



HAL
open science

On the rigid-lid approximation for two shallow layers of immiscible fluids with small density contrast

Vincent Duchêne

► **To cite this version:**

Vincent Duchêne. On the rigid-lid approximation for two shallow layers of immiscible fluids with small density contrast. 2013. hal-00861093v1

HAL Id: hal-00861093

<https://hal.science/hal-00861093v1>

Preprint submitted on 11 Sep 2013 (v1), last revised 4 Feb 2014 (v3)

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.

On the rigid-lid approximation for two shallow layers of immiscible fluids with small density contrast

Vincent Duchêne

September 11, 2013

Abstract

The rigid-lid approximation is a commonly used simplification in the study of density-stratified fluids in oceanography. One assumes that the displacements of the surface are negligible compared with internal displacements. We offer a rigorous justification of this approximation in the case of two shallow layers of immiscible fluid with constant and quasi-equal mass densities. More precisely, we control the difference between the solutions of the Cauchy problem predicted by the shallow-water (Saint-Venant) system in the rigid-lid and free-surface configuration. We also describe explicitly the first-order behavior of the deformation of the surface in the latter situation.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Motivation | 1 |
| 1.2 | Presentation of the models, and main result | 2 |
| 2 | Preliminary results | 6 |
| 3 | Proof of the main result | 8 |
| 3.1 | Construction of the approximate solution | 9 |
| 3.2 | Strategy, and completion of the proof | 11 |
| 3.3 | Symmetrization of the system | 13 |
| 3.4 | Energy estimate | 18 |
| 4 | Additional results and discussion | 21 |
| 4.1 | Construction of the first-order correction | 21 |
| 4.2 | The case of ill-prepared initial data | 26 |
| 4.3 | Discussion and numerical simulations | 31 |
| A | Proof of Propositions 2.2 | 35 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

The mass density of water in the ocean is not constant, due to variations of temperature and salinity. As a matter of fact, one usually observes a sharp separation between a layer of warm, relatively fresh water above a layer of cold, more salted water. The interface between these two layers may experience great deformations that are mostly invisible at the surface, but account for important oceanographic features, such as internal solitary waves or the dead-water phenomenon (see, *e.g.*, [13, 16, 17] and references therein). The study of these internal waves has attracted a

considerable amount of attention in the past decades, and lead to a vast collection of various models. In order to simplify the setting, two approximations are commonly used in the literature, namely the rigid-lid and Boussinesq approximations. Roughly speaking, the rigid-lid approximation consists in neglecting the surface displacements in front of interface displacements, while the Boussinesq approximation relies on the assumption that the differences of mass density between the two layers is small. Acknowledgedly, these two assumptions are related: a fixed amount of energy generates a much smaller displacement on the air–water interface than on the fresh-salted water interface, because the ratio of mass densities across the interface is negligible in the former case when compared to the latter.

The ambition of this article is to offer a rigorous justification of the above presumption. We restrict ourselves to one of the simplest possible setting, that is two infinite, two-dimensional layers of immiscible fluids with constant densities, above a flat bottom. Moreover, we consider extremely shallow layers, so that the horizontal velocity field is assumed to be constant throughout the depth of each layer; thus we study the so-called Saint-Venant [9], or shallow-water systems. Even in that much simplified setting, we will come across serious difficulties, which come from the fact that the typical surface wave speed, as predicted by the linearized system, is much greater than the typical interface wave speed, in particular in the limit of vanishing density contrast. Thus within the terms neglected in the rigid-lid approximation are contributions whose velocity blows up in the limit we consider. Controlling these terms on the relevant timescale is the main challenge we face.

To our knowledge, very few works are concerned with the validity of the aforementioned approximations, despite the early concerns expressed by Long [25] and Benjamin [3]. Grimshaw, Pelinovsky, Poloukhina [14], Craig, Guyenne, Kalisch [7], Craig, Guyenne, Sulem [8] and the author [11] derived and compared asymptotic models in both the rigid-lid and free surface settings. However, they do not directly compare solutions of the two models for given initial data, but rather parameters of their models, or explicit solutions (solitary waves). Moreover, and maybe more importantly, their analysis is restricted to weakly nonlinear waves, so that the deformation of both the surface and interface are assumed to be small. Recently, Leonardi [24] studied in much details the validity of the rigid-lid approximation in a linearized setting, and without explicitly looking at the limit of small density differences. On the contrary, our study allows fully nonlinear waves, and directly compare the solutions predicted by the rigid-lid and free-surface systems, in the limit of vanishing density contrast.

1.2 Presentation of the models, and main result

In this section, we present the two models we study, namely the shallow-water (or Saint-Venant) systems in the free-surface and rigid-lid configuration; see Figure 1. We briefly describe some early properties of these models, and state our main result in Theorem 1.2. It follows a brief outline of the present paper, and some notations used therein.




Figure 1: Sketch of the domain in the two different situations

The free-surface system. Let us begin introduce the shallow-water model with free surface, that we refer to as *free-surface system*.

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \partial_t \zeta_1 + \partial_x(h_1 u_1) + \partial_x(h_2 u_2) = 0, \\ \partial_t \zeta_2 + \partial_x(h_2 u_2) = 0, \\ \partial_t u_1 + \alpha \frac{\delta + \gamma}{1 - \gamma} \partial_x \zeta_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \partial_x(|u_1|^2) = 0, \\ \partial_t u_2 + (\delta + \gamma) \partial_x \zeta_2 + \gamma \alpha \frac{\delta + \gamma}{1 - \gamma} \partial_x \zeta_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \partial_x(|u_2|^2) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where we denote $h_1 = 1 + \epsilon \alpha \zeta_1 - \epsilon \zeta_2$, and $h_2 = \frac{1}{\delta} + \epsilon \zeta_2$.

This system has been obtained¹ in [6, 7], and rigorously justified in [10] as an asymptotic model for a system of two layers of immiscible, homogeneous, ideal, incompressible fluid under the only influence of gravity. It describes the evolution of the deformation of the surface, ζ_1 , the interface, ζ_2 , and the velocity of the fluid in the upper (resp. lower) layer u_1 (resp. u_2). More precisely, the two layers are assumed to be connected, infinite in the horizontal dimension $x \in \mathbb{R}$, delimited below by a flat bottom, and by the graph of the functions $\zeta_1(t, x)$, $\zeta_2(t, x)$ (see figure 1(a)).

The parameters $\alpha, \delta, \gamma, \epsilon$ are dimensionless parameters that describe characteristics of the flow. More precisely:

δ represents the ratio of the upper-layer to the lower-layer depth;

γ represents the ratio of the mass density between the two fluids;

ϵ represents the maximal deformation of the interface, divided by the upper-layer depth;

α represents the ratio of the maximal deformation of the surface to the one of the interface.

In particular, h_1 denotes the depth of the upper layer, and h_2 the depth of the lower layer.

Remark 1.1. *Another dimensionless parameter plays an important role, but is not visible here, although it is essential for the construction and relevance of the shallow-water models. If we denote by μ the ratio of the depth of the two layers to a characteristic horizontal length, then one assumes $\mu \ll 1$, and all terms of size $\mathcal{O}(\mu)$ are neglected.*

An additional dimensionless parameter is ubiquitous in the present work, and obtained as a combination of the aforementioned parameters. It turns out to be convenient to express the assumption that the density differences between the two fluids are small with

$$\varrho \ll 1 \quad ; \quad \varrho \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1 - \gamma}{\gamma + \delta}}.$$

We conclude the presentation of the free-surface system by mentioning that system (1.1) is obviously a system of four conservation laws, but also induces at least two other conserved quantities. Indeed, as noticed in [2], after manipulating the equations, one may obtain:

- Conservation of horizontal momentum:

$$\partial_t(\gamma h_1 u_1 + h_2 u_2) + \partial_x p + \partial_x(\gamma h_1 |u_1|^2 + h_2 |u_2|^2),$$

where p is the “pressure”: $p = \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma \frac{\delta + \gamma}{1 - \gamma} (h_1 + h_2)^2 + (\gamma + \delta) h_2^2 \right)$.

- Conservation of energy:

$$\partial_t E + \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} (\gamma h_1 |u_1|^2 u_1 + h_2 |u_2|^2 u_2) + \gamma h_1^2 u_1 + h_2^2 u_2 + \gamma h_1 h_2 (u_1 + u_2) \right),$$

where we denote $E \equiv \frac{1}{2} \gamma h_1 |u_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2} h_2 |u_2|^2 + p$.

¹The models presented in these works are not limited to flat bottom or dimension $d = 1$. They present different constants in the velocity equations. This is due to a different choice of scaling in the non-dimensionalizing step. We chose our scaling in order to set the typical velocity of the internal wave (obtained by solving linear system when $\alpha = \epsilon = 0$) as $c_0 = \pm 1$, consistently with the rigid-lid system (1.2).

The rigid-lid system. The model corresponding to (1.1) in the rigid-lid configuration, that we refer to as *rigid-lid system*, is

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \eta + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1 h_2}{h_1 + \gamma h_2} v \right) = 0, \\ \partial_t v + (\gamma + \delta) \partial_x \eta + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1^2 - \gamma h_2^2}{(h_1 + \gamma h_2)^2} |v|^2 \right) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Here, η represents the deformation of the interface, and v the shear velocity (typically, $v = u_2 - \gamma u_1$; see below). Again, h_1, h_2 denote the depth of the upper (resp. lower) layers, thus $h_1 = 1 - \epsilon \eta$ and $h_2 = 1/\delta + \epsilon \eta$. Parameters γ, δ, ϵ are defined as previously.

This model has been rigorously justified in [5], starting from the full Euler system in rigid-lid configuration. Let us show how to *formally* recover (1.2) from (1.1). Set $\zeta_1 \equiv 0$ (or, equivalently, $\alpha = 0$) in (1.1). It follows in particular from the first equation that

$$\partial_x(h_1 u_1) + \partial_x(h_2 u_2) = 0.$$

Since $h_1 u_1$ and $h_2 u_2$ are scalar functions vanishing at infinity, we deduce the identity $h_1 u_1 = -h_2 u_2$. Thus, when we define $v \equiv u_2 - \gamma u_1$, one obtains

$$u_1 \equiv \frac{-h_2 v}{h_1 + \gamma h_2} \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 \equiv \frac{h_1 v}{h_1 + \gamma h_2}.$$

It is now clear that the second equation, and a linear combination of the last two equations of (1.1) yield (1.2) (with $\eta \equiv \zeta_2$). We aim at giving a rigorous confirmation of the above calculations.

Main result. We state here the main result of the present work (see below for the definition of the different functional spaces used therein).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$. For any $(\alpha, \delta, \epsilon, \gamma) \in \mathcal{P}$, with*

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \{(\alpha, \delta, \epsilon, \gamma), 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \delta_{\min} \leq \delta \leq \delta_{\max}, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1, 0 < \gamma < 1\},$$

there exists positive constants ϱ_0, M, T, C , depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, \frac{1}{s_0 - 1/2}$, such that for any $(\alpha, \delta, \epsilon, \gamma) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $0 < \varrho \leq \varrho_0$ and for any $\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\frac{\alpha}{\varrho} |\zeta_1^0|_{H^{s+1}} + |\zeta_2^0|_{H^{s+1}} + |u_1^0|_{H^{s+1}} + |u_2^0|_{H^{s+1}} \leq M, \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$\frac{\alpha}{\varrho} |\zeta_1^0|_{H^{s+1}} + |h_1 u_1^0 + h_2 u_2^0|_{H^{s+1}} \leq M \varrho, \quad (1.4)$$

the following holds.

1. *There exists a unique solution, $(\eta, v) \in C([0, T/(\epsilon M)]; H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})^2) \cap C^1([0, T/(\epsilon M)]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^2)$ to (1.2), with initial data $(\eta|_{t=0} = \zeta_2^0, v|_{t=0} = u_2^0 - \gamma u_1^0)$.*
2. *There exists a unique solution, $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2) \in C([0, T_{\max}); H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})^4) \cap C^1([0, T_{\max}); H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$ to (1.1), with initial data $(\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0)$, and $T_{\max} \geq T/\max\{\epsilon M, \varrho\}$.*
3. *One has, for any $0 \leq t < T/\max\{\epsilon M, \varrho\}$,*

$$\frac{\alpha}{\varrho} \|\zeta_1\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; H^s)} + \|h_1 u_1 + h_2 u_2\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; H^s)} \leq C M \varrho,$$

and

$$\|\eta - \zeta_2\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; H^s)} + \|v - (u_2 - \gamma u_1)\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; H^s)} \leq C M \varrho.$$

Remark 1.3. *The restriction on the maximal time of existence for the solution of the free-surface system, $T_{\max} \geq T/\max\{\epsilon M, \varrho\}$, as opposed to the classical $T_{\max} \geq T/(\epsilon M)$, is purely technical, and do not reveal any limitation that would appear in the weakly non-linear case, $\epsilon M = \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$. On the contrary, we know that in the latter case (see Proposition 2.2 and Remark 2.3), the system (1.1) is well-posed over time $\mathcal{O}((\epsilon M)^{-1})$, without the additional condition (1.4). Moreover, it would not be difficult to obtain an asymptotic description of the solution similar to the one obtained by the author in [11] (without the dispersion terms), namely that the flow may be accurately approximated as a superposition of four independent waves; each driven by an inviscid Burgers' equation. The solution of the rigid-lid system (1.2) complies to similar description (with only two counter-propagating waves), thus the two solutions are easily compared. One ambition of the present article is to extend such results to stronger nonlinearities; see in particular Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.7. In order to acknowledge the fact that we are interested in strong nonlinearities, we set $\epsilon = 1$ in the following, without loss of generality.*

Remark 1.4. *The factor $\frac{\alpha}{\varrho}$ in front of ζ_1 is natural in our context. Indeed, one easily deduces from the aforementioned conservation of energy for (1.1) that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} E(x) - E(\infty) dx \approx \frac{\gamma}{\varrho^2} |\alpha \zeta_1|_{L^2}^2 + |\zeta_2|_{L^2}^2 + \gamma |u_1|_{L^2}^2 + |u_2|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{is constant in time,}$$

so that without any further assumption than a finite initial energy, we know that $\gamma^{1/2} \frac{\alpha}{\varrho} |\zeta_1|_{L^2}$ remains bounded as long as the solution is well-defined. In the following, and without loss of generality, we set $\alpha \equiv \varrho$.

Let us emphasize again the consequences of the assumptions made on the preceding remarks. The set of parameters we consider throughout the rest of the paper is now

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \left\{ (\alpha, \delta, \epsilon, \gamma), \quad \alpha = \varrho \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+\delta}}, \quad \delta_{\min} \leq \delta \leq \delta_{\max}, \quad \epsilon = 1, \quad 0 < \gamma < 1 \right\}.$$

with $0 < \delta_{\min} \leq \delta_{\max} < \infty$. Except for Section 2 and Appendix A, we additionally restrict $\varrho \leq \varrho_0$ with ϱ_0 sufficiently small, so that γ cannot approach zero.

Outline of the paper. Section 2 is dedicated to some preliminary results on the Cauchy problem for systems (1.2) and (1.1), obtained through classical techniques on quasilinear, hyperbolic systems. Indeed, one easily checks that system (1.2) is Friedrichs-symmetrizable for sufficiently small data. As a matter of fact, the Cauchy problem for (1.2) has been studied in much details in [15] (with the much more difficult case of dimension $d = 2$), and we recall their result in Proposition 2.1.

In the same way, one obtains easily the well-posedness of the free-surface equation (which is also a Friedrichs-symmetrizable quasilinear system) with standard energy methods; we state the result in Proposition 2.2, and postpone its proof to Appendix A. However, the resulting time of existence is only of size $T \approx \varrho$. This is the main purpose of our work to obtain a control of the energy over large time (*i.e.* uniform with respect to ϱ small), as well as describing the asymptotic behavior of the solution when ϱ vanishes.

Let us mention that Proposition 2.2 also contains the usual blow-up criterion, so that item 2. is a consequence of the control of the solution over large time. Thus it suffices to prove item 3., and the Theorem follows. Section 3 is dedicated to the proof of item 3.

Finally, in section 4, we discuss several natural developments of Theorem 1.2, namely

- The construction of a first-order corrector in order to reach a higher precision. In particular, we describe the asymptotic behavior of the small deformation at the surface.
- The case of ill-prepared initial data, that is satisfying (1.3) but not (1.4).

On both counts, the relevant notion lies in a decomposition between fast mode and slow mode, that we precise therein. Finally, Section 4 also contains a discussion on the different results of the present work, supported with numerical simulations.

Notations. If not specified, C_0 denotes a nonnegative constant whose exact expression is of no importance. In the present work, C_0 almost always depend non-decreasingly on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, and often on $\frac{1}{s_0-1/2}$, such dependency being non-necessarily specified. The notation $a \lesssim b$ or $a = \mathcal{O}(b)$ means $a \leq C_0 b$, and $a \approx b$ means $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$, while $a \sim b$ means $\frac{a}{b} \rightarrow 1$ ($\varrho \rightarrow 0$).

We denote by $C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ a nonnegative constant depending on the parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$, and whose dependence on the λ_j is always assumed to be nondecreasing.

The real inner product of any functions f_1 and f_2 in the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions, $L^2 = L^2(\mathbb{R})$, is denoted by

$$(f_1, f_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x) f_2(x) dx.$$

The space $L^\infty = L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ consists of all essentially bounded, Lebesgue-measurable functions f , and

$$|f|_{L^\infty} = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f(x)| < \infty.$$

For any real $s \geq 0$, $H^s = H^s(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the Sobolev space of all tempered distributions, f , endowed with the norm $|f|_{H^s} = |\Lambda^s f|_{L^2} < \infty$, where Λ is the fractional derivative $\Lambda = (\text{Id} - \partial_x^2)^{1/2}$.

For any $F \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2)^\top \in H^s(\mathbb{R})^4$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$, we introduce the following norm:

$$|F|_{X^s}^2 = \gamma |\zeta_1|_{H^s}^2 + |\zeta_2|_{H^s}^2 + \gamma |u_1|_{H^s}^2 + |u_2|_{H^s}^2.$$

Notice that most of the time (that is everywhere except in Section 2 and Appendix A), γ is uniformly bounded from below, since we restrict $0 < \varrho \leq \varrho_0$. In that case, X^s is equivalent to the standard $H^s(\mathbb{R})^4$ -norm, and will be used as such.

For any functions $u = u(t, x)$ and $v(t, x)$ defined on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ with some $T > 0$, we denote the inner product, the L^2 -norm as well as the Sobolev norms with respect to the spatial variable x , with $(u, v) = (u(t, \cdot), v(t, \cdot))$, $|u|_{L^2} = |u(t, \cdot)|_{L^2}$, and $|u|_{H^s} = |u(t, \cdot)|_{H^s}$, respectively.

We denote $L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)$ the space of functions such that $u(t, \cdot)$ is controlled in H^s , uniformly for $t \in [0, T]$. This space is endowed with the following norm:

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)} = \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} |u(t, \cdot)|_{H^s} < \infty.$$

Finally, $C^k(\mathbb{R})$ denote the space of k -times continuously differentiable functions.

2 Preliminary results

In this section, we present some results concerning the Cauchy problem related to the free-surface and rigid-lid systems, in Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 2.1 (Well-posedness result concerning the rigid-lid system).

Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$, and $U^0 = (\zeta^0, v^0)^\top \in H^s(\mathbb{R})^2$ be such that there exists $h_0 > 0$ with

$$h_1 \equiv 1 - \eta \geq h_0 > 0, \quad h_2 \equiv \frac{1}{\delta} + \eta \geq h_0 > 0, \quad \gamma + \delta - \gamma \frac{(1 + \delta^{-1})^2}{(h_1 + \gamma h_2)^3} |v|^2 \geq h_0 > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

There exists $T_{\max} > 0$ and a unique $U_{\text{RL}} = (\eta, v)^\top \in C([0, T_{\max}]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^2) \cap C^1([0, T_{\max}]; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})^2)$, maximal solution to (1.2) (with $\epsilon = 1$), with initial data $U_{\text{RL}}|_{t=0} = U^0$.

Moreover, there exists constants $0 < C_0, T^{-1} \leq |U^0|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})^2} C(|U^0|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})^2}, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1})$ such that one has $T_{\max} \geq T$, and for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|U_{\text{RL}}(t, \cdot)|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})^2} + |\partial_t U_{\text{RL}}(t, \cdot)|_{H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})^2} \leq C_0 \exp(C_0 t),$$

and (2.1) is satisfied (with $h_0/2$ replacing h_0).

This result has been precisely expressed in [15, Theorem 1], and follows from standard techniques on quasilinear, Friedrichs-symmetrizable systems. More precisely, the existence and uniqueness of a solution follows from energy estimates on the linearized equation, of which the estimate above is a

particular case. In order to assert the well-posedness in the sense of Hadamard, one should also state that the flow depends continuously upon the initial data. Such a result holds: one may control the energy of the difference between two solutions corresponding to different initial data, provided these initial data are sufficiently regular. Precise blow-up conditions, specifying the possible scenarios within the ones stated in Proposition 2.2, below, are also presented in [15, Corollary 1].

Let us now turn to the free-surface system, (1.1). We recall that we set $\alpha = \varrho = \sqrt{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+\delta}}$ and $\epsilon = 1$, so that the system may be written as

$$\partial_t U + A[U] \partial_x U = 0,$$

with $U \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2)^\top$ and

$$A[U] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & \frac{u_2 - u_1}{\varrho} & \frac{1 + \varrho \zeta_1 - \zeta_2}{\varrho} & \frac{\delta^{-1} + \zeta_2}{\varrho} \\ 0 & u_2 & 0 & \delta^{-1} + \zeta_2 \\ \frac{1}{\varrho} & 0 & u_1 & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma}{\varrho} & \delta + \gamma & 0 & u_2 \end{pmatrix} = A_0 + A_1(U),$$

where A_0 is a constant 4-by-4 matrix, and $A_1(U)$ a linear mapping into 4-by-4 matrices.

Written as above, one clearly sees that the system exhibits $1/\varrho$ factors, which complicate its study. We state in Proposition 2.2, below, the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem as given by standard energy methods on quasilinear, Friedrichs-symmetrizable systems. We see that the existence of the solution is restricted to a poor *a priori* time of existence: $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$. This timescale is intuitively seen from a change of variable: the function $U(t, \cdot) \equiv \tilde{U}(t/\varrho, \cdot)$, where \tilde{U} satisfies

$$\partial_\tau \tilde{U} + \varrho A[\tilde{U}] \partial_x \tilde{U} = 0,$$

and $\varrho A[U] \equiv \varrho A_0 + \varrho A_1(U)$, with the matrix ϱA_0 and the linear mapping ϱA_1 both uniformly bounded with respect to $\varrho \ll 1$.

Proposition 2.2 (Naive well-posedness result for the free-surface system).

Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$, and $U^0 \equiv (\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0)^\top \in X^s$ be such that there exists $h_0 > 0$ with

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad h_1^0(x) \geq h_0 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_2^0(x) \geq h_0 > 0 \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\gamma + \delta) h_1^0(x) h_2^0(x) - (h_2^0(x) |u_1^0(x)|^2 + h_1^0(x) |u_2^0(x)|^2) \geq h_0 > 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where we define $h_1^0 \equiv 1 + \varrho \zeta_1^0 - \zeta_2^0$ and $h_2^0 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \zeta_2^0$.

There exists $T_{\max} > 0$ and $U = (\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0)^\top \in C([0, T_{\max}]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4) \cap C^1([0, T_{\max}]; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})^4)$, unique maximal solution to (1.1) (with $\alpha = \varrho, \epsilon = 1$), with initial data $U|_{t=0} = U^0$.

Moreover, there exists positive constants $0 < C_0, T^{-1} \leq |U^0|_{X^s} C(|U^0|_{X^s}, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1})$, such that one has $T_{\max} > T\varrho$, (2.2), (2.3) are satisfied on $[0, T\varrho]$ (with $h_0/2$ replacing h_0), and

$$\forall t \in [0, T\varrho], \quad |U(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} + \varrho |\partial_t U(t, \cdot)|_{X^{s-1}} \leq C_0 \exp(C_0 \varrho^{-1} t).$$

Finally, if $T_{\max} < \infty$, then at least one of the following holds:

- $|U|_{L^\infty([0, t] \times \mathbb{R})^4}$ or $|\partial_x U|_{L^\infty([0, t] \times \mathbb{R})^4}$ blows up as $t \nearrow T_{\max}$; or
- one of the two conditions (2.2), (2.3) ceases to be true at $t = T_{\max}$.

The proof of Propositions 2.2 is postponed to Appendix A, so as not to interrupt the flow of the text.

Remark 2.3. Notice that the uniform time of existence, $T \approx 1$, is recovered for sufficiently small initial data: $|U_0|_{X^s} = \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$. This result can be viewed through the following change of unknown: $U \equiv \varrho \check{U}$. The function \check{U} satisfies

$$\partial_t \check{U} + A[\varrho \check{U}] \partial_x \check{U} = 0,$$

and $A[\varrho \check{U}] \equiv A_0 + \varrho A_1(\check{U})$. The fact that the constant operator $A_0 \partial_x$ is not uniformly bounded with respect to $\varrho \ll 1$ does not prevent solutions to exist in a time domain independent of ϱ , because it does not contribute to commutator estimates. This simple observation motivates the strategy we use to prove Theorem 1.2, as described in Section 3.

3 Proof of the main result

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.2. Our first ingredient consists in constructing a system equivalent to (1.1), but whose non-linear contribution is uniformly bounded with respect to ϱ . In order to do so, we shall use different variables. Considering the conservation of horizontal momentum displayed in Section 1.2, we introduce the horizontal momentum, $m \equiv \gamma h_1 u_1 + h_2 u_2$, and the shear velocity $u_s \equiv u_2 - \gamma u_1$. One has immediately:

$$u_s \equiv u_2 - \gamma u_1 \quad \text{and} \quad m \equiv \gamma h_1 u_1 + h_2 u_2 \quad (3.1)$$

if and only if

$$u_1 = \frac{m - h_2 u_s}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 = \frac{m + h_1 u_s}{h_1 + h_2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Straightforward manipulations of the system (1.1) yield the new system we consider:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \zeta_1 + \frac{1}{\varrho} \partial_x m + \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma \varrho} \partial_x \left(h_1 \frac{m - h_2 u_s}{h_1 + h_2} \right) = 0, \\ \partial_t \zeta_2 + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_2}{h_1 + h_2} (h_1 u_s + m) \right) = 0, \\ \partial_t u_s + (\delta + \gamma) \partial_x \zeta_2 + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x \left(\frac{\gamma(m + h_1 u_s)^2 - (m - h_2 u_s)^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} \right) = 0, \\ \partial_t m + \gamma \frac{h_1 + h_2}{\varrho} \partial_x \zeta_1 + (\gamma + \delta) h_2 \partial_x \zeta_2 + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1(m - h_2 u_s)^2 + \gamma h_2(m + h_1 u_s)^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} \right) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

We still refer to this system as the *free-surface system*. Systems (3.3) and (1.1) are equivalent in the following sense.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$. Let $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$ be a strong solution to (3.3), with $T > 0$, given. Assume that for any $t \in [0, T]$, one has*

$$\exists h_0 > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{h_1(t, x), h_2(t, x)\} \geq h_0 > 0.$$

Then $U \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2)^\top \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$, where u_1 and u_2 are given by (3.2), is a strong solution to (1.1).

Conversely, if a given $U \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2)^\top \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$ is a strong solution to (1.1), and the above non-vanishing depth condition holds; then $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$, given by (3.1), is a strong solution to (3.3).

Proof. The existence and regularity of $V \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$ (resp. $U \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{R})^4)$) is deduced from the corresponding control of U (resp. V), using product estimates in Lemma A.1, as well as Corollary A.2. The fact that U satisfies (1.1) if V satisfied (3.3), and conversely, demands somewhat tedious but straightforward computations, that we leave to the reader. \square

Remark 3.2. *We do not claim here that the aforementioned solutions are unique. The uniqueness of a solution to (1.1) is given in Proposition 2.2 and requires an additional condition on the initial data, namely (2.3). In the same way, the existence and uniqueness of a solution to (3.3) is guaranteed by its strict hyperbolicity, which is proved later on to be valid at least for sufficiently small initial data and ϱ ; see Section 3.3.*

We see two benefits in considering (3.3) in lieu of (1.1). First, the the rigid-lid system which was encrypted in (1.1) is now apparent in (3.3). This will be helpful, although not necessary, for the construction of the approximate solution in the subsequent subsection. More importantly, one sees that the only terms factored by ϱ^{-1} in (3.3) are constant. This second property is crucial for our analysis, and justifies the use of (3.3).

However, let us remark that we loose the simple structure of the original system (1.1). In particular, finding an explicit symmetrizer of (3.3) seems out of reach. Specifying its domain of hyperbolicity is equivalently difficult. This is why we turn to perturbation analysis, and prove that (3.3) is strictly hyperbolic (thus Friedrichs-symmetrizable) for ϱ sufficiently small, and data not too large. This explains the corresponding restrictions in Theorem 1.2, and below.

The rest of this section is as follows. In Section 3.1, we construct an approximate solution to (3.3), using the solution to the rigid-lid system (1.2) with corresponding initial data. This result is expressed in the sense of consistency, meaning that the approximate solution is proved to satisfy (3.3) up to a small remainder term. The subsequent subsections are dedicated to the proof that the difference between the exact solution and the constructed approximation remains small for large time (independent of ϱ). This is the most difficult step, and the heart of our strategy.

In Section 3.2, we discuss the main issues we face, and how we deal with them. We state therein an intermediate result, Proposition 3.6, from which Theorem 1.2 is deduced. Section 3.3 contains several algebraic results on our system, and in particular on its symmetrizer. Finally, we show in Section 3.4 how to deduce from these the desired energy estimates (Lemma 3.13), and consequently Proposition 3.6.

3.1 Construction of the approximate solution

In this section, we construct an approximate solution to the free-surface system (3.3), using the corresponding solution to the rigid-lid system (1.2), as defined below.

Definition 3.3 (Rigid lid approximate solution). *For a given initial data ζ_2^0, u_s^0 , satisfying (2.1), the rigid lid approximate solution corresponding to $(\zeta_2^0, u_s^0)^\top$ is denoted $V^{\text{RL}} \equiv (0, \eta, v, 0)^\top$, where $V \equiv (\eta, v)^\top$ is the unique solution to the rigid-lid system (1.2) with $V|_{t=0} \equiv (\zeta_2^0, u_s^0)^\top$.*

Proposition 3.4. *Let $s \geq s_0$, $s_0 > 1/2$, and $\zeta_2^0, u_s^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$. There exists $M^{-1} = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$ such that if $|(\zeta_2^0, u_s^0)^\top|_{H^{s+1} \times H^{s+1}} \leq M$, then there exists $0 < T^{-1}, C_1, C_2, C_3 \leq M C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$, with*

- $V^{\text{RL}} \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1})$ is well-defined as above, and satisfies

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} \leq C_1. \quad (3.4)$$

- There exists $V_{\text{rem}} \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1})$, with

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V_{\text{rem}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}|_{X^s} \leq \varrho C_2, \quad (3.5)$$

such that $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{rem}}$ satisfies (3.3), up to a remainder term R , satisfying

$$\|R\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)} \leq C_3 \varrho (M + \varrho). \quad (3.6)$$

Remark 3.5. *The explicit formula for V_{rem} , which is precisely displayed in the proof, below, does not play a significant role in this section, except as a technical artifice to obtain the desired estimate. In particular, it does not appear in Theorem 1.2. However, as discussed in section 4, it corresponds to a first order correction of the approximate solution, and is clearly observable in our numerical simulations.*

Proof of Proposition 3.4. It is clear that one can choose M sufficiently small so that (2.1) is satisfied. Thus by Proposition 2.1, there exists positive constants $C_1, T^{-1} \leq M C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$ such that $V^{\text{RL}} \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1})$ is well-defined by Definition 3.3, and (3.4) holds.

We now plug $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{rem}}$ into (3.3), and check that one can explicitly define a function $V_{\text{rem}} \equiv V_{\text{rem}}[\eta, v]$ such that the remainder term, R , satisfies the estimates of the Proposition. Anticipating the result, we denote $V_{\text{app}} \equiv (\varrho \check{\zeta}_1, \eta, v, \varrho^2 \check{m})^\top$, and subsequently

$$\begin{cases} \varrho \partial_t \check{\zeta}_1 + \varrho \partial_x \check{m} + \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma \varrho} \partial_x \left(h_1 \frac{\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v}{h_1 + h_2} \right) = r_1, \\ \partial_t \eta + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_2}{h_1 + h_2} (h_1 v + \varrho^2 \check{m}) \right) = r_2, \\ \partial_t v + (\delta + \gamma) \partial_x \eta + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x \left(\frac{\gamma (\varrho^2 \check{m} + h_1 v)^2 - (\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v)^2}{\gamma (h_1 + h_2)^2} \right) = r_3, \\ \varrho^2 \partial_t \check{m} + \gamma (h_1 + h_2) \partial_x \check{\zeta}_1 + (\gamma + \delta) h_2 \partial_x \eta + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1 (\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v)^2 + \gamma h_2 (\varrho^2 \check{m} + h_1 v)^2}{\gamma (h_1 + h_2)^2} \right) = r_4, \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

with $h_1 \equiv 1 + \varrho^2 \check{\zeta}_1 - \eta$ and $h_2 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \eta$.

Our aim is to prove that one can choose $\check{\zeta}_1$ and \check{m} such that

$$|\check{\zeta}_1|_{H^{s+1}} + |\check{m}|_{H^{s+1}} + |\partial_t \check{\zeta}_1|_{H^s} + |\partial_t \check{m}|_{H^s} \leq C_2, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$|r_1|_{H^s} + |r_2|_{H^s} + |r_3|_{H^s} + |r_4|_{H^s} \leq C_3 \varrho (M + \varrho). \quad (3.9)$$

In order to ease the reading of the argument, we first assume that (3.8) holds, and see how $\check{\zeta}_1, \check{m}$ can be naturally chosen so that (3.9) is satisfied. Our choice for $\check{\zeta}_1, \check{m}$ is precisely stated in (3.12) and (3.14), and checking that (3.8) is actually satisfied is then a straightforward consequence of (3.4).

Recall that, by definition, $(\eta, v)^\top$ satisfies (1.2). In particular, from the first equation in (1.2), one deduces

$$r_2 \equiv \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1 h_2 v}{h_1 + h_2} - \frac{\underline{h}_1 h_2 v}{\underline{h}_1 + \gamma h_2} \right) + \varrho^2 \partial_x \left(\frac{h_2 \check{m}}{h_1 + h_2} \right),$$

where we denote $\underline{h}_1 \equiv 1 - \eta$.

Let us recall that V^{RL} satisfies (3.4), and also (2.1). Thus one can apply the product estimates in Lemma A.1 as well as Corollary A.2 (we also recall that by definition, $1 - \gamma = \varrho^2(\gamma + \delta)$), to deduce

$$\|r_2\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \leq M \varrho^2 C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2), \quad (3.10)$$

where we used the *a priori* estimate (3.8).

Similarly, one deduces from the second equation in (1.2) that

$$r_3 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_x \left(\left\{ \frac{\gamma h_1^2 - h_2^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} - \frac{h_1^2 - \gamma h_2^2}{(h_1 + \gamma h_2)^2} \right\} v^2 + \frac{\gamma(\varrho^2 \check{m} + h_1 v)^2 - \gamma^2 h_1^2 v^2 + h_2^2 v^2 - (\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v)^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} \right),$$

so that one has as above,

$$\|r_3\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \leq M \varrho^2 C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2). \quad (3.11)$$

Let us now look at the fourth equation in (3.7). Note that one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma(h_1 + h_2) \partial_x \check{\zeta}_1 + (\gamma + \delta) h_2 \partial_x \eta + \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1 h_2 (h_1 + \gamma h_2) v^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} \right) \\ &= \partial_x \left(\gamma((1 + \delta^{-1}) \check{\zeta}_1 + \frac{\varrho^2}{2} \check{\zeta}_1^2) + (\gamma + \delta) (\delta^{-1} \eta + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2) + \frac{h_1 h_2 (h_1 + \gamma h_2) v^2}{\gamma(h_1 + h_2)^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is now clear that one can choose

$$\check{\zeta}_1 \equiv -(\eta + \frac{\delta}{2} \eta^2) - \frac{(1 - \eta)(\delta^{-1} + \eta)v^2}{\gamma(1 + \delta^{-1})^2}, \quad (3.12)$$

so that the above is of size $\mathcal{O}(\varrho^2)$. More precisely, and using once again (3.8), one has

$$\|r_4\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \leq M \varrho^2 C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2). \quad (3.13)$$

We conclude with the first equation in (3.7). Using that $\varrho^2 = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+\delta}$, one has

$$r_1 = \varrho \left(\partial_t \check{\zeta}_1 + \partial_x \check{m} + \frac{\gamma + \delta}{\gamma} \partial_x \left(h_1 \frac{\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v}{h_1 + h_2} \right) \right).$$

We now recall that η, v satisfies (1.2), so that

$$\left| \partial_t \check{\zeta}_1 - \partial_x \left(\frac{h_1 h_2 v}{h_1 + \gamma h_2} \right) \right|_{H^s} \leq M^2 C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2).$$

Now, one can check that by choosing

$$\check{m} \equiv \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta} v, \quad (3.14)$$

it follows

$$\left| \frac{h_1 h_2 v}{h_1 + \gamma h_2} + \check{m} - \frac{\gamma + \delta}{\gamma} \frac{h_1 h_2 v}{h_1 + h_2} \right|_{H^s} \leq (M^2 + M \varrho^2) C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2),$$

so that estimates (3.4) and (3.5) yield

$$\|r_1\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \lesssim (M^2 \varrho + M \varrho^2) C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, C_2). \quad (3.15)$$

Altogether, (3.10), (3.11), (3.13) and (3.15) give the desired estimate: (3.9), or equivalently (3.6). Moreover, one easily deduces from the estimate concerning V^{RL} in (3.4), the corresponding estimate on $V_{\text{rem}} \equiv (\varrho \check{\zeta}_1, 0, 0, \varrho^2 \check{m})^\top$: (3.8), or equivalently (3.5). Proposition 3.4 is proved. \square

3.2 Strategy, and completion of the proof

Denote $U \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_1, u_2)^\top \in C([0, T_{\max}]; X^s)$ with $s > 3/2$, a solution to the free-surface system (1.1) satisfying the non-vanishing depth condition, and $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top \in C([0, T_{\max}]; X^s)$ the corresponding solution to (3.3) given in Proposition 3.1. Our aim is to prove that conditions (1.3), (1.4) in Theorem 1.2 are sufficient to ensure that V is controlled on a time domain $[0, T]$, uniformly with respect to $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0]$. The heart of the matter is the following result.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$ and $T > 0$ with $V \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1}) \cap C^1([0, T]; X^s)$, solution to (3.3), and let $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{rem}} \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1}) \cap C^1([0, T]; X^s)$, defined in Definition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4. Denote*

$$M_1 \equiv \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \{ |V_{\text{app}}(t, \cdot)|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V_{\text{app}}(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} \}.$$

Denote $W \equiv V - V_{\text{app}}$ and assume moreover that

$$|W|_{t=0}|_{X^s} \leq M_2 \varrho.$$

There exists ϱ_0, M, T' , depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$ such that for any $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0]$, and $M_1, M_2 \in [0, M]$, and for any $t \in [0, \min\{T, T'/M, T'/\varrho\}]$, one has

$$|W(t; \cdot)|_{X^s} + \varrho |\partial_t W(t; \cdot)|_{X^{s-1}} \leq C_0 M \varrho \exp(C_0 M t), \quad (3.16)$$

with $C = C(M_1, M_2, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Let us briefly sketch our strategy to prove Proposition 3.6 (the detailed proof being postponed to Sections 3.3 and 3.4), before we explain how Theorem 1.2 follows.

Sketch of the argument. The estimate (3.16) is obtained using classical energy methods for Friedrichs-symmetrizable quasilinear systems. It is essential to show that the constants involved in the energy estimates remain uniformly bounded as ϱ vanishes.

The major complication in our case is that the symmetrizer is not explicitly known, but rather obtained as a consequence of the strict hyperbolicity of the system, and constructed through perturbation arguments (see Section 3.3).

Let us introduce some notations, used thereafter. We rewrite the hyperbolic system (3.3) as

$$\partial_t V + \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} L_\varrho + B[V] \right) \partial_x V = 0,$$

with $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top$, and where

- $\frac{1}{\varrho} L_\varrho$ represents the linear component of the system, obtained by setting $\epsilon = 0$ in (1.1);
- $B[\cdot]$ contains the nonlinear contribution: it is uniformly bounded with respect to ϱ .

We prove in Section 3.3 that L_ϱ has four distinct, real eigenvalues, although $L_{(0)} \equiv \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 1} L_\varrho$ has a kernel of dimension 2. By perturbation arguments, it follows that $(\frac{1}{\varrho}L_\varrho + B[V])$ shares the same property as long as V is not too large. Thus the system is strictly hyperbolic, and a symmetrizer may be constructed from its spectral projectors. The main difficulty now consists in proving that the symmetrizer enjoys some properties allowing the approach described below.

One can easily check that $W \equiv V - V_{\text{app}}$ satisfies the following system:

$$\partial_t W + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V_{\text{app}} + W]) \partial_x W + (B[V_{\text{app}} + W] - B[V_{\text{app}}]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}} + R = 0, \quad (3.17)$$

with R as in Proposition 3.4. The system we study is therefore of the form

$$\partial_t W + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V_{\text{app}} + W]) \partial_x W = \mathcal{R}, \quad (3.18)$$

with $|W|_{t=0}|_{X^s} \leq M_2 \varrho$ and $|\mathcal{R}(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} \lesssim M_1 \varrho (M_1 + M_2 + \varrho)$.

When compared with the classical theory of Friedrichs-symmetrizable quasilinear systems, the main issue we face lies in the fact that one cannot use the equation in order to deduce a uniform control of $\partial_t W$ from the corresponding control of $\partial_x W$ (typically, one would like to have $|\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}} \lesssim |W|_{X^s}$). However, we will see that in our case, it is sufficient to prove:

(i) $|\partial_t(V_{\text{app}} + W)|_{(L^\infty)^4}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to ϱ (for L^2 estimates); the control of $\partial_t V_{\text{app}}$ is given in Proposition 3.4, and the control of $\partial_t W$ is ensured by the identity (3.18), as long as $|W|_{X^s}$ is of size $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$.

(ii) $|\Pi \partial_t W|_{X^s} \leq C |W|_{X^s}$, where Π is the orthogonal projector onto the kernel of $L_{(0)}^\top$ (for commutator terms in H^s estimates), which is once again due to (3.18), when multiplied by $L_{(0)}^\top$.

The fact that (i) and (ii) are sufficient to deduce the desired energy estimates is true because of some properties of the symmetrizer, and in particular that $(\text{Id} - \Pi)S = S_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$, where $(\text{Id} - \Pi)$ is the projection onto the orthogonal of the kernel of $L_{(0)}^\top$, S the aforementioned symmetrizer, and S_0 a constant matrix.

As previously mentioned, the construction of the symmetrizer, as well as the proof of its essential properties, are given in Section 3.3; while the argument yielding the energy estimate (3.16) is detailed in Section 3.4.

Completion of the proof. Let us now quickly show how Theorem 1.2 follows from Proposition 3.6, and previous results. For a given initial data as in the Theorem, it is clear that one can choose M sufficiently small so that the conditions (2.2),(2.3) hold. Thus Proposition 2.2 yields the existence of $T_{\text{max}} > 0$ and a unique solution $U \in C([0, T_{\text{max}}]; X^{s+1})$ to (1.1). It follows that $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top$ and V_{app} are well-defined and bounded for $t \in [0, T/M]$, thanks to Proposition 3.4.

The hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 thus imply the ones of Proposition 3.6, with $M_1, M_2 \lesssim M$. Thus estimate (3.16) on $W \equiv V - V_{\text{app}}$ holds, and triangular inequalities immediately yield (restricting the upper bound on the time interval $T^\# \leq \min\{T_{\text{max}}, T/M, T'/M, T'/\varrho\}$ if necessary)

$$\|\zeta_2\|_{L^\infty([0, T^\#]; H^s)} + \|u_s\|_{L^\infty([0, T^\#]; H^s)} \leq M \exp(C_0 M t), \quad (3.19)$$

$$\|\zeta_1\|_{L^\infty([0, T^\#]; H^s)} + \|m\|_{L^\infty([0, T^\#]; H^s)} \leq M \varrho \exp(C_0 M t), \quad (3.20)$$

$$\| |\partial_t \zeta_1| + |\partial_t \zeta_2| + |\partial_t u_s| + |\partial_t m| \|_{L^\infty([0, T^\#]; H^{s-1})} \leq M \exp(C_0 M t), \quad (3.21)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \varrho_0, \delta_{\text{min}}^{-1}, \delta_{\text{max}})$.

It follows in particular from (3.21) that for any $t \in [0, T^\#]$, one has

$$|h_2(t, \cdot) - h_2(0, \cdot)|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \left| \int_0^t \partial_t \zeta_2(t', \cdot) dt' \right|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C(M) M t,$$

where we recall that $h_2 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \zeta_2$. Similar estimates on $h_1 \equiv 1 + \varrho \zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ and u_1, u_2 given by (3.2) show that conditions (2.2),(2.3) hold uniformly on $U(t, \cdot)$ for $t \in [0, \min\{T^\#, T''/M\}]$, with $T''^{-1} = C(M)$.

From the blow-up conditions stated in Proposition 2.2 and a classical continuity argument, it is now clear that there exists $T > 0$, depending only on $M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that $T_{\max} \geq T / \max\{M, \varrho\}$.

The estimates in Theorem 1.2 are a straightforward consequence of (3.16) (3.19) and (3.20) (using Lemma A.1 and Corollary A.2), and the proof is now complete.

3.3 Symmetrization of the system

This section is dedicated to some algebraic results on the system we study. We recall the following notation: system (3.3) is written

$$\partial_t V + \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} L_\varrho + B[V] \right) \partial_x V = 0,$$

with $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top$ and

$$L_\varrho \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma(\delta+1)} & \frac{\gamma+\delta}{\gamma(\delta+1)} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} \\ 0 & \varrho(\gamma+\delta) & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma(1+\delta^{-1}) & \varrho \frac{\delta+\gamma}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

so that $B[V]$ is a 4-by-4 matrix, depending smoothly on V , vanishing for $V \equiv 0$, and uniformly bounded with respect to ϱ sufficiently small.

It is convenient to denote

$$L_{(0)} \equiv \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 1} L_\varrho \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 + \delta^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 3.7. *There exists $\varrho_0 > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that L_ϱ has four distinct eigenvalues, that we denote $\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho), \lambda_\pm^s(\varrho)$. Moreover, one has*

$$\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho) = \pm \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho^2) \quad ; \quad \lambda_\pm^s(\varrho) = \pm \varrho + \mathcal{O}(\varrho^3).$$

We denote by $P_\pm^f(\varrho)$ (resp. $P_\pm^s(\varrho)$) the spectral projection onto $\mathbf{x}_\pm^f(\varrho)$ (resp. $\mathbf{x}_\pm^s(\varrho)$), the corresponding left eigenvectors (i.e. $L_\varrho^\top \mathbf{x}_\pm = \lambda_\pm \mathbf{x}_\pm$). Then one has

$$\|P_\pm^f(\varrho) - P_\pm^f(0)\| \leq C_0 \varrho \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_\pm^s(\varrho) - P_\pm^s(0)\| \leq C_0 \varrho,$$

with $C_0 = C(\varrho_0, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$, and

$$P_\pm^f(0) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \pm \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}} & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad P_\pm^s(0) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \pm(1 + \delta) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\pm 1}{1 + \delta} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular, one has the approximate orthogonality property:

$$\|P_\pm^f(\varrho)^\top P_\pm^s(\varrho)\| \leq C_0 \varrho,$$

with $C_0 = C(\varrho_0, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Remark 3.8. *Here and thereafter, the subscript “f” is for fast mode and “s” is for slow mode; by analogy with the linear case, where the flow (as a consequence of the above result) can be decomposed as the superposition of four exact traveling waves, with velocities $\frac{\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho)}{\varrho} \approx \frac{\pm 1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho)}{\varrho} \approx \pm 1$. Such decomposition approximately holds in the weakly non-linear setting (V small); see [11] and references therein. We show how it also extends to the strongly nonlinear case in Section 4.*

Remark 3.9. We denote $\Pi \equiv P_+^s(0) + P_-^s(0)$ the orthogonal projector onto $\ker(L_{(0)}^\top)$. Identically, $(\text{Id} - \Pi) \equiv P_+^f(0) + P_-^f(0)$ is the orthogonal projector onto the orthogonal complement of $\ker(L_{(0)}^\top)$. Notice that $P_\pm^f(0)$ is equivalently defined as the spectral projection onto the left eigenvector of $L_{(0)}$ associated with $\lambda_\pm^f(0) = \pm\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}$. This is however not the case for $P_\pm^f(0)$, since 0 is an eigenvalue of $L_{(0)}$ with multiplicity two.

It is a consequence of the definition of the spectral projectors that $P_\pm^f(0)P_\pm^s(0) \equiv \mathbf{0}$, the matrix with all zero components. The fact that $P_\pm^f(0)^\top P_\pm^s(0) \equiv \mathbf{0}$, however, is a specific property of our system and crucial for our analysis. Roughly speaking, our strategy relies strongly on the fact that the fast and slow modes are supported on approximately orthogonal components, and therefore coupling effects are small.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. $L_{(0)}$ has three distinct eigenvalues: $\pm\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}$ and 0, the latter of multiplicity two. The fact that $\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho) = \pm\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$ could be proved from standard perturbation argument concerning the regularity of the spectrum around a point of constant multiplicity. To prove that the kernel of $L_{(0)}$ bifurcates into two distinct eigenvalues would be much more technical. In our case, the shortest route is to use a computer algebra system, such as `Maple`, which allows to compute *explicitly* $\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho)$ and $\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho)$, and check that the estimates hold.

The similar estimates on the spectral projections may be obtained as follows. Since L_ϱ is diagonalizable, one has that P_k , the spectral projection onto the left eigenvalue corresponding to λ_k , is defined as

$$P_k = \prod_{j \neq k} Q_{k,i} = \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{L_\varrho^\top - \lambda_j \text{Id}}{\lambda_k - \lambda_j},$$

where Id is the identity matrix. Note that the $Q_{k,j}$ obviously commute, so that ordering the product is not necessary.

One easily checks that the above product identity, applied on $P_\pm^f(0)$, behaves smoothly as $\varrho \rightarrow 0$. More precisely, the fact that $\|L_\varrho - L_{(0)}\| \leq C_0\varrho$, as well as the estimate on $\lambda_\pm^f(\varrho)$, $\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho)$, imply

$$\|P_\pm^f(\varrho) - P_\pm^f(0)\| \leq C_0\varrho,$$

with

$$P_\pm^f(0) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\pm 1}{\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}} L_{(0)}^\top + \text{Id} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}} L_{(0)}^\top \right)^2.$$

The product identity applied on $P_\pm^s(0)$ requires a more detailed analysis, due to the factor $\frac{1}{\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho) - \lambda_\mp^s(\varrho)} \sim \frac{1}{2\varrho}$. More precisely, one has

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pm^s(\varrho) &= \frac{L_\varrho^\top - \lambda_\mp^s(\varrho) \text{Id}}{\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho) - \lambda_\mp^s(\varrho)} \frac{L_\varrho^\top - \lambda_+^f(\varrho) \text{Id}}{\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho) - \lambda_+^f(\varrho)} \frac{L_\varrho^\top - \lambda_-^f(\varrho) \text{Id}}{\lambda_\pm^s(\varrho) - \lambda_-^f(\varrho)} \\ &= \frac{\mp 1}{2\varrho(1 + \delta^{-1})} (L_\varrho^\top \pm \varrho \text{Id})(L_\varrho^\top - \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}} \text{Id})(L_\varrho^\top + \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}} \text{Id}) + \mathcal{O}(\varrho) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\varrho(1 + \delta^{-1})} (\mp L_\varrho^\top - \varrho \text{Id})((L_\varrho^\top)^2 - (1 + \delta^{-1}) \text{Id}) + \mathcal{O}(\varrho), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$ means that the remainder is a matrix with norm at most $C_0\varrho$. Now, we use that

$$\|L_\varrho - L_{(0)} - \varrho L_{(1)}\| \leq C_0\varrho^2, \quad \text{with} \quad L_{(1)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{1+\delta} & \frac{1}{1+\delta} \\ 0 & 1+\delta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\delta+1}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows

$$\|P_\pm^s(\varrho) - P_\pm^s(0)\| \leq C_0\varrho,$$

with

$$P_\pm^s(0) = \frac{1}{2(1 + \delta^{-1})} \{ (\mp L_{(1)}^\top - \text{Id})((L_{(0)}^\top)^2 - (1 + \delta^{-1}) \text{Id}) \mp L_{(0)}^\top (L_{(0)}^\top L_{(1)}^\top + L_{(1)}^\top L_{(0)}^\top) \},$$

where we used that $(\mp L_{(0)}^\top)((L_{(0)}^\top)^2 - (1 + \delta^{-1})\text{Id}) = \mathbf{0}$, the matrix with all zero components.

Finally, the last estimate is easily deduced from the following fact: $P_\pm^f(0)^\top P_\pm^s(0) \equiv \mathbf{0}$. \square

We now perturb the matrix L_ϱ by a *generic* matrix: $L[B] \equiv L_\varrho + \varrho B$. We do not use at first any property on B , but only that $\|B\|$ is bounded, uniformly with respect to ϱ . We then gradually specify B to cover our case of interest: $B \equiv B[V]$ with V bounded in X^s .

Lemma 3.10. *There exists $\varrho_0 > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that if one has $\|B\| \in [0, M_0], \varrho \in (0, \varrho_0]$, then L_B has four distinct eigenvalues, that we denote $\lambda_\pm^f[B], \lambda_\pm^s[B]$. Moreover, $\lambda_\pm^f[B], \lambda_\pm^s[B]$ are holomorphic with respect to B , and one has*

$$|\lambda_\pm^f[B] \mp \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}| \lesssim \varrho^2 + \varrho\|B\|, \quad |\lambda_\pm^s[B] \mp \varrho| \lesssim \varrho^3 + \varrho\|B\|.$$

The associated left projectors are holomorphic with respect to B , and satisfy

$$\|P_\pm^f[B] - P_\pm^f(\varrho)\| \lesssim \varrho\|B\|, \quad \|P_\pm^s[B] - P_\pm^s(\varrho)\| \lesssim \|B\|.$$

Moreover, the following approximate orthogonality properties holds:

$$\|P_\pm^f[B]^\top P_\pm^s[B]\| \lesssim \varrho\|B\|, \quad \|L_\varrho^\top (P_\pm^s[B] - P_\pm^s(\varrho))\| \lesssim \varrho\|B\|.$$

Proof. The holomorphic attribute of the perturbation of a diagonalizable matrix is detailed, *e.g.*, in [19, II, Theorem 5.16]. We recall that a complex valued function $\mu[B]$ is said to be holomorphic at $B = B_0$ if it can be expanded into an absolutely convergent power series in $\Delta B \equiv B - B_0$:

$$\mu[B_0 + \Delta B] = \mu[B_0] + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^{(n)}[B_0, \Delta B],$$

where $\mu^{(n)}[B_0, \Delta B]$ is a form of degree n in B_0 . We say that a matrix is holomorphic if all its components are holomorphic.

We detail the argument which yield our estimates below. The proof is based on the following Cauchy formula for the projection onto the left eigenvalue $\mathbf{x}_j[B]$, corresponding to $\lambda_j[B]$. One has

$$P_j[B] = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R(\zeta) (-\varrho BR(\zeta))^n d\zeta, \quad (3.22)$$

where Γ_j is a positively oriented closed curve enclosing the eigenvalue $\lambda_j(\varrho)$, but excluding the other eigenvalues of L_ϱ . $R(\zeta) = (L_\varrho^\top - \zeta)^{-1}$ is the resolvent of L_ϱ , whose decomposition into partial fractions is (since L_ϱ is diagonalizable)

$$R(\zeta) = \sum_{j=1}^4 (\zeta - \lambda_j)^{-1} P_j(\varrho),$$

where $P_j(\varrho)$ have been defined and estimated in Lemma 3.7. The estimates are now obtained as follows.

Let $\lambda_j = \lambda_\pm^f(\varrho)$. Then Γ_j may be chosen as the circle of center λ_j and of radius 1, so that $R(\zeta)$ is bounded for $\zeta \in \Gamma_j$, uniformly with respect to ϱ . It follows that one can restrict $\varrho < \varrho_0 = (\|B\| \max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|R(\zeta)\|)^{-1}$ so that the series (3.22) is uniformly convergent. In particular,

$$P_j[B] = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} R(\zeta) d\zeta + \frac{\varrho}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R(\zeta) BR(\zeta) (-\varrho BR(\zeta))^n d\zeta.$$

The first term on the right hand side is exactly $P_j(\varrho)$ (by the Cauchy formula), and the series in the second term is uniformly convergent for $\varrho < \varrho_0$, so that the estimate follows: one has

$$\|P_j[B] - P_j(\varrho)\| \lesssim \varrho\|B\| \left(\max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|R(\zeta)\| \right)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\varrho}{\varrho_0} \right)^n.$$

Now, let $\lambda_j = \lambda_{\pm}^s(\varrho)$, and set Γ_j as the circle of center λ_j and of radius ϱ . In this case, one may only claim that $\varrho R(\zeta)$ is bounded for $\zeta \in \Gamma_j$, uniformly with respect to ϱ . This is why we require some smallness condition on $\|B\|$. More precisely, for $\|B\| < M_0 = (\max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|\varrho R(\zeta)\|)^{-1}$, the series (3.22) is uniformly convergent. In particular,

$$P_j[B] = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} R(\zeta) d\zeta + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R(\zeta) B \varrho R(\zeta) (-\varrho B R(\zeta))^n d\zeta.$$

As above, the first term on the right hand side is exactly $P_j(\varrho)$, and the series in the second term is uniformly convergent for $\|B\| < M_0$. Notice that for any matrix C ,

$$\left| \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} R(\zeta) C d\zeta \right| = \left| \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{B(\lambda_j/\varrho, 1)} R(\varrho \zeta') C \varrho d\zeta' \right| \leq \|C\| \max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|\varrho R(\zeta)\|,$$

so that the estimate follows:

$$\|P_j[B] - P_j(\varrho)\| \lesssim \|B\| (\max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|\varrho R(\zeta)\|)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\|B\| \max_{\zeta \in \Gamma_j} \|\varrho R(\zeta)\| \right)^n.$$

Now, we note that $P_{\pm}^f(\varrho)^{\top} R(\zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^4 (\zeta - \lambda_j)^{-1} P_{\pm}^f(\varrho)^{\top} P_j(\varrho)$ is uniformly bounded for $\zeta \in \Gamma_j$, the circle of center $\lambda_{\pm}^s(\varrho)$ and of radius ϱ (using in particular that $P_{\pm}^f(\varrho)^{\top} P_{\pm}^s(\varrho) = \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$, as seen in Lemma 3.7). Thus, multiplying (3.22) on the left by $P_{\pm}^f(\varrho)^{\top}$ and proceeding as above, we deduce $\|P_{\pm}^f(\varrho)^{\top} P_{\pm}^s[B]\| = \mathcal{O}(\varrho \|B\|)$. The same results on $\|P_{\pm}^f[B]^{\top} P_{\pm}^s[B]\|$ immediately follows.

Similarly, notice that $L_{\varrho}^{\top} R(\zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^4 (\zeta - \lambda_j)^{-1} L_{\varrho}^{\top} P_j(\varrho) = \sum_{i=1}^4 (\zeta - \lambda_j)^{-1} \lambda_j P_j(\varrho)$. As above, this allows to control $L_{\varrho}^{\top} R(\zeta)$ for $\zeta \in \Gamma_j$, uniformly with respect to ϱ , and one deduces $\|L_{\varrho}^{\top} (P_j[B] - P_j(\varrho))\| = \mathcal{O}(\varrho \|B\|)$. This estimate was straightforward for $P_j \equiv P_{\pm}^f$, but not for $P_j \equiv P_{\pm}^s$.

The estimates concerning the eigenvalues can then be deduced from the ones concerning $P_j[B]$. Indeed, since $P_j[B]$ is one-dimensional, one has

$$\lambda_j[B] = \text{tr}((L_{\varrho}^{\top} + \varrho B) P_j[B]) = \lambda_j(\varrho) + \text{tr}(L_{\varrho}^{\top} (P_j[B] - P_j(\varrho))) + \text{tr}(\varrho B P_j[B]),$$

and the desired estimates follow. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Let $B(\varkappa)$ be depending on a variable \varkappa . Then there exists $\varrho_0 > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that if $\max\{\|B(\varkappa)\|, \|\partial_{\varkappa} B(\varkappa)\|\} \in [0, M_0]$ and $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$, then one has*

$$\|\partial_{\varkappa} P_{\pm}^f[B]\| \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|), \quad \|\partial_{\varkappa} P_{\pm}^s[B]\| \lesssim \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|),$$

and the approximate orthogonality properties

$$\|P_{\pm}^f[B]^{\top} \partial_{\varkappa} P_{\pm}^s[B]\| \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|), \quad \|L_{\varrho}^{\top} \partial_{\varkappa} P_{\pm}^s[B]\| \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|).$$

Concerning eigenvalues, one has

$$|\partial_{\varkappa} \lambda_{\pm}^f[B]| \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|), \quad |\partial_{\varkappa} \lambda_{\pm}^s[B]| \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_{\varkappa} B\| C(\|B\|).$$

Proof. These estimates are obtained as in the proof of Lemma 3.10, using the Cauchy formula (3.22). Differentiating the formula with respect to \varkappa , one has

$$\partial_{\varkappa} P_j[B] = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_j} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} R(\zeta) \partial_{\varkappa} \{(-\varrho B R(\zeta))^n\} d\zeta,$$

and the series is uniformly convergent for sufficiently small ϱ, B . More precisely, one can write

$$\partial_{\varkappa} P_j[B] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varrho^n P_j^{(n)}[B, \partial_{\varkappa} B],$$

where $P_j^{(n)}[B, \partial_{\varkappa} B]$ is a form of degree $n - 1$ in B , and linear in $\partial_{\varkappa} B$. Using the estimates of the resolvent on Γ_j exactly as in the proof of Lemma 3.10, one easily deduces the desired estimates.

Once again, the corresponding estimates on the eigenvalue are then deduced:

$$\partial_{\varkappa} \lambda_j[B] = \partial_{\varkappa} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \left((L_{\varrho}^{\top} + \varrho B) P_j[B] \right) \right\} = \operatorname{tr} \left(L_{\varrho}^{\top} \partial_{\varkappa} P_j[B] \right) + \varrho \operatorname{tr} \left(\partial_{\varkappa} (B P_j[B]) \right),$$

and the result follows. \square

We shall apply the above results to $L[V] \equiv L_{\varrho} + \varrho B[V]$, where $B[\cdot]$ determined by (3.3). Indeed, the knowledge of the spectral projectors allows to construct a symmetrizer of our system (see [28] for example), as

$$S[V] \equiv \sum_{j=1}^4 P_j[B[V]] P_j[B[V]]^{\top} \quad (3.23)$$

and therefore

$$\Sigma[V] \equiv \frac{1}{\varrho} S[V] L[V] = \frac{1}{\varrho} \sum_{j=1}^4 \lambda_j[B[V]] P_j[B[V]] P_j[B[V]]^{\top}. \quad (3.24)$$

We deduce below the desired properties of S, Σ , as a consequence of the preceding Lemmata.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $V \in X \subset L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^4)$, where $(X, |\cdot|_X)$ is a Banach algebra. Define $B[V], S[V], \Sigma[V]$ as above. Then there exists $\varrho_0 > 0$ and $M > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that if $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$ and $|V|_X \in [0, M]$, then the following holds.*

For any $W \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, one has

$$\frac{1}{C_0} |W|_{L^2}^2 \leq (S[V]W, W) \leq C_0 |W|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.25)$$

with $C_0 = C(|V|_X, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

$$\|B[V]\|_X \leq C_0 |V|_X, \quad \|S[V]\|_X \leq C_0, \quad \|\Sigma[V]\|_X \leq \varrho^{-1} C_0, \quad (3.26)$$

with $C_0 = C(|V|_X, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$, and where we denote $\|A\|_X \equiv \sup_{V \in X \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|AV|_X}{|V|_X}$.

If $U \in X$ and $V \in X$, then

$$\|B[U] - B[V]\|_X \leq C_0 |U - V|_X, \quad (3.27)$$

with $C_0 = C(|U|_X, |V|_X, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

If $V \equiv V(\varkappa)$ and $\partial_{\varkappa} V \in X$, then

$$\|\partial_{\varkappa} (S[V])\|_X \leq C_0 |\partial_{\varkappa} V|_X, \quad \|\partial_{\varkappa} (\Sigma[V])\|_X \leq C_0 |\partial_{\varkappa} V|_X, \quad (3.28)$$

and (recalling the notation $\Pi \equiv P_+^s(0) + P_-^s(0)$, thus $\operatorname{Id} - \Pi \equiv P_+^f(0) + P_-^f(0)$)

$$\|\partial_{\varkappa} (S[V])(\operatorname{Id} - \Pi)\|_X \leq \varrho C_0 |\partial_{\varkappa} V|_X, \quad (3.29)$$

with $C_0 = C(|V|_X, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Proof. Let us first note that since $(X, |\cdot|_X)$ is a Banach algebra, and $B[V]$ involves only products of the components of V , or factors of the form treated in Remark A.3, one has clearly, in addition to (3.27),

$$\|B[V]\|_X \lesssim |V|_X C(|V|_X) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_{\varkappa} B[V]\|_X \lesssim |\partial_{\varkappa} V|_X C(|V|_X).$$

Thus one can find ϱ_0, M such that for $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0]$ and $|V|_X \in [0, M]$, the assumptions of Lemmata 3.7, 3.10, 3.11 are satisfied. The remaining estimates in (3.26) follow immediately from Lemmata 3.7 and 3.10.

Define $S_{(0)} \equiv P_+^f(0)P_+^f(0)^\top + P_-^f(0)P_-^f(0)^\top + P_+^s(0)P_+^s(0)^\top + P_-^s(0)P_-^s(0)^\top$. It is straightforward to check that one has

$$\frac{1}{C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})} |W|_{L^2}^2 \leq (S_{(0)}W, W) \leq C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) |W|_{L^2}^2.$$

From Lemmata 3.7 and 3.10, one easily sees that for $\varrho_0, |V|_X$ sufficiently small, similar estimates hold for $S[V]$, thus (3.25) is proved.

Finally the estimates (3.28) and (3.29) are direct consequences of the estimates in Lemmata 3.10 and 3.11, when deriving identities (3.23), (3.24). In particular, the last estimate is obtained using

$$\|\partial_x P_\pm^f[V]\|_X = \mathcal{O}(\varrho |\partial_x V|_X), \quad \|\partial_x P_\pm^s[V]^\top P_\pm^f[V]\|_X = \mathcal{O}(\varrho |\partial_x V|_X), \quad \|P_\pm^f[V] - P_\pm^f(0)\|_X = \mathcal{O}(\varrho),$$

and all other terms are of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$, with a factor $|\partial_x V|_X$ if derived. \square

3.4 Energy estimate

This subsection is dedicated to the proof of the energy estimates that yield Proposition 3.6. Recalling that $W \equiv V - V_{\text{app}}$ satisfies (3.17), we consider W solution to the linearized system

$$\partial_t W + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V]) \partial_x W = \mathcal{R}. \quad (3.30)$$

The following Lemma presents an a priori energy estimate on W satisfying the above system. Proposition 3.6 is a direct application of the Lemma, as is detailed at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$, and W a strong solution to (3.30), with $W|_{t=0} \in X^s$. Then there exists $M, \varrho_0 > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that if $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$ and*

$$\frac{1}{\varrho} \|\Pi V\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)} + \|V\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)} + \|\partial_t V\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^{s-1})} \leq M,$$

for some given $T > 0$, then one has

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |W(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 |W(0, \cdot)|_{X^s} e^{C_0 M t} + C_0 \int_0^t e^{C_0 M (t-t')} |\mathcal{R}(t', \cdot)|_{X^s} dt'. \quad (3.31)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Proof. We compute the inner product of (3.30) with $S[V] \Lambda^{2s} W$, and obtain

$$(\Lambda^s S[V] \partial_t W, \Lambda^s W) + (\Lambda^s \Sigma[V] \partial_x W, \Lambda^s W) = (\Lambda^s S[V] \mathcal{R}, \Lambda^s W).$$

From the symmetry of $S[\cdot]$ and $\Sigma[\cdot]$, one deduces

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^s(W) &= \frac{1}{2} ([\partial_t, S[V]] \Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W) + \frac{1}{2} ([\partial_x, \Sigma[V]] \Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W) \\ &\quad - ([\Lambda^s, S[V]] \partial_t W, \Lambda^s W) - ([\Lambda^s, \Sigma[V]] \partial_x W, \Lambda^s W) + (\Lambda^s S[V] \mathcal{R}, \Lambda^s W), \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where we define

$$E^s(W) \equiv (S[V] \Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W).$$

We estimate below each of the terms in the right-hand side of (3.32).

Estimate of $([\partial_t, S[V]] \Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W)$. From (3.28) in Lemma 3.12 (with $X = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$), one has

$$|[\partial_t, S[V]] \Lambda^s W|_{L^2} \leq |\partial_t V|_{L^\infty} C(|V|_{L^\infty}, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) |\Lambda^s W|_{L^2}.$$

By hypothesis, $|\partial_t V|_{X^{s-1}}$ is controlled, and continuous Sobolev embedding for $s - 1 \geq s_0 > 1/2$ imply an equivalent control on the L^∞ norm. One obtains simply

$$|[\partial_t, S[V]] \Lambda^s W|_{L^2} \leq M C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) |\Lambda^s W|_{L^2}.$$

It follows from the above and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$|([\partial_t, S[V]]\Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W)| \leq C_0 M |W|_{X^s}^2, \quad (3.33)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Estimate of $([\partial_x, \Sigma[V]]W, W)$. As above, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.12 yield

$$([\partial_x, \Sigma[V]]W, W) \leq |\partial_x V|_{L^\infty} C(|V|_{L^\infty}, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) |W|_{L^2}^2,$$

which is easily estimated thanks to continuous Sobolev embeddings. One obtains

$$|([\partial_x, \Sigma[V]]\Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W)| \leq C_0 M |W|_{X^s}^2, \quad (3.34)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Estimate of $(F, S[V]W)$. We apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.26) in Lemma 3.12, with the algebra $X = H^s$ (see Lemma A.1). One deduces

$$(\Lambda^s S[V]\mathcal{R}, \Lambda^s W) \leq C_0 |W|_{X^s} |\mathcal{R}|_{X^s}, \quad (3.35)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Estimate of $([\Lambda^s, \Sigma[V]]\partial_x W, \Lambda^s W)$. We make use of Kato-Ponce's commutator estimate recalled in Lemma A.4. It follows

$$|[\Lambda^s, \Sigma[V]]\partial_x W|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \lesssim \|\partial_x(\Sigma[V])\|_{X^{s-1}} |\partial_x W|_{X^{s-1}}.$$

From Lemma 3.12, and since X^{s-1} is an algebra, one has

$$\|\partial_x(\Sigma[V])\|_{X^{s-1}} \lesssim |\partial_x V|_{X^{s-1}} C(|V|_{X^{s-1}}) \lesssim M C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}).$$

It follows

$$|([\Lambda^s, \Sigma[V]]\partial_x W, \Lambda^s W)| \leq C_0 M |W|_{X^s}^2, \quad (3.36)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Estimate of $([\Lambda^s, S[V]]\partial_t W, \Lambda^s W)$. As above, Kato-Ponce's commutator estimate yields

$$|[\Lambda^s, S[V]]\partial_t W|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)} \lesssim \|\partial_x(S[V])\|_{X^{s-1}} |\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}} \lesssim M |\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}}.$$

Unfortunately, making use of the equation satisfied by W only yields $|\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\varrho} |W|_{X^s}$, which is not sufficient to conclude. Thus we need now to use precisely the structure of our system, and in particular the estimate (3.29). Thus we decompose into two components:

$$[\Lambda^s, S[V]]\Pi\partial_t W + [\Lambda^s, S[V]](\text{Id} - \Pi)\partial_t W,$$

where we recall that $\Pi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is the projection onto $\ker(L_{(0)}^\top)$.

One can use the equation satisfied by W , (3.30), to control $\Pi\partial_t W$. Indeed, one has

$$\Pi\partial_t W = -\frac{1}{\varrho}\Pi L_\varrho \partial_x W - \Pi B[V]\partial_x W + \Pi\mathcal{R},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}} &\leq |\Pi\frac{1}{\varrho}(L_\varrho - L_{(0)})\partial_x W|_{X^{s-1}} + |B[V]\partial_x W|_{X^{s-1}} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}}, \\ &\lesssim (1 + MC(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})) |\partial_x W|_{X^{s-1}} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used estimate (3.26) in Lemma 3.12, and the explicit expression of $L_\varrho = L_{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$. It follows

$$|[\Lambda^s, S[V]] \Pi \partial_t W|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})^4} \lesssim C_0 M (|W|_{X^s} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}}),$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

The fast component is small as well. Since $(\text{Id} - \Pi)$ is constant, it commutes with Λ^s , and Kato-Ponce's commutator estimates yield

$$|[\Lambda^s, S[V]] (\text{Id} - \Pi) \partial_t W|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})^4} \lesssim \|\partial_x (S[V] (\text{Id} - \Pi))\|_{H^{s-1}} |\partial_t W|_{X^s}.$$

Now, one has as above,

$$|\partial_t W|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} |W|_{X^s} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}} \right),$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$. Estimate (3.29) in Lemma 3.12 allows to recover a factor of ϱ :

$$\|\partial_x (S[V] (\text{Id} - \Pi))\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C_0 M \varrho,$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$. Altogether, one has

$$|([\Lambda^s, S[V]] \partial_t W, \Lambda^s W)| \leq C_0 M (|W|_{X^s} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}}) |W|_{X^s}, \quad (3.37)$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Plugging (3.33), (3.34), (3.35), (3.36), (3.37) into (3.32) yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^s(W) \leq C_0 (M |W|_{X^s}^2 + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^s} |W|_{X^s}).$$

Finally, estimate (3.25) in Lemma 3.12 yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^s(W) \leq C'_0 M E^s(W) + C'_0 |\mathcal{R}|_{X^s} E^s(W)^{1/2}.$$

with $C'_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$, and Lemma 3.13 follows from Gronwall-Bihari's Lemma. \square

We conclude this section with the proof of Proposition 3.6. Recalling that W satisfies (3.17), we apply Lemma 3.13, with $V \equiv V_{\text{app}} + W$ and $-\mathcal{R} \equiv (B[V_{\text{app}} + W] - B[V_{\text{app}}]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}} + R$.

Let us first define

$$T^\sharp \equiv \sup \left\{ t \in [0, T], \ \|W\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; X^s)} \leq 2M_2 \varrho \right\}.$$

One has $T^\sharp > 0$, since $W = V - V_{\text{app}} \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1})$.

It is easy to check that $V \equiv V_{\text{app}} + W$ satisfies the requirements of Lemma 3.13 for $t \in [0, T^\sharp]$. Indeed, V_{app} is controlled as a hypothesis in Proposition 3.6, and Proposition 3.4 yields

$$|\Pi V_{\text{app}}|_{X^s} = |\Pi V_{\text{rem}}|_{X^s} \lesssim M_1 \varrho.$$

The control of W is a consequence of the definition of T^\sharp , and its derivative is controlled using the equation satisfied by W , namely (3.17):

$$|\partial_t W|_{X^{s-1}} \leq \frac{1}{\varrho} C(M_1, M_2, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) |\partial_x W|_{X^{s-1}} + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}} \leq C(M_1, M_2, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}) + |\mathcal{R}|_{X^{s-1}}.$$

Thus we only need to estimate \mathcal{R} . From Proposition 3.4, one has

$$\|R\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M_1]; X^s)} \lesssim M_1 \varrho (M_1 + \varrho).$$

Now, using that $(X^s, |\cdot|_{X^s})$ is a Banach algebra, and using (3.27) in Lemma 3.12, one has

$$|(B[V_{\text{app}} + W] - B[V_{\text{app}}]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}}| \lesssim C(|V_{\text{app}}|_{X^s}, |W|_{X^s}) |W|_{X^s} |\partial_x V_{\text{app}}|_{X^s}.$$

It follows, since $M_1, M_2 \in [0, M]$,

$$\|\mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty([0, \min\{T^\sharp, T/M_1\}]; X^s)} \leq C_0(M^2\varrho + M\varrho^2),$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$.

Thus we can apply (3.31) in Lemma 3.13, and deduce

$$\forall 0 \leq t \leq \min\{T^\sharp, T/M\}, \quad |W(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} \leq C_0 M \varrho e^{C_0 M t} + C_0(M\varrho + \varrho^2)(e^{C_0 M t} - 1),$$

with $C_0 = C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max})$. We finally deduce that there exists $T' > 0$, depending only on $M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}$, such that $T^\sharp \geq \min\{T, T'/M, T'/\varrho\}$, and Proposition 3.6 follows.

4 Additional results and discussion

In this section, we give partial answers to two of the natural questions arising from Theorem 1.2:

1. *Can we construct a first-order corrector in order to describe the asymptotic behavior of the solution, and in particular the deformation at the surface?*
2. *Can we extend the result to ill-prepared initial data, that is satisfying (1.3) but not (1.4)?*

In both cases, as we shall see, the answer will be given through a decomposition between fast and slow modes. Such decomposition is easily seen in the linear case ($\epsilon = 0$ in (1.1)) as the solution is then simply a superposition of four traveling waves, with velocity asserted by the eigenvalues of $\frac{1}{\varrho}L_\varrho$. From Lemma 3.7, we know that when $\varrho \rightarrow 0$, two of these waves (corresponding to the solution of the rigid-lid system, and mainly supported on variables ζ_2, u_s) are moving at velocity $c_\pm^s \sim \pm 1$, while the two other ones (supported on ζ_1, m) are moving at velocity $c_\pm^f \sim \pm\sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}/\varrho$.

This decomposition is far from being new. In the literature, the two modes are also often referred as surface and interface modes, or barotropic and baroclinic modes, since the fast mode components share the properties of water-waves for one layer of a fluid of constant mass density [13]. The decomposition is exact in the linear setting, and has been showed to hold approximately in the weakly nonlinear setting; see [11], and references therein. In that case, the smallness of ϵ allows to control the coupling terms between each of the waves (even when additional —small— dispersion terms are included), provided they are sufficiently spatially localized initially.

Our aim in this section is to show that this decomposition is quite robust, and holds even when strong nonlinearities are involved. As above, such result will rely on a condition of spatial localization of the initial data, that we express through weighted Sobolev spaces.

In subsection 4.1, we construct slow and fast-mode correctors which allow to obtain a very precise approximate solution of the free-surface system, using only the corresponding solution of the rigid-lid system and the initial data. In subsection 4.2, we extend the consistency result obtained in Proposition 3.4 to ill-prepared initial data, that is data allowing non-small horizontal momentum and deformation of the surface, and thus involving a leading order slow mode. Finally, subsection 4.3 contains numerical simulations illustrating the aforementioned results, and an accompanying discussion.

4.1 Construction of the first-order correction

In this section, we show that one can construct the first-order corrector to the rigid-lid approximate solution to (1.1) displayed in Theorem 1.2, provided the initial data is bounded in weighted Sobolev spaces. A key ingredient is the establishment of a fast mode corrector, which allows to take into account small initial data supported on variables ζ_1, m .

In order to achieve this, one simply needs to provide higher-order approximate solutions to (3.3) in the sense of consistency, *i.e.* similarly to Proposition 3.4. The results is expressed in Proposition 4.1. One can then apply the strategy developed in the previous section, and one obtains the stronger result expressed in Theorem 4.5.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $s \geq s_0$, $s_0 > 1/2$, $\sigma > 1/2$, and $\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_s^0, m^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$. There exists $M > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1}$, such that if one has*

$$|(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_1^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma m^0|_{H^s} + \varrho |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_2^0|_{H^s} + \varrho |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma u_s^0|_{H^s} \leq M \varrho,$$

then there exists $0 < T^{-1}, C_0 \leq C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$ such that

1. $V^{\text{RL}} \equiv (0, \eta, v, 0)^\top$ is well-defined by Definition 3.3, and satisfies

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} \leq C_0 M.$$

2. $V_{\text{cor}}^s \equiv (\check{\varrho} \zeta_1, 0, 0, 0)^\top$ is well-defined with

$$\check{\zeta}_1 \equiv -(\eta + \frac{\delta}{2}\eta^2) - \frac{(1-\eta)(\delta^{-1} + \eta)v^2}{\gamma(1 + \delta^{-1})^2}.$$

3. V_{cor}^f is well-defined with

$$V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u_+(x - c/\varrho t) + u_-(x + c/\varrho t) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ c(u_+(x - c/\varrho t) - u_-(x + c/\varrho t)) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c \equiv \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}$, and $u_\pm(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\zeta_1^0 - \varrho \check{\zeta}_1|_{t=0} \pm c^{-1}m^0)$.

4. There exists V_{rem} , with

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V_{\text{rem}}(t, \cdot)|_{X_{\text{ul}}^{s+1}} \leq C_0 M,$$

such that $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s + V_{\text{cor}}^f + \varrho^2 V_{\text{rem}}$ satisfies (3.3), up to a remainder term, R , with

$$\int_0^T |R(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} dt \leq C_0 M \varrho^2.$$

Remark 4.2. We denote $(H_{\text{ul}}^s, |\cdot|_{H_{\text{ul}}^s})$ the uniformly local Sobolev space introduced in [18]:

$$|u|_{H_{\text{ul}}^s} \equiv \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |\chi(\cdot - j)u(\cdot)|_{H^s},$$

where χ is a smooth function satisfying $\chi \equiv 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$, $\chi \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq 1/2$, and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi(x-j) = 1$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (the space is independent of the choice of χ satisfying these assumptions).

We then denote $(X_{\text{ul}}^s, |\cdot|_{X_{\text{ul}}^s})$, $(L^\infty([0, T]; X_{\text{ul}}^s), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X_{\text{ul}}^s)})$ similarly to the previously used Sobolev-based spaces.

Remark 4.3. The last item is restricted to the time domain $t \in [0, T]$ instead of $t \in [0, T/M]$. As discussed in Remark 1.3, we do not expect any particular limitation when M is small.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The well-posedness and estimate of V^{RL} for $t \in [0, T/M]$ has already been stated in Proposition 3.4. The definition of the corrector and remainder terms, as well as the desired estimates, is obtained in three steps. First we construct a high-order approximate solution corresponding to the initial data ζ_2^0, u_s^0 , using the corresponding solution to the rigid-lid system, and that we will refer as *slow mode approximate solution*. Then we see how to construct the *fast mode approximate solution* in order to deal with the inadequacy of the slow mode approximate solution with regards to the initial data. Finally, we show that, thanks to the localization in space of the initial data, the coupling between the two modes are weak, so that the superposition of the two modes produces the desired approximate solution.

Construction of the slow mode approximate solution. We proceed as in the proof of Proposition 3.4, but with a more precise definition for the corrector term, in order to reach the improved consistency.

More precisely, we seek $V_{\text{app}}^s \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s + \varrho^2 V_{\text{rem}}$, with $V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s \equiv (\varrho \check{\zeta}_1, \eta, v, 0)^\top$ as in Proposition 3.4, and $V_{\text{rem}} \equiv (0, 0, 0, \check{m})^\top$ to be determined. Following the exact same steps and notation as in the proof of Proposition 3.4, we see that the only difficulty we face lies in the estimate of

$$r_1 = \varrho \left(\partial_t \check{\zeta}_1 + \partial_x \check{m} + \frac{\gamma + \delta}{\gamma} \partial_x \left(h_1 \frac{\varrho^2 \check{m} - h_2 v}{h_1 + h_2} \right) \right).$$

It is therefore natural to define

$$\check{m}(t, x) \equiv - \int_0^x \partial_t \check{\zeta}_1(t, x') dx' + \underline{h}_1(t, x) h_2(t, x) v(t, x), \quad (4.1)$$

where we denote $\underline{h}_1 \equiv 1 - \eta$ and $h_2 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \zeta$.

Note that \check{m} does not have finite energy, since it does not necessarily decay when $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. However, recall the estimates of Proposition 3.4:

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 M, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |\check{\zeta}_1|_{H^{s+1}} + |\partial_t \check{\zeta}_1|_{H^s} \lesssim C_0 M, \quad (4.3)$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$. One deduces

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |\check{m}|_{H_{\text{ul}}^{s+1}} + |\partial_x \check{m}|_{H^s} \lesssim C_0 M, \quad (4.4)$$

where we use that H^s is continuously embedded in H_{ul}^s and H_{ul}^s is an algebra, for any $s \geq s_0$ (see, e.g., [23, App. B.4]). The estimate on V_{rem} , stated in the Proposition, is given by (4.2), (4.3), (4.4).

Note that (4.4) yields in particular, for any $f \in H^{s+1}$, $s \geq s_0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{m}f|_{H^s} &\leq |\check{m}\Lambda^s f|_{L^2} + |[\Lambda^s, \check{m}]f|_{L^2} \lesssim |\check{m}|_{L^\infty} |f|_{H^s} + |\partial_x \check{m}|_{H^{\max\{s-1, s_0\}}} |f|_{H^{\max\{s-1, s_0\}}} \\ &\lesssim C_0 M |f|_{H^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where we used the commutator estimate recalled in Lemma A.4. Using the above, it is now straightforward to check that $V_{\text{app}}^s \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s + \varrho^2 V_{\text{rem}} \equiv (\varrho \check{\zeta}_1, \eta, v, \varrho^2 \check{m})^\top$ satisfies (3.3), up to a remainder term, R^s , with

$$\|R^s\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \lesssim C_0 M \varrho^2. \quad (4.6)$$

Here, we used the fact that the occurrences of \check{m} in (3.3) are either of the form $\partial_x \check{m}$, or $\check{m} \times f$ with $f \in H^s$, and both of these contributions are bounded in H^s , thanks to (4.4) and (4.5).

Construction of the fast mode approximate solution. The corrector V_{cor}^f has been defined as the unique solution to

$$\partial_t V_{\text{cor}}^f + \frac{1}{\varrho} L_{(0)} \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f = 0, \quad \text{where we recall } L_{(0)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 + \delta^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with initial data $V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{t=0} \equiv (\zeta_1^0 - \varrho \check{\zeta}_1|_{t=0}, 0, 0, m^0)^\top$.

Our aim is to prove that V_{cor}^f is an approximate solution to (3.3). We recall that the system reads

$$\partial_t V + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V]) \partial_x V = 0, \quad \text{with } L_\varrho \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma(\delta+1)} & \frac{\gamma+\delta}{\gamma(\delta+1)} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} \\ 0 & \varrho(\gamma+\delta) & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma(1+\delta^{-1}) & \varrho \frac{\delta+\gamma}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus V_{cor}^f satisfies

$$\partial_t V_{\text{cor}}^f + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V]) \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f = R^f,$$

with

$$R^f \equiv \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho - L_{(0)}) \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f + B[V_{\text{cor}}^f] \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f.$$

It is obvious that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, V_{cor}^f satisfies

$$|V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, \cdot)|_{X^{s+1}} \lesssim |V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{t=0}|_{X^{s+1}} \leq C_0 M \varrho, \quad (4.7)$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$ (where we used (4.3) and the hypothesis of the Proposition).

In particular, since $\|B[V]\| \lesssim |V|_{(L^\infty)^4}$ (see Lemma 3.12), Lemma A.1 yields

$$|B[V_{\text{cor}}^f] \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^s} \lesssim |V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{(L^\infty)^4} |V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^{s+1}} \leq C_0 M^2 \varrho^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Now, we use the fact that $(\text{Id} - \Pi)V_{\text{cor}}^f = V_{\text{cor}}^f$ where we recall that Π represents the orthogonal projection onto $\ker(L_{(0)})$: $\text{Id} - \Pi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

It is straightforward to check that

$$\|(L - L_{(0)})(\text{Id} - \Pi)\| \lesssim \varrho^2,$$

so that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho - L_{(0)}) \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f \right|_{X^s} = \left| \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho - L_{(0)})(\text{Id} - \Pi) \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f \right|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 M \varrho^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Estimates (4.8), (4.9), immediately yield the desired result: V_{cor}^f satisfies (3.3), up to a remainder term, R^f , satisfying

$$\|R^f\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; H^s)} \lesssim C_0 M \varrho^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Completion of the proof. One easily checks that $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V_{\text{app}}^s + V_{\text{cor}}^f$ satisfies

$$\partial_t V_{\text{app}} + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V_{\text{app}}]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}} = R^f + R^s + R^c,$$

where

$$R^c \equiv (B[V_{\text{app}}] - B[V_{\text{cor}}^f]) \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f + (B[V_{\text{app}}] - B[V_{\text{app}}^s]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}}^s.$$

The contribution of $R^f + R^s$ is controlled as a result of the above calculations; see (4.6), (4.10). Thus the only component to control is R^c , which contains the coupling terms between V_{cor}^f and V_{app}^s .

Note that using (3.27) in Lemma 3.12 as well as estimates (4.2) (4.3), (4.4), (4.5) and (4.7), one has

$$|R^c|_{X^s} \leq C_0 (|V^{\text{RL}} \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^s} + |V_{\text{cor}}^f \partial_x V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} + M \varrho^2) \quad (4.11)$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$.

In order to control the latter contribution, we will use the fact that we assumed the initial data to be spatially localized. V_{cor}^f is the superposition of two spatially localized waves, with center of mass $x \approx \pm c/\varrho t$. Thus we seek to prove that V^{RL} remains spatially localized around $x = 0$ on the relevant timescale.

It is convenient here to restrict the time domain to $t \in [0, T]$ instead of the more stringent $t \in [0, T/M]$. Indeed, recall the linearized equation predicts that V^{RL} is the superposition of two counter-propagating waves of velocity ± 1 , so that the spatial localization does not hold for large time. One could work with a time-varying spatial localization (*e.g.* replacing $\langle x \rangle^\sigma \equiv (1 + |x|^2)^{\sigma/2}$ with $(1 + |x/\langle t \rangle|)^\sigma$) but again, as our analysis is focused on strong nonlinearities, M is typically of size 1, and it is easier to restrict ourselves to $t \in [0, T]$.

We state and prove below the persistence of the spatial decay which holds generically for a quasilinear, hyperbolic system; and complete the proof of Proposition 4.1 thereafter.

Lemma 4.4 (Persistence of the spatial decay). *Let $s \geq s_0$, $s_0 > 1/2$ and $V^{\text{RL}} \equiv (\eta, v)^\top$ be the solution to (1.2), with initial data $V^{\text{RL}}|_{t=0} \equiv (\eta^0, v^0)^\top$ as above. Assume moreover that there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that one has $\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma \eta^0, \langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma v^0 \in H^s$ (where we denote $\langle x \rangle \equiv (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$). There exists $M > 0$ such that if $|(\eta^0, v^0)^\top|_{H^s \times H^s} \leq M$, then one has*

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma \eta|_{H^s} + |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma v|_{H^s} \leq C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma \eta^0|_{H^s} + |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma v^0|_{H^s}).$$

Proof of the Lemma. Consider $W(t, x) = \langle x \rangle^\sigma V^{\text{RL}}(t, x)$ (here and thereafter, multiplying a vector-valued function by $\langle x \rangle^\sigma$ means that all components are multiplied). One has

$$S[V^{\text{RL}}]\partial_t(\langle \cdot \rangle^{-\sigma} W) + \Sigma[V^{\text{RL}}]\partial_x(\langle x \rangle^{-\sigma} W) = 0,$$

where $S[\cdot], \Sigma[\cdot]$ are smooth mappings onto the space of 2-by-2 symmetric matrices (S and Σ are explicit; see [15] for more details), provided M is chosen sufficiently small (so that the condition of hyperbolicity (2.1) is satisfied).

It follows, since the multiplication with $\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma$ obviously commutes with $S[\cdot], \Sigma[\cdot], \partial_t$,

$$S[V^{\text{RL}}]\partial_t W + \Sigma[V^{\text{RL}}]\partial_x W + \langle x \rangle^\sigma \partial_x(\langle x \rangle^{-\sigma}) \Sigma[V^{\text{RL}}]W = 0.$$

For M sufficiently small, $S[V^{\text{RL}}]$ is positive definite, so that there exists $0 < c_0 < \infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_0} |W|_{X^s}^2 \leq E^s(W) \equiv (S[V^{\text{RL}}]\Lambda^s W, \Lambda^s W) \leq c_0 |W|_{X^s}^2.$$

Using the usual technique for *a priori* H^s estimates (see Lemma A.7 for example), one obtains

$$\frac{d}{dt} E^s(W) \leq C(|V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s}) E^s(W) + C(|\langle x \rangle^\sigma \partial_x(\langle x \rangle^{-\sigma})|_{X^s}, |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s}) E^s(W)^{1/2}.$$

Now, using the control of $V^{\text{RL}} \in X^s$ in (4.2), and since one has

$$|\langle x \rangle^\sigma \partial_x(\langle x \rangle^{-\sigma})|_{H^s} = |\sigma x \langle x \rangle^{-2}|_{H^s} \leq C_{s,\sigma},$$

it follows from Gronwall-Bihari's inequality:

$$E^s(W) \leq E^s(W|_{t=0}) \exp(C_0 t) + \int_0^t C_1 \exp(C_0(t-t')) dt',$$

with $C_0, C_1 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma \eta^0|_{H^s} + |\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma v^0|_{H^s})$, and the Lemma is proved. \square

Let us now complete the proof of Proposition 4.1. We use the following calculation to estimate R^c in (4.11). Set $s > 1/2$, $\sigma \geq 0$, and $c \neq 0$. Let u, v satisfy $\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma v(t, \cdot) \in H^s$, and $\langle \cdot \rangle^\sigma u(\cdot) \in H^s$. Then one has

$$|v(\cdot)u_\pm(\cdot - c/\varrho t)|_{H^s} \lesssim |(1 + |\cdot|^2)v|_{H^s} |(1 + |\cdot|^2)u|_{H^s} |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{-\sigma} (1 + |\cdot - c/\varrho t|^2)^{-\sigma}|_{H^s},$$

and one can check (see [21] for example) that for any $\sigma > 1/2$ and $T > 0$, one has

$$\int_0^T |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{-\sigma} (1 + |\cdot - c/\varrho t'|^2)^{-\sigma}|_{H^s} dt' \leq C_\sigma \varrho,$$

with $C_\sigma = C(\frac{1}{2\sigma-1}, \frac{1}{c})$, thus uniform with respect to $1/\varrho$ and T .

It is now straightforward, applying Lemma 4.4 and the definition of V_{cor}^f with the above calculations to (4.11), that the following estimate holds:

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \int_0^t |R^c(t', \cdot)|_{X^s} dt' \leq C_0 M \varrho^2, \quad (4.12)$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$.

Estimates (4.6), (4.10), and (4.12) conclude the proof of Proposition 4.1. \square

Let us conclude this section with the following result, which corresponds to Theorem 1.2, when we use Proposition 4.1 instead of Proposition 3.4.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$, and $\sigma > 1/2$. Then there exists positive constants ϱ_0, M, T, C , depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, \frac{1}{s_0-1/2}, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1}$, such that for any $0 < \varrho \leq \varrho_0$ and for any $\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying*

$$|(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_1^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_2^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma u_1^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma u_2^0|_{H^s} \leq M, \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$|(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_1^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma (h_1 u_1^0 + h_2 u_2^0)|_{H^s} \leq M\varrho, \quad (4.14)$$

one can uniquely define $U \in C([0, T]; X^{s+1}) \cap C^1([0, T]; X^s)$ as the solution to (3.3) with initial data $U|_{t=0} = (\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_1^0, u_2^0)^\top$, and $V^{\text{RL}}, V_{\text{cor}}^s, V_{\text{cor}}^f$ as in Proposition 4.1. Denote U_{app} the approximate solution corresponding to $V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s + V_{\text{cor}}^f$, after the change of variables (3.2). Then one has

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \|U - U_{\text{app}}\|_{L^\infty([0, t]; X_{\text{ul}}^s)} \leq C M \varrho^2.$$

Remark 4.6. *Recall we set $\epsilon = 1$ and $\alpha = \varrho$ after Theorem 1.2; see Remarks 1.3 and 1.4. The statement of Theorem 4.5 is easily extended to the general case.*

Sketch of the proof. The existence and uniqueness of U has already been stated in Theorem 1.2. The existence and uniqueness of $V^{\text{RL}}, V_{\text{cor}}^s, V_{\text{cor}}^f$ is guaranteed by Proposition 4.1. Now, one can follow the exact same procedure as described in Section 3, using the result of Proposition 4.1 instead of the corresponding Proposition 3.4. Note however that the remainder term constructed in Proposition 4.1, V_{rem} , has not a finite H^s norm, as it may not decay when $x \pm \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we need to work with uniformly local Sobolev spaces, defined in Remark 4.2.

However, as initially remarked by Kato [18], the usual theory of hyperbolic quasilinear system in Sobolev spaces extends naturally to uniformly local Sobolev spaces, without significant change in the proof (in particular, similar product and commutator estimates hold; see [23, App. B]); thus we do not detail further on.

We simply remark that V_{app} has been constructed so that $W \equiv V - V_{\text{app}}$ satisfies

$$|W|_{t=0}|_{X_{\text{ul}}^s} \lesssim C_0 M \varrho^2,$$

where we denote $V \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top$ the solution to (3.3) corresponding to U , in terms of the unknowns defined by (3.1). Consequently, the energy estimate (3.31) in Lemma 3.13 implies

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |W|_{X_{\text{ul}}^s} \lesssim C_0 M \varrho^2 + \int_0^t |R(t', \cdot)|_{X_{\text{ul}}^s} dt',$$

which immediately yields the desired estimate. \square

4.2 The case of ill-prepared initial data

In this section, we are concerned with the case of ill-prepared initial data, that is initial data satisfying (1.3), but not (1.4). Once again, we construct an approximate solution as the superposition of a slow-mode approximate solution, obtained from the corresponding solution to the rigid-lid system (1.2), and a fast-mode approximate solution, that we shall exhibit below. There are two main differences with the previous results, due to the fact that the slow-mode approximate solution is no longer of size $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$:

1. Nonlinear effects have a non-trivial contribution on the behavior of the slow-mode approximate solution, and cannot be neglected.
2. The strategy developed in Section 3 is not valid anymore, as the hypothesis of Lemma 3.13 is no longer satisfied.

As a consequence, we restrict our statement to a consistency result, Proposition 4.7, and cannot deduce an estimate on the difference of the exact and approximate solutions, as in Theorems 1.2 and 4.5; or even that (1.1) is well-posed for a large time (independent of ϱ). However, numerical simulations, presented in the subsequent subsection, are in full agreement with the intuitive conjecture that

$$|V - V^{\text{RL}} - V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^s} = \mathcal{O}(\varrho),$$

with the notations introduced below.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $s \geq s_0$, $s_0 > 1/2$, $\sigma > 1/2$ and let $\zeta_1^0, \zeta_2^0, u_s^0, m^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there exists $M > 0$, depending only on $\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1}$, such that if one has*

$$|(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_1^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma m^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \zeta_2^0|_{H^s} + |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma u_s^0|_{H^s} \leq M ,$$

then there exists $0 < T^{-1}, C_0 \leq C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$ such that

1. $V^{\text{RL}} \equiv (0, \eta, v, 0)^\top$ is well-defined by Definition 3.3, and satisfies

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} \leq C_0 M .$$

2. V_{cor}^f is well-defined with

$$V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u_+(t, x) + u_-(t, x) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ c(u_+(t, x) - u_-(t, x)) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c \equiv \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}$, and u_\pm is the unique solution to

$$\partial_t u_\pm \pm \frac{c}{\varrho} \partial_x u_\pm \pm \frac{3}{2c} u_\pm \partial_x u_\pm = 0,$$

with $u_\pm|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2}(\zeta_1^0 \pm c^{-1}m^0)$.

3. There exists V_{rem} with

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V_{\text{rem}}|_{X^{s+1}} + \varrho |\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}|_{X^s} \leq C_0 M ,$$

such that $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^f + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}$ satisfies (3.3), up to a remainder term, R , satisfying

$$\int_0^T |R(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} dt \leq C_0 M \varrho .$$

Remark 4.8. *The fast-mode contribution V_{cor}^f is different from the one defined in the previous subsection. It is also not a corrector term per se, since it has the same order of magnitude as V^{RL} . We decide to use the same notation in order to acknowledge the following fact: one can replace V_{cor}^f in Proposition 4.1 by the one defined above, without modifying the rest of the statement; nonlinear effects on the fast-mode component are negligible in the case of well-prepared initial data.*

Proof of Proposition 4.7. We follow the same three steps as in the proof of Proposition 4.1. We first construct an approximate solution corresponding to the slow-mode and fast-mode, respectively. Finally, we prove that the coupling between the two modes are weak, thanks to the appropriate spatial localization of the initial data, and therefore the superposition of the two modes yields an approximate solution.

Construction of the slow-mode approximate solution. Proposition 3.4 directly gives the desired result: denoting $V_{\text{rem}}^s \equiv (\zeta_1, 0, 0, \varrho \check{m})$, with ζ_1, \check{m} defined in (3.12),(3.14), one has

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 M, \quad (4.15)$$

$$\forall t \in [0, T/M], \quad |V_{\text{rem}}^s|_{X^{s+1}} + |\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^s|_{X^s} \lesssim C_0 M, \quad (4.16)$$

and $V_{\text{app}}^s \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^s$ satisfies (3.3) up to a remainder term, R^s , satisfying

$$\|R^s\|_{L^\infty([0, T/M]; X^s)} \lesssim C_0 M (M \varrho + \varrho^2) \lesssim C_0 M \varrho, \quad (4.17)$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, M)$.

Construction of the fast-mode approximate solution. We recall that (3.3) reads

$$\partial_t V + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V]) \partial_x V = 0,$$

denoting $U \equiv (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, u_s, m)^\top$, and

$$L_\varrho \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma(\delta+1)} & \frac{\gamma+\delta}{\gamma(\delta+1)} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} & \frac{\varrho}{1+\delta} \\ 0 & \varrho(\gamma+\delta) & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma(1+\delta^{-1}) & \varrho \frac{\delta+\gamma}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We denote $L_\varrho \equiv L_{(0)} + \varrho L_{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho^2)$, with

$$L_{(0)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1+\delta^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_{(1)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{1+\delta} & \frac{1}{1+\delta} \\ 0 & \gamma+\delta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\delta+1}{\delta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

One can also check that $B[(\zeta_1, 0, 0, m)^\top] \equiv B_{(1)}[(\zeta_1, 0, 0, m)^\top] + \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$, with

$$B_{(1)}[(\zeta_1, 0, 0, m)^\top] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\delta}{\delta+1}m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\delta}{\delta+1}m & 0 \\ \zeta_1 & 0 & 0 & 2\frac{\delta}{\delta+1}m \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho).$$

In the following, we seek an approximate solution to

$$\partial_t V + \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} L_{(0)} + L_{(1)} + B_{(1)}[V] \right) \partial_x V = 0. \quad (4.18)$$

Our strategy is based on a BKW-type expansion, namely we seek an approximate solution to (4.18) under the form

$$V_{\text{app}}^f(t, x) = V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, t/\varrho, x) + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^f(t, t/\varrho, x),$$

where (with a straightforward abuse of notation) $V_{\text{app}}^f(t, \tau, x)$ is an approximate solution to

$$\frac{1}{\varrho} \partial_\tau V_{\text{app}}^f + \partial_t V_{\text{app}}^f + \left(\frac{1}{\varrho} L_{(0)} + L_{(1)} + B_{(1)}[V_{\text{app}}^f] \right) \partial_x V_{\text{app}}^f = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

More precisely, and based on the fact that at first order (in terms of ϱ), the system (4.19) is a simple linear equation, $\partial_\tau V + L_{(0)} \partial_x V = 0$, we set V_{cor}^f as the superposition of decoupled waves, supported on the eigenspaces of $L_{(0)}$. The analysis of higher-order terms yield

- the behavior of V_{cor}^f with respect to the large-time variable, t , which takes into account the nonlinear effects on the propagation of each decoupled waves;
- a remainder term, $V_{\text{rem}}^f(t, \tau, x)$, which mimics the coupling effects between the two counter-propagating waves of V_{cor}^f , as well as the “slow mode component”, supported on $(0, \cdot, \cdot, 0)^\top$.

The key ingredient in the proof is to show that one can set V_{cor}^f such that V_{rem}^f remains small for large time. This strategy has been applied notably to the rigorous justification of the Korteweg-de Vries equation as a model for the propagation of surface waves in the long wave regime [4, 26], and later on to similar problems [11, 12] in the bi-fluidic setting. It is described comprehensively for example in [23, Chap. 7], thus we do not detail the calculations, and simply state the outcome.

It is convenient to introduce here the following eigenvectors of $L_{(0)}$:

$$\mathbf{e}_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ c \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -c \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

(of course a fourth vector —second linearly independent element of $\ker(L_{(0)})$ — could be defined, but this is not necessary in our analysis).

We set

$$V_{\text{cor}}^f(\cdot, \tau, x) \equiv u_+(\cdot, x - c\tau)\mathbf{e}_+ + u_-(\cdot, x + c\tau)\mathbf{e}_-,$$

where $u_{\pm}(t, y)$ is uniquely defined by

$$\partial_t u_{\pm} \pm \frac{3}{2c} u_{\pm} \partial_y u_{\pm} = 0,$$

with $u_{\pm}|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2}(\zeta_1^0 \pm c^{-1}m^0)$. One checks immediately that $V_{\text{cor}}^f : (t, x) \mapsto V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, t/\varrho, x)$ is as in the Proposition, explaining our (slightly misused) notation.

In the same way, we write

$$V_{\text{rem}}^f(\cdot, \tau, x) \equiv r_+(t, \tau, x)\mathbf{e}_+ + r_-(t, \tau, x)\mathbf{e}_- + r_0(t, \tau, x)\mathbf{e}_0,$$

with functions r_+, r_-, r_0 determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau r_+(\cdot, \tau, x) + c\partial_x r_+(\cdot, \tau, x) + \frac{3}{4c}\partial_x(u_-(\cdot, x - c\tau)^2) - \frac{1}{2c}\partial_x(u_-(\cdot, x - c\tau)u_+(\cdot, x + c\tau)) &= 0, \\ \partial_\tau r_-(\cdot, \tau, x) - c\partial_x r_+(\cdot, \tau, x) - \frac{3}{4c}\partial_x(u_+(\cdot, x - c\tau)^2) + \frac{1}{2c}\partial_x(u_-(\cdot, x - c\tau)u_+(\cdot, x + c\tau)) &= 0, \\ \partial_\tau r_0(\cdot, \tau, x) + \frac{1}{\delta c}\partial_x(u_+(\cdot, x + c\tau) - u_-(\cdot, x - c\tau)) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and $V_{\text{rem}}^f(\cdot, 0, x) \equiv 0$.

One can check that $V_{\text{app}}^f(t, \tau, x) = V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, \tau, x) + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^f(t, \tau, x)$, as defined above, satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\varrho}\partial_\tau V_{\text{app}}^f + \partial_t V_{\text{app}}^f + \left(\frac{1}{\varrho}L_{(0)} + L_{(1)} + B_{(1)}[V_{\text{app}}^f]\right)\partial_x V_{\text{app}}^f = R^f,$$

with $R^f \equiv \partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^f + \varrho L_{(1)}\partial_x V_{\text{rem}}^f + B_{(1)}[V_{\text{app}}^f]\partial_x V_{\text{app}}^f - B_{(1)}[V_{\text{cor}}^f]\partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f$.

It follows (using (3.27) in Lemma 3.12) that

$$\|R^f\|_{X^s} \leq \varrho C(\|\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^f\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_x V_{\text{rem}}^f\|_{X^s}, \|V_{\text{cor}}^f\|_{X^{s+1}}, \|V_{\text{rem}}^f\|_{X^{s+1}}). \quad (4.20)$$

In order to estimate the above, one needs to control V_{rem}^f , using the following two Lemmata.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $s \geq 0$, and $f^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there exists a unique global strong solution, $u(\tau, x) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}; H^{s+1}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; H^s)$, of*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_\tau + c_1\partial_x)u = \partial_x f & \text{with} & \begin{cases} (\partial_\tau + c_2\partial_x)f = 0 \\ f_i|_{t=0} = f^0 \end{cases} \\ u|_{t=0} = 0 \end{cases}$$

where $c_1 \neq c_2$. Moreover, one has the following estimates for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \frac{2}{|c_1 - c_2|} \|f^0\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq |\tau| \|f^0\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Lemma 4.10. *Let $s \geq s_0 > 1/2$, and $v_1^0, v_2^0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there exists a unique global strong solution, $u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}; H^{s+1}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; H^s)$, of*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_\tau + c\partial_x)u = g(v_1, v_2) & \text{with} & \forall i \in \{1, 2\}, \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_\tau + c_i\partial_x)v_i = 0 \\ v_i|_{t=0} = v_i^0 \end{cases} \\ u|_{t=0} = 0 \end{cases}$$

where $c_1 \neq c_2$, and g is a bilinear mapping defined on \mathbb{R}^2 and with values in \mathbb{R} . Moreover, one has the following estimates:

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty([0, \tau]; H^s)} \leq C_s |\tau|, \quad \|\partial_\tau u\|_{L^\infty([0, \tau]; H^s)} \leq C_{s+1} |\tau|.$$

If moreover, there exists $\sigma > 1/2$ such that $v_1^0(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma$, and $v_2^0(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, then one has the (uniform in time) estimate

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|v_1^0(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \|v_2^0(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})},$$

with $C = C(\frac{1}{c_1 - c_2}, \frac{1}{\sigma - 1/2})$.

Lemma 4.9 is straightforward, and Lemma 4.10 follows from Propositions 3.2 and 3.5 in [21]. Lemmata 4.9 and 4.10 applied to V_{rem}^f and $\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^f$ immediately yield

$$|V_{\text{rem}}^f(t, \tau, \cdot)|_{X^s} + |\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^f(t, \tau, \cdot)|_{X^s} \leq C \min(\tau, 1) |u_+(t, \cdot)(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} |u_-(t, \cdot)(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

It is not difficult to show that the inviscid Burgers' equation propagates the localization in space of its solutions (see Lemma 4.4), so that one has

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |u_-(t, \cdot)(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim |u_-(0, \cdot)(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq M. \quad (4.21)$$

In particular, we deduce (recalling that $V_{\text{cor}}^f \equiv u_+(t, x - ct/\varrho)\mathbf{e}_+ + u_-(t, x + ct/\varrho)\mathbf{e}_-$)

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^{s+1}} + \varrho |\partial_t V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^s} \lesssim C_\sigma M, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad |V_{\text{rem}}^f|_{X^{s+1}} + \varrho |\partial_t V_{\text{rem}}^f|_{X^s} \lesssim C_\sigma M, \quad (4.23)$$

with $C_\sigma = C(M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$.

Therefore (4.20) simply becomes

$$\|R^f\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)} \leq C_\sigma M \varrho, \quad (4.24)$$

with C_σ as above.

Completion of the proof. One easily checks that $V_{\text{app}} \equiv V_{\text{app}}^s + V_{\text{app}}^f \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^f + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^s + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^f$ satisfies

$$\partial_t V_{\text{app}} + \frac{1}{\varrho} (L_\varrho + \varrho B[V_{\text{app}}]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}} = R^s + R^f + R^c,$$

where R^s and R^f have been defined and estimated above, and with

$$R^c \equiv (B[V_{\text{app}}] - B[V_{\text{app}}^f]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}}^f + (B[V_{\text{app}}] - B[V_{\text{app}}^s]) \partial_x V_{\text{app}}^s.$$

The contribution of $R^f + R^s$ is controlled as a result of the above calculations; see (4.17) and (4.24). Thus the only component to control comes from the coupling effects between V_{app}^s and V_{app}^f , displayed in R^c . Recalling the construction of $V_{\text{app}}^s \equiv V^{\text{RL}} + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^s$ and $V_{\text{app}}^f \equiv V_{\text{cor}}^f + \varrho V_{\text{rem}}^f$, using estimates (4.15), (4.16), (4.22), (4.23) as well as (3.27) in Lemma 3.12, one immediately sees that

$$|R^c|_{X^s} \leq C_\sigma (|V^{\text{RL}} \partial_x V_{\text{cor}}^f|_{X^s} + |V_{\text{cor}}^f \partial_x V^{\text{RL}}|_{X^s} + M\varrho),$$

with $C_\sigma = C(M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$.

We estimate the above as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, using spatial localization. For any v satisfying $(1 + |x|^2)v(t, x) \in H^s$, with $s > 1/2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |v(t, x)u_\pm(t, x \mp c/\varrho t)|_{H^s} \\ & \lesssim |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma v(t, \cdot)|_{H^s} |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^\sigma u_\pm(t, \cdot)|_{H^s} |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{-\sigma} (1 + |x \mp c/\varrho t|^2)^{-\sigma}|_{H^s}, \end{aligned}$$

and recall that for any $\sigma > 1/2$ and $t > 0$, one has

$$\int_0^t |(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{-\sigma} (1 + |\cdot \mp c/\varrho t'|^2)^{-\sigma}|_{H^s} dt' \leq C_\sigma M \varrho,$$

with $C_\sigma = C(\frac{1}{2\sigma-1}, \frac{1}{c})$, thus uniform with respect to $1/\varrho$ and T .

Thus it follows from Lemma 4.4 and (4.21) that one can restrict $T > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^T |R^c(t, \cdot)|_{X^s} dt \leq C_\sigma M \varrho,$$

with $C_\sigma \equiv C(M, \frac{1}{2\sigma-1})$. Proposition 4.7 is proved. \square

4.3 Discussion and numerical simulations

In this section, we illustrate and discuss the results displayed in Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 3.4 (validity of the rigid-lid approximation), Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.5 (first-order corrector) and Proposition 4.7 (ill-prepared initial data).

In each case, we construct the appropriate approximate solution $(V^{\text{RL}}, V_{\text{cor}}^f, V_{\text{cor}}^s)$ and compare with the exact solution of the free-surface system (3.3) (which is equivalent to (1.1) with the corresponding variables); for different values of ϱ , while the other parameters are fixed.

More precisely, we set:

$$\delta = 1/2 \quad \epsilon = 1/2 \quad \gamma \in \{0.75, 0.9, 0.93, 0.95, 0.965, 0.0975, 0.09825, 0.09875, 0.099\}.$$

The initial data is given as follows:

$$\zeta_2|_{t=0} = \exp(-(x/2)^2) \quad ; \quad u_s|_{t=0} = \frac{-1}{3} \exp(-(x/2)^2),$$

and

$$\zeta_1|_{t=0} = 0 \quad ; \quad u_s|_{t=0} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in the well-prepared case;} \\ 2 \exp(-(x/2)^2) & \text{in the ill-prepared case.} \end{cases}$$

We compute for times $t \in [0, T]$ with $T = 4$.

Each figure contains three panels. The upper-left panel represents the initial data. For the sake of readability, we plot respectively $1 + \delta^{-1} + \epsilon \zeta_1|_{t=0}$, $\delta^{-1} + \epsilon \zeta_2|_{t=0}$, $1 + u_s|_{t=0}$ and $m|_{t=0}$. The lower panel represents the solution of the free-surface system (3.3) as well as the corresponding approximate solution at stake (the latter with dotted lines), at final time $T = 4$, for $\gamma = 0.9$, thus $\varrho \approx 0.2673$. Finally, in the upper-right panel, we plot the discrete l^2 -norm of the difference between the aforementioned data in a log-log scale, for several values of ϱ (the markers reveal the positions which have been computed), at final time $T = 4$.

The numerical scheme we use is based on spectral methods as for the space discretization (see [29]), thus yields an exponential accuracy with respect to the size of the grid Δx , as long as the signal is smooth (note that the major drawback is that the discrete differentiation matrices are not sparse). We set $\Delta x = 0.1$ (for $x \in [-100, 100]$), which is sufficient for the numerical errors to be undetectable. We then use the Matlab solver `ode45`, which is based on the fourth and fifth order Runge-Kutta-Merson method [27], with a tolerance of 10^{-8} , in order to solve the time-dependent problem.

Well-prepared initial data. In figure 2, we present a numerical simulation corresponding to the setting of Theorem 1.2, thus we compare the solution of the free-surface system with the corresponding solution of the rigid-lid system (or more precisely, the rigid-lid approximate solution defined in Definition 3.3). One straightforwardly sees that the free-surface solution closely follows the deformation of the interface and shear velocity predicted by the rigid-lid approximation, even for a relatively large value of ϱ (we recall $\gamma = 0.1$ in the panel 2(c)). As a matter of fact, the precision of the approximation is not foreseen from Theorem 1.2: as we can see from the panel 2(b), the convergence rate for ζ_2 and u_s is $\mathcal{O}(\varrho^2)$, as Theorem 1.2 predicts only $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$. One can see that the main error in the rigid-lid approximation is supported on the deformation of the surface, ζ_1 , as well as on the horizontal momentum, m (and more precisely the fast mode of the horizontal momentum).

Of course, such result is predicted by Theorem 4.5, since the first-order corrector constructed in Proposition 4.1 follows precisely the above description. We show in figure 3 the precision of the improved rigid-lid approximation. One sees that the main differences between the free-surface solution and the rigid-lid approximate solution have been recovered. The rate of convergence is now $\mathcal{O}(\varrho^2)$ for each variable ζ_1, ζ_2, u_s, m , in full accordance with Theorem 4.5.




Figure 2: Solution of the free-surface system compared with the rigid-lid approximate solution




Figure 3: Solution of the free-surface system compared with the improved approximate solution

Ill-prepared initial data. We discuss now the case of ill-prepared initial data, that is when $\zeta_1|_{t=0}, m|_{t=0}$ are not assumed to be small. Recall however that the surface deviation from the flat equilibrium value is represented by $\epsilon\alpha\zeta_1 = \varrho\zeta_1$ (in other words, the total depth of the two layers is $h_1 + h_2 \equiv 1 + \delta^{-1} + \varrho\zeta_1$) so that it is still vanishing when ϱ tends to zero. In order to ensure that this scaling does not affect our numerical simulations, and especially the computed convergence rate, we set $\zeta_1|_{t=0} = 0$, and fix $m|_{t=0} \neq 0$. In that way, the initial data does not depend on the varying parameter, ϱ .

We plot in Figure 4 the difference between the exact solution of the free-surface system and the one of the approximate solution constructed in Proposition 4.7, for such initial data. As one can see, there is a noticeable difference between the two solutions. Moreover, this discrepancy seems to be mainly located on the fast-mode, and on the variables ζ_1, m . As a matter of fact, the variables ζ_2, u_s present a slightly better convergence rate (around $\mathcal{O}(\varrho^{1.2})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\varrho^{1.5})$, respectively) than the expected $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$.

Such a result advocates for the construction of a higher-order approximation. We know from Proposition 4.1 that one can construct a first-order slow-mode corrector $(\varrho\check{\zeta}_1, 0, 0, 0)^\top$ and that its initial value plays a role in the fast-mode corrector. More precisely, one has to modify the initial data of the fast-mode corrector in order to ensure that the full approximate solution enjoys the correct initial data. Using both statements of Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.7, we define the improved approximation for ill-prepared initial data as

$$V_{\text{app}} = V^{\text{RL}} + V_{\text{cor}}^s + V_{\text{cor}}^f,$$

where

- $V^{\text{RL}} \equiv (0, \eta, v, 0)^\top$ is defined by Definition 3.3;
- $V_{\text{cor}}^s \equiv (\varrho\check{\zeta}_1, 0, 0, 0)^\top$ is defined by $\check{\zeta}_1 \equiv -(\eta + \frac{\delta}{2}\eta^2) \frac{(1-\eta)(\delta^{-1}+\eta)v^2}{\gamma(1+\delta^{-1})^2}$.
- V_{cor}^f is well-defined with

$$V_{\text{cor}}^f(t, x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u_+(t, x) + u_-(t, x) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ c(u_+(t, x) - u_-(t, x)) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c \equiv \sqrt{1 + \delta^{-1}}$, and u_\pm is the unique solution to $\partial_t u_\pm \pm \frac{c}{\varrho} \partial_x u_\pm \pm \frac{3}{2c} u_\pm \partial_x u_\pm = 0$, with $u_\pm|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2}(\zeta_1^0 - \varrho\check{\zeta}_1|_{t=0} \pm c^{-1}m^0)$.

Let us notice that, as mentioned in Remark 4.8, this improved approximation is equivalent to the one already defined in Proposition 4.1 for well-prepared initial data. Thus this approximate solution is quite general and robust: it offers the same accuracy as our previously constructed approximate solutions in the well-prepared case (Proposition 4.1) as well as in the ill-prepared case (Proposition 4.7).

We investigate in figure 5 the precision of this improved approximate solution. Comparing panels 4(c) and 5(c), one clearly obtains a better result than with the former approximate solution, and the main discrepancy seems to be recovered. However, as one can see from panel 5(b), this apparent improvement is not reflected in the convergence rate. Although the produced error is clearly smaller, the rate is not better than $\mathcal{O}(\varrho)$ where ζ_1 and m are involved (ζ_2 and u_s are unchanged). It is not clear whether a better approximate solution can be constructed, or what explains the slightly better convergence rate on ζ_2 and u_s . Our numerical simulations indicate that there is a non-trivial coupling between the fast and slow modes during early times (when both are localized at the same place), and that the contribution of these coupling effects is of size $\approx \varrho$. Thus in order to take into account these coupling effects, one may have no other choice than solving a fully coupled system, at least for small time, $t = \mathcal{O}(\varrho)$.




Figure 4: Solution of the free-surface system compared with the approximate solution, for ill-prepared initial data




Figure 5: Solution of the free-surface system compared with the improved approximate solution, for ill-prepared initial data

A Proof of Propositions 2.2

In this section, we detail the proof of Proposition 2.2, which follows the classical theory concerning Friedrichs-symmetrizable quasilinear systems. The proof is based on *a priori* energy estimates, for which the key ingredients are product and commutator estimates in Sobolev spaces. We first recall such results, and let the reader refer to, *e.g.*, [1, 23] for the proof of Lemmata A.1 and A.4.

Lemma A.1 (Product estimates).

Let $s \geq 0$. For any $f, g \in H^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, one has:

$$|fg|_{H^s} \lesssim |f|_{L^\infty} |g|_{H^s} + |f|_{H^s} |g|_{L^\infty}.$$

If $s \geq s_0 > 1/2$, one deduces thanks to continuous embedding of Sobolev spaces,

$$|fg|_{H^s} \lesssim |f|_{H^s} |g|_{H^s}.$$

Let $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $F(0) = 0$. If $g \in H^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $s \geq 0$, one has $F(g) \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$|F(g)|_{H^s} \leq C(|g|_{L^\infty}, |F|_{C^\infty}) |g|_{H^s}.$$

Throughout the paper, we repeatedly make use of the following Corollary.

Corollary A.2. Let $f, \zeta \in L^\infty \cap H^s$, with $s \geq 0$ and $h(\zeta) \equiv 1 - \zeta$, with $h(\zeta) \geq h_0 > 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f \right|_{H^s} &\leq C(h_0^{-1}, |\zeta|_{L^\infty}) (|f|_{H^s} + |\zeta|_{H^s} |f|_{L^\infty}) \\ \left| f - \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f \right|_{H^s} &\leq C(h_0^{-1}, |\zeta|_{L^\infty}) (|\zeta|_{L^\infty} |f|_{H^s} + |\zeta|_{H^s} |f|_{L^\infty}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will use the identity

$$\frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f = \frac{1}{1-\zeta} f = f + \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} f.$$

By Lemma A.1, one deduces

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f \right|_{H^s} &\leq |f|_{H^s} + \left| \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} f \right|_{H^s} \\ &\lesssim |f|_{H^s} + \left| \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} \right|_{L^\infty} |f|_{H^s} + \left| \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} \right|_{H^s} |f|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The only non-trivial term to estimate is now $\left| \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} \right|_{H^s}$. Using that $h(\zeta) = 1 - \zeta \geq h_0 > 0$, we introduce a function $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$F(X) = \begin{cases} \frac{X}{1-X} & \text{if } 1-X \geq h > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } 1-X \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

The function F satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma A.1, and one has

$$\left| \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} \right|_{H^s} = |F(\zeta)|_{H^s} \leq C(|\zeta|_{L^\infty}, h_0^{-1}) |\zeta|_{H^s}.$$

The first estimate of the Lemma is proved. The second estimate is obtained in the same way, using

$$f - \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f = -\frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} f.$$

The Corollary is proved. \square

Remark A.3. *The above result is straightforward if one replaces the assumption $h(\zeta) \geq h_0 > 0$ with the more stringent $\max\{|\zeta|_{H^s}, |\zeta|_{L^\infty}\} < 1$. In fact for any Banach Algebra $(X, |\cdot|_X)$, one has under the hypothesis $|\zeta|_X < 1$, that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f \right|_X \lesssim \frac{1}{1 - |\zeta|_X} |f|_X \quad \text{and} \quad \left| f - \frac{1}{h(\zeta)} f \right|_X \lesssim \frac{1}{1 - |\zeta|_X} |\zeta|_X |f|_X,$$

using the identity $\frac{1}{1-\zeta} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta^n$, which holds under the aforementioned hypothesis.

The following Lemma presents a generalization of the Kato-Ponce [20] commutator estimates due to Lannes [22] (one has $|f|_{H^s}$ instead of $|\partial_x f|_{H^{s-1}}$ in the standard Kato-Ponce estimate).

Lemma A.4 (Commutator estimates).

For any $s \geq 0$, and $\partial_x f, g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})$, one has

$$\left| [\Lambda^s, f]g \right|_{L^2} \lesssim \left| \partial_x f \right|_{H^{s-1}} |g|_{L^\infty} + \left| \partial_x f \right|_{L^\infty} |g|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Thanks to continuous embedding of Sobolev spaces, one has for $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\left| [\Lambda^s, f]g \right|_{L^2} \lesssim \left| \partial_x f \right|_{H^{s-1}} |g|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Let us now continue with the proof of Proposition 2.2. The system (1.1) is quasilinear. We prove below that it is Friedrichs-symmetrizable, under conditions (2.2),(2.3). We display below the symmetrizer of the system, and compute the necessary energy estimates in Lemmata A.6 and A.7.

Symmetrizer of the system. Recall that (1.1) reads $\partial_t U + A[U]\partial_x U = 0$, with

$$A[U] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & \frac{u_2 - u_1}{\varrho} & \frac{h_1}{\varrho} & \frac{h_2}{\varrho} \\ 0 & u_2 & 0 & h_2 \\ \frac{1}{\varrho} & 0 & u_1 & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma}{\varrho} & \delta + \gamma & 0 & u_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we denote $h_1 \equiv 1 + \varrho\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ and $h_2 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \zeta_2$. Define

$$S[U] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 0 & \varrho\gamma u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma + \delta & -\gamma u_1 & u_2 \\ \varrho\gamma u_1 & -\gamma u_1 & \gamma h_1 & 0 \\ 0 & u_2 & 0 & h_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

One can easily check that $S[U]A[U] \equiv \Sigma[U]$ and $S[U]$ are symmetric. More precisely, one has

$$\Sigma[U] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 2\gamma u_1 & \frac{\gamma(u_2 - u_1)}{\varrho} & \frac{\gamma h_1}{\varrho} + \gamma\varrho u_1^2 & \frac{\gamma h_2}{\varrho} \\ \frac{\gamma(u_2 - u_1)}{\varrho} & 2(\gamma + \delta)u_2 & -\gamma u_1^2 & (\gamma + \delta)h_2 + u_2^2 \\ \frac{\gamma h_1}{\varrho} + \gamma\varrho u_1^2 & -\gamma u_1^2 & 2\gamma h_1 u_1 & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma h_2}{\varrho} & (\gamma + \delta)h_2 + u_2^2 & 0 & 2h_2 u_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By looking at its upper-left determinants, and after tedious but straightforward calculations, one may check that $S[U]$ is positive definite provided that the following holds:

$$\gamma > 0, \quad \gamma + \delta > 0, \quad |u_1|^2 < h_1(\gamma + \delta), \quad |u_2|^2 < h_2(\gamma + \delta),$$

and

$$h_1 h_2 (\gamma + \delta)^2 + (1 - \gamma)|u_1|^2 |u_2|^2 - (h_1 |u_2|^2 + h_2 |u_1|^2)(\gamma + \delta) > 0.$$

One easily sees that conditions (2.2) and (2.3) are *sufficient* for the above to hold.

Energy of the system. The natural energy of our system is

$$\begin{aligned} E^s(U) &\equiv (S[\underline{U}]\Lambda^s U, \Lambda^s U) \\ &= \gamma|\zeta_1|_{H^s}^2 + (\gamma + \delta)|\zeta_2|_{H^s}^2 + \gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}} \underline{h}_1 |\Lambda^s u_1|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \underline{h}_2 |\Lambda^s u_2|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma \underline{u}_1 \{\Lambda^s u_1\} \{\Lambda^s(\varrho\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)\} + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \underline{u}_2 \{\Lambda^s u_2\} \{\Lambda^s \zeta_2\}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

with $\underline{h}_1 \equiv 1 + \varrho\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ and $\underline{h}_2 \equiv \delta^{-1} + \zeta_2$.

Recall that X^s denotes the space $(H^s)^4$, endowed with the following norm:

$$|U|_{X^s}^2 = \gamma|\zeta_1|_{H^s}^2 + |\zeta_2|_{H^s}^2 + \gamma|u_1|_{H^s}^2 + |u_2|_{H^s}^2.$$

Then we have the following result:

Lemma A.5. *Let $s \geq 0$ and $\zeta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, satisfying (2.2),(2.3). Then $E^s(U)$ is uniformly equivalent to the $|\cdot|_{X^s}$ -norm. More precisely, there exists positive constants $C_2 = C(h_0^{-1}, \delta_{\min}^{-1}) > 0$ and $C_1 = C(|\underline{h}_1|_{L^\infty}, |\underline{h}_2|_{L^\infty}, \delta_{\max}) > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_1} E^s(U) \leq |U|_{X^s}^2 \leq C_2 E^s(U).$$

Proof. The fact that $E^s(U) \leq C_1 |U|_{X^s}^2$ is a simple consequence of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, applied to (A.4), where we use that $\gamma < 1$, and (2.3) yields $|\underline{u}_1|^2 < (\gamma + \delta)\underline{h}_1$, $|\underline{u}_2|^2 < (\gamma + \delta)\underline{h}_2$.

Let us now show how to obtain the other inequality. We recall that

$$S[\underline{U}] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 0 & \varrho\gamma\underline{u}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma + \delta & -\gamma\underline{u}_1 & \underline{u}_2 \\ \varrho\gamma\underline{u}_1 & -\gamma\underline{u}_1 & \gamma\underline{h}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{u}_2 & 0 & \underline{h}_2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \gamma & 0 & & \\ 0 & \gamma + \delta & & \\ \hline & & M[\underline{U}]^\top & \\ M[\underline{U}] & & \gamma\underline{h}_1 & 0 \\ & & 0 & \underline{h}_2 \end{array} \right).$$

Standard Gaussian elimination yields $S[\underline{U}] = L[\underline{U}]D[\underline{U}]L[\underline{U}]^\top$, with

$$L[\underline{U}] = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & 0 & & \\ 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline & & 1 & 0 \\ L_{21}[\underline{U}] & & l[\underline{U}] & 1 \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad D[\underline{U}] = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \gamma & 0 & & \\ 0 & \gamma + \delta & & \\ \hline & & d_3[\underline{U}] & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & & 0 & d_4[\underline{U}] \end{array} \right),$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the 2-by-2 zero matrix, and $L_{21}[\underline{U}], l[\underline{U}], d_3[\underline{U}], d_4[\underline{U}]$ may have complicated expressions. However, since we know that $S[\underline{U}]$ is positive definite, one has $d_3[\underline{U}], d_4[\underline{U}] > 0$. It follows in particular that

$$\begin{aligned} E^s(U) &= (S[\underline{U}]\Lambda^s U, \Lambda^s U) = (D[\underline{U}]L[\underline{U}]^\top \Lambda^s U, L[\underline{U}]^\top \Lambda^s U) \\ &> (\gamma\Lambda^s \zeta_1, \Lambda^s \zeta_1) + ((\gamma + \delta)\Lambda^s \zeta_2, \Lambda^s \zeta_2) = \gamma|\zeta_1|_{H^s}^2 + (\gamma + \delta)|\zeta_2|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, one can make use of Gaussian elimination, starting from lower rows. It follows $S[\underline{U}] = \tilde{R}[\underline{U}]\tilde{D}[\underline{U}]\tilde{R}[\underline{U}]^\top$, with

$$\tilde{L}[\underline{U}] = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & r[\underline{U}] & & \\ 0 & 1 & R_{12}[\underline{U}] & \\ \hline & & 1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D}[\underline{U}] = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} d_1[\underline{U}] & 0 & & \\ 0 & d_2[\underline{U}] & & \\ \hline & & \gamma\underline{h}_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & & 0 & \underline{h}_2 \end{array} \right).$$

Again, since $S[\underline{U}]$ is positive definite, one has $d_1[\underline{U}], d_2[\underline{U}] > 0$, and one deduces

$$E^s(U) > (\gamma\underline{h}_1 \Lambda^s u_1, \Lambda^s u_1) + (\underline{h}_2 \Lambda^s u_2, \Lambda^s u_2) \geq h_0(\gamma|u_1|_{H^s}^2 + |u_2|_{H^s}^2).$$

It follows from above estimates that one can find $C_2 = C(h_0^{-1}, \delta_{\min}^{-1})$ such that

$$|U|_{X^s} \leq C_2 E^s(U).$$

The Lemma is now proved. \square

We now highlight energy estimates concerning the linearized system from (1.1), namely

$$\partial_t U + A[\underline{U}]\partial_x U = F, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with given \underline{U}, F .

Lemma A.6 (L^2 energy estimate). *Set $T, M > 0$. Let $U \in L^\infty([0, T]; X^0)$ satisfy (A.5) with given $F \in L^1([0, T]; X^0)$, and \underline{U} satisfying (2.2), (2.3) as well as*

$$\|\underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} + \|\partial_x \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} + \varrho \|\partial_t \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} \leq M.$$

Then there exists $C_0 \equiv C(M, \delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1})$ such that

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad E^0(U)(t) \leq e^{C_0 M \varrho^{-1} t} E^0(U|_{t=0}) + C_0 \int_0^t e^{C_0 M \varrho^{-1} (t-t')} |F(t', \cdot)|_{X^s} dt'. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof. Let us consider the L^2 -inner product of (A.5) and $S[\underline{U}]U$:

$$(\partial_t U, S[\underline{U}]U) + (A[\underline{U}]\partial_x U, S[\underline{U}]U) = (F, S[\underline{U}]U).$$

From the symmetry property of $S[\underline{U}], \Sigma[\underline{U}]$, and using the definition of $E^0(U)$, one deduces

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^0(U) &= \frac{1}{2} (U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]]U) - (\Sigma[\underline{U}]\partial_x U, U) + (F, S[\underline{U}]U) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]]U) + \frac{1}{2} ((\partial_x, \Sigma[\underline{U}])U, U) + (F, S[\underline{U}]U). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We now estimate each of the terms in the right-hand side of (A.7).

Estimate of $(U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]]U)$. One has $(U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]]U) = (U, S_t U)$, with

$$S_t \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \varrho \gamma \partial_t u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\gamma \partial_t u_1 & u_2 \\ \varrho \gamma \partial_t u_1 & -\gamma \partial_t u_1 & \gamma \partial_t (\varrho \zeta_1 - \zeta_2) & 0 \\ 0 & \partial_t u_2 & 0 & \partial_t \zeta_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and Lemma A.5, one has straightforwardly

$$|(U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]]U)| \leq C_0 |\partial_t \underline{U}|_{L^\infty} C_2^{-1} |U|_{X^0}^2 \leq C_0 M \varrho^{-1} E^0(U), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1})$.

Estimate of $((\partial_x, \Sigma[\underline{U}])U, U)$. One has $((\partial_x, \Sigma[\underline{U}])U, U) = (U, \Sigma_x U)$ with

$$\Sigma_x \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 2\gamma \partial_x u_1 & \frac{\gamma \partial_x (u_2 - u_1)}{\varrho} & \frac{\gamma \partial_x (\varrho \zeta_1 - \zeta_2 + \varrho^2 u_1^2)}{\varrho} & \frac{\gamma \partial_x \zeta_2}{\varrho} \\ \frac{\gamma \partial_x (u_2 - u_1)}{\varrho} & 2(\gamma + \delta) \partial_x u_2 & -\gamma \partial_x (u_1^2) & (\gamma + \delta) \partial_x \zeta_2 + \partial_x (u_2^2) \\ \frac{\gamma \partial_x (\varrho \zeta_1 - \zeta_2 + \varrho^2 u_1^2)}{\varrho} & -\gamma \partial_x (u_1^2) & 2\gamma \partial_x (h_1 u_1) & 0 \\ \frac{\gamma \partial_x \zeta_2}{\varrho} & (\gamma + \delta) \partial_x \zeta_2 + \partial_x (u_2^2) & 0 & 2\partial_x (h_2 u_2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

As above, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.5 yield

$$|(\Sigma[\underline{U}]\partial_x U, U)| \leq C_0 M \varrho^{-1} E^0(U), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1}, M)$.

Estimate of $(F, S[\underline{U}]U)$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.5,

$$|(F, S[\underline{U}]U)| \leq C_1 |U|_{X^s} |F|_{X^s} \leq C_0 E^s(U)^{1/2} |F|_{X^s}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1}, M)$.

Estimate (A.6) is now a consequence of Gronwall-Bihari's inequality applied to the differential inequality obtained when plugging (A.8), (A.9), (A.10) into (A.7). \square

Lemma A.7 (*H^s energy estimate*). *Set $M, T > 0$ and $s \geq s_0 + 1$, $s_0 > 1/2$. Let $U \in L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)$ satisfy (A.5) with $F \in L^1([0, T]; X^s)$, and $\underline{U} \in L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)$ satisfying (2.2)(2.3) as well as*

$$\|\underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)} + \varrho \|\partial_t \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^{s-1})} \leq M.$$

Then there exists $C_0 \equiv C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1}, M)$ such that

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad E^s(U)(t) \leq e^{C_0 M \varrho^{-1} t} E^s(U|_{t=0}) + C_0 \int_0^t e^{C_0 M \varrho^{-1} (t-t')} |F(t', \cdot)|_{X^s} dt'. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Proof. As previously, we deduce from (A.5) the identity

$$(\Lambda^s \partial_t U, S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s U) + (\Lambda^s A[\underline{U}] \partial_x U, S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s U) = (\Lambda^s F, S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s U),$$

where we recall the notation $\Lambda \equiv (1 - \partial_x^2)^{1/2}$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^s(U) &= \frac{1}{2} (\Lambda^s U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]] \Lambda^s U) - (S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s A[\underline{U}] \partial_x U, \Lambda^s U) + (\Lambda^s F, S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s U) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\Lambda^s U, [\partial_t, S[\underline{U}]] \Lambda^s U) + \frac{1}{2} ([\partial_x, \Sigma[\underline{U}]] \Lambda^s U, \Lambda^s U) + (\Lambda^s F, S[\underline{U}] \Lambda^s U) \\ &\quad - (S[\underline{U}] [\Lambda^s, A[\underline{U}]] \partial_x U, \Lambda^s U). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The first three terms are bounded exactly as above, when replacing U with $\Lambda^s U$. The only novelty lies in the use of continuous Sobolev embeddings, so that

$$\|\underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} + \|\partial_x \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} \lesssim \|\underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^s)}.$$

Similarly, one has

$$\varrho \|\partial_t \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})^4} \lesssim \varrho \|\partial_t \underline{U}\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; X^{s-1})}.$$

The remaining term is estimated as follows. Using the commutator estimate in Lemma A.4, one has

$$|[\Lambda^s, A[\underline{U}]] \partial_x U|_{L^2} \leq C |\partial_x U|_{H^{s-1}} |[\partial_x, A[\underline{U}]]|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C_0 M \varrho^{-1} |U|_{X^s},$$

with $C_0 = C(\delta_{\min}^{-1}, \delta_{\max}, h_0^{-1}, M)$. Altogether, one deduces from (A.12)

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} E^s(U) \leq C_0 M \varrho^{-1} E^s(U) + C_0 E^s(U)^{1/2} |F|_{X^s}.$$

Estimate (A.11) is now a consequence of Gronwall-Bihari's inequality, and the Lemma is proved. \square

Proposition 2.2 is now a consequence of the energy estimates of Lemmata A.6 and A.7. More precisely, the solution of the nonlinear problem (1.1), U , is obtained as the limit of the following iterative scheme:

$$\partial_t U^{n+1} + A[U^n] \partial_x U^n = 0.$$

The restriction on the timescale $T_{\max} \geq T\varrho$ is necessary to guarantee that $(U^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence, and in particular that U^n is uniformly bounded with respect to n , over the relevant time domain. The desired estimate on $|U|_{X^s}$ follows directly from Lemma A.7 with $\underline{U} = U$ and $F \equiv 0$, and the corresponding estimate on $|\partial_t U|_{X^s}$ is then deduced using (1.1). The uniqueness comes from a similar estimate on the difference of two solutions, and the blow-up criterion as $t \rightarrow T_{\max}$ if $T_{\max} < \infty$ follows from standard continuation arguments. This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.2.

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Christophe Chevy and Frédéric Rousset for helpful advice and stimulating discussions. This work received the support of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (project ANR BLANC SIMI 1 2013 DYFICOLTI).

References

- [1] S. Alinhac and P. Gérard. *Opérateurs pseudo-différentiels et théorème de Nash-Moser*. Savoirs Actuels. InterEditions et Editions du CNRS, Paris, 1991.
- [2] R. Barros, S. L. Gavriluk, and V. M. Teshukov. Dispersive nonlinear waves in two-layer flows with free surface. I. Model derivation and general properties. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 119(3):191–211, 2007.
- [3] T. B. Benjamin. Internal waves of finite amplitude and permanent form. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 25(2):241–270, 1966.
- [4] J. L. Bona, T. Colin, and D. Lannes. Long wave approximations for water waves. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 178(3):373–410, 2005.
- [5] J. L. Bona, D. Lannes, and J.-C. Saut. Asymptotic models for internal waves. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 89(6):538–566, 2008.
- [6] W. Choi and R. Camassa. Weakly nonlinear internal waves in a two-fluid system. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 313:83–103, 1996.
- [7] W. Craig, P. Guyenne, and H. Kalisch. Hamiltonian long-wave expansions for free surfaces and interfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 58(12):1587–1641, 2005.
- [8] W. Craig, P. Guyenne, and C. Sulem. Coupling between internal and surface waves. *Natural Hazards*, 57(3):617–642, 2010.
- [9] B. de Saint-Venant. Théorie du mouvement non-permanent des eaux, avec application aux crues des rivières et à l’introduction des marées dans leur lit. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 73:147–154, 1871.
- [10] V. Duchêne. Asymptotic shallow water models for internal waves in a two-fluid system with a free surface. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(5):2229–2260, 2010.
- [11] V. Duchêne. Boussinesq/Boussinesq systems for internal waves with a free surface, and the KdV approximation. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 46:145–185, 2011.
- [12] V. Duchêne. Decoupled and unidirectional asymptotic models for the propagation of internal waves. *M3AS:Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 24(01), 2014.
- [13] A. E. Gill. *Atmosphere-ocean dynamics*, volume 30 of *International geophysics series*. Academic Press, 1982.
- [14] R. Grimshaw, E. Pelinovsky, and O. Poloukhina. Higher-order korteweg-de vries models for internal solitary waves in a stratified shear flow with a free surface. *Nonlinear Processes Geophys.*, 9:221–235, 2002.
- [15] P. Guyenne, D. Lannes, and J.-C. Saut. Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for models of large amplitude internal waves. *Nonlinearity*, 23(2):237–275, 2010.
- [16] K. R. Helfrich and W. K. Melville. Long nonlinear internal waves. In volume 38 of *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, pages 395–425. Annual Reviews, 2006.
- [17] C. R. Jackson. An atlas of internal solitary-like waves and their properties. Accessible at url http://www.internalwaveatlas.com/Atlas2_index.html.
- [18] T. Kato. The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 58(3):181–205, 1975.
- [19] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.

-
- [20] T. Kato and G. Ponce. Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 41(7):891–907, 1988.
- [21] D. Lannes. Secular growth estimates for hyperbolic systems. *J. Differential Equations*, 190(2):466–503, 2003.
- [22] D. Lannes. Sharp estimates for pseudo-differential operators with symbols of limited smoothness and commutators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 232(2):495–539, 2006.
- [23] D. Lannes. *The water waves problem*, volume 188 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, 2013.
- [24] D. Leonardi. *Internal and Surface Waves in a Two-Layer Fluid*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois, 2011.
- [25] R. R. Long. On the Boussinesq approximation and its role in the theory of internal waves. *Tellus*, 17(1):46–52, 1965.
- [26] G. Schneider and C. E. Wayne. The long-wave limit for the water wave problem. I. The case of zero surface tension. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(12):1475–1535, 2000.
- [27] L. F. Shampine and M. W. Reichelt. The MATLAB ODE suite. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 18(1):1–22, 1997.
- [28] M. E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations. III Nonlinear equations*, volume 117 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [29] L. N. Trefethen. *Spectral methods in MATLAB*, volume 10 of *Software, Environments, and Tools*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), 2000.