A BLOWUP CRITERION FOR THE FULL COMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS*
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Abstract. In this paper, we establish a blow up criterion for strong solutions of the full compressible Navier-Stokes equations just in terms of the gradient of the velocity. It shows that the gradient of the velocity alone dominates the global existence of strong solutions.
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1. Introduction. This paper is devoted to study the following 3-dimensional full compressible Navier-Stokes equations:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho + \text{div}(\rho u) &= 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho u) + \text{div}(\rho u \otimes u) - \mu \Delta u - (\mu + \lambda) \nabla (\text{div} u) + \nabla P &= 0 \\
c_v [\partial_t (\rho \theta) + \text{div}(\rho \theta u)] - \kappa \Delta \theta + P \text{div} u &= \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^T|^2 + \lambda (\text{div} u)^2
\end{aligned}
\]

where \( \rho \geq 0 \) denotes the density of the mass, \( u \) is the velocity.

\[
P = R \rho \theta \quad (a > 0, \gamma > 1)
\]

is the pressure. \( \mu, \lambda, R, c_v \) and \( \kappa \) are the physical constants satisfying

\[
\mu > 0, \quad \lambda + \frac{2}{3} \mu \geq 0, \quad R > 0, \quad c_v > 0, \quad \kappa > 0.
\]

The global existence of classical solutions for the full compressible Navier-Stokes equations was established by Matmusura and Nishida[7, 8] with initial data close to an non-vacuum equilibrium. When the initial density is allowed to vanish, the local existence of strong solutions is recently shown by Cho and Kim[1], which can be described as follows.

Consider the following initial boundary value problem for a viscous heat-conductive fluid:

\[
\rho_t + \text{div}(\rho u) = 0, \text{in} (0, T) \times \Omega
\]

\[
(\rho e)_t + \text{div}(\rho eu) - \kappa \Delta e + P \text{div} u = Q(\nabla u), \text{in} (0, T) \times \Omega
\]

\[
(\rho u)_t + \text{div}(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla P = 0, \text{in} (0, T) \times \Omega
\]

\[
(\rho, e, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, e_0, u_0), \text{in} \Omega
\]

\[
(e, u) = (0, 0), \text{on} (0, T) \times \partial \Omega
\]
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Here, if $\Omega$ is a bounded domain (or the whole space), then condition (1.8) at infinity (or the boundary condition, respectively) is unnecessary and should be neglected.

**Theorem 1.1** (Cho and Kim[1]). Let $\rho^\infty \in [0, \infty)$ and $q \in (3, 6]$ be fixed constants, and define $r$ by

$$r = 2 \text{ if } \rho^\infty = 0, \text{ and } r = 2 \text{ or } 3 \text{ if } \rho^\infty > 0. \quad (1.9)$$

Assume that the data $\rho_0, e_0, u_0$ satisfy the regularity condition

$$\rho_0 \geq 0, \quad \rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in W^{1, r} \cap W^{1, q}, \quad (e_0, u_0) \in D_0^1 \cap D^2, \quad (1.10)$$

and the compatibility condition

$$-\kappa \Delta e_0 - Q(\nabla u_0) = \rho_0^\perp g_1 \text{ and } Lu_0 + \nabla P_0 = \rho_0^\parallel g_2 \quad (1.11)$$

for some $(g_1, g_2) \in L^2$, where $P_0 = (\gamma - 1)\rho_0 c_0$. Then there exist a small time $T_0 > 0$ and a unique strong solution $(\rho, e, u)$ to the initial boundary value problem such that

$$\rho - \rho^\infty \in C([0, T_*]; W^{1, r} \cap W^{1, q}), \quad e_t \in C([0, T_*]; L^r \cap L^q),$$

$$(e, u) \in C([0, T_*]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; D^{2, q}),$$

$$(e_t, u_t) \in L^2(0, T_*; D_0^1) \text{ and } (\rho_0^\perp e_t, \rho_0^\parallel e_t) \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2). \quad (1.12)$$

**Remark 1.1.** We may translate the existence results in terms of the temperature. It is essentially proved that in[1] if

$$\inf \rho_0 > 0, \rho_0 \in W^{1, \tilde{q}}(\Omega) \quad \text{for some } \tilde{q} > N \quad (1.13)$$

with the following boundary conditions

$$u|_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \quad (1.14)$$

where $\nu$ is the normal to $\partial \Omega$.

Then there exist a $T_* > 0$ and a unique strong solution $(\rho, \theta, u)$ on $[0, T_*]$ to the problem, such that for any $q_0 \in (N, \tilde{q})$,

$$\rho \in C([0, T_*], W^{1, q_0}), \quad \rho_t \in C([0, T_*], L^{q_0}), \inf \rho > 0$$

$$u \in C([0, T_*], H_0^1 \cap H^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; W^{2, q_0})$$

$$u_t \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; H_0^1) \quad (1.15)$$

$$\theta \in C([0, T_*]; H^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; W^{2, q_0}), \theta > 0$$

$$\theta_t \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; H^1)$$

where $N = 2 \text{ or } 3$.

Concerning this local existence, roughly speaking, for large data, it is still an open problem whether a global small solution exists or not. Even for weak solutions, we mention that only a global ”variational solutions” have been obtained by Feireisl[4].
However, it is shown in [2] that, with the density away from vacuum, a blow up criterion for the heat-conductive gas is established in two dimensional bounded domain.

**Theorem 1.2 (Fan and Jiang [2]).** Assume that the initial data satisfy (1.13) – (1.14). Let \((\rho, u, \theta)\) be a strong solution of the initial-boundary value problem for 1.1 and satisfy the regularity (1.15). Then, if \(T^* < \infty\) is the maximal time of existence, then for some \(r > 2\)

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}, \|\rho^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}, \|\theta\|_{L^\infty}) + \int_0^T (\|\rho\|_{W^{1,q}_0} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^4) + \int_0^T \|u\|_{L^r,\infty}^{\frac{2r}{r-2}} dt = \infty. \tag{1.16}
\]

Furthermore, if \(2\mu > \lambda\), then

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}, \|\rho^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}, \|\theta\|_{L^\infty}) + \int_0^T (\|\rho\|_{W^{1,q}_0} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^4) dt = \infty. \tag{1.17}
\]

**Remark 1.2.** The results of Fan and Jiang shows that the density and temperature dominates the regular motion of the fluid.

**Remark 1.3.** The main goal of this paper is to show that in fact the gradient of the velocity alone plays a central role in the global existence of strong solutions.

**2. Main results.** In this paper, we show a certain regularity of \(\nabla u\) will be enough to avoid the blow-up of strong solutions.

**Basic assumptions:** \(\mu\) and \(\lambda\) are assumed to satisfy the physical restriction

\[
\mu + \frac{3}{2} \lambda \geq 0, \quad \mu > 0 \tag{2.1}
\]

and without lose of generality,

\[
c_v = 1. \tag{2.2}
\]

We shall consider the following initial boundary value problem

\[
u|_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \tag{2.3}
\]

\[(\rho, u, \theta)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, u_0, \theta_0) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \tag{2.4}
\]

where \(n = 2, 3\), and \(\nu\) is the out normal of \(\partial \Omega\). Our main theorem is stated as follows.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3\) be a bounded domain. \(Q_T = (0, T) \times \Omega\). Assume that the initial data satisfy (1.13) and (1.14). Let \((\rho, u)\) be a strong solution of the system (1.1) – (1.2) with initial boundary conditions (2.3) and (2.4) satisfying the regularity (1.15). If \(T^* < \infty\) is the maximal time of existence, then

\[
\lim_{T \to T^*} \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 dt = \infty. \tag{2.5}
\]

**Remark 2.1.** The blow up criterion (2.5) is both sufficient and necessary.
Remark 2.2. There is something new in the blowup criteria contrast to [5, 6] in the isentropic case. One don't require any restrictions on the viscous coefficients $\mu$ and $\lambda$. The main difficulty is to bound $\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty L^2}$ at first. In fact, we can derive a $L^\infty(Q_T)$ bound of $\theta$ by using the energy equation. The result will be adopted to deduce that the $L^2(Q_T)$ norm of the convection term $F = \rho u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u$ is bounded by that of $\nabla \rho$ as in the isentropic case. This, in turn gives the $L^\infty L^2$ bound of $\nabla \rho$. Combining the above estimates, one can derive the desired bound for $\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty L^2}$. The higher estimates on the space and time derivatives of the temperature $\theta$ are also more involved than the non-isentropic case.

Remark 2.3. More recently, Fan [3] told me they obtained a new criteria for the heat-conductive flow, motivated by [5, 6], if $7\mu > \lambda$, then

\[
\left( \lim_{T \to T^*} \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^1 L^\infty(Q_T)} \right) = \infty. \tag{2.6}
\]

In this paper, we denote

$$Lu = \mu \Delta u + (\mu + \lambda) \nabla \text{div} u$$

the elliptic operator in the momentum equations.

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $(\rho, u)$ be a strong solution described in Theorem 2.1. We assume that the opposite holds, i.e.

$$\lim_{T \to T^*} \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \, dt \leq C < \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

By assumption (3.1) and the conservation of mass, the upper and lower bounds of the density follows immediately.

Lemma 3.1. Assume that

$$\int_0^T \|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \, dt \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*, \tag{3.2}$$

then

$$\|\rho, \rho^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. It follows from the conservation of mass that for $\forall q > 1$,

$$\partial_t (\rho^q) + \text{div} (\rho^q u) + (q - 1) \rho^q \text{div} u = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Integrating (3.4) over $\Omega$ to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho^q \, dx \leq (q - 1) \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \rho^q \, dx, \tag{3.5}$$

i.e

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho\|_{L^q} \leq \frac{q - 1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\rho\|_{L^q}, \tag{3.6}$$
which implies immediately
\[ \|\rho\|_{L^q(t)} \leq C, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)
with \( C \) independent of \( q \), so our lemma follows. The same hold for \( \|\rho^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \). □

**Lemma 3.2.** Assume that
\[ \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 dt \leq C, \quad 0 < T < T^*, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)
one has
\[ \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \leq C. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

**Proof.** Multiplying \( \theta^{p+1} \) in the energy equation and integrating gives
\[ \frac{1}{q+2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \rho \theta^{p+2} dx - \kappa \int_\Omega \Delta \theta \cdot \theta^{p+1} + \int_\Omega R \rho \theta^{p+2} \text{div} u dx = \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^T|^2 + \lambda (\text{div} u)^2 \right] \theta^{p+1} dx. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)
Set \( f(t) = \int_\Omega \rho \theta^{p+2} dx \), one has
\[ \int_\Omega R \rho \theta^{p+2} \text{div} u dx \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} f(t). \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)
\[ \int_\Omega \mu \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^T|^2 - (\text{div} u)^2 \right] \theta^{p+1} dx \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} f(t) \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + 1) f(t). \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)
Substituting (3.11)-(3.12) into (3.10), one gets
\[ \partial_t f \leq C(q + 2)(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 1) f. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)
Hence,
\[ f(t) \leq f(0) \left[ \frac{1}{q+2} \right] e^{C \int_\Omega \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + 1) dx}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.14)
Letting \( q \to \infty \), make use of (3.3) yields
\[ \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \leq C. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.15)
□

Next, we have \( \theta \geq 0 \) in \( [0, T] \times \Omega \). The proof is standard, one can refer to([4]) for more detail.

**Lemma 3.3.** Under the condition (3.1), it holds that, for \( 0 \leq t \leq T < T^* \),
\[ \int_{Q_T} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla \theta|^2 dx dt \leq C. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.16)

**Proof.** Recalling the entropy estimate, one has
\[ \partial_t (\rho s) + \text{div}(\rho su) - \text{div} \left( \frac{\mu}{\theta} \nabla \theta \right) \geq \frac{1}{\theta} \mu \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^T|^2 + \lambda (\text{div} u)^2 \right] + \frac{K}{\theta^2} |\nabla \theta|^2. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.17)
One can conclude by lemma 3.2 that
\[ \int_{Q_T} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla \theta|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C. \] (3.18)

**Lemma 3.4.** Under the condition (3.1), the following energy estimate holds
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\Omega} \rho |u|^2 \, dx(t) + \int_{Q_T} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C, \quad 0 < T < T^*. \] (3.19)

**Proof.** Multiplying \( u \) on both sides of the momentum equations, one gets
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^2}{2} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \mu |\nabla u|^2 + (\mu + \lambda)(\text{div}u)^2 \, dx \\
= \int_{\Omega} P \text{div}u \, dx \\
\leq \frac{\mu}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + C(\mu) \int_{\Omega} P^2 \, dx. \] (3.20)

This finishes the proof. \( \square \)

The next lemma shows a connection between a convection term and the gradient of the density.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \( F = \rho u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u \). Then it holds that
\[ \int_{Q_T} F^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_{Q_T} |\nabla \rho|^2 \, dx \, dt + C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \]

**Proof.** Note that
\[
\int_{Q_T} F^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C^* \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 \, dx \, dt + 2 \int_{Q_T} |\rho u \cdot \nabla u|^2 \, dx \, dt. \] (3.21)

It follows from lemma 3.1 and 3.4 that
\[
\int_{Q_T} F^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C^* \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_{\Omega} \rho^2 u^2 \, dx \, dt \\
\leq C \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 \, dx \, dt + C. \] (3.22)

Multiplying the momentum equation by \( u_t \) and integrating show that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \rho u_t^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_t \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx = \int_{\Omega} P \text{div}u \, dx, \] (3.23)

the righthand side of (3.23) can be rewritten as
\[
\int_{\Omega} P \text{div}u \, dx = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} P \text{div}u - \int_{\Omega} P_t \text{div}u \, dx. \] (3.24)
One obtain from the mass equation that

\[ P_t + \text{div}(Pu) - R\kappa \Delta \theta + RP \text{div} u = R \left[ \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^T|^2 + \lambda (\text{div} u)^2 \right]. \]

Consequently

\[ P_t = -(A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4), \quad (3.25) \]

which can be estimated separately as follows.

\[ \int_{\Omega} A_1 \text{div} u dx = \int_{\Omega} P(\text{div} u)^2 + R \rho u \cdot \nabla \theta \text{div} u + R \theta u \cdot \nabla \rho \text{div} u dx \]
\[ \leq C \|\text{div} u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\rho u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \]
\[ \leq C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2). \quad (3.26) \]

Note that

\[ \|\nabla P\|_{L^2} = R \|\nabla (\rho \theta)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2} \quad (3.27) \]

it follows from the elliptic regularity for \( Lu = F + \nabla P \) that

\[ \|u\|_{H^2} \leq C (\|F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla P\|_{L^2}). \quad (3.28) \]

\[ \int_{\Omega} A_2 \text{div} u dx = \int_{\Omega} R \kappa \nabla \theta \cdot \nabla \text{div} u dx \]
\[ \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} F^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \theta|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx, \quad (3.29) \]

\[ \int_{\Omega} A_3 \text{div} u dx = \int_{\Omega} R \rho (\text{div} u)^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad (3.30) \]

\[ \int_{\Omega} A_4 \text{div} u dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^3 dx \]
\[ \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| dx \]
\[ \leq C \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2. \quad (3.31) \]

Direct estimates show that

\[ \int_{\Omega} P \text{div} u dx(T) \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx(T) + C, \quad (3.32) \]

\[ \int_{Q_T} \rho u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 + C \int_{Q_T} \rho |u \cdot \nabla u|^2 dx dt \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 + C \int_{0}^{T} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_{\Omega} \rho |u|^2 dx dt \quad (3.33) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 + C. \]
On the other hand, using \( F = Lu - \nabla P \) again, one obtain
\[
\int_{Q_T} P u \cdot \nabla \text{div} u dx dt \leq C \int_{Q_T} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx dt + \epsilon \int_{Q_T} F^2 dx dt + C, \quad (3.34)
\]
which in turn gives
\[
\int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx(T) \leq C \int_{Q_T} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx dt + 2 \epsilon \int_{Q_T} F^2 dx dt + C \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C. \quad (3.35)
\]
Choosing \( \epsilon \) as \( 2C^* \epsilon < 1 \), one may conclude
\[
\int_{Q_T} F^2 dx dt \leq C \int_{Q_T} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx dt + C, \quad (3.36)
\]
which completes the proof of lemma 3.

The next lemma will derive the first order spatial derivatives of the density.

**Lemma 3.6.** Under the condition (3.1), it holds that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*, \quad (3.37)
\]
\[
\int_{Q_T} \rho u_t^2 dx dt + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*, \quad (3.38)
\]
\[
\int_0^T \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 dt \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \quad (3.39)
\]

**Proof.** Differentiating the mass equation in (1.1) with respect to \( x_i \) and multiplying the resulting equation by \( 2\partial_i \rho \) yield
\[
\partial_t |\partial_i \rho|^2 + \text{div}(|\partial_i \rho|^2 u) + |\partial_i \rho|^2 \text{div}u + 2\partial_i \rho \partial_\ell \partial_i \text{div}u + 2\partial_i \rho \partial_i u \cdot \nabla \rho = 0. \quad (3.40)
\]
Integrating over \( \Omega \) to show that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_i \rho|^2 dx = -\int_{\Omega} |\partial_i \rho|^2 \text{div}u dx - 2\int_{\Omega} \partial_\ell \rho \partial_\ell \partial_i \text{div}u dx - \int_{\Omega} 2\partial_i \rho \partial_i u \cdot \nabla \rho dx = -(A_1 + A_2 + A_3). \quad (3.41)
\]
Each term on the right hand side of (3.41) can be estimated as follows:
\[
|A_1(t)| \leq \|\text{div}u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |\partial_i \rho|^2 dx \leq \|\text{div}u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 dx, \quad (3.42)
\]
\[
|A_2(t)| \leq C\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} (\|\nabla P\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^2}) \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + |\nabla \theta|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} F^2 dx \right), \quad (3.43)
\]
\[ |A_3(t)| \leq C \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(t)} \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx. \]  

Consequently,
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx \leq C(\| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(t)} + 1) \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx + C \int_\Omega (F^2 + | \nabla \theta |^2) dx.
\]  

This, together with Gronwall’s inequality yields
\[
\int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx(t) \leq C e^{C \int_0^t (\| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(s)} + 1) ds} \left( \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho_0 |^2 dx + \int_0^t \int_\Omega F^2 dx ds + C \int_0^t \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx ds + C. \right)
\]  

Hence
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_\Omega | \nabla \rho |^2 dx \leq C.
\]  

Next, it follows from (3.35) and (3.36) that
\[
\int_{Q_T} \rho u_i^2 dx dt + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_\Omega | \nabla u |^2 dx \leq C.
\]  

This, together with \( Lu = \rho u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P \) yield
\[
\| u \|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\Omega))} \leq \| \rho u_t \|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \| \rho u \cdot \nabla u \|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \| \nabla P \|_{L^2(Q_T)} \\
\leq C + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2(Q_T)} + C \| \nabla \rho \|_{L^2(Q_T)} \leq C.
\]  

Next, we show an improved regularity of the temperature.

**Lemma 3.7.**
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| \theta(t) \|_{H^1} + \int_0^T \| \theta(t) \|_{H^2}^2 dt \leq C, \quad 0 < T < T^*.
\]  

**Proof.** Multipling the energy equation by \( \theta_t \) and integrating, one may get
\[
\int_\Omega \rho \theta_t^2 dx + \frac{\kappa}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega | \nabla \theta |^2 dx = - \int_\Omega P \theta_t \nabla u - \nabla u^T |^2 + \lambda (\nabla u)^2 \theta_t dx \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho \theta_t^2 dx + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^4}^4 \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho \theta_t^2 dx + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_\Omega | \nabla u |^2 dx \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho \theta_t^2 dx + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty}^2.
\]  

(3.50)
Recall that
\[ \kappa \triangle \theta = \rho \theta_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla \theta + P \text{div} u - \frac{\mu}{2} |[\nabla u + \nabla u^T]^2 - (\text{div} u)^2| \in L^2(Q_T). \] (3.51)

This finishes the proof of lemma 3.7. \qed

**Lemma 3.8.** Under the condition (3.1), it holds that
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| \rho^{1/2} u(t) \|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{Q_T} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx dt \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \] (3.52)
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| u \|_{H^2} \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \] (3.53)

**Proof.** Differentiating the momentum equations in (1.1) with respect to time \( t \) yields
\[ \rho u_{tt} + \rho u \cdot \nabla u_t - \Delta u_t + \nabla p_t = -\rho_t (u_t + u \cdot \nabla u) - \rho u_t \cdot \nabla u. \] (3.54)

Taking the inner product of the above equation with \( u_t \) in \( L^2(\Omega) \) and integrating by parts, one gets
\[ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \rho u_t^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} P_t \text{div} u_t dx = -\int_{\Omega} (\rho u \cdot \nabla[(u_t + u \cdot \nabla u)u_t] + \rho(u_t \cdot \nabla u) \cdot u_t dx. \] (3.55)

The last term on the left-hand side of (3.55) can be rewritten as (using (2.33)):
It follows from (3.56) and (3.57) that
\[ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \rho u_t^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} P_t \text{div} u_t dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{2}{\rho} u_t |u_t| |\nabla u_t| + \rho |u||u_t||\nabla u|^2 + \rho |u_t|^2 |u_t||\nabla^2 u| + \rho |u|^2 |\nabla u||\nabla u_t| \right. \\
+ \rho |u_t|^2 |\nabla u| + |\nabla P||u||\nabla u_t| + \gamma P |u||\nabla u||\nabla^2 u| + \gamma^2 P |\nabla u|^3 \left. \right) \ dx \]
\[ = \sum_{i=0}^{8} F_i. \] (3.56)

Recall Lemmas 3.6-3.7 that
\[ \|P_t\|_{L^2(Q_T)} = \|R \rho_t \theta + R \rho \theta_t\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \leq C \] (3.57)
which gives
\[ \int_{\Omega} P_t \text{div} u_t dx \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx + C(\epsilon). \] (3.58)

Now, we estimate each \( F_i \) separately.
\[ |F_1| = \int_{\Omega} 2\rho|u||u_t||\nabla u|dx \]
\[ \leq C\|u\|_{L^6}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^3}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \quad (3.59) \]
\[ \leq C\|u\|_{L^6}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^3}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{H^2}^2 . \]

Thus, it follows from Hölder inequality, Sobolev imbedding and interpolation inequality that

\[ |F_2| = \int_{\Omega} \rho|u||u_t||\nabla u|^2dx \]
\[ \leq C\|u\|_{L^6}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})^2 \quad (3.60) \]
\[ \leq C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6} \]
\[ \leq C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6} \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{H^2}^2 , \]

\[ |F_3| = \int_{\Omega} \rho|u|^2|u_t||\nabla^2 u|dx \]
\[ \leq \|u^2\|_{L^3}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \quad (3.61) \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{H^2}^2 , \]

\[ |F_4| = \int_{\Omega} \rho|u|^2|\nabla u||\nabla u_t|dx \]
\[ \leq C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6}\|u^2\|_{L^3} \quad (3.62) \]
\[ \leq C\|\nabla u\|_{L^6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{H^2}^2 \]

\[ |F_5| = \int_{\Omega} \rho|u_t|^2|\nabla u|dx \]
\[ \leq C\|\rho u_t^2\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \quad (3.63) \]
\[ \leq C\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^4}^2 \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|u_t\|_{L^6}^2 + C\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2} \]

\[ |F_6| = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla P||u||\nabla u_t|dx \]
\[ \leq C\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{L^6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \quad (3.64) \]
\[ \leq C\|u\|_{H^2}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \]
\[ \leq \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{H^2}^2 , \]
\[ |F_7| = \int_{\Omega} \gamma P |u| \| \nabla u \| \| \nabla^2 u \| dx \]
\[ \leq C \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^2} \| \nabla u \|_{L^2} \| u \|_{L^\infty} \]
\[ \leq C \| \nabla^2 u \|_{L^2} \| u \|_{L^\infty} \]
\[ \leq C \| u \|_{H^2}^2 + C, \quad (3.65) \]

\[ |F_8| = \int_{\Omega} \gamma^2 P |\nabla u|^3 dx \]
\[ \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^3 dx \]
\[ \leq C \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \]
\[ \leq C \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \] \quad (3.66)

Collecting all the estimates for \( F_i \), we conclude that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho u_t^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \rho (\text{div} u)^2 \right) dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx \]
\[ \leq 5\epsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx + C(\| \rho^{1/2} u \|_{L^2}^2 + \| u \|_{H^2}^2 + \| \nabla \rho \|_{L^2}^2 + \| \nabla u \|_{L^\infty}). \] \quad (3.67)

Therefore, taking \( \epsilon \) small enough in (3.67) yields
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| \rho^{1/2} u_t(t) \|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{Q_T} |\nabla u_t|^2 dx dt \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*. \] \quad (3.68)

Moreover,
\[
\| u \|_{H^2} \leq C(\| \rho^{1/2} u \|_{L^2} + \| u \|_{L^6} \| \nabla u \|_{L^3} + \| \nabla P \|_{L^2}) \]
\[ \leq C(\| \rho^{1/2} u \|_{L^2} + \| \nabla u \|_{L^2}^2 \| u \|_{H^2}^4 + \| \nabla P \|_{L^2}). \] \quad (3.69)

Therefore,
\[
\sup_{0 \leq T < T^*} \| u \|_{H^2}^2 \leq C. \] \quad (3.70)

Furthermore, the following lemma gives bounds of spatial derivatives of the density and the second spatial derivatives of the velocity.

**Lemma 3.9.** Under the condition (3.1), let \( q_0 \) be as the same in Theorem 1.1. Then it holds that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\| \rho_t(t) \|_{L^{q_0}} + \| \rho \|_{W^{1,q_0}}) \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*,
\]
\[
\int_0^T \| u(t) \|_{W^{2,q_0}}^2 dt \leq C, \quad 0 \leq T < T^*, q_0 = \min(6, \bar{q}).
\]
Proof. It follows from (3.68) and (3.69) that

\[ u_t \in L^2(0, T; L^6(\Omega)), \nabla u \in L^6(Q_T), \]

\[ F \in L^2(0, T; L^6(\Omega)), \nabla P \in L^2(0, T; L^6(\Omega)). \]

Differentiating the mass equation in (1.1) with respect to \( x_i \), and multiplying the resulting identity by \( q_0|\partial_i\rho|^{q_0-2}\partial_i\rho \), one gets after integration that

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega |\partial_i\rho|^{q_0} dx = -(q_0 - 1) \int_\Omega |\partial_i\rho|^{q_0} \text{div} u dx - q_0 \int_\Omega |\partial_i\rho|^{q_0-2}\partial_i\rho \text{div} u dx \\
- q_0 \int_\Omega |\partial_i\rho|^{q_0} \partial_i\rho \cdot \nabla \rho dx = -(B_1 + B_2 + B_3). \tag{3.71}
\]

Each quantity in the righthand side of (3.71) can bounded as follows.

\[
|B_1(t)| \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \int_\Omega |\partial_i\rho|^{q_0} dx \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^{q_0} dx , \tag{3.72}
\]

\[
|B_2(t)| \leq C \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^{q_0}} \frac{\|\nabla P\|_{L^{q_0}} + \|F\|_{L^{q_0}}} {\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^{q_0}}} , \tag{3.73}
\]

\[
|B_3(t)| \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^{q_0} dx. \tag{3.74}
\]

Substituting (3.71)-(3.73) into (3.74), one has

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^{q_0}} \leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} (t) + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^{q_0}} + \|F\|_{L^{q_0}}). \tag{3.75}
\]

Hence,

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^{q_0}} \leq C .
\]

Therefore, due to this, (3.71) and interpolation inequality, one has

\[
\rho_t = -(u \cdot \nabla \rho + \rho \text{div} u) \in L^\infty L^{q_0} . \tag{3.76}
\]

Finally, taking into account that

\[ Lu = F + \nabla P \in L^2 L^{q_0} , \]

one has

\[
\int_0^T \|u\|_{W^{2,q_0}(\Omega)}^2 dt \leq C. \tag{3.77}
\]

This finishes the proof of lemma 3.9.

We will improve the regularity of the temperature \( \theta \).
Lemma 3.10.
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 \leq C, \quad 0 < T < T^*. \tag{3.78}
\]

Proof. Differentiating the energy equation with the time \(t\), one gets
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho \theta_t^2 \, dx + \kappa \int_{\Omega} |
abla \theta_t|^2 \, dx \\
\leq \int_{\Omega} P |\text{div} \, u_t||\theta_t| + R |\rho_t||\text{div} \, \theta_t| + R \rho |\text{div} \, u_t|^2 \\
+ 2 \mu |\nabla u_t||\theta_t| + |\rho_t|u_t||\nabla \theta| + |\rho_t||u_t||\nabla \theta_t| + |\rho_t|^2 \, dx \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{7} B_i. \tag{3.79}
\]

We can estimate each \(B_i\) as follows
\[
|B_1| \leq C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2), \tag{3.80}
\]
\[
|B_2| \leq \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|\text{div} \, u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2), \tag{3.81}
\]
\[
|B_3| \leq C \|\text{div} \, u_t\|_{L^3} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \leq \epsilon \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C (\epsilon) \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2, \tag{3.82}
\]
\[
|B_4| \leq C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.83}
\]
\[
|B_5| \leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^4} \|\theta_t\|_{L^4}, \tag{3.84}
\]
\[
|B_6| \leq C \|u_t\|_{L^6} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6}, \tag{3.85}
\]
\[
|B_7| \leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^4}^2 \leq C \|\theta_t\|_{L^4}^2 \leq C \|\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6}. \tag{3.86}
\]

Collecting all the estimates (3.80-3.86) and applying Lemmas 3.6-3.10, we easily obtain
\[
\sup_{0 < T < T^*} \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\theta_t\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\theta\|_{H^2} dt \leq C. \tag{3.87}
\]

Finally, the following lemma gives the desired estimated for the temperature.
Lemma 3.11. Under the condition (3.1), it holds that
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\theta\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad 0 < T < T^*.
\]  
(3.88)

Proof. We may rewrite the energy equation as
\[
\kappa \Delta \theta = c_v \left[ \partial_t (\rho \theta) + \text{div}(\rho \theta u) \right] + P \text{div}u - \left( \frac{\mu}{2} \left| \nabla u + \nabla u^T \right|^2 + \lambda (\text{div}u)^2 \right).
\]  
(3.89)

Based on the lemmas (3.6-3.10), one immediately has (3.88) by noticing that the righthand side of (3.89) is bounded in $L^\infty L^2$.

We are now ready to extend the strong solutions beyond the time $T^*$. In fact, Lemmas 3.6-3.8 and Lemma 3.11, the functions $(\rho, u, \theta)|_{t=T^*} = \lim_{t \to T^*} (\rho, u, \theta)$ satisfy the conditions imposed on the initial data (1.13) – (1.14) at the time $t = T^*$. Therefore, one can take $(\rho, u, \theta)|_{t=T^*}$ as the initial data and apply the local existence Theorem 1.1 to extend our local strong solution beyond $T^*$. This contradicts the assumption on $T^*$. \qed
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