TRANSACTIONS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 361, Number 2, February 2009, Pages 653–669
S 0002-9947(08)04684-9
Article electronically published on September 26, 2008

STRONG L^p-SOLUTIONS TO THE NAVIER-STOKES FLOW PAST MOVING OBSTACLES: THE CASE OF SEVERAL OBSTACLES AND TIME DEPENDENT VELOCITY

EVA DINTELMANN, MATTHIAS GEISSERT, AND MATTHIAS HIEBER

Abstract. Consider the Navier-Stokes flow past several moving or rotating obstacles with possible time-dependent velocity. It is shown that under suitable assumptions on the data, there exists a unique, local strong solution in the $L^p - L^q$-setting for suitable $p, q \in (1, \infty)$. Moreover, it is proved that this strong solution coincides with the known mild solution in the very weak sense.

1. Introduction

The mathematical description of the Navier-Stokes flow past rotating or moving obstacles gained quite a bit of attention in the last years. The motion is hereby described by the equations of Navier-Stokes in an exterior domain depending on the time variable t. More precisely, consider the equation

(1.1)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - \Delta v + (v \cdot \nabla) v + \nabla q &= f & \text{in} \quad \Omega(t), & t \in (0,T), \\ \operatorname{div} v &= 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega(t), & t \in (0,T), \\ v(x,t) &= M_i(t)x & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_i(t),\ i = 1, \dots, m, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(x,0) &= v_0(x) & \text{in} \quad \Omega(0). \end{cases}$$

Here $v = v(x,t)$ and $q = q(x,t)$ denote the velocity and the pressure of the fluid, respectively. In this paper we consider time-dependent domains $\Omega(t)$ of the following form: let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be compact sets with boundaries $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_m$ of class $C^{1,1}$. We denote by $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}_i$ the exterior domain. For time-dependent matrices

$$M_i \in C^\infty([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}),$$

with $\operatorname{tr} M_i(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we define the time dependent exterior domain

$$\Omega(t) := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}_i(t)$$

with $\mathcal{O}_i(t) := \{y = G_{(i)}(t)x, x \in \mathcal{O}_i\}$, $\Gamma_i(t) := \{y = G_{(i)}(t)x, x \in \Gamma_i\}$ for $t \in [0,T]$ and a suitably defined isomorphism $G_{(i)}(t) : \overline{\mathcal{O}_i} \to \overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}$; for details see (2.5). As the obstacles shall not collide, we require

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}, \overline{\mathcal{O}_j(t)}\right) > 0, \qquad i \neq j,\ t \in [0,T].$$

Received by the editors July 28, 2006.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 76D03, 35Q30, 35B30.
Key words and phrases. Navier-Stokes equations, rotating obstacles, strong L^p-solutions.

The boundary condition on $\Gamma_i(t)$ is the usual no-slip condition. It is the aim of this paper to construct a strong L^p-solution to (1.1).

It is interesting to compare our solution to problem (1.1) with the results which have recently been obtained by several different approaches. The situation of *one* obstacle rotating with *constant* angular velocity (i.e. M equals the rotation matrix) was first considered by Hishida [His99]. He proved the existence of a unique local *mild* solution to (1.1) in the context of L^2.

Strong solutions, again in the L^2-context and for one obstacle, were obtained by Galdi and Silvestre in [GS05] using Galerkin methods as well as by Cumsille and Tucsnak [CT06]. In the case of two dimensions, these strong solutions are even global in time under appropriate assumptions on the data; see [CT06].

The situation where the data belong to L^p for $1 < p < \infty$ was first considered in [GHH06a], where the existence of a unique, local, *mild L^p-solution* to (1.1) was established. It was shown by Hishida and Shibata in [HS06] that this solution is even a global one, provided the data are small enough.

In this paper, we consider the situation of *strong L^p-solutions*. We prove the existence of a local, strong solution to (1.1) in L^p even for *several* non-colliding obstacles which may rotate or move with a *time-dependent* angular velocity. One of the main tools in the proof of our results will be the maximal $L^p - L^q$-regularity of the Stokes operator in exterior domains.

It is a natural question to ask whether the strong solution to (1.1) obtained in Theorem 3.1 below coincides with the mild solution constructed in [GHH06a]. We give an affirmative answer to this question in Theorem 3.3 below. Of course, we need to explain first the meaning of *coincides*, since mild and strong solutions are defined on different spaces. In this section we make use of the concept of *very weak solutions* which was introduced in [FJR72] for $\mathbb{R}^n$ and in [Ama00] for domains.

For more information about the Navier-Stokes equation in the rotating framework of all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, we refer to the papers [CM97], [BMN99], [HS05], [GIMM04] and [GIMMS05] dealing in particular with data non-decaying at infinity.

2. Preliminaries

We start by transforming equation (1.1) defined in the time-dependent domain $\Omega(t)$ to an equation on a fixed cylindrical domain. More precisely, following the approach introduced by Inoue and Wakimoto [IW77], we introduce a change of coordinates which coincides in the special case of pure rotation, i.e. M equals the rotation matrix, with the rotation in a neighborhood of the rotating obstacle, but equals the identity far away from the rotating body; see also [CT06].

For the time being, assume there is only one moving obstacle. We then make the following assumption:

(A1) Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a compact set (the obstacle) with boundary $\Gamma := \partial\mathcal{O}$ of class $C^{1,1}$. Denote by $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{O}$ the exterior domain corresponding to $\mathcal{O}$. For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ with $\operatorname{tr} M = 0$ define $\Omega(t), \Gamma(t), \mathcal{O}(t)$ as $\Omega(t) := \{y = e^{tM}x, x \in \Omega\}$, $\Gamma(t) := \{y = e^{tM}x, x \in \Gamma\}$, $\mathcal{O}(t) := \{y = e^{tM}x, x \in \mathcal{O}\}$.

We then consider a ball $B_r(0)$ of radius $r > 0$ such that $B_r(0) \supset \mathcal{O}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ for some $T > 0$. Choose a cut-off function $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta = 1$ on $B_r(0)$ and $\eta = 0$ on $B_{2r}(0)^c$. Define $b : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$b(y) := \eta(y)My - B_K\left((\nabla\eta)M\cdot\right)(y), \tag{2.1}$$

where $K := \operatorname{supp}(\nabla\eta)$. Here B_K denotes the Bogovskiĭ operator. For the definition and properties of this operator, we refer e.g. to [Bog79], [Gal94], and [GHH06b]. Note that $b(y) = My$ for $y \in \overline{\mathcal{O}(t)}$. Moreover, since $\int_K (\nabla\eta)(y)My \,\mathrm{d}y = 0$, thanks to $\operatorname{tr} M = 0$, it follows by construction that $\operatorname{div} b = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Then consider the initial value problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t X(y,t) &=& b(X(y,t)), & t>0, \quad y\in\mathbb{R}^n,\\ X(y,0) &=& y, & y\in\mathbb{R}^n. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.2}$$

Then, by standard theory of ODE's, there exists a unique vector field

$$X \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

satisfying (2.2). Moreover, $X(\cdot,t)$ is a C^∞-diffeomorphism from Ω onto $\Omega(t)$. Its inverse $Y(\cdot,t)$ is of the same class of regularity and satisfies the initial value problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t Y(x,t) &=& -b(Y(x,t)), & t>0, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^n,\\ Y(x,0) &=& x, & x\in\mathbb{R}^n. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.3}$$

In fact, we only need the restrictions of X and Y on $[0,T]$, nevertheless even (2.2) and (2.3) can be solved on the whole of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

Denote by $J_X(\cdot,t)$ and $J_Y(\cdot,t)$ the Jacobian of $X(\cdot,t)$ and $Y(\cdot,t)$, respectively. Since $\operatorname{div} b = 0$, Liouville's theorem, see e.g. [Arn92], implies that

$$J_X(y,t)J_Y(X(y,t),t) = \mathrm{id} \text{ and } \det J_X(y,t) = \det J_Y(x,t) = 1 \tag{2.4}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

In the situation of several obstacles moving with time dependent velocity we make the following assumption:

(A2) Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be compact sets with boundaries $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m$ of class $C^{1,1}$. We denote by $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{O}_i$ the exterior domain. For time-dependent matrices

$$M_i \in C^\infty([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}),$$

with $\operatorname{tr} M_i(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, we define the time-dependent sets $\Omega(t), \Gamma_i(t)$ and $\mathcal{O}_i(t)$ for $t \in [0,T]$ by aid of the unique solution $G_{(i)}(t) : \overline{\mathcal{O}_i} \to \overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}$ of the following ODE:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} G'_{(i)}(t)x &=& M_i(t)G_{(i)}(t)x, & x\in\overline{\mathcal{O}_i}, \quad t\in(0,T),\\ G_{(i)}(0)x &=& x, & x\in\overline{\mathcal{O}_i}. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that $G_{(i)}(t) : \overline{\mathcal{O}_i} \to \overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}$ is an isomorphism, as

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} [G'_{(i)}(t)x]_k &=& M_i(t)[G_{(i)}(t)x]_k, & x\in\overline{\mathcal{O}_i}, \quad t\in(0,T),\\ [G_{(i)}(0)x]_k &=& x_k, & x\in\overline{\mathcal{O}_i}, \end{array}\right.$$

with $1 \leq k \leq n$, $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, has a unique fundamental system of linear independent solutions $G_{(i)}(t) = \left(G^1_{(i)}(t), \ldots, G^n_{(i)}(t)\right)$, due to the non-vanishing Wronski-determinant at zero. In particular, for the case of constant matrices $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, we are left with $G_{(i)}(t) = e^{tM_i}$ and inverse $G^{-1}_{(i)}(t) = e^{-tM_i}$.

As the obstacles shall not collide, we require

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}, \overline{\mathcal{O}_j(t)}\right) > 0, \qquad i \neq j,\ t \in [0,T].$$

We now choose open sets $B_{1_i}, B_{2_i} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $\overline{\mathcal{O}_i} \subset B_{1_i} \subset \overline{B_{1_i}} \subset B_{2_i}$ and set

$$B_{k_i}(t) := \left\{ y = G_{(i)}(t)x, x \in B_{k_i} \right\}, \quad t \in [0,T],\, k = 1,2,\, i \in \{1,\dots,m\}.$$

Then

$$\overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)} \subset B_{1_i}(t) \subset \overline{B_{1_i}(t)} \subset B_{2_i}(t)$$

for $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover, we demand the sets B_{2_i} to be so small that the sets $B_{2_i}(t)$ are pairwise disjoint for $t \in [0,T]$. Next, we introduce a time-dependent cut-off function $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, such that

$$\eta(y,t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on} \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^m B_{1_i}(t), & t \in [0,T], \\ 0 & \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m B_{2_i}(t), & t \in [0,T]. \end{cases}$$

We define the sets

$$K_i(t) := (\operatorname{supp} \nabla_y \eta(t,\cdot)) \cap \overline{B_{2_i}(t)}, \quad t \in [0,T], i \in \{1,\dots,m\},$$

and the time dependent vector fields $b, b^* : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$b(y,t) := \eta(y,t) \sum_{i=1}^m M_i(t)y - \sum_{i=1}^m B_{K_i(t)} \left((\nabla_y \eta)(\cdot,t) M_i(t) \cdot \right)(y),$$

$$\begin{aligned} b^*(y,t) := \eta(y,t) &\sum_{i=1}^m G_i^{-1}(t) M_i(t) G_i(t) y \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^m B_{K_i(t)} \left((\nabla_y \eta)(\cdot,t) G_i^{-1}(t) M_i(t) G_i(t) \cdot \right)(y). \end{aligned}$$

Note, that due to tr $M_i(t) = 0$, $t \in [0,T]$, $i = 1,\dots,m$, and properties of the Bogovskiĭ operator, the vector field b is solenoidal for $t \in [0,T]$ on all of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Further, $b(y,t) = M_i(t)y$ for $y \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_i(t)}, t \in [0,T], i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$. Note that for fixed $t^* \in [0,T]$

$$b(y,t^*) \quad = \quad \eta(y,t^*) \sum_{i=1}^m M_i(t^*)y - \sum_{i=1}^m B_{K_i^*} \left((\nabla_y \eta)(\cdot,t^*) M_i(t^*) \cdot \right)(y).$$

Since η is smooth in the first variable, the mapping properties of the Bogovskiĭ operator imply that $b(\cdot,t^*) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Now, freeze $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and consider

$$b(y^*,t) \quad = \quad \eta(y^*,t) \sum_{i=1}^m M_i(t)y^* - \sum_{i=1}^m B_{K_i^*} \left((\nabla_y \eta)(\cdot,t) M_i(t) \cdot \right)(y^*).$$

The smoothness of the cut-off function η and the matrices $M_i(\cdot)$ is inherited by b, and we thus see that

$$b \in C_{c,\sigma}^\infty \left(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; \mathbb{R}^n \right).$$

In particular, b is uniformly Lipschitz continuous with respect to the first variable and is bounded on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Thus, the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t X(y,t) &= b(X(y,t),t), \quad t > 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ X(y,0) &= y, \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad\;\; y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

admits a unique solution by the Picard-Lindelöf theorem. Moreover,

$$X \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

As above, let $Y(\cdot,t)$ be the inverse of $X(\cdot,t)$. Then Y satisfies

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t Y(x,t) &=& -(J_X)^{-1}(Y(x,t),t)b(x,t), & t>0, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^n,\\ Y(x,0) &=& x, & x\in\mathbb{R}^n, \end{array}\right. \tag{2.7}$$

and (2.4). Again, only the restrictions of X, Y to $[0,T]$ will be relevant in the sequel.

We set

$$\begin{array}{rcll} U(y,t) &:=& J_Y\left(X(y,t),t\right)v\left(X(y,t),t\right), & y\in\Omega, \quad t\in[0,T],\\ \pi(y,t) &:=& q(X(y,t),t), & y\in\Omega, \quad t\in[0,T]. \end{array}$$

Then (similar to [IW77], [CT06, Prop.3.5]), a function

$$v\in L^p(0,T;W^{2,q}(\Omega(\cdot)))\cap W^{1,p}(0,T;L^q(\Omega(\cdot))), \quad q\in L^p(0,T;\hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega(\cdot)))$$

is a solution to (1.1) if and only if

$$U\in L^p(0,T;W^{2,q}(\Omega))\cap W^{1,p}(0,T;L^q(\Omega)), \quad \pi\in L^p(0,T;\hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega))$$

and (U,π) satisfies the following set of equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t U+(\mathcal{M}-\mathcal{L})\,U &=& f-\mathcal{N}U-\mathcal{G}\pi, & \text{in} \quad \Omega\times(0,T),\\ \operatorname{div} U &=& 0, & \text{in} \quad \Omega\times(0,T),\\ U &=& G_i^{-1}(t)M_i(t)G_i(t)y, & \text{on} \quad \Gamma_i\times(0,T),\ i=1,\dots,m,\\ U(0) &=& v_0, & \text{in} \quad \Omega. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.8}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}U)_i &:= \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_j(g^{jk}\partial_k U_i)+2\sum_{j,k,l=1}^n g^{kl}\Gamma^i_{jk}\partial_l U_j\\ &\quad+\sum_{j,k,l=1}^n\left(\partial_k(g^{kl}\Gamma^i_{jl})+\sum_{m=1}^n g^{kl}\Gamma^m_{jl}\Gamma^i_{km}\right)U_j,\\ (\mathcal{N}U)_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^n U_j\partial_j U_i+\sum_{j,k=1}^n \Gamma^i_{jk}U_jU_k,\\ (\mathcal{M}U)_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{Y}_j\partial_j U_i+\sum_{j,k=1}^n\left(\Gamma^i_{jk}\dot{Y}_k+(\partial_k Y_i)(\partial_j\dot{X}_k)\right)U_j,\\ (\mathcal{G}\pi)_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^n g^{ij}\partial_j\pi, \end{aligned}$$

with the metric contravariant tensor

$$g^{ij}=\sum_{k=1}^n(\partial_k Y_i)(\partial_k Y_j),$$

the metric covariant tensor

$$g_{ij}=\sum_{k=1}^n(\partial_i X_k)(\partial_j X_k)$$

and Christoffel's symbol

$$\Gamma^k_{ij}=1/2\sum_{l=1}^n g^{kl}\left(\partial_j g_{il}+\partial_i g_{jl}-\partial_l g_{ij}\right).$$

Note that $\mathcal{L}$ is the transformed Stokes operator, while $\mathcal{M}$ arises from transforming the time derivative. The non-linearity $\mathcal{N}$ and modified gradient $\mathcal{G}$ correspond to $(v\cdot\nabla)v$ and ∇, respectively.

Setting $u(y,t) := U(y,t) - b(y,t)$, we see that

$$U \in L^p(0,T;W^{2,q}(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,p}(0,T;L^q(\Omega)), \quad \pi \in L^p(0,T;\hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega)),$$

is a solution of (2.8) if and only if

$$u \in L^p(0,T;W^{2,q}(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,p}(0,T;L^q(\Omega)), \quad \pi \in L^p(0,T;\hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega)),$$

and (u,π) solves

(2.9)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \nabla\pi &= F - \mathcal{N}u - \mathcal{B}u + (\mathcal{L}-\Delta)u \\ & \qquad\qquad - \mathcal{M}u + (\nabla - \mathcal{G})\pi \quad \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i\times(0,T),\ i=1,\dots,m, \\ u(0) &= v_0 - b(0) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with

$$(\mathcal{B}u)_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (u_j\partial_j b_i^* + b_j^*\partial_j u_i) + 2\sum_{j,k=1}^n \Gamma_{jk}^i b_k^* u_j, \quad F = f - \partial_t b^* - (\mathcal{M}-\mathcal{L})b^* - \mathcal{N}b^*.$$

In the sequel, maximal L^p-regularity of the Stokes operator in $L^q_\sigma(\Omega)$ plays an important role. More precisely, for $1<q<\infty$, we define the Stokes operator A_q in $L^q_\sigma(\Omega)$ by

$$\begin{cases} A_q u &:= P_q\Delta u, \\ D(A_q) &:= W^{2,q}(\Omega)\cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)\cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

As usual, P_q denotes the Helmholtz projection on $L^q(\Omega)$.

Let $T_0>0$, $1<p<\infty$, $T\in(0,T_0)$, $f\in L^p(0,T;L^q_\sigma(\Omega))$ and $u_0\in(L^q_\sigma(\Omega), D(A_q))_{1-\frac{1}{p},p}$. Then it follows from a classical result of Solonnikov [Sol77] (also see [Gig81], [Frö02] or [GHHSS06]) that there exists a unique solution

$$u \in X^T_{p,q} := W^{1,p}(0,T;L^q_\sigma(\Omega)) \cap L^p(0,T;W^{2,q}(\Omega)\cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)\cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega))$$

of the inhomogeneous Stokes problem

$$\begin{cases} u'(t) - A_q u(t) &= f(t), \qquad t\in(0,T), \\ u(0) &= u_0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, there exists $C>0$, independent of T, f and u_0, such that

$$\|u\|_{X^T_{p,q}} \le C(\|f\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|u_0\|_{(L^q_\sigma(\Omega),D(A_q))_{1-\frac{1}{p},p}}).$$

Setting $\nabla\pi := (\mathrm{Id}-P_q)\Delta u$, we see that (u,π) is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} u'(t) - \Delta u(t) - \nabla\pi(t) &= f(t), \qquad t\in(0,T), \\ u(0) &= u_0, \end{cases}$$

satisfying

$$\|u\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + \|\pi\|_{Y^T_{p,q}} \le C(\|f\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|u_0\|_{(L^q_\sigma,(\Omega)D(A_q))_{1-\frac{1}{p},p}}), \tag{2.10}$$

where $Y^T_{p,q} := L^p(0,T;\hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega))$ and $C>0$ is a constant independent of $T\in(0,T_0)$, f and u_0.

For the rest of this section, assume that $M = -M^t$, (A1) holds and consider

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t v - \Delta v + (v\cdot\nabla)v + \nabla q &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t\in(0,T),\\ \operatorname{div} v &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t\in(0,T),\\ v(x,t) &=& Mx & \text{on } \Gamma(t), \quad t\in(0,T),\\ v(x,0) &=& v_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega(0). \end{array}\right. \tag{2.11}$$

It was shown in [GHH06a] that (2.11) admits a unique, local, mild solution w. In order to compare the solutions obtained in [GHH06a] and in Corollary 3.2, we introduce the notion of very weak solutions to equation (2.11). To this end, let $1 < p, q < \infty$. A function $u \in L^p(0,T_0;L^q(\Omega(\cdot)))$ satisfying $\operatorname{div} u(t) = 0$ in $\Omega(t)$ is called a *very weak solution* to (2.11) if

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_0,\varphi\rangle_\Omega \quad &- \int_0^{T_0} \langle u(t), \varphi'(t) + \Delta\varphi(t) + (u(t)\cdot\nabla)\varphi(t)\rangle_{\Omega(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+ \int_0^{T_0} \langle Mx, (\nu(t)\cdot\nabla)\varphi(t)\rangle_{\Gamma(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $\varphi \in \mathrm{D}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D} := \Big\{\varphi \in C^1\Big([0,T_0]; C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega(\cdot)})\Big) : \varphi(T_0) = 0, \operatorname{div}\varphi(t) = 0,\\ \varphi(t)|_{\Gamma(t)} = 0 \text{ for all } t\in[0,T_0]\Big\} \end{aligned}$$

and $\nu(t)$ is the outer normal. We say that two very weak solutions

$$u, v \in L^p(0,T_0;L^q(\Omega(\cdot)))$$

to (2.11) with initial value $v_0 \in L^q(\Omega)$ coincide in the *very weak sense* if there exists $T \in (0,T_0)$ such that $u(t) = v(t)$ for a.a. $t \in (0,T)$.

In [GHH06a], problem (2.11) is transformed into the equation

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \hat u' - A_{\Omega,b}\hat u + (\hat u\cdot\nabla\hat u) &=& F_2, & t\in(0,T),\\ \hat u(0) &=& v_0 - b, \end{array}\right. \tag{2.12}$$

where $\hat u(x,t) := \mathrm{e}^{-tM} v(\mathrm{e}^{tM}x,t) - b(x)$. Here,

$$A_{\Omega,b}\hat u := P_q(\Delta\hat u + Mx\cdot\nabla\hat u - M\hat u - b\cdot\nabla\hat u - \hat u\cdot\nabla b)$$

with $D(A_{\Omega,b}) := \Big\{\hat u \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)\cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)\cap L^p_\sigma(\Omega) : Mx\cdot\nabla\hat u \in L^q(\Omega)\Big\}$ and $F_2 := \Delta b + Mx\cdot\nabla b - Mb - b\cdot\nabla b$. It is proved that, for $v_0 - b \in L^r_\sigma(\Omega)$ with $r \ge n$, there exists a *mild solution* $\hat u$ to (2.12), i.e. $\hat u \in C([0,T];L^r_\sigma(\Omega))$ satisfies the integral equation

$$\hat u(t) = T_{\Omega,b}(v_0-b) - \int_0^t T_{\Omega,b}(t-s)P_q(\hat u\cdot\nabla\hat u)(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t T_{\Omega,b}P_qF_2(s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad t\in(0,T). \tag{2.13}$$

Here, $(T_{\Omega,b}(t))_{t\ge0} := \left(e^{tA_{\Omega,b}}\right)_{t\ge0}$ is the semigroup generated by $(A_{\Omega,b}, D(A_{\Omega,b}))$ in $L^r_\sigma(\Omega)$. Moreover, this solution $\hat u$ satisfies:

$$t \mapsto t^{\frac{n}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{q}\right)}\hat u(\cdot) \in C([0,T];L^q_\sigma(\Omega)), \tag{2.14}$$

$$t \mapsto t^{\frac{n}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+\frac{1}{2}}\nabla\hat u(\cdot) \in C([0,T];L^q(\Omega)). \tag{2.15}$$

We show in Section 4 that w given by

$$w(x,t) := \mathrm{e}^{tM}\hat{u}(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x,t) + \mathrm{e}^{tM}b(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x), \tag{2.16}$$

with $\hat{u}$ given by the variation-of-constants formula, (2.13) is a very weak solution to (2.11) for suitable choices of p, q and n. We are in the position to state our main results.

3. Main results

Our existence and uniqueness result for equation (1.1) reads as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (A2) and let $p, q \in (1,\infty)$ such that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Assume that*

a) $f \in L^p(0,T; L^q_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot)))$,
b) $v_0 - b(\cdot,0) \in (L^q_\sigma(\Omega), W^{1,q}_0(\Omega) \cap W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega))_{1-1/p,p}$.

Then there exists a $T > 0$ such that the problem (1.1) admits a unique strong solution

$$v \in L^p(0,T; W^{2,q}(\Omega(\cdot))) \cap W^{1,p}(0,T; L^q_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot))), \quad q \in L^p(0,T; \hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega(\cdot))).$$

Moreover, one may choose $T > 0$ such that either $T = +\infty$ or the function

$$t \mapsto \|v(t)\|_{\left(L^q_\sigma(\Omega(t)), W^{1,q}_0(\Omega(t)) \cap W^{2,q}(\Omega(t) \cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega(t)))\right)_{1-1/p,p}}$$

is unbounded on its maximal interval of existence $[0,T)$.

Corollary 3.2. *Assume (A1) and let $p, q \in (1,\infty)$ such that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Assume that*

a) $f \in L^p(0,T; L^q_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot)))$,
b) $v_0 - b \in (L^q_\sigma(\Omega), W^{1,q}_0(\Omega) \cap W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega))_{1-1/p,p}$.

Then there exists a $T > 0$ such that the problem (2.11) admits a unique strong solution

$$v \in L^p(0,T; W^{2,q}(\Omega(\cdot))) \cap W^{1,p}(0,T; L^q_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot))), \quad q \in L^p(0,T; \hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega(\cdot))).$$

Moreover, either $T = +\infty$ or

$$t \mapsto \|v(t)\|_{\left(L^q_\sigma(\Omega(t)), W^{1,q}_0(\Omega(t)) \cap W^{2,q}(\Omega(t) \cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega(t)))\right)_{1-1/p,p}}$$

is unbounded on its maximal interval of existence $[0,T)$.

The following theorem says that the two solutions v and w coincide in the very weak sense. More precisely, the following holds true.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $1 < p, q < \infty$ such that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Assume that*

a) $v_0 - b \in (L^q_\sigma(\Omega), D(A_q))_{1-\frac{1}{p},p}$,
b) $v_0 - b \in L^r_\sigma(\Omega)$ *for some $r > n$ provided* $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{3}{2}$.

Then w given by (2.16) and v given in Corollary 3.2 coincide in the very weak sense.

4. Proof of the first main result

Note that in order to prove our main result it suffices to construct a unique solution (u,π) to (2.9). The strategy of the proof is as follows: first, we derive estimates on the coefficients of the operators $\mathcal{N},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{L},\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ in problem (2.9). Then, a fixed point argument in a suitable closed subspace of $X^T_{p,q}\times Y^T_{p,q}$ yields a unique solution $(u,\pi)\in X^T_{p,q}\times Y^T_{p,q}$ via maximal L^p-regularity of the Stokes operator.

Observe that for a multi-index α and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ there is some constant $K_{|\alpha|,k,T}>0$ such that

$$\left\|\partial_y^\alpha\partial_t^k b\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T])}\le K_{|\alpha|,k,T},\qquad |\alpha|+k>0.$$

The following lemma yields estimates of the transformation mappings X and Y, respectively, that are defined by (2.6) and (2.7). Clearly, the assertions remain true in the case of b being independent from the time variable and X, Y defined as in (2.2) and (2.3).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $T_0>0$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and α be a multi-index satisfying $|\alpha|+k>0$. Then there exists $C_{|\alpha|,k,T_0}>0$ such that*

$$\|\partial_y^\alpha\partial_t^k X\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T_0])}\le C_{|\alpha|,k,T_0}.$$

The above estimates remain valid when $X(\cdot,t)$ is replaced by its inverse $Y(\cdot,t)$.

Proof. Let $T_0>0$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and α be a multi-index satisfying $|\alpha|+k>0$. By a direct calculation, we see that $X(t,y)=y$ for $y\notin\operatorname{supp} b$. Hence,

$$\|\partial_y^\alpha\partial_t^k X\|_{L^\infty((\operatorname{supp} b)^c\times[0,T_0])}\le 1.$$

Since supp b is compact and $X\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}_+)$, there exists $C_{|\alpha|,k,T_0}$ such that

$$\|\partial_y^\alpha\partial_t^k X\|_{L^\infty((\operatorname{supp} b)\times[0,T_0])}\le C_{|\alpha|,k,T_0}.$$

□

It follows from the definition of g^{ij}, g_{ij} and Γ^k_{ij} and the previous lemma that all coefficients of $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are smooth and bounded on finite time intervals $[0,T_0]$ for any $T_0>0$. Moreover, by the mean value theorem, for $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $g^{ij}(x,t)-\delta_{ij}=t\partial_\tau g^{ij}(x,\tau)$ for some $\tau\in(0,t)$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\|g^{ij}-\delta_{ij}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T_0])}\le t\|\partial_t g^{ij}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T_0])}\le Ct,\quad t\in(0,T_0). \tag{4.1}$$

The following embedding of $X^T_{p,q}$ in $L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))$ is needed to cope with the gradient terms. It mainly relies on the mixed derivative theorem. Precisely, the following lemma holds:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $1<p,q<\infty$, $T_0>0$ and $s=0$ or $s=1$. Assume that $k,m\in(1,\infty)$ obey $\frac{2-s}{2}+\frac{n}{2m}-\frac{n}{2q}\ge\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{k}$. Then $X^T_{p,q}$ is continously embedded in $L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))$ for any $T\in(0,T_0)$. Moreover, there exists $C_{T_0}>0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))}\le C_{T_0}\|u\|_{X^T_{p,q}},\qquad T\in(0,T_0),\ u\in X^T_{p,q},\ u(0)=0.$$

Proof. By the mixed derivative theorem (see [Sob75] or [DHP07]), for $\theta\in(0,1)$ there exists $C>0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^{\theta,p}(0,T_0;H^{2-2\theta,q}(\Omega))}\le C\|u\|_{X^{T_0}_{p,q}},\quad u\in X^{T_0}_{p,q}.$$

It then follows from Sobolev embeddings that

$$\|u\|_{L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))} \leq C_{T_0}\|u\|_{X^{T_0}_{p,q}}, \qquad u \in X^{T_0}_{p,q}.$$

Let $S : \{u \in X^T_{p,q} : u(0) = 0\} \to X^{T_0}_{p,q}$ be defined by

$$Su(t) := \begin{cases} u(t-(T_0-T)), & t \geq T_0 - T, \\ 0, & 0 \leq t < T_0 - T. \end{cases}$$

Then $\|Su\|_{X^{T_0}_{p,q}} = \|u\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$ and $\|Su\|_{L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))} = \|u\|_{L^k(0,T_0;W^{s,m}(\Omega))}$. We thus obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^k(0,T_0;W^{s,m}(\Omega))} = \|Su\|_{L^k(0,T;W^{s,m}(\Omega))} \leq C_{T_0}\|Su\|_{X^{T_0}_{p,q}} = C_{T_0}\|u\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$$

for all $u \in X^T_{p,q}$ satisfying $u(0) = 0$. □

Next, we prove estimates for the terms on the right-hand side of (2.9).

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $T_0 > 0$ and $u \in X^{T_0}_{p,q}$. Then, for $T \in (0, T_0)$ there exists $C > 0$, independent of T and $K(T) > 0$ with $\lim_{T\to 0} K(T) = 0$, such that for $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q}$ satisfying $v_1(0) = v_2(0) = 0$,*

(a) $\|\mathcal{N}u\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq (K(T))^2$,

(b) $\|\mathcal{N}(v_1+u) - \mathcal{N}(v_2+u)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq C(K(T) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \|v_i\|_{X^T_{p,q}})\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}})$,

(c) $\|\mathcal{B}(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{3p}}\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$,

(d) $\|\mathcal{M}(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{3p}}\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$,

(e) $\|(\mathcal{L} - \Delta)(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq C(T + T^{\frac{1}{3p}})\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$,

(f) $\|(\nabla - \mathcal{G})(q_1 - q_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq CT\|q_1 - q_2\|_{Y^T_{p,q}}$.

The estimates above are valid even if $v_1(0) \neq 0$ and $v_2(0) \neq 0$. However, in this case, C depends on T as well.

Proof. Set $k = 3p$, $k' = 3p/2$, $m = 3q$, $m' = 3q/2$. By Hölder's inequality, we obtain for the first term of $\mathcal{N}u$

$$\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \quad \leq \quad \|u\|_{L^k(0,T;L^m(\Omega))}\|u\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,m'}(\Omega))}.$$

We now define

$$K(T) := \|u\|_{L^k(0,T;L^m(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,m'}(\Omega))}.$$

Then,

$$\|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq (K(T))^2 .$$

Since $\lim_{T_0\to 0} K(T) = 0$, assertion (a) follows.

Next, set $w_1 = v_1 + u$ and $w_2 = v_2 + u$. By Hölder's inequality, we similarly obtain for the first term of $\mathcal{N}w_1 - \mathcal{N}w_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w_1 \cdot \nabla w_1 - w_2 \cdot \nabla w_2\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\quad \leq \|(v_1 - v_2) \cdot \nabla v_1 + v_2 \cdot (\nabla v_1 - \nabla v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\qquad + \|(v_1 - v_2) \cdot \nabla u + u \cdot (\nabla v_1 - \nabla v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\quad \leq \left(\|v_1\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,m'}(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,m'}(\Omega))}\right) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^k(0,T;L^m(\Omega))} \\
&\qquad + \left(\|v_2\|_{L^k(0,T;L^m(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^k(0,T;L^m(\Omega))}\right) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^{k'}\left(0,T;W^{1,m'}(\Omega)\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.2, there exists $C > 0$, independent of $T \in (0, T_0)$ and v_1, v_2, such that

$$\|w_1 \cdot \nabla w_1 - w_2 \cdot \nabla w_2\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq C \left(\|v_1\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + \|v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + K(T)\right) \|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}.$$

Since the second term of $\mathcal{N}w_1 - \mathcal{N}w_2$ can be estimated similary, assertion (b) follows.

Similarly, (c) and (d) follow from the estimates

$$\|\mathcal{B}(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{k}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{k}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{M}(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{k}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^{k'}(0,T;W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \leq CT^{\frac{1}{k}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}},$$

respectively, where $C > 0$ is independent of $T \in (0, T_0)$ and v_1, v_2.

As all coefficients of $\mathcal{L}$ are smooth we may rewrite it in non-divergence form, and, by (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\mathcal{L} - \Delta)(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\quad \leq C\|g^{jk} - \delta_{jk}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T))} \|D^2(v_1 - v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\qquad + CT^{\frac{1}{k}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{L^p(0,T;W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \\
&\quad \leq C(T + T^{\frac{1}{k}})\|v_1 - v_2\|_{X^T_{p,q}}, \quad T \in (0, T_0),\ v_1, v_2 \in X^T_{p,q},\ v_1(0) = 0,\ v_2(0) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (e) follows. Assertion (f) similarly follows from (4.1). □

Let $T_0 > 0$, $T \in (0, T_0)$ and $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Next, we introduce the space for the fixed point argument. In order to do this, consider

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t u^* - \Delta u^* + \nabla \pi^* &= \hat{F}(0,0) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\
\operatorname{div} u^* &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\
u^* &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma \times (0,T), \\
u^*(0) &= u_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,
\end{cases}$$

where $\hat{F} : X^{T_0}_{p,q} \times Y^{T_0}_{p,q} \to L^p(0, T_0; L^q(\Omega))$ is defined by

$$\hat{F}(v, q) := F - \mathcal{N}v - \mathcal{B}v + (\mathcal{L} - \Delta)v - \mathcal{M}v + (\nabla - \mathcal{G})q.$$

Note that $\hat{F}$ is well-defined by Lemma 4.3 thanks to $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Hence, by (2.10), there exists a unique solution $(u^*, \pi^*) \in X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q}$. We equivalently rewrite (2.9)

in terms of a fixed point problem by

$$
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \tilde{u} - \Delta \tilde{u} + \nabla \tilde{\pi} &= F + \hat{F}(v + u^*, q + \pi^*) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\
\operatorname{div} \tilde{u} &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \times (0,T), \\
\tilde{u} &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma \times (0,T), \\
\tilde{u}(0) &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,
\end{cases}
\tag{4.2}
$$

where we used the notation

$$
u := \tilde{u} - u^*, \qquad \pi := \tilde{\pi} - \pi^*.
$$

In view of the Banach fixed point theorem we define for a given radius $R > 0$ and $T \in (0, T_0)$ the closed set

$$
\mathcal{K}_{R,T} := \Big\{ (v,q) \in X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q} : v(0) = 0 \text{ and } \|v\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + \|q\|_{Y^T_{p,q}} \le R \Big\}
$$

and a mapping

$$
\Phi_{R,T} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_{R,T} &\to X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q}, \\ (v,q) &\mapsto (\tilde{u}, \tilde{\pi}) \end{cases} \quad \text{such that (4.2) holds.}
$$

In order to apply the Banach fixed point theorem to $\Phi_{R,T}$ we have to show that the mapping is well-defined, maps $\mathcal{K}_{R,T}$ into itself and is a contraction.

Note that $\phi_{R,T}$ is well-defined due to Lemma 4.3 and (2.10). The next lemma shows that for suitable choices of $R > 0$ and $T > 0$ the closed set $\mathcal{K}_{R,T}$ is mapped by $\Phi_{R,T}$ into itself.

Lemma 4.4. *There exist $R > 0$ and $T_1 > 0$, such that $\Phi_{R,T} : \mathcal{K}_{R,T} \to \mathcal{K}_{R,T}$ for all $T \in (0, T_1)$.*

Proof. By (2.10) and Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\Phi_{R,T}(v,q)\|_{X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q}} \le C \|F + \hat{F}(v + u^*, q + \pi^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\quad \le C\big(\|F\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|\mathcal{N}(v+u^*) - \mathcal{N}u^*\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|\mathcal{N}u^*\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\qquad + \|\mathcal{B}(v+u^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|(\mathcal{L} - \Delta)(v+u^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \\
&\qquad + \|\mathcal{M}(v+u^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|(\nabla - \mathcal{G})(q+\pi^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \big) \\
&\quad \le C\big(\|F\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + K(T)R + R^2 + (K(T))^2 + \|u^*\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + \|\pi^*\|_{Y^T_{p,q}} \\
&\qquad + T^{\frac{1}{3p}} R + TR \big), \quad (v,q) \in \mathcal{K}_{R,T}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$
\lim_{T \to 0} \|F\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + K(T) + \|u^*\|_{X^T_{p,q}} + \|\pi^*\|_{Y^T_{p,q}} = 0,
$$

we obtain $\|\Phi_{R,T}(v,q)\|_{X^T_{p,q} \times Y^T_{p,q}} \le R$ provided R and T are small enough. □

Lemma 4.5. *There exists $T_0 > 0$ such that $\Phi_{R,T} : \mathcal{K}_{R,T} \to \mathcal{K}_{R,T}$ is a contraction for all $T \in (0, T_0)$.*

Proof. Again, by (2.10) and Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Phi_{R,T}(v_1,q_1)-\Phi_{R,T}(v_2,q_2)\|_{X^T_{p,q}\times Y^T_{p,q}}\\
&\quad\le\ C\Big(\|\mathcal{N}(v_1+u^*)-\mathcal{N}(v_2+u^*)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}+\|\mathcal{B}(v_1-v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\\
&\qquad\quad+\|(\mathcal{L}-\Delta)(v_1-v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}+\|\mathcal{M}(v_1-v_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\\
&\qquad\quad+\|(\nabla-\mathcal{G})(q_1-q_2)\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\Big)\\
&\quad\le\ C(K(T)+R+T+T^{\frac{1}{3p}})\,\|(v_1,q_1)-(v_2,q_2)\|_{X^T_{p,q}\times Y^T_{p,q}},\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (v_1,q_1),(v_2,q_2)\in\mathcal{K}_{R,T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing T and R small enough, we obtain $C(K(T)+R+T+T^{\frac{1}{3p}})<1$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The existence of a unique strong solution now follows from Lemma 4.4, Lemma 4.5 and the Banach fixed point theorem. Now, the theorem follows in a standard way from the fact that $T>0$ is uniform with respect to v_0, provided

$$\|v_0\|_{\left(L^q_\sigma(\Omega),W^{1,q}_0(\Omega)\cap W^{2,q}(\Omega)\cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega)\right)_{1-1/p,p}}<C_0,$$

and the continuous embedding

$$X^T_{p,q}\hookrightarrow C\left(0,T;\left(W^{1,q}_0(\Omega)\cap W^{2,q}(\Omega)\cap L^q_\sigma(\Omega),L^q_\sigma(\Omega)\right)_{1-1/p,p}\right).$$

□

5. Comparison of strong and mild solutions

In this section we prove Theorem 3.3. For the notion of *very weak* solutions we refer back to Section 2. In a first step, we show that a mild solution is a very weak solution.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(v_0-b)\in L^q_\sigma(\Omega)$ for some $q\ge n$ and denote the mild solution to* (2.12) *on $[0,T]$ for some $T>0$ by $\hat u$ (for a representation by the variation-of-constants formula see* (2.13)*). Then w, defined by* (2.16)*, is a very weak solution to* (2.11)*.*

Proof. By (2.14) and (2.15), we obtain

$$\hat u\in C([0,T];L^q_\sigma(\Omega))\quad\text{and}\quad\nabla\hat u\in L^1(0,T;L^q(\Omega)).$$

Choose $\hat u^1_n\in C^1([0,T];C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\Omega))$ and $\hat u^2_n\in C^1([0,T];C^\infty_c(\overline{\Omega}))$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|\hat u^1_n-\hat u\|_{C([0,T];L^q(\Omega))}=0\ \text{and}\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\|\nabla\hat u^2_n-\nabla\hat u\|_{L^1(0,T,L^q(\Omega))}=0. \tag{5.1}$$

Then, by [Paz83, Chapter 4, Theorem 2.9], there exists a solution

$$\hat v_n\in L^1(0,T;D(A_{\Omega,b}))\cap W^{1,1}(0,T;L^q_\sigma(\Omega))$$

satisfying

$$\begin{cases}\hat v_n'(t)-A_{\Omega,b}\hat v_n(t)+P_q\left((\hat u^1_n\cdot\nabla\hat u^2_n)(t)\right) &=& P_qF_2(t), \qquad t\in(0,T),\\ \hat v_n(0) &=& \hat u^1_n(0).\end{cases}$$

By the representation of $\hat{v}_n$ via the variation-of-constants formula, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\hat{v}_n - \hat{u}\|_{L^1(0,T;L^{\frac{q}{2}}(K))} = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

for any compact $K \subset \overline{\Omega}$. Setting

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\hat{\pi}_n &= (\mathrm{Id} - P_q)[F_2(t) + \hat{u}_n^1 \cdot \nabla\hat{u}_n^2(t) - \Delta\hat{v}_n(t) - Mx \cdot \nabla\hat{v}_n(t) \\ &\quad + M\hat{v}_n(t) + b \cdot \nabla\hat{v}_n(t) + \hat{v}_n(t) \cdot \nabla b]\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0,T)$, we see that $(\hat{v}_n, \hat{\pi}_n)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \begin{aligned} \hat{v}_n' - \Delta\hat{v}_n - Mx \cdot \nabla\hat{v}_n + M\hat{v}_n \\ + b \cdot \nabla\hat{v}_n + \hat{v}_n \cdot \nabla b + \hat{u}_n^1 \cdot \nabla\hat{u}_n^2 + \nabla\hat{\pi}_n &= F_2 && \text{in } \Omega, \quad t \in (0,T), \\ \operatorname{div} v_n &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \quad t \in (0,T), \\ \hat{v}_n &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma, \quad t \in (0,T), \\ \hat{v}_n(0) &= \hat{u}_n^1(0) && \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \end{cases}$$

Hence, $(v_n, \pi_n) := (\mathrm{e}^{tM}\hat{v}_n(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x, t) + \mathrm{e}^{tM}b(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x), \hat{\pi}(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x, t))$ is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} \begin{aligned} \partial_t v_n - \Delta v_n + u_n^1 \cdot \nabla u_n^2 + (b \cdot \nabla)(v_n - u_n^2) \\ + \big((v_n - u_n^1) \cdot \nabla\big) b + \nabla\pi_n &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0,T), \\ \operatorname{div} v_n &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0,T), \\ v_n &= Mx && \text{on } \Gamma(t), \quad t \in (0,T), \\ v_n(0) &= u_n^1(0) && \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \end{cases}$$

where

$$u_n^1 := \mathrm{e}^{tM}\hat{u}_n^1(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x, t) + \mathrm{e}^{tM}b(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x)$$

and

$$u_n^2 := \mathrm{e}^{tM}\hat{u}_n^2(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x, t) + \mathrm{e}^{tM}b(\mathrm{e}^{-tM}x).$$

Moreover,

$$(v_n, \pi_n) \in \big(L^1(0,T; W^{2,q}(\Omega(\cdot))) \cap W^{1,1}(0,T; L^q(\Omega(\cdot)))\big) \times L^1(0,T; \hat{W}^{1,q}(\Omega(\cdot)))$$

thanks to $\hat{v}_n \in L^1(0,T; D(A_{\Omega,b})) \cap W^{1,1}(0,T; L^q(\Omega))$. Therefore, integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_n(0), \varphi\rangle_\Omega - \int_0^T \langle v_n(t), \varphi'(t) + \Delta\varphi(t)\rangle + \langle u_n^2(t), (u_n^1(t) \cdot \nabla)\varphi(t)\rangle_{\Omega(t)} \,\mathrm{d}t \\ + \int_0^T \langle (b \cdot \nabla)(v_n - u_n^2) + \big((v_n - u_n^1) \cdot \nabla\big) b, \varphi\rangle_{\Omega(t)} \,\mathrm{d}t \\ + \int_0^T \langle Mx, \nu(t) \cdot \nabla\varphi(t)\rangle_{\Gamma(t)} \,\mathrm{d}t = 0, \quad \varphi \in \mathrm{D}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, it follows from (5.1) and (5.2) that u is a very weak solution. □

In a second step, the following lemma shows uniqueness of the very weak solution for suitable values of p and q. Especially, we will conclude coincidence of the mild and strong notion of solutions, as stated in Theorem 3.3.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $1 < p, q < \infty$ be such that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and let $v_1, v_2 \in L^p(0, T_0; L^q(\Omega(\cdot)))$ be two very weak solutions to (2.11) for some $T_0 > 0$ with initial value $v_0 \in L^q(\Omega)$. Assume that $v_1 - v_2 \in L^p(0, T_0; L^q_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot)))$. Then there exists $T \in (0, T_0)$ such that $v_1(t) = v_2(t)$ for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$.*

Proof. For the time being, let us assume that for some $T \in (0, T_0)$ and all $f \in L^{p'}(0, T; L^{q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$, there exists a solution

$$(\varphi, \pi) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ext}} := \Big(W^{1,p'}(0, T; L^{q'}_\sigma(\Omega(\cdot))) \cap L^{p'}(0, T; W^{2,q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))\Big) \times L^{p'}(0, T; \hat{W}^{1,q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))$$

to the dual backward problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} -\partial_t\varphi - \Delta\varphi + \nabla\pi - (v_1 + v_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi &=& f & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \operatorname{div}\varphi &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \varphi &=& 0 & \text{on } \Gamma(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \varphi(T) &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{array}\right. \tag{5.3}$$

Then, we obtain for all $f \in L^{p'}(0, T; L^{q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \langle v_1(t) - v_2(t), f(t)\rangle_{\Omega(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ =\ &\int_0^T \langle v_1(t) - v_2(t), (-\partial_t\varphi - \Delta\varphi + \nabla\pi - (v_1 + v_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi)(t)\rangle_{\Omega(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ =\ &\int_0^T \langle v_1(t) - v_2(t), (-\partial_t\varphi - \Delta\varphi - (v_1 + v_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi)(t)\rangle_{\Omega(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used that φ can be approximated by functions in D. This implies $v_1 = v_2$ in $(0, T)$.

It thus remains to show that for $f \in L^{p'}(0, T; L^{q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))$, there exists a solution $(\varphi, \pi) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ to (5.3). In order to do so, we first consider the forward problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} \partial_t\varphi - \Delta\varphi + \nabla\pi - (v_1^{\mathrm{T}} + v_2^{\mathrm{T}})\cdot\nabla\varphi &=& f^{\mathrm{T}} & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \operatorname{div}\varphi &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \varphi &=& 0 & \text{on } \Gamma(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \varphi(0) &=& 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{array}\right. \tag{5.4}$$

where $v_1^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = v_1(T - t)$, $v_2^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = v_2(T - t)$ and $f^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = f(T - t)$ for $t \in (0, T)$. Note first that by a scaling argument, we may assume that $\|f^T\|_{L^{p'}(0,T;L^{q'}(\Omega(\cdot)))}$ is arbitrarily small. Then, similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1, it follows that there exists $T > 0$, independent of f^T, and a solution $(\varphi, \pi) \in \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ to (5.3). Indeed, we have an additional term coming from f^T, which is no problem since f^T is arbitrarily small. Moreover, the non-linear term has to be replaced by a term coming from $(v_1^{\mathrm{T}} + v_2^{\mathrm{T}})\cdot\nabla\varphi$. For the convenience of the reader, we will give the estimates for $(\tilde{v}_1^{\mathrm{T}} + \tilde{v}_2^{\mathrm{T}})\cdot\nabla\tilde{\varphi}$. We choose $r, s \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}$ and $\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{s}$.

Then, it follows from Hölder's inequality and Lemma 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\tilde{v}_1^{\mathrm{T}} - \tilde{v}_2^{\mathrm{T}}) \cdot \nabla\tilde{\varphi}\|_{L^{p'}(0,T;L^{q'}(\Omega))} &\le \|\tilde{v}_1^{\mathrm{T}} - \tilde{v}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\|\nabla\tilde{\varphi}\|_{L^r(0,T;L^s(\Omega))} \\ &\le C\|\tilde{v}_1^{\mathrm{T}} - \tilde{v}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{X^T_{p',q'}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\tilde{v}_1^{\mathrm{T}} - \tilde{v}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \to 0$ for $T \to 0$, we get a solution $(\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}, \pi^{\mathrm{T}})$ to (5.4) for some $T > 0$. Finally, (φ, π), where $\varphi(t) := \varphi^{\mathrm{T}}(T-t)$ and $\pi(t) := \pi^{\mathrm{T}}(T-t)$ for $t \in (0,T)$, is a solution to (5.3). □

We finally prove Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let us first assume that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} < \frac{3}{2}$. Then, by Sobolev embeddings,

$$(L^q_\sigma(\Omega), D(A_q))_{1-\frac{1}{p},p} \hookrightarrow L^{\tilde{r}}_\sigma(\Omega)$$

for some $\tilde{r} > n$. Hence, $v, w \in C([0,T_0]; L^{\tilde{r}}(\Omega)$ for some $T_0 > 0$. In particular, v, w satisfy the assumption of Lemma 5.2. Hence, the assertion follows from iteration in this case.

Let us now assume that $\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{3}{2}$ and $v_0 - b \in L^r_\sigma(\Omega)$ for some $r > n$. By Sobolev embeddings, we have

$$v \in L^s(0,T; L^{\tilde{s}}(\Omega))$$

for some $\tilde{s} \in (n,r)$ and $1 < s < \infty$ satisfying $\frac{n}{2\tilde{s}} + \frac{1}{s} \le \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, since $v_0 - b \in L^{\tilde{s}}_\sigma(\Omega)$, we have $v \in C([0,T]; L^{\tilde{s}}(\Omega))$. Hence, in this case the assertion follows similar to the above. □

References

[Ama00] H. Amann, On the strong solvability of the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **2** (2000), 16–98. MR1755865 (2002b:76028)

[Arn92] V. Arnol'd, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer, Berlin, 1992. MR1162307 (93b:34001)

[Bal77] J. M. Ball, Strongly continuous semigroups, weak solutions, and the variation of constants formula, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **63** (1977), 370–373. MR0442748 (56:1128)

[BMN99] A. Babin, A. Mahalov and B. Nicolaenko, Global regularity of 3D rotating Navier-Stokes equations for resonant domains, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **48** (1999), 1133–1176. MR1736966 (2001b:35241)

[Bog79] M. E. Bogovskiĭ, Solution of the first boundary value problem for an equation of continuity of an incompressible medium, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **248** (1979), 1037–1040. MR0553920 (82b:35135)

[CT06] P. Cumsille and M. Tucsnak, Wellposedness for the Navier-Stokes flow in the exterior of a rotating obstacle, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **29** (2006), 595–623. MR2205973 (2007b:35250)

[CM97] Z. Chen and T. Miyakawa, Decay properties of weak solutions to a perturbed Navier-Stokes system in $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **7** (1997), 741–770. MR1476275 (98k:35147)

[DHP03] R. Denk, M. Hieber and J. Prüss, *$\mathcal{R}$-boundedness, Fourier Multipliers and Problems of Elliptic and Parabolic Type*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. (2003). MR2006641 (2004i:35002)

[DHP07] ———, Optimal L^p-L^q-estimates for parabolic boundary value problems with inhomogeneous data, *Math. Z.* **257** (2007), 193-224. MR2318575 (2008f:35166)

[FJR72] E.B. Fabes, B.F. Jones and N.M. Riviere, The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations with data in L^p, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **45** (1972), 222–240. MR0316915 (47:5463)

[Frö02] A. Fröhlich, Maximal regularity for the non-stationary Stokes system in an aperture domain, *J. Evol. Equ.* **4** (2002), 471–493. MR1941038 (2003h:35200)

[Gal94] G. P. Galdi, *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Vol. I, Springer, New York, 1994. MR1284205 (95i:35216a)

[Gal03] G.P. Galdi, Steady flow of a Navier-Stokes fluid around a rotating obstacle, *J. Elasticity* **71** (2003), 1–31. MR2042672 (2005c:76030)

[GS05] P. Galdi, A. Silvestre, Strong solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations around a rotating obstacle, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **176** (2005), 331-350. MR2185661 (2006i:35276)

[GHH06a] M. Geissert, H. Heck, M. Hieber, L^p-theory of the Navier-Stokes flow past rotating or moving obstacles, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **596** (2006), 45-62. MR2254804 (2007d:35208)

[GHH06b] ———, *On the equation* div $u = f$ *and the Bogovskiĭ Operator*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 168, Birkäuser, Basel, 2006. MR2240056 (2007k:35034)

[GHHSS06] M. Geissert, M. Hess, M. Hieber, C. Schwarz and K. Stavrakidis, Maximal $L^p - L^q$-estimates for the Stokes equation: a short proof of Solonnikov's theorem, *J. Math. Fluid Mechanics*, to appear.

[Gig81] Y. Giga, Analyticity of the semigroup generated by the Stokes operator in L_r spaces, *Math. Z.* **178** (1981), 297–329. MR0635201 (83e:47028)

[GIMM04] Y. Giga, K. Inui, A. Mahalov, S. Matsui, Navier-Stokes equations in a rotating frame in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with initial data nondecreasing at infinity, *Hokkaido Math. J.* **35** (2006), 321–364. MR2254655 (2007f:35217)

[GIMMS05] Y. Giga, K. Inui, A. Mahalov, S. Matsui, J. Saal, Rotating Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3_+$ with initial data nondecreasing at infinity: the Ekman boundary layer problem, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, **186** (2007), 177–224. MR2342201

[HS05] M. Hieber and O. Sawada, The Navier-Stokes equations in R^n with linearly growing initial data, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **175** (2005), 269–285. MR2118478 (2006k:35216)

[His99] T. Hishida, An existence theorem for the Navier-Stokes flow in the exterior of a rotating obstacle, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **150** (1999), 307–348. MR1741259 (2001b:76024)

[HS06] T. Hishida, Y. Shibata, Stability of the Navier-Stokes flow past a rotating obstacle, preprint (2006).

[IW77] A. Inoue and M. Wakimoto, On existence of solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in a time dependent domain, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, Sect. IA Math. **24** (1977), 303–319. MR0481649 (58:1750)

[Paz83] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Springer, New York, 1983. MR0710486 (85g:47061)

[Sob75] P. E. Sobolevskiĭ, Fractional powers of coercively positive sums of operators, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **225** (1975), 1271–1274. MR0482314 (58:2387)

[Sol77] V. Solonnikov, Estimates for solutions of nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Sov. Math.* **8** (1977), 467-529.

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstr. 7, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail address: dintelmann@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstr. 7, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail address: geissert@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstr. 7, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail address: hieber@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de