# The incompressible Euler limit of the Boltzmann equation for a gas of fermions 

Thibaut Allemand

## To cite this version:

Thibaut Allemand. The incompressible Euler limit of the Boltzmann equation for a gas of fermions. 2010. hal-00493760v3

## HAL Id: hal-00493760 https://hal.science/hal-00493760v3

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# THE INCOMPRESSIBLE EULER LIMIT OF THE BOLTZMANN EQUATION FOR A GAS OF FERMIONS 

THIBAUT ALLEMAND


#### Abstract

We are interested in the hydrodynamic limit of the Boltzmann equation for a gas of fermions in the incompressible Euler regime. We use the relative entropy method as improved by Saint-Raymond in the classical case [12. Our result is analogous to the classical case result, but the treatment is slightly complicated by the cubic nonlinearity of the collision operator.


## 1. Introduction

The study of quantum gases has been given increasing interest in the literature over the last decade. In particular, quantum kinetic theory is an expanding field of research. By quantum gases we mean gases made of quantum particles, that are, bosons or fermions. The first ones aim at aggregating together, forming the so-called "Bose-Einstein condensates". Conversely, fermions obey Pauli's exclusion principle, which prevents any pair of fermions from being in the same state.

Among the possible models for quantum gases, the Boltzmann-type models first proposed by Nordheim in 1928 [10] then Uehling and Uhlenbeck in 1933 (14] are very popular. Although their range of validity is not clear, they seem to capture some aspects of the behaviour of bosonic or fermionic particles. Indeed, it has been proved, in the bosonic (and space homogeneous) case, that under a threshold temperature, a condensate occurs in infinite time (6). On the contrary, solutions of the fermionic Boltzmann equation satisfy a natural $L^{\infty}$ bound which makes the Cauchy problem easier. Indeed, there is no need for renormalized solutions in this case since one can prove the existence of global weak solutions [9, 5, 2].
1.1. The Boltzmann equation for fermions. In this work, we investigate the incompressible Euler limit of the Boltzmann equation for a gas of fermions (or Boltzmann-Fermi equation). It reads in nondimensional form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Ma}_{t} f+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Kn}} Q(f) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f(t, x, v)$ is the density of particles which at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$are at the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$ with velocity $v \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$. The left-hand term express the free transport of the particle in absence of interactions, while the right-hand term takes into account the effects of collisions between particles. The positive constants Ma and Kn are numbers determined by the physical situation of the gas and defined by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Kn}=\frac{\text { mean free path }}{\text { observation length scale }} \\
\mathrm{Ma}=\frac{\text { bulk velocity }}{\text { speed of sound }}
\end{gathered}
$$

The Knudsen number is a measure of the rarefaction of the gas whereas the Mach number measures its compressibility.

The collision integral $Q(f)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(f)=\int_{S^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right)\left(f^{\prime} f_{*}^{\prime}(1-f)\left(1-f_{*}\right)-f f_{*}\left(1-f^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{*}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the usual notations

$$
f_{*}=f\left(t, x, v_{*}\right), \quad f^{\prime}=f\left(t, x, v^{\prime}\right), \quad f_{*}^{\prime}=f\left(t, x, v_{*}^{\prime}\right)
$$

and where the precollisional velocities $\left(v^{\prime}, v_{*}^{\prime}\right)$ are deduced from the postcollisional ones by the relations

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
v^{\prime}=v-\left(v-v_{*}\right) \cdot \omega \omega \\
v_{*}^{\prime}=v_{*}+\left(v-v_{*}\right) \cdot \omega \omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\omega$ is a unit norm vector. These relations express the conservation of momentum and kinetic energy at each collision.

The collision integral (1.2) differs from the classical one by the presence of cubic terms, due to Pauli's exclusion principle, and thus take into account the quantum nature of the gas. Indeed the probability for a particle with velocity $v^{\prime}$ of taking velocity $v$ after a collision is all the more penalized as other particles at the same point already have velocity $v$. This prevents any pair of two fermions from being in the same quantum state. As a consequence the solution $f$ satisfy a natural $L^{\infty}$ bound : if the initial datum $f_{0}$ is chosen such that

$$
0 \leq f_{0} \leq 1
$$

this bound is preserved by the solution $f$ for all times. This property is of great help in the study of this equation and make it having very different features from the classical or the bosonic Boltzmann equation although they look very similar.

The function $B(z, \omega)$, known as the collision kernel, is measurable, a.e. positive, and depends only on $|z|$ and on the scalar product $z \cdot \omega$. It is often assumed to satisfy Grad's cutoff assumption:

$$
\begin{gather*}
0<B(z, \omega) \leq C_{B}(1+|z|)^{\beta} \text { a.e. on } S^{2} \times \mathbb{R}^{3}  \tag{1.3}\\
\int_{S^{2}} B(z, \omega) \mathrm{d} \omega \geq \frac{1}{C_{B}} \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \text { a.e. on } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{1.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

for some constants $C_{B}>0$ and $\beta \in[0,1]$. These assumptions guarantee the existence of a solution to equation (1.1) in the whole domain $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or in the torus $\mathbb{T}^{3}$ (5.) 9. However, in order to have existence of solutions in more general domains and to ensure that they satisfy the local conservation of mass, momentum, and energy, as well as the entropy inequality, we will have to make more restrictive assumptions [2], as will be explained later.

The symmetry properties of the collision operator, coming from the fact that the transformations $\left(v, v_{*}\right) \mapsto\left(v^{\prime}, v_{*}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(v, v^{\prime}\right) \mapsto\left(v_{*}, v_{*}^{\prime}\right)$ have unit jacobian, imply that at least formally,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} Q(f) \varphi \mathrm{d} v=\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \int_{S^{2}} B\left(f^{\prime} f_{*}^{\prime}(1-f)\left(1-f_{*}\right)-f f_{*}\left(1-f^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{*}^{\prime}\right)\right)  \tag{1.5}\\
\times\left(\varphi+\varphi_{*}-\varphi^{\prime}-\varphi_{*}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{array}
$$

and then

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(1, v,|v|^{2}\right) Q(f) \mathrm{d} v=0
$$

As a consequence, the solution $f$ of equation (1.1) formally satisfies the conservations of mass, momentum and kinetic energy:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\partial_{t} \int f \mathrm{~d} v+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ma}} \nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int v f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0 \\
\partial_{t} \int v f \mathrm{~d} v+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ma}} \nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int v \otimes v f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0 \\
\partial_{t} \int|v|^{2} f \mathrm{~d} v+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ma}} \nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int v|v|^{2} f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Moreover, taking $\varphi=\log \left(\frac{f}{1-f}\right)$ in (1.5) leads to the so-called H-theorem, which expresses the second principle of thermodynamics:

$$
\partial_{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} s(f)(v) \mathrm{d} v+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ma}} \nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v s(f)(v) \mathrm{d} v\right)=-\frac{1}{\mathrm{MaKn}} D(f)
$$

with

$$
s(f)=f \log f+(1-f) \log (1-f)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
D(f)=\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) & \left(f^{\prime} f_{*}^{\prime}(1-f)\left(1-f_{*}\right)-f f_{*}\left(1-f^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{*}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \cdot \log \left(\frac{f^{\prime} f_{*}^{\prime}(1-f)\left(1-f_{*}\right.}{f f_{*}\left(1-f^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{*}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that $D(f)$ is non-negative. The minimizers of the entropy which are also the functions that cancel the collision operator, are given by :

Proposition 1.1. Assume that $g \in L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ is such that $Q(g)$ and $D(g)$ are well defined and satisfy the bounds $0 \leq f \leq 1$. Then

$$
Q(g)=0 \Longleftrightarrow D(g)=0 \Longleftrightarrow g=\frac{M}{1+M} \text { or } g=\mathbb{1}_{v \in \Lambda}
$$

where $M$ is a maxwellian distribution, that is,

$$
M=a e^{-\frac{|v-u|^{2}}{2 b}}
$$

with $a \geq 0, b>0$, and for some subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$. In the first case the distributions are called Fermi-Dirac or Planckian distributions, whereas they are called degenerate Fermi-Dirac distributions in the second case.

Proofs and details are to be found in [5, 7]. The coefficiens of the Planckian distribution $a, b, u$ are fully determined by macroscopic parameters of the fluid with distribution $g$, namely the mass $\rho_{g}$, bulk velocity $u_{g}$ and pressure $p_{g}$, defined by

$$
\rho_{g}(t, x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v, \quad u_{g}(t, x)=\frac{1}{\rho_{g}(t, x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v g(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v
$$

and

$$
p_{g}(t, x, v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|v-u_{g}(t, x)\right|^{2} g(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v .
$$

This relation will be detailed in the next Section.
1.2. The formal hydrodynamic limit. In the fast relaxation regime, that is, when the Knudsen number goes to 0 , the collision process becomes predominant and we expect in view of (1.1) that a local thermodynamic equilibrium is reached almost instantaneously. The distribution $f$ describing the gas is then close to Planckian distribution fully determined by some coefficients $a, b, u$ which in turn are caracterized by the hydrodynamic fields $\rho_{f}(t, x), u_{f}(t, x)$ and $p_{f}(t, x)$. The conservation laws then become up to order $O(\mathrm{Kn})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Ma} \partial_{t} \rho_{f}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\rho_{f} u_{f}\right)=0 \\
& \operatorname{Ma}_{t}\left(\rho_{f} u_{f}\right)+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\rho_{f} u_{f} \otimes u_{f}+\frac{1}{3} p_{f} I_{3}\right)=0 \\
& \operatorname{Ma} \partial_{t}\left(\rho_{f} u_{f}^{2}+p_{f}\right)+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\rho_{f}\left|u_{f}\right|^{2} u_{f}+\frac{5}{3} p_{f} u_{f}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

which are the compressible Euler equations for perfect gases. If now the Mach number also goes to 0 , that is, in an incompressible regime, the first equation becomes $\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\rho_{f} u_{f}\right)=0$, which is nothing but the incompressibility constraint. The other equations of motions are obtained by a systematic multiscale expansion, depending on another parameter: the Reynolds number, defined by

$$
\mathrm{Re}=\frac{\mathrm{Ma}}{\mathrm{Kn}}
$$

for perfect gases, and measuring the viscosity of the gas. In all the sequel, we are interested in the inviscid incompressible regime, so that we consider

$$
\mathrm{Ma}=\varepsilon, \quad \mathrm{Kn}=\varepsilon^{q}, \quad q>1
$$

and investigate the asymptotic $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The Boltzmann equation for fermions then writes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon \partial_{t} f+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q}} Q(f) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the hydrodynamic fluids will be assumed to be fluctuations around a global constant equilibrium $\left(\rho_{0}, 0, p_{0}\right)$, so that, denoting the fluctuations around the mass, momentum and pressure by $\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{p}$,

$$
\rho_{f}=\rho_{0}+\varepsilon \tilde{\rho}, \quad u_{f}=\varepsilon \tilde{u}, \quad p_{f}=p_{0}+\varepsilon \tilde{p} .
$$

We also define the temperature $T_{f}$ by

$$
p_{f}=\rho_{f} T_{f}
$$

and its fluctuation $\tilde{T}$ by $T_{f}=T_{0}+\varepsilon \tilde{T}$ where $T_{0}$ is a constant equilibrium value. Plugging these expressions into the hydrodynamic equations (1.2) we get at leading order

$$
\nabla_{x} \tilde{u}=0, \quad \nabla_{x}\left(T_{0} \tilde{\rho}+\rho_{0} \tilde{T}\right)=0
$$

which are known as the incompressibility and the Boussinesq relations; at next order it comes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{t} \tilde{\rho}+\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \tilde{\rho}=0 \\
& \partial_{t} \tilde{u}+\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \tilde{u}+\nabla_{x}(\tilde{\rho} \tilde{T})=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we give some details about equation (1.6). Then in Section 3 we explain the strategy which is based on the modulated entropy and give our main result Theorem 3.1. We give some useful intermediate results in Section 4. In Section we compute the time derivative of the modulated entropy. In Section 6 we construct an approximate solution of (1.6) the parameters of which satisfy the incompressible Euler equation. Finally in Section 7 we end the proof of the main result by controling some flux terms.

## 2. Some details on the Boltzmann equation for fermions

In this Section we explain the relation between the hydrodynamic fields and the coefficients $a, u, b$ of the Planckian distribution defined in Proposition (1.1). We then state the existence result to be used in the sequel.
2.1. Relations between the coefficients and the macroscopic quantities. We recall here the definition of the hydrodynamic fields: for a given distribution function $f$ the mass $\rho_{f}$, the bulk velocity $u_{f}$ and the pressure $p_{f}$ are defined by

$$
\rho_{f}(t, x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v, \quad u_{f}(t, x)=\frac{1}{\rho_{f}(t, x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v f(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v
$$

and

$$
p_{f}(t, x, v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|v-u_{f}(t, x)\right|^{2} f(t, x, v) \mathrm{d} v .
$$

When the thermodynamic equilibrium is reached, the density function is an equilibrium solution

$$
f=\frac{M}{1+M}, \quad M=a e^{-\frac{|v-u|^{2}}{2 b}},
$$

with $a, b \geq 0$. It is then clear that $u=u_{f}$. Let us define for comodity the functions

$$
F_{p}(a)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|v|^{p} \frac{a e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}}}{1+a e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}}} .
$$

They are well defined for $a \in[0,+\infty)$. Then we write

$$
\rho_{f}=b^{3 / 2} F_{0}(a), \quad p_{f}=b^{5 / 2} F_{2}(a) .
$$

If we define now the internal energy

$$
e_{f}=\frac{1}{2 \rho_{f}}\left(p_{f}-4 \rho_{f}\left|u_{f}\right|^{2}\right),
$$

we can quote the following result from (3):
Proposition 2.1. There exists a positive constant $l$ such that the mapping

$$
(a, b) \in(0,+\infty)^{2} \mapsto\left(\rho_{f}, e_{f}\right) \in \mathcal{E}
$$

where $\mathcal{E}=\left\{\left(\rho_{f}, e_{f}\right)\right.$ s.t. $\left.e_{f}>l \rho_{f}^{2 / 3}\right\}$, is one-to-one.
From now on, we will denote by $P_{0}$ a global equilibrium defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{0}=\frac{M_{0}}{1+M_{0}}, \quad M_{0}=e^{a_{0}} e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{0}, b_{0}>0$ and $a_{0}$ is such that

$$
F_{2}\left(e^{a_{0}}\right)>2 l F_{0}\left(e^{a_{0}}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}
$$

2.2. Existence theory. Let $\Omega$ be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ regular enough such that the normal is well defined on the boundary. The equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} f+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f=Q(f) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

must be supplemented with an initial condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(0, x, v)=f_{0}(x, v) \quad \forall(x, v) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and a boundary condition we choose to be specular reflection for simplicity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t, x, v)=f\left(t, x, R_{x}(v)\right) \quad \forall(x, v) \in \partial \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \text { such that } n(x) . v<0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $R_{x}(v)$ is the specular reflection law

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{x}(v)=v+2(v \cdot n(x)) n(x) . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The choice of the specular reflection as a boundary condition makes all the boundary terms vanish in the weak formulation of the equation. It also cancels the Prandtl layer along the boundary.

The following existence result was proved in [5, 2]:
Theorem 2.2. Let $\Omega$ be either $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or a regular subset of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Let the collision kernel $B$ be such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq B \in L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0} \in L^{\infty}\left(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}\right), \quad 0 \leq f_{0} \leq 1 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, the problem (2.2)-(2.4) has a unique solution $f$ satisfying

$$
f \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+} \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}\right), \quad 0 \leq f \leq 1 \text { a.e. }
$$

Moreover, $f$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $t$.
The assumption made on the collision kernel (2.6) is very strong, much more than Grad's cut-off assumption (1.3)-(1.4) which would be enough to ensure the existence of a solution 6]. However, it is (until now) necessary in order to prove that the local conservation laws are satisfied by the solution. It is the case if we assume that the collision kernel has the symmetry

$$
\begin{equation*}
B(w, \omega)=q(|w|,|w \cdot \omega|) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is physically relevant. The following proposition was proved in 2 using a dispersion argument which states roughly that if $f$ is the solution to the transport equations

$$
\partial_{t} f+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f=g
$$

and $\int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}|v|^{2} g \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} t \leq C_{0}$, then $\int_{0}^{T} \int_{K} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|v|^{3} f \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} t \leq C_{K}$ for all compact subsets $K \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$.

Proposition 2.3. Assume that the collision kernel $B$ is as in (2.6) and (2.8). Assume moreover that the initial data is as in (2.7), and

$$
\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(1+|v|^{3}\right) f_{0}(x, v) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v<+\infty
$$

Then, the solution $f$ to (2.2)-(2.4) satisfies, in the distributional sense, the local conservation laws

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\partial_{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f \mathrm{~d} v+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0  \tag{2.9}\\
\partial_{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v f \mathrm{~d} v+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v \otimes v f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0 \\
\partial_{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|v|^{2} f \mathrm{~d} v+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v|v|^{2} f \mathrm{~d} v\right)=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

Finally, under the same assumptions, Boltzmann's H-theorem is true:
Proposition 2.4. Let the collision kernel $B$ satisfy (2.6) and (2.6). Assume that the initial data satisfy (2.7), and

$$
\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(|x|^{2}+|v|^{2}\right) f_{0}(x, v) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v<+\infty
$$

and let $f$ be the solution to (2.2)-(2.4). Then,

$$
\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} s(f)(t) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D(f) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s=\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} s\left(f_{0}\right) .
$$

## 3. Strategy and main result

In investigating the incompressible Euler limit of the Boltzmann-Fermi equation, we use the modulated entropy method as in the classical case 122. Let us first introduce the relative entropy of the solution $f_{\varepsilon}$ to (1.6) with respect to the global thermodynamic equilibrium $P_{0}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{0}\right)=\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}( & f_{\varepsilon} \log \frac{f_{\varepsilon}}{P_{0}}-f_{\varepsilon}+P_{0} \\
& \left.+\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right) \log \frac{1-f_{\varepsilon}}{1-P_{0}}-\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)+1-P_{0}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

It is a non-negative Lyapunov functional for the Boltzmann-Fermi equation thanks to the H theorem. In the fast relaxation limit, $f_{\varepsilon}$ is supposed to be clos to a thermodynamic equilibrium, we therefore define the modulated entropy by

$$
\begin{aligned}
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)=\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}( & f_{\varepsilon} \log \frac{f_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}-f_{\varepsilon}+P_{\varepsilon} \\
& \left.+\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right) \log \frac{1-f_{\varepsilon}}{1-P_{\varepsilon}}-\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)+1-P_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

where $P_{\varepsilon}=\frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}$ is some local equilibrium which approximates the solution $f_{\varepsilon}$, with $M_{\varepsilon}=a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{\left|v-u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}}$. The relative entropy functional measures this approximation since

$$
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right) \geq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}}-\sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x
$$

consequence of the pointwise inequality

$$
(\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y})^{2} \leq x \log \frac{x}{y}-x+y \quad \forall x, y>0
$$

We then study the time evolution of the modulated entropy and prove the following stability equality:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(t)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}\right)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q+3}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s \\
& \quad-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(1, \frac{v-\varepsilon u}{b_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& \quad-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{3 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right] \mathrm{d} s .
\end{aligned}
$$

where the acceleration term $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right)$ is defined by (5.3). It will go to 0 when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ together with the last term by choosing some appropriate functions $a_{1}, u, b_{1}$ thanks to some filtering techniques.

The main difficulty relies in the control of the flux terms

$$
\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \text { and } \frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s
$$

containing translated and rescaled variants of the flux momentum and energy

$$
\Phi=v \otimes v-\frac{1}{3}|v|^{2} I, \quad \Psi=v\left(|v|^{2}-\tau_{0}\right) .
$$

They are dealt with thanks to some bounds containing the relative entropy and the entropy dissipation, coming from the theory of the linearized collision operator. Using Gronwall's lemma we finally prove that

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right) \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0
$$

Our main result is the following:
Theorem 3.1. Let $\Omega$ be some regular bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Let $\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n}\right)$ be a family of measurable nonnegative functions over $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}$ satisfying the bounds

$$
\begin{gathered}
\int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(1+|x|^{2}+|v|^{3}\right) f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \leq C_{\varepsilon} \\
0 \leq f_{\varepsilon, i n} \leq 1
\end{gathered}
$$

and the scaling condition

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{0}\right) \leq C
$$

Without loss of generality, assume that the fluctuation $g_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}$ defined by $f_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}=$ $P_{0}\left(1+\varepsilon g_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}\right)$ converges

$$
g_{\varepsilon, i n} \rightarrow g_{i n}=\frac{1}{1+M_{0}}\left(\frac{a_{i n}}{a_{0}}+\frac{u_{i n}}{b_{0}} \cdot v+\frac{b_{i n}}{2 b_{0}}|v|^{2}\right) .
$$

We assume moreover that the initial data is well-prepared:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $f_{\varepsilon}$ be some family of solutions to the scaled Boltzmann-Fermi equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\varepsilon \partial_{t} f_{\varepsilon}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q}} Q\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)  \tag{3.2}\\
f_{\varepsilon}(0, x, v)=f_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}(x, v) \quad \text { on } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

with $q>1$, and with $B_{\varepsilon}(z, \omega)=\mathbb{1}_{|z| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$, endowed with the boundary condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\varepsilon}(t, x, v)=f_{\varepsilon}\left(t, x, R_{x}(v)\right) \quad \forall(x, v) \in \partial \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \text { such that } n(x) . v<0 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $R_{x}(v)$ is the specular reflection law (2.5). Assume that we have the following control on the tails :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{0}\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{0}}{P_{0}}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \leq C \text { a.e. } \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, finally, assume that
(3.5) $\quad \tilde{\Phi}=\mathcal{L}^{-1} \Phi \quad$ and $\quad \tilde{\Psi}=\mathcal{L}^{-1} \Psi \quad$ are at most polynomial as $\quad|v| \rightarrow \infty$.

Then the fluctuation $\left(g_{\varepsilon}\right)$ defined by $f_{\varepsilon}=P_{0}\left(1+\varepsilon g_{\varepsilon}\right)$ converges in $L^{1}([0, T] ;(1+$ $\left.\left.|v|^{2}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right)$ weak

$$
g_{\varepsilon} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{1+M_{0}}\left(\frac{\bar{a}}{a_{0}}+\frac{\bar{u}}{b_{0}} \cdot v+\frac{\bar{b}}{2 b_{0}}|v|^{2}\right)
$$

where $(\bar{a}, \bar{u}, \bar{b})$ is the unique Lipschitz solution to the incompressible Euler equations

$$
\partial_{t} \bar{u}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{u}+\nabla_{x} p=0, \quad \nabla_{x} \cdot \bar{u}=0
$$

supplemented with

$$
\partial_{t} \bar{a}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{a}=0, \quad \partial_{t} \bar{b}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{b}=0, \quad \nabla_{x}\left(b_{0} \bar{a}+\tau_{0} \bar{b}\right)=0
$$

on $[0, T]$, and $T$ is the maximal lifespan of the solution.

In (3.5), $\mathcal{L}$ is the linearized collision operator around $P_{0}$. We will see in the next subsection that it is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and that $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ are orthogonal to its kernel. This gives a sense to $\tilde{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}$.

It should be very technical but not very hard to prove that (3.5) is true, as it was proved in the classical case in [8]. Actually, the real assumptions are (3.1), which allows us to consider solutions that are close to equilibrium even at $t=0$, and thus not to talk about relaxation and Knudsen layer; and (3.4), which gives a stronger control that what is needed, but will be used in the control of the flux terms.

## 4. Useful intermediate results

In this section we define and study the linearized collision operator, and then give some bounds that will be very useful in the proof of Theorem 3.1.
4.1. The linearized collision operator. As we look at solutions of (1.6) which are fluctuations around an equilibrium state, that is,

$$
f_{\varepsilon}=P_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \bar{g}_{\varepsilon}\right),
$$

it makes sense to use the linearized collision operator, which is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g=\int_{S^{2}} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) \frac{M_{\varepsilon, *}}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}} \\
& \times\left(g\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)+g_{*}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-g^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)-g_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{\varepsilon}(v)=\int_{S^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{B\left(v-v_{*}\right) M_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)}{\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and recall that $P_{\varepsilon}=\frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}$ with $M_{\varepsilon}=a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{\left|v-u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}}$; the following proposition gives some properties of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ :

Proposition 4.1. Assume that the cross section $B(z, \omega)$ satisfies Grad's cutoff assumptions (1.3)-(1.4); then $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator on $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ with domain

$$
\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right)=\left\{g \in L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right) \mid \nu_{\varepsilon} g \in L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)\right\}=L^{2}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right) .
$$

and kernel

$$
\operatorname{Ker}_{\mathcal{L}}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{v}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v|^{2}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right\} .
$$

It can be decomposed as

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g(v)=\nu_{\varepsilon}(v) g(v)+\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon} g(v)
$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}$ is a compact integral operator on $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ and

$$
0<\nu_{-} \leq \nu_{\varepsilon}(v) \leq C_{B}\left(1+|v|^{\beta}\right)
$$

provided that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq a_{\varepsilon} \leq C \text { and } \frac{1}{C} \leq b_{\varepsilon} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $C$ a positive constant independent of $\varepsilon$.
Remark 4.2. The assumption about the collision kernel $B(z, \omega)$ (1.3)-(1.4) is not compatible with the assumption $B \in L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}\right)$ that we made to ensure the existence of a solution which satisfies the local conservation laws. To bypass this difficulty, we will consider the simplified situation with a collision kernel

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{\varepsilon}(z, \omega)=\mathbb{1}_{|z| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}, \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}\right)$ but satisfies Grad's cutoff assumptions in the limt $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. When spectral properties of the linearized collision operator will be needed, we will consider the cross section $B \equiv 1$ and then evaluate the difference between the terms involving $B_{\varepsilon}$ and those with $B$.
Proof. Let $g, h \in L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int h \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v=\int h\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g \frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \mathrm{d} v \\
&=\frac{1}{4} \iiint_{S^{2}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) \frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \frac{M_{\varepsilon, *}}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \times\left(g\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)+g_{*}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-g^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)-g_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \times\left(h\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)+h_{*}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-h^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)-h_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{aligned}
$$

which easily shows that $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator. Moreover, letting $h=g$ implies that $g$ is in the nullspace of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ if and only if, for almost all $\left(v, v_{*}, \omega\right) \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{3} \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}$,

$$
g\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)+g_{*}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)=g^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)+g_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)
$$

In other words, $g\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)$ must be a collision invariant, and therefore the nullspace of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ is made of all linear combinations of $\frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{v_{i}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v|^{2}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}$ (see (4)).

The next step is to split $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ into two parts:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g=\nu_{\varepsilon}(v) g+\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon} h(v)
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{\varepsilon}(v)=\int_{S^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{B\left(v-v_{*}\right) M_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)}{\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon} g(v)=\int_{S^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} B( & \left.v-v_{*}, \omega\right) \frac{M_{\varepsilon, *}}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}} \\
& \times\left(g_{*}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-g^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)-g_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{aligned}
$$

The bounds on $\nu_{\varepsilon}$ can be proved using Grad's cutoff assumptions (1.3)-(1.4). They are uniform in $\varepsilon$ thanks to (4.2). The operator $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}$ can be split into two operators in the following way:

$$
\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon} g(v)=\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{1} g(v)-\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{2} g(v)
$$

with

$$
\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{1} g(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \int_{S^{2}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) M_{\varepsilon, *} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}} g_{*} \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{2} g(v)=\int_{S^{2}} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) \frac{M_{\varepsilon, *}}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}} \frac{1}{1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}} \\
& \times\left(g^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)+g_{*}^{\prime}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{aligned}
$$

In the classical case, the same decomposition holds, and a clever change of variables known as "Carleman's parametrization" allows to show that the following two operators are compact on $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ (see [11] for example):

$$
\begin{gathered}
\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{1} g(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \int_{S^{2}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) M_{\varepsilon, *} g_{*} \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{2} g(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \int_{S^{2}} B\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) M_{\varepsilon, *}\left(g^{\prime}+g_{*}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{gathered}
$$

It is easy to see that

$$
\left\|\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{1} g\right\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)} \leq C\left\|\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{1} g\right\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}
$$

and

$$
\left\|\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^{2} g\right\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)} \leq C\left(\left\|\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{2} g\right\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}+\left\|\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} g\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}\right)
$$

from which we deduce that $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}$ is a compact operator on $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$.
With these results, we can assert that $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ is coercive, and therefore is a Fredholm operator:
Corollary 4.3. There exists $C>0$ such that, for each $g \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right) \cap\left(\operatorname{Ker}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{\perp}$,

$$
\int g \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \geq C_{\mathcal{L}}\|g\|_{L^{2}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{2}
$$

If (4.2) holds, then $C_{\mathcal{L}}$ is independent of $\varepsilon$.
Proof. This result is a consequence of Proposition 4.1. Indeed, the multiplication operator $g \mapsto \nu_{\varepsilon} g$ is self-adjoint on $L^{2}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ and has continuous spectrum, namely the numerical range of $\nu_{\varepsilon}\left[\nu_{\varepsilon}^{-},+\infty[\right.$ where

$$
\nu_{-} \leq \nu_{\varepsilon}^{-}=\inf _{v \in \mathbb{R}^{3}} \nu_{\varepsilon}(v)
$$

Then, since $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}$ is self-adjoint and compact on $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$, Weyl's theorem ensures that the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$ is made of $\left[\nu_{\varepsilon}^{-},+\infty[\right.$ and of a sequence of eigenvalues on the interval $\left[0, \nu_{\varepsilon}^{-}\right]$with $\nu_{\varepsilon}^{-}$as unique possible accumulation point. Consequently, there exists a smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1}$ which is bounded by below by $\lambda^{1}$ if (4.2) holds, and the following spectral gap inequality is satisfied for each $g \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right) \cap\left(\operatorname{Ker}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{\perp}$ :

$$
\int g \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \geq C_{\mathcal{L}}\|g\|_{L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{2}
$$

Recalling that

$$
\int g \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} g M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v=\int \nu_{\varepsilon} g^{2} M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v-\int g \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon} g M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v
$$

and using the continuity of $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}$, we get the inequality with the weighted norm as stated above.
4.2. Useful bounds. This subsection lists some a priori bounds which are needed for the proof of convergence in the hydrodynamic limit. The first estimate comes from Young's inequality:

Proposition 4.4. For $z>-1$ we define the function

$$
h(z)=(1+z) \log (1+z)-z .
$$

It satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h(z) \geq 0 \quad \text { for } z>-1, \\
& p|z| \leq \lambda h^{*}(p)+\frac{1}{\lambda} h(z)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $h^{*}$ is the Legendre transform of $h$

$$
h^{*}(p)=\max _{z>-1}(p z-h(z))=e^{p}-p-1 .
$$

The study of the function $h$ is motivated by the relation

$$
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)=\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x+\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(1-P_{\varepsilon}\right) h\left(\frac{P_{\varepsilon}-f_{\varepsilon}}{1-P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x
$$

Proof. The first two properties are immediate from the definitions of $h$ and the modulated entropy. The last one comes from Young's inequality

$$
p z \leq h^{*}(p)+h(z)
$$

supplemented with the two inequalities

$$
\begin{gathered}
h(|z|) \leq h(z) \quad z>-1 \\
h^{*}(\lambda p) \leq \lambda^{2} h^{*}(p) \quad p \geq 0, \lambda \in[0,1] .
\end{gathered}
$$

It will be useful to work in $L^{2}$ since it is the natural space for the study of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$, and then we will use renormalized fluctuations instead of the natural one defined as $f_{\varepsilon}=P_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \bar{g}_{\varepsilon}\right)$ :
Proposition 4.5. Let us define the renormalized fluctuations

$$
\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\sqrt{\frac{f_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}}-1\right)
$$

and

$$
\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-f_{\varepsilon}}{1-P_{\varepsilon}}}-1\right)
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x+\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(1-P_{\varepsilon}\right) \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right) . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varepsilon \sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x)}+\left\|\varepsilon \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x)} \leq C \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C>0$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$, provided that (4.2) holds.
Proof. Estimate (4.5) is a direct consequence of the definition of $\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}$ and the following inequality:

$$
x \log \frac{x}{y}-x+y \geq(\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y})^{2}, \quad \forall x, y>0
$$

Recalling that $0 \leq f_{\varepsilon} \leq 1$ and that $P_{\varepsilon}$ is bounded indipendently of $\varepsilon$ the second point comes by direct inspection.

In the $L^{2}$ setting, the collision kernel needs also to be renormalized. We repeat here the définition of the entropy dissipation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)=\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}} B_{\varepsilon}\left(v-v_{*}, \omega\right) & \left(f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \cdot \log \left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right.}{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 4.6. Define the renormalized collision kernel by
$\hat{q}_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{P_{\varepsilon}} \iint B_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega$, with

$$
\Lambda_{\varepsilon}=\frac{M_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon, *}}{\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1+M_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}
$$

Assume that (4.2) holds. Then

$$
\left\|\hat{q}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon}^{-1} P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{2} \leq C D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

where $\nu_{\varepsilon}$ is the collision frequency defined by (4.1) and $C$ is a positive constant independent of $\varepsilon$.

Proof. This estimate is obtained by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$
\hat{q}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \leq \frac{1}{P_{\varepsilon}^{2}}\left(\iint B_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega\right)\left(\iint B_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega\right)
$$

with

$$
G_{\varepsilon}=\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)} .
$$

We easily see that

$$
\iint B_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega=\nu_{\varepsilon} \frac{P_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}
$$

Next, using the classical inequality

$$
(x-y) \log \frac{x}{y} \geq 4(\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y})^{2}, \quad \forall x, y>0
$$

we get thanks to (4.2)

$$
\left\|\hat{q}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\nu_{\varepsilon}^{-1} P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{2} \leq C D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

Mixing together the previous estimates, we can prove a relaxation result. Define $\Pi_{\varepsilon}$ as the orthogonal projection in $L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ on $\operatorname{Ker} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$. The following proposition will be useful in the control of the flux terms: couped with the control on the tails (3.4) and some interpolation argument, it will allow us to control the third moment of $f_{\varepsilon}$.

Proposition 4.7. Define $\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}$ as in Proposition 4.5 and assume (4.2). Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}-\Pi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)} \\
& =\varepsilon O\left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon}\right)}^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\sqrt{\left.\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v\right)}+o(\varepsilon) .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Plugging the identities

$$
f_{\varepsilon}=P_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2}, \quad 1-f_{\varepsilon}=\left(1-P_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1+\varepsilon \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2}
$$

into

$$
\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}
$$

gives
$\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}=\sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} P_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-P_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-P_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}\left(1+\varepsilon \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1+\varepsilon \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)(1+\varepsilon \hat{h})\left(1+\varepsilon \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)$
which leads to the key following identity:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)} \\
&= \varepsilon \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}-\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right)-\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\right) \\
&+\varepsilon^{2} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right. \\
&\left.\quad+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)  \tag{4.7}\\
&+\varepsilon^{3} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}\left(\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
&\left.\quad+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\right) \\
&+\varepsilon^{4} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Raising it to the square and dividing by $\varepsilon^{2}$, we get, thanks to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varepsilon \sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x)}+\left\|\varepsilon \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x)} \leq C \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

the following control:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
& +\varepsilon^{2}\left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{4}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}(\mathrm{~d} v)}^{4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that here we used the fact that, for a given integrable function $u$, we have (see [1] for more details)

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \times S^{2}} u\left(v^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} \omega \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u(v) \mathrm{d} v
$$

The next step is to decompose $B=B_{\varepsilon}+\left(B-B_{\varepsilon}\right)$, so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint B\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} \omega \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)+\frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint\left(B-B_{\varepsilon}\right) f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *} \mathrm{~d} \omega \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

Recalling that $f_{\varepsilon}$ can be written $f_{\varepsilon}=P_{\varepsilon}\left(1+2 \varepsilon \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\varepsilon^{2} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$ and $M_{\varepsilon}=a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{|v-u \varepsilon|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}}$, and thanks to the following inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} M_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon, *} \leq a_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} M_{\varepsilon}^{3 / 4} M_{\varepsilon, *}^{3 / 4} e^{-\frac{1}{16 b_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{2}}}, \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint \mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *} \mathrm{~d} \omega \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{2}}}+2 \iiint \mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} P_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*}  \tag{4.10}\\
& \quad+2 \varepsilon \iiint \mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} P_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*}
\end{align*}
$$

Using Proposition 4.4 we obtain for $\delta>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iiint \mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} P_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \\
& \leq \delta \iint P_{\varepsilon, *} P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*}+\iint \mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} P_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon, *} h^{*}\left(\frac{1}{\delta \varepsilon^{2}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^{2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v\right)+C e^{-\frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

if $\delta$ is chosen big enough. Since $\varepsilon \sqrt{P_{\varepsilon, *}} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}$ is bounded, the same computation works for the second term in the right hand side of (4.10), so that we finally get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint B\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} \omega \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)+\varepsilon^{2}\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{4}+C \varepsilon^{2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v\right)+C e^{-\frac{1}{C \varepsilon^{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Collecting all the pieces together and using the coercivity of the linearized operator (Corollary 4.3) leads to the inequality stated above.

## 5. The modulated entropy

The main idea to prove the convergence of the solutions to the scaled BoltzmannFermi equation toward a solution of the incompressible Euler equation is to study the time evolution of the modulated entropy. Let

$$
P_{\varepsilon}=\frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}, \quad M_{\varepsilon}=a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}},
$$

be a local equilibrium which approximates the solution $f_{\varepsilon}$, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{\varepsilon}=e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}}, \quad b_{\varepsilon}=b_{0} e^{\varepsilon b_{1}} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $a_{0}$ and $b_{0}$ are positive constants which were defined in Subsection 2.1. The modulated entropy is defined by
$H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)=\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f_{\varepsilon} \log \frac{f_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}-f_{\varepsilon}+P_{\varepsilon}+\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right) \log \frac{1-f_{\varepsilon}}{1-P_{\varepsilon}}-\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)+1-P_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x$.
Proposition 5.1. Any solution to the scaled Boltzmann-Fermi equation (1.6) satisfies the following identity

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(t)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, \text { in }}\right)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q+3}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s \\
&-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(1, \frac{v-\varepsilon u}{b_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
&-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
&+\frac{1}{3 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{|v|}}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right] \mathrm{d} s .
\end{aligned}
$$

where the acceleration operator $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right)$ is defined by (5.3).
Proof. The modulated entropy can be written as

$$
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)=H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{0}\right)+\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f_{\varepsilon} \log \frac{M_{0}}{M_{\varepsilon}}+\log \frac{1+M_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{0}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x
$$

The H-theorem allows to write

$$
\begin{align*}
H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(t) & =H\left(f_{\varepsilon, \text { in }} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}\right)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q+1}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s \\
& +\int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v\right] \mathrm{d} s  \tag{5.2}\\
& +\int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \log \left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v\right] \mathrm{d} s
\end{align*}
$$

The last term is rewritten thanks to an integration per part,

$$
\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \log \left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v=\frac{1}{3} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{1}{b_{\varepsilon}}|v|^{2} \frac{a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}}}{1+a_{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}}} \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x .
$$

For the other term in (5.2), we compute the time derivative:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \\
& =\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[\partial_{t} f_{\varepsilon}\left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+f_{\varepsilon}\left(-\partial_{t} \log a_{\varepsilon}-\frac{\partial_{t} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}} \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{\varepsilon}{b_{\varepsilon}}(v-\varepsilon u) \cdot \partial_{t} u\right)\right] \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the conservation laws (2.9), it comes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} & \left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \\
& =-\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left[\partial_{t} \log a_{\varepsilon}+u \cdot \nabla_{x} \log a_{\varepsilon}\right. \\
& +\frac{\varepsilon}{b_{\varepsilon}}(v-\varepsilon u)\left(\partial_{t} u+u \cdot \nabla_{x} u+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} u:(v-\varepsilon u)+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} b_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \log a_{\varepsilon}\right) \\
& \left.+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\left(\frac{\partial_{t} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}+u \cdot \frac{\nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(v-\varepsilon u) \cdot \frac{\nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}\right)\right] \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Introducing the rescaled translated versions of the momentum and energy fluxes

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Phi_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{b_{\varepsilon}}\left((v-\varepsilon u)^{\otimes 2}-|v-\varepsilon u|^{2} I\right) \\
\Psi_{\varepsilon}=\frac{v-\varepsilon u}{b_{\varepsilon}^{2}}\left(|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}-\tau_{\varepsilon}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

$\left(\tau_{\varepsilon}\right.$ is chosen so that $\left.\frac{\Psi_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \in\left(\operatorname{Ker} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{\perp}\right)$ we then obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} & \left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \\
& =-\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left[\partial_{t} \log a_{\varepsilon}+u \cdot \nabla_{x} \log a_{\varepsilon}\right. \\
& +\frac{\varepsilon}{b_{\varepsilon}}(v-\varepsilon u)\left(\partial_{t} u+u \cdot \nabla_{x} u+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} b_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \tau_{\varepsilon} \frac{\nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \\
& \left.+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\left(\frac{\partial_{t} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}+u \cdot \frac{\nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon}}{b_{\varepsilon}}+\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \cdot u\right)\right] \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x \\
& -\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v .
\end{aligned}
$$

We now replace $a_{\varepsilon}$ and $b_{\varepsilon}$ by (5.1), which leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} & \left(-\log a_{\varepsilon}+\frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \\
& =-\iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left[\varepsilon\left(\partial_{t} a_{1}+u \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{1}\right)\right. \\
& +\frac{\varepsilon}{b_{\varepsilon}}(v-\varepsilon u)\left(\partial_{t} u+u \cdot \nabla_{x} u+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} a_{1}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tau_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} b_{1}\right) \\
& \left.+\varepsilon \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\left(\partial_{t} b_{1}+u \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1}+\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \cdot u\right)\right] \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x \\
& -\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v .
\end{aligned}
$$

Summarizing, the modulated entropy satisfies the following equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(t) & =\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}\right)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q+3}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s \\
& -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(1, \frac{v-\varepsilon u}{b_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& -\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1}+\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& +\frac{1}{3 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1|v|^{2}}^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}}{\left.1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right] \mathrm{d} s .} .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where the acceleration operator is defined by
$\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}(a, u, b)=\left(\begin{array}{l}\partial_{t} a+u \cdot \nabla_{x} a \\ \partial_{t} u+u \cdot \nabla_{x} u+b_{0} \frac{e^{\varepsilon b}-1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} a+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\tau_{\varepsilon}-\tau_{0}\right) \nabla_{x} b+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x}\left(b_{0} a+\tau_{0} b\right) \\ \partial_{t} b+u \cdot \nabla_{x} b+\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \cdot u\end{array}\right)$

## 6. Construction of the approximate solutions

A global equilibrium solution is not expected to be a good approximation of $f_{\varepsilon}$ in the fast relaxation limit since fast oscillations can take place, such as acoustic waves. Hence we have to find correctors in order to obtain a refined approximation which will lead to the convenient asymptotics.

Define the unknown

$$
V=\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right)
$$

the penalization operator

$$
W V=\left(0, \nabla_{x}\left(b_{0} a_{1}+\tau_{0} b_{1}\right), \frac{2}{3} \nabla_{x} . u\right)
$$

and the bilinear operator

$$
B(V, V)=\left(\begin{array}{l}
u \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{1} \\
u \cdot \nabla_{x} u+b_{0} b_{1} \nabla_{x} a_{1}+\tau_{1} \nabla_{x} b_{1} \\
u \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1}
\end{array}\right)
$$

( $\tau_{1}$ is a linear combination of $a_{1}$ and $b_{1}$ ); we want to find $V_{\varepsilon}=\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon}\right)$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{2}$, that is,

$$
\partial_{t} V_{\varepsilon}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon} W V_{\varepsilon}+B\left(V_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

with the constraint

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1|v|^{2}}}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \rightarrow 0 \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the main difficulty. However, for this constraint to be satisfied, we only need the mass conservation, as shown by Proposition 6.2.

In $L^{2}$ equipped with the norm

$$
\|V\|_{L^{2}}^{2}=\left\|a_{1}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\|u\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\frac{3}{2 \tau_{0}}\left\|b_{0} a_{1}+\tau_{0} b_{1}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}
$$

the operator $W$ is skew-symmetric. We can thus defined the associated semigroup $\mathcal{W}$. If we conjugate the equation with $\mathcal{W}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)$, it comes

$$
\partial_{t}\left(\mathcal{W}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) V\right)+\mathcal{W}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) B(V, V)=0
$$

Defining

$$
\tilde{V}=\mathcal{W}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) V
$$

it becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \tilde{V}+\mathcal{W}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) B\left(\mathcal{W}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) \tilde{V}, \mathcal{W}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) \tilde{V}\right)=0 \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The problem can be dealt with using filtering methods (see 133 for example). We will prove the following result:

Theorem 6.1. Let $\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)$ belong to $H^{s}(\Omega)$ for some $s>\frac{5}{2}$. Then there exists some $T>0$ and some family $\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right)$ such that

$$
\sup _{N \in \mathbb{N}^{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left\|\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left([0, T] ; H^{s}(\Omega)\right)} \leq C_{T}
$$

$$
\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N, i n}, u^{\varepsilon, N, i n}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N, i n}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right) \quad \text { in } H^{s}(\Omega) \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text { then } N \rightarrow+\infty,
$$

$$
\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { in } L^{2}([0, T] \times \Omega) \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text { then } N \rightarrow+\infty
$$

and

$$
A_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}}{2 b_{0}}|v|^{2}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \longrightarrow 0
$$

in $L^{1}([0, T])$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $N \rightarrow+\infty$.
6.1. Study of $W$. At this point, we need spectral properties of the operator $W$. As it is skew-symmetric, its eigenvalues are purely imaginary, and its eigenvectors satisfy

$$
W V_{\lambda}=i \lambda V_{\lambda},
$$

which can be written

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
0=i \lambda a_{\lambda} \\
\nabla_{x}\left(b_{0} a_{\lambda}+\tau_{0} b_{\lambda}\right)=i \lambda u_{\lambda} \\
\frac{2}{3} \nabla_{x} \cdot u_{\lambda}=i \lambda b_{\lambda}
\end{array}\right.
$$

In other words, if $\lambda \neq 0$, the eigenvectors satisfy

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
a_{\lambda}=0 \\
\Delta_{x} b_{\lambda}=-\frac{3}{2 \tau_{0}} \lambda^{2} b_{\lambda} \\
\nabla_{x} b_{\lambda}=i \frac{\lambda}{\tau_{0}} u_{\lambda}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Hence, the operator $W$ has the same spectral structure as the laplacian on $\Omega$, which means that is is diagonalizable on the orthogonal of its kernel. Indeed, there exists an hilbertian basis $\left(\phi_{n}\right)_{n \in I}$ of $L^{2}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
-\Delta_{x} \phi_{n}=\mu_{n} \phi_{n} \quad \text { with } \quad n . \nabla_{x} \phi_{n}=0 \quad \text { on } \quad \partial \Omega
$$

with $\mu_{n}>0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ and

$$
\Delta_{x} \phi_{n}=0 \quad \text { with } \quad n \cdot \nabla_{x} \phi_{n}=0 \quad \text { on } \quad \partial \Omega
$$

for $n \in I \backslash \mathbb{N}^{*}$. This yields that the family $\left(\psi_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined by

$$
\psi_{n}=\left(0, i \operatorname{sgn}(n) \sqrt{\frac{3 \tau_{0}}{2 \mu_{|n|}}} \nabla_{x} \phi_{|n|}, \phi_{|n|}\right)
$$

is an hilbertian basis of $(\operatorname{ker} W)^{\perp}$. An explicit computation shows that the orthogonal projection on ker $W$ is

$$
\Pi_{0}(a, u, b)=\left(a, P u, \frac{|\Omega|^{-1} \int\left(b_{0} a+\tau_{0} b\right) \mathrm{d} x-b_{0} a}{\tau_{0}}\right)
$$

where $P$ is the Leray projection, that is, the orthogonal projection onto the divergencefree vectors. In the sequel, $\Pi_{\lambda}$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\operatorname{ker}(W-\lambda I)$.
6.2. Construction. We just sketch here the construction of approximate solutions to (6.2), but we refer to 12 for all the details. The method consists in:

- Decompose the operator $W$ as $W=\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{p}} \lambda \Pi_{\lambda}$ and plug this into (6.2). It leads to

$$
\partial_{t} \tilde{V}+\sum_{k_{1}, k_{2}, k_{3} \in \sigma_{p}} e^{i \frac{t}{\varepsilon}\left(\lambda_{k_{1}}-\lambda_{k_{2}}-\lambda_{k_{3}}\right)} \Pi_{\lambda_{k_{1}}} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda_{k_{2}}} \tilde{V}, \Pi_{\lambda_{k_{3}}} \tilde{V}\right)=0
$$

- The first order approximation $\tilde{V}_{0}$ of $\tilde{V}$ is defined as the solution of equation (6.2) when we take into account only the resonant modes, that is,

$$
\partial_{t} \tilde{V}_{0}+\sum_{\lambda_{k_{1}}=\lambda_{k_{2}}+\lambda_{k_{3}}} \Pi_{\lambda_{k_{1}}} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda_{k_{2}}} \tilde{V}_{0}, \Pi_{\lambda_{k_{3}}} \tilde{V}_{0}\right)=0
$$

This equation is known to have solutions in $L_{l o c}^{\infty}\left(\left[0, T_{*}\right), H^{s}(\Omega)\right)$ provided that $V^{i n} \in H^{s}(\Omega)$ and $s>\frac{5}{2}$. However, $\tilde{V}_{0}$ is not an approximation of $\tilde{V}$ in the sense that $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(\tilde{V}_{0}\right)$ converges weakly but not strongly in $L^{2}$ to 0 . We therefore have to add correctors.

- Hence, we construct the second order approximation plugging $\tilde{V}=\tilde{V}_{0}+$ $\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{1}+o(\varepsilon)$ into (6.2). To avoid the problem of small divisors, we introduce the projection onto a finite dimensional subset of $C^{\infty}(\bar{\Omega}) J_{N}$, which is the orthogonal projection onto the $N$ first harmonics of $W$ and the $N$ first harmonics in ker $W$. We then denote $\tilde{V}_{0}^{N}=J_{N} \tilde{V}_{0}$, and we check that $\int \tilde{V}_{0} \mathrm{~d} x=\int \tilde{V}_{0}^{N} \mathrm{~d} x$. We define $\tilde{V}_{1}^{N}$ by
$\tilde{V}_{1}^{N}=J_{N} \sum_{\lambda_{k_{1}}+\lambda_{k_{2}} \neq \lambda_{k}} \frac{\exp \left(\frac{i t}{\varepsilon}\left(\lambda_{k}-\lambda_{k_{1}}-\lambda_{k_{2}}\right)\right)}{i\left(\lambda_{k_{1}}+\lambda_{k_{2}}-\lambda_{k}\right)} \Pi_{\lambda_{k}} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda_{k_{1}}} \tilde{V}_{0}^{N}, \Pi_{\lambda_{k_{2}}} \tilde{V}_{0}^{N}\right)$.
Then, $\tilde{V}_{0}^{N}+\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{1}^{N}$ is an approximate solution of (6.2). However, it does not satisfy $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int\left(\tilde{V}_{0}^{N}+\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{1}^{N}\right) \mathrm{d} x \rightarrow 0$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
- We therefore define the third order approximation $\tilde{V}_{2}^{N}$ as in 12 by plugging $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\tilde{V}_{0}^{N}+\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{1}^{N}+\varepsilon^{2} \tilde{V}_{2}^{N}+o\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$ into (6.2), and we check that
$-\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\tilde{V}_{0}^{N}+\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{1}^{N}+\varepsilon^{2} \tilde{V}_{2}^{N}$ is an approximate solution of (6.2),
$-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{N} \mathrm{~d} x \rightarrow 0$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
The key ingredient for the above computations to work is that, for $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$ with $\lambda \neq \mu$, we have

$$
\Pi_{0} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda} V, \Pi_{\mu} V\right)=0
$$

Indeed, writing $\Pi_{\lambda} V=\left(a_{\lambda}, u_{\lambda}, b_{\lambda}\right)$, we get

$$
\Pi_{0} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda} V, \Pi_{\mu} V\right)=\frac{1}{2} \Pi_{0}\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{\lambda} \\
u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\lambda}+b_{0} b_{\lambda} \nabla_{x} a_{\mu}+b_{0} b_{\mu} \nabla_{x} a_{\lambda} \\
+\left(c^{1} a_{\lambda}+c^{2} b_{\lambda}\right) \nabla_{x} b_{\mu}+\left(c^{1} a_{\mu}+c^{2} b_{\mu}\right) \nabla_{x} b_{\lambda} \\
u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\lambda}
\end{array}\right) ;
$$

but $a_{\lambda}=a_{\mu}=0$ since $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$, so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{0} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda} V, \Pi_{\mu} V\right) & =\frac{1}{2} \Pi_{0}\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\lambda}+c^{2} b_{\lambda} \nabla_{x} b_{\mu}+c^{2} b_{\mu} \nabla_{x} b_{\lambda} \\
u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\lambda}
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
P\left(u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\lambda}\right) \\
\left.\oint\left(u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\lambda}\right) \mathrm{d} x\right)
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $\int u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{\mu} \mathrm{d} x=-\frac{3 \mu^{2}}{2 i \lambda} \int b_{\lambda} \cdot b_{\mu} \mathrm{d} x=0$ since $\lambda \neq \mu$. Moreover,

$$
\left(u_{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\mu}+u_{\mu} \cdot \nabla_{x} u_{\lambda}\right)_{i}=\left(\nabla_{x}\left(u_{\lambda} \cdot u_{\mu}\right)\right)+u_{\lambda}^{j}\left(\partial_{j} u_{\mu}^{i}-\partial_{i} u_{\mu}^{j}\right)+u_{\mu}^{j}\left(\partial_{j} u_{\lambda}^{i}-\partial_{i} u_{\lambda}^{j}\right),
$$

so that

$$
\Pi_{0} B\left(\Pi_{\lambda} V, \Pi_{\mu} V\right)=0
$$

In addition, if $\lambda \neq 0$,

$$
\int_{\Omega} b_{\lambda} \mathrm{d} x=-i \frac{2}{3 \lambda} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{x} \cdot u_{\lambda} \mathrm{d} x=i \frac{2}{3 \lambda} \int_{\partial \Omega} u \cdot n \mathrm{~d} \sigma_{x}=0 .
$$

At the end, we get that

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{b} \mathrm{~d} x=\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \int_{\Omega} b_{0} \mathrm{~d} x=0
$$

and

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{a} \mathrm{~d} x=0
$$

which is the key to see that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{N} \mathrm{~d} x \rightarrow 0$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
The equation for the non-oscillating part can be decoupled from the rest of the system, and writes

$$
\partial_{t} \Pi_{0} \tilde{V}+\Pi_{0} B\left(\Pi_{0} \tilde{V}, \Pi_{0} \tilde{V}\right)=0
$$

which can be rewritten, with the notation $\Pi_{0} \tilde{V}=(\bar{a}, \bar{u}, \bar{b})$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\partial_{t} \bar{a}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{a}=0, \quad \partial_{t} \bar{b}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{b}=0, \quad \nabla_{x}\left(b_{0} \bar{a}+\tau_{0} \bar{b}\right)=0, \\
\partial_{t} \bar{u}+\bar{u} \cdot \nabla_{x} \bar{u}+\nabla_{x} p=0, \quad \nabla_{x} \cdot \bar{u}=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

This is the incompressible Euler system. Now it remains to show that the approximate solution we constructed satisfies the constraint (6.1). This is the object of the following result:
Proposition 6.2. With the above contruction of $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\left(a_{1}^{N}, u^{N}, b_{1}^{N}\right)$, the quantity

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

goes to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for all $N \geq 1$.
Proof. $A_{\varepsilon}^{N}$ can be rewritten

$$
A_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \int\left(\beta_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right)^{3 / 2} F_{2}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) \mathrm{d} x
$$

where

$$
\beta_{\varepsilon}^{N}=b_{0} e^{\varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}, \quad \alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}=e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{N}}
$$

and

$$
F_{p}(\alpha)=\int|v|^{p} \frac{\alpha e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}}}{1+\alpha e^{-\frac{|v|^{2}}{2}}} \mathrm{~d} v
$$

Using the equality

$$
\alpha F_{2}^{\prime}(\alpha)=\frac{3}{2} F_{0}(\alpha),
$$

we compute

$$
A_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\frac{3 b_{0}^{3 / 2}}{2 \varepsilon} \int\left(e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}} F_{2}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) \partial_{t} b_{1}^{N}+e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}} F_{0}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) \partial_{t} a_{1}^{N}\right) \mathrm{d} x .
$$

We easily prove the two identities

$$
e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}\left(u \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1}^{N}+\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \cdot u^{N}\right)=\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}} u^{N}\right)
$$

and

$$
\int F_{2}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) \nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}} u^{N}\right) \mathrm{d} x=-\int e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}} F_{0}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) u^{N} \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{1}^{N} \mathrm{~d} x
$$

which imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{\varepsilon}^{N}=\frac{3 b_{0}^{3 / 2}}{2 \varepsilon} \int & \left(F_{2}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}\left(\partial_{t} b_{1}^{N}+u^{N} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1}^{N}+\frac{2}{3 \varepsilon} \nabla_{x} \cdot u^{N}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+F_{0}\left(\alpha_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) e^{\frac{3}{2} \varepsilon b_{1}^{N}}\left(\partial_{t} a_{1}^{N}+u^{N} \cdot \nabla_{x} a_{1}^{N}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the fact that $\mathcal{A}\left(a_{1}^{N}, u^{N}, b_{1}^{N}\right) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{2}$ and the conservation of the mass, we deduce that

$$
A_{\varepsilon}^{N} \underset{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} 0
$$

## 7. End of the proof

We now have all the ingredients to prove Theorem 3.1. We begin by controlling the flux terms, and then end the proof of the theorem.
7.1. Control of the flux terms. Our goal is to estimate the terms

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s
$$

and

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s
$$

with respect to the modulated entropy and the entropy dissipation. The main difficulty is that $\Psi_{\varepsilon}=O\left(|v|^{3}\right)$ whereas the modulated entropy allows us to control the powers of $v$ only up to 2 , via Young's inequality. We therefore try to gain as much integrability as possible. Here the relaxation estimate (4.3) plays an central role. Since it gives a control on $\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}$, we use a new decomposition of $f_{\varepsilon}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\varepsilon}=P_{\varepsilon}+\varepsilon^{2} P_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right) \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we obtain the following estimate:
Proposition 7.1. Assume that $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_{\varepsilon}$ have at most polynomial growth and that (4.2) holds. Then the flux terms are bounded by the following quantities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon} b_{\varepsilon} \Psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} b_{1} \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla_{x} u\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|D_{x}\left(u, b_{1}\right)(s)\right\|_{L^{2} \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)}\left(H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(s)+\int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)(s) \mathrm{d} x\right) \mathrm{d} s+o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The proof for the momentum flux (involving $\Phi_{\varepsilon}$ ) is identical to the one with the energy flux (involving $\Psi_{\varepsilon}$ ), hence we will focus on the first one. Writing $f_{\varepsilon}$ as in (7.1), we use a first decomposition of the flux terms:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \Phi_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v=\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \mathrm{d} v+\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{\varepsilon} \Phi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v=0$. To treat the first term in the right hand side, we use the identity (4.7), wich implies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \Phi_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} M_{\varepsilon} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}} \mathrm{d} v  \tag{7.3}\\
& =\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iiint B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
& -\iiint B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
& -\varepsilon \iiint B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}\left(\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
& -\varepsilon^{2} \iiint B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}-\hat{g}_{\varepsilon} \hat{g}_{\varepsilon, *} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{h}_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{align*}
$$

The first term can be estimated by the entropy dissipation as showed by the next lemma, while the other terms are controlled straightforwardly by the $L^{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)$ norm of $\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}$, and hence by the modulated entropy.
Lemma 7.2. Assume that $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}$ has at most a polynomial growth and that (4.2) holds.
Then the first term in the decomposition (7.3) is estimated by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int\left(\int B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2}\left(\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} x \\
\leq & C\left(\int D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x+e^{\frac{1}{16 \varepsilon^{2}}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Let

$$
G_{\varepsilon}=\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}\right)}-\sqrt{f_{\varepsilon} f_{\varepsilon, *}\left(1-f_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)\left(1-f_{\varepsilon, *}^{\prime}\right)} ;
$$

We decompose

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int B \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} G_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega  \tag{7.4}\\
& =\int B_{\varepsilon} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} G_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega+\int\left(B-B_{\varepsilon}\right) \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} G_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega
\end{align*}
$$

The first term is dealt with thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Proposition (4.6):

$$
\int B_{\varepsilon} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} G_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \leq C\left(\int B\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2} \Lambda_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} \omega\right)^{1 / 2} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

By Corollary 4.3, the coercivity inequality implies, since $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon} \in\left(\operatorname{Ker} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{\perp}$, that

$$
\int B\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2} \Lambda_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} \omega \leq C \int \frac{M_{\varepsilon}}{\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2}}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} v
$$

with $C>0$ independent of $\varepsilon$.
The second term in the right hand side of (7.4), containing the high velocities, is handled using the inequality

$$
\mathbb{1}_{\left|v-v_{*}\right|>\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} M_{\varepsilon} M_{\varepsilon, *} \leq a_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} M_{\varepsilon}^{3 / 4} M_{\varepsilon, *}^{3 / 4} e^{-\frac{1}{16 b_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{2}}},
$$

using that $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is at most polynomial:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int\left(B-B_{\varepsilon}\right) \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(1+M_{\varepsilon}\right) \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{1 / 2} G \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} v_{*} \mathrm{~d} \omega \\
& \leq C e^{-\frac{1}{32 b_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

The next terms in (7.3) are dealt with using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the a priori bound (4.6), and therefore are easily bounded by $C\left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left[P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right.}^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right)$. Coming back to (7.2), the second term on the right hand side is splitted as follows, in order to use the relaxation estimate:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v=\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}-\Pi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v \\
+\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon} \Pi_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v
\end{array}
$$

The last term is easily handled:

$$
\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon} \Pi_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v \leq C\left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}\right)
$$

while we need some control on the high velocities for the first one. From the hypothesis (3.4), we deduce that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} P_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right)^{2 p} \mathrm{~d} v \leq C_{p} \text { a.e. }
$$

for all $p<1$ and uniformly in $\varepsilon$ (which depends on $p$ ), since the moments of $P_{\varepsilon}$ differ from that of $P_{0}$ only by terms of order $\varepsilon$. This estimate leads to some control on the rescaled fluctuations:

$$
\varepsilon\left|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right|+\varepsilon\left|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right|=O(1)_{L_{t, x}^{\infty} L^{4 p}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}
$$

so that

$$
\varepsilon\left(\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)-\Pi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)=O(1)_{L_{t, x}^{\infty} L^{4 p}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}
$$

The relaxation estimate (4.3) coupled with some interpolation gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}-\Pi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right\|_{L^{\frac{8 p}{2 p+1}}{ }_{\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}}=O\left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}\right. \\
&\left.+\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v\right)^{1 / 2}\right)+o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Choosing $p>\frac{1}{2}$ implies $\frac{8 p}{2 p+1}>2$, and we can obtain the final estimate:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int \Phi_{\varepsilon} P_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}-\Pi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}-\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}}{1+M_{\varepsilon}}\right)\left(\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}+\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} v=O & \left(\left\|\hat{g}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d} v\right)}^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int P_{\varepsilon} h\left(\frac{f_{\varepsilon}-P_{\varepsilon}}{P_{\varepsilon}}\right) \mathrm{d} v\right)+o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

7.2. Proof of convergence. In view of the preceding results, we are now able to prove Theorem 3.1. Proposition 5.1 together with Proposition 7.1 imply the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(t)+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{q+3}} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} s \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}\right)-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{0}^{t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(1, \frac{v-\varepsilon u}{b_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{|v-\varepsilon u|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}, u, b_{1}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} s \\
& +\frac{1}{3 \varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left[\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}}{1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}|v|^{2}}}{2 b_{0}}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right] \mathrm{d} s \\
& +\frac{C}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{0}^{t}\left\|D_{x}\left(u, b_{1}\right)(s)\right\|_{L^{2} \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)}\left(H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}\right)(s)+\int_{\Omega} D\left(f_{\varepsilon}\right)(s) \mathrm{d} x\right) \mathrm{d} s+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We plug the functions $\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right)$ constructed in Theorem 6.1 in the approximate solution $P_{\varepsilon}$. It follows by Gronwall's lemma that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right)(t) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}^{N}\right) \exp \left(\int_{0}^{t}\left\|D_{x}\left(u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right)(s)\right\|_{L^{2} \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)}\right) \mathrm{d} s \\
&+\int_{0}^{t} \exp \left(\int_{s}^{t}\left\|D_{x}\left(u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right)(\tau)\right\|_{L^{2} \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \mathrm{d} \tau\right) \\
& \quad \times\left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} f_{\varepsilon}\left(1, \frac{v-\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon, N}}{b_{\varepsilon}}, \frac{\left|v-\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon, N}\right|^{2}}{2 b_{\varepsilon}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right) \mathrm{d} x \mathrm{~d} v\right. \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{3 \varepsilon^{2}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \iint_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}}{b_{0}}|v|^{2} \frac{e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}}}{\left.\left.1+e^{a_{0}+\varepsilon a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}-\frac{e^{-\varepsilon b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}}|v|^{2}}{2 b_{0}}} \mathrm{~d} v \mathrm{~d} x\right)+o(1)\right] \mathrm{d} s}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The last term go to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $N \rightarrow 0$ thanks to Theorem 6.1, using the fact that

$$
\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon}\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}, u^{\varepsilon, N}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N}\right) \mathrm{d} x=0 .
$$

The fist term can be decomposed as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}^{N}\right)= & \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}\right)+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)} \mid P_{\varepsilon, i n}^{N}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \iint\left(\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n}-P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}\right) \log \frac{P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}}{P_{\varepsilon, i n}^{N}}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\left(P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}-f_{\varepsilon, i n}\right) \log \frac{1-P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}}{1-P_{\varepsilon, i n}^{N}}\right) \mathrm{d} v \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

which tends to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$ since $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon, i n} \mid P_{\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)}\right) \rightarrow 0$ by hypothesis and $\left(a_{1}^{\varepsilon, N, i n}, u^{\varepsilon, N, i n}, b_{1}^{\varepsilon, N, i n}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{1}^{i n}, u^{i n}, b_{1}^{i n}\right)$.

This leads to

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} H\left(f_{\varepsilon} \mid P_{\varepsilon}^{N}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text { in } L_{l o c}^{\infty}([0 ; T)) \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text { then } N \rightarrow \infty
$$

which is a stronger result respect to the one stated above.
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