

GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF INHOMOGENEOUS NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS WITH BOUNDED DENSITY

TIANTIAN HAO, FENG SHAO, DONGYI WEI, AND ZHIFEI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we solve Lions' open problem: *the uniqueness of weak solutions for the 2-D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations (INS)*. We first prove the global existence of weak solutions to 2-D (INS) with bounded initial density and initial velocity in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, if the initial density is bounded away from zero, then our weak solution equals to Lions' weak solution, which in particular implies the uniqueness of Lions' weak solution. We also extend a celebrated result by Fujita and Kato on the 3-D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations to 3-D (INS): *the global well-posedness of 3-D (INS) with bounded initial density and initial velocity being small in $\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$* . The proof of the uniqueness is based on a surprising finding that the estimate $t^{1/2}\nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ instead of $\nabla u \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is enough to ensure the uniqueness of the solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$):

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0, \\ \rho(\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u) - \Delta u + \nabla P = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ (\rho, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, u_0), \end{cases}$$

where ρ , u stand for the density and velocity of the fluid respectively, and P is a scalar pressure function. This system is known as a model for the evolution of a multi-phase flow consisting of several immiscible, incompressible fluids with different densities. We refer to [31] for a detailed derivation of (1.1).

Ladyženskaja and Solonnikov [25] first addressed the question of unique solvability of (1.1) in a bounded domain Ω . Under the assumption that $u_0 \in W^{2-\frac{2}{p}, p}(\Omega)$ ($p > d$) is divergence free and vanishes on $\partial\Omega$ and $\rho_0 \in C^1(\Omega)$ is bounded away from zero, they proved the global well-posedness in dimension $d = 2$, and local well-posedness in dimension $d = 3$. To obtain well-posedness for less regular initial data or global results, the following three major features of (1.1) are very crucial:

- the incompressible condition $\operatorname{div} u = 0$ implies

$$\operatorname{meas}\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \alpha \leq \rho(t, x) \leq \beta\} \text{ is independent of } t \geq 0, \quad \forall 0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta,$$

and in particular $\|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$;

- the conservation of energy

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(t, x) |u(t, x)|^2 dx + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 ds = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_0(x) |u_0(x)|^2 dx;$$

Date: July 1, 2024.

- the scaling invariance property which states that if (ρ, u, P) is a solution of (1.1) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, then for all $\lambda > 0$, the triplet $(\rho_\lambda, u_\lambda, P_\lambda)$ defined by

$$(1.3) \quad (\rho_\lambda, u_\lambda, P_\lambda)(t, x) := (\rho(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), \lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x), \lambda^2 P(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x))$$

solves (1.1) on $[0, T/\lambda^2] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

A large number of works have been devoted to proving the well-posedness of (1.1) in the so-called *critical functional framework*, which is to say, in functional spaces with scaling invariant norms.

When the density ρ is a constant (let's say, $\rho \equiv 1$), in which case (1.1) becomes the classical incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (NS). The pioneering work of Leray [27] proved that if the initial velocity $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$, then there exists a global weak (turbulent) solution to (NS) satisfying (1.2) with an inequality. Later on, this result was extended to any domain of \mathbb{R}^d with $d = 2, 3$, see [10]. In dimension $d = 2$, the proof of uniqueness is contained in Leray [26, 27, 28], Ladyženskaja [24], and Lions and Prodi [32]. However, the uniqueness of Leray's weak solution in dimension $d = 3$ remains a longstanding open problem. See [7, 9, 22] for recent breakthrough on non-uniqueness of weak solutions.

We first recall the celebrated result by Fujita and Kato [19], which proves the global solvability of the 3-D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in a critical framework.

Theorem ([19]). *Let $d = 3$. Given a divergence-free vector field $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}$ small enough, then (NS) has a unique global solution*

$$u \in C([0, +\infty); \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^4(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Recently, several works are devoted to the extension of Leray's weak solution to 2-D (INS) and the extension of Fujita-Kato's solution to 3-D (INS), which are both in the critical functional framework.

In this framework for (INS), Danchin [12] and Abidi [1] proved that if ρ_0 is close to a positive constant in $\dot{B}_{p,1}^{d/p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and u_0 is sufficiently small in $\dot{B}_{p,1}^{-1+d/p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then there is a global solution to (1.1) with the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) for all $p \in (1, 2d)$ and the uniqueness holds for $p \in (1, d]$. The existence result has been extended to general Besov spaces in [6, 14, 34] even without the size restriction for the density, see [2, 3, 4, 5], and in [14], Danchin and Mucha proved the existence and uniqueness for $p \in [1, 2d)$, where ρ_0 is close to a positive constant in a multiplier space $\mathcal{M}(\dot{B}_{p,1}^{-1+d/p})$.

In all these aforementioned results, the density has to be at least continuous or near a positive constant, which excludes some physical cases when the density is discontinuous and has large variations along a hypersurface (but still bounded), for example, $\rho = a\mathbf{1}_D + b$ for some $a > b \geq 0$ and some bounded open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Now we consider the general case when $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty$. In 1974, Kazhikhov [23] proved the existence of global weak solutions if ρ_0 is bounded away from vacuum (i.e., $\inf \rho_0 > 0$) and $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The no vacuum assumption was later removed by Simon [38]. Then Lions [31] extended the previous results to the case of a density dependent viscosity, where the density equation of (1.1) is satisfied in a renormalized meaning. (We remark that the uniqueness of Lions' weak solution, even in dimension $d = 2$, in which case Leray's weak solution for the classical (NS) is unique, is a longstanding open problem, and we will come back to this topic later in Remark 1.3.) While with $u_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Danchin and Mucha [15] proved that the system (1.1) has a unique local in time solution. Paicu, Zhang and the fourth author [35] proved the global well-posedness of (1.1) with $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ bounded away from zero and $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $s > 0$, and for $d = 3$ they require $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|u_0\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}$ small. The 3-D result in [35] was

further improved to $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $s > 1/2$ in [11]. We also mention that in [21], the authors solved the so-called *density patch problem* in the 2-D case, which states that if $\rho_0 = \mathbf{1}_D$ for a $C^{1,\alpha}$ domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ then the regularity of the boundary is preserved for Lions' weak solution, by showing the weak-strong uniqueness. See also [16, 18, 20, 29, 30, 36] for related results. In these works, (except for Lions' 2-D weak solutions and Leray's 2-D weak solutions,) we note that the norms of the initial velocity are not critical in the sense that the norms are not invariant under the scaling transformation (1.3).

The first result where ρ_0 is merely bounded and u_0 lies in a critical space was obtained by Zhang [39], where he established the global existence of solutions to 3-D (INS) with initial density $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, bounded away from zero, and initial velocity u_0 sufficiently small in a critical Besov space $\dot{B}_{2,1}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. The uniqueness has been proved later by Danchin and Wang [17]. In [17], Danchin and Wang proved global existence and uniqueness for $u_0 \in \dot{B}_{p,1}^{-1+2/p}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\|\rho_0 - 1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ small, where $p \in (1, 2)$; in the 3-D case, they proved global existence if u_0 is small in $\dot{B}_{p,1}^{-1+3/p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $p \in (1, 3)$ and $\|\rho_0 - 1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ is small, and they obtained the uniqueness for $p \in (1, 2]$ and also for $p \in (2, 3)$ if additionally $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. See also [37] for another extension of Zhang's result to asymmetric fluids. In these results, the summability index 1 in the Besov spaces insures that the gradient of the velocity is in $L^1(0, T; L^\infty)$, which is a key ingredient in the proof of uniqueness. In a very recent paper by Danchin [13], for the 2-D case he proved the global existence of solutions to (1.1) if $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded away from zero and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and he obtained the uniqueness if u_0 lies in a suitable subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ resembling $\dot{B}_{2,1}^0(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We emphasize that, all these works require ρ_0 to be bounded away from zero for their existence, and the uniqueness holds only for u_0 belonging to a subspace of $\dot{H}^{d/2-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ or some L^p type Besov space such that $\nabla u \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty)$.

Now we state our main results of this paper.

In the 2-D case, we prove the global existence of weak solution for $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and we also obtain the uniqueness if ρ_0 is also bounded away from zero.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d = 2$. Given the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfying $0 \leq \rho_0(x) \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$, $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$, the system (1.1) has a global weak solution $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ with $0 \leq \rho(t, x) \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, $\sqrt{\rho}u \in C([0, +\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and the following properties*

- $\sqrt{\rho}u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and $\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$;
- $t^{1/2}\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and $t^{1/2}\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$;
- $t\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$ and $t\nabla\dot{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$, where $\dot{u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_t + u \cdot \nabla u$;
- $t^{1/2}\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$.

Moreover, if ρ_0 is bounded away from zero, then the solution is unique.

In the 3-D case, we prove the global existence and uniqueness of Fujita-Kato's solution to the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations. Here we only require $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (even for the uniqueness) and $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ small.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $d = 3$. Given the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfying $0 \leq \rho_0(x) \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$, $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ such that if $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then the system (1.1) has a unique global weak solution $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ with $0 \leq \rho(t, x) \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, $u \in L^4(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$, $\sqrt{\rho}u \in C([0, +\infty); L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and the following properties*

- $\sqrt{\rho}u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$, $t^{-1/4}\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$, and $t^{1/4}\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$;

- $t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}$, $t^{1/4}\nabla^2 u$, $t^{3/4}\nabla\dot{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$, and $t^{3/4}\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$, where $\dot{u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_t + u \cdot \nabla u$;
- $t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho}u_t$, $t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho_0}u_t$, $t^{3/4}\nabla u_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $t^{3/4}\sqrt{\rho}u_t \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$;
- $t^{1/2}\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

Remark 1.1. (1) Compared with Zhang's result [39], we allow for vacuum density and extend the condition $u_0 \in \dot{B}_{2,1}^{1/2}$ to $\dot{B}_{2,2}^{1/2} = \dot{H}^{1/2}$, which is exactly the functional space used by Fujita and Kato in Theorem 1. Moreover, we also obtain the uniqueness of the solution even though here we can not get the $L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ estimate for ∇u . Indeed, we only have $\|t^{1/2}\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$.

(2) If ρ_0 is bounded away from zero, then we have $u \in C([0, +\infty); \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

(3) In the proof of uniqueness, we only use the following properties of the solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla u &\in L^4(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad \sqrt{\rho}u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad t^{1/4}\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ t^{3/4}\nabla\dot{u} &\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho}u_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \quad t^{3/4}\nabla u_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)), \\ &\text{and } t^{1/2}\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)). \end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness parts of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are consequences of the following much more general result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $T > 0$. Let $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ and $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \nabla \bar{P})$ be two solutions of (1.1) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ corresponding to the same initial data. Assume in addition that*

- $\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}(\bar{u} - u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$;
- $\nabla\bar{u} - \nabla u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$;
- $t^{1/2}\nabla\bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$;
- *Case $d = 2$: ρ_0 is bounded away from zero and*

$$\nabla\bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)), \quad t\dot{\bar{u}} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)), \quad t\nabla\dot{\bar{u}} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2));$$
- *Case $d = 3$: $\nabla\bar{u} \in L^4(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $t^{3/4}\nabla\dot{\bar{u}} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$, where $\dot{\bar{u}} := \partial_t\bar{u} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla\bar{u}$.*

Then $(\rho, u, \nabla P) = (\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \nabla \bar{P})$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Remark 1.2. Note that regularity requirements in the above uniqueness result are all at the critical level in the sense of (1.3). Here we use $t^{1/2}\nabla\bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ instead of $\nabla\bar{u} \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$, which is a great improvement compared with previous works on the uniqueness.

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.3 solves Lions' open problem on the uniqueness of weak solutions for 2-D (INS), see page 31 of [31]. In section 2.5 of [31], Lions indicated that the uniqueness of weak solutions could be showed by constructing a more regular "strong" solution and proving the coincidence of weak solution and the strong one. In [36], Prange and Tan proved the uniqueness of Lions' weak solution for u_0 satisfying $\sqrt{\rho_0}u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\nabla u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for ρ_0 satisfying several cases.¹ Compared with [36], the authors in [21] proved that if $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and ρ_0 allows for a vacuum bubble or a far-field vacuum without the compatibility condition, then Lions' weak solution is unique. Note that, for dimension $d = 2$, these two

¹In [36], if ρ_0 has a far-field vacuum, they need an extra compatibility condition and a technical extra condition on the weak solution.

works both require $\nabla u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$,² although they allow the vacuum for ρ_0 . Theorem 1.3 implies that in the 2-D case, if $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded away from zero and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then our solution is the same as Lions' weak solution [31]. In particular, we prove that Lions' weak solution is unique if $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded away from zero and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Notations.

- $\mathbb{R}^+ := (0, +\infty)$. $D_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla)$ is the material derivative.
- For a Banach space X and an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $C(I; X)$ the set of continuous functions on I with values in X . For $p \in [1, +\infty]$, the notation $L^p(I; X)$ stands for the collection of measurable functions on I with values in X , such that $t \mapsto \|f(t)\|_X$ belongs to $L^p(I)$. For any $T > 0$, we abbreviate $L^p((0, T); X)$ to $L^p(0, T; X)$ and sometimes we further abbreviate to $L^p(0, T)$ if there is no confusion.
- $B(a, R) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - a| < R\}$, $B_R := B(0, R)$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $R > 0$.
- For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [1, +\infty]$, we denote by $\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (or shortly $\dot{W}^{s,p}$) the standard homogeneous Sobolev spaces, and we also denote $\dot{H}^s := \dot{W}^{s,2}$.
- We shall always denote C to be a positive absolute constant which may vary from line to line. The dependence of the constant C will be explicitly indicated if there are any exceptions.

2. A PRIORI ESTIMATES IN THE 2-D CASE

This part is devoted to the proof of a priori estimates for (1.1) in the 2-D case. All estimates in this section are essentially taken from [21]. Note that in [21], some estimates hold only if additionally $\nabla u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$; nevertheless, here we only use those estimates in [21] that depend only on the condition $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $0 < \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Let (ρ, u) be a smooth solution to the system (1.1) on $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $\rho_* < \rho \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ for some constant $\rho_* > 0$.³ Firstly, standard energy estimate gives

$$(2.1) \quad \|\sqrt{\rho}u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 + 2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 \leq 2\|\sqrt{\rho_0}u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The following lemma was essentially proved in Lemma 3.2 of [33] and Lemma 3.2 of [21].

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a positive constant C depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\sqrt{\rho_0}u_0\|_{L^2}$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \|t^{1/2}\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|t^{1/2}(\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}, \nabla^2 u, \nabla P)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} \leq C,$$

$$(2.3) \quad \|t(\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}, \nabla^2 u, \nabla P)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|t\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} \leq C.$$

Proof. It was proved in [33] (3.11), (3.12) that (also using $0 \leq \rho \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$)

$$(2.4) \quad \|(\nabla^2 u, \nabla P)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2},$$

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4,$$

where C depends only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$. Multiplying (2.5) by t , using (2.1), Grönwall's inequality and (2.4) yields (2.2). It was proved in [21] (3.5), (3.7), (3.8) that

$$(2.6) \quad \Psi'(t) + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2/2 \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4 + C\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

²This regularity, higher than the critical one, ensures the weak-strong uniqueness for those ρ_0 possessing no positive lower bound. We also remark that in [21], the regularity $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is not optimal, it is possible to prove the weak-strong uniqueness if $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $s \in (0, 1)$.

³In this and the next section, we require the density to be bounded away from zero to ensure the smoothness and appropriate decay of the solution (ρ, u) , which will be useful in some steps involving integration by parts. Nevertheless, in all estimates, the constant $C > 0$ is independent of this positive lower bound ρ_* .

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx - C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 \leq \Psi(t) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx + C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4 + \|\nabla P\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where C depends only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, and

$$\Psi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho |\dot{u}|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j u^i dx.$$

Multiplying (2.6) by t^2 and using (2.7), (2.8), (2.2), (2.1) and (2.4) yields (2.3). \square

In order to prove the existence of weak solution, we need a L^∞ bound of $|u(t, x)|$. As $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$, there exists $R_0 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(2.9) \quad \int_{B(0, R_0)} \rho_0(x) dx \geq c_0 > 0.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume (2.9). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|\sqrt{\rho_0} u_0\|_{L^2}$, R_0 and c_0 such that*

$$\sqrt{t} |u(t, x)| \leq C [t + \ln(|x| + t + t^{-1})]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Proof. Let $R(t) := R_0 + 2t \|\sqrt{\rho_0} u_0\|_{L^2} / \sqrt{c_0}$. Then by Lemma 2.2 of [21], we have

$$\int_{B(0, R(t))} \rho(t, x) dx \geq c_0/4.$$

So, we obtain

$$\frac{c_0}{4} \inf_{x \in B(0, R(t))} |u(t, x)|^2 \leq \int_{B(0, R(t))} \rho |u|^2 dx \leq \|\sqrt{\rho_0} u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C,$$

which implies that there exists a $x_t \in B(0, R(t))$ such that $|u(t, x_t)| \leq C_1$.

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{u}(t, \xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 d\xi \leq C t^{-1}, \quad \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{u}(t, \xi)|^2 |\xi|^4 d\xi \leq C t^{-2},$$

which ensures that

$$(2.10) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{u}(t, \xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 (1 + t|\xi|^2) d\xi \leq C t^{-1}.$$

Thus, for any $x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have (as $|e^{i\xi \cdot x} - e^{i\xi \cdot y}| \leq \min(|\xi||x - y|, 2)$)

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |u(t, x) - u(t, y)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{u}(t, \xi)| |e^{i\xi \cdot x} - e^{i\xi \cdot y}| d\xi \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\hat{u}(t, \xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 (1 + t|\xi|^2) d\xi \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\min(|\xi|^2 |x - y|^2, 4)}{|\xi|^2 (1 + t|\xi|^2)} d\xi \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\min(|\xi|^2 |x - y|^2, 4)}{|\xi|^2 (1 + t|\xi|^2)} d\xi &= \left(\int_{|\xi| \leq |x - y|^{-1}} + \int_{|\xi| > |x - y|^{-1}} \right) \frac{\min(|\xi|^2 |x - y|^2, 4)}{|\xi|^2 (1 + t|\xi|^2)} d\xi \\ &\leq C \ln \left(2 + |x - y|/\sqrt{t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with (2.10) and (2.11) implies

$$(2.12) \quad |u(t, x) - u(t, y)| \leq C t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[\ln \left(2 + |x - y|/\sqrt{t} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, by (2.12), $x_t \in B(0, R(t))$, $|u(t, x_t)| \leq C_1$ and $R(t) = R_0 + 2t\|\sqrt{\rho_0}u_0\|_{L^2}/\sqrt{c_0}$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t, x)| &\leq |u(t, x_t)| + |u(t, x) - u(t, x_t)| \leq C + Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\ln(2 + t^{-1} + |x| + R(t))]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C + Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\ln(t + |x| + t^{-1})]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$|\sqrt{t}u(t, x)| \leq C\sqrt{t} + C[\ln(t + |x| + t^{-1})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C[t + \ln(|x| + t + t^{-1})]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\sqrt{\rho_0}u_0\|_{L^2}$ such that*

$$(2.13) \quad \|t^{1/2}\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))} \leq C.$$

Proof. Following the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [21], we have

$$(2.14) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{1/2}\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^{1/2} + C\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant. Then by Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty t\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt &\leq C \int_0^\infty t(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2) dt \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}\|t\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)} + C\|\sqrt{t\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

3. A PRIORI ESTIMATES IN THE 3-D CASE

In this section, we establish the estimates that are needed to prove Theorem 1.2. Let (ρ, u) be a smooth solution to the system (1.1) on $[0, T_*) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\rho_* < \rho \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ for some constant $\rho_* > 0$ (recalling footnote 3) and $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, where $T_* \in (0, +\infty]$ is the maximal time of existence.

Lemma 3.1 (Estimates on the linear system). *Assume that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^4(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq 1$. Then the following linear system for $(v, \nabla \pi)$*

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \rho(\partial_t v + u \cdot \nabla v) - \Delta v + \nabla \pi = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ v|_{t=0} = v_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution $v \in C([0, T_]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ on $[0, T_*) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ with the following estimates*

$$(3.2) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T_*)} \|\sqrt{\rho}v(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T_*)} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\sqrt{\rho}\partial_t v\|_{L^2(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

$$(3.4) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T_*)} \|\sqrt{t}\nabla v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\sqrt{t\rho}\partial_t v\|_{L^2(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

$$(3.5) \quad \|t^{-\alpha}\nabla v\|_{L^2(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C_\alpha\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1-2\alpha}\|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{2\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1/2),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, and $C_\alpha > 0$ depends only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.

Proof. Taking L^2 inner product of the momentum equation of (3.1) with v and using the transport equation of (1.1), one can show (3.2) along the same way as the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [39].

Taking L^2 inner product of the momentum equation of (3.1) with $\partial_t v$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(u \cdot \nabla v) \cdot \partial_t v(t, x) \, dx \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2} \|u(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^3} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} \\
(3.6) \quad &\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla^2 v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the Stokes estimate implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2 v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \pi(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|u \cdot \nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C (\|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|u(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^3}) \\
&\leq C \left(\|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla^2 v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality, we have

$$\|\nabla^2 v(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T_*].$$

Thus, (3.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} \left(\|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right) \\
&= C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^4 \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Young's inequality. Hence, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^4 \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_*].$$

Then it follows from Grönwall's inequality that

$$\|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq \exp \left(C \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4 \, ds \right) \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_*],$$

which gives (3.3).

Multiplying both sides of (3.7) by t , we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} (t \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + t \|\sqrt{\rho} \partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + Ct \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^4 \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_*].$$

Then it follows from Grönwall's inequality and (3.2) that

$$t \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\sqrt{s\rho} \partial_t v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq \exp \left(C \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^2)}^4 \right) \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^2 \leq C \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2$$

for $t \in [0, T_*)$, which proves (3.4).

Finally, we prove (3.5). It suffices to show that

$$(3.8) \quad \int_0^t s^{-2\alpha} \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq C_\alpha \|v_0\|_{L^2}^{2-4\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^{4\alpha}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_*].$$

Let $t_0 := \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^{-2}$. If $0 \leq t \leq t_0$, then we get by (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t s^{-2\alpha} \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds &\leq C \int_0^t s^{-2\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq C_\alpha t^{1-2\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C_\alpha t_0^{1-2\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 = C_\alpha \|v_0\|_{L^2}^{2-4\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^{4\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

If $t \geq t_0$, then by (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t s^{-2\alpha} \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds &\leq C \int_0^{t_0} s^{-2\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 ds + t_0^{-2\alpha} \int_{t_0}^t \|\nabla v(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C_\alpha t_0^{1-2\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 + C t_0^{-2\alpha} \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 = (C + C_\alpha) \|v_0\|_{L^2}^{2-4\alpha} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^{4\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.8), and thus completes the proof of (3.5). \square

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a constant $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ such that if $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then we have*

$$(3.9) \quad \|t^{1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|t^{-1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^2(0, T_*; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. We denote

$$(3.10) \quad T^* := \sup\{t \in (0, T_*) : \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(0, t; L^2)} \leq 1\}.$$

Then we prove (3.9) on $(0, T^*)$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we consider the following coupled system⁴ of $(u_j, \nabla P_j)$:

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} \rho(\partial_t u_j + u \cdot \nabla u_j) - \Delta u_j + \nabla P_j = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u_j = 0, \\ u_j|_{t=0} = \Delta_j u_0. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows from the uniqueness of local smooth solution to (1.1) that

$$(3.12) \quad u = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} u_j, \quad \nabla P = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \nabla P_j.$$

By Lemma 3.1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty(0, T^*; L^2)} &\leq C \|\nabla \Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2} \leq C 2^{j/2} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}, \\ \|\sqrt{t} \nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty(0, T^*; L^2)} &\leq C \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2} \leq C 2^{-j/2} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $t \in [0, T^*)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{t} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sqrt{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx = \sum_{j, k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sqrt{t} \nabla u_j(t, x) \cdot \nabla u_k(t, x) dx \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} \sqrt{t} \|\nabla u_k(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_j(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-k/2} c_k \sum_{j \leq k} 2^{j/2} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k \left(\sum_{j \leq k} 2^{(j-k)/2} c_j \right) \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

⁴In the proof of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we use the same notations as in [39]. In particular, the definition of Δ_j can be found in Appendix A of [39], and (c_j) denotes a generic element of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $c_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} c_j^2 = 1$. Similarly for (\tilde{c}_k) and (\tilde{c}'_k) .

$$\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k \tilde{c}_k \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2.$$

This shows that

$$(3.13) \quad \|t^{1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^\infty(0, T^*; L^2)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}.$$

Taking $\varepsilon = 1/8 \in (0, 1/4)$, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|t^{-(1/2-\varepsilon)} \nabla u_j\|_{L^2(0, T^*; L^2)} &\leq C \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2}^{2\varepsilon} \|\nabla \Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2}^{1-2\varepsilon} \leq C 2^{j(1/2-2\varepsilon)} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}, \\ \|t^{-\varepsilon} \nabla u_j\|_{L^2(0, T^*; L^2)} &\leq C \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2}^{1-2\varepsilon} \|\nabla \Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2}^{2\varepsilon} \leq C 2^{j(2\varepsilon-1/2)} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T^*} t^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx dt &\leq \sum_{j, k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^{T^*} t^{-1/2} \|\nabla u_j(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_k(t)\|_{L^2} dt \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} \int_0^{T^*} \|t^{-(1/2-\varepsilon)} \nabla u_j(t)\|_{L^2} \|t^{-\varepsilon} \nabla u_k(t)\|_{L^2} dt \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{k(2\varepsilon-1/2)} c_k \sum_{j \leq k} 2^{j(1/2-2\varepsilon)} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-|k-j|(1/2-2\varepsilon)} c_j \right) \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k \tilde{c}'_k \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(3.14) \quad \|t^{-1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^2(0, T^*; L^2)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}.$$

It follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$(3.15) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(0, T^*; L^2)} \leq C^* \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}$$

for some constant $C^* > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$. Now we take $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{1/(2C^*), 1/2\} \in (0, 1)$. Thus, if $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0$, then by (3.10), (3.15) and a continuity argument, we have $T^* = T_*$, and hence (3.9) follows from (3.13) and (3.14). \square

Remark 3.1. By Lemma 3.2, if $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0$, then $\|t^{1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^\infty(0, T^*; L^2)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}$, hence we deduce from the classical theory of inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations that $T_* = +\infty$, i.e., the smooth solution (ρ, u) to (1.1) is globally defined. As a consequence, in this subsection, we have $T_* = +\infty$ and

$$(3.16) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)} < 1.$$

Lemma 3.3 (Critical estimates). *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then we have*

$$(3.17) \quad \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. Consider the system (3.11) for $(u_j, \nabla P_j)$, then we have (3.12). Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sqrt{\rho}u_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} &\leq C\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2} \leq C2^{-j/2}c_j\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}, \\ \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} &\leq C\|\nabla\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2} \leq C2^{j/2}c_j\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|\sqrt{\rho}u_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^6)} \leq C\|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} \leq C2^{j/2}c_j\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

As a consequence, there holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sqrt{\rho}u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 &= \|\rho|u|^2(t)\|_{L^{3/2}} \leq \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\rho|u_i u_j|(t)\|_{L^{3/2}} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq i} \|\sqrt{\rho}u_i(t)\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho}u_j(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq i} 2^{-i/2} c_i 2^{j/2} c_j \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} c_i \left(\sum_{j \leq i} 2^{-(i-j)/2} c_j \right) \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \leq C \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} c_i \tilde{c}_i \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (3.17). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then*

$$(3.18) \quad \|t^{1/4}\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|t^{1/4}(\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}, \nabla^2 u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. Taking L^2 inner product of the momentum equation of (1.1) with \dot{u} , we obtain⁵

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \langle \nabla u(t), \nabla \dot{u}(t) \rangle_{L^2} + \langle \nabla P(t), \dot{u}(t) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_i u^j \partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_j u^k \partial_k u^j \, dx.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq (\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^6} + \|P(t)\|_{L^6}) \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla P(t)\|_{L^2}) \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2}, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).\end{aligned}$$

Recall the Stokes estimate

$$(3.19) \quad \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla P(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\rho\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \\ &\leq C\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).\end{aligned}$$

Or equivalently, $\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6$, hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(t^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + t^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} t^{-1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C t^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6$$

⁵Repeated indices represent summation.

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Now it follows from Grönwall's lemma that

$$(3.20) \quad \sqrt{t} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \sqrt{s} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(C \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^2)}^4\right) \|s^{-1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^2.$$

By (3.16), (3.9), (3.20) and (3.19), we deduce (3.18). \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then*

$$(3.21) \quad \|t^{3/4} \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|t^{3/4} \nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. Applying the material derivative D_t to the momentum equation of (1.1), we get

$$\rho(\partial_t \dot{u} + u \cdot \nabla \dot{u}) - \Delta \dot{u} = -\partial_k(\partial_k u \cdot \nabla u) - \partial_k u \cdot \nabla \partial_k u - (\nabla P_t + u \cdot \nabla(\nabla P)).$$

Taking L^2 inner product with \dot{u} of the above equation, we get by integration by parts and $\operatorname{div} u = 0$ that

$$(3.22) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_k u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot \partial_k \dot{u} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_k u \cdot (\partial_k u \cdot \nabla \dot{u}) dx + J,$$

where

$$J(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\nabla P_t + u \cdot \nabla(\nabla P)) \cdot \dot{u} dx, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).$$

Along the same lines as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [21], we have⁶

$$(3.23) \quad J(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j u^i dx - 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j \dot{u}^i dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j \partial_j \dot{u}^i dx.$$

for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Let

$$(3.24) \quad \Psi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j \dot{u}^i dx, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Psi'(t) + \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_k u \cdot \nabla u) \cdot \partial_k \dot{u} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_k u \cdot (\partial_k u \cdot \nabla \dot{u}) dx \\ &\quad - 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j \dot{u}^i dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j \partial_j \dot{u}^i dx \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} + C \|P(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C \|P(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \|(\nabla^2 u(t), \nabla P(t))\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|(\nabla^2 u(t), \nabla P(t))\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(3.19)}{\leq} C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

hence,

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi'(t) + \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \\ (t^{3/2} \Psi)'(t) + t^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \frac{3}{2} t^{1/2} \Psi(t) + C t^{3/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$.

⁶Here we stress that $\partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j \partial_j u^i = 0$ holds for $d = 2$, but not for $d = 3$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P \partial_i u^j \partial_j u^i \, dx \right| &\leq \|P(t)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla P(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \stackrel{(3.19)}{\leq} C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6, \end{aligned}$$

thus,

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6 \leq \Psi(t) \leq 2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).$$

It follows from (3.25) and (3.26) that

$$\begin{aligned} (t^{3/2} \Psi)'(t) + t^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C t^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C t^{1/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6 + C t^{3/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} t^{3/2} \Psi(t) + \int_0^t s^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \\ \leq C \int_0^t s^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \left(1 + \sup_{0 < s < t} s \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^3}^2 \right) + C \int_0^t s^{1/2} \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^6 \, ds \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Moreover, it follows from (3.18), (3.9) and (3.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t s^{1/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds + \int_0^t s^{1/2} \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2}^6 \, ds \\ \leq C \|t^{1/4} \sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 + C \|t^{1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^4 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2; \end{aligned}$$

and we also have (for all $s > 0$, also using (3.9) and (3.19))

$$s \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^3}^2 \leq C s^{1/4} \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^2} s^{3/4} \|\nabla^2 u(s)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} s^{3/4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus, (3.27) implies that (for all $t > 0$, also using $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0 < 1$)

$$(3.28) \quad t^{3/2} \Psi(t) + \int_0^t s^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 (1 + A(t)),$$

where $A(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{0 < s < t} s^{3/4} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}$. Thus using (3.26), (3.28) and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} t^{3/2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t s^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds &\leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 (1 + A(t)) + C t^{3/2} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^6 \\ &\leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 (1 + A(t)) + C \|t^{1/4} \nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^6 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 (1 + A(t)) + C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^6, \\ A(t)^2 + \int_0^t s^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds &\leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 (1 + A(t)) + C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^6, \\ A(t)^2 + \int_0^t s^{3/2} \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds &\leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2 + C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^4 + C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^6 \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.6 (Estimates for u_t). *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0$, then*

$$(3.29) \quad \|t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} + \|t^{3/4}\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} + \|t^{3/4}\nabla u_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. Using the inequality $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\|\nabla f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/2}\|\nabla f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\rho}u \cdot \nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|u(t)\|_{L^6}\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3} \leq C\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}; \\ \|\nabla(u \cdot \nabla u)(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^3}\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^6} + \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.9), (3.18), (3.19) and (3.21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\sqrt{\rho}u \cdot \nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^3\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} dt \\ &\leq C\|t^{1/4}\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)}^2\|t^{-1/4}\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)}\|t^{1/4}\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^4; \\ t^{\frac{3}{4}}\|\sqrt{\rho}u \cdot \nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq Ct^{\frac{3}{4}}\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}}\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\|t^{\frac{1}{4}}\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}}\|t^{\frac{3}{4}}\sqrt{\rho}u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2; \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} t^{3/2}\|\nabla(u \cdot \nabla u)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} t^{3/2}\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^3 dt \\ &\leq \|t^{1/4}\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)}\|t^{3/4}\sqrt{\rho}u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} t^{1/2}\|\sqrt{\rho}u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.29) follows from (3.18), (3.21) and $u_t = \dot{u} - u \cdot \nabla u$. \square

Corollary 3.7 (Estimates for $\sqrt{\rho_0}u_t$). *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then*

$$(3.30) \quad \|t^{1/4}\sqrt{\rho_0}u_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. By the density equation of (1.1) and (3.17), we get

$$(3.31) \quad \|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \leq \int_0^t \|\rho u(s)\|_{L^3} ds \leq t\|\rho u\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^3)} \leq Ct\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}.$$

Note that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho_0|u_t|^2 dx dt = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho(t)|u_t|^2 dx dt - \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} t^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho(t) - \rho_0)|u_t|^2 dx dt.$$

By duality and (3.31), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\rho(t) - \rho_0)|u_t|^2 dx \right| &\leq \|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}}\| |u_t|^2 \|_{\dot{W}^{1,\frac{3}{2}}} \leq 2\|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\|u_t\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq Ct\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.30) follows from (3.29). \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. If $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \varepsilon_0$, then*

$$(3.32) \quad \|t^{1/2}\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \leq C\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$.

Proof. Applying the Stokes estimate to $-\Delta u + \nabla P = -\rho \dot{u}$ gives

$$(3.33) \quad \|\nabla^2 u(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho} \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\nabla \dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

By the inequality $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/2} \|\nabla f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/2}$ and (3.33), for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t s \|\nabla u(s)\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds &\leq C \int_0^t s \|\nabla^2 u(s)\|_{L^6} \|\nabla^2 u(s)\|_{L^2} ds \leq C \int_0^t s \|\nabla \dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla^2 u(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq \|s^{1/4} \nabla^2 u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)} \|s^{3/4} \nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)} \leq C \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.18) and (3.21). \square

4. PROOF OF GLOBAL EXISTENCE

This section is devoted to proving the existence of a global solution to (1.1) under our assumptions (both in dimension $d = 2$ and $d = 3$).

Proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.1. Let $d = 2$, $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We consider (where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$)

$$u_0^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{with} \quad \operatorname{div} u_0^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon \leq \rho_0^\varepsilon \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}$$

such that

$$u_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0 \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad \rho_0^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \rho_0 \text{ in } L^\infty \text{ weak-}^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho_0 \text{ in } L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ if } p < \infty,$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$. In light of the classical strong solution theory for the system (1.1), there exists a unique global smooth solution $(\rho^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, P^\varepsilon)$ corresponding to data $(\rho_0^\varepsilon, u_0^\varepsilon)$. Thus, the triple $(\rho^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, P^\varepsilon)$ satisfies all the a priori estimates of this subsections uniformly with respect to $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Hence, $(\rho^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)$ converges weakly (or weakly-*) to a limit (ρ, u) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$, up to subsequence. To show that the limit solves (1.1) weakly, in view of standard compactness arguments, it suffices to prove that

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \int_0^t \langle \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon(s) - \rho u \otimes u(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle ds = 0 \quad \forall t > 0$$

for any divergence-free function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2)$. We fix $t > 0$. Let $\eta > 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle| &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}^2 \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C, \\ |\langle \rho u \otimes u(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle| &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho} u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}^2 \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $s > 0$, where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|\sqrt{\rho_0} u_0\|_{L^2}$; taking $\delta_0 := \min\{t/2, \eta/(4C)\} > 0$, we have

$$\int_0^{\delta_0} |\langle \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon(s) - \rho u \otimes u(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle| ds < \frac{\eta}{2}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

To prove (4.1), it suffices to show that

$$(4.2) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \int_{\delta_0}^t \langle \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon(s) - \rho u \otimes u(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle ds = 0.$$

Indeed, assuming that $\operatorname{supp}_x \varphi(s) \subset B(0, R)$ for all $s \in [\delta_0, t]$, on one hand, by the weak convergence of ρ^ε to ρ in $L^2([0, T] \times B_R)$ (up to subsequence) and Lemma 2.2 (and the compact support property of φ), we have

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \int_{\delta_0}^t \langle (\rho^\varepsilon - \rho) u \otimes u(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle ds = 0.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 (and Lemma 2.2, Lemma A.2 of [21], by adjusting $R > 0$ to be larger is necessary) we know that u^ε is uniformly bounded in $H^1([\delta_0, t] \times B_R)$ (for fixed $\delta_0 \in (0, t)$), hence the compact embedding $H^1([\delta_0, t] \times B_R) \subset\subset L^2([\delta_0, t] \times B_R)$ implies $u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ in $L^2([\delta_0, t] \times B_R)$ up to subsequence, thus $u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u \otimes u$ in $L^1([\delta_0, t] \times B_R)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$, which along with the uniform boundedness of ρ^ε in L^∞ implies that

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \int_{\delta_0}^t |\langle \rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon - u \otimes u)(s), \nabla \varphi \rangle| ds = 0.$$

Now (4.2) follows from (4.3) and (4.4). \square

Proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.2. Let $d = 3$. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given by Lemma 3.2. Assume that $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0$ and $0 \leq \rho_0 \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ for some constant $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} > 0$ with $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$. We are going to show that there exists a global weak solution $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ to (1.1) with initial data (ρ_0, u_0) . The idea is to take advantage of classical result to construct smooth solutions corresponding to smoothed-out approximate data with no vacuum, then to pass to the limit. More precisely, for $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, we consider

$$u_0^\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{with} \quad \text{div} u_0^\delta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0^\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{with} \quad \delta \leq \rho_0^\delta \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$$

such that

$$u_0^\delta \rightarrow u_0 \text{ in } \dot{H}^{1/2}, \quad \|u_0^\delta\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0, \quad \rho_0^\delta \rightharpoonup \rho_0 \text{ in } L^\infty \text{ weak-}^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0^\delta \rightarrow \rho_0 \text{ in } L_{\text{loc}}^p \text{ if } p < \infty,$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0+$. By the classical theory of (INS), for each $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, (1.1) has a unique local smooth solution (ρ^δ, u^δ) on $[0, T_*^\delta)$ with initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta)$. We also have (3.9) for (ρ^δ, u^δ) . Thus, $\|u_0^\delta\|_{\dot{H}^{1/2}} < \varepsilon_0$ and Remark 3.1 implies that $T_*^\delta = +\infty$, i.e., (ρ^δ, u^δ) is a global smooth solution. Moreover, we have (3.18), (3.21) for (ρ^δ, u^δ) . Here we recall that the constants in (3.9), (3.18), (3.21), (3.29) and (3.32) depend only on $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, so these inequalities are uniform in $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. As a consequence, a standard compactness argument (see [35]) combining with an argument similar to the 2-D case (here we use L^6 for $d = 3$ instead of L^∞ for $d = 2$ above) implies the convergence of (ρ^δ, u^δ) to a weak solution (ρ, u) of (1.1) with initial data (ρ_0, u_0) . This completes the proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.2. \square

5. PROOF OF THE UNIQUENESS

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3, and to show that it implies the uniqueness part of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

5.1. Preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix $t > 0$. Assume that $\bar{u} = \bar{u}(s, x) : (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $s^{1/2} \nabla \bar{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Let $p \in (1, +\infty)$ and $\varphi(x) \in \dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there is a unique solution $\phi = \phi(s, x) : (0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to*

$$(5.1) \quad \partial_s \phi + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0, \quad (s, x) \in (0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \phi(t, x) = \varphi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

such that

$$(5.2) \quad \|\nabla \phi(s)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}} \quad \forall s \in (0, t],$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|s^{1/2} \nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))}$.

Proof. The classical theory on transport equations ([8], Theorem 3.2) implies the existence and uniqueness of the solution ϕ , with the estimate

$$\|\nabla\phi(s)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \exp\left(\int_s^t \|\nabla\bar{u}(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} d\tau\right), \quad \forall s \in (0, t]$$

for some constant $C > 0$. By $\tau^{1/2}\nabla\bar{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t \|\nabla\bar{u}(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} d\tau &= \int_s^t \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \tau^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla\bar{u}(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} d\tau \leq |\ln(t/s)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla\bar{u}(\tau)\|_{L^2(0,t;L^\infty)} \\ &\leq C|\ln(t/s)|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $T > 0$ and $f : (0, T] \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be such that $f \in L^4(0, T)$. Let $A > 0$ and*

$$(5.3) \quad F(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) e^{A|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}} ds \quad \forall t \in (0, T].$$

Then we have $F \in L^4(0, T)$ with

$$(5.4) \quad \|F\|_{L^4(0,T)} \leq C_A \|f\|_{L^4(0,T)},$$

where $C_A > 0$ is a constant depending only on A .

Proof. By (5.3), we have

$$F(t) = \int_0^1 f(\tau t) e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau, \quad \forall t \in (0, T].$$

Hence

$$\|F\|_{L^4(0,T)} \leq \int_0^1 \|f(\tau \cdot)\|_{L^4(0,T)} e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau = \int_0^1 \|f\|_{L^4(0,T)} \tau^{-1/4} e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau.$$

Note that there exists $\tau_0 = \tau_0(A) \in (0, 1)$ such that $A|\ln(1/\tau)|^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2}|\ln(1/\tau)|$ for $\tau \in (0, \tau_0)$, then

$$\int_0^{\tau_0} \tau^{-1/4} e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau \leq \int_0^{\tau_0} \tau^{-1/4} e^{\ln(\tau^{-1/2})} d\tau = \int_0^{\tau_0} \tau^{-3/4} d\tau = 4\tau_0^{1/4},$$

thus

$$\int_0^1 \tau^{-1/4} e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau \leq 4\tau_0^{1/4} + \int_{\tau_0}^1 \tau^{-1/4} e^{A|\ln \tau|^{1/2}} d\tau = C_A.$$

This completes the proof. \square

5.2. Uniqueness in the 2-D case of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $d = 2$. Assume that $0 < \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ has a positive lower bound and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ and $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \nabla \bar{P})$ be two weak solutions to (1.1) with the same initial data (ρ_0, u_0) and satisfies all the hypotheses listed in Theorem 1.3. We denote $\delta\rho = \rho - \bar{\rho}$ and $\delta u = u - \bar{u}$. Then $(\delta\rho, \delta u)$ satisfies

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \delta\rho + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \delta\rho + \delta u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \rho(\partial_t \delta u + u \cdot \nabla \delta u) - \Delta \delta u + \nabla \delta P = -\delta\rho \bar{u} - \rho \delta u \cdot \nabla \bar{u}, \\ \operatorname{div} \delta u = 0, \\ (\delta\rho, \delta u)|_{t=0} = (0, 0). \end{cases}$$

Here $\dot{\bar{u}} := \partial_t \bar{u} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \bar{u}$. Let $T_1 \in (0, T)$ be small enough. For all $t \in (0, T_1]$, we set

$$(5.6) \quad D(t) := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\nabla \delta u\|_{L^2(0, t; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}.$$

Testing (5.5) against δu gives

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = -\mathbf{I}(t) - \mathbf{II}(t) \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1],$$

where

$$\mathbf{I}(t) := \langle \delta \rho(t), \dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u(t) \rangle, \quad \mathbf{II}(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\rho \delta u \cdot \nabla \bar{u}) \cdot \delta u(t, x) dx, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

Since (thanks to the positive lower bound of ρ)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{II}(t)| &\leq \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(t)\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \delta u(t)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2|\mathbf{I}(t)| + C \|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

It follows from Grönwall's lemma and $\nabla \bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))$ that

$$\|\sqrt{\rho} \delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \delta u\|_{L^2(0, t; L^2)}^2 \leq C_* \int_0^t |\mathbf{I}(s)| ds, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1],$$

where $C_* > 0$ depends only on $\|\nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}$ and $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$. Thus,

$$(5.8) \quad D(t)^2 \leq C_* \int_0^t |\mathbf{I}(s)| ds, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

For any fixed $t \in (0, T_1]$, by Lemma 5.1, there exists a unique $\phi(s, x; t)$ solving

$$\partial_s \phi(s, x; t) + \bar{u}(s, x) \cdot \nabla \phi(s, x; t) = 0, \quad (s, x) \in (0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \phi(t, x; t) = (\dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u)(t, x)$$

with the estimate

$$(5.9) \quad \|\nabla \phi(s, \cdot; t)\|_{L^{4/3}} \leq C \|\nabla(\dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u)(t)\|_{L^{4/3}} e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}}, \quad \forall s \in (0, t].$$

Using the first equation of (5.5) and integration by parts, we have

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \langle \delta \rho(s), \phi(s, \cdot; t) \rangle &= \langle -\operatorname{div}\{\delta \rho \bar{u}\}, \phi \rangle - \langle \operatorname{div}\{\rho \delta u\}, \phi \rangle - \langle \delta \rho, \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho \delta u, \nabla \phi(s, \cdot; t) \rangle, \quad \forall s \in (0, t] \end{aligned}$$

then integrating over $(0, t)$, by (5.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{I}(t)| &= |\langle \delta \rho(t), \phi(t, \cdot; t) \rangle| \leq \int_0^t |\langle \rho \delta u(s), \nabla \phi(s, \cdot; t) \rangle| ds \leq \int_0^t \|\rho \delta u(s)\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \phi(s, \cdot; t)\|_{L^{4/3}} ds \\ &\leq \|\nabla(\dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u)(t)\|_{L^{4/3}} \int_0^t \|\rho \delta u(s)\|_{L^4} e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}} ds \\ &= \|t \nabla(\dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u)(t)\|_{L^{4/3}} \cdot \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \|\rho \delta u(s)\|_{L^4} e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}} ds =: \|t \nabla(\dot{\bar{u}} \cdot \delta u)(t)\|_{L^{4/3}} \cdot F(t) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_1]$. Lemma 5.2 implies that

$$(5.11) \quad \|F\|_{L^4(0, t)} \leq C \|\rho \delta u\|_{L^4} \|F\|_{L^4(0, t)} = C \|\rho \delta u\|_{L^4(0, t; L^4)}, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

Hence by Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$(5.12) \quad \int_0^t |I(s)| ds \leq \|s\nabla(\dot{u} \cdot \delta u)\|_{L^{4/3}(0,t;L^{4/3})} \|\rho \delta u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^4)}, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

Moreover, by Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embedding we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s\nabla(\dot{u} \cdot \delta u)\|_{L^{4/3}(0,t;L^{4/3})} &= \|s(\nabla\dot{u} \cdot \delta u + \dot{u} \cdot \nabla\delta u)\|_{L^{4/3}(0,t;L^{4/3})} \\ &\leq \|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)} \|\delta u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^4)} + \|s\dot{u}\|_{L^4(0,t;L^4)} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

and (since $\rho(t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded away from zero)

$$\|\delta u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^4)} \leq C \left\| \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \right\|_{L^4(0,t)} \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2} \leq CD(t)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_1]$, then we get (using the fact that $\rho(t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is bounded away from zero)

$$\begin{aligned} \|s\nabla(\dot{u} \cdot \delta u)\|_{L^{4/3}(0,t;L^{4/3})} &\leq CD(t) (\|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)} + \|s\dot{u}\|_{L^4(0,t;L^4)}) \\ &\leq CD(t) \left(\|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)} + \|s\dot{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2} \|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_1]$. Thus, (5.12) implies that

$$(5.13) \quad \int_0^t |I(s)| ds \leq CD(t)^2 \|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2}, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1]$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of t and T_1 . Combining (5.8) and (5.13), we obtain

$$(5.14) \quad D(t)^2 \leq CD(t)^2 \|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^{1/2}, \quad \forall t \in (0, T_1].$$

As $t\nabla\dot{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2)$, we can take $T_1 > 0$ small enough such that

$$C \|s\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,T_1;L^2)}^{1/2} < 1/2,$$

then (5.14) implies $0 \leq D(t)^2 \leq D(t)^2/2$ for all $t \in (0, T_1]$, hence $D(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \in (0, T_1]$. Therefore, we have $\delta u \equiv 0$ on $[0, T_1]$. Then by the first equation of (5.5), we get $\delta\rho \equiv 0$ on $[0, T_1]$. This proves the uniqueness on $[0, T_1]$. The uniqueness on the whole time interval $[0, +\infty)$ can be obtained by a bootstrap argument. \square

5.3. Uniqueness in the 3-D case of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $d = 3$. Assume that $0 \leq \rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Let $(\rho, u, \nabla P)$ and $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, \nabla \bar{P})$ be two weak solutions to (1.1) with the same initial data (ρ_0, u_0) and satisfies all the hypotheses listed in Theorem 1.3. We denote $\delta\rho := \rho - \bar{\rho}$ and $\delta u := u - \bar{u}$. Then $(\delta\rho, \delta u)$ satisfies (5.5). Let $T > 0$. For all $t \in (0, T]$, set

$$(5.15) \quad X(t) := \sup_{s \in (0,t]} s^{-\frac{3}{4}} \|\delta\rho(s)\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

$$(5.16) \quad Y(t) := \left(\sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u(s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

For $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, by Lemma 5.1, there exists a unique $\phi(s, x)$ solving

$$\partial_s \phi + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0, \quad (s, x) \in (0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \phi(t, x) = \varphi(x),$$

with the estimate

$$(5.17) \quad \|\nabla\phi(s)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \leq C \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}}, \quad \forall s \in (0, t].$$

Note that

$$(5.18) \quad \int_0^t e^{C|\ln(t/s)|^{1/2}} ds = t \int_0^1 e^{C|\ln(\tau)|^{1/2}} d\tau \leq Ct \int_0^1 \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\tau \leq Ct.$$

Similarly with (5.10), we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} \langle \delta\rho(s), \phi(s) \rangle = \langle -\operatorname{div}\{\delta\rho\bar{u}\}, \phi \rangle - \langle \operatorname{div}\{\rho\delta u\}, \phi \rangle - \langle \delta\rho, \bar{u} \cdot \nabla\phi \rangle = \langle \rho\delta u, \nabla\phi \rangle.$$

Integrating over $(0, t)$, and using (5.17) and (5.18) yield that

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \delta\rho(t), \phi(t) \rangle| &\leq \int_0^t |\langle \rho\delta u, \nabla\phi \rangle| ds \leq \int_0^t \|\rho\delta u(s)\|_{L^3} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} ds \\ &\leq Ct^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|\rho\delta u\|_{L^4(0,t;L^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embedding, we have

$$\int_0^t \|\rho\delta u\|_{L^3}^4 ds \leq \int_0^t \|\rho\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\rho\delta u\|_{L^6}^2 ds \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2)}^2 \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)}^2,$$

then it follows from (5.15), (5.16) and (5.19) that

$$(5.20) \quad X(t) \leq CY(t), \quad \forall t \in (0, T].$$

Next, testing (5.5) against δu gives

$$(5.21) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \delta\rho\dot{u} \cdot \delta u dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\rho\delta u \cdot \nabla\bar{u}) \cdot \delta u dx.$$

By Hölder's inequality and Sobolev embedding, we have

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\rho\delta u \cdot \nabla\bar{u}) \cdot \delta u dx \right| &\leq \|\rho\delta u\|_{L^3} \|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2} \|\delta u\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2}^4; \end{aligned}$$

By duality, Sobolev embedding and Young's inequality, we have

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \delta\rho\dot{u} \cdot \delta u dx \right| &\leq \|\delta\rho\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \|\dot{u}\|_{\dot{W}^{1,3/2}} \|\delta u\|_{L^6} \\ &\leq \|\delta\rho\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} (\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} \|\delta u\|_{L^6} + \|\dot{u}\|_{L^6} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}) \leq C \|\delta\rho\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + Ct^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\delta\rho\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}}^2 \cdot t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + CX^2(t)t^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence plugging (5.22) and (5.23) into (5.21) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla\bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^4 + CX^2(t)t^{3/2} \|\nabla\dot{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Grönwall's lemma, $\nabla\bar{u} \in L^4(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $t^{3/4}\nabla\dot{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\rho}\delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla\delta u(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds &\leq C \exp\left(\int_0^t \|\nabla\bar{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^4 ds\right) \int_0^t X^2(s)s^{3/2} \|\nabla\dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t X^2(s)\gamma(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq \gamma(s) := s^{3/2} \|\nabla\dot{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \in L^1(0, T)$. Thus,

$$(5.24) \quad Y^2(t) \leq C \int_0^t X^2(s)\gamma(s) ds.$$

It follows from (5.20) and (5.24) that $X^2(t) \leq C \int_0^t X^2(s) \gamma(s) ds$, hence by Grönwall's lemma we have $X(t) \equiv 0$, then by (5.24) we know that $Y(t) \equiv 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

5.4. Proof of the uniqueness part of Theorem 1.2. Let $d = 3$. Let (ρ, u) and $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$ be two solutions to (1.1) satisfying all the properties listed in Theorem 1.2 with the same initial data (ρ_0, u_0) . To prove $(\rho, u) = (\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$, it suffices to check that Theorem 1.3 is applicable. Denote $\delta\rho := \rho - \bar{\rho}$ and $\delta u := u - \bar{u}$. Let $T > 0$.

Firstly, by (3.31) we know that

$$\|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} + \|\bar{\rho}(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \leq Ct \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

thus $t^{-\frac{3}{4}} \delta\rho$ belongs to $L^\infty(0, T; \dot{W}^{-1,3}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Next we show that δu is in the energy space. Note that

$$(5.25) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(t, x) |u(t, x) - \bar{u}(t, x)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_0(x) |u(t, x) - \bar{u}(t, x)|^2 dx \\ + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\rho(t, x) - \rho_0(x)) |u(t, x) - \bar{u}(t, x)|^2 dx.$$

By (3.30), we have

$$(5.26) \quad \|\sqrt{\rho_0}(u(t) - u_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \int_0^t \|\sqrt{\rho_0} u_t(s)\|_{L^2} ds = \int_0^t s^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|s^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\rho_0} u_t(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\ \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{4}} \|s^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\rho_0} u_t\|_{L^2(0,t;L^2)} \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{4}} \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

and the same inequality holds for \bar{u} . On the other hand, by duality, Sobolev embedding, (3.31) and (3.18), we have

$$(5.27) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\rho(t) - \rho_0) |u(t) - \bar{u}(t)|^2 dx \right| \leq \|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \|\nabla(|u(t) - \bar{u}(t)|^2)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ \leq 2 \|\rho(t) - \rho_0\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,3}} \|\nabla u(t) - \nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2} \|u(t) - \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^6} \\ \leq Ct \|\nabla u(t) - \nabla \bar{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|t^{1/4} (\nabla u, \nabla \bar{u})\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2)}^2 \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^3.$$

Plugging (5.26) and (5.27) into (5.25) gives that $\sqrt{\rho}(u - \bar{u}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$. By (3.16), we have $(\nabla u, \nabla \bar{u}) \in L^4(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \subset L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$. From this, we eventually conclude that $\sqrt{\rho} \delta u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $\nabla \delta u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Finally, by Theorem 1.2, we have $t^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \bar{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $t^{\frac{3}{4}} \nabla \dot{\bar{u}} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Hence, all the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied by the solutions (ρ, u) and $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u})$ constructed in Theorem 1.2, which are thus equal to each other.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

D. Wei is partially supported by the National Key R&D Program of China under the grant 2021YFA1001500. Z. Zhang is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 12288101.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abidi, Équation de Navier-Stokes avec densité et viscosité variables dans l'espace critique. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, **23** (2007), 537–586.
- [2] H. Abidi and G. Gui, Global well-posedness for the 2-D inhomogeneous incompressible Navier-Stokes system with large initial data in critical spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **242** (2021), 1533–1570.
- [3] H. Abidi, G. Gui and P. Zhang, On the wellposedness of three-dimensional inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations in the critical spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **204** (2012), 189–230.
- [4] H. Abidi, G. Gui and P. Zhang, Well-posedness of 3-D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations with highly oscillatory initial velocity field. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, **100** (2013), 166–203.
- [5] H. Abidi, G. Gui and P. Zhang, On the global existence and uniqueness of solution to 2-D inhomogeneous incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in critical spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, **406** (2024), 126–173.
- [6] H. Abidi and M. Paicu, Existence globale pour un fluide inhomogène. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **57** (2007), 883–917.
- [7] D. Albritton, Dallas, E. Brué and M. Colombo, Non-uniqueness of Leray solutions of the forced Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **196** (2022), 415–455.
- [8] H. Bahouri, J. Y. Chemin and R. Danchin, *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. **343** (2011), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [9] T. Buckmaster and V. Vicol, Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **189** (2019), 101–144.
- [10] J. Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher and E. Grenier. *Mathematical geophysics. An introduction to rotating fluids and the Navier-Stokes equations*. Oxford Lecture Ser. Math. Appl., **32**. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006. xii+250 pp.
- [11] D. Chen, Z. Zhang and W. Zhao, Fujita-Kato theorem for the 3-D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Differential Equations*, **261**(2016), 738–761.
- [12] R. Danchin, Density-dependent incompressible viscous fluids in critical spaces. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, **133** (2003), 1311–1334.
- [13] R. Danchin, Global well-posedness for 2D inhomogeneous viscous flows with rough data via dynamic interpolation. To appear in *Anal. PDE*; arXiv:2404.02541, 2024.
- [14] R. Danchin and P. B. Mucha, A Lagrangian approach for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with variable density. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **65** (2012), 1458–1480.
- [15] R. Danchin and P. B. Mucha, Incompressible flows with piecewise constant density. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **207** (2013), 991–1023.
- [16] R. Danchin and P. B. Mucha, The incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in vacuum. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **72** (2019), 1351–1385.
- [17] R. Danchin and S. Wang, Global unique solutions for the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations with only bounded density in critical regularity spaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **399** (2023), 1647–1688.
- [18] R. Danchin and X. Zhang, On the persistence of Hölder regular patches of density for the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, **4** (2017), 781–811
- [19] H. Fujita and T. Kato, On the Navier-Stokes initial value problem. I. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **16** (1964), 269–315.
- [20] F. Gancedo and E. García-Juárez, Global regularity of 2D density patches for inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **229** (2018), 339–360.
- [21] T. Hao, F. Shao, D. Wei and Z. Zhang, On the density patch problem for the 2-D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations. arXiv:2406.07984, 2024.
- [22] H. Jia and V. Šverák, Are the incompressible 3d Navier-Stokes equations locally ill-posed in the natural energy space?. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **268** (2015), 3734–3766.
- [23] A. V. Kazhikhov, Solvability of the initial-boundary value problem for the equations of the motion of an inhomogeneous viscous incompressible fluid. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **216** (1974), 1008–1010.
- [24] O. A. Ladyženskaja, Solution “in the large” of the nonstationary boundary value problem for the Navier-Stokes system with two space variables. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **12** (1959), 427–433.
- [25] O. A. Ladyženskaja and V. A. Solonnikov, The unique solvability of an initial-boundary value problem for viscous incompressible inhomogeneous fluids. (Russian) Boundary value problems of mathematical physics, and related questions of the theory of functions, 8, *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov.*, **52** (1975), 52–109, 218–219.

- [26] J. Leray, Étude de diverses équations intégrales non linéaires et de quelques problèmes que pose l'hydrodynamique. *J. Math. Pures. Appl. (9)*, **12** (1933), 1-82. PhD Thesis, published also as: Thèses françaises de l'entre-deux-guerres 142 (1933).
- [27] J. Leray, Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. *Acta Math.*, **63** (1934), 193–248.
- [28] J. Leray, Essai sur les mouvements plans d'un fluide visqueux que limitent des parois. *J. Math. Pures. Appl. (9)*, **13** (1934), 331–418.
- [29] X. Liao and P. Zhang, On the global regularity of the two-dimensional density patch for inhomogeneous incompressible viscous flow. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **220** (2016), 937–981.
- [30] X. Liao and P. Zhang, Global regularity of 2D density patches for viscous inhomogeneous incompressible flow with general density: low regularity case. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **72**(2019), 835–884.
- [31] P. L. Lions, *Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 1. Incompressible models*, Oxford Lecture Ser. Math. Appl., **3**. Oxford Sci. Publ. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. xiv+237 pp.
- [32] J. L. Lions and G. Prodi, Un théorème d'existence et unicité dans les équations de Navier-Stokes en dimension 2. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **248** (1959), 3519–3521.
- [33] B. Lü, X. Shi and X. Zhong, Global existence and large time asymptotic behavior of strong solutions to the Cauchy problem of 2D density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum. *Nonlinearity*, **31** (2018), no.6, 2617-2632.
- [34] M. Paicu and P. Zhang, Global solutions to the 3-D incompressible inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes system. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **262** (2012), 3556–3584.
- [35] M. Paicu, P. Zhang and Z. Zhang, Global unique solvability of inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations with bounded density. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **38** (2013), 1208–1234.
- [36] C. Prange and J. Tan, Free boundary regularity of vacuum states for incompressible viscous flows in unbounded domains. arXiv:2310.09288v3, 2023.
- [37] C. Qian, H. Chen and T. Zhang, Global existence of weak solutions for 3D incompressible inhomogeneous asymmetric fluids. *Math. Ann.*, **386** (2023), 1555–1593.
- [38] J. Simon, Nonhomogeneous viscous incompressible fluids: existence of velocity, density, and pressure. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **21** (1990), 1093-1117.
- [39] P. Zhang, Global Fujita-Kato solution of 3-D inhomogeneous incompressible Navier-Stokes system. *Adv. Math.*, **363** (2020), 107007, 43 pp.

(T. Hao) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, CHINA
Email address: haotiantian@pku.edu.cn

(F. Shao) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, CHINA
Email address: fshao@stu.pku.edu.cn

(D. Wei) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, CHINA
Email address: jnwdyi@pku.edu.cn

(Z. Zhang) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, CHINA
Email address: zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn