 \|\chi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^2 \|v_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}}^2,$$

while the second is bounded by $C \|v_0\|_{L_{\text{uloc}}^2}^2$.

Gathering all the terms, we obtain (2-30). This concludes the proof. □

2C. Presentation of the new system. We now come to our main concern in this paper, which is proving the existence of weak solutions to the linear system of rotating fluids in the bumpy half-space (1-1). There are two features which make this problem particularly difficult. Firstly, the fact that the bottom is now bumpy rather than flat prevents us from using the Fourier transform in the tangential direction. Secondly, as the domain Ω is unbounded, it is not possible to rely on Poincaré type inequalities. We face this problem using an idea of [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]. It consists in defining a problem equivalent to (1-1) yet posed in the bounded channel Ω^b , by the mean of a transparent boundary condition at the interface $\Sigma = \{x_3 = 0\}$, namely,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + e_3 \times u + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^b, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^b, \\ u|_\Gamma = u_0, \\ -\partial_3 u + p e_3 = \operatorname{DN}(u|_{x_3=0}) & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases} \tag{2-31}$$

In the system above and throughout the rest of the paper, we assume without any loss of generality that $\sup \omega < 0, \inf \omega \geq -1$. Notice that thanks to assumption (1-3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{3|x_3=0}(x_h) &= u_{0,3}(x_h) - \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 \nabla_h \cdot u_h(x_h, z) dz \\ &= u_{0,3}(x_h) - \nabla_h \omega \cdot u_{0,h}(x_h) - \nabla_h \cdot \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z) dz \\ &= \nabla_h \cdot \left(U_h(x_h) - \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z) dz \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that $u_{3|x_3=0}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.22.

Let us start by explaining the meaning of (2-31):

Definition 2.27. A function $u \in H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega^b)$ is a solution of (2-31) if it satisfies the bottom boundary condition $u|_\Gamma = u_0$ in the trace sense, and if, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\overline{\Omega_b})$ such that $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$ and $\varphi|_\Gamma = 0$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega^b} (\nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + e_3 \times u \cdot \varphi) = -\langle \operatorname{DN}(u|_{x_3=0}), \varphi|_{x_3=0} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}.$$

Remark 2.28. Notice that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\overline{\Omega_b})$ is such that $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$ and $\varphi|_\Gamma = 0$, then

$$\varphi_{3|x_3=0} = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h, \quad \text{where } \Phi_h(x_h) := - \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 \varphi_h(x_h, z) dz \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Therefore φ is an admissible test function for Proposition 2.22.

We then have the following result, which is the Stokes–Coriolis equivalent of [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010, Proposition 9], and which follows easily from Lemma 2.24 and Corollary 2.17:

Proposition 2.29. Let $u_0 \in L^2_{\text{uloc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (1-3), and assume that $\omega \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

- Let (u, p) be a solution of (1-1) in Ω such that $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all } a > 0, \quad & \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+[0,1]^2} \int_{\omega(x_h)}^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) < \infty, \\ & \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+[0,1]^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla^q u|^2 < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some $q \in \mathbb{N}, q \geq 1$.

Then $u|_{\Omega^b}$ is a solution of (2-31), and for $x_3 > 0$, u is given by (2-23), with $v_0 := u|_{x_3=0} \in \mathbb{K}$.

- Conversely, let $u^- \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega^b)$ be a solution of (2-31), and let $v_0 := u^-|_{x_3=0} \in \mathbb{K}$. Consider the function $u^+ \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3_+)$ defined by (2-23). Setting

$$u(x) := \begin{cases} u^-(x) & \text{if } \omega(x_h) < x_3 < 0, \\ u^+(x) & \text{if } x_3 > 0, \end{cases}$$

the function $u \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all } a > 0, \quad & \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+[0,1]^2} \int_{\omega(x_h)}^a (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) < \infty, \\ & \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \int_{l+[0,1]^2} \int_1^\infty |\nabla^q u|^2 < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, and is a solution of (1-1).

As a consequence, we work with the system (2-31) from now on. In order to have a homogeneous Poincaré inequality in Ω^b , it is convenient to lift the boundary condition on Γ , so as to work with a homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. Therefore, we define $V = (V_h, V_3)$ by

$$V_h := u_{0,h}, \quad V_3 := u_{0,3} - \nabla_h \cdot u_{0,h}(x_3 - \omega(x_h)).$$

Notice that $V|_{x_3=0} \in \mathbb{K}$ thanks to (1-3), and that V is divergence free. By definition, the function

$$\tilde{u} := u - V \mathbf{1}_{x \in \Omega^b}$$

is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \tilde{u} + e_3 \times \tilde{u} + \nabla \tilde{p} = f & \text{in } \Omega^b, \\ \operatorname{div} \tilde{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega^b, \\ \tilde{u}|_\Gamma = 0, \\ -\partial_3 \tilde{u} + \tilde{p} e_3 = \operatorname{DN}(\tilde{u}|_{x_3=0^-}) + F & \text{on } \Sigma \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \tag{2-32}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f &:= \Delta V - e_3 \times V = \Delta_h V - e_3 \times V, \\ F &:= \operatorname{DN}(V|_{x_3=0}) + \partial_3 V|_{x_3=0}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that thanks to the regularity assumptions on u_0 and ω , we have, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\overline{\Omega^b})^3$ with $\operatorname{Supp} \varphi \subset ((-l, l)^2 \times (-1, 0)) \cap \overline{\Omega^b}$,

$$| \langle f, \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{D}', \mathfrak{D}} | \leq Cl (\|u_{0,h}\|_{H^2_{\text{loc}}} + \|u_{0,3}\|_{H^1_{\text{loc}}}) \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega^b)}, \tag{2-33}$$

where the constant C depends only on $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$. In a similar fashion, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^3$ is such that $\varphi_3 = \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h$ for some $\Phi_h \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$, and if $\text{Supp } \varphi, \text{Supp } \Phi_h \subset B(x_0, l)$, then, according to Lemma 2.26,

$$|\langle F, \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}| \leq C l (\|u_{0,h}\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^2} + \|u_{0,3}\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^1} + \|U_h\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^{1/2}}) (\|\varphi\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\Phi_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)}). \tag{2-34}$$

2D. Strategy of the proof. From now on, we drop the \sim 's in (2-32) so as to lighten the notation.

• In order to prove the existence of solutions of (2-32) in $H_{\text{uloc}}^1(\Omega)$, we truncate horizontally the domain Ω , and we derive uniform estimates on the solutions of the Stokes–Coriolis system in the truncated domains. More precisely, we introduce, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_n &:= \Omega^b \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_1| \leq n, x_2 \leq n\}, \\ \Omega_{k,k+1} &:= \Omega_{k+1} \setminus \Omega_k, \\ \Sigma_n &:= \{(x_h, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_1| \leq n, x_2 \leq n\}, \\ \Sigma_{k,k+1} &:= \Sigma_{k+1} \setminus \Sigma_k, \\ \Gamma_n &:= \Gamma \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_1| \leq n, x_2 \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the Stokes–Coriolis system in Ω_n , with homogeneous boundary conditions on the lateral boundaries

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_n + e_3 \times u_n + \nabla p_n = f, & x \in \Omega_n, \\ \nabla \cdot u_n = 0, & x \in \Omega_n, \\ u_n = 0, & x \in \Omega^b \setminus \Omega_n, \\ u_n = 0, & x \in \Gamma_n, \\ -\partial_3 u_n + p_n e_3|_{x_3=0} = \text{DN}(u_n|_{x_3=0}) + F, & x \in \Sigma_n. \end{cases} \tag{2-35}$$

Notice that the transparent boundary condition involving the Dirichlet to Neumann operator only makes sense if $u_n|_{x_3=0}$ is defined on the whole plane Σ (and not merely on Σ_n), due to the nonlocality of the operator DN. This accounts for the condition $u_n|_{\Omega^b \setminus \Omega_n} = 0$.

Taking u_n as a test function in (2-35), we get a first energy estimate on u_n

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega^b)}^2 &= \underbrace{-\langle \text{DN}(u_n|_{x_3=0}), u_n|_{x_3=0} \rangle}_{\leq 0} - \langle F, u_n|_{x_3=0} \rangle + \langle f, u_n \rangle \\ &\leq C n \left(\|u_{n,h}|_{x_3=0}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma_n)} + \left\| \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_{n,h}(x_h, z') dz' \right\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma_n)} \right) + C n \|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega_n)} \\ &\leq C n \|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega_n)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2-36}$$

where the constant C depends only on $\|u_0\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^2}$ and $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$. This implies, thanks to the Poincaré inequality,

$$E_n := \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla u_n \leq C_0 n^2. \tag{2-37}$$

The existence of u_n in $H^1(\Omega^b)$ follows. Uniqueness is a consequence of equality (2-36) with $F = 0$ and $f = 0$.

In order to prove the existence of u , we derive H^1_{uloc} estimates on u_n , uniform with respect to n . Then, passing to the limit in (2-35) and in the estimates, we deduce the existence of a solution of (2-32) in $H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega^b)$. In order to obtain H^1_{uloc} estimates on u_n , we follow the strategy in [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010], which is inspired by [Ladyženskaja and Solonnikov 1980]. We work with the energies

$$E_k := \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla u_n. \tag{2-38}$$

The goal is to prove an inequality of the type

$$E_k \leq C(k^2 + (E_{k+1} - E_k)) \quad \text{for all } k \in \{m, \dots, n\}, \tag{2-39}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is a large, but fixed integer (independent of n) and C is a constant depending only on $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ and $\|u_{0,h}\|_{H^2_{\text{uloc}}}$, $\|u_{0,3}\|_{H^1_{\text{uloc}}}$, $\|U_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}$. Then, by backwards induction on k , we deduce that

$$E_k \leq Ck^2 \quad \text{for all } k \in \{m, \dots, n\}$$

so that E_m in particular is bounded uniformly in n . Since the derivation of the energy estimates is invariant by translation in the horizontal variable, we infer that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathcal{E}_m} \int_{(c \times (-1,0)) \cap \Omega^b} |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq C,$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_m := \{c, \text{ square of edge of length } m \text{ contained in } \Sigma_n \text{ with vertices in } \mathbb{Z}^2\}. \tag{2-40}$$

Hence the uniform H^1_{uloc} bound on u_n is proved. As a consequence, by a diagonal argument, we can extract a subsequence $(u_{\psi(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\psi(n)} &\rightharpoonup u && \text{weakly in } H^1(\Omega_k), \\ u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} &\rightharpoonup u|_{x_3=0} && \text{weakly in } H^{1/2}(\Sigma_k) \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Of course, u is a solution of the Stokes–Coriolis system in Ω^b , and $u \in H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega^b)$. Looking closely at the representation formula in Proposition 2.22, we infer that

$$\langle \text{DN } u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0}, \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \text{DN } u|_{x_3=0}, \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}$$

for all admissible test functions φ . For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}} * (1 - \chi)(u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} - u|_{x_3=0}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{|t| \leq k} dt \varphi(x) M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}(x - t)(1 - \chi)(u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} - u|_{x_3=0})(t) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{|t| \geq k} dt \varphi(x) M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}(x - t)(1 - \chi)(u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} - u|_{x_3=0})(t). \end{aligned}$$

For all k , the first integral vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ as a consequence of the weak convergence in $L^2(\Sigma_k)$. As for the second integral, let $R > 0$ be such that $\text{Supp } \varphi \subset B_R$, and let $k \geq R + 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{|t| \geq k} dt \varphi(x) M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}(x-t) ((1-\chi)(u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} - u|_{x_3=0}))(t) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{|t| \geq k} dt |\varphi(x)| \frac{1}{|x-t|^3} (|u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0}(t)| + |u|_{x_3=0}(t)|) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx |\varphi(x)| \left(\int_{|t| \geq k} \frac{1}{|x-t|^3} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|x-t| \geq 1} \frac{dt}{|x-t|^3} (|u|_{x_3=0}|^2 + |u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0}|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C (\|u|_{x_3=0}\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} + \sup_n \|u_n|_{x_3=0}\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx |\varphi(x)| \left(\int_{|t| \geq k} \frac{1}{|x-t|^3} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C (\|u|_{x_3=0}\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}} + \sup_n \|u_n|_{x_3=0}\|_{L^2_{\text{uloc}}}) \|\varphi\|_{L^1} (k-R)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the second integral vanishes as $k \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n . We infer that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}} * ((1-\chi)(u_{\psi(n)}|_{x_3=0} - u|_{x_3=0})) = 0.$$

Therefore u is a solution of (2-32).

The final induction inequality will be much more complicated than (2-39), and the proof will also be more involved than that in [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]. However, the general scheme will be very close to the one described above.

• Concerning uniqueness of solutions of (2-32), we use the same type of energy estimates as above. Once again, we give in the present paragraph a very rough idea of the computations, and we refer to Section 4 for all details. When $f = 0$ and $F = 0$, the energy estimates (2-39) become

$$E_k \leq C(E_{k+1} - E_k),$$

and therefore

$$E_k \leq r E_{k+1}$$

with $r := C/(1+C) \in (0, 1)$. Hence, by induction,

$$E_1 \leq r^{k-1} E_k \leq C r^{k-1} k^2$$

for all $k \geq 1$, since u is assumed to be bounded in $H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega^b)$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that $E_1 = 0$. Since all estimates are invariant by translation in x_h , we obtain that $u = 0$.

3. Estimates in the rough channel

This section is devoted to the proof of energy estimates of the type (2-39) for solutions of the system (2-35), which eventually lead to the existence of a solution of (2-32).

The goal is to prove that, for some $m \geq 1$ sufficiently large (but independent of n), E_m is bounded uniformly in n , which automatically implies the boundedness of u_n in $H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega^b)$. We reach this objective in two steps:

- We prove a Saint-Venant estimate: We claim that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ uniform in n such that, for all $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq m$,

$$E_k \leq C_1 \left[k^2 + E_{k+m+1} - E_k + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq m+k} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right]. \tag{3-1}$$

The crucial fact is that C_1 depends only on $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ and $\|u_{0,h}\|_{H^2_{\text{uloc}}}$, $\|u_{0,3}\|_{H^1_{\text{uloc}}}$, $\|U_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}$, so that it is independent of n , k , and m .

- This estimate allows us to deduce the bound in $H^1_{\text{uloc}}(\Omega)$ via a nontrivial induction argument.

Let us first explain the induction, assuming that (3-1) holds. The proof of (3-1) is postponed to Section 3B.

3A. Induction. We aim at deducing from (3-1) that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $C > 0$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\Omega_m} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla u_n \leq C. \tag{3-2}$$

The proof of this uniform bound is divided into two points:

- Firstly, we deduce from (3-1), by downward induction on k , that there exist positive constants C_2 , C_3 , m_0 , depending only on C_0 and C_1 , appearing respectively in (2-37) and (3-1), such that, for all (k, m) such that $k \geq C_3 m$ and $m \geq m_0$,

$$E_k \leq C_2 \left[k^2 + m^3 + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq m+k} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right]. \tag{3-3}$$

Let us insist on the fact that C_2 and C_3 are independent of n, k, m . They will be adjusted in the course of the induction argument (see (3-8)).

- Secondly, we notice that (3-3) yields the bound we are looking for, choosing $k = \lfloor C_3 m \rfloor + 1$ and m large enough.
- We thus start with the proof of (3-3), assuming that (3-1) holds.

First, notice that thanks to (2-37), (3-3) is true for $k \geq n$ as soon as $C_2 \geq C_0$, remembering that $u_n = 0$ on $\Omega^b \setminus \Omega_n$. We then assume that (3-3) holds for $n, n - 1, \dots, k + 1$, where k is an integer such that $k \geq C_3 m$ (further conditions on C_2, C_3 will be derived at the end of the induction argument; see (3-7)).

We prove (3-3) at the rank k by contradiction. Assume that (3-3) does not hold at the rank k , so that

$$E_k > C_2 \left[k^2 + m^3 + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq m+k} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right]. \tag{3-4}$$

Then the induction assumption implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{k+m+1} - E_k &\leq C_2 \left[(k+m+1)^2 - k^2 + \frac{(k+m+1)^4 - k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right] \\
 &\leq C_2 \left[2k(m+1) + (m+1)^2 + 80 \frac{k^3}{m^4} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3-5}$$

Above, we have used the following inequality, which holds for all $k \geq m \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (k+m+1)^4 - k^4 &= 4k^3(m+1) + 6k^2(m+1)^2 + 4k(m+1)^3 + (m+1)^4 \\
 &\leq 8mk^3 + 6k^2 \times 4m^2 + 4k \times 8m^3 + 16m^4 \\
 &\leq 80mk^3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using (3-4), (3-1), and (3-5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 &C_2 \left[k^2 + m^3 + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right] \\
 &< E_k \leq C_1 \left[k^2 + 2C_2k(m+1) + C_2(m+1)^2 + \left(80C_2 \frac{k^3}{m^4} + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \right) \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3-6}$$

The constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$ are fixed and depend only on $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ and $\|u_{0,h}\|_{H^2_{\text{uloc}}}, \|u_{0,3}\|_{H^1_{\text{uloc}}}, \|U_h\|_{H^{1/2}_{\text{uloc}}}$ (see (2-37) for the definition of C_0). We choose $m_0 > 1, C_2 > C_0$, and $C_3 \geq 1$ depending only on C_0 and C_1 so that

$$\begin{cases} k \geq C_3m, \\ \text{and } m \geq m_0 \end{cases} \quad \text{implies} \quad \begin{cases} C_2(k^2 + m^3) > C_1[k^2 + 2C_2k(m+1) + C_2(m+1)^2], \\ \text{and } C_2k^4/m^5 \geq C_1(80C_2k^3/m^4 + k^4/m^5). \end{cases}
 \tag{3-7}$$

One can easily check that it suffices to choose C_2, C_3 , and m_0 so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &C_2 > \max(2C_1, C_0), \\
 &(C_2 - C_1)C_3 > 80C_1C_2, \\
 &\text{for all } m \geq m_0, \quad (C_2C_1 + C_1)(m+1)^2 < m^3.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3-8}$$

Plugging (3-7) into (3-6), we reach a contradiction. Therefore (3-3) is true at the rank k . By induction, (3-3) is proved for all $m \geq m_0$ and for all $k \geq C_3m$.

- It follows from (3-3), choosing $k = \lfloor C_3m \rfloor + 1$, that there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3 , and therefore only on $\|\omega\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ and on Sobolev–Kato norms on u_0 and U_h , such that, for all $m \geq m_0$,

$$E_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \leq E_{\lfloor C_3m \rfloor + 1} \leq C \left[m^3 + \frac{1}{m} \sup_{j \geq \lfloor C_3m \rfloor + m + 1} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right].
 \tag{3-9}$$

Let us now consider the set \mathcal{C}_m defined by (2-40) for an even integer m . As \mathcal{C}_m is finite, there exists a square c in \mathcal{C}_m which maximizes

$$\{ \|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega_c)} : c \in \mathcal{C}_m \},$$

where $\Omega_c = \{x \in \Omega^b : x_h \in c\}$. We then shift u_n in such a manner that c is centered at 0. We call \tilde{u}_n the shifted function. It is still compactly supported, but in Ω_{2n} instead of in Ω_n :

$$\int_{\Omega_{2n}} |\nabla \tilde{u}_n|^2 = \int_{\Omega_n} |\nabla u_n|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_{m/2}} |\nabla \tilde{u}_n|^2 = \int_{\Omega_c} |\nabla u_n|^2.$$

Analogously to E_k , we define \tilde{E}_k . Since the arguments leading to the derivation of energy estimates are invariant by horizontal translation, and all constants depend only on Sobolev norms on u_0, U_h , and ω , we infer that (3-9) still holds when E_k is replaced by \tilde{E}_k . On the other hand, recall that $\tilde{E}_{m/2}$ maximizes $\|\tilde{u}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega_c)}^2$ on the set of squares of edge length m . Moreover, in the set

$$\Sigma_{j+m} \setminus \Sigma_j \quad \text{for } j \geq 1,$$

there are at most $4(j+m)/m$ squares of edge length m . As a consequence, we have, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\tilde{E}_{j+m} - \tilde{E}_j \leq 4 \frac{j+m}{m} \tilde{E}_{m/2},$$

so that (3-9) written for \tilde{u}_n becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{m/2} &\leq C \left[m^3 + \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\sup_{j \geq (C_3+1)m} 1 + \frac{m}{j} \right) \tilde{E}_{m/2} \right] \\ &\leq C \left[m^3 + \frac{1}{m^2} \tilde{E}_{m/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This estimate being uniform in $m \in \mathbb{N}$ provided $m \geq m_0$, we can take m large enough and get

$$\tilde{E}_{m/2} \leq C \frac{m^3}{1 - C(1/m^2)},$$

so that eventually there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}_m} \|u_n\|_{H^1((c \times (-1,0)) \cap \Omega^b)}^2 \leq C \frac{m^3}{1 - C(1/m^2)}.$$

This means exactly that u_n is uniformly bounded in $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega^b)$. Existence follows, as explained in Section 2D.

3B. Saint-Venant estimate. This part is devoted to the proof of (3-1). We carry out a Saint-Venant estimate on the system (2-35), focusing on having constants uniform in n as explained in Section 2D. The preparatory work of Sections 2A and 2B allows us to focus on very few issues. The main problem is the nonlocality of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, which at first sight does not seem to be compatible with getting estimates independent of the size of the support of u_n .

Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ be fixed. Also let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\Omega^b)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0, \quad \varphi = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega^b \setminus \Omega_n, \quad \varphi|_{x_3=\omega(x_h)} = 0. \tag{3-10}$$

Remark 2.28 states that such a function φ is an appropriate test function for (2-35). In the spirit of **Definition 2.27**, the weak formulation for (2-35) is

$$\int_{\Omega^b} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega^b} u_{n,h}^\perp \cdot \varphi_h = -\langle \text{DN}(u_n|_{x_3=0^-}), \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} - \langle F, \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} + \langle f, \varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}}. \tag{3-11}$$

Thanks to the representation formula for DN in **Proposition 2.22**, and to the estimates (2-33) for f and (2-34) for F , the weak formulation (3-11) still makes sense for $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega^b)$ satisfying (3-10).

In the sequel we drop the n subscripts. Note that all constants appearing in the inequalities below are uniform in n . However, one should be aware that E_k defined by (2-38) depends on n . Furthermore, we denote $u|_{x_3=0^-}$ by v_0 .

In order to estimate E_k , we introduce a smooth cutoff function $\chi_k = \chi_k(y_h)$ supported in Σ_{k+1} and identically equal to 1 on Σ_k . We carry out energy estimates on the system (2-35). Remember that a test function has to meet the conditions (3-10). We therefore choose

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_h \\ \nabla \cdot \Phi_h \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \chi_k u_h \\ -\nabla_h \cdot (\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z u_h(x_h, z') dz') \end{pmatrix} \in H^1(\Omega^b), \\ &= \chi_k u - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \nabla_h \chi_k(x_h) \cdot \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z u_h(x_h, z') dz' \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be readily checked to satisfy (3-10). Notice that this choice of test function is different from the one in [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010], which is merely $\chi_k u$. Aside from being a suitable test function for (2-35), the function φ has the advantage of being divergence free, so that there will be no need to estimate commutator terms stemming from the pressure.

Plugging φ into the weak formulation (3-11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \chi_k |\nabla u|^2 &= - \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot (\nabla \chi_k) u + \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_3 \cdot \nabla \left(\nabla_h \chi_k(x_h) \cdot \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \\ &\quad - \langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle - \langle F, \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle + \langle f, \varphi \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3-12}$$

Before coming to the estimates, we state an easy bound on Φ_h and φ :

$$\|\Phi_h\|_{H^1(\Omega^b)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega^b)} + \|\Phi_h|_{x_3=0}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\varphi|_{x_3=0}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C E_{k+1}^{1/2}. \tag{3-13}$$

As we have recourse to **Lemma 2.26** to estimate some terms in (3-12), we use (3-13) repeatedly in the sequel, sometimes with slight changes.

We have to estimate each of the terms appearing in (3-12). The most difficult term is the one involving the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, because of the nonlocal feature: although v_0 is supported in Σ_n , $\text{DN}(v_0)$ is not in general. However, each term in (3-12), except $-\langle \text{DN}(v_0), \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle$, is local, and hence very easy to bound. Let us sketch the estimates of the local terms. For the first term, we simply use the Cauchy–Schwarz and Poincar e inequalities:

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot (\nabla \chi_k) u \right| \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega_{k,k+1}} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega_{k,k+1}} |u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(E_{k+1} - E_k).$$

In the same fashion, using (3-13), we find that the second term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_3 \cdot \nabla \left(\nabla_h \chi_k(x_h) \cdot \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) dx_h dz \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_3| |\nabla \nabla_h \chi_k(x_h)| \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z |u_h(x_h, z')| dz' dx_h dz \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_h u_3| |\nabla_h \chi_k(x_h)| \int_{\omega(x_h)}^z |\nabla_h u_h(x_h, z')| dz' dx_h dz + \int_{\Omega} |\partial_3 u_3 \nabla_h \chi_k(x_h) \cdot u_h(x_h, z)| dx_h dz \\ & \leq C(E_{k+1} - E_k). \end{aligned}$$

We finally bound the last two terms in (3-12) using (3-13), and (2-34) or (2-33):

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle F, \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle| & \leq C(k+1) \left[\|\chi_k u_h|_{x_3=0^-}\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \left\| \nabla_h \cdot \left(\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \right] \\ & \leq C(k+1) [E_{k+1}^{1/2} + (E_{k+1} - E_k)^{1/2}] \leq C(k+1) E_{k+1}^{1/2}, \\ |\langle f, \varphi \rangle| & \leq (k+1) E_{k+1}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term to handle is $-\langle \text{DN}_h(v_0), \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \rangle$. The issue of the nonlocality of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator is already present for the Stokes system. Again, we attempt to adapt the ideas of [G erard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010]. In order to handle the large scales of $\text{DN}(v_0)$, we are led to introduce the auxiliary parameter $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, which appears in (3-1). We decompose v_0 into

$$\begin{aligned} v_0 = & \left(\chi_k v_{0,h} - \nabla_h \cdot \left(\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right) + \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left((\chi_{k+m} - \chi_k) \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right) \\ & + \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left((1 - \chi_{k+m}) v_{0,h} \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The truncations on the vertical component of v_0 are put inside the horizontal divergence in order to apply the Dirichlet to Neumann operator to functions in \mathbb{K} .

The term corresponding to the truncation of v_0 by χ_k , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left\langle \text{DN} \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left(\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right), \left(\varphi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \right) \right\rangle \\ & = - \left\langle \text{DN} \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left(\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right), \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left(\chi_k \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right) \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

is negative by positivity of the operator DN (see Lemma 2.24). For the term corresponding to the truncation by $\chi_{k+m} - \chi_k$, we resort to Lemma 2.26 and (3-13). This yields

$$\left| \left\langle \text{DN} \left(-\nabla_h \cdot \left((\chi_{k+m} - \chi_k) v_{0,h} \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \right), \left(\nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \right) \right\rangle \right| \leq C(E_{k+m+1} - E_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_{k+1}^{1/2}.$$

However, the estimate of [Lemma 2.26](#) is not refined enough to address the large scales independently of n . For the term

$$\left\langle \text{DN} \left(\begin{array}{c} (1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h} \\ -\nabla_h \cdot \left((1 - \chi_{k+m}) \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \varphi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \\ \nabla_h \cdot \Phi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle,$$

we must have a closer look at the representation formula given in [Proposition 2.22](#). Let

$$\tilde{v}_0 := \left(\begin{array}{c} (1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h} \\ -\nabla_h \cdot \left((1 - \chi_{k+m}) \int_{\omega(x_h)}^0 u_h(x_h, z') dz' \right) \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} (1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h} \\ -\nabla_h \cdot \tilde{V}_h \end{array} \right).$$

We take $\chi := \chi_{k+1}$ in the formula of [Proposition 2.22](#). If $m \geq 2$, $\text{Supp } \chi_{k+1} \cap \text{Supp}(1 - \chi_{k+m}) = \emptyset$, so that the formula of [Proposition 2.22](#) becomes²

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{DN } \tilde{v}_0, \varphi \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot K_S * \tilde{v}_0 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}} * \tilde{v}_0 \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_1](\rho * \tilde{v}_{0,h}) + K_1^{\text{rem}} * \tilde{v}_{0,h} \} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_2](\rho * \tilde{V}_h) + K_2^{\text{rem}} * \tilde{V}_h \} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_3](\rho * \tilde{v}_{0,h}) + K_3^{\text{rem}} * \tilde{v}_{0,h} \} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi_h|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot \{ \mathcal{J}[M_4](\rho * \tilde{V}_h) + K_4^{\text{rem}} * \tilde{V}_h \}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have two types of terms to estimate:

- On the one hand are the convolution terms with the kernels K_S , $M_{\text{HF}}^{\text{rem}}$, and K_i^{rem} for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, which all decay like $1/|x_h|^3$.
- On the other hand are the terms involving $\mathcal{J}[M_i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

For the first ones, we rely on the following nontrivial estimate:

Lemma 3.1. *For all $k \geq m$,*

$$\left\| \tilde{v}_0 * \frac{1}{|\cdot|^3} \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq C \frac{k^{3/2}}{m^2} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3-14}$$

This estimate still holds with \tilde{V}_h in place of \tilde{v}_0 .

For the second ones, we have recourse to:

Lemma 3.2. *For all $k \geq m$ and all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$,*

$$\left\| \mathcal{J} \left[\begin{array}{c} \xi_i \xi_j \\ |\xi| \end{array} \right] (\rho * \tilde{v}_{0,h}) \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq C \frac{k^2}{m^{5/2}} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3-15}$$

²Here we use in a crucial (but hidden) way the fact that the zero-order terms at low frequencies are constant. Indeed, such terms are local, so that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi|_{x_3=0^-} \cdot \bar{M} \tilde{v}_0 = 0$.

This estimate still holds with \tilde{V}_h in place of $v_{0,h}$.

We postpone the proofs of these two key lemmas to Section 3C. Applying repeatedly Lemmas 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 together with the estimates (3-13), we are finally led to the estimate

$$E_k \leq C \left((k+1)E_{k+1}^{1/2} + (E_{k+1} - E_k) + E_{k+1}^{1/2}(E_{k+m+1} - E_k)^{1/2} + \frac{k^2}{m^{5/2}} E_{k+1}^{1/2} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)$$

for all $k \geq m \geq 1$. Now, since E_k is increasing in k , we have

$$E_{k+1} \leq E_k + (E_{k+m+1} - E_k).$$

Using Young’s inequality, we infer that, for all $\nu > 0$, there exists a constant C_ν such that, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$E_k \leq \nu E_k + C_\nu \left(k^2 + E_{k+m+1} - E_k + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right).$$

Choosing $\nu < 1$, inequality (3-1) follows.

3C. Proof of the key lemmas. It remains to establish the estimates (3-14) and (3-15). The proofs are quite technical, but similar ideas and tools are used in both.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We use an idea of Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi [2010] to treat the large scales: we decompose the set $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}$ as

$$\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}.$$

On every set $\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}$, we bound the L^2 norm of \tilde{v}_0 by $E_{k+m(j+1)} - E_{k+mj}$. Let us stress here a technical difference with the work of Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi: since Σ has dimension two, the area of the set $\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}$ is of order $(k+mj)m$. In particular, we expect

$$E_{k+m(j+1)} - E_{k+mj} \sim (k+mj)m \|u\|_{H_{\text{uloc}}^1}^2$$

to grow with j . Thus we work with the quantity

$$\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j},$$

which we expect to be bounded uniformly in n, k , rather than with $\sup_{j \geq k+m} (E_{j+m} - E_j)$.

Now, applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields, for $\eta > 0$,

$$\int_{\Sigma_{k+1}} dy \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|y-t|^3} \tilde{v}_0(t) dt \right)^2 \leq C \int_{\Sigma_{k+1}} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|t|}{|y-t|^{3+2\eta}} dt \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|\tilde{v}_0(t)|^2}{|t||y-t|^{3-2\eta}} dt.$$

The role of the division by the $|t|$ factor in the second integral is precisely to force the apparition of the quantities $(E_{j+m} - E_j)/j$. More precisely, for $y \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ and $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|\tilde{v}_0(t)|^2}{|t||y-t|^{3-2\eta}} dt &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} \frac{|\tilde{v}_0(t)|^2}{|t||y-t|^{3-2\eta}} dt \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (E_{k+m(j+1)} - E_{k+mj}) \frac{1}{(k+mj)|mj+k-|y|_{\infty}|^{3-2\eta}} \\ &\leq C \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|mj+k-|y|_{\infty}|^{3-2\eta}} \\ &\leq C_{\eta} \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{|m+k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $|x|_{\infty} := \max(|x_1|, |x_2|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. A simple rescaling yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_{k+1}} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|t|}{|y-t|^{3+2\eta} |m+k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}} dt dy \\ = \int_{\Sigma_{1+1/k}} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{1+m/k}} \frac{|t|}{|y-t|^{3+2\eta} |1+m/k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}} dt dy. \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that $k \geq m \geq 2$ and take $\eta \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$. We decompose $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{1+m/k}$ as $(\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_2) \cup (\Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma_{1+m/k})$. On the one hand, since $|t-y| \geq C|t-y|_{\infty} \geq C(|t|_{\infty} - |y|_{\infty}) \geq C(|t|_{\infty} - 3/2)$,

$$\int_{\Sigma_{1+1/k}} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_2} \frac{|t|}{|y-t|^{3+2\eta} |1+m/k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}} dt dy \leq C_{\eta} \int_{\Sigma_{1+1/k}} \frac{dy}{|1+m/k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}}.$$

Decomposing $\Sigma_{1+1/k}$ into elementary regions of the type $\Sigma_{r+dr} \setminus \Sigma_r$, on which $|y|_{\infty} \simeq r$, we infer that the right-hand side of the above inequality is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C \int_0^{1+1/k} \frac{r}{|1+m/k-r|^{2-2\eta}} dr &\leq C \int_0^{1+1/k} \frac{dr}{|r+(m-1)/k|^{2-2\eta}} \\ &\leq C_{\eta} \left(\left(1 + \frac{m}{k}\right)^{2\eta-1} - \left(\frac{m-1}{k}\right)^{2\eta-1} \right) \leq C_{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $y \in \Sigma_{1+1/k}$ implies $|1+m/k-|y|_{\infty}| \geq (m-1)/k$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_{1+1/k}} \int_{\Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma_{1+m/k}} \frac{|t|}{|y-t|^{3+2\eta} |1+m/k-|y|_{\infty}|^{2-2\eta}} dt dy \\ \leq C \left(\frac{k}{m-1} \right)^{2-2\eta} \int_{\Sigma_{1+1/k}} dy \int_{\Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma_{1+m/k}} \frac{dt}{|t-y|^{3+2\eta}} \\ \leq C \left(\frac{k}{m-1} \right)^{2-2\eta} \int_{X \in \mathbb{R}^2, (m-1)/k \leq |X| \leq C} \frac{dX}{|X|^{3+2\eta}} \leq C_{\eta} \left(\frac{k}{m} \right)^3. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering these bounds leads to (3-14). □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. As in the preceding proof, the overall strategy is to decompose

$$(1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\chi_{k+m(j+1)} - \chi_{k+mj})v_{0,h}.$$

In the course of the proof, we introduce some auxiliary parameters, whose meanings we explain. We cannot use Lemma 2.10 as such, because we will need a much finer estimate. We therefore rely on the splitting (2-19) with $K := m/2$. An important property is the fact that $\rho := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\phi$ belongs to the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of rapidly decreasing functions.

As in the proof of Lemma 2.10, for $K = m/2$ and $x \in \Sigma_{k+1}$, we have

$$|A(x)| \leq Cm \|\nabla^2 \rho * ((1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h})\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{k+1+m/2})},$$

and for all $\alpha > 0$ and all $y \in \Sigma_{k+1+m/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^2 \rho * (1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h}(y)| &\leq \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} |\nabla^2 \rho(y-t)| |v_{0,h}(t)| dt \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} |\nabla^2 \rho(y-t)|^2 |t|^\alpha dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|v_{0,h}(t)|^2}{|t|^\alpha} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Yet, on the one hand, for $\alpha > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|v_{0,h}(t)|^2}{|t|^\alpha} dt &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} \frac{|v_{0,h}(t)|^2}{|t|^\alpha} dt \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+mj)^{\alpha-1}} \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(k+m)^{\alpha-2}} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $y \in \Sigma_{k+1+m/2}$ and $t \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}$ implies $|y-t| \geq m/2 - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} |\nabla^2 \rho(y-t)|^2 |t|^\alpha dt &\leq C \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} |\nabla^2 \rho(y-t)|^2 (|y-t|^\alpha + |y|^\alpha) dt \\ &\leq C \left(\left(k+1 + \frac{m}{2} \right)^\alpha \int_{|s| \geq m/2-1} |\nabla^2 \rho(s)|^2 + \int_{|s| \geq m/2-1} |\nabla^2 \rho(s)|^2 |s|^\alpha \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, for all $\beta > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that

$$\int_{|s| \geq m/2-1} (1 + |s|^\alpha) |\nabla^2 \rho(s)|^2 \leq C_\beta m^{-2\beta}.$$

The role of auxiliary parameter β is to “eat” the powers of k in order to get a Saint-Venant estimate for which the induction procedure of Section 3A works. Gathering the latter bounds, we obtain, for $k \geq m$,

$$\|A\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq C_\beta k m^{-\beta} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3-16}$$

The second term in (2-19) is even simpler to estimate. One ends up with

$$\|B\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq C_\beta k m^{-\beta} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3-17}$$

Therefore A and B satisfy the desired estimate, since

$$\|A\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq Ck \|A\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{k+1})}, \quad \|B\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq Ck \|B\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{k+1})}.$$

The last integral in (2-19) is more intricate, because it is a convolution integral. Furthermore, $\rho * (1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h}(y)$ is no longer supported in $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}$. The idea is to “exchange” the variables y and t , that is, to replace the kernel $|x - y|^{-3}$ by $|x - t|^{-3}$. Indeed, we have, for all $x, y, t \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{|x - y|^3} - \frac{1}{|x - t|^3} \right| \leq \frac{C|y - t|}{|x - y||x - t|^3} + \frac{C|y - t|}{|x - y|^3|x - t|}. \tag{3-18}$$

We decompose the integral term accordingly. We obtain, using the fast decay of ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \frac{1}{|x-y|^3} |\rho * ((1 - \chi_{k+m})v_{0,h})(y)| \\ & \leq C \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} dt \frac{1}{|x-t|^3} |\rho(y-t)| |v_{0,h}(t)| \\ & \quad + C \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} dt \frac{|y-t|}{|x-y|^3|x-t|} |\rho(y-t)| |v_{0,h}(t)| \\ & \quad + C \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} dt \frac{|y-t|}{|x-y||x-t|^3} |\rho(y-t)| |v_{0,h}(t)| \\ & \leq C \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} dt \frac{1}{|x-t|^3} |v_{0,h}(t)| + C \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} dt \frac{|y-t|}{|x-y|^3|x-t|} |\rho(y-t)| |v_{0,h}(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side above can be addressed thanks to Lemma 3.1. We focus on the second term. As above, we use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|y-t||\rho(y-t)|}{|x-t|} |v_{0,h}(t)| dt \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} \frac{|y-t||\rho(y-t)|}{|x-t|} |v_{0,h}(t)| dt \\ & \leq \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{m+j} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k+mj - |x|_\infty} \left(\int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} |y-t|^2 |\rho(y-t)|^2 |t| dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The idea is to use the fast decay of ρ so as to bound the integral over $\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}$. However, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 1/(k+mj-|x|) = \infty$, so that we also need to recover some decay with respect to j in this integral. For $t \in \Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}$,

$$1 \leq \frac{|t| - |x|_{\infty}}{k+mj-|x|_{\infty}} \leq \frac{|t|}{k+mj-|x|_{\infty}},$$

so that, for all $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} |y-t|^2 |\rho(y-t)|^2 |t| dt \\ & \leq \frac{1}{(k+mj-|x|_{\infty})^{2\eta}} \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} |y-t|^2 |\rho(y-t)|^2 |t|^{1+2\eta} dt \\ & \leq \frac{C}{(k+mj-|x|_{\infty})^{2\eta}} \int_{\Sigma_{k+m(j+1)} \setminus \Sigma_{k+mj}} |y-t|^2 (|y-t|^{1+2\eta} + |y|^{1+2\eta}) |\rho(y-t)|^2 dt \\ & \leq \frac{C_{\eta}}{(k+mj-|x|_{\infty})^{2\eta}} (1 + |y-x|^{1+2\eta} + |x|^{1+2\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing in j , we have, as before,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+mj-|x|_{\infty})^{1+\eta}} \leq \frac{C_{\eta}}{m(k+m-|x|_{\infty})^{\eta}} \leq \frac{C_{\eta}}{m^{1+\eta}}$$

so that, for $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{2}$, one finally obtains, for $x \in \Sigma_{k+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} dy \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k+m}} \frac{|y-t| |\rho(y-t)|}{|x-y|^3 |x-t|} |v_{0,h}(t)| dt \\ & \leq Cm^{-1-\eta} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{m+j} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{|x-y| \geq m/2} [|x-y|^{-\frac{5}{2}+\eta} + |x|^{\frac{1}{2}+\eta} |x-y|^{-3}] dy \\ & \leq Cm^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[1 + \left(\frac{k}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}+\eta} \right] \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{k+j} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering all the terms, and again using the fact that

$$\|F\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq Ck \|F\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{k+1})} \quad \text{for all } F \in L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{k+1}),$$

we infer that, for all $k \geq m$ and all $\eta > 0$,

$$\|C\|_{L^2(\Sigma_{k+1})} \leq C_{\eta} \frac{k^{3/2+\eta}}{m^{2+\eta}} \left(\sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{k+j} - E_j}{j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Choose $\eta = 1/2$; Lemma 3.2 is thus proved. □

4. Uniqueness

This section is devoted to the proof of uniqueness of solutions of (2-32). Therefore we consider the system (2-32) with $f = 0$ and $F = 0$, and we intend to prove that the solution u is identically zero.

Following the notations of the previous section, we set

$$E_k := \int_{\Omega_k} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u.$$

We can carry out the same estimates as those of Section 3B and get a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $k \geq m$,

$$E_k \leq C_1 \left(E_{k+m+1} - E_k + \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \right). \tag{4-1}$$

Let m be a positive even integer and $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Analogously to Section 3A, the set \mathcal{C}_m is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_m := \{c, \text{ square with edge of length } m \text{ with vertices in } \mathbb{Z}^2\}.$$

Note that the situation is not quite the same as in Section 3A since this set is infinite. The values of $E_c := \int_{\Omega_c} |\nabla u|^2$ when $c \in \mathcal{C}_m$ are bounded by $Cm^2 \|u\|_{H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega^b)}^2$, so the following supremum exists:

$$\mathcal{E}_m := \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}_m} E_c < \infty,$$

but it may not be attained. Therefore, for $\varepsilon > 0$, we choose a square $c \in \mathcal{C}_m$ such that $\mathcal{E}_m - \varepsilon \leq E_c \leq \mathcal{E}_m$. As in Section 3A, up to a shift we can always assume that c is centered in 0.

From (4-1), we retrieve, for all $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq m$,

$$E_k \leq \frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} E_{k+m+1} + \frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} \frac{k^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j}.$$

Again, the conclusion $E_k = 0$ would be very easy to get if there were no second term in the right-hand side taking into account the large scales due to the nonlocal operator DN.

An induction argument then implies that, for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_k \leq \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} \right)^r E_{k+r(m+1)} + \sum_{r'=0}^{r-1} \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} \right)^{r'+1} \frac{(k + r'(m+1))^4}{m^5} \sup_{j \geq k+m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j}. \tag{4-2}$$

Now, for $\kappa := \ln(C_1/(C_1 + 1)) < 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, the function $x \mapsto \exp(\kappa(x+1))(k+x(m+1))^4$ is decreasing on $(-1, \infty)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r'=0}^{r-1} \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} \right)^{r'+1} \frac{(k + r'(m+1))^4}{m^5} &\leq \sum_{r'=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1} \right)^{r'+1} \frac{(k + r'(m+1))^4}{m^5} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m^5} \int_{-1}^{\infty} \exp(\kappa(x+1))(k+x(m+1))^4 dx \\ &\leq C \frac{k^5}{m^6} \int_{-(m+1)/k}^{\infty} \exp\left(\frac{\kappa k}{m+1}u\right)(1+u)^4 du, \\ &\leq C \frac{k^5}{m^6} \end{aligned}$$

since $k/(m + 1) \geq 1/2$ as soon as $k \geq m \geq 1$. Therefore, we conclude from (4-2) for $k = m$ that, for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_m - \varepsilon \leq E_m = E_c &\leq \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1}\right)^r E_{m+r(m+1)} + \frac{C}{m} \sup_{j \geq 2m} \frac{E_{j+m} - E_j}{j} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1}\right)^r (r + 1)^2 (m + 1)^2 \|u\|_{H^1_{\text{uloc}}}^2 + 4 \frac{C}{m} \sup_{j \geq 2m} \frac{j + m}{jm} \mathcal{E}_m \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1}\right)^r (r + 1)^2 (m + 1)^2 \|u\|_{H^1_{\text{uloc}}}^2 + \frac{C}{m^2} \mathcal{E}_m. \end{aligned}$$

Since the constants are uniform in m , we have, for m sufficiently large and for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathcal{E}_m \leq C \left[\left(\frac{C_1}{C_1 + 1}\right)^r (r + 1)^2 (m + 1)^2 + \varepsilon \right],$$

which, letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, gives $\mathcal{E}_m = 0$. The latter holds for all m large enough, and thus we have $u = 0$.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4

This section is devoted to the proofs of Lemma 2.3, which gives a formula for the determinant of M , and Lemma 2.4, which contains the low and high frequency expansions of the main functions we work with, namely, λ_k and A_k . As A_1, A_2, A_3 can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues λ_k solution to (2-5), it is essential to begin by stating some properties of the latter. Usual properties on the roots of polynomials entail that the eigenvalues satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \Re(\lambda_k) > 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, 3, \quad \lambda_1 \in]0, \infty[, \quad \lambda_2 = \bar{\lambda}_3, \\ -(\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3)^2 = -|\xi|^6, \quad \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 = |\xi|^3, \quad (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_1^2)(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2) = |\xi|^2, \\ \frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2}{\lambda_k} = \frac{\lambda_k}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{A-1}$$

and can be computed exactly:

$$\lambda_1^2(\xi) = |\xi|^2 + \left(\frac{-|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - \left(\frac{|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \tag{A-2a}$$

$$\lambda_2^2(\xi) = |\xi|^2 + j \left(\frac{-|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - j^2 \left(\frac{|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \tag{A-2b}$$

$$\lambda_3^2(\xi) = |\xi|^2 + j^2 \left(\frac{-|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - j \left(\frac{|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{A-2c}$$

A.1. Expansion of the eigenvalues λ_k . The expansions below follow directly from the exact formulas (A-2). In high frequencies, that is, for $|\xi| \gg 1$, we have

$$\lambda_1^2 = |\xi|^2(1 - |\xi|^{-\frac{4}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{8}{3}})), \quad \lambda_1 = |\xi| - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}), \tag{A-3a}$$

$$\lambda_2^2 = |\xi|^2(1 - j^2|\xi|^{-\frac{4}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{8}{3}})), \quad \lambda_2 = |\xi| - \frac{j^2}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}), \tag{A-3b}$$

$$\lambda_3^2 = |\xi|^2(1 - j|\xi|^{-\frac{4}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{8}{3}})), \quad \lambda_3 = |\xi| - \frac{j}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}). \tag{A-3c}$$

In low frequencies, that is, for $|\xi| \ll 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(|\xi|^4 + \frac{4}{27}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{27}} \left[1 + \frac{27}{8}|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^8)\right], \\ \left(\frac{-|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6), \\ \left(\frac{|\xi|^2 + (|\xi|^4 + 4/27)^{1/2}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^2 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6), \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce

$$\lambda_2^2 = i + \frac{3}{2}|\xi|^2 - \frac{3}{8}i|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6), \quad \lambda_2 = e^{i\pi/4} \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}i|\xi|^2 + \frac{3}{32}|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6)\right), \tag{A-4a}$$

$$\lambda_3^2 = -i + \frac{3}{2}|\xi|^2 + \frac{3}{8}i|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6), \quad \lambda_3 = e^{-i\pi/4} \left(1 + \frac{3}{4}i|\xi|^2 + \frac{3}{32}|\xi|^4 + O(|\xi|^6)\right). \tag{A-4b}$$

Since $\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 = |\xi|^3$, we infer that

$$\lambda_1 = |\xi|^3 + O(|\xi|^7).$$

A.2. Expansion of A_1, A_2 , and A_3 . Let us recall that $A_k = A_k(\xi)$, $k = 1, \dots, 3$, solve the linear system

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \\ (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_1^2)/\lambda_1 & (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)/\lambda_2 & (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2)/\lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}}_{=:M(\xi)} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \\ A_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{v_{0,3}} \\ i\xi \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} \\ -i\xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The exact computation of A_k is not necessary. For the record, note however that A_k can be written in the form of a quotient

$$A_k = \frac{P(\xi_1, \xi_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)}{Q(|\xi|, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)}, \tag{A-5}$$

where P is a polynomial with complex coefficients and

$$Q := \det(M) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)(|\xi| + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3). \tag{A-6}$$

This formula for $\det(M)$ is shown using the relations (A-1):

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M) &= \frac{\lambda_2^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2)^2 - \lambda_3^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)^2}{\lambda_2\lambda_3} - \frac{\lambda_1^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2)^2 - \lambda_3^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_1^2)^2}{\lambda_1\lambda_3} + \frac{\lambda_1^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)^2 - \lambda_2^2(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_1^2)^2}{\lambda_1\lambda_2} \\ &= |\xi|(\lambda_1(\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_3^2) - \lambda_2(\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_3^2) + \lambda_3(\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_2^2)) + \lambda_2\lambda_3(\lambda_3^2 - \lambda_2^2) - \lambda_1\lambda_3(\lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1^2) + \lambda_1\lambda_2(\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_1^2) \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)(|\xi| + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (A-6), and thus Lemma 2.3.

We now concentrate on the expansions of $M(\xi)$ for $|\xi| \gg 1$ and $|\xi| \ll 1$.

A.2.1. High frequency expansion. At high frequencies, it is convenient to work with the quantities B_1, B_2, B_3 introduced in (2-12). Indeed, inserting the expansions (A-3) into the system (2-7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \widehat{v}_{0,3}, \\ |\xi|B_1 - \frac{1}{2}|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}}B_2 + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{5}{3}}|A|) &= i\xi \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h}, \\ |\xi|^{\frac{1}{3}}B_3 + O(|\xi|^{-1}|A|) &= -i\xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course A and B are of the same order, so that the above system becomes

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \widehat{v}_{0,3}, \\ B_2 &= 2|\xi|^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\xi|\widehat{v}_{0,3} - i\xi \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h}) + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{4}{3}}|B|), \\ B_3 &= -i|\xi|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h} + O(|\xi|^{-\frac{4}{3}}|B|). \end{aligned}$$

We infer immediately that $|B| = O(|\xi|^{4/3}|\widehat{v}_0|)$, and therefore the result of Lemma 2.4 follows.

A.2.2. Low frequency expansion. At low frequencies, we invert M thanks to the adjugate matrix formula

$$M^{-1}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\det(M(\xi))} [\text{Cof}(M(\xi))]^T.$$

We have

$$\frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_2^2)^2}{\lambda_2} = \frac{e^{i\pi}(1 + O(|\xi|^2))}{e^{i\pi/4}(1 + O(|\xi|^2))} = -e^{-i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2) = \overline{\frac{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_3^2)^2}{\lambda_3}}.$$

Hence,

$$M(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ O(|\xi|^3) & e^{i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2) & e^{-i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2) \\ |\xi| + O(|\xi|^5) & -e^{-i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2) & -e^{i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\text{Cof}(M) = \begin{pmatrix} -2i & |\xi|e^{-i\pi/4} & -|\xi|e^{i\pi/4} \\ \sqrt{2}i & -e^{i\pi/4} - |\xi| & e^{-i\pi/4} + |\xi| \\ -\sqrt{2}i & -e^{-i\pi/4} & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|^2).$$

We deduce that

$$M^{-1}(\xi) = -\frac{1}{2i(1 + (\sqrt{2}/2)|\xi| + O(|\xi|^2))} [\text{Cof}(M(\xi))]^T$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi| & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}[1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi|] & +\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}[1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi|] \\ (e^{i\pi/4}/2)|\xi| & -(1/2i)[-e^{i\pi/4} - (1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}e^{i\pi/4})|\xi|] & -(e^{i\pi/4}/2)[1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi|] \\ (e^{-i\pi/4}/2)|\xi| & -(1/2i)[e^{-i\pi/4} + (1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}e^{-i\pi/4})|\xi|] & -(e^{-i\pi/4}/2)[1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi|] \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|^2).$$

Finally,

$$A_1 = \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi|\right) \widehat{v_{0,3}} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}i(\xi + \xi^\perp) \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} + O(|\xi|^2|\widehat{v_0}|), \tag{A-7a}$$

$$A_2 = \frac{e^{i\pi/4}}{2}|\xi|\widehat{v_{0,3}} + \frac{1}{2}e^{i\pi/4}\xi \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-i\pi/4}\xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} + O(|\xi|^2|\widehat{v_0}|), \tag{A-7b}$$

$$A_3 = \frac{e^{-i\pi/4}}{2}|\xi|\widehat{v_{0,3}} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-i\pi/4}\xi \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} + \frac{1}{2}e^{i\pi/4}\xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v_{0,h}} + O(|\xi|^2|\widehat{v_0}|). \tag{A-7c}$$

A.3. Low frequency expansion for $L_1, L_2,$ and L_3 . For the sake of completeness, we sketch the low-frequency expansion of L_1 in detail. We recall that

$$L_k(\xi)\widehat{v_0}(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|^2)(-\lambda_k\xi + (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)/\lambda_k)\xi^\perp \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} A_k(\xi)$$

Hence, for $|\xi| \ll 1$,

$$L_1(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|)\xi^\perp + O(|\xi|^2) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}(\xi_1 - \xi_2) & -\frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}(\xi_1 + \xi_2) & 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\xi| \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|^2),$$

which yields (2-16). The calculations for L_2 and L_3 are completely analogous.

A.4. The Dirichlet to Neumann operator. Let us recall the expression of the operator DN in Fourier space:

$$\widehat{\text{DN}(v^0)} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|^2)[(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2\xi^\perp - \lambda_k^2\xi] \\ \lambda_k + (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)/\lambda_k \end{pmatrix} A_k \tag{A-8}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -i\widehat{v_3^0}(\xi)\xi \\ i\xi \cdot \widehat{v_h^0}(\xi) \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{k=1}^3 \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|^2)[(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)^2\xi^\perp + (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)\xi] \\ (|\xi|^2 - \lambda_k^2)/\lambda_k \end{pmatrix} A_k. \tag{A-9}$$

A.4.1. High frequency expansion. Using the exact formula (A-9) for $\widehat{\text{DN} v_0}$ together with the expansions (A-3) and (2-10), we get for the high frequencies

$$\widehat{\text{DN} v_0} = \begin{pmatrix} -i\widehat{v_3^0}(\xi)\xi \\ i\xi \cdot \widehat{v_h^0}(\xi) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} (i/|\xi|^2)((|\xi|^{4/3}B_3 + O(|\xi|^{4/3}|\widehat{v_0}|))\xi^\perp + (|\xi|^{2/3}B_2 + O(|\xi|^{2/3}|\widehat{v_0}|))\xi) \\ |\xi|^{-1/3}B_2 + O(|\xi|^{-1/3}|\widehat{v_0}|) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} |\xi|\widehat{v_h^0} + (\xi \cdot \widehat{v_h^0}/|\xi|)\xi + i\widehat{v_3^0}\xi \\ 2|\xi|\widehat{v_3^0} - i\xi \cdot \widehat{v_h^0} \end{pmatrix} + O(|\xi|^{1/3}|\widehat{v_0}|). \tag{A-10}$$

A.4.2. Low frequency expansion. For $|\xi| \ll 1$, using (A-8), (A-4), and (A-7) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{DN}}_h v_0 &= \frac{i}{2|\xi|^2} \sum_{\pm} (-\xi^\perp \mp i\xi + O(|\xi|^3))(e^{\pm i\pi/4} |\xi| \widehat{v}_{0,3} \pm e^{\pm i\pi/4} \xi \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h} \mp e^{\mp i\pi/4} \xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h} + O(|\xi|^2 |\widehat{v}_0|)) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}i}{2} \frac{\xi - \xi^\perp}{|\xi|} \widehat{v}_{0,3} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (\widehat{v}_{0,h} + \widehat{v}_{0,h}^\perp) + O(|\xi| |\widehat{v}_0|). \end{aligned}$$

For the vertical component of the operator DN, we have in low frequencies

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{DN}}_3 v_0 &= i\xi \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h} + \left(\frac{1}{|\xi|} + O(|\xi|) \right) A_1(\xi) - (e^{i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2)) A_2(\xi) - (e^{-i\pi/4} + O(|\xi|^2)) A_3(\xi) \\ &= \frac{\widehat{v}_{0,3}}{|\xi|} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \widehat{v}_{0,3} - \frac{\sqrt{2}i}{2} \frac{\xi \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h} + \xi^\perp \cdot \widehat{v}_{0,h}}{|\xi|} + O(|\xi| |\widehat{v}_0|). \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B. Lemmas for the remainder terms

The goal of this section is to prove that the various remainder terms encountered throughout the paper decay like $|x|^{-3}$. To that end, we introduce the algebra

$$E := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) : \exists \mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ finite, } \exists r_0 > 0, f(r) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} r^\alpha f_\alpha(r) \text{ for all } r \in [0, r_0), \right. \\ \left. \text{where, for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, f_\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is analytic in } B(0, r_0) \right\}. \quad (\text{B-1})$$

We then have the following result:

Lemma B.1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

- Assume that $\text{Supp } \widehat{\varphi} \subset B(0, 1)$, and that $\widehat{\varphi}(\xi) = f(|\xi|)$ for ξ in a neighborhood of zero, with $f \in E$ and $f(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 1$. Then $\varphi \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ and there exists a constant C such that

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq \frac{C}{|x|^3} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

- Assume that $\text{Supp } \widehat{\varphi} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0, 1)$, and that $\widehat{\varphi}(\xi) = f(|\xi|^{-1})$ for $|\xi| > 1$, with $f \in E$ and $f(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > -1$. Then $\varphi \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ and there exists a constant C such that

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq \frac{C}{|x|^3} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We prove the Lemma in several steps: we first give some properties of the algebra E . We then compute the derivatives of order 3 of functions of the type $f(|\xi|)$ and $f(|\xi|^{-1})$. Eventually, we explain the link between the bounds in Fourier space and in the physical space.

Properties of the algebra E .

Lemma B.2. • E is stable by differentiation.

- Let $f \in E$ with $f(r) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} r^\alpha f_\alpha(r)$, and let $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that

$$f(r) = O(r^{\alpha_0})$$

for r in a neighborhood of zero. Then

$$\inf\{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} : f_\alpha(0) \neq 0\} \geq \alpha_0.$$

- Let $f \in E$, and let $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(r) = O(r^{\alpha_0})$$

for r in a neighborhood of zero. Then

$$f'(r) = O(r^{\alpha_0-1})$$

for $0 < r \ll 1$.

Proof. The first point simply follows from the chain rule and the fact that if f_α is analytic in $B(0, r_0)$, so is f'_α . Concerning the second point, notice that we can always choose the set \mathcal{A} and the functions f_α so that

$$f(r) = r^{\alpha_1} f_{\alpha_1}(r) + \dots + r^{\alpha_s} f_{\alpha_s}(r),$$

where $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_s$ and f_{α_i} is analytic in $B(0, r_0)$ with $f_{\alpha_i}(0) \neq 0$. Therefore

$$f(r) \sim r^{\alpha_1} f_{\alpha_1}(0), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0,$$

so that $r^{\alpha_1} = O(r^{\alpha_0})$. It follows that $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_0$. Using the same expansion, we also obtain

$$f'(r) = \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i r^{\alpha_i-1} f_{\alpha_i}(r) + r^{\alpha_i} f'_{\alpha_i}(r) = O(r^{\alpha_1-1}).$$

Since $r^{\alpha_1} = O(r^{\alpha_0})$, we infer eventually that $f'(r) = O(r^{\alpha_0-1})$. □

Differentiation formulas. Now, since we wish to apply the preceding lemma to functions of the type $f(|\xi|)$, or $f(|\xi|^{-1})$, where $f \in E$, we need to have differentiation formulas for such functions. Tedious but easy computations yield, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\xi_i}^3 f(|\xi|) &= \left(3 \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^5} - 3 \frac{\xi_i}{|\xi|^3}\right) f'(|\xi|) + \left(3 \frac{\xi_i}{|\xi|^2} - \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^4}\right) f''(|\xi|) + \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^3} f^{(3)}(|\xi|) \\ \partial_{\xi_i}^3 f(|\xi|^{-1}) &= \left(9 \frac{\xi_i}{|\xi|^5} - 11 \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^7}\right) f'(|\xi|^{-1}) + \left(3 \frac{\xi_i}{|\xi|^6} - 7 \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^8}\right) f''(|\xi|^{-1}) + \frac{\xi_i^3}{|\xi|^9} f^{(3)}(|\xi|^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\varphi(\xi) = f(|\xi|)$ for ξ in a neighborhood of zero, where $f \in E$ is such that $f(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ for r close to zero, we infer that

$$|\partial_{\xi_1}^3 \varphi(\xi)| + |\partial_{\xi_2}^3 \varphi(\xi)| = O(|\xi|^{\alpha-3})$$

for $|\xi| \ll 1$. In a similar fashion, if $\varphi(\xi) = f(|\xi|^{-1})$ for ξ in a neighborhood of zero, where $f \in E$ is such that $f(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ for r close to zero, we infer that

$$|\partial_{\xi_1}^3 \varphi(\xi)| + |\partial_{\xi_2}^3 \varphi(\xi)| = O\{|\xi|^{-4}(|\xi|^{-1})^{-\alpha-1} + |\xi|^{-5}(|\xi|^{-1})^{-\alpha-2} + |\xi|^{-6}(|\xi|^{-1})^{-\alpha-3}\} = O(|\xi|^{\alpha-3}).$$

Moments of order 3 in the physical space.

Lemma B.3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\partial_{\xi_1}^3 \varphi, \partial_{\xi_2}^3 \varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Then

$$|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi)(x_h)| \leq \frac{C}{|x_h|^3} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the formula

$$x_h^\alpha \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi) = i \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\nabla_\xi^\alpha \varphi)$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $|\alpha| = 3$. When $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the formula is a consequence of standard properties of the Fourier transform. It is then extended to $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by duality. □

Remark B.4. Notice that constants or polynomials of order less than two satisfy the assumptions of the above lemma. In this case, the inverse Fourier transform is a distribution whose support is $\{0\}$ (Dirac mass or derivative of a Dirac mass). This is of course compatible with the result of [Lemma B.3](#).

The result of [Lemma B.1](#) then follows easily. It only remains to explain how we can apply it to the functions in the present paper. To that end, we first notice that, for all $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, λ_k is a function of $|\xi|$ only, say $\lambda_k = f_k(|\xi|)$. In a similar fashion,

$$L_k(\xi) = G_k^0(|\xi|) + \xi_1 G_k^1(|\xi|) + \xi_2 G_k^2(|\xi|).$$

We then claim the following result:

Lemma B.5. • *For all $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, the functions f_k, G_k^j , as well as*

$$r \mapsto f_k(r^{-1}), \quad r \mapsto G_k^j(r^{-1}) \tag{B-2}$$

all belong to E .

• *For ξ in a neighborhood of zero,*

$$M_k^{\text{rem}} = P_k(\xi) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \xi_i \xi_j a_k^{ij}(|\xi|) + \xi \cdot b_k(|\xi|),$$

$$N_k^{\text{rem}} = Q_k(\xi) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \xi_i \xi_j c_k^{ij}(|\xi|) + \xi \cdot d_k(|\xi|),$$

where P_k, Q_k are polynomials, and $a_k^{ij}, c_k^{i,j} \in E$ and $b_k, d_k \in E^2$ with $b_k(r), d_k(r) = O(r)$ for r close to zero.

• *There exists a function $m \in E$ such that*

$$(M_{SC} - M_S)(\xi) = m(|\xi|^{-1})$$

for $|\xi| \gg 1$.

The lemma can be easily proved using the formulas (A-2) together with the Maclaurin series for functions of the type $x \mapsto (1+x)^s$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Appendix C. Fourier multipliers supported in low frequencies

This appendix is concerned with the proof of Lemma 2.7, which is a slight variant of a result by Droniou and Imbert [2006] on integral formulas for the fractional Laplacian. Notice that this corresponds to the operator $\mathcal{J}[|\xi|] = \mathcal{J}[(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)/|\xi|]$. We recall that $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and $\rho := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\zeta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \zeta(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi)\right)(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{|\xi|}\right) * \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\xi_i \xi_j \zeta(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi))(x).$$

As explained in [Droniou and Imbert 2006], the function $|\xi|^{-1}$ is locally integrable in \mathbb{R}^2 and therefore belongs to $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Its inverse Fourier transform is a radially symmetric distribution with homogeneity $-2 + 1 = -1$. Hence there exists a constant C_I such that

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{|\xi|}\right) = \frac{C_I}{|x|}.$$

We infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \zeta(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi)\right)(x) &= \frac{C_I}{|\cdot|} * \partial_{ij}(\rho * g) \\ &= C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|x-y|} \partial_{ij}(\rho * g)(y) dy \\ &= C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{ij}(\rho * g)(x+y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The idea is to put the derivatives ∂_{ij} on the kernel $1/|y|$ through integrations by parts. As such, it is not possible to realize this idea. Indeed, $y \mapsto \partial_i(1/|y|)\partial_j(\rho * g)(x+y)$ is not integrable in the vicinity of 0. In order to compensate for this lack of integrability, we consider an even function $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ and $\theta = 1$ on $B(0, K)$, and we introduce the auxiliary function

$$U_x(y) := \rho * g(x+y) - \rho * g(x) - \theta(y)(y \cdot \nabla)\rho * g(x),$$

which satisfies

$$|U_x(y)| \leq C|y|^2, \quad |\nabla_y U_x(y)| \leq C|y| \tag{C-1}$$

for y close to 0. Then, for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} U_x = \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \rho * g(x+y) - (\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \theta)(y \cdot \nabla)\rho * g(x) - (\partial_{y_j} \theta) \partial_{x_i} \rho * g(x) - (\partial_{y_i} \theta) \partial_{x_j} \rho * g(x),$$

where

$$y \mapsto -(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \theta)(y \cdot \nabla)\rho * g(x) - (\partial_{y_j} \theta) \partial_{x_i} \rho * g(x) - (\partial_{y_i} \theta) \partial_{x_j} \rho * g(x)$$

is an odd function. Therefore, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\int_{\varepsilon < |y| < \varepsilon^{-1}} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{ij}(\rho * g)(x+y) dy = \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) dy. \quad \Sigma$$

A first integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \rho * g(x+y) dy \\ &= \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) dy \\ &= \int_{|y|=\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) n_i(y) dy + \int_{|y|=1/\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|y|} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) n_i(y) dy + \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \frac{y_i}{|y|^3} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The first boundary integral vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ because of (C-1), and the second thanks to the fast decay of $\rho * g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Another integration by parts leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \frac{y_i}{|y|^3} \partial_{y_j} U_x(y) dy \\ &= \int_{|y|=\varepsilon} \frac{y_i}{|y|^3} U_x(y) n_j(y) dy + \int_{|y|=1/\varepsilon} \frac{y_i}{|y|^3} U_x(y) n_j(y) dy + \int_{\varepsilon \leq |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) U_x(y) dy \\ &\xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) U_x(y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} = -\frac{\delta_{ij}}{|y|^3} + 3 \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^5}, \quad \left| \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right| \leq \frac{C}{|y|^3},$$

and the boundary terms vanish because of (C-1) and the fast decay of U_x . Therefore, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \zeta(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi) \right) (x) &= C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) U_x(y) dy \\ &= C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) [\rho * g(x+y) - \rho * g(x) - \theta(y)(y \cdot \nabla) \rho * g(x)] dy \\ &= C_I \int_{B(0,K)} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) [\rho * g(x+y) - \rho * g(x) - y \cdot \nabla \rho * g(x)] dy \\ &\quad + C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0,K)} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) [\rho * g(x+y) - \rho * g(x)] dy \\ &\quad - C_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B(0,K)} \left(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} \frac{1}{|y|} \right) \theta(y)(y \cdot \nabla) \rho * g(x) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The last integral is zero as $y \mapsto \theta(y)(\partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} (1/|y|))y$ is odd. We then perform a last change of variables by setting $y' = x + y$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{\xi_i \xi_j}{|\xi|} \zeta(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi) \right) (x) &= - \int_{|x-y'| \leq K} \gamma_{ij}(x-y') \{ \rho * g(y') - \rho * g(x) - (y' - x) \nabla \rho * g(x) \} dy' \\ &\quad - \int_{|x-y'| \geq K} \gamma_{ij}(x-y') \{ \rho * g(y') - \rho * g(x) \} dy'. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.7.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank David Gérard-Varet for his helpful insights on the derivation of energy estimates. Anne-Laure Dalibard has been partially funded by the ANR project Dyficolti ANR-13-BS01-0003-01 and by the project Emergence(s) “Instabilités Hydrodynamiques”.

References

- [Alazard et al. 2013] T. Alazard, N. Burq, and C. Zuily, “Cauchy theory for the gravity water waves system with non localized initial data”, preprint, 2013. [arXiv 1305.0457](#)
- [Bae and Jin 2012] H.-O. Bae and B. J. Jin, “Existence of strong mild solution of the Navier–Stokes equations in the half space with nondecaying initial data”, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **49**:1 (2012), 113–138. [MR 2012k:35384](#) [Zbl 1234.35176](#)
- [Basson 2006] A. Basson, “Homogeneous statistical solutions and local energy inequality for 3D Navier–Stokes equations”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **266**:1 (2006), 17–35. [MR 2007d:76059](#) [Zbl 1106.76017](#)
- [Cannon and Knightly 1970] J. R. Cannon and G. H. Knightly, “A note on the Cauchy problem for the Navier–Stokes equations”, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **18** (1970), 641–644. [MR 42 #4897](#) [Zbl 0202.37203](#)
- [Chemin et al. 2002] J.-Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher, and E. Grenier, “Ekman boundary layers in rotating fluids”, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **8** (2002), 441–466. [MR 2003i:76108](#) [Zbl 1070.35505](#)
- [Chemin et al. 2006] J.-Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher, and E. Grenier, *Mathematical geophysics: an introduction to rotating fluids and the Navier–Stokes equations*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications **32**, Oxford University Press, 2006. [MR 2007m:76148](#) [Zbl 1205.86001](#)
- [Dalibard and Gérard-Varet 2011] A.-L. Dalibard and D. Gérard-Varet, “Effective boundary condition at a rough surface starting from a slip condition”, *J. Differential Equations* **251**:12 (2011), 3450–3487. [MR 2012k:35031](#) [Zbl 1235.35025](#)
- [Droniou and Imbert 2006] J. Droniou and C. Imbert, “Fractal first-order partial differential equations”, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **182**:2 (2006), 299–331. [MR 2009c:35037](#) [Zbl 1111.35144](#)
- [Ekman 1905] V. W. Ekman, “On the influence of the earth’s rotation on ocean-currents”, *Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys.* **2** (1905), Article No. 11.
- [Gala 2005] S. Gala, “Quasi-geostrophic equations with initial data in Banach spaces of local measures”, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* (2005), Article No. 63. [MR 2006e:35261](#) [Zbl 1070.35031](#)
- [Galdi 1994] G. P. Galdi, *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier–Stokes equations, I: Linearised steady problems*, Springer Tracts in Natural Philosophy **38**, Springer, New York, 1994. [MR 95i:35216a](#) [Zbl 0949.35004](#)
- [Gallagher and Planchon 2002] I. Gallagher and F. Planchon, “On global infinite energy solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations in two dimensions”, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **161**:4 (2002), 307–337. [MR 2002m:35182](#) [Zbl 1027.35090](#)
- [Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi 2010] D. Gérard-Varet and N. Masmoudi, “Relevance of the slip condition for fluid flows near an irregular boundary”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **295**:1 (2010), 99–137. [MR 2011a:35382](#) [Zbl 1193.35130](#)
- [Giga and Miyakawa 1989] Y. Giga and T. Miyakawa, “Navier–Stokes flow in \mathbb{R}^3 with measures as initial vorticity and Morrey spaces”, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **14**:5 (1989), 577–618. [MR 90e:35130](#) [Zbl 0681.35072](#)
- [Giga et al. 1999] Y. Giga, K. Inui, and S. Matsui, “On the Cauchy problem for the Navier–Stokes equations with nondecaying initial data”, pp. 27–68 in *Advances in fluid dynamics*, edited by P. Maremonti, *Quad. Mat.* **4**, Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 1999. [MR 2001g:35210](#) [Zbl 0961.35110](#)
- [Giga et al. 2001] Y. Giga, S. Matsui, and O. Sawada, “Global existence of two-dimensional Navier–Stokes flow with nondecaying initial velocity”, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **3**:3 (2001), 302–315. [MR 2002h:35236](#) [Zbl 0992.35066](#)
- [Giga et al. 2006] Y. Giga, K. Inui, A. Mahalov, and S. Matsui, “Navier–Stokes equations in a rotating frame in \mathbb{R}^3 with initial data nondecreasing at infinity”, *Hokkaido Math. J.* **35**:2 (2006), 321–364. [MR 2007f:35217](#) [Zbl 1192.35132](#)
- [Giga et al. 2007] Y. Giga, K. Inui, A. Mahalov, S. Matsui, and J. Saal, “Rotating Navier–Stokes equations in \mathbb{R}_+^3 with initial data nondecreasing at infinity: the Ekman boundary layer problem”, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **186**:2 (2007), 177–224. [MR 2009i:76176](#) [Zbl 1130.76025](#)

- [Giga et al. 2008] Y. Giga, K. Inui, A. Mahalov, and J. Saal, “Uniform global solvability of the rotating Navier–Stokes equations for nondecaying initial data”, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **57**:6 (2008), 2775–2791. MR 2010b:35342 Zbl 1159.35055
- [Greenspan 1980] H. P. Greenspan, *The theory of rotating fluids*, Cambridge University Press, 1980. MR 83m:76077 Zbl 0443.76090
- [Kato 1975] T. Kato, “The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems”, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **58**:3 (1975), 181–205. MR 52 #11341 Zbl 0343.35056
- [Kato 1992] T. Kato, “Strong solutions of the Navier–Stokes equation in Morrey spaces”, *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.)* **22**:2 (1992), 127–155. MR 93i:35104 Zbl 0781.35052
- [Konieczny and Yoneda 2011] P. Konieczny and T. Yoneda, “On dispersive effect of the Coriolis force for the stationary Navier–Stokes equations”, *J. Differential Equations* **250**:10 (2011), 3859–3873. MR 2012b:35248 Zbl 1211.35218
- [Ladyženskaja and Solonnikov 1980] O. A. Ladyženskaja and V. A. Solonnikov, “О нахождении решений краевых задач для стационарных уравнений Стокса и Навье–Стокса, имеющих неограниченный интеграл Дирихле”, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* **96** (1980), 117–160. Translated as “Determination of the solutions of boundary value problems for stationary Stokes and Navier–Stokes equations having an unbounded Dirichlet integral” in *J. Sov. Math.* **21**:5 (1983), 728–761. MR 81k:35132 Zbl 0509.35066
- [Lemarié-Rieusset 1999] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset, “Solutions faibles d’énergie infinie pour les équations de Navier–Stokes dans \mathbb{R}^3 ”, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **328**:12 (1999), 1133–1138. MR 2000d:35179 Zbl 0930.35125
- [Lemarié-Rieusset 2002] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset, *Recent developments in the Navier–Stokes problem*, Research Notes in Mathematics **431**, CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002. MR 2004e:35178 Zbl 1034.35093
- [Maekawa and Terasawa 2006] Y. Maekawa and Y. Terasawa, “The Navier–Stokes equations with initial data in uniformly local L^p spaces”, *Differential Integral Equations* **19**:4 (2006), 369–400. MR 2007h:35251 Zbl 1212.35350
- [Pedlosky 1987] J. Pedlosky, *Geophysical fluid dynamics*, Springer, New York, 1987. Zbl 0713.76005
- [Solonnikov 2003] V. A. Solonnikov, “On nonstationary Stokes problem and Navier–Stokes problem in a half-space with initial data nondecreasing at infinity”, *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* **114**:5 (2003), 1726–1740. MR 2004h:35183 Zbl 1054.35059
- [Taylor 1992] M. E. Taylor, “Analysis on Morrey spaces and applications to Navier–Stokes and other evolution equations”, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **17**:9-10 (1992), 1407–1456. MR 94b:35218 Zbl 0771.35047
- [Yoneda 2009] T. Yoneda, “Global solvability of the Navier–Stokes equations in a rotating frame with spatially almost periodic data”, *RIMS Kôkyûroku* **1640** (2009), 104–115.

Received 23 Apr 2013. Revised 28 Jan 2014. Accepted 1 Mar 2014.

ANNE-LAURE DALIBARD: dalibard@ann.jussieu.fr

Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6), UMR 7598 Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, F-75005 Paris, France

and

Centre national de la recherche scientifique, UMR 7598 Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, F-75005 Paris, France

CHRISTOPHE PRANGE: cp@math.uchicago.edu

Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago, 5734 South University Avenue, Chicago, 60637, United States

Analysis & PDE

msp.org/apde

EDITORS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Maciej Zworski
zworski@math.berkeley.edu
University of California
Berkeley, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| Nicolas Burq | Université Paris-Sud 11, France nicolas.burq@math.u-psud.fr | Yuval Peres | University of California, Berkeley, USA peres@stat.berkeley.edu |
| Sun-Yung Alice Chang | Princeton University, USA chang@math.princeton.edu | Gilles Pisier | Texas A&M University, and Paris 6 pisier@math.tamu.edu |
| Michael Christ | University of California, Berkeley, USA mchrist@math.berkeley.edu | Tristan Rivière | ETH, Switzerland riviere@math.ethz.ch |
| Charles Fefferman | Princeton University, USA cf@math.princeton.edu | Igor Rodnianski | Princeton University, USA irod@math.princeton.edu |
| Ursula Hamenstaedt | Universität Bonn, Germany ursula@math.uni-bonn.de | Wilhelm Schlag | University of Chicago, USA schlag@math.uchicago.edu |
| Vaughan Jones | U.C. Berkeley & Vanderbilt University vaughan.f.jones@vanderbilt.edu | Sylvia Serfaty | New York University, USA serfaty@cims.nyu.edu |
| Herbert Koch | Universität Bonn, Germany koch@math.uni-bonn.de | Yum-Tong Siu | Harvard University, USA siu@math.harvard.edu |
| Izabella Laba | University of British Columbia, Canada ilaba@math.ubc.ca | Terence Tao | University of California, Los Angeles, USA tao@math.ucla.edu |
| Gilles Lebeau | Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis, France lebeau@unice.fr | Michael E. Taylor | Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA met@math.unc.edu |
| László Lempert | Purdue University, USA lempert@math.purdue.edu | Gunther Uhlmann | University of Washington, USA gunther@math.washington.edu |
| Richard B. Melrose | Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA rbm@math.mit.edu | András Vasy | Stanford University, USA andras@math.stanford.edu |
| Frank Merle | Université de Cergy-Pontoise, France Frank.Merle@u-cergy.fr | Dan Virgil Voiculescu | University of California, Berkeley, USA dvv@math.berkeley.edu |
| William Minicozzi II | Johns Hopkins University, USA minicozz@math.jhu.edu | Steven Zelditch | Northwestern University, USA zelditch@math.northwestern.edu |
| Werner Müller | Universität Bonn, Germany mueller@math.uni-bonn.de | | |

PRODUCTION

production@msp.org

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

See inside back cover or msp.org/apde for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2014 is US \$180/year for the electronic version, and \$355/year (+\$50, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

Analysis & PDE (ISSN 1948-206X electronic, 2157-5045 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

APDE peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW[®] from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2014 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 7 No. 6 2014

| | |
|--|------|
| Sharp constant for a k -plane transform inequality ALEXIS DROUOT | 1237 |
| Well-posedness of the Stokes–Coriolis system in the half-space over a rough surface ANNE-LAURE DALIBARD and CHRISTOPHE PRANGE | 1253 |
| Optimal control of singular Fourier multipliers by maximal operators JONATHAN BENNETT | 1317 |
| The Hartree equation for infinitely many particles, II: Dispersion and scattering in 2D MATHIEU LEWIN and JULIEN SABIN | 1339 |
| On the eigenvalues of Aharonov–Bohm operators with varying poles V. BONNAILLIE-NOËL, B. NORIS, M. NYS and S. TERRACINI | 1365 |
| On multiplicity bounds for Schrödinger eigenvalues on Riemannian surfaces GERASIM KOKAREV | 1397 |
| Parabolic boundary Harnack principles in domains with thin Lipschitz complement ARSHAK PETROSYAN and WENHUI SHI | 1421 |