



HAL
open science

The global existence issue for the compressible Euler system with Poisson or Helmholtz couplings

Šárka Nečasová, Xavier Blanc, Raphaël Danchin, Bernard Ducomet

► **To cite this version:**

Šárka Nečasová, Xavier Blanc, Raphaël Danchin, Bernard Ducomet. The global existence issue for the compressible Euler system with Poisson or Helmholtz couplings. *Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, 2021, 18 (1), pp.169-193. 10.1142/S0219891621500041 . hal-02160016

HAL Id: hal-02160016

<https://hal.science/hal-02160016v1>

Submitted on 19 Jun 2019

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

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

THE GLOBAL EXISTENCE ISSUE FOR THE COMPRESSIBLE EULER SYSTEM WITH POISSON OR HELMHOLTZ COUPLINGS

X. BLANC, R. DANCHIN, B. DUCOMET AND Š. NEČASOVÁ

ABSTRACT. We consider the Cauchy problem for the barotropic Euler system coupled to Helmholtz or Poisson equations, in the whole space. We assume that the initial density is small enough, and that the initial velocity is close to some reference vector field u_0 such that the spectrum of Du_0 is bounded away from zero. We prove the existence of a global unique solution with (fractional) Sobolev regularity, and algebraic time decay estimates. Our work extends the papers by D. Serre and M. Grassin [20, 21, 43] dedicated to the compressible Euler system without coupling and integer regularity exponents.

Keywords: compressible Euler system, Helmholtz, Poisson, global solution, decay.
AMS subject classification: 35Q30, 76N10

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known from physics textbooks that Euler-Poisson system is relevant either *in the attractive case* for describing plasma dynamics when the compressible electron fluid interacts with a constant charged ionic background [14], or *in the repulsive case* as a model of evolution of self-gravitating gaseous stars [9].

The Euler-Helmholtz system has been introduced more recently to investigate some vortex flows of compressible media [10].

In the plasma context, the inertia of ions being much larger than that of electrons, a standard approximation consists in assuming that the dynamics reduces to the motion of electrons in a constant ionic background. A simple description is given by the following barotropic Euler system:

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t n + \operatorname{div}_x(nu) = 0,$$

$$(1.2) \quad \partial_t(nu) + \operatorname{div}_x(nu \otimes u) + \frac{1}{m_e} \nabla_x P(n) = \frac{ne}{m_e} \nabla_x \phi,$$

with initial data

$$(1.3) \quad (n, u)(x, 0) = (n_0, u_0)(x),$$

where the electric potential ϕ satisfies the Helmholtz equation

$$(1.4) \quad \Delta \phi - \mu^2 \phi = 4\pi e(n - \bar{n}) \quad \text{with} \quad |\phi| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here, $n(t, x)$ is the density of electrons of charge e and mass m_e (t denotes the time variable and $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the Eulerian spatial variable), μ is a non negative parameter, \bar{n} is the density of the ionic background, $u(t, x)$ is the velocity of the electronic flow and $P(n) = An^\gamma$ ($\gamma \geq 1$) is the electronic pressure.

In the astrophysical context, as explained in e.g. [9] [13], a simple evolutionary model for the density $\rho = \rho(t, x)$, the velocity field $u = u(t, x)$ and the gravitational potential $\phi = \phi(t, x)$ is the following self-gravitating Euler-Helmholtz system:

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) = 0,$$

$$(1.6) \quad \partial_t(\rho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x \Pi(\rho) = -\varrho \nabla_x \phi,$$

$$(1.7) \quad \Delta \phi - \mu^2 \phi = 4\pi \Gamma \rho,$$

with initial data

$$(1.8) \quad (\rho, u)(x, 0) = (\rho_0, u_0)(x),$$

where $\Pi(\rho) = A\rho^\gamma$ is the barotropic pressure with $A > 0$ and the adiabatic exponent $\gamma > 1$, and Γ is the Newton gravitational constant.

In the attractive case (that is, (1.5), (1.6), (1.7)), as the gravitational ingredient in the system (Newton equation) must produce a convergent potential, at least in the massless case ($\mu = 0$), the density has to be decreasing at large distance and a reasonable model for a gaseous star is thus a compactly supported density materializing the domain of the star matter. This introduces the classical difficulty of vacuum (as first observed by Kato [25]) when symmetrizing the system. Despite this, the corresponding Cauchy problem for Euler-Poisson with vacuum for strong solutions was solved locally in time in the eighties by various authors, among them: Makino [33, 34], Makino-Ukai [37], Makino-Pertame [36], Gamblin [17], Bézard [5], Braun and Karp [7] (see also [35] for a clear survey).

Owing to the fact that no dissipative process takes place in the system, existence results are expected to be only local in time even for small data [12] (see blow-up results of Chemin [11] (3D case) or Makino and Perthame [36] (1D spherically symmetric case)). However, in a series of papers [43] [20] [21], D. Serre and M. Grassin pointed out that under a suitable “dispersive” spectral condition on the initial velocity that will be specified in the next section, and a smallness hypothesis on the initial density, the compressible Euler system admits a unique global smooth solution. They first considered the isentropic case for a compactly supported density, then relaxed the support condition and finally extended the result to the non-isentropic case. In [28], Lécourieux-Mercier obtained similar results for the Van der Waals equation of state.

The main purpose of the present work is to show that the Serre-Grassin global existence result extends to the compressible Euler system coupled with the Poisson or Helmholtz equations, *regardless of the sign of the coupling*.

Compared to the pure Euler system, once the global existence problem has been solved, a new situation arises regarding the study of the static solutions of the Euler-Poisson (resp. Euler-Helmholtz) system and their stability. In the gravitational Poisson case, this is a classical question in astrophysics (see [11] [42]) which is difficult to address in the general case for technical reasons (see [30] for a survey in the 1D case).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we state our main results and give some insights on our strategy. In Section 3, we establish decay estimates in Sobolev spaces first for the multi-dimensional Burgers equation (that is expected to provide an approximate solution for our system), and next for the compressible Euler equation coupled with the Poisson or the Helmholtz equation. The next section is devoted to the proofs of the main global existence results, then we show the uniqueness of the solution. Some technical results like, in particular, first and second order commutator estimates are proved in the appendix.

Throughout the paper, C denotes a harmless ‘constant’ that may change from line to line, and we use sometimes the notation $A \lesssim B$ to mean that $A \leq CB$. The notation $A \approx B$ is used if both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

In order to reformulate Systems (1.1)-(1.4) and (1.5)-(1.8) in a unified way, let us consider the following general system for the density $\varrho = \varrho(t, x)$, velocity field $u = u(t, x)$ and potential $\phi = \phi(t, x)$:

$$(2.9) \quad \partial_t \varrho + \operatorname{div}_x(\varrho u) = 0,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \partial_t(\varrho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\varrho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x p(\varrho) = \kappa \varrho \nabla_x \phi,$$

$$(2.11) \quad \Delta \phi - \mu^2 \phi = 4\pi G \varrho,$$

supplemented with initial data

$$(2.12) \quad (\varrho, u)(0, x) = (\varrho_0, u_0)(x).$$

That system encompasses the previous ones: take $\bar{n} = 0$, $\varrho(t, x) = n(t, x)$, $p(\varrho) = \frac{1}{m_e} P(n)$, $G = e$ and $\kappa = e/m_e$ (resp. $\varrho(t, x) = \rho(t, x)$, $p(\varrho) = \Pi(\rho)$, $G = \Gamma$ and $\kappa = -1$). By analogy with the original systems, the case $\kappa < 0$ will be named attractive, the case $\kappa > 0$, repulsive and the case $\kappa = 0$, pure Euler system. For $\kappa \neq 0$, the Poisson and Helmholtz couplings correspond to $\mu = 0$ and $\mu > 0$, respectively.

Since our functional framework will force the density to tend to 0 at infinity, the standard symmetrization for the compressible Euler equations is not appropriate. For that reason, we shall rather use the one that has been introduced by T. Makino in [33], namely, we set

$$(2.13) \quad \rho := \frac{2\sqrt{A\gamma}}{\gamma-1} \varrho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}.$$

After that change of unknown, System (2.9)-(2.12) rewrites

$$(MP) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla) \rho + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho \operatorname{div} u = 0, \\ (\partial_t + u \cdot \nabla) u + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho \nabla \rho = \kappa \nabla \phi, \\ \Delta \phi - \mu^2 \phi = \tilde{G} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{G} := 4\pi G \left(\frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{4A\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Consider the auxiliary Cauchy problem for the d -dimensional Burgers equation:

$$(2.14) \quad \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla_x v = 0,$$

with initial data

$$(2.15) \quad v(0, x) = v_0(x).$$

In the particular case of the Euler equation (that is $\kappa = 0$) and under suitable spectral conditions on Du_0 , it is known [19],[20] that (2.14) is a good approximation of (2.9)-(2.11) provided the density of the fluid is small enough. The formal heuristics is that if one divides by ϱ , then equation (2.10) becomes

$$(2.16) \quad \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla_x u + \frac{A\gamma}{\gamma-1} \nabla_x(\varrho^{\gamma-1}) = \kappa \nabla_x \phi,$$

and neglecting ϕ and $\nabla_x(\varrho^{\gamma-1})$ in (2.16), we get (2.14).

In order to state our results, we need to introduce the following function space:

$$E^s := \{z \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d), Dz \in L^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad D^2 z \in H^{s-2}\}.$$

The following result has been first proved in [19], [20] in the case of integer regularity exponents. Here, we extend it to *real* exponents.

Proposition 2.1. *Let v_0 be in $E^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $s > 1 + d/2$ and satisfy:*

(H0) *there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\text{dist}(\text{Sp}(Dv_0(x)), \mathbb{R}_-) \geq \varepsilon$,*

where $\text{Sp} A$ denotes the spectrum of the matrix A .

Then (2.14)-(2.15) has a classical solution v on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$D^2v \in \mathcal{C}^j(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s-2-j}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1.$$

Moreover, $Dv \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and we have for any $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(2.17) \quad Dv(t, x) = (1+t)^{-1}I + (1+t)^{-2}K(t, x)$$

for some function $K \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ that satisfies also

$$(2.18) \quad \|K(t)\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq K_\sigma(1+t)^{d/2-\sigma} \quad \text{for all } 0 < \sigma \leq s-1.$$

Finally, if D^2v_0 is bounded, then we have

$$(2.19) \quad \|D^2v(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(1+t)^{-3}.$$

The main goal of the paper is to prove the following global existence and uniqueness result for System (2.9)-(2.12).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $s > 1 + d/2$ and $\gamma > 1$. Assume that the initial data (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy:*

- (H1) *there exists v_0 in E^{s+1} satisfying (H0) and such that $u_0 - v_0$ is small in H^s ;*
- (H2) *$\varrho_0^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}$ is small enough in H^s .*

Denote by v the global solution of (2.14)-(2.15) given by Proposition 2.1.

Then, there exists a unique global solution (ϱ, u, ϕ) to (2.9)-(2.12), such that

$$(\varrho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}, u - v) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)),$$

provided d, γ and s satisfy the following additional conditions:

- *Pure Euler case $\kappa = \mu = 0$: no additional condition on d, γ and s .*
- *Poisson case $\kappa \neq 0$ and $\mu = 0$: $d \geq 3$, $\gamma < \min(\frac{5}{3}, 1 + \frac{4}{d-1})$ and $s < \frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma-1}$ (no upper bound for s if $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{k}$ for some integer k).*
- *Helmholtz case $\kappa \neq 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$: either (d, s, γ) are as for the Poisson case, or $d \geq 2$, $s < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma-1}$ and $\gamma < 1 + \frac{4}{d+1}$ (no upper bound for s if $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{k}$ for some integer k).*

Remark 2.1. *The fact that $\varrho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s(\mathbb{R}^d))$ implies that $\varrho \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ whenever $\gamma \leq 2$ (a condition which is always satisfied in the Poisson and Helmholtz cases with $d = 3$). Hence, the constructed solutions have finite mass, and one can show that it is conserved through the evolution.*

Remark 2.2. *Even for the pure Euler case, our results extend those of Grassin and Serre [21, 20, 43] since we are able to treat any dimension $d \geq 1$ and real Sobolev exponent $s > 1 + d/2$.*

The following decay estimates are satisfied by the global solutions constructed in the previous theorem (to be compared with those for the Burgers equation).

Theorem 2.2. *Let all the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 be in force. Then, for all σ in $[0, s]$, the solution (ϱ, u, ϕ) constructed therein satisfies*

$$\left\| \varrho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}, u - v \right\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C_\sigma (1+t)^{\frac{d}{2} - \sigma - \min(1, d(\frac{\gamma-1}{2}))},$$

where C_σ depends only on the initial data, on d, γ, μ , and on σ .

Regarding the Poisson coupling in the repulsive case (that is $\mu = 0$ and $\kappa > 0$), our results have to be compared with the remarkable work of Y. Guo in [19]. There, having $\kappa > 0$ and $\nabla \times u_0 = 0$ is fundamental, and the result holds for small perturbations of the state $(\rho, u) = (\bar{\rho}, 0)$ with $\bar{\rho}$ a *positive* constant. He also proved that $\|\rho(t) - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ decay as $(1+t)^{-p}$ for any $p < 3/2$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$, which does not correspond to the decay we here establish here.

Guo's approach is somehow orthogonal to ours since it strongly relies on the stability properties of the linearized Euler-Poisson system about $(\bar{\rho}, 0)$.

3. DECAY ESTIMATES IN SOBOLEV SPACES

The goal of the present section is to prove a priori decay estimates in Sobolev spaces first for the multi-dimensional Burgers equation (2.14) and, next, for the discrepancy between the solution to (MP) and to (2.14). Those estimates will play a fundamental role in the proof of our global existence result.

3.1. Decay estimates for the Burgers equation. The purpose of this part is to prove Proposition 2.1 for any real regularity exponent $s > 1 + d/2$.

Let X be the flow of v . The proof relies on the fact that the matrix valued function $A : (t, y) \mapsto Dv(t, X(t, y))$ satisfies the Riccati equation

$$A' + A^2 = 0, \quad A|_{t=0} = Dv_0.$$

From Hypothesis **(H0)**, one can deduce that $v(t, y)$ is defined for all $t \geq 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and that

$$Dv(t, X(t, y)) = (\text{Id} + tDv_0(y))^{-1} Dv_0(y) \quad \text{with} \quad X(t, y) = y + tv_0(y).$$

Therefore, denoting $X_t : y \mapsto X(t, y)$, we have

$$(3.20) \quad Dv(t, x) = \frac{\text{Id}}{1+t} + \frac{K(t, x)}{(1+t)^2}$$

with $K(t, x) := (1+t)(\text{Id} + tDv_0(X_t^{-1}(x)))^{-1}(Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(x)) - \text{Id}).$

In particular, we have

$$(3.21) \quad \text{div} v(t, y + tv_0(y)) = \frac{d}{1+t} + \frac{\text{Tr} K(t, y + tv_0(y))}{(1+t)^2}.$$

Furthermore, Hypothesis **(H0)** implies that

$$(3.22) \quad \|(\text{Id} + tDv_0)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1 + \varepsilon t)^{-1},$$

and K is thus bounded on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

For the proof of (2.19) we refer to [21]. We proceed with the proof of (2.18) in the case $\sigma \in]0, 1[$ (for the integer case, see [21]). To bound $\tilde{K}_t := (1+t)^{-1}K(t, \cdot)$ in \dot{H}^σ , we use the following characterization of Sobolev norms by finite differences:

$$\|\tilde{K}_t\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\tilde{K}_t(y) - \tilde{K}_t(x)|^2}{|y-x|^{d+2\sigma}} dx dy$$

and the fact that $\tilde{K}_t(y) - \tilde{K}_t(x) = I_t^1(x, y) + I_t^2(x, y)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^1(x, y) &= (\text{Id} + tDv_0(X_t^{-1}(y)))^{-1} (Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(y)) - Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(x))), \\ I_t^2(x, y) &= t(\text{Id} + tDv_0(X_t^{-1}(y)))^{-1} (Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(x)) - Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(y))) \\ &\quad \times (\text{Id} + tDv_0(X_t^{-1}(x)))^{-1} (Dv_0(X_t^{-1}(x)) - \text{Id}). \end{aligned}$$

We see, thanks to (3.22) and to the change of variable $x' = X_t^{-1}(x)$ and $y' = X_t^{-1}(y)$, that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|I_t^1(x, y)|^2}{|y - x|^{d+2\sigma}} dx dy \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \varepsilon t)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|Dv_0(y') - Dv_0(x')|^2}{|X_t(y') - X_t(x')|^{d+2\sigma}} J_{X_t}(x') J_{X_t}(y') dx' dy'.$$

Therefore, using the fact that $\|J_{X_t}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(1 + \varepsilon t)^d$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} |y' - x'| &= |X_t^{-1}(X_t(y')) - X_t^{-1}(X_t(x'))| \leq \|DX_t^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} |X_t(y') - X_t(x')| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{1 + \varepsilon t} |X_t(y') - X_t(x')|, \end{aligned}$$

we get that

$$(3.23) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|I_t^1(x, y)|^2}{|y - x|^{d+2\sigma}} dx dy \leq C(1 + \varepsilon t)^{d-2-2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|Dv_0(y') - Dv_0(x')|^2}{|y' - x'|^{d+2\sigma}} dx' dy'.$$

Similarly, (3.22) and the change of variable $x' = X_t^{-1}(x)$ and $y' = X_t^{-1}(y)$ imply that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|I_t^2(x, y)|^2}{|y - x|^{d+2\sigma}} dx dy \leq \frac{Ct^2}{(1 + \varepsilon t)^4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|Dv_0(y') - Dv_0(x')|^2}{|X_t(y') - X_t(x')|^{d+2\sigma}} J_{X_t}(x') J_{X_t}(y') dx' dy',$$

and we thus also have (3.23) for I_t^2 . As a conclusion, using the characterization of $\|Dv_0\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}$ by finite difference, we get

$$\|\tilde{K}_t\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C(1 + \varepsilon t)^{\frac{d}{2}-1-\sigma} \|Dv_0\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma},$$

which gives the desired estimate for $\sigma \in]0, 1[$.

Proving the result for higher order regularity exponents may be done by taking advantage of the explicit formula for partial derivatives of \tilde{K}_t that has been derived by M. Grassin in [21, p. 1404]. The same method as in the case $\sigma \in]0, 1[$ has to be applied to each term of the formula. The details are left to the reader. \square

3.2. Sobolev estimates for System (MP). Let v be the solution of the Burgers equation given by Proposition 2.1. Let us set $w := u - v$ where (ρ, u, ϕ) stands for a sufficiently smooth solution of (MP) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then (ρ, w, ϕ) satisfies:

$$(BB) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla) \rho + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho \operatorname{div} w + v \cdot \nabla \rho + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ (\partial_t + w \cdot \nabla) w + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho \nabla \rho + v \cdot \nabla w + w \cdot \nabla v = \kappa \nabla \phi, \\ \Delta \phi - \mu^2 \phi = \tilde{G} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Our aim is to prove decay estimates in \dot{H}^σ for (BB), for all $0 \leq \sigma \leq s$. Clearly, arguing by interpolation, it suffices to consider the border cases $\sigma = 0$ and $\sigma = s$.

Now, taking advantage of (3.20), we get

$$-\partial_j v^k \dot{\Lambda}^{-2} \partial_{jk}^2 z = \frac{1}{1+t} z - \frac{K_{kj}}{(1+t)^2} \dot{\Lambda}^{-2} \partial_{jk}^2 z,$$

and using (3.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Lambda}^s(\rho \operatorname{div} v) &= \frac{d}{1+t} \rho_s + \frac{1}{(1+t)^2} \dot{\Lambda}^s(\rho \operatorname{Tr} K) \\ \text{and } \dot{\Lambda}^s(w \cdot \nabla v) &= \frac{1}{1+t} w_s + \frac{1}{(1+t)^2} \dot{\Lambda}^s(K \cdot w). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking the L^2 inner product of (BB_s) with (ρ_s, w_s) , and denoting

$$(3.27) \quad c_{d,\gamma,s} := c_{d,\gamma} + s,$$

we discover that

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(\rho_s, w_s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c_{d,\gamma,s}}{1+t} \|(\rho_s, w_s)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq |\kappa| \|\nabla \phi_s\|_{L^2} \|w_s\|_{L^2} \\ &+ \frac{\|\operatorname{div} w\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \|(\rho_s, w_s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_s\|_{L^2} \|w_s\|_{L^2} + \frac{sM}{(1+t)^2} \|(\rho_s, w_s)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{(1+t)^2} \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2} \|\dot{\Lambda}^s(\rho \operatorname{Tr} K)\|_{L^2} + \|\dot{\Lambda}^s(K \cdot w)\|_{L^2} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^6 \|\dot{R}_s^j\|_{L^2} \right) \|(\rho_s, w_s)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The terms \dot{R}_s^1 , \dot{R}_s^2 , \dot{R}_s^4 and \dot{R}_s^5 may be treated according to the homogeneous version of Kato and Ponce commutator estimates (see Lemma 4.3 in the Appendix). We get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{R}_s^1\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla w\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s}, \\ \|\dot{R}_s^4\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|w\|_{\dot{H}^s}, \\ \|\dot{R}_s^2\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\operatorname{div} w\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\operatorname{div} w\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}, \\ \|\dot{R}_s^5\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

The (more involved) terms \dot{R}_s^3 and \dot{R}_s^6 may be handled thanks to Lemma 4.4. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{R}_s^3\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \rho\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2}}, \\ \|\dot{R}_s^6\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla w\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the standard Sobolev tame estimate yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\dot{\Lambda}^s(\rho \operatorname{Tr} K)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla(\operatorname{Tr} K)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|\operatorname{Tr} K\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\ \text{and } \|\dot{\Lambda}^s(K \cdot w)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|w\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla K\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|K\|_{L^\infty} \|w\|_{\dot{H}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging all the above estimates in (3.28) and using Proposition 2.1, we end up with

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + \frac{c_{d,\gamma,s}}{1+t} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 \leq |\kappa| \|\nabla \phi\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|w\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\ &+ \frac{CM}{(1+t)^2} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + C \|D^2 v\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \|(\rho, w)\|_{L^\infty} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\ &+ \|(\nabla \rho, \nabla w)\|_{L^\infty} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce the notation

$$\dot{X}_\sigma := \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad X_\sigma := \sqrt{\dot{X}_0^2 + \dot{X}_\sigma^2} \approx \|(\rho, w)\|_{H^\sigma} \quad \text{for } \sigma \geq 0.$$

Our aim is to bound the right-hand side of (3.26) and (3.29) in terms of \dot{X}_0 and \dot{X}_s only.

The standard compressible Euler equations ($\kappa = \mu = 0$). Arguing by interpolation, we get

$$(3.30) \quad \|(\rho, w)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \dot{X}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{X}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}},$$

$$(3.31) \quad \|(D\rho, Dw)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \dot{X}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{X}_s^{\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)},$$

$$(3.32) \quad \|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \dot{X}_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \dot{X}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}.$$

Then, plugging these inequalities and those of Proposition 2.1 in (3.26) and (3.29) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \dot{X}_0 + \frac{c_{d,\gamma}}{1+t} \dot{X}_0 \lesssim \frac{\dot{X}_0}{(1+t)^2} + \dot{X}_0^{2-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{X}_s^{\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)},$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \dot{X}_s + \frac{c_{d,\gamma,s}}{1+t} \dot{X}_s \lesssim \frac{\dot{X}_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{X}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{X}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}}}{(1+t)^{s+2-\frac{d}{2}}} + \dot{X}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{X}_s^{1+\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} + \frac{\dot{X}_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \dot{X}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^3}.$$

Since we expect to have $\dot{X}_\sigma \lesssim (1+t)^{-c_{d,\gamma,\sigma}}$ for all $\sigma \in [0, s]$, it is natural to introduce the function $\dot{Y}_\sigma := (1+t)^{c_{d,\gamma,\sigma}} \dot{X}_\sigma$. However, for technical reasons, we proceed as in [21] and work with

$$(3.33) \quad \dot{Y}_\sigma := (1+t)^{c_{d,\gamma,\sigma}-a} \dot{X}_\sigma \quad \text{for some } a > 1.$$

Then, observing that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \dot{Y}_\sigma + \frac{a}{1+t} \dot{Y}_\sigma = (1+t)^{c_{d,\gamma,\sigma}-a} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \dot{X}_\sigma + \frac{c_{d,\gamma,\sigma}}{1+t} \dot{X}_\sigma \right),$$

the above inequalities for \dot{X}_0 and \dot{X}_s lead us to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \dot{Y}_0 + \frac{a}{1+t} \dot{Y}_0 \lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_0}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{2-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}},$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \dot{Y}_s + \frac{a}{1+t} \dot{Y}_s \lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}}}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{Y}_s^{1+\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \dot{Y}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^2},$$

whence, introducing the notation $Y_\sigma := \sqrt{\dot{Y}_0^2 + \dot{Y}_\sigma^2}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y_s + \frac{a}{1+t} Y_s \lesssim \frac{Y_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{Y_s^2}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}}.$$

At this stage, one can take $a = 1 + \frac{d}{2} + c_{d,\gamma}$ so that $a > 1$ is satisfied as soon as $\gamma > 1$. Then, we eventually get the differential inequality

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y_s + \frac{a}{1+t} Y_s \lesssim \frac{Y_s}{(1+t)^2} + Y_s^2,$$

from which one can get a global control of Y_s without any restriction on $\gamma > 1$ and $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, see Proposition 4 in [21], or Lemma 4.1 below¹.

¹Having $\gamma = 1$ would force us to take $a = 1$ in Lemma 4.1, in which case the expected inequality unfortunately fails.

Poisson coupling ($\kappa \neq 0$ and $\mu = 0$). Compared to the previous paragraph, one has to bound the additional term $\nabla\phi$ in H^s or, equivalently, $\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}})$ in L^2 and in \dot{H}^s .

To bound the L^2 norm, we will have to assume that $d \geq 3$. Then, by virtue of the Sobolev embedding $L^p \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^{-1}$ with $\frac{d}{p} = 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, we get

$$\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}})\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^q}^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{with} \quad q = \frac{2p}{\gamma-1} = \frac{4d}{(\gamma-1)(d+2)}.$$

Bounding the L^q norm from the Sobolev norm H^s requires $q \geq 2$, whence the constraint

$$(3.34) \quad 1 < \gamma \leq \frac{3d+2}{d+2}.$$

Then, remembering the definition of q , one may argue by interpolation as follows:

$$\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}})\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\|\rho\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s}^\theta \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{with} \quad \theta = \frac{1}{s} \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{(\gamma-1)(d+2)}{4} \right).$$

Using the definition of θ , this eventually leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt}\dot{Y}_0 + \frac{a}{1+t}\dot{Y}_0 \lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_0}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{2-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}\dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{(\dot{Y}_0^{1-\theta}\dot{Y}_s^\theta)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{(1+t)^{(c_{d,\gamma}+\frac{d}{2}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)-1}}.$$

Bounding the \dot{H}^s norm of the potential term relies on Lemma 4.2 in the Appendix, from which we get if $\frac{2}{\gamma-1} \geq 1$, taking $z = \rho$, $\alpha = \frac{2}{\gamma-1}$ and $\sigma = s-1$,

$$(3.35) \quad \|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq \|\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \quad \text{if} \quad 0 \leq s-1 < \frac{2}{\gamma-1} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since we need $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, Inequality (3.35) yields the following additional restrictions on γ :

$$(3.36) \quad 1 < \gamma \leq 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma < 1 + \frac{4}{d-1}.$$

From that point, arguing as in the previous paragraph, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\dot{Y}_s + \frac{a}{1+t}\dot{Y}_s &\lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}}\dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}}}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}\dot{Y}_s^{1+\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}}\dot{Y}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{(\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}}\dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}})^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1}\dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}}\dot{Y}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^{(c_{d,\gamma}+\frac{d}{2}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, still denoting $Y_s := \sqrt{\dot{Y}_0^2 + \dot{Y}_s^2}$, we get

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{d}{dt}Y_s + \frac{a}{1+t}Y_s \lesssim \frac{Y_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{Y_s^2}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{Y_s^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{(1+t)^{(c_{d,\gamma}+\frac{d}{2}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)-1}}.$$

At this stage, one may apply Lemma 4.1 with

$$m = \frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad m' = 2 + \left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \right) \left(a - c_{d,\gamma} - \frac{d}{2} \right)$$

and eventually get, provided $\|(\rho_0, w_0)\|_{H^s}$ is small enough:

$$(3.38) \quad \sqrt{(1+t)^{2s}\|(\rho, w)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + \|(\rho, w)\|_{L^2}^2} \leq 2 \frac{e^{\frac{Ct}{1+t}}}{(1+t)^{c_{d,\gamma}}} \|(\rho_0, w_0)\|_{H^s}.$$

Let us emphasize that in order to apply Lemma 4.1, we need $a > 1$ and $m' < ma$, the second condition being equivalent to

$$2 + \left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \right) \left(a - c_{d,\gamma} - \frac{d}{2} \right) < a \left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \right),$$

that is to say

$$\min \left(1, d \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2} \right) \right) \left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \right) > 2.$$

For $d \geq 3$, that latter inequality is equivalent to $\gamma < 5/3$ (and for $d \leq 2$, it is never satisfied). Keeping in mind the constraints (3.34), (3.35) and (3.36), one can conclude that (3.38) holds true whenever

$$(3.39) \quad 1 < \gamma < \min \left(\frac{5}{3}, 1 + \frac{4}{d-1} \right), \quad 1 + \frac{d}{2} < s < \frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} \quad \text{and} \quad d \geq 3.$$

Of course, (3.38) is valid for all $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$ in the case where $\frac{2}{\gamma-1}$ is an integer, that is to say, if $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{k}$ for some integer $k > \max(3, \frac{d}{2})$.

Helmholtz coupling. Let us finally consider the case $\mu > 0$ and $\kappa \neq 0$. Since $\mu > 0$, we have on the one hand, if $\frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1 \geq 0$ (that is $\gamma \leq 3$),

$$\|\nabla(\mu^2 - \Delta)^{-1} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla(\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}})\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2}$$

and, on the other hand, as may be seen after decomposing into small and large ξ 's in the definition of the norm in \dot{H}^s ,

$$\|\nabla(\mu^2 - \Delta)^{-1} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}.$$

The right-hand side may be bounded according to (3.35). Hence, arguing as in the case $m = 0$, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \dot{Y}_0 + \frac{a}{1+t} \dot{Y}_0 &\lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_0}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{2-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{(\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}})^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} \dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^{(\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)+1}}, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \dot{Y}_s + \frac{a}{1+t} \dot{Y}_s &\lesssim \frac{\dot{Y}_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}}}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \dot{Y}_s^{1+\frac{1}{s}(\frac{d}{2}+1)}}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{\dot{Y}_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \dot{Y}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{(\dot{Y}_0^{1-\frac{d}{2s}} \dot{Y}_s^{\frac{d}{2s}})^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} \dot{Y}_0^{\frac{1}{s}} \dot{Y}_s^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{(1+t)^{(\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

As expected, the estimate for \dot{Y}_0 is “better” than in the Poisson case and, at this stage, one does not have any constraint on the dimension. Unfortunately, this is not of much help since the inequality for \dot{Y}_s is the same as before, leading us again to

$$(3.40) \quad \frac{d}{dt} Y_s + \frac{a}{1+t} Y_s \lesssim \frac{Y_s}{(1+t)^2} + \frac{Y_s^2}{(1+t)^{1+\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a}} + \frac{Y_s^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{(1+t)^{(\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a)(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1)-1}}$$

and thus to (3.38) under condition (3.39).

To handle the case $d = 2$, one may use the fact that we also have

$$\|\nabla(\mu^2 - \Delta)^{-1} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|\rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Hence, using Lemma 4.2 yields

$$\|\nabla(\mu^2 - \Delta)^{-1} \rho^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} \|\rho\|_{\dot{H}^s} \quad \text{if } s < \frac{2}{\gamma-1} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Consequently the denominator of the inequality for \dot{Y}_s becomes $(1+t)^{\left(\frac{d}{2}+c_{d,\gamma}-a\right)\left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1\right)}$ so that, using Lemma 4.1, we now arrive, if $d = 2$, at the constraints

$$1 < \gamma < \frac{7}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad s < \frac{2}{\gamma-1} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Using the same method as for $d \geq 3$ (one has to take $m' = 1 + \left(\frac{2}{\gamma-1}\right)\left(a - c_{d,\gamma} - \frac{d}{2}\right)$ and $m = \frac{2}{\gamma-1} - 1$ in Lemma 4.1), one can still complete the proof if

$$1 < \gamma < 1 + \frac{4}{d+1} \quad \text{and} \quad s < \frac{2}{\gamma-1} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Note that, if $\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{k}$ for some $k > 2$, then $\frac{2}{\gamma-1}$ is an integer so that the only remaining constraint on s is that $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$.

4. PROVING THEOREM 2.1

A number of works have been devoted to the local existence issue for the Euler-Poisson system, in various functional settings (see e.g. Makino [33], Gamblin [17], Bézard [5] and Brauer-Karp [7]). However, to the best of our knowledge, none of them treats also the case $\mu \neq 0$ and Sobolev spaces with fractional regularity (furthermore, our data are not exactly in uniformly local Sobolev spaces). For the reader's convenience, we sketch the proof of global existence for (2.9)–(2.12) in the functional setting of Theorem 2.1, then establish uniqueness by means of a classical energy method.

4.1. Existence. Here we are given (ρ_0, u_0) satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. Our goal is to prove the existence of a global-in-time solution.

Step 1: Solving an approximate system. Fix some cut-off function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in, say, the ball $B(0, 4/3)$ and with value 1 on $B(0, 3/4)$. Set $v^n := \chi(n^{-1}\cdot)v$. Let J_n be the Friedrichs' truncation operator defined by $J_n z := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(1_{B(0,n)}\mathcal{F}z)$.

For all $n \geq 1$, we consider the following regularization of (BB) :

$$(BB_n) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + J_n((v^n + J_n w) \cdot \nabla J_n \rho) + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} J_n(J_n \rho \operatorname{div}(v^n + J_n w)) = 0, \\ \partial_t w + J_n((v^n + J_n w) \cdot \nabla J_n w) + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} J_n(J_n \rho \nabla J_n \rho) + J_n(J_n w \cdot \nabla v^n) \\ \quad \quad \quad = -\kappa \tilde{G} J_n \nabla(\mu^2 \operatorname{Id} - \Delta)^{-1}(J_n \rho)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}, \end{cases}$$

supplemented with initial data $(J_n \rho_0, J_n w_0)$.

Note that v^n is in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1})$. Hence the above system may be seen as an ODE in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Applying the standard Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem thus ensures that there exists a unique maximal solution $(\rho^n, w^n) \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T^n]; L^2)$ to (BB_n) .

Now, from $J_n^2 = J_n$, we deduce that $(J_n \rho^n, J_n w^n)$ also satisfies (BB_n) . Hence, uniqueness of the solution entails that $J_n \rho^n = \rho^n$ and $J_n w^n = w^n$. In other words, (ρ^n, w^n) is spectrally localized in the ball $B(0, n)$, and one can thus assert that $(\rho^n, w^n) \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T^n]; H^\sigma)$

for all σ in \mathbb{R} , and actually satisfies:

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \rho^n + J_n((v^n + w^n) \cdot \nabla \rho^n) + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} J_n(\rho^n \operatorname{div}(v^n + w^n)) = 0, \\ \partial_t w^n + J_n((v^n + w^n) \cdot \nabla w^n) + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} J_n(\rho^n \nabla \rho^n) + J_n(w^n \cdot \nabla v^n) \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad = -\kappa \tilde{G} J_n \nabla(\mu^2 \operatorname{Id} - \Delta)^{-1}(\rho^n)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}, \\ (\rho^n, w^n)|_{t=0} = (J_n \rho_0, J_n w_0). \end{cases}$$

Step 2: Uniform a priori estimates in the solution space. Since J_n is an orthogonal projector in any Sobolev space and $(J_n \rho^n, J_n w^n) = (\rho^n, w^n)$, one can repeat verbatim (and rigorously) the computations of subsection 3.2. The only change is that since $Dv^n = Dv + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, the final estimates therein only hold on the time interval $[0, \min(cn, T_n))$ for some $c > 0$, which eventually implies that $T_n \geq cn$.

The conclusion of this step is that for any fixed $T > 0$, the couple (ρ^n, w^n) for n large enough is defined on $[0, T]$, belongs to $\mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and is bounded in $L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)$.

Step 3: Convergence. Let us fix some $T > 0$. Given the uniform bounds of the previous step, the weak * compactness theorem ensures that (up to an omitted extraction), there exists some $(\rho, w) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)$ so that

$$(\rho^n, w^n) \rightharpoonup (\rho, w) \text{ weak } * \text{ in } L^\infty([0, T]; H^s).$$

Furthermore, computing $\partial_t \rho^n$ and $\partial_t w^n$ by means of (4.41) and using standard product laws in Sobolev spaces, one can prove that for all $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $(\theta \partial_t \rho^n, \theta \partial_t w^n)$ is bounded in $L^\infty([0, T]; H^{s-1})$. Hence, from Aubin-Lions lemma, interpolation and Cantor diagonal process, we gather that (still up to an omitted extraction), we have

$$(\theta \rho^n, \theta w^n) \rightarrow (\theta \rho, \theta w) \text{ in } L^\infty([0, T]; H^{s'}) \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } s' < s.$$

This allows to pass to the limit in (4.41) and to conclude that (ρ, w) satisfies (BB) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Of course, since $T > 0$ is arbitrary, (ρ, w) actually satisfies (BB) on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and belongs to $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s)$.

Step 4: Time continuity. That (ρ, w) lies in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s)$ may be achieved either by adapting the arguments of Kato in [25] or those of [1, Chap. 4]. Note that ref. [25] allows in addition to prove the continuity of the flow map in the space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s)$.

4.2. Uniqueness. This part is devoted to the proof of the following uniqueness result.

Proposition 4.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 be in force and assume that (ρ^1, u^1) and (ρ^2, u^2) are two solutions of (MP) on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(\rho^i)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; L^2 \cap L^\infty)$, $\nabla \rho^i \in L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $(u^i - v^i) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; L^2)$ and $\nabla u^i \in L^1([0, T]; L^\infty)$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

If, in addition, (ρ^1, u^1) and (ρ^2, u^2) coincide at time $t = 0$, then the two solutions are the same on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: We define $w^i = u^i - v^i$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $(\delta \rho, \delta w, \delta \phi) := (\rho^2 - \rho^1, w^2 - w^1, \phi^2 - \phi^1)$. Since (ρ^1, u^1) and (ρ^2, u^2) coincide at time $t = 0$, so do v^1 and v^2 . Hence, uniqueness for

Burgers equation implies $v^1 = v^2 := v$. We thus have

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + w^2 \cdot \nabla) \delta \rho + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho^2 \operatorname{div} \delta w + v \cdot \nabla \delta \rho + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \delta \rho \operatorname{div} v = -\delta w \cdot \nabla \rho^1 - \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \delta \rho \operatorname{div} w^1, \\ (\partial_t + w^2 \cdot \nabla) \delta w + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \rho^2 \nabla \delta \rho + v \cdot \nabla \delta w + \delta w \cdot \nabla v \\ \quad \quad \quad = -\delta w \cdot \nabla w^1 - \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \delta \rho \nabla \rho^1 + \kappa \nabla \delta \phi, \\ \Delta \delta \phi - \mu^2 \delta \phi = \tilde{G}((\rho^2)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - (\rho^1)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}). \end{cases}$$

Taking the L^2 scalar product of the first and second equations with $\delta \rho$ and δw , respectively, and arguing as for proving (3.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(\delta \rho, \delta w)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\delta \rho^2 + |\delta w|^2) \operatorname{div}(v + w^2) dx + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta \rho \delta w \cdot \nabla(\rho^2 - \rho^1) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta w \cdot \nabla \rho^1 \delta \rho dx - \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\delta \rho)^2 \operatorname{div}(v + w^1) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\delta w \cdot \nabla(v + w^1)) \cdot \delta w dx + \kappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \delta \phi \cdot \delta w dx, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|(\delta \rho, \delta w)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla v, \nabla w^1, \nabla w^2, \nabla \rho^1, \nabla \rho^2\|_{L^\infty} \|(\delta \rho, \delta w)\|_{L^2}^2 + |\kappa| \|\nabla \delta \phi\|_{L^2} \|\delta w\|_{L^2}.$$

After time integration, this gives for all $t \in [0, T]$ (since $\delta \rho|_{t=0} = 0$ and $\delta w|_{t=0} = 0$):

$$\|(\delta \rho, \delta w)(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C \int_0^t \|\nabla v, \nabla w^1, \nabla w^2, \nabla \rho^1, \nabla \rho^2\|_{L^\infty} \|(\delta \rho, \delta w)\|_{L^2} d\tau + |\kappa| \int_0^t \|\nabla \delta \phi\|_{L^2} d\tau.$$

- In the pure Euler case (namely $\kappa = 0$), applying Gronwall lemma readily gives $(\delta \rho, \delta w) \equiv (0, 0)$ on $[0, T]$.
- In the Poisson case ($\kappa \neq 0$ and $\mu = 0$) with $d \geq 3$ one can use the fact that operator $\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}$ maps L^p (with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{2}$) to L^2 and that

$$(\rho^2)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} - (\rho^1)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}} = \frac{2}{\gamma-1} \delta \rho \int_0^1 (\rho^1 + \eta \delta \rho)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} d\eta.$$

Hence

$$\|\nabla \delta \phi\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\delta \rho\|_{L^2} \left\| \int_0^1 (\rho^1 + \eta \delta \rho)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} d\eta \right\|_{L^d}.$$

Note that since $\gamma \leq 1 + 2d/(d+2)$, and $\rho^i \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2 \cap L^\infty)$ for $i = 1, 2$, we are guaranteed that the integral is bounded in terms of ρ^1 and ρ^2 . Hence, we have

$$\|\nabla \delta \phi\|_{L^2} \leq C_{\rho^1, \rho^2} \|\delta \rho\|_{L^2}$$

and applying Gronwall lemma still ensures uniqueness.

- In the Helmholtz case ($\kappa \neq 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$) with $d \geq 2$, we just use the fact that $\nabla(\mu - \Delta)^{-1}$ maps L^2 to itself, and thus, arguing as above,

$$\|\nabla \delta \phi\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\delta \rho\|_{L^2} \left\| \int_0^1 (\rho^1 + \eta \delta \rho)^{\frac{2}{\gamma-1}-1} d\eta \right\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Since ρ^1 and ρ^2 are bounded, one can apply Gronwall lemma to prove that the two solutions coincide.

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

APPENDIX

For the reader's convenience, we prove here some technical results that have been used in the paper. Let us start with an ODE estimate.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $Y : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfy the differential inequality*

$$\frac{d}{dt}Y + \frac{a}{1+t}Y \leq C \left(\frac{Y}{(1+t)^2} + Y^2 + (1+t)^{m'-1}Y^{m+1} \right) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+$$

for some $C > 0$, $a > 1$, $m > 0$ and $m' < ma$. Then, there exists $c = c(a, m, m', C)$ such that if $Y(0) \leq c$, then we have

$$Y(t) \leq 2e^{\frac{Ct}{1+t}} \frac{Y_0}{(1+t)^a} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof. We set $Z(t) := (1+t)^a e^{-\frac{Ct}{1+t}} Y(t)$ and observe that the above differential inequality recasts in

$$\frac{d}{dt}Z \leq C(1+t)^{-a} e^{\frac{Ct}{1+t}} Z^2 + C(1+t)^{m'-ma-1} e^{\frac{Cmt}{1+t}} Z^{m+1},$$

which implies that

$$(4.42) \quad \frac{d}{dt}Z \leq Ce^C (1+t)^{-a} Z^2 + C(1+t)^{m'-ma-1} e^{Cm} Z^{m+1}.$$

The conclusion stems from a bootstrap argument : let $Z_0 := Z(0)$ and assume that

$$(4.43) \quad Z(t) \leq 2Z_0 \quad \text{on } [0, T].$$

Then (4.42) implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}Z \leq 4Ce^C (1+t)^{-a} Z_0^2 + C(1+t)^{m'-ma-1} e^{Cm} (2Z_0)^{m+1}.$$

Hence, integrating in time, we discover that on $[0, T]$, we have

$$Z(t) \leq Z_0 + \frac{4Ce^C}{a-1} Z_0^2 (1 - (1+t)^{1-a}) + \frac{Ce^{Cm} (2Z_0)^{m+1}}{ma - m'} (1 - (1+t)^{m'-ma}).$$

Let us discard the obvious case $Z_0 = 0$. Then, if Z_0 is so small as to satisfy

$$\frac{4Ce^C}{a-1} Z_0 + \frac{2^{m+1} Ce^{Cm} Z_0^m}{ma - m'} \leq 1,$$

the above inequality ensures that we actually have $Z(t) < 2Z_0$ on $[0, T]$. Therefore the supremum of $T > 0$ satisfying (4.43) has to be infinite. \square

The following result has been used to bound the potential term.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\alpha \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \sigma < \alpha + \frac{1}{2}$. Then we have the inequality*

$$(4.44) \quad \| |z|^\alpha \|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \lesssim \|z\|_{L^\infty}^{\alpha-1} \|z\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}.$$

Proof. The corresponding inequality for nonhomogeneous Sobolev spaces, namely

$$\| |z|^\alpha \|_{H^\sigma} \lesssim \|z\|_{L^\infty}^{\alpha-1} \|z\|_{H^\sigma}$$

is a particular case of [24, Thm. 1.2].

Applying that inequality to $z(\lambda \cdot)$ for all $\lambda > 0$, and using the fact that

$$\| |z(\lambda \cdot)|^\alpha \|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} = \lambda^{\sigma - \frac{d}{2}} \| |z|^\alpha \|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \| z(\lambda \cdot) \|_{H^\sigma} \approx \lambda^{-\frac{d}{2}} (\| z \|_{L^2} + \lambda^\sigma \| z \|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}),$$

we get the desired inequality after having λ tend to $+\infty$. \square

We also used the following first order commutator estimate that corresponds to the end of [29, Rem. 1.5], or may be seen as a straightforward adaptation to the homogeneous framework of the second inequality of [2, Lemma A.2]:

Lemma 4.3. *If $s > 0$, then we have:*

$$\| [v, \dot{\Lambda}^s] u \|_{L^2} \lesssim \| v \|_{\dot{H}^s} \| u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla v \|_{L^\infty} \| u \|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}.$$

The following second order commutator inequality played a key role in the proof of Sobolev estimates with noninteger exponent for the solution to (BB) .

Lemma 4.4. *If $s > 1$, then we have:*

$$\| [v, \dot{\Lambda}^s] u - s \nabla v \cdot \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} \nabla u \|_{L^2} \lesssim \| v \|_{\dot{H}^s} \| u \|_{L^\infty} + \| \nabla^2 v \|_{L^\infty} \| u \|_{\dot{H}^{s-2}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the lines of that of [2, Lemma A.3], which deals with the non-homogeneous case. It relies on Bony's decomposition and on continuity results for the paraproduct and remainder operators. For the reader convenience, let us shortly recall how it works. Fix some smooth radial function χ supported in (say) the ball $B(0, 4/3)$ and with value 1 on $B(0, 3/4)$, then set $\varphi := \chi(\cdot/2) - \chi$. For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the spectral cut-off operators $\dot{\Delta}_j$ and \dot{S}_j acting on tempered distributions u as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Delta}_j u &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-j} \cdot) \mathcal{F} u) = 2^{jd} (\mathcal{F}^{-1} \varphi)(2^j \cdot) \star u, \\ \dot{S}_j u &:= \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(2^{-j} \cdot) \mathcal{F} u) = 2^{jd} (\mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi)(2^j \cdot) \star u, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{F} denotes the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^d .

Whenever the product uv of two tempered distributions u and v is defined, its so-called Bony's decomposition (first introduced in [6]) reads:

$$uv = T_u v + T_v u + R(u, v)$$

where the *paraproduct* operator T and *remainder* operator R are defined by

$$T_u v := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \dot{S}_{j-1} u \dot{\Delta}_j v \quad \text{and} \quad R(u, v) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \dot{\Delta}_j u (\dot{\Delta}_{j-1} v + \dot{\Delta}_j v + \dot{\Delta}_{j+1} v).$$

One can now start the proof. Decomposing the terms $v \dot{\Lambda}^s u$, $\dot{\Lambda}^s(uv)$ and $\nabla v \cdot \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} \nabla u$ according to Bony's decomposition, we get with the usual summation convention,

$$\begin{aligned} [v, \dot{\Lambda}^s] u - s \nabla v \cdot \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} \nabla u &= \underbrace{[T_v, \dot{\Lambda}^s] u}_{R^1} - s \underbrace{T_{\partial_k v} \partial_k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} u}_{R^4} + \underbrace{T_{\dot{\Lambda}^s u} v}_{R^2} - \underbrace{\dot{\Lambda}^s T_u v}_{R^3} \\ &\quad - s \underbrace{T_{\partial_k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} u} \partial_k v}_{R^4} + \underbrace{R(v, \dot{\Lambda}^s u)}_{R^5} - \underbrace{\dot{\Lambda}^s R(v, u)}_{R^6} - s \underbrace{R(\partial_k v, \partial_k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} u)}_{R^7}. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding R^1 . From the definition of the paraproduct, we have $R^1 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} R_j^1$ with $R_j^1 := \dot{S}_{j-1} v \tilde{\varphi}(2^{-j} D) \dot{\Lambda}^s \dot{\Delta}_j u - \tilde{\varphi}(2^{-j} D) \dot{\Lambda}^s (\dot{S}_{j-1} v \dot{\Delta}_j u) - s \dot{S}_{j-1} \partial_k v \tilde{\varphi}(2^{-j} D) (\partial^k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2}) \dot{\Delta}_j u$, for some suitable $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in an annulus. From second order Taylor's formula, we gather

$$R_j^1 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^1 h_{s,j}(y) y \cdot D^2 \dot{S}_{j-1} v(x - \tau y) \cdot y \dot{\Delta}_j u(x - y) (1 - \tau) d\tau dy,$$

where $h_{s,j} := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(| \cdot |^s \tilde{\varphi}(2^{-j} \cdot)) = 2^{js} \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\varphi}_s(2^{-j} \cdot))$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_s(\xi) := |\xi|^s \tilde{\varphi}(\xi)$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_j^1\|_{L^2} &\leq 2^{j(s-2)} \| | \cdot |^2 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \tilde{\varphi}_s \|_{L^1} \|D^2 \dot{S}_{j-1} v\|_{L^\infty} \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|D^2 v\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(s-2)} \|\dot{\Delta}_j u\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the spectral localization of the terms R_j^1 implies that

$$\|R^1\|_{L^2}^2 \approx \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|R_j^1\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and because, for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\|z\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 \approx \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{2j\sigma} \|\dot{\Delta}_j z\|_{L^2}^2,$$

one ends up with

$$\|R^1\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2}}.$$

Bounding R^2 . Combining a standard continuity result for the paraproduct (see e.g. [1, Chap. 2]) with the fact that $\dot{\Lambda}^s : L^\infty \rightarrow \dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^s$ is continuous implies if $s > 0$,

$$\|R^2\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\dot{\Lambda}^s u\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{-s}} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Bounding R^3 . Since $\dot{\Lambda}^s$ maps \dot{H}^s to L^2 , we have for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|R^3\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Bounding R^4 . Standard continuity results for the paraproduct combined with the fact that $(\partial^k | \cdot |^s)(D)$ is a homogeneous multiplier of degree $s - 1$ yield, if $s > 1$,

$$\|R^4\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} u\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{1-s}} \|\nabla v\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Bounding R^5 . Basic results of continuity for the remainder, see e.g. [41], ensure that for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, since $\dot{\Lambda}^s$ maps L^∞ to $\dot{F}_{\infty, 2}^{-s}$,

$$\|R^5\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|\dot{\Lambda}^s u\|_{\dot{F}_{\infty, 2}^{-s}} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|u\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Bounding R^6 . If $s > 0$, then we have

$$\|R^6\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|u\|_{L^\infty},$$

Bounding R^7 . Since $\partial^k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2}$ is a homogeneous multiplier of degree $s - 1$, we have

$$\|R^7\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \|\partial^k \dot{\Lambda}^{s-2} u\|_{\dot{F}_{\infty, 2}^{1-s}} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \|u\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Putting together all the above estimates gives what we want. \square

Acknowledgments: We warmly thank Denis Serre [44] for his interest in our work and fruitful discussions about his results in [43], [20], [21] and the doctoral thesis of Magali Grassin [19].

Šárka Nečasová was supported by the Czech Science Foundation grant GA19-04243S in the framework of RVO 67985840.

Raphaël Danchin and Bernard Ducomet are partially supported by the ANR project INFAMIE (ANR-15-CE40-0011).

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin and R. Danchin. *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, **343**, Springer (2011).
- [2] S. Benzoni-Gavage, R. Danchin and S. Descombes. On the well-posedness for the Euler-Korteweg model in several space dimensions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **56**(4): 1499–1579, 2007.
- [3] H. Berestycki and P.-L. Lions. Existence of solutions for nonlinear scalar field equations, I Existence of a ground state. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **82**:313–346, 1983.
- [4] H. Berestycki and P.-L. Lions. Existence of solutions for nonlinear scalar field equations, II Existence of infinitely many solutions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **82**:347–376, 1983.
- [5] M. Bézard. Existence locale de solutions pour les equations d’Euler-Poisson. *Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math.*, **10**:431–450, 1993.
- [6] J.-M. Bony. Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.*, **14**:209–246, 1981.
- [7] U. Brauer and L. Karp. Local existence of solutions to the Euler-Poisson system including densities without compact support. *Journal of Differential Equations*, **264**:755–785, 2018.
- [8] T. Cazenave. *An introduction to semilinear elliptic equations*. Editions of IM-UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, 2006.
- [9] S. Chandrasekhar. *An introduction to the study of stellar structure*. Dover Publications, New York, 1957.
- [10] S.G. Chefranov and A.S. Chefranov. Exact time-dependent solution to the three-dimensional Euler-Helmholtz and Riemann-Hopf equations for vortex flow of a compressible medium and one of the millenium prize problems. *arXiv:1703.07239v3*, 25 Sep 2017.
- [11] J.M. Chemin. Dynamique des gaz à masse totale finie. *Asymptotic Analysis*, **3**:215–220, 1990.
- [12] G.Q. Chen and D. Wang. The Cauchy problem for the Euler equations for compressible fluids. in *“Handbook of Mathematical Fluid Dynamics, Vol. 1”*, S. Friedlander, D. Serre Eds. North-Holland, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Boston, London, New York, 2002.
- [13] H.-Y. Chiu. *Stellar physics*. Blaisdell Publishing Company, Waltham, Toronto, London, 1968.
- [14] A.R. Choudhuri. *The physics of fluids and plasmas. An introduction for astrophysicists*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [15] P. d’Ancona. A short proof of commutator estimates. *arXiv:1709.01294v2 [math.AP]*, 14 Mar 2018.
- [16] M.J. Esteban and P.-L. Lions. Existence and non-existence results for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains. *Proc. Roy. Soc. of Edinburgh*, **93A**:1–14, 1982.
- [17] P. Gamblin. Solution régulière à temps petit pour l’équation d’Euler-Poisson. *Commun. in Partial Differential Equations*, **18**:731–745, 1993.
- [18] B. Gidas, W.-M. Ni and L. Nirenberg. Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **68**:209–243, 1979.
- [19] M. Grassin-Hillairet. Existence et stabilité de solutions globales en dynamique des gaz. *PHD thesis, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon*, 1999.
- [20] M. Grassin and D. Serre. Existence de solutions globales et régulières aux équations d’Euler pour un gaz parfait isentropique. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I*, **325**:721–726, 1997.
- [21] M. Grassin. Global smooth solutions to Euler equations for a perfect gas. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **47**:1397–1432, 1998.
- [22] Y. Guo. Smooth irrotational flows in the large to the Euler-Poisson system in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} . *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **195**:249–265, 1998.
- [23] J. Jang. Nonlinear instability in gravitational Euler-Poisson system for $\gamma = 6/5$. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **188**:265–307, 2008.
- [24] D. Kateb. On the boundedness of the mapping $f \mapsto |f|^\mu$, $\mu > 1$ on Besov spaces. *Math. Nachr.*, **248/249**:110–128 (2003).

- [25] T. Kato. The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **58**:181–205, 1975.
- [26] T. Kato and G. Ponce. Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **41**(7): 891–907 (1988).
- [27] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega. Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized Korteweg-de-Vries equation via the contraction principle, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **46**(4): 527–620 (1993).
- [28] M. Lécureux-Mercier. Global smooth solutions of Euler equations for Van der Waals gases. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **43**:877–903, 2011.
- [29] D. Li. On Kato-Ponce and fractional Leibniz. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, **35**(1):23–100, 2019.
- [30] S-S. Lin. Stability of gaseous stars in spherically symmetric motions. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **28**:539–569, 1997.
- [31] P.-L. Lions. Minimization problems in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **41**:236–275, 1981.
- [32] A. Majda. *Compressible fluid flow and systems of conservation laws in several variables*. Springer-Verlag, New-York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokyo, 1984.
- [33] T. Makino. On a local existence theorem for the evolution equation of gaseous stars. In *Patterns and Waves-Qualitative Analysis of Nonlinear Differential Equations*, **3**:459–479, 1986.
- [34] T. Makino. Blowing-up solutions of the Euler-Poisson equations for the evolution of gaseous stars. *Transport Theory and Statistical Physics*, **21**:615–624, 1992.
- [35] T. Makino. Mathematical aspects of the Euler-Poisson equations for the evolution of gaseous stars. *NCTU-MATH 930001, Lect. Notes Dep. of Applied Math., National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan, R.O.C.*, March 2003.
- [36] T. Makino and B. Perthame. Sur les solutions à symétrie sphérique de l'équation d'Euler-Poisson pour l'évolution d'étoiles gazeuses. *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, **7**:165–170, 1990.
- [37] T. Makino and S. Ukai. Sur l'existence des solutions locales de l'équation d'Euler-Poisson pour l'évolution d'étoiles gazeuses. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, **27**:387–399, 1987.
- [38] B. Perthame. Non-existence of global solutions to Euler-Poisson equations for repulsive forces. *Japan J. Appl. Math.*, **7**:363–367, 1990.
- [39] R. Racke. *Lectures on nonlinear evolution equations*. Vieweg, Braunschweig, Wiesbaden, 1992.
- [40] G. Rein. Nonlinear stability of gaseous stars. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **168**:115–130, 2003.
- [41] T. Runst and W. Sickel. *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Nonlinear Analysis and Applications, **3**. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996.
- [42] E. Schatzman and F. Praderie. *Les étoiles*. InterEditions, Editions du CNRS, Paris, 1990.
- [43] D. Serre. Solutions classiques globales des équations d'Euler pour un fluide parfait compressible. *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble*, **47**:139–159, 1997.
- [44] D. Serre. *Personal communications*.

Xavier Blanc

Université de Paris, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions (LJLL), F-75005 Paris, France

Sorbonne Université, CNRS, LJLL, F-75005 Paris, France

E-mail: blanc@ann.jussieu.fr

Raphaël Danchin

Université Paris-Est

LAMA (UMR 8050), UPEMLV, UPEC, CNRS

61 Avenue du Général de Gaulle, F-94010 Créteil, France

E-mail: danchin@u-pec.fr

Bernard Ducomet

Université Paris-Est

LAMA (UMR 8050), UPEMLV, UPEC, CNRS

61 Avenue du Général de Gaulle, F-94010 Créteil, France

E-mail: bernard.ducomet@u-pec.fr

Šárka Nečasová
Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Žitná 25, 115 67 Praha 1, Czech Republic
E-mail: matus@math.cas.cz