

LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS FOR FRACTIONAL REGULARIZATIONS OF HYPERBOLIC SYSTEMS OF EQUATIONS

FELIPE ANGELES

ABSTRACT. We establish a local well-posedness theory for a class of hyperbolic quasilinear evolution systems with fractional dissipation and non-local commutators of the fractional Laplacian. The analysis is motivated by the compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with fractional diffusion and the compressible Euler alignment system with singular communication weights. Our approach does not rely on the cancellation condition previously used to recover the coercivity of the highest-order non-local terms. Instead, we exploit the self-adjointness of the fractional Laplacian together with an elementary algebraic identity for commutators of Fourier multipliers. Combined with the non-homogeneous Littlewood-Paley theory, these ingredients yield the coercive structure and remains applicable for systems with variable coefficients. We further show that the associated solution operator fails to satisfy Banach's contraction principle. To overcome this difficulty, we establish a Hölder continuity estimate of order $\frac{1}{2}$, combine it with the Aubin-Lions compactness theorem and a tail-control argument, that yields the relative compactness of the solution operator, allowing the application of Schauder's fixed point theorem. The resulting theory provides local existence for arbitrary fractional orders $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and identifies the obstacles for the local uniqueness of solutions in the presence of fractional commutators.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present work deals with the local well-posedness of the following Cauchy problem for a nonlinear system of evolution equations

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U)\partial_t U + A^j(U)\partial_j U + D(U)U + B(U)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + H(U)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U)]\mathcal{L}U &= 0, \\ U|_{t=0} &= U_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where the notation $\Lambda^\sigma = (-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}$ and the summation convention have been used. Here, U stands as the variable to be determined and is such that $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$, for some $T > 0$. The coefficients $A^0(U)$, $A^j(U)$, $D(U)$, $B(U)$, $H(U)$ and $G(U)$ are real matrices of order $N \times N$ and \mathcal{L} is a constant real matrix of the same order. The fractional Laplace operator $\Lambda^{2\alpha} := (-\Delta)^\alpha$ is the Fourier multiplier with symbol $|\xi|^{2\alpha}$, namely

$$\mathcal{F}(\Lambda^{2\alpha} f)(\xi) = |\xi|^{2\alpha} \widehat{f}(\xi)$$

Equivalently, for functions defined on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\Lambda^{2\alpha} f(x) = c_\alpha \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2\alpha}} dy, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad c_\alpha := \frac{2^{2\alpha} \Gamma(\alpha + \frac{d}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}} |\Gamma(-\alpha)|}. \tag{1.2}$$

We use the notation

$$[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g := \Lambda^{2\alpha}(fg) - f\Lambda^{2\alpha}g,$$

for the commutator of the operator $\Lambda^{2\alpha}$.

The system (1.1) is motivated by two classes of compressible fluid models involving non-local dissipation mechanisms. Although arising from different physical contexts, both systems contain fractional diffusion

operators and lead naturally to quasilinear hyperbolic-parabolic type systems coupled with non-local commutator terms.

The first corresponds to the compressible isentropic fluid dynamics equations in space ($x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 1, 2, 3$) with a non-local diffusion mechanism modeled by the fractional Laplace operator, namely

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\partial_t(\rho v) + \nabla \cdot (\rho v \otimes v) = -\nabla p - \mu_0 \Lambda^{2\alpha} v, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\rho = \rho(x, t)$ is the mass density, $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the velocity field, p is the pressure. The constant $\mu_0 > 0$ denotes the viscosity coefficient.

The system (1.3)-(1.4) was introduced by S. Wang and S. Zhang in [11]. The authors consider the Cauchy problem for (1.3)-(1.4) when the pressure satisfies a power law and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$ in three space dimensions. For initial data in H^4 sufficiently close to a constant equilibrium state, the authors established global existence of smooth solutions together with optimal time-decay estimates. In a subsequent work [12], the regularity assumptions on the initial data were significantly relaxed. More precisely, local well-posedness was established for initial data in $H^{3\alpha+1}$ when $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. Furthermore, under this assumptions, a global well-posedness theory is established for small initial data, where solutions converge to a constant steady state exponentially in time.

It is important to highlight that, although the analysis in [11] is carried out for $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$, the local existence argument extends to the hypo-dissipative regime $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and the proof follows along the same lines with only straightforward modifications.

A second source of motivation for this paper is the compressible Euler system with singular velocity alignment, known as the *Euler alignment system*, describing the flocking behaviors of large animal groups, namely

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = 0,$$

$$\partial_t(\rho v) + \nabla \cdot (\rho v \otimes v) + \nabla p(\rho) = -\beta \rho v - \rho \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x-y)(u(x) - u(y))\rho(y)dy, \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\phi(x) := \frac{c_\alpha}{|x|^{d+2\alpha}}. \quad (1.6)$$

The pressure is given by the power law $p(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$ with $\gamma \geq 1$, and the damping coefficient $\beta \geq 0$.

The integral term in (1.5) represents the non-local velocity alignment, where ϕ is called the communication weight, measuring the strength of the alignment interactions. Such systems arise as hydrodynamic descriptions of agent-based models for self-organized dynamics (see, [5], [9]).

In [3], L. Chen, C. Tan and L. Tong consider the initial value problem for (1.5) near the constant equilibrium state $(\rho_c, v_c) = (1, 0)$. Following [10], the authors introduce the change of variables,

$$\sigma = \sigma(\rho) := \begin{cases} \ln \rho & \gamma = 1, \\ \frac{2\sqrt{\gamma}}{\gamma-1} (\rho^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} - 1) & \gamma > 1, \end{cases}$$

and reformulate (1.5) into the following equivalent system

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \sigma + u \cdot \nabla \sigma + \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2} \sigma + \sqrt{\gamma} \right) \nabla \cdot u &= 0, \\ \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{2} \sigma + \sqrt{\gamma} \right) \nabla \sigma &= -\beta u - \Lambda^{2\alpha} u - [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, u](\rho(\sigma) - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

subject to the initial data

$$\sigma|_{t=0} = \sigma(\rho_0), \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.$$

The authors establish local and global energy estimates in Sobolev spaces (see, [3, Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.2]). In particular, their local well-posedness theory requires initial data in H^s with $s > \frac{d}{2} + \max\{1, 2\alpha\}$.

The analysis in [3] relies crucially on a *cancellation property*, showing that the commutator contribution $[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, u](\rho(\sigma) - 1)$ is controlled by the dissipation generated by $\Lambda^{2\alpha}u$. More precisely, after applying the operator Λ^s to system (1.7) and performing the standard energy estimates, one encounters the contribution

$$J := - \langle \Lambda^s \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, u](\rho(\sigma) - 1)\}, \Lambda^s u \rangle_{L^2}. \quad (1.8)$$

After expanding the commutator and integrating by parts, one obtains

$$J := - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho(\sigma) - 1) \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u \cdot \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u dx + \mathcal{R},$$

where the remainder satisfies

$$|\mathcal{R}| \leq \theta \|(\rho - 1, u)\|_{H^s} \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u\|_{L^2}$$

for some function $\theta \in L^2([0, T])$. Therefore, there is a cancellation of the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u \Lambda^{s+\alpha} (\rho(\sigma) - 1) \cdot \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u dx,$$

which itself cannot be controlled. On the other hand, it is easily seen that the contribution from the term \mathcal{R} is absorbed by the dissipation. The key observation is that the high-order contribution

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho(\sigma) - 1) \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u \cdot \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u dx$$

combines with the dissipative term

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u|^2 dx,$$

yielding

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(\sigma) |\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u|^2 dx.$$

Since $\rho(\sigma)$ remains positive, one obtains the coercive estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(\sigma) |\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u|^2 dx \geq \frac{\rho_{\min}}{2} \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha} u\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \text{with } \rho_{\min}(t) := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho(\sigma(x, t)) > 0.$$

Therefore, the coercive contribution is obtained from a precise combination between the commutator and the dissipative terms. As a consequence, this cancellation mechanism is highly sensitive to the particular structure for the equation. For instance, if the sign of the commutator contribution were reversed, the resulting coercive term would become

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (2 - \rho(\sigma)) \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u \cdot \Lambda^{s+\alpha} u dx,$$

which is positive under the additional assumption $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} < 2$. Such condition can be expected in a global theory for initial data sufficiently close to a constant equilibrium, but it is not natural in a general local well-posedness framework with arbitrary initial data. Likewise, if $2J$ replaces J , the coercivity requires the stronger lower bound $\rho_{\min} > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, this cancellation argument relies heavily on the constants involved in the structure of the non-local terms.

A natural question is whether the commutator contribution J , can be controlled directly, without the cancellation mechanism described above. In principle, such an approach would not depend on the particular coefficient structure of the equation. Given that

$$\Lambda^s[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, u](\rho(\sigma) - 1) = [\Lambda^{s+2\alpha}, u](\rho(\sigma) - 1) - [\Lambda^s, u]\Lambda^{2\alpha}(\rho(\sigma) - 1),$$

the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with standard commutator estimates for the fractional Laplacian (see, (3.6)), imply

$$|J| \leq \theta \|(\rho - 1, u)\|_{H^s} \|\Lambda^{s+2\alpha-1}(\rho(\sigma) - 1)\|_{L^2}, \quad (1.9)$$

for some $\theta \in L^2([0, T])$. However, when $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$, this estimate requires additional regularity for the density. As a consequence, it cannot be used to close the energy estimates.

2. OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

We investigate the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem associated with (1.1). We assume a block structure of the matrix coefficients that is reminiscent of the structure of a quasilinear hyperbolic-parabolic composite system of evolution equations (see, [6]). In particular, there is a partition $U = (u, v)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$, where v is the variable that experiences the fractional diffusion and u is the *hyperbolic* variable. We assume that the constant matrix \mathcal{L} is either the identity matrix \mathbb{I}_N or

$$\mathcal{L}_N := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times k} & \mathbb{O}_{k \times m} \\ \mathcal{L}_0 & \mathbb{O}_{m \times m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_0 is a constant $m \times k$ matrix. The choice $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_N$ is designed to capture the structure of the Euler alignment system, where the nonlocal commutator acts only through the hyperbolic variables. In section 13.2, the reader will find the matrix coefficients that allow system (1.5) to be written in the form (1.1). By contrast, the choice $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{I}_N$ corresponds to a situation in which both the fractional dissipation and the commutator act directly on the diffusive variable v . It is naturally associated with evolution equations of the form

$$v_t + \Lambda^{2\alpha}v + [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]v = 0.$$

Moreover, it is motivated by the following situation of a system of equations

$$\tilde{A}^0(U)U_t + \tilde{A}^j(U)\partial_j U + \tilde{D}(U)U + \Lambda^{2\alpha}(\tilde{B}(v)U) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Since

$$\Lambda^{2\alpha}(\tilde{B}(v)U) = \tilde{B}(v)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, \tilde{B}(v)]U,$$

it is possible to write this system in the form (1.1).

Motivated by the previous discussion, the present work has three main objectives:

- (O1) To establish a local well-posedness theory for a class of quasilinear systems with fractional dissipation of arbitrary order $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, assuming only initial data in H^s with $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$.
- (O2) To develop a method that yields the coercive structure of the non-local contributions, which does not rely on the cancellation condition and remains applicable in the variable coefficient setting.
- (O3) To develop a local well-posedness theory for hyperbolic quasilinear systems coupled with dissipation terms involving fractional commutators, in situations where the classical contraction mapping principle is unavailable.

Regarding (O2), the analysis in [3] avoids estimates of the form (1.9) by exploiting the self-adjointness of Λ^α in L^2 . This allows the authors to use the cancellation property and recover the required coercive estimates. In contrast, the present work follows a different route. While the self-adjointness of $\Lambda^{2\alpha}$ is used to derive the L^2 energy estimate (see theorem 7.5), the high order analysis does not rely on the cancellation argument. Instead, we develop a collection of new commutator estimates that make it possible to control the highest order non-local contributions and recover the necessary coercive structure (see theorem 7.1).

The commutator estimates developed in theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 are based on the following simple, yet fundamental, commutator identity. Consider two Fourier multiplier operators T_1 and T_2 with corresponding symbols p_1 and p_2 , respectively. Assume that $T_1 f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(p_1 f)$ and $T_2 f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(p_2 f)$ are well-defined on a class of sufficiently smooth functions f . Notice that

$$T_1[T_2, f]g = T_2[T_1, f]g + [T_2, f]T_1g - [T_1, f]T_2g. \quad (2.3)$$

In this decomposition, the last two commutator terms can be estimated by standard techniques, reducing the analysis to the term $T_2[T_1, f]g$. Consequently, if T_2 is bounded on L^p , the remaining contribution can be estimated through the corresponding commutator estimates for T_1 .

This identity is a central observation of this work and we apply it several operators, including the non-homogeneous dyadic block Δ_j , the Friedrichs' mollifier \mathbb{J}_ϵ , differential operators D^γ , and the fractional Laplacian Λ^σ (see section 4).

Applying the identity (2.3) together with the non-homogeneous Littlewood-Paley decomposition, we first establish the commutator estimates of theorem 4.1. This result provides one of the main ingredients for theorem 4.2, where we derive estimates required to control terms of the form (1.8). The same strategy also leads to the commutator estimate in theorem 4.3. This estimate is the key ingredient in proving the energy estimates for solutions of (1.1).

We next discuss objective (O3). The coercivity and energy estimates described above provide the a priori bounds for the well-posedness of the linearized problem. The main remaining issue is to construct solutions to the nonlinear system. Nonetheless, our analysis reveals an additional difficulty that does not arise at the level of the energy estimates. Although the local existence argument in [3] is described as standard and its proof is omitted, the presence of the fractional commutator prevents the solution map from satisfying contraction type estimates. More precisely, the non-local contribution

$$[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1)]\mathcal{L}U^1 - [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2,$$

cannot be controlled in the topology of the *low norm* to obtain a contraction type estimate (see the discussion prior to theorem 9.1).

An alternative to the classical contraction mapping principle was developed in [1]. There, it is shown that, for quasilinear hyperbolic-parabolic systems of evolution equations with coupling in the linearization, the energy estimates cannot directly yield a contraction inequality for the solution operator. Nonetheless, by going to a second iteration to the solution operator, the author establishes a contraction-type inequality (referred to as a Fibonacci contraction), which leads to the local existence of solutions.

The present setting, however, falls outside the scope of that theory. The Fibonacci contraction method requires the nonlinear terms to have one differential order less than the dominant term in the equation. In contrast, the fractional commutator $[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U)]\mathcal{L}U$ has the same differential order as the fractional diffusion $\Lambda^{2\alpha}U$. Consequently, the argument of [1] cannot be applied.

To overcome this difficulty, we establish a Hölder continuity estimate of order 1/2 for the solution operator (see theorem 9.1). This regularity is sufficient to apply the Aubin-Lions lemma on bounded domains. We then combine this local compactness with a tail control argument (i.e. a tightness of the L^2 -norm) to recover compactness on the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , thereby establishing the relative compactness of the solution

operator (see lemma 8). Consequently, Schauder's fixed point theorem applies, which in turn implies the local existence of solutions (see section 11).

The tightness of the L^2 norm proved during the proof of lemma 8, is motivated by Leray's compactness argument for weak solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, as presented for instance in [7, Chapter 12]. The argument developed here, however, is more general. It is formulated for abstract quasilinear systems and depends only on three fundamental ingredients: the L^2 energy estimates, the Aubin-Lions compactness theorem, and the Kato-Ponce-Li commutator estimates (see, lemma 4). Consequently, the argument for the tightness of the L^2 norm is driven by the structure of the energy estimates rather than by the specific form of the underlying equations.

It is worth mentioning that, when $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_N$, our regularity assumptions on the initial data required for the local well-posedness theory coincide with those assumed in [3], namely $s > \frac{d}{2} + \max\{1, 2\alpha\}$. By contrast, when $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{I}_N$, the regularity assumptions can be relaxed to $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, independently of the order of the fractional diffusion. This is a consequence of the fact that, in the second case the commutator acts only on the variable that experiences the regularizing effect of the fractional diffusion. This compensates the loss of regularity produced by the commutator contribution.

Finally, the uniqueness theory also reflects the lack of a contraction property. In the absence of fractional commutator terms, the energy estimates lead to the standard contraction inequality, yielding local uniqueness. On the other hand, in the presence of commutators, the Hölder continuity of the solution map is not enough to imply uniqueness. As a consequence, the local uniqueness of solutions can only be established under additional assumptions, such as the smallness of the initial data in H^s (see theorem 12.1).

In section 13.2, we apply our results to the particular cases of the Navier-Stokes equations (1.3)-(1.4) and the Euler system with velocity alignment (1.5).

3. BASIC LEMMAS

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We denote $\widehat{H}^m := \widehat{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the Banach space,

$$\widehat{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \nabla u \in H^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)\},$$

with norm $\|f\|_{\widehat{H}^m} = \|f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{m-1}$. When $m = 0$ we define $\widehat{H}^0 := L^\infty$ and $\|f\|_{\widehat{H}^0} = \|f\|_{L^\infty}$. The following result can be found in [4].

Lemma 1. *If $s > \frac{d}{2}$ the space \widehat{H}^s is an algebra under point by point multiplications. That is, if $f, g \in \widehat{H}^s$ their product fg belongs to \widehat{H}^s and*

$$\|fg\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \leq C\|f\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|g\|_{\widehat{H}^s},$$

where C is a constant independent of f and g . More generally, if $f \in \widehat{H}^s$ and $g \in H^r$, $0 \leq r \leq s$, then $fg \in H^r$, and

$$\|fg\|_r \leq C\|f\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|g\|_r,$$

where C is a constant independent of f and g .

The following result provides chain rule estimates (see, [6] and [4] for example).

Lemma 2. *Let $s \geq 1$ be an integer and assume that $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \widetilde{H}^s$. Let $F = F(v)$ be a C^∞ -function of $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then for $1 \leq j \leq s$, we have $D_x F(v) \in H^{j-1}$ and*

$$\|D_x F(v)\|_{H^{j-1}} \leq CM(1 + \|v\|_{L^\infty})^{j-1} \|D_x v\|_{H^{j-1}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where C is a positive constant and $M := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} \sup\{|D_v^k F(v)| \mid |v| \leq \lambda = \|v\|_{L^\infty}\}$.

A simple but useful consequence of these lemmas is the following result.

The following results provide product estimates for fractional Sobolev spaces and a generalization to the chain rule estimates in lemma 2 but for fractional derivatives.

Lemma 3. *Let $\sigma > 0$.*

(i) *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that, for any $u, v \in H^\sigma \cap L^\infty$,*

$$\|uv\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H^\sigma} + \|u\|_{H^\sigma} \|v\|_{L^\infty}); \quad (3.2)$$

similarly, if $u, v \in \dot{H}^\sigma \cap L^\infty$,

$$\|uv\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \|v\|_{L^\infty}). \quad (3.3)$$

(ii) *Assume that $1 \leq p_1, p_4 \leq \infty$ and $1 < p, p_2, p_3 < \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}.$$

Suppose that $u \in L^{p_1}$, $\Lambda^\sigma u \in L^{p_2}$, $v \in L^{p_4}$ and $\Lambda^\sigma v \in L^{p_3}$. Then $\Lambda^\sigma(uv) \in L^p$ and there is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\Lambda^\sigma(uv)\|_{L^p} \leq C (\|u\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Lambda^\sigma v\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|\Lambda^\sigma u\|_{L^{p_3}} \|v\|_{L^{p_4}}) \quad (3.4)$$

(iii) *Assume that $u, v \in \dot{H}^\sigma$. If $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, there is a positive constant C (depending on σ), such that*

$$\|[\Lambda^\sigma, u]v\|_{L^p} \leq C \|\Lambda^\sigma u\|_{L^p} \|v\|_{L^\infty}. \quad (3.5)$$

If, on the other hand, $\sigma > 1$, there exists a positive constant C (depending on σ) such that

$$\|[\Lambda^\sigma, u]v\|_{L^p} \leq C (\|Du\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Lambda^{\sigma-1} v\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|\Lambda^\sigma u\|_{L^{p_3}} \|v\|_{L^{p_4}}). \quad (3.6)$$

In order to state the particular cases of the Kato-Ponce-Li inequality used throughout this work (see [8, Theorem 1.2, eq. (1.6)]), we first introduce the following notation. Let $\sigma > 0$. For any pair of given functions f and g we define its Kato-Ponce-Li commutator as

$$\mathbb{K}_\sigma(f, g) := \Lambda^\sigma(fg) - \sum_{|\beta| \leq \sigma} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta f \Lambda^{\sigma, \beta} g, \quad (3.7)$$

where, for any multi-index β , the operator $\Lambda^{\sigma, \beta}$ is defined via Fourier transform as

$$\widehat{\Lambda^{\sigma, \beta} g}(\xi) = \widehat{\Lambda^{\sigma, \beta}}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\xi) \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{\Lambda^{\sigma, \beta}}(\xi) := i^{-|\beta|} D_\xi^\beta (|\xi|^\sigma).$$

Observe that if $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ we have that $\mathbb{K}_\sigma(f, g) = [\Lambda^\sigma, f]g$. The following result can be found in [8, Theorem 1.2, eq. (1.6)].

Lemma 4. *Let $\sigma > 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Then, there is a positive constant $C = C(d, \sigma)$ such that, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\|\mathbb{K}_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Lambda^\sigma f\|_{BMO} \|g\|_{L^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

In particular, if $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, it holds that

$$\|[\Lambda^\sigma, f]g\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Lambda^\sigma f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Lemma 5. *Let $s > 0$. Suppose that $g \in H^s \cap L^\infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^{[s]}(\text{Range}(g))$. Then $f(g) \in H^s \cap L^\infty$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ depending on s and $\|g\|_{L^\infty}$, such that*

$$\|D_x^s f(g)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[s]}} \|D^s g\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.10)$$

In particular, for $s \in (0, 1]$,

$$\|\Lambda^s f(g)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[s]}} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^2},$$

where the constant C depends only on s and $\|g\|_{L^\infty}$.

Now, we establish the Sobolev embedding theorem.

Lemma 6. *The space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ embeds continuously in the Lebesgue space $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, if $0 \leq s < \frac{d}{2}$ and $2 \leq p \leq \frac{2d}{d-2s}$.*

4. COMMUTATOR ESTIMATES

In this section we establish some commutator estimates involving the operators D^γ , Λ^σ and $J_\epsilon = \eta_\epsilon * \cdot$. We constantly make use of the following estimates: Assume that $f \in \dot{H}^\sigma$ for any $\sigma \in [\alpha, s + \alpha]$. Then, if $\alpha + |\beta| + r \in [\alpha, s + \alpha]$ we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\beta f\|_{H^r}^2 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{2\alpha} (1 + |\xi|^2)^r |\xi|^{2|\beta|} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq C_0 \left[\int_{|\xi| \leq 1} |\xi|^{2\alpha} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi + \int_{|\xi| \geq 1} |\xi|^{2(s+\alpha)} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right] \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha D^\beta f\|_{H^r} \leq C [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}].$$

Similarly, if $|\beta| + r \in [\alpha, s + \alpha]$ with $|\beta| \geq 1$,

$$\|D^\beta f\|_{H^r} \leq C [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}].$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Assume that $f \in \dot{H}^\alpha \cap \widehat{H}^s \cap \dot{H}^{s+\alpha}$ and $g \in H^m$ for some integer $1 \leq m \leq s$. Then, for any multi-index γ with $|\gamma| = m$, there is a positive constant C , depending only on α, m, d and s such that,*

$$\|[D^\gamma, f]g\|_{H^\alpha} \leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|g\|_{H^m}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. First, we apply the non-homogeneous dyadic blocks Δ_j to obtain the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, f]g\} &= D^\gamma \{[\Delta_j, f]g\} + [D^\gamma, f]\Delta_j g - [\Delta_j, f]D^\gamma g \\ &=: \mathcal{K}_1^j + \mathcal{K}_2^j + \mathcal{K}_3^j, \end{aligned}$$

so that,

$$2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, f]g\}\|_{L^2} \leq 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_1^j\|_{L^2} + 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_2^j\|_{L^2} + 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_3^j\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

By standard commutator estimates (see, [2, Lemma 2.97] and [4, Proposition 1.5.10]), there is a positive constant

$$\|\mathcal{K}_2^j\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(m-1)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{K}_3^j\|_{L^2} \leq C 2^{-j} \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma g\|_{L^2},$$

The assumptions, $\nabla f \in H^{s-1}$ and $s-1 > \frac{d}{2}$, imply that

$$2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, f]g\}\|_{L^2} \leq 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_1^j\|_{L^2} + C \|f\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \left(2^{j(m-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2} + 2^{j(\alpha-1)} \|g\|_{H^m} \right). \quad (4.2)$$

In order to estimate \mathcal{K}_1^j we use the Leibniz rule to decompose it as

$$\mathcal{K}_1^j = D^\gamma \{[\Delta_j, f]g\} = [\Delta_j, f]D^\gamma g + \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} \mathcal{M}(\beta, j),$$

where $C_{\beta, \gamma} = \frac{\gamma!}{\beta!(\alpha-\beta)!}$ and for each $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with $0 < \beta \leq \gamma$,

$$\mathcal{M}(\beta, j) := \Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g) - D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g.$$

Note that the first term in \mathcal{K}_1^j and $-\mathcal{K}_3^j$ coincide, so that

$$2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_1^j\|_{L^2} \leq C 2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma g\|_{L^2} + \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{M}(\beta, j)\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Although the terms within $\mathcal{M}(\beta, j)$ are commutators of the dyadic block operator Δ_j , we cannot apply to them the standard commutator estimate ([2, Lemma 2.97]) since it requires the L^∞ control on $D^{|\beta|+1}f$ for $|\beta| \geq 1$. Instead, we use a combination of the fractional Leibniz rule and the Sobolev embedding theorem to obtain proper estimates for these terms. Observe that

$$\sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{M}(\beta, j)\|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} [2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g)\|_{L^2} + 2^{j\alpha} \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{L^2}] \quad (4.4)$$

For the terms with $|\beta| = 1$ apply the fractional Leibniz rule (3.4) with $p_3 = p_4 = 4$, $p_1 = \infty$ and $p_2 = 2$,

$$\|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} \leq C (\|\Lambda^\alpha D^\beta f\|_{L^4} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^4} + \|D^\beta f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\alpha D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^2}).$$

If $d = 3$ the Sobolev embedding theorem yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} &\leq C (\|\Lambda^\alpha D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{H^1} + \|D^\beta f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\alpha D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{2+\alpha}}) \|g\|_{H^m} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{H^m} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^2} &\leq \|D^\beta f\|_{L^4} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^4} \leq C \|D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{H^1} \\ &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^2}) \|g\|_{H^m}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2 + \alpha < 3 \leq s$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for all } \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \text{ with } |\beta| = 1, \\ &\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{L^2} + \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} \\ &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}) \|g\|_{H^m}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Similarly, by the fractional Leibniz rule with $p_i = 4$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and the embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^4$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for all } \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \text{ with } 2 \leq |\beta| \leq m-1, \\
& \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C (\|D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{H^1} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{H^1} \\
& \quad + \|D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|\Lambda^\alpha D^{\gamma-\beta} g\|_{H^1}) \\
& \leq C (\|\nabla f\|_{H^{m-1}} \|g\|_{H^{m-1}} + [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+\alpha}}] \|g\|_{H^{m-1}} \\
& \quad + \|\nabla f\|_{H^{m-1}} \|g\|_{H^m}) \\
& \leq C (\|\nabla f\|_{H^{m-1}} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+\alpha}}) \|g\|_{H^m}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

For the case in which $\beta = \gamma$ in (4.4) we have to distinguish the cases $|\gamma| = 1$, $2 \leq |\gamma| \leq s-1$ and $|\gamma| = s$. The fractional Leibniz rule combined with the embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^4$, yields

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha(D^\gamma f g)\|_{L^2} \leq C \begin{cases} \|D^\gamma f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\alpha g\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma f\|_{H^1} \|g\|_{H^1} & \text{if } |\gamma| = m = 1, \\ \|D^\gamma f\|_{H^1} \|\Lambda^\alpha g\|_{H^1} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma f\|_{H^1} \|g\|_{H^1} & \text{if } 2 \leq |\gamma| = m \leq s-1. \end{cases}$$

If $|\gamma| = m = s$, we use the fractional commutator estimate (3.5) and the fact that $s > \frac{d}{2} + \alpha$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Lambda^\alpha(D^\gamma f g)\|_{L^2} & \leq \|[\Lambda^\alpha, D^\gamma f]g\|_{L^2} + \|D^\gamma f \Lambda^\alpha g\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+\alpha}} \|g\|_{L^\infty} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|\Lambda^\alpha g\|_{L^\infty} \\
& \leq C [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}] \|g\|_{H^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $1 \leq |\gamma| \leq s$, the following estimate holds

$$\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\gamma f g)\|_{L^2} \right) \leq C [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}] \|g\|_{H^m}. \tag{4.7}$$

By applying Hölder's inequality in the second term of (4.4), we obtain the following estimates

$$\text{for all } \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \text{ with } |\beta| = 1, \quad \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(m-1)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for all } \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \text{ with } 2 \leq |\beta| \leq m-1, \\
& \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \leq \|D^\beta f\|_{L^4} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{L^4} \leq C \|D^\beta f\|_{H^1} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{H^1} \\
& \leq C [\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}] 2^{j(m-1)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Similarly, if $\beta = \gamma$ we have

$$\|D^\gamma f \Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \leq C \begin{cases} \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2} & \text{if } |\gamma| = m = 1 \\ \|D^\gamma f\|_{H^1} \|\Delta_j g\|_{H^1} & \text{if } 2 \leq |\gamma| = m \leq s-1, \\ \|D^\gamma f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^\infty} & m = |\gamma| = s. \end{cases}$$

Since $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, for any $1 \leq |\gamma| \leq s$, we deduce that

$$\|D^\gamma f \Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{H}^m} \|\Delta_j g\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{H}^m} 2^{j(m-1)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2}. \tag{4.10}$$

As a consequence of (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10) we obtain the estimate

$$\sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} \Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) 2^{j(m-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2}.$$

By applying this estimate in (4.4) and using the resulting inequality in (4.3), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{K}_1^j\|_{L^2} &\leq C 2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma g\|_{L^2} + \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) 2^{j(m-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Therefore, by using estimate (4.11) in (4.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, f]g\}\|_{L^2} &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left[2^{j(\alpha-1)} \|g\|_{H^m} + 2^{j(m-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j(D^\beta f D^{\gamma-\beta} g)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, estimates (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, f]g\}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left[\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j(\alpha-1)} \right)^{1/2} \|g\|_{H^m} + \left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j(m-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j g\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \|g\|_{H^m} \right] \\ &\leq C (\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|g\|_{H^m}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends on α, d, m and s . We conclude the result. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer, $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\gamma| = m \in [1, s]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Assume that $G \in \dot{H}^\alpha \cap \dot{H}^{s+\alpha} \cap \dot{H}^s$ is a $p \times p$ matrix-valued function and that $w \in H^m, h \in H^\alpha$ are \mathbb{R}^p -valued vector fields. Then, there is a positive constant C , depending only on α, m, d and s such that the following statements hold:*

(I1) *If $w \in H^{m+\alpha}$, then*

$$|\langle D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]w\}, h \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) (\|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha} + \|\Lambda^\alpha w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{L^2}). \quad (4.12)$$

(I2) *If $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $w \in H^m$, then*

$$|\langle D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]w\}, h \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}. \quad (4.13)$$

(I3) *If $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $s > \frac{d}{2} + 2\alpha$ and $w \in H^m$, then estimate (4.13) remains valid.*

Proof. We begin with the identity

$$D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]w\} = \Lambda^{2\alpha} \{[D^\gamma, G]w\} + [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]D^\gamma w - [D^\gamma, G]\Lambda^{2\alpha} w.$$

Consequently, by the self-adjointness of Λ^α ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]w\}, h \rangle_{L^2} &= \langle \Lambda^\alpha \{[D^\gamma, G]w\}, \Lambda^\alpha h \rangle_{L^2} + \langle [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]D^\gamma w, h \rangle_{L^2} - \langle [D^\gamma, G]\Lambda^{2\alpha} w, h \rangle_{L^2} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, in all cases, estimate (4.1) implies that,

$$|I_1| \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

For I_2 we use the self-adjointness of $\Lambda^{2\alpha}$ in order to have

$$I_2 = - \langle D^\gamma w, [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G^\top]h \rangle_{L^2}$$

and thus,

$$|I_2| \leq \|D^\gamma w\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G^\top]h\|_{L^2}.$$

Assume that $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. By setting $\sigma = 2\alpha \leq 1$ in lemma 4, we obtain the existence of a constant $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ such that,

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G^\top]h\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{L^\infty}\|h\|_{L^2}. \quad (4.14)$$

On the other hand, if $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $1 \leq \sigma = 2\alpha < 2$ and the Kato-Ponce-Li inequality in Lemma 4 yields the estimate

$$\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G^\top h) - G^\top \Lambda^{2\alpha}h - \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j G^\top \Lambda^{2\alpha, e_j} h\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{BMO}\|h\|_{L^2}.$$

Then, by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G^\top]h\|_{L^2} &\leq C\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{BMO}\|h\|_{L^2} + \sum_{j=1}^d \|\partial_j G^\top \Lambda^{2\alpha, e_j} h\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left[\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{BMO}\|h\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^{2\alpha-1}h\|_{L^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Using the embedding $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \dot{H}^{d/2} \hookrightarrow BMO$ and the assumption $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, we obtain the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{BMO} \leq C\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2}} \leq C\|G\|_{\dot{H}^{2\alpha+\frac{d}{2}}} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})$$

As a consequence of (4.14) and (4.15), for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that,

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G^\top]h\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|\Lambda^\alpha h\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$|I_2| \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|w\|_{H^m}\|h\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

We prove estimates (4.12) and (4.13) under the assumptions (I1) and (I2). Apply the standard commutator estimates for D^γ ([4, Proposition 1.5.10]) in I_3 to obtain,

$$|I_3| \leq C\|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}w\|_{H^{m-1}}\|h\|_{L^2}$$

and thus, the embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ yields,

$$|I_3| \leq C\|\nabla G\|_{H^{s-1}} \begin{cases} \|w\|_{H^m}\|h\|_{L^2} & 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \|\Lambda^\alpha w\|_{H^m}\|h\|_{L^2} & \frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1. \end{cases}$$

After combining the estimates for I_1 , I_2 and I_3 , the statements in (I1) and (I2) follow.

Now assume that $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $s > \frac{d}{2} + 2\alpha$. By the Leibniz rule,

$$I_3 = - \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta, \gamma} \langle D^\beta G D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, h \rangle_{L^2}.$$

We split this sum according to the size of $|\beta|$:

$$I_3 = I_{3,1} + I_{3,2} + I_{3,3}$$

where

$$I_{3,1} := - \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ |\beta|=1}} C_{\beta,\gamma} \langle D^\beta G D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, h \rangle_{L^2}, \quad I_{3,2} := - \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ 2 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-1}} C_{\beta,\gamma} \langle D^\beta G D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, h \rangle_{L^2}$$

and $I_{3,3} := - \langle D^\gamma G \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, h \rangle_{L^2}$.

Here and below, empty sums are understood to be zero. By using the self-adjointness of Λ^α we can write $I_{3,1}$ as

$$I_{3,1} = - \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ |\beta|=1}} C_{\beta,\gamma} \langle D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^\alpha w, \Lambda^\alpha (D^\beta G^\top h) \rangle_{L^2}$$

and thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the commutator estimate in lemma 4 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{3,1}| &\leq \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ |\beta|=1}} C_{\beta,\gamma} \|D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^\alpha w\|_{L^2} (\|[\Lambda^\alpha, D^\beta G^\top] h\|_{L^2} + \|D^\beta G^\top \Lambda^\alpha h\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \|w\|_{H^m} (\|\Lambda^\alpha \nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Since, by hypothesis, $G \in \dot{H}^{s+\alpha}$ and $\nabla G \in H^{s-1}$ we infer that $\nabla G \in H^{s+\alpha-1}$, which in turn implies that $\Lambda^\alpha \nabla G \in H^{s-1}$. Therefore, by the embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$,

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha \nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|\Lambda^\alpha \nabla G\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})$$

and thus,

$$|I_{3,1}| \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

For $I_{3,2}$, we write

$$I_{3,2} := - \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ 2 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-1}} C_{\beta,\gamma} \langle D^{\gamma-\beta} \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, D^\beta G^\top h \rangle_{L^2}$$

and since, $|\beta| \geq 2$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies the estimate

$$|I_{3,2}| \leq C \|w\|_{H^m} \sum_{\substack{\beta \leq \gamma \\ 2 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-1}} \|D^\beta G^\top h\|_{L^2}.$$

By applying Hölder's inequality with $p = \frac{d}{d-2\alpha}$ and $q = \frac{d}{2\alpha}$ we obtain

$$\|D^\beta G^\top h\|_{L^2} \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |D^\beta G|^\frac{d}{\alpha} dx \right)^\frac{\alpha}{d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |h|^\frac{2d}{d-2\alpha} dx \right)^\frac{d-2\alpha}{2d}.$$

Given that $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $d = 2, 3$, it holds that, $2 < \frac{d}{\alpha} < 6$ and we can apply the continuous embeddings $\dot{H}^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\frac{2d}{d-2\alpha}$ and $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^\frac{d}{\alpha}$ to the right-hand side of the last inequality and thus obtain,

$$\|D^\beta G^\top h\|_{L^2} \leq C \|D^\beta G\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha}.$$

Since, in $I_{3,2}$, $|\beta| \leq |\gamma| - 1$, we conclude that

$$|I_{3,2}| \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

For $I_{3,3}$ we have to distinguish three cases, namely, $|\gamma| = 1$, $2 \leq |\gamma| \leq s-1$ and $|\gamma| = s$. We assume first that $|\gamma| = 1$ and proceed as in the estimate for $I_{3,1}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{3,3}| &= |\langle \Lambda^\alpha w, \Lambda^\alpha (D^\gamma G^\top h) \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C \|w\|_{H^1} (\|\Lambda^\alpha \nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}) \\ &\leq (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

If $2 \leq |\gamma| \leq s-1$ we argue as in the estimate for $I_{3,2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{3,3}| &= |\langle \Lambda^{2\alpha} w, D^\gamma G^\top h \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C \|w\|_{H^2} \|D^\gamma G\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} \\ &\leq (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^2} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $|\gamma| = s$ we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain,

$$|I_{3,3}| \leq \|D^\gamma G \Lambda^{2\alpha} w\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2} \leq \|D^\gamma G\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} w\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, by the assumption $s > \frac{d}{2} + 2\alpha$, we apply the embedding $H^{s-2\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ and thus,

$$|I_{3,3}| \leq (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^s} \|h\|_{L^2}.$$

Hence, for any $1 \leq |\gamma| = m \leq s$,

$$|I_{3,3}| \leq (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|w\|_{H^m} \|h\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

Thus, statement (I3) is satisfied. This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m \in [0, s]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Assume that $G \in \dot{H}^\alpha \cap \dot{H}^{s+\alpha} \cap \widehat{H}^s$ is a square matrix of order p and $v \in H^m$ is a vector field with range in \mathbb{R}^p . There is a positive constant C depending only on d, s and α such that,*

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]g\|_{H^m} \leq C (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|v\|_{H^m}$$

Proof. First observe that

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]v\|_{H^m}^2 \leq \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \|D^\gamma \{[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]v\}\|_{H^\alpha}^2 = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2\alpha j} \|\Delta_j D^\gamma \{[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]v\}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.16)$$

Hence, we concentrate on estimating the L^2 norms of $\Delta_j D^\gamma \{[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]v\}$ for each $j \geq -1$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\gamma| \leq m$. Observe that, for each $j \geq -1$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j D^\gamma \{[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]v\} &= \Delta_j \{\mathbb{J}_\epsilon [D^\gamma, G]v\} + \Delta_j \{[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]D^\gamma v\} - \Delta_j \{[D^\gamma, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon v\} \\ &=: \mathcal{L}_1^j + \mathcal{L}_2^j + \mathcal{L}_3^j. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate each term \mathcal{L}_k^j , we apply the block operator Δ_j into each commutator to obtain a second decomposition as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1^j &= \mathbb{J}_\epsilon (D^\gamma \{[\Delta_j, G]v\} + [D^\gamma, G]\Delta_j v - [\Delta_j, G]D^\gamma v), \\ \mathcal{L}_2^j &= \mathbb{J}_\epsilon \{[\Delta_j, G]D^\gamma v\} + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\Delta_j D^\gamma v - [\Delta_j, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon D^\gamma v, \\ \mathcal{L}_3^j &= D^\gamma \{[\Delta_j, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon v\} + [D^\gamma, G]\Delta_j \mathbb{J}_\epsilon v - [\Delta_j, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon D^\gamma v. \end{aligned}$$

By the commutator estimates for the operators D^γ and Δ_j (see, [2, Lemma 2.97] and [4, Proposition 1.5.10]),

$$2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_1^j\|_{L^2} \leq 2^{j\alpha} \|D^\gamma \{[\Delta_j, G]v\}\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(|\gamma|-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j v\|_{L^2} + C 2^{j(\alpha-1)} \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}.$$

Observe that the first term in \mathcal{L}_1^j coincides with \mathcal{K}_1^j defined in the proof of theorem 4.1 and thus, by (4.11),

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_1^j\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left(2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + 2^{j(|\gamma|-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j v\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 < \beta \leq \gamma} C_{\beta,\gamma} 2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j (D^\beta G D^{\gamma-\beta} v)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as a consequence of (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7), it follows that

$$\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_1^j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|v\|_{H^m}.$$

The same estimate can be obtained for \mathcal{L}_3^j .

The commutator estimates for the operator Δ_j (see, [2, Lemma 2.97]), yield

$$2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_2^j\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) 2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + 2^{j\alpha} \|[J_\epsilon, G] \Delta_j D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}.$$

Observe that we cannot apply the commutator estimates for the operator \mathbb{J}_ϵ (see, [4, Section 1.5.4]) directly to the remaining term in the last inequality, since it would yield upper bounds involving $\|v\|_{H^{m+\alpha}}$. Instead, we treat this term by a duality argument. Indeed, set $h = \Delta_j D^\gamma v$ and use the self-adjointness of \mathbb{J}_ϵ on L^2 to show that

$$\langle [J_\epsilon, G] h, \varphi \rangle_{L^2} = -\langle h, [J_\epsilon, G^\top] \varphi \rangle_{L^2} \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in L^2.$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and by [4, Lemma 1.5.2], we have

$$|\langle [J_\epsilon, G] h, \varphi \rangle_{L^2}| \leq \|h\|_{H^{-1}} \|[J_\epsilon, G^\top] \varphi\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{H^{-1}},$$

for some positive constant C independent of h , G and φ . Hence,

$$\|[J_\epsilon, G] h\|_{L^2} = \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2}=1} |\langle [J_\epsilon, G] h, \varphi \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{H^{-1}}. \quad (4.17)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_2^j\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left(2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + 2^{j\alpha} \|\Delta_j D^\gamma v\|_{H^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left(2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + 2^{j(|\gamma|-1+\alpha)} \|\Delta_j v\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \left(2^{(\alpha-1)j} \|v\|_{H^m} + 2^{jm} \|\Delta_j v\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\sum_{j \geq -1} 2^{2j\alpha} \|\mathcal{L}_2^j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|v\|_{H^m}.$$

After collecting all the estimates for \mathcal{L}_1^j , \mathcal{L}_2^j , \mathcal{L}_3^j and using (4.16) we conclude the result. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given and let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer. Assume that G is $p \times p$ matrix-valued function and that w is a \mathbb{R}^p -valued vector field. Then, there is a positive constant C depending only on d , s and α such that the following statements are satisfied.*

(i) *If $w \in H^{s-\alpha}$ and $G \in \hat{H}^s$, then*

$$\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha} [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G] w\|_{L^2} \leq C \|G\|_{\hat{H}^s} \|w\|_{H^{s-1}} \quad (4.18)$$

and $\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha} [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G] w\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(ii) Set $s_\alpha := \max\{1, 2\alpha\}$. If $s > \frac{d}{2} + s_\alpha$, $G \in \widehat{H}^s$ and $w \in H^{s-s_\alpha}$, then

$$\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \leq C\|G\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|w\|_{H^{s-s_\alpha}} \quad (4.19)$$

and $\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

(iii) If $G \in \dot{H}^\alpha \cap \widehat{H}^s \cap \dot{H}^{s+\alpha}$ and $w \in H^s$ we have that

$$\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|w\|_{H^s} \quad (4.20)$$

and $\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. (i) Let us first assume that $w \in H^{s-\alpha}$ and notice that,

$$\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w = \mathbb{J}_\epsilon[\Lambda^{s-\alpha}, G]w + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\Lambda^{s-\alpha}w - [\Lambda^{s-\alpha}, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon w.$$

By the fractional Leibniz rule and the duality argument that led us to (4.17) it follows that,

$$\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha-1}w\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}G\|_{L^2}\|w\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}w\|_{H^{-1}}).$$

Then, estimate (4.18) is a consequence of applying the Sobolev embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ into the last inequality.

(ii) Now assume that $s > \frac{d}{2} + s_\alpha$ and $w \in H^{s-s_\alpha}$. Let $\{\varphi_m\} \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that $\varphi_m \rightarrow w$ in H^{s-s_α} . Since, $\varphi_m \in H^{s-\alpha}$, we apply the decomposition

$$\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m = \mathbb{J}_\epsilon[\Lambda^{s-\alpha}, G]\varphi_m + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\Lambda^{s-\alpha}\varphi_m - [\Lambda^{s-\alpha}, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m$$

Then, as in step (i), for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that,

$$\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|\varphi_m\|_{H^{s-\alpha-1}} + \|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}G\|_{L^2}\|\varphi_m\|_{L^\infty}),$$

Therefore, by the embeddings $H^{s-s_\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ and $H^{s-s_\alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{s-\alpha-1}$ we obtain that

$$\|\Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m\|_{L^2} \leq C\|G\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|\varphi_m\|_{H^{s-s_\alpha}} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consequently, for every $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that,

$$|\langle [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m, \Lambda^{s-\alpha}\phi \rangle_{L^2}| = |\langle \Lambda^{s-\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m, \phi \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C\|G\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|\varphi_m\|_{H^{s-s_\alpha}}\|\phi\|_{L^2}.$$

Since, $[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m \rightarrow [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w$ in L^2 , for any $\epsilon > 0$, it follows that

$$|\langle [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w, \Lambda^{s-\alpha}\phi \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C\|G\|_{\widehat{H}^s}\|w\|_{H^{s-s_\alpha}}\|\phi\|_{L^2}, \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathcal{S}.$$

The estimate (4.19) now follows by the Riesz representation theorem.

(iii) Assume that $w \in H^s$. Since

$$\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{L^2} \leq \|\Lambda^\alpha[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w\|_{H^s},$$

(4.20) is a consequence of theorem 4.3.

Now, we prove the convergence assertion in case (iii). Let $\{\varphi_m\} \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that, $\varphi_m \rightarrow w$ in H^s . In order to prove the convergence to zero in L^2 , we fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and use the following decomposition,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m &= \mathbb{J}_\epsilon[\Lambda^{s+\alpha}, G]\varphi_m + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m - [\Lambda^{s+\alpha}, G]\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m \\ &=: I_{1,\epsilon}^m + I_{2,\epsilon}^m - I_{3,\epsilon}^m. \end{aligned}$$

By [4, Lemma 1.5.2], $I_{2,\epsilon}^m \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Meanwhile, since $\Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m)$, $G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m$ and $\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m$ belong to L^2 , it follows that

$$\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m) \rightarrow \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m), \quad \mathbb{J}_\epsilon(G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m) \rightarrow G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m \quad \text{and} \quad G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m \rightarrow G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m$$

in L^2 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, by the fractional Leibniz rule combined with the embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ we have the estimate

$$\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m) - \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{L^\infty}\|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m - \varphi_m\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}\|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m - \varphi_m\|_{H^{s-1}}),$$

which goes to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (I_{1,\epsilon}^m - I_{3,\epsilon}^m) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\mathbb{J}_\epsilon \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m) - \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m) - \mathbb{J}_\epsilon(G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m) + G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\mathbb{J}_\epsilon\varphi_m) \\ &= \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m) - \Lambda^{s+\alpha}(G\varphi_m) - G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m + G\Lambda^{s+\alpha}\varphi_m = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe that, as a consequence of (4.20),

$$\|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]w - \Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\varphi_m\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|w - \varphi_m\|_{H^s}$$

and the result follows. The convergence statements in (i) and (ii) are obtained by the same argument, replacing $\Lambda^{s+\alpha}$ by $\Lambda^{s-\alpha}$ and by using estimates (4.18) and (4.19), respectively. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Assume that $f \in \dot{H}^\alpha \cap \widehat{H}^s \cap \dot{H}^{s+\alpha}$ and $g \in H^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq m \leq s$. Then, there is a positive constant C depending only on α, m, d and s , such that*

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq C(\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|g\|_{H^m}. \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. First, notice that if $m = 1$ the result follows directly from the L^2 estimates for the commutator of $\Lambda^{2\alpha}$. Indeed, if $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we use (3.9) and if $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$ we apply (3.6) with $p_1 = \infty, p_2 = 2, p_3 = p_4 = 4$ together with the embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^4$.

Then, we assume $2 \leq m \leq s$. Given that

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq C(\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{m-1}[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g\|_{L^2}),$$

it is enough to prove the required estimate for the term $\Lambda^{m-1}[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g$. By using the identity

$$\Lambda^{m-1}[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, f]g = [\Lambda^{m-1+2\alpha}, f]g - [\Lambda^{m-1}, f]\Lambda^{2\alpha}g,$$

the result reduces to estimate the L^2 norm of each commutator separately. If $2 \leq m \leq s-1$ we proceed as in the case above. If, on the other hand, $m = s$ we apply (3.6) with $p_1 = \infty, p_2 = 2, p_3 = 2$ and $p_4 = \infty$ together with the embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow L^\infty$. \square

5. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS FOR LINEARIZED FRACTIONAL SYSTEMS

In this section we establish the basic structural assumptions for the following linearized system of equations,

$$A^0(\tilde{U})\partial_t U + A^j(\tilde{U})\partial_j U + D(\tilde{U})U + B(\tilde{U})\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + H(\tilde{U})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})]\mathcal{L}U = F, \quad (5.1)$$

The initial data is prescribed at $t = 0$,

$$U|_{t=0} = U_0. \quad (5.2)$$

Here, U denotes the unknown variable and is such that $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$, for some $T > 0$. For each $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$, an open convex set of \mathbb{R}^N , the coefficients $A^0(\tilde{U}), A^j(\tilde{U}), D(\tilde{U}), B(\tilde{U}), H(\tilde{U})$ and $G(\tilde{U})$ in (5.1) are real matrices of order $N \times N$ and \mathcal{L} is a constant real matrix of the same order. We make the following assumptions for the linear system (5.1).

- Condition 1.** (C1) *The functions $A^0(\tilde{U}), A^j(\tilde{U}), D(\tilde{U}), B(\tilde{U}), H(\tilde{U})$ and $G(\tilde{U})$ are smooth in $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$.*
(C2) *$A^0(\tilde{U})$ is real symmetric and positive definite for $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$.*
(C3) *$A^j(\tilde{U})$ are real symmetric for each $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$.*

(C4) There is a partition in the vector functions $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$ and $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ so that,

$$\tilde{U}(x, t) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})^\top(x, t), \quad \text{and} \quad U(x, t) = (u, v)^\top(x, t),$$

with $\tilde{u}(x, t), u(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\tilde{v}(x, t), v(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $N = k + m$, for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$.

(C5) For each $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$, $B(\tilde{U}) \geq 0$. Moreover, $B(\tilde{U})$ is of the form,

$$B(\tilde{U}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times k} & \mathbb{O}_{k \times m} \\ \mathbb{O}_{m \times k} & B_0(\tilde{U}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $B_0(\tilde{U})$ is a real symmetric positive definite matrix of order $m \times m$ for all $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$ and there is a positive constant $\mu_0 > 0$ such that,

$$\text{for all } v \in H^\alpha, \quad \langle B_0(\tilde{U})\Lambda^{2\alpha}v, v \rangle_{L^2} \geq \mu_0 \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{L^2}^2.$$

(C6) There are matrices H_0 and G_0 of order $m \times m$ that are smooth functions only on $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that for any $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$,

$$H(\tilde{U}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times k} & \mathbb{O}_{k \times m} \\ \mathbb{O}_{m \times k} & H_0(\tilde{v}) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad G(\tilde{U}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times k} & \mathbb{O}_{k \times m} \\ \mathbb{O}_{m \times k} & G_0(\tilde{v}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.4)$$

(C7) \mathcal{L} is a constant square matrix of order N .

Condition 2. Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ be arbitrary. For $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})(x, t)$, given functions on Q_T , we assume the following conditions.

(A1) $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$, $\tilde{v} \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s+\alpha})$.

(A2) $\partial_t \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1})$. If $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, we assume that $\partial_t \tilde{v} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-1})$ and, if on the other hand, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we assume that $\partial_t \tilde{v} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-1})$.

(A3) $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}_1$ for any $(x, t) \in Q_T$, where \mathcal{O}_1 is an open bounded convex set in \mathbb{R}^N satisfying $\mathcal{O}_1 \subset \mathcal{O}$.

Remark 1. Observe that, by conditions (A2) and (C3) there are positive constants $a_0 = a_0(\mathcal{O}_1)$ and $a_1 = a_1(\mathcal{O}_1)$ such that,

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, T], \quad a_0 |V|^2 \leq (A^0(\tilde{U}(t))V, V)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \leq a_1 |V|^2$$

In the following sections we assume that the constant matrix \mathcal{L} is either the identity matrix \mathbb{I}_N or the matrix \mathcal{L} defined in (2.1). In the second case, for every $U = (u, v)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_N U = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times 1} \\ \mathcal{L}_0 u \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.5)$$

We show that the estimates for the commutator term in (5.1) can be absorbed by the dissipation if, in addition to condition 1, one of the following hypotheses holds:

(E1) $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{I}_N$.

(E2) $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_N$ and $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

(E3) $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_N$, $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $s > \frac{d}{2} + 2\alpha$. Furthermore, $A^0(\tilde{U})$ has the block structure

$$A^0(\tilde{U}) = \begin{pmatrix} A_1^0(\tilde{U}) & \mathbb{O}_{k \times m} \\ \mathbb{O}_{m \times k} & A_2^0(\tilde{v}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_1^0(\tilde{U})$ and $A_2^0(\tilde{v})$ are real symmetric, positive definite matrices of order $k \times k$ and $m \times m$ for all $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{O}$.

To establish the well-posedness of the linear Cauchy problem 5.1-(5.2), we introduce the following assumptions, which will be assumed throughout the next section.

(L1) $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ is an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is fixed but arbitrary.

(L2) $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})^\top$ satisfies condition 2. Moreover, we fix a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\|\tilde{U}(t)\|_{H^s} \leq M \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.6)$$

(L3) Condition 1 is satisfied with one of the hypothesis (E1)-(E3).

5.1. Preliminary estimates. For convenience, we collect the following estimates, which will be used repeatedly throughout the remainder of the paper. Let $A = A(\tilde{U})$ denote any of the matrix coefficients in (5.1) and assume that \tilde{U} satisfies condition 2 and the uniform bound (5.6).

First note that, since $s - 1 > \frac{d}{2}$, the Sobolev embedding theorem combined with (5.6), yield

$$\|\tilde{U}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa_d M, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.7)$$

By the smoothness of A , $A(\tilde{U}) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$. Moreover, since $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}_1$, there is a positive constant $c_A(\mathcal{O}_1)$, such that

$$\|A(\tilde{U})\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_A(\mathcal{O}_1).$$

Let $m \in [1, s]$ be an integer. As a consequence of the chain rule estimates (3.1) in 2 and (5.7), there is a positive constant C , for which

$$\|\nabla^x A(\tilde{U})\|_{H^{m-1}} \leq C \|A\|_{C^m(\overline{\mathcal{O}_1})} (1 + M)^{m-1} \|\nabla \tilde{U}\|_{H^{m-1}}.$$

Hence, there is a positive constant $C_A = C_A(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$, such that

$$\|A(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{\tilde{H}^m} \leq c_A(\mathcal{O}_1) + C_A(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

Define

$$C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) := \sup_A c_A(\mathcal{O}_1) + C_A(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M,$$

where the supremum is taken over the set of all matrix coefficients A in (5.1). Similarly, for every $\sigma \in [0, s]$ we use the fractional chain rule estimates in (3.10) to ensure the existence of a constant $C = C(\mathcal{O}_1)$ such that

$$\|A(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1) \|\tilde{U}(t)\|_{H^s} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

Assume that $V \in H^m$. Then, by the Sobolev product estimates 1,

$$\|A(\tilde{U})V\|_{H^m} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|V\|_{H^m}. \quad (5.8)$$

Let $G = G(\tilde{U})$ be as in condition 1 and let $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})^\top$ satisfy condition 2. By the chain rule estimates (3.10) together with condition (C6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(\tilde{U})\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G(\tilde{U})\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} &\leq \|G_0(\tilde{v})\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G_0(\tilde{v})\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1) \left(\|\tilde{U}\|_{H^s} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

These constants may vary from line to line throughout the proofs. Whenever convenient, they will be denoted by $C_i(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$. In particular, all the coefficient estimates appearing below can be expressed in terms of the generic constant $C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$.

6. APPROXIMATE LINEARIZED SYSTEM

In this section, we establish the well-posedness of the linear Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.2).

6.1. Smoothing through Friedrichs' mollification. First, we approximate the solutions of (5.1)-(5.2) by means of the Friedrichs' mollifier, namely,

$$\mathbb{J}_\epsilon u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\eta}_\epsilon \widehat{u}) = \eta_\epsilon * u.$$

Let $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that, $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We consider the following approximation of system (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t U_n + (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \left[\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(A^j(\tilde{U}) \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \right) + \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(D(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \right) + \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(B(\tilde{U}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \right) \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(H(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})] \mathcal{L} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \right) \right] = (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (F), \end{aligned} \tag{LSn}$$

for the unknown $U_n = (u_n, v_n)^\top$, with $u_n(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $v_n(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$ and initial data,

$$U_n|_{t=0} = \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_0. \tag{6.1}$$

In order to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions for (LSn) we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $L = L(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$ be a family of linear bounded operators in a Banach space X and let $L \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{B}(X))$. Then, for any $v_0 \in X$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; X)$ the problem*

$$\begin{aligned} v'(t) &= L(t)v(t) + f(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ v(0) &= v_0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

has a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{C}((0, T); X) \cap C^1([0, T]; X)$. This means in particular that the derivative $v'(t)$ exists with respect to the norm of X in $(0, T)$ and the equation in (6.2) is satisfied pointwise.

Proposition 1. *Assume that conditions 1 and 2 are satisfied and that $F \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in [0, s]$. Then, for each fixed $t \in [0, T]$, the mapping $L(t) : H^s \rightarrow H^s$ defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} V \xrightarrow{L} & -(A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(A^j(\tilde{U}) \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) - (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(D(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) - (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(B(\tilde{U}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) \\ & - (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(H(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})] \mathcal{L} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right), \end{aligned}$$

is continuous and $L \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{B}(H^s))$. Moreover, $(A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (F) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$.

Proof. First, we estimate the H^s norm of each term separately by using the Sobolev product estimates 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(A^j(\tilde{U}) \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) \right\|_{H^s} & \leq C \|(A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1}\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \|A^j(\tilde{U})\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \partial_j V\|_{H^s} \\ & \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} \|\partial_j V\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(D(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) \right\|_{H^s} & \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|V\|_{H^s} \\ \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(B(\tilde{U}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} V \right) \right\|_{H^s} & \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} V\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left(H(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}V \right) \right\|_{H^s} \\
& \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} (G(\tilde{U}) \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}V)\|_{H^s} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (G(\tilde{U}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}V)\|_{H^s} \right) \\
& \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} \|V\|_{H^s}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

By combining (6.3), (6.4) and (6.5) we conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{\substack{V \in \widehat{H}^s \\ \|V\|_{H^s} = 1}} \|L(t)V\|_{H^s} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_n} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} \right). \tag{6.6}$$

In particular, this implies that $L \in L^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{B}(H^s))$. It remains to show that $L(t) \rightarrow L(t_0)$ in $\mathcal{B}(H^s)$ if $t \rightarrow t_0$ for any $t, t_0 \in [0, T]$. Define $L_0(t) := A^0(\tilde{U}(t))L(t)$. For any $V \in H^s$ with $\|V\|_{H^s} = 1$, the same estimates that led us to (6.3)-(6.5) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|L_0(t)V - L_0(t_0)V\|_{H^s} \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \|A^j(\tilde{U}(t)) - A^j(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} + \|D(\tilde{U}(t)) - D(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} + \|B(\tilde{U}(t)) - B(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} \\
& + \|H(\tilde{U}(t)) - H(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}V\|_{H^s} + \|H(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0))] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}V\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \|A^j(\tilde{U}(t)) - A^j(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} + \|D(\tilde{U}(t)) - D(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} + \|B(\tilde{U}(t)) - B(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} \\
& + \|H(\tilde{U}(t)) - H(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}} + \|G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\widehat{H}^s} C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{2\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The smoothness of the coefficients combined with condition 2 imply that $A^0, A^j, D, B, H, G \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \widehat{H}^s)$ (see, [1, Lemma 7.2]). Therefore, we infer that

$$\forall V \in H^s, \text{ with } \|V\|_{H^s} = 1, \quad \|L_0(t)V - L_0(t_0)V\|_{H^s} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow t_0 \tag{6.7}$$

and since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|L(t)V - L(t_0)V\|_{H^s} & \leq \left\| \left((A^0(\tilde{U}(t)))^{-1} - (A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1} \right) L_0(t)V \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1} (L_0(t) - L_0(t_0))V \right\|_{H^s} \\
& \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\|(A^0(\tilde{U}(t)))^{-1} - (A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1}\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \|L_0(t)V\|_{H^s} + \|L_0(t)V - L_0(t_0)V\|_{H^s} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

(6.6) and (6.7) yield that $L \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{B}(H^s))$. Finally, for any $t, t_0 \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(A^0(\tilde{U}(t)))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F(t) - (A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F(t_0)\|_{H^s} \\
& \leq \left\| (A^0(\tilde{U}(t)))^{-1} - (A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1} \right\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{s-\sigma}} \|F(t)\|_{H^\sigma} + \|(A^0(\tilde{U}(t_0)))^{-1}\|_{\widehat{H}^s} \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^{s-\sigma}} \|F(t) - F(t_0)\|_{H^\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof now follows. \square

Theorem 6.1. *There is a unique solution U_n of the Cauchy problem (LSn) that belongs to the space $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s) \cap \mathcal{C}^1((0, T); H^s)$ and satisfies the equation pointwise.*

Proof. By proposition 1, we can view (LSn) as the Cauchy problem (6.2) and thus, by lemma 7, there is a unique $U_n \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s) \cap \mathcal{C}^1((0, T); H^s)$ such that $U_n(0) = \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_0$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt} U_n = L(t)U_n + (A^0(\tilde{U}))^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F \in \mathcal{C}((0, T); H^s).$$

□

7. ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR FRACTIONAL SYSTEMS

In this section we prove the well-posedness of the linear Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.2). It will be useful to introduce, for any $\sigma \in [0, s]$ and any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the vector space

$$X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}^\infty := \{U = (u, v) \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^\sigma) \mid v \in L^2([0, T]; H^{\sigma+\alpha})\},$$

and for any $U \in X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}$, we define

$$E_{\sigma, \alpha}^2(U(t)) := \|U(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 d\tau \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, we define $X_{\sigma, \alpha, T} := \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma) \cap X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}^\infty$. Observe that, under the norm, $E_{\sigma, \alpha, T}(U) := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} E_{\sigma, \alpha}(U(t))$, $X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}^\infty$ and $X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}$ are Banach spaces.

Definition 7.1. *Assume condition 1 is satisfied under one of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3). Let \tilde{U} satisfy condition 2. For a fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we introduce the family of operators $\{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$, defined as follows. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and let $U = (u, v)^\top$ be such that the expressions below are well defined. For each $t \in [0, T]$, we set*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma U)(t) &:= B(\tilde{U}(t)) \Lambda^{2\alpha} D^\gamma U(t) + H(\tilde{U}(t)) D^\gamma \left\{ [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathcal{L}U(t) \right\} \\ &\quad + [D^\gamma, H(\tilde{U}(t))] [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathcal{L}U(t). \end{aligned}$$

For the regularized problem (LSn), we similarly introduce the family of operators $\{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^{\gamma, n}\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^{\gamma, n} U)(t) &:= B(\tilde{U}(t)) \Lambda^{2\alpha} D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U(t) + H(\tilde{U}(t)) D^\gamma \left\{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}U(t) \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \left([D^\gamma, H(\tilde{U}(t))] \left\{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}U(t) \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7.1. *Assume conditions (L1)-(L3) hold. Then, there exists a nonnegative function $\omega \in L^1([0, T])$, depending only on \tilde{U} , M and \mathcal{O}_1 , such that for any integer $m \in [1, s]$, the following statements hold.*

(i) *If $U \in X_{s+\alpha, \alpha, T}^\infty$,*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \left\langle (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma U)(t), D^\gamma U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{H^m}^2 - \omega(t) \|U(t)\|_{H^m}^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (7.1)$$

(ii) *If $U \in X_{s, \alpha, T}^\infty$,*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \left\langle (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^{\gamma, n} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U)(t), D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v(t)\|_{H^m}^2 - \omega(t) \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U(t)\|_{H^m}^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (7.2)$$

Proof. We first prove (i). Fix an integer $m \in [1, s]$ and let $U \in X_{s+\alpha, \alpha, T}^\infty$. Observe that, by condition (C5), we have

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \langle B_0 \Lambda^{2\alpha} D^\gamma v, D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2} \geq \mu_0 \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^m}^2.$$

Therefore, by taking the inner product in L^2 between $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}}^\gamma U$ and $D^\gamma U$, we obtain

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \left\langle (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}}^\gamma U)(t), D^\gamma U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \mu_0 \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^m}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \mathcal{C}_\gamma + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \mathcal{D}_\gamma,$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_\gamma := \langle HD^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U\}, D^\gamma U \rangle_{L^2}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_\gamma := \langle ([D^\gamma, H] \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U\}), D^\gamma U \rangle_{L^2}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with the commutator estimates for D^γ , we have

$$|\mathcal{D}_\gamma| \leq \|\nabla H\|_{H^{s-1}} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]U\|_{H^{m-1}} \|D^\gamma U\|_{L^2}.$$

Then, by using estimate (4.21) together with (5.9) and the assumption (5.6), we obtain

$$|\mathcal{D}_\gamma| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) \|U\|_{H^m}^2. \quad (7.3)$$

Now, let $\mathcal{L}U = (y, w) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$. As a consequence of condition (C6), we have

$$\mathcal{C}_\gamma = \langle D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0]w\}, H_0^\top D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Assume condition (E1) is satisfied. Then, $w = v$. Consequently, by applying estimate (4.12) in theorem 4.2 with $G = G_0$, $w = v$ and $h = H_0^\top D^\gamma v$, we obtain

$$|\mathcal{C}_\gamma| \leq C (\|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) (\|v\|_{H^m} \|H_0^\top D^\gamma v_n\|_{H^\alpha} + \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^m} \|H_0^\top D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}).$$

Using the characterization of the H^α norm, together with the Kato-Ponce-Li inequality in Lemma 4 and the estimate in (14.1) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_0^\top D^\gamma v\|_{H^\alpha} &\leq \|H_0^\top D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha (H_0^\top D^\gamma v)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|H_0\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|[\Lambda^\alpha, H_0^\top] D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|H_0^\top \Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|H_0\|_{L^\infty} (\|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}) + \|\Lambda^\alpha H_0\|_{L^\infty} \|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq (\|H_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Lambda^\alpha H_0\|_{L^\infty}) (\|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \left(\|H_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|H_0\|_{C([0, T]; \dot{H}^\alpha)} + \|H_0\|_{C([0, T]; \dot{H}^s)} \right) (\|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|D^\gamma v\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^\alpha D^\gamma v\|_{L^2}) \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

Applying the previous estimate together with (5.9), yields

$$|\mathcal{C}_\gamma| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) (\|U\|_{H^m}^2 + \|U\|_{H^m} \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^m}). \quad (7.5)$$

By Young's inequality, for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$ there is a constant $C(\mathcal{O}_1, M, \epsilon_0)$ such that

$$|\mathcal{C}_\gamma| + |\mathcal{D}_\gamma| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) \|U\|_{H^m}^2 + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M, \epsilon_0) (M^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2) \|U\|_{H^m}^2 + \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^m}^2.$$

Choosing $\epsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, yields

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq m} \left\langle (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}}^\gamma U)(t), D^\gamma U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{H^m}^2 - \omega(t) \|U(t)\|_{H^m}^2.$$

Here, the function $\omega : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined by

$$\omega(t) := C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + M^2 + \|\tilde{v}(t)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\tilde{v}(t)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2) \quad (7.6)$$

for some constant $C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$. Moreover $\omega \in L^1([0, T])$ as a consequence of condition 2. This concludes the proof under the assumption (E1).

Observe that, under the assumptions (E2) and (E3), it follows from (5.5) that $w = \mathcal{L}_0 u$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{C}_\gamma := \langle D^\gamma \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathcal{L}_0 u\}, H_0^\top D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0 u \in H^m$ for any $1 \leq m \leq s$, since \mathcal{L}_0 is constant. By applying estimate (4.13) in theorem 4.2, it holds that

$$|\mathcal{C}_\gamma| \leq C (\|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|U\|_{H^m} \|H_0^\top D^\gamma v\|_{H^\alpha}.$$

Proceeding as in the previous case and using (7.4), we recover estimate (7.5). Therefore, (7.1) holds with ω given by (7.6).

The proof of (ii) is analogous. The only difference is that the terms \mathcal{C}_γ and \mathcal{D}_γ are replaced by

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,\gamma} := \langle HD^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \{[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}U\}, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U \rangle_{L^2}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_{n,\gamma} := \langle \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} ([D^\gamma, H] \{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L}U\}, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U) \rangle_{L^2}.$$

The estimate for $\mathcal{D}_{n,\gamma}$ is obtained as in the treatment of \mathcal{D}_γ , yielding (7.3). Concerning $\mathcal{C}_{n,\gamma}$, condition (C6) and the self-adjointness of \mathbb{J}_{ϵ_n} on L^2 imply

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,\gamma} = \langle D^\gamma [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} w, \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (H_0^\top D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v) \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, the same argument used in the estimate for \mathcal{C}_γ yields (7.5). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Theorem 7.2. *Assume conditions (L1)-(L3) are satisfied. Define $\mu_1 : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as*

$$\mu_1(t) := 1 + M + M^2 + \|\tilde{v}(t)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\tilde{v}(t)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2 + \|\partial_t \tilde{U}(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}$$

which, by Condition 2, belongs to $L^1([0, T])$. Let $F = (f_1, f_2)^\top : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfy $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^m)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{m-\alpha})$. Assume moreover that $U_0 \in H^m$. Let $U_n = (u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s) \cap \mathcal{C}^1((0, T); H^s)$ be the unique solution of the Cauchy problem (LSn)-(6.1). Then, for every $t \in [0, T]$ the following estimate holds

$$\|U_n(t)\|_{H^m}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 d\tau \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^m(U_0, F, t), \quad (7.7)$$

where

$$K(t) := C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) e^{C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \int_0^t \mu_1(s) ds},$$

for some positive constants $C_0 = C_0(\mathcal{O}_1)$, $C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ and

$$\Phi_\alpha^m(U_0, F, t) := \|U_0\|_{H^m}^2 + \int_0^t (\|f_1(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 + \|f_2(\tau)\|_{H^{m-\alpha}}^2) d\tau.$$

In particular, for every integer $m \in [1, s]$, every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and every $t \in [0, T]$, the estimate

$$E_{m,\alpha,T}^2(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n(t)) \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^m(U_0, F, t) \quad (7.8)$$

holds.

Proof. Let U_n be the unique solution to the Cauchy problem (LSn). For simplicity, we omit the dependence of the coefficients on \tilde{U} . Let $m \in [1, s]$ be an integer and $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ satisfy $|\gamma| \leq m$. We apply the operator D^γ to the linear system (LSn) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t D^\gamma U_n + (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (A^j \partial_j D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) + (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (DD^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) + (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \\ + (A^0)^{-1} R_{\gamma, n}^1 + R_{\gamma, n}^2 = (A^0)^{-1} D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F + [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} (A^0)^{-1} R_{\gamma, n}^1 &:= (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} ([D^\gamma, A^j] \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) + (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} ([D^\gamma, B] \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \\ &\quad + (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} ([D^\gamma, D] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n), \\ R_{\gamma, n}^2 &:= [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \} + [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} D \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \} \\ &\quad + [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} B \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$R_{\gamma, n}^3 := [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L} U_n) \}$$

We multiply equation (7.9) by A^0 and take L^2 -inner product with $D^\gamma U_n$. Since \mathbb{J}_{ϵ_n} is self-adjoint on L^2 and each matrix A^j is symmetric, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (A^j \partial_j D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n), D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2} &= \langle A^j \partial_j D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_j A^j) D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \langle \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (B \Lambda^{2\alpha} D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n), D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2} &= \langle B \Lambda^{2\alpha} D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \langle \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (DD^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n), D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2} &= \langle DD^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by taking the inner product in L^2 between (7.9) and $D^\gamma U_n$ and using conditions (C5) and (C6) together with the definition of $(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n)$ (see theorem 7.1) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle A^0 D^\gamma U_n, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2} + \langle (\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{U}}^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n), D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n \rangle_{L^2} = \mathcal{A}_{n, \gamma} + \mathcal{B}_{n, \gamma} - \mathcal{I}_{n, \gamma} - \mathcal{J}_{n, \gamma} - \mathcal{M}_{n, \gamma}, \quad (7.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{n, \gamma} &= \langle D^\gamma F, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2} + \langle A^0 [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \mathcal{B}_{n, \gamma} &= \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_j A^j) D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2} - \langle DD^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_t A^0) D^\gamma U_n, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \mathcal{I}_{n, \gamma} &= \langle R_{\gamma, n}^1, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \mathcal{J}_{n, \gamma} &= \langle A^0 R_{\gamma, n}^2, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{n, \gamma} &= \langle A^0 R_{\gamma, n}^3, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate each term separately. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|\mathcal{B}_{n, \gamma}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\partial_j A^j\|_{L^\infty} + \|D\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t A^0\|_{L^\infty} \right) \|D^\gamma U_n\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Therefore, there is a positive constant $C = C(\mathcal{O}_1)$ such that

$$|\mathcal{B}_{n, \gamma}| \leq C \left(1 + \|\partial_t \tilde{U}\|_{H^{s-1}} + M \right) \|D^\gamma U_n\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (7.11)$$

To estimate $\mathcal{I}_{n, \gamma}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{n, \gamma}$ we apply the commutator estimates for D^γ to obtain

$$|\mathcal{I}_{n, \gamma}|, |\mathcal{J}_{n, \gamma}| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|U_n\|_{H^m}^2 + \|U_n\|_{H^m} \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^m}). \quad (7.12)$$

By the symmetry of A^0 in condition (C2), it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}_{n,\gamma} = \langle [D^\gamma, (A^0)^{-1}] \{ \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \mathcal{L} U_n) \}, (A^0)^{-1} D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Observe that the previous term has the same structure as $\mathcal{D}_{n,\gamma}$ in the proof of theorem 7.1. Therefore, proceeding exactly as in the estimate for $\mathcal{D}_{n,\gamma}$ (see, (7.3)), we obtain

$$|\mathcal{M}_{n,\gamma}| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) \|U_n\|_{H^m}^2.$$

Applying the coercivity inequality (7.2), together with the estimates for $\mathcal{B}_{n,\gamma}$, $\mathcal{I}_{n,\gamma}$, $\mathcal{J}_{n,\gamma}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{n,\gamma}$ in (7.10) and summing over $|\gamma| \in [0, m]$, we obtain the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^m \langle A^0 D^\gamma U_n, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^m}^2 - \omega(t) \|U_n\|_{H^m}^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^m |\mathcal{A}_{n,\gamma}| + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (1 + M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\partial_t \tilde{U}_n\|_{H^{s-1}}) (\|U_n\|_{H^m}^2 + \|U_n\|_{H^m} \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^m}) \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

Since $F = (f_1, f_2)^\top$, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^m |\mathcal{A}_{n,\gamma}| & \leq \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^m |\langle D^\gamma f_1, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} u_n \rangle_{L^2}| + |\langle D^\gamma f_2, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n \rangle_{L^2}| \\ & \leq \|f_1\|_{H^m} \|u_n\|_{H^m} + \|f_2\|_{L^2} \|v_n\|_{L^2} + \sum_{|\gamma|=1}^m |\langle D^\gamma f_2, D^\gamma \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n \rangle_{L^2}| \\ & \leq (\|f_1\|_{H^m} \|U_n\|_{H^m} + \|f_2\|_{H^{m-\alpha}} [\|U_n\|_{H^m} + \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^m}]). \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

Then, using the definition of ω given in (7.6) and applying Young's inequality in the right hand side of (7.13) and (7.14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^m \langle A^0 D^\gamma U_n, D^\gamma U_n \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{\mu_0}{2} \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^m}^2 \\ & \leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|f_1\|_{H^m}^2 + \|f_2\|_{H^{m-\alpha}}^2 + \mu_1(t) \|U_n\|_{H^m}^2] \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

for some positive constant $C_1 = C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$. If we integrate this inequality in the interval $[0, t]$ with $t \in (0, T]$ and use Remark 1, we can assure the existence of positive constants $a_0 = a_0(\mathcal{O}_1)$ and $a_1 = a_1(\mathcal{O}_1)$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} & a_0 \|U_n(t)\|_{H^m}^2 + \frac{\mu_0}{2} \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 d\tau \\ & \leq a_1 \|U_0\|_{H^m}^2 + C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \int_0^t [\|f_1(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 + \|f_2(\tau)\|_{H^{m-\alpha}}^2 + \mu_1(\tau) \|U_n(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2] d\tau \end{aligned}$$

Then, a standard application of Gronwall's inequality yields estimate (7.7) with

$$C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) := \frac{a_1(\mathcal{O}_1)}{\min \{a_0(\mathcal{O}_1), \frac{\mu_0}{2}\}}. \quad (7.16)$$

Finally, estimate (7.8) follows from the standard inequality,

$$\|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U_n(t)\|_{H^m} \leq \|U_n(t)\|_{H^m},$$

valid for every $t \in [0, T]$ and $\epsilon > 0$. □

The next results establish the convergence of $\{U_n\}$ to a strong solution of (5.1) under one of the assumptions (E1)-(E3). We will repeatedly use the following observation: for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $f \in H^{\sigma+\delta}$, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})f\|_{H^\sigma}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |\xi|^2)^\sigma |\widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_{n+p}\xi) - \widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_n\xi)|^{2-2\delta} |\widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_{n+p}\xi) - \widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_n\xi)|^{2\delta} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq (2\|\widehat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty})^{2-2\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |\xi|^2)^\sigma |\widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_{n+p}\xi) - \widehat{\eta}(\epsilon_n\xi)|^{2\delta} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq (2\|\widehat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty})^{2-2\delta} \|\nabla \widehat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty}^{2\delta} |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |\xi|^2)^\sigma |\xi|^{2\delta} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq C_0(\delta)^2 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2\delta} \|f\|_{H^{\sigma+\delta}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

with $C_0(\delta) := (2\|\widehat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty})^{1-\delta} \|\nabla \widehat{\eta}\|_{L^\infty}^\delta$. Similarly, since $\widehat{\eta}(0) = 1$, the same argument yields

$$\|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} - \mathbb{I})f\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq C_0(\delta) \epsilon_n^{2\delta} \|f\|_{H^{\sigma+\delta}}^2. \quad (7.18)$$

Theorem 7.3. *Under assumptions (L1)-(L3), let $U_n = (u_n, v_n)$ be the unique solution of (LSn) associated with data*

$$U_0 \in H^s, \quad f_1 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^s), \quad f_2 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha}).$$

Then, there exists $U \in \cap_{\sigma \in [0, s]} X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}$ such that,

$$\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rightarrow U \quad \text{in } X_{\sigma, \alpha, T} \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in [0, s]. \quad (7.19)$$

Proof. We only treat the case corresponding to hypothesis (E1), since the proofs under assumptions (E2) and (E3) follow along the same lines. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $V_{n,p} := U_{n+p} - U_n$ and, in particular, $z_{n,p} := v_{n+p} - v_n$. Subtracting the equations satisfied by U_{n+p} and U_n , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A^0 \partial_t V_{n,p} + \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p} + D \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p} + B \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p} + H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}) &= F_{n,p}^\alpha \\ V_{n,p}|_{t=0} &= (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_0 \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

where the source term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_{n,p}^\alpha &:= (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})(F) - (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})(A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) - (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})(D \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \\ &\quad - (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})(B \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (H(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \\ &\quad - (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) (H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (A^j \partial_j (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_n) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (D(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_n) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (B \Lambda^{2\alpha} (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_n) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} (H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_n) \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

Moreover, we decompose $F_{n,p}^\alpha = (f_{n,p}^{1,\alpha}, f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha})^\top$ where $f_{n,p}^{1,\alpha}$ and $f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}$ take values in \mathbb{R}^k and \mathbb{R}^m , respectively.

According to theorem 7.2, the sequence $\{U_n\}$ satisfies the estimate,

$$\|U_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (7.22)$$

Furthermore, since $V_{n,p}$ satisfies (7.20), we may apply $m = s - 2$ in (7.8) to obtain,

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, T], \quad \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} z_{n,p}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^{s-2}(V_{n,p}(0), F_{n,p}^\alpha, t). \quad (7.23)$$

We first prove that, as a consequence of (7.22) and (7.23), $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}$ converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with respect to the norm of the space $X_{s-2,\alpha,T}^\infty$. Employing (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 2$ and $\delta = 1$, together with the Sobolev product estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{n,p}^{1,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-2}} &\leq C_0 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|D \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\ &\quad + \|A^j (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) \partial_j U_n\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|D (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) U_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\leq C_0 C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.24)$$

To estimate $f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}$ we apply (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 2 - \alpha$ and $\delta = \alpha$, combined with conditions (C5) and (C6), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}} &\leq C_0(\alpha) C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^\alpha (\|f_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}) + C_0(\alpha) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^\alpha \|B_0 \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\quad + \|H_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}} + C_0(\alpha) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^\alpha \|H_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\quad + \|B_0 \Lambda^{2\alpha} (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}} + \|H_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the embedding $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow H^{s-2-\alpha}$ and the Sobolev product estimates, we have

$$\|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}} \leq C_0(\alpha) C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^\alpha (\|f_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}) + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) R_{n,p}^\alpha \quad (7.25)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,p}^\alpha &:= \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^{s-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the case $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Applying (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 2$ and $\delta = 1$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,p}^\alpha &\leq C_0 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-1}}) + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (G_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n)\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\quad + \|G_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| \|v_n\|_{H^s} + \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) C_0 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| \|v_n\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.26)$$

On the other hand, if $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, we set $\sigma = s - 2$ and $\delta = 2 - 2\alpha$ in (7.17). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,p}^\alpha &\leq C_0 (2 - 2\alpha) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2-2\alpha} (\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}}) \\ &\quad + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (G_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n)\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|G_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\leq C_0 (2 - 2\alpha) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2-2\alpha} (\|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n)\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}} + \|G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}} + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}}) \\ &\quad + \|G_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq C_0 (2 - 2\alpha) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2-2\alpha} (C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|v_n\|_{H^s} + \|G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}}) \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}) v_n\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the fractional Leibniz rule (3.4) with $p_1 = \infty$, $p_2 = 2$ and $p_3 = p_4 = 4$, and using the Sobolev embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^4$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}} &\leq \|G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^{s-2\alpha} (G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{L^2} + \|G_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v_n\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^{s-2\alpha} G_0\|_{L^4} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|v_n\|_{H^s} + C \|\Lambda^{s-2\alpha} G_0\|_{H^1} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2\alpha > 1$, we have $\|\Lambda^{s-2\alpha} G_0\|_{H^1} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$, which yields

$$\|G_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^{2\alpha} v_n\|_{H^{s-2\alpha}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|v_n\|_{H^s}.$$

Hence, for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$,

$$R_{n,p}^\alpha \leq C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (|\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2-2\alpha} \|v_n\|_{H^s} + \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n\|_{H^s}). \quad (7.27)$$

Substituting (7.26) and (7.27) into (7.25), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}} &\leq C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (|\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^\alpha + |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2-2\alpha} + |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|) (\|f_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}) \\ &\quad + C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.28)$$

Since $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, we may assume that $|\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| < 1$. Combining (7.24) and (7.28) with (7.23), we obtain, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} z_{n,p}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \\ &\leq K(T) \left[C_0^2 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^2 \|U_0\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^T (\|f_{n,p}^{1,\alpha}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2-\alpha}}^2) d\tau \right] \\ &\leq K(T) \left[C_0^2 |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2\alpha} \left(\|U_0\|_{H^s}^2 + C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M)^2 \int_0^T (\|f_1(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|U_n(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2) d\tau \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M)^2 (|\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2\alpha} + |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2(2-2\alpha)}) \int_0^T (\|f_2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}}^2 + \|U_n(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2) d\tau \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M)^2 \int_0^T \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a positive constant $C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} z_{n,p}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \\ &\leq C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M) K(T) \left(|\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2\alpha} + |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^{2(2-2\alpha)} \right) \left(\Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, T) + T \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|U_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \int_0^T \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we cannot apply (7.17) to the last term of the previous inequality (with $\sigma = s$ and $\delta = \alpha$), since the energy estimate (7.7) only provides control on $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \Lambda^\alpha v_n$ and not on $\Lambda^\alpha v_n$. Nonetheless, observe that for every $t \in [0, T]$, $\|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n(t)\|_{H^s} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq 2\|v_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq 2K(T)\Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, T).$$

In consequence, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\int_0^T \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The previous estimate implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \int_0^T \|\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} z_{n,p}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (7.29)$$

Using the triangle inequality, it holds that

$$E_{s-2,\alpha,T}(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} U_{n+p} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) \leq E_{s-2,\alpha,T}(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}) + E_{s-2,\alpha,T}((\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})U_n).$$

By (7.29), $E_{s-2,\alpha,T}(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}V_{n,p}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Furthermore, by (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 2$ and $\delta = 1$ and the bound in (7.22),

$$\begin{aligned} E_{s-2,\alpha,T}^2((\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})U_n) &\leq |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^2 \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|U_n(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^T \|\Lambda^\alpha v_n(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right) \\ &\leq |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n|^2 K(T) \Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, T) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $E_{s-2,\alpha,T}(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}U_{n+p} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since, by theorem 6.1, $\{U_n\} \subset \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$, we conclude that $\{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $X_{s-2,\alpha,T}$. Consequently, $\{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $X_{\sigma,\alpha,T}$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s - 2]$.

It remains to consider the case $\sigma \in (s - 2, s)$. Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\sigma = (1 - \theta)(s - 2) + \theta s$. By the interpolation between non-homogeneous Sobolev spaces and Hölder's inequality with $p = (1 - \theta)^{-1}$ and $q = \theta^{-1}$, we have, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\sigma,\alpha}^2(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)) &\leq \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^{2(1-\theta)} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)\|_{H^s}^{2\theta} \\ &+ \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}v_n(\tau) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}v_m(\tau))\|_{H^{s-2}}^{2(1-\theta)} \|\Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}v_n(\tau) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}v_m(\tau))\|_{H^s}^{2\theta} d\tau \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)\|_{H^{s-2}}^{2(1-\theta)} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)\|_{H^s}^{2\theta} \\ &+ \left(\int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}v_n(\tau) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}v_m(\tau))\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}v_n(\tau) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}v_m(\tau))\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right)^\theta. \end{aligned}$$

The bound in (7.22) shows that $\{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n\}$ is bounded in $X_{s,\alpha,T}^\infty$, while the previous argument proves that it is Cauchy in $X_{s-2,\alpha,T}$. Hence, by interpolation, we deduce that $E_\sigma^2(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_m}U_m(t)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, $\{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $X_{\sigma,\alpha,T}$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s)$, which concludes the proof. \square

The next theorem shows that the limit $U(u, v)$ obtained in theorem 7.3 is a strong solution of (5.1), provided that the initial data have H^s regularity.

Theorem 7.4. *Assume that $U_0 \in H^s$, $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^s)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$. Under assumptions (L1)-(L3), there exists a solution $U = (u, v)$ of (5.1)-(5.2) in the space $X_{s,\alpha,T}^\infty \cap \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ with $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{\sigma-1})$ and $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{\sigma-2\alpha})$ for any $\sigma \in [0, s)$. Furthermore, U satisfies the estimate*

$$E_{m,\alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^m(U_0, F, t) \tag{7.30}$$

for all integers $m \in [1, s]$ and $t \in [0, T]$. If, in addition, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{\sigma-1})$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s)$.

Proof. We begin by establishing the convergence of the sequence $\{\partial_t U_n\}$ in a suitable space. By theorem 6.1, the difference $V_{n,p} = U_{n+p} - U_n$ satisfies (7.20) pointwise in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$, with source term given by (7.21). Taking the H^{s-3} -norm in (7.20) and using the Sobolev product estimates, we obtain

$$\|\partial_t V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-3}} \leq \|f_{n,p}^{1,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-3}} + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-1}}]. \tag{7.31}$$

By estimate (7.24),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-3}} &\leq \|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-3}} + C_0 C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}) \\ &+ C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}}V_{n,p}\|_{H^{s-1}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the Sobolev product estimates with (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 3$ and $\delta = 1$, and applying the resulting estimate to all terms in $f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}$ except the last one, we obtain

$$\|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-3}} \leq C_0 C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}) + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0](\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n\|_{H^{s-3}}.$$

Expanding the commutator in the remaining term and applying the triangle inequality, yields

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0](\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n\|_{H^{s-3}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})v_n\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Thus, (7.17) with $\sigma = s - 1$ and $\delta = 1$, implies that

$$\|f_{n,p}^{2,\alpha}\|_{H^{s-3}} \leq C_0 C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|U_n\|_{H^s}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_t V_{n,p}(t)\|_{H^{s-3}} &\leq C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) |\epsilon_{n+p} - \epsilon_n| (\|f_1\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1})} + \|f_2\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha})} + \|U_n\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)}) \\ &\quad + C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2})} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p}\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1})}]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.32)$$

Since theorem 7.3 implies that $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} V_{n,p} \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s)$, and theorem 7.2 shows that $\{U_n\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$, estimate (7.32) yields that $\{\partial_t U_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, by (7.19), there exists $U \in \cap_{\sigma \in [0, s)} \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ and $V \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})$ such that

$$\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rightarrow U = (u, v) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma) \quad \text{for any } \sigma \in [0, s) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t U_n \rightarrow V \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3}). \quad (7.33)$$

Moreover, by theorem 6.1, the identity,

$$\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n(0) = \int_0^t \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} \partial_t U_n(\tau) d\tau$$

holds in the space $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By taking the limit in the norm of the space $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})$ and using (7.33), it follows that,

$$U(t) - U_0 = \int_0^t V(\tau) d\tau \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3}),$$

which implies that $\partial_t U = V$.

We now show that U is a solution of the Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.2) by passing to the limit in each term of equation (LSn) in the space H^{s-3} . Using (7.18) with $\sigma = s - 3$ and $\delta = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) - A^j \partial_j U\|_{H^{s-3}} &\leq \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} - \mathbb{I}) A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-3}} + \|A^j \partial_j (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U)\|_{H^{s-3}} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 \epsilon_n \|U_n\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U\|_{H^{s-2}}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} D \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - D U\|_{H^{s-3}} &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 \epsilon_n \|U_n\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U\|_{H^{s-3}}) \\ \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} B \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - B \Lambda^{2\alpha} U\|_{H^{s-3}} &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 \epsilon_n \|U_n\|_{H^s} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U\|_{H^{s-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the commutator term,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} (H \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n) - H [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] U\|_{H^{s-3}} \\ &\leq \|(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} - \mathbb{I}) H_0 \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-3}} + \|H_0 (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} - \mathbb{I}) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-3}} + \|H_0 [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U)\|_{H^{s-3}} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 \epsilon_n \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0] (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U)\|_{H^{s-3}}) \\ &\leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (C_0 \epsilon_n \|U_n\|_{H^s} + \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n - U\|_{H^{s-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of each of the previous inequalities converges to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$ by (7.33) and the uniform boundedness of $\{U_n\}$ in $L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)$. Finally, the assumptions of the theorem imply that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} F - F\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_0 - U_0\|_{H^{s-3}} = 0.$$

Moreover, by (7.33)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^0 \partial_t U_n - A^0 \partial_t U\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})} = 0.$$

Therefore, U is a solution of equation (5.1) that satisfies the initial condition (5.2) in the space $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-3})$.

Now, by theorem 7.2, the sequence $\{U_n\}$ is bounded in the space $X_{s, \alpha, T}^\infty$, which implies that, for each $t \in [0, T]$, $\{\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n(t)\}$ is weakly convergent (up to a subsequence) to some U^t in H^s and $\Lambda^\alpha \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} v_n$ is weakly convergent to some v_α in the space $L^2([0, t]; H^s)$. However, by theorem 7.3, the convergence $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n} U_n \rightarrow U = (u, v)$ in $X_{\sigma, \alpha, T}$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s)$, implies that $U^t = U(t)$ and $v_\alpha = \Lambda^\alpha v$. Hence, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|U(t)\|_{H^m}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 d\tau \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|U_n(t)\|_{H^m}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v_n(\tau)\|_{H^m}^2 d\tau \right)$$

and thus, estimate (7.30) holds whenever $m = s$. If $m \in [1, s) \cap \mathbb{N}$, pass to the limit in (7.7) and (7.30) follows.

Now assume that $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and let $\sigma \in [0, s)$. In this case, the embedding $H^{\sigma-2\alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{\sigma-1}$ implies that, $f_2, B\Lambda^{2\alpha}U$ and $H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]U$ belong to the space $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{\sigma-1})$. Since U is a solution of (5.1), it follows that $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^{\sigma-1})$ for every $\sigma \in [0, s)$. On the other hand, if $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ the previous conclusion remains true for the first component u of U , that is, $u \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^{\sigma-1})$. Meanwhile, for the second component v of U , we can only guarantee that $v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^{\sigma-2\alpha})$ and the result follows. \square

Theorem 7.5. *Assume conditions (L1)-(L3) hold. Let $U \in X_{s, \alpha, T}^\infty$ be a solution of the Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.2) corresponding to the data*

$$U_0 \in H^s, \quad f_1 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^s), \quad f_2 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha}).$$

Then, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$E_{0, \alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq K(t) \left[\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|F(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right] \quad (7.34)$$

and

$$E_{s, \alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, t). \quad (7.35)$$

Furthermore, if $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in [0, s)$, then $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$.

Proof. We begin by proving the low-order estimate (7.34). The argument follows the standard L^2 -energy method. To avoid repetition, we only detail the treatment of the term

$$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}} U(t) := B(\tilde{U}(t)) \Lambda^{2\alpha} U(t) + H(\tilde{U}(t)) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}(t))] \mathcal{L}U(t),$$

since all remaining contributions are estimated exactly as in the proof of theorem 7.2. By condition (C5), we have

$$\left\langle \mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}} U(t), U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \mu_0 \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\langle H(\tilde{U}(t)) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G\tilde{U}(t)] \mathcal{L}U(t), U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2}. \quad (7.36)$$

Therefore, it remains to estimate the commutator contribution.

Assume first that $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with lemma 4 imply that

$$|\left\langle H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathcal{L}U, U \right\rangle_{L^2}| \leq C \|H\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} G\|_{L^\infty} \|U\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since $0 < 2\alpha \leq 1$, we use the embedding $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ to obtain,

$$|\langle H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U, U \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1)\|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}\|U\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (7.37)$$

On the other hand, if $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ we use the method developed for the term I_2 during the proof of theorem 4.2. Let $\mathcal{L}U = (y, w) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$. First observe that, by condition (C6),

$$\langle H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U, U \rangle_{L^2} = \langle H_0[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0]w, v \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Then, by the self-adjointness of the operator $\Lambda^{2\alpha}$, we have

$$\langle H_0[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0]w, v \rangle_{L^2} = -\langle w, [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0^\top](H_0^\top v) \rangle_{L^2}$$

and thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it follows that

$$|\langle H_0[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0]w, v \rangle_{L^2}| \leq |\mathcal{L}||U|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0^\top](H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2}.$$

By using (3.7), the triangle inequality and the commutator estimate (3.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0^\top](H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(G_0^\top, H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{0 < \beta \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta G_0^\top \Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}(H_0^\top v) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{L^\infty} \|H_0^\top v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha-1}(H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

We use the embeddings $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ and $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ to control the terms $\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\nabla G\|_{L^\infty}$, respectively, and since $\|\Lambda^{2\alpha-1}(H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\Lambda^\alpha(H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2}$, the commutator estimate (3.9) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0^\top](H_0^\top v)\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) (\|H_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^2} + \|[\Lambda^\alpha, H_0^\top]v\|_{L^2} + \|H_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)(\|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|v\|_{H^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (5.9), it follows that

$$|\langle H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U, U \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)(M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}})\|U\|_{L^2}\|v\|_{H^\alpha}. \quad (7.38)$$

Using (7.37) in the case $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and (7.38) in the case $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and then applying Young's inequality in (7.36), yields

$$\left\langle \mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \tilde{v}}U(t), U(t) \right\rangle_{L^2} \geq \frac{\mu_0}{2}\|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \omega(t)\|U(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where $\omega \in L^1([0, T])$ is defined as in (7.6). Combining the previous estimate with the L^2 -energy identity and applying Gronwall's inequality yields (7.34).

We now turn to the proof of (7.35). By applying the operator \mathbb{J}_ϵ to (5.1) we obtain that $\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U$ satisfies the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} A^0 \partial_t \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U + A^j \partial_j \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U + D \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U + B \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U + H[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G] \mathcal{L} \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U &= A^0 F_\epsilon + A^0 K_\epsilon \\ \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U|_{t=0} &= \mathbb{J}_\epsilon U_0, \end{aligned} \quad (7.39)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F_\epsilon &:= (A^0)^{-1} \mathbb{J}_\epsilon F + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, (A^0)^{-1}] F - [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{A}^j] \partial_j U - [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{D}] U - [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{B}] \Lambda^{2\alpha} U, \\ K_\epsilon &:= -[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{H}] \Lambda^{2\alpha} (G \mathcal{L} U) - \bar{H} \Lambda^{2\alpha} ([\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G] \mathcal{L} U) + [\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{H} G] \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathcal{L} U, \end{aligned}$$

and where we have set, $\bar{A}^j = (A^0)^{-1} A^j$, $\bar{B} = (A^0)^{-1} B$, $\bar{D} = (A^0)^{-1} D$ and $\bar{H} = (A^0)^{-1} H$.

Let us show that $K_\epsilon \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_\epsilon\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} &\leq \|[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{H}] \Lambda^{2\alpha} (G \mathcal{L} U)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} + \|\bar{H} \Lambda^{2\alpha} ([\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G] \mathcal{L} U)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} + \|[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{H} G] \Lambda^{2\alpha} \mathcal{L} U\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} \\ &=: K_\epsilon^1 + K_\epsilon^2 + K_\epsilon^3, \end{aligned} \quad (7.40)$$

we treat each term separately. Observe that, by the duality argument (4.17),

$$\begin{aligned} K_\epsilon^1 &\leq C (\|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \overline{H}\| \Lambda^{2\alpha}(G\mathcal{L}U)\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \overline{H}\| \Lambda^{2\alpha}(G\mathcal{L}U)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\alpha}}) \\ &\leq C (\|\overline{H}\|_{\hat{H}^s} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G\mathcal{L}U)\|_{H^{-1}} + \|\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \overline{H}\| \Lambda^{2\alpha}(G\mathcal{L}U)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\alpha}}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.41)$$

For K_ϵ^2 we use the fractional Leibniz rule (3.3),

$$K_\epsilon^2 \leq C (\|\overline{H}\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\alpha[J_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{H^s} + \|\overline{H}\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\alpha}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}[J_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{L^\infty}).$$

Then, we apply theorem 4.3 with $m = s$ for the first term in the right hand side of the last inequality. Thus,

$$K_\epsilon^2 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [(\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|U\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}[J_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{L^\infty}] \quad (7.42)$$

and let $K_\epsilon^4 := \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}[J_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{L^\infty}$.

Assume first that hypothesis (E1) holds. Then,

$$G\mathcal{L}U = GU = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times 1} \\ G_0 v \end{pmatrix} \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s+\alpha})$$

which implies that $\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\mathcal{L}U \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$. Therefore, by applying statement (i) in theorem 4.4 to the second term in the right hand side of (7.41) we obtain

$$K_\epsilon^1 \leq C \|\overline{H}\|_{\hat{H}^s} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_0 v)\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Then, by the fractional Leibniz rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_0 v)\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq C (\|G_0 v\|_{L^2} + \|G_0 v\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \\ &\leq C (\|G_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^2} + \|G_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} + \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} \|v\|_{L^\infty}) \\ &\leq C \|G_0\|_{\hat{H}^s} (\|v\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) + C \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} \|v\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$K_\epsilon^1 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} \|U\|_{H^s}). \quad (7.43)$$

Furthermore, by the block structure in conditions (C5)-(C6) and the triangle inequality

$$K_\epsilon^4 \leq \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_0 v)\|_{L^\infty} + \|G_0 \Lambda^{2\alpha} v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Since $v, G_0 v \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s+\alpha})$, it holds that $\Lambda^{2\alpha} v, \Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_0 v) \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$. Therefore, the embedding $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ and the fractional Leibniz rule imply that

$$\begin{aligned} K_\epsilon^4 &\leq C (\|G_0 v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|G_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}) \\ &\leq C (\|G_0\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|G_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}} \|v\|_{L^\infty}) \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} \|U\|_{H^s}) \end{aligned}$$

By using this estimate in (7.42) we obtain that

$$K_\epsilon^2 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [(M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}})\|U\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}]. \quad (7.44)$$

If, on the other hand, one of the assumptions (E2) or (E3) hold true, we have

$$G\mathcal{L}U = G\mathcal{L}_N U = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{O}_{k \times 1} \\ G_0 \mathcal{L}_0 u \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s).$$

Then, $\Lambda^{2\alpha}G\mathcal{L}_N U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-s_\alpha})$ and we can apply statement (ii) of theorem 4.4 to the second term in the right hand side of (7.41) to obtain that

$$K_\epsilon^1 \leq C \|\overline{H}\|_{\hat{H}^s} \|G_0 \mathcal{L}_0 u\|_{H^s} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|U\|_{H^s}. \quad (7.45)$$

For the term K_ϵ^4 , the embedding $H^{s-s_\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ yields the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} K_\epsilon^4 &\leq \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_0\mathcal{L}_0u)\|_{L^\infty} + \|G_0\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}_0u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\|U\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (7.42), estimate (7.44) remains true. The estimates for K_ϵ^3 are similar to those for K_ϵ^1 . Therefore, by combining estimates (7.43), (7.44) and (7.45) we conclude that, under any of the assumptions (E1)-(E3), the following estimate holds

$$K_\epsilon \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [(M + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + 1)\|U\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}]. \quad (7.46)$$

Since \tilde{U} satisfies condition 2 and $U \in X_{s,\alpha,T}^\infty$ it follows that $K_\epsilon \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$.

Now, let us show that

$$\int_0^T \|K_\epsilon(t)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}}^2 dt \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.47)$$

Notice that, $K_\epsilon^1(t)$ and $K_\epsilon^3(t)$ converge to zero for almost all $t \in [0, T]$. In fact, this is an immediate consequence of theorem 4.4: statement (i) yields the convergence under hypothesis (E1), while statement (ii) yields the same conclusion under hypotheses (E2) and (E3).

Now, as we previously showed, it holds that

$$K_\epsilon^2 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (K_\epsilon^4 + K_\epsilon^5)$$

with $K_\epsilon^4 := \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{L^\infty}$ and $K_\epsilon^5 := \|\Lambda^\alpha[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{H^s}$. Since

$$K_\epsilon^5 \leq \|[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{H^1} + \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{L^2}$$

and $\mathcal{L}U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$ under any of the hypotheses (E1)-E(3), statement (iii) in theorem 4.4 together with [4, Lemma 1.5.2] imply that $K_\epsilon^5(t) \rightarrow 0$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$.

Finally, consider the term K_ϵ^4 . If hypothesis (E1) is satisfied we use conditions (C5)-(C6) together with the embedding $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ to obtain

$$K_\epsilon^4 \leq C\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G_0]v\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} \leq C(\|[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G_0]v\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda^{s+\alpha}[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G_0]v\|_{L^2}).$$

Therefore, as a consequence of [4, Theorem 1.5.6] and statement (iii) in theorem 4.4 we conclude that $K_\epsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$. The same conclusion is obtained under hypotheses (E2) and (E3). Indeed, in this case we use the embedding $H^{s-s_\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ to obtain

$$K_\epsilon^4 \leq C\|[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, G]\mathcal{L}_N U\|_{H^s}.$$

Then, the conclusion follows by [4, Theorem 1.5.6]. Therefore, $K_\epsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$ and thus, by (7.46), the dominated convergence theorem yields (7.47).

Applying the coercivity estimate (7.1) with U replaced by $\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U$, and combining it with the energy argument used in the proof of theorem 7.2, we obtain

$$E_{s,\alpha}^2(\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U(t)) \leq K(t)\Phi_\alpha^s(\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U_0, A^0 F_\epsilon + A^0 K_\epsilon, t) \quad (7.48)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Since the fractional Leibniz rule and the embedding $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ imply that

$$\|A^0 K_\epsilon\|_{H^{s-\alpha}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\|K_\epsilon\|_{H^{s-\alpha}},$$

it follows from (7.47) that $A^0 K_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$.

To establish the convergence of F_ϵ , write $A^0 F_\epsilon = (f_1^\epsilon, f_2^\epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Observe that, as a consequence of conditions (C5)-(C6), the nonzero components of $A^0[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \bar{B}]\Lambda^{2\alpha}U$ are contained in the second block f_2^ϵ . Therefore, by the convergence properties of \mathbb{J}_ϵ (see, [4, Theorem 1.5.1 and Lemma 1.5.2]) it follows that

$f_1^\epsilon \rightarrow f_1$ in $L^2([0, T]; H^s)$. For the second component, statement (i) in theorem 4.4 yields $A^0[\mathbb{J}_\epsilon, \overline{B}]\Lambda^{2\alpha}U \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$ and thus, $f_2^\epsilon \rightarrow f_2$ in $L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\Phi_\alpha^s(\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U_0, A^0 F_\epsilon + A^0 K_\epsilon, t) \rightarrow \Phi_\alpha^s(U_0, F, t) \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, passing to the limit in (7.48) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields estimate (7.35), which proves the first assertion of the theorem.

Finally, if $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in [0, s)$ it follows that $\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ and observe that $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_1}U - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_2}U$ satisfies (7.39) with source term $A^0(F_{\epsilon_1} - F_{\epsilon_2}) + A^0(K_{\epsilon_1} - K_{\epsilon_2})$ and initial data $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_1}U_0 - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_2}U_0$. Then, the energy method yields the estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E_{s,\alpha}^2(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_1}U(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_2}U(t)) &\leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|f_1^{\epsilon_1}(t) - f_1^{\epsilon_2}(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|f_2^{\epsilon_1}(t) - f_2^{\epsilon_2}(t)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}}^2 \\ &\quad + \|A^0 K_{\epsilon_1}(t) - A^0 K_{\epsilon_2}(t)\|_{H^{s-\alpha}}^2 + \mu_1(t) \|\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_1}U(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_2}U(t)\|_{H^s}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

By integrating this inequality and using (7.47) it follows that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} E_{s,\alpha}^2(\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_1}U(t) - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_2}U(t)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Consequently, $\{\mathbb{J}_\epsilon U\}_{\epsilon > 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$ and thus, $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$. \square

Theorem 7.6. *Let $1 \leq m \leq s$ be an integer and assume that $U_0 \in H^m$, $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-1}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^m)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{m-\alpha})$. Under conditions (L1)-(L3), the Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.2) admits a unique solution $U = (u, v)$ in the space $X_{m,\alpha,T}$. Moreover, $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-1})$, $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{m-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{m-\alpha})$ and U satisfies the estimate*

$$E_{m,\alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^m(U_0, F, t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. We consider the sequence $\{U'_n\}$ of solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\tilde{U})\partial_t U'_n + A^j(\tilde{U})\partial_j U'_n + D(\tilde{U})U'_n + B(\tilde{U})\Lambda^{2\alpha}U'_n + H(\tilde{U})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})]\mathcal{L}U'_n &= \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}F, \\ U'_n|_{t=0} &= \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n}U_0. \end{aligned} \quad (7.49)$$

Thanks to theorems 7.4 and 7.5, $U'_n = (u'_n, v'_n)$ is a well-defined element of the space $X_{s,\alpha,T}$. Moreover, $\partial_t u'_n \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-1})$ and $\partial_t v'_n \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{s-2\alpha}) \cap L^2([0, T]; H^{s-\alpha})$. Set $V'_{n,p} := U'_{n+p} - U'_n$ and note that $V'_{n,p}$ satisfies the following Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\tilde{U})\partial_t V'_{n,p} + A^j(\tilde{U})\partial_j V'_{n,p} + D(\tilde{U})V'_{n,p} + B(\tilde{U})\Lambda^{2\alpha}V'_{n,p} + H(\tilde{U})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})]\mathcal{L}V'_{n,p} &= (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})F, \\ V'_{n,p}|_{t=0} &= (\mathbb{E}_{n+p} - \mathbb{E}_n)U_0. \end{aligned}$$

In consequence, for every $1 \leq m \leq s$ we have the estimate,

$$E_{m,\alpha}^2(V'_{n,p}(t)) \leq K(t) \Phi_\alpha^m((\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})U_0, (\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_{n+p}} - \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_n})F, t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (7.50)$$

By the assumptions on F and the dominated convergence theorem, the right hand side of (7.50) goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\{U'_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $X_{m,\alpha,T}$. Therefore, there exists $U \in X_{m,\alpha,T}$ such that $U'_n \rightarrow U$ in $X_{m,\alpha,T}$. Passing to the limit in (7.49) shows that U is a solution of (5.1)-(5.2). The uniqueness is a consequence of the energy estimates. The regularity properties of $\partial_t u$ and $\partial_t v$ follow directly from equation (5.1), the regularity of U , and the assumptions on F . \square

8. INVARIANT SETS UNDER ITERATIONS AND BOUNDEDNESS ON THE HIGH NORM

In this section, we establish the local well-posedness of the initial value problem for the quasilinear counterpart of (5.1), namely, system (1.1). We use the following assumption.

Condition 3. $U_0 \in H^s$ and $U_0 \in \mathcal{O}_0$, where \mathcal{O}_0 is a bounded open convex set in \mathbb{R}^N such that $\overline{\mathcal{O}_0} \subset \mathcal{O}$.

Definition 8.1. Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. We denote by $X_{s,\alpha,T}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ the set of functions $\tilde{U} = \tilde{U}(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}$ satisfying condition 2 and such that

$$E_{s,\alpha}^2(\tilde{U}(t)) \leq M^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T] \quad (8.1)$$

and

$$\int_0^t \|\partial_t \tilde{U}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq M_1^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T], \quad (8.2)$$

where M and M_1 are constants.

The first objective of this section is to determine \mathcal{O}_1 , M , M_1 and $T_0 > 0$ ($\leq T$) such that for $\tilde{U} \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$, the Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\tilde{U})\partial_t U + A^j(\tilde{U})\partial_j U + D(\tilde{U})U + B(\tilde{U})\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + H(\tilde{U})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U})]\mathcal{L}U &= 0, \\ U|_{t=0} &= U_0, \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

has a unique solution in $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$. That is, X_{s,α,T_0} is invariant under the solution map, $\tilde{U} \mapsto U$.

Proposition 2. Assume that condition 1 is satisfied with one of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3). Moreover, assume that $U_0 \in H^s$ satisfies condition 3. Let $\tilde{U} \in X_{s,\alpha,T}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ and let U be a solution of (8.3) satisfying (8.1) with M replaced by \bar{M} . Then, there is a positive constant $C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M) > 0$ for which

$$\int_0^t \|\partial_t U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\bar{M}^2 [t + 1 + M^2] \quad (8.4)$$

Proof. Since $\tilde{U} \in X_{s,\alpha,T}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ and U is a solution of (8.3), theorem 7.6 implies that we can take the norm of $\partial_t U$ in the space H^{s-1} . Then, by the Sobolev product estimates,

$$\|\partial_t U\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|U\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}v\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G]\mathcal{L}U\|_{H^{s-1}}). \quad (8.5)$$

Under any of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3), $\mathcal{L}U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$. Therefore, we can apply estimate (4.21) in (8.5). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t U\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|U\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}v\|_{H^{s-1}} + (\|G\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}})\|U\|_{H^s}] \\ &\leq C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M) [\|U\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{H^s} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}\|U\|_{H^s}]. \end{aligned}$$

By integrating and using the uniform bounds for U and \tilde{U} it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|\partial_t U\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\int_0^t \|U(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha \tilde{v}(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \|U(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right] \\ &\leq C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\bar{M}^2 t + \bar{M}^2 + \bar{M}^2 M^2 \right] \\ &= C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\bar{M}^2 [t + 1 + M^2]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Now, fix a constant $\delta_1 > 0$ so that $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_0 := d(\mathcal{O}_0, \partial\mathcal{O})$ and take

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \delta_1 - \text{neighborhood of } \mathcal{O}_0, \quad (8.6)$$

$$M = \sqrt{2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1)}\|U_0\|_{H^s} \quad (8.7)$$

Theorem 8.1. *Assume condition 3 holds true. There is a positive constant T_0 depending on δ_0 , δ_1 and $\|U_0\|_{H^s}$ such that, if $\tilde{U} \in X_{s,\alpha,T}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with \mathcal{O}_1 and M defined by (8.6)-(8.7), the Cauchy problem (8.3) has a unique solution $U = (u, v)$ in the same set $X_{s,\alpha,T}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$.*

Proof. The existence of a unique solution to the Cauchy problem (8.3) follows from 7.6 with $m = s$. By using the energy estimates we have

$$E_{s,\alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq C_0(\mathcal{O}_1)e^{C_2(\mathcal{O}_1,M)\int_0^t \mu_1(\tau)d\tau}\|U_0\|_{H^s}^2, \quad (8.8)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mu_1(\tau)d\tau &= \int_0^t \left[1 + M + M^2 + \|\tilde{v}(\tau)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}} + \|\tilde{v}(\tau)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2 + \|\partial_t \tilde{U}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} \right] d\tau \\ &\leq \left[(1 + M + M^2)t + t^{1/2}M^2 \right] + t^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\partial_t \tilde{U}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2} + \int_0^t \|\tilde{v}(\tau)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2 d\tau \\ &\leq \left[(1 + M + M^2)t + t^{1/2}M^2 \right] + t^{1/2}M_1 + \int_0^t \|\tilde{v}(\tau)\|_{H^{s+\alpha}}^2 d\tau \end{aligned}$$

In consequence, since $\tilde{v} \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s+\alpha})$ there is $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$e^{C_1(\mathcal{O}_1,M)\int_0^{T_0} \mu_1(\tau)d\tau} \leq 2$$

and thus, by (8.8),

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_0]} E_{s,\alpha}^2(U(t)) \leq 2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1)\|U_0\|_{H^s}^2 := M^2.$$

Then, by applying proposition 2 with $\bar{M} = M$ it holds that

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\partial_t U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M^2 [T_0 + 1 + M^2].$$

Therefore, if we take $0 < T_0 < 1$ and define M_1 as

$$M_1^2 := C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M^2[2 + M^2],$$

condition (8.2) is satisfied. This estimate gives

$$|U(x, t) - U(x, 0)| \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_t U(\tau)\|_{L^\infty} d\tau \leq \kappa_{s-1} \int_0^t \|\partial_j U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} d\tau \leq \kappa_{s-1} T_0^{1/2} M_1.$$

Hence, by taking $T_0 > 0$ such that $\kappa_{s-1} T_0^{1/2} M_1 \leq \delta_1$, we conclude that $U(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}_1$ for all $(x, t) \in Q_{T_0}$. \square

9. HÖLDER CONTINUITY IN THE LOW NORM

According with theorem 8.1, for every $\tilde{U} \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ there is a unique $U \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ that satisfies the Cauchy problem (8.3). Hence, the solution map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\alpha : X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1) &\rightarrow X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1), \\ \tilde{U} &\mapsto U, \end{aligned} \quad (9.1)$$

is well-defined. Observe that $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1) \subset Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}$, where

$$Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0} := \{U = (u, v)^\top \in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}) \mid \Lambda^\alpha v \in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})\}.$$

The purpose of this section is to prove that the solution map \mathcal{T}_α is continuous when $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ is endowed with the topology induced by Y_{s-1,α,T_0} .

Consider $\tilde{U}^1, \tilde{U}^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ and the corresponding $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^1) := U_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^2) := U_2$ also in $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$. Then, the difference $U^1 - U^2 =: U$ satisfies

$$A^0(\tilde{U}^1)\partial_t U + A^j(\tilde{U}^1)\partial_j U + D(\tilde{U}^1)U + B(\tilde{U}^1)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + H(\tilde{U}^1)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1)]\mathcal{L}U = F^{1,2} + L^{1,2} \quad (9.2)$$

with,

$$\begin{aligned} (A^0(\tilde{U}^1))^{-1}F^{1,2} &:= -\left[\bar{A}^j(\tilde{U}^1) - \bar{A}^j(\tilde{U}^2)\right]\partial_j U^2 - \left[\bar{D}(\tilde{U}^1) - \bar{D}(\tilde{U}^2)\right]U^2 - \left[\bar{B}(\tilde{U}^1) - \bar{B}(\tilde{U}^2)\right]\Lambda^{2\alpha}U^2, \\ (A^0(\tilde{U}^1))^{-1}L^{1,2} &:= -\left[\bar{H}(\tilde{U}^1) - \bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)\right][\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1)]\mathcal{L}U^2 - \bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2 \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

and initial data, $U|_{t=0} = 0$. Here, for every matrix coefficient A , we have used the notation, $\bar{A}(\tilde{U}^\ell) = (A^0(\tilde{U}^\ell))^{-1}A(\tilde{U}^\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

At first sight, one might attempt to establish a contraction estimate for the solution operator \mathcal{T}_α in the norm of the space $X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}^\infty$ by applying the energy method to the difference $U^1 - U^2$. The main obstacle to this approach is the non-local contribution

$$\mathcal{N}_{1,2} := \bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2,$$

which appears in the source term $L^{1,2}$ of (9.3). In order to obtain a contraction estimate, one would need a bound of the form

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\mathcal{N}_{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}}^2 d\tau \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)f(T_0)\|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}^\infty}^2, \quad (9.4)$$

where $f(T_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $T_0 \rightarrow 0$. A natural idea is to invoke standard commutator estimates. However, such estimates typically involve quantities of the form $\|\nabla(G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2))\|_{L^\infty}$, which cannot be controlled in the norm of the space $X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}^\infty$. Therefore, the standard commutator theory does not lead to the desired contraction estimate.

To better understand the difficulty, let us temporarily assumed that H and A^0 are constant matrices. In this situation, the triangle inequality combined with the fractional Leibniz rule and the embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$, yield the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}_{1,2}\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} &\leq |\bar{H}| \left(\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}((G(\tilde{v}^1) - G(\tilde{v}^2))\mathcal{L}U^2)\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} + \|(G(\tilde{v}^1) - G(\tilde{v}^2))\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \right) \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}^\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.5)$$

This estimate is sufficient to prove the Lipschitz continuity of the solution map. Nonetheless, it does not contain the small factor $f(T_0)$ required above and therefore fails to establish a contraction inequality. In the general case, the variables coefficient $\bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)$ introduces an additional difficulty. Indeed, applying the fractional Leibniz rule yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}_{1,2}\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} &\leq \|\bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{L^\infty} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ &\quad + \|\bar{H}(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The first contribution can be handled as in (9.5). The second one, however, involves the higher order norm $\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty}$, and cannot be controlled solely in terms of the norm of $X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}^\infty$. Consequently, neither the standard commutator estimates nor a direct Leibniz rule argument yield a contraction estimate.

The next theorem establishes a Hölder continuity estimate of order 1/2 for the solution map with respect to the norm Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . Although a Lipschitz continuity estimate can be obtained in certain simplified situations, the Hölder estimate is more naturally adapted to the compactness argument developed below.

Theorem 9.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. There is a constant $C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M, T_0) > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{U}^1, \tilde{U}^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ and any $t \in [0, T_0]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^2(t)) - \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^1(t))\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_1(\tau) - v_2(\tau))\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \\ & \leq C_3(\mathcal{O}_1, M, T_0) \left(\int_0^t \|\tilde{U}^1(\tau) - \tilde{U}^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau + T_0 \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(\tilde{v}^1(\tau) - \tilde{v}^2(\tau))\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

In particular, the mapping $\mathcal{T}_\alpha : X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \rightarrow X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ is Hölder continuous of order 1/2 in the topology of the space Y_{s-1,α,T_0} .

Proof. For any $\tilde{U}^1, \tilde{U}^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ set $U^1 = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^1)$ and $U^2 = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}^2)$. Since $U = U^1 - U^2$, is a solution of (9.2) with (9.3), we can apply the energy method described in theorem 7.2 to any value of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (see estimates (7.15)) in order to obtain that,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \leq C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{J}_\gamma(t)| + |\mathcal{K}_\gamma(t)| + \mu_1(t) \|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right], \quad (9.7)$$

where,

$$\mathcal{J}_\gamma(t) := \langle D^\gamma F^{1,2}(t), D^\gamma U(t) \rangle_{L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_\gamma(t) := \langle D^\gamma L^{1,2}(t), D^\gamma U(t) \rangle_{L^2}.$$

After integrating in the interval $[0, T_0]$ and using Gronwall's inequality, we arrive at the estimate

$$\|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq 2C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \int_0^t \left(\sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{J}_\gamma(\tau)| + |\mathcal{K}_\gamma(\tau)| \right) dt \quad (9.8)$$

for all $t \in [0, T_0]$. It remains to estimate the source contributions \mathcal{J}_γ and \mathcal{K}_γ . The treatment of \mathcal{J}_γ is relatively straightforward. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Sobolev product estimates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{J}_\gamma(t)| & \leq C \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \|A^j(\tilde{U}^1) - A^j(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{s-1}} \|U^2\|_{H^s} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|D(\tilde{U}^1) - D(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{s-1}} \|U^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|B_0(\tilde{U}^1) - B_0(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{s-1}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\ & \leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|U^2\|_{H^s} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|U\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $U^j \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{J}_\gamma(t)| \leq 2MC_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (M + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}}. \quad (9.9)$$

Thus, the terms \mathcal{J}_γ can be controlled directly in terms of the norm $\|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}}$.

The situation is different for the commutator contribution contained in \mathcal{K}_γ . Indeed, a direct estimate would require controlling $G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)$ at a regularity level that is not available in the topology of Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . To overcome this difficulty, we integrate by parts in the higher order contributions. This allows us to transfer derivatives away from $G(\tilde{U}^1) - G(\tilde{U}^2)$, thereby reducing the regularity required on $\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2$.

Let $\mathcal{L}U^2 = (y^2, w^2) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$. We begin by isolating the contributions that can be estimated directly. As consequence of condition (C6), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{K}_\gamma(t)| &\leq \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\langle D^\gamma \{ [H_0(\tilde{v}^1) - H_0(\tilde{v}^2)] [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1)] w^2 \}, D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2} | \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\langle D^\gamma \{ H_0(\tilde{v}^2) [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2 \}, D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2} | \\ &=: \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^1 + \mathcal{K}_{s-2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For estimating \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^1 we first apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then estimate (4.21) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^1 &\leq \|H(\tilde{U}^1) - H(\tilde{U}^2)\|_{\tilde{H}^{s-1}} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1)] w^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|G_0(\tilde{v}^1)\|_{\dot{H}^\alpha} + \|G_0(\tilde{v}^1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+\alpha}}) \|U^2\|_{H^s} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\tilde{U}^j\|_{H^s}, \|U^j\|_{H^s} \leq M$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^1 \leq 2M^2 C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} (M + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} \tilde{v}^1\|_{H^{s-1}}) \quad (9.10)$$

In order to estimate the term \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^2 we first observe that,

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^2 \leq \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^3 + \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4,$$

with

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^3 := \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\langle [D^\gamma, H_0(\tilde{v}^2)] [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2, D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2} |$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4 := \sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\langle D^\gamma [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2, H_0(\tilde{v}^2)^\top D^\gamma v \rangle_{L^2} |.$$

For the term \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^3 , the commutator estimates for D^γ together with the Sobolev embedding theorem imply that

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^3 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} \|U\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

The term \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4 contains the highest-order derivatives falling on the commutator. To estimate \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4 we write $\gamma = \eta + \beta$ with $|\eta| = 1$ for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|\gamma| \geq 1$ and use integration by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4 &:= |\langle [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2, H_0(\tilde{v}^2)^\top v \rangle_{L^2} | \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\beta|=0}^{s-2} |\langle D^\beta [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2, D^\eta (H_0(\tilde{v}^2)^\top D^{\beta+\eta} v) \rangle_{L^2} | \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)] w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} \|U\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the triangle inequality, the Sobolev product estimates and the fractional Leibniz rule it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)]w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} &\leq \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)) w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|(G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)) \Lambda^{2\alpha} w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\leq C (\|(G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2))w^2\|_{H^2} + \|(G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2))w^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2+2\alpha}}) \\ &\quad + \|G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{\hat{H}^{s-1}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ &\leq C (\|G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{\hat{H}^{s-1}} \|U^2\|_{H^s} + \|G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2+2\alpha}} \|U^2\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + \|G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{L^\infty} \|U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2+2\alpha}}) \end{aligned}$$

and thus, by (14.2) we obtain that

$$\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_0(\tilde{v}^1) - G_0(\tilde{v}^2)]w^2\|_{H^{s-2}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M \left(\|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{H^{s-2+2\alpha}} \right).$$

In consequence, by combining the estimates for \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^3 and \mathcal{K}_{s-1}^4 we conclude that

$$\mathcal{K}_{s-1}^2 \leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M)2M^2 \left(\|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{H^{s-2+2\alpha}} \right). \quad (9.11)$$

Therefore, by (9.10) and (9.11), we have

$$\sum_{|\gamma|=0}^{s-1} |\mathcal{K}_\gamma(t)| \leq 2M^2 C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[(1 + M + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} \tilde{v}^1\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|\tilde{U}^1 - \tilde{U}^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{H^{s-2+2\alpha}} \right] \quad (9.12)$$

By using (9.9) and (9.12) in the right hand side of (9.8), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq 2MC_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \int_0^t (M + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|\tilde{U}^1(\tau) - \tilde{U}^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} d\tau \\ &\quad + 2M^2 C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\int_0^t (1 + M + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} \tilde{v}^1(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|\tilde{U}^1(\tau) - \tilde{U}^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} d\tau \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} (\tilde{v}^1(\tau) - \tilde{v}^2(\tau))\|_{H^{s-2}} d\tau \right] \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_0]$. Then, Hölder's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\int_0^t (M^2 + \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\Lambda^\alpha \tilde{v}^1\|_{H^s}^2) d\tau \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\tilde{U}^1(\tau) - \tilde{U}^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) t^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha (\tilde{v}^1(\tau) - \tilde{v}^2(\tau))\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{U}^1, U^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (Mt^{1/2} + M) \left(\int_0^t \|\tilde{U}^1(\tau) - \tilde{U}^2(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C_2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) t^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha (\tilde{v}^1(\tau) - \tilde{v}^2(\tau))\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_0]$. Consequently, estimate (9.6) follows. \square

10. COMPACTNESS: TIGHTNESS OF THE L^2 NORM

In the following result we establish the relative compactness of the solution mapping $\mathcal{T}_\alpha : X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1) \rightarrow X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with respect to the topology of Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . The proof relies on three ingredients: The Aubin-Lions lemma, a uniform control of the L^2 -tails of the family $U_n = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}_n)$, and the Kato-Ponce-Li commutator expansion. More precisely, if ω is a scalar valued function and V is a vector field, then

$$\omega \Lambda^{2\alpha} V = \Lambda^{2\alpha}(\omega V) - \mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(\omega, V) - \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta \omega \Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta} V, \quad (10.1)$$

where $\mathbb{K}_\sigma(\omega, V)$ was defined in lemma 4.

Lemma 8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The set $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)) \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ is relatively compact in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} .*

Proof. Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and consider the sequences $\{\tilde{U}_n\}, \{U_n\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ where $U_n = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the definition of $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$, the weak convergence properties of Hilbert spaces and the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, we can extract a sub-sequence $\{U_{n(j)}\} \subset \{U_n\}$ and some $U \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{n(j)} &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} U && \text{in } L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^s), \\ \Lambda^\alpha v_{n(j)} &\rightharpoonup \Lambda^\alpha v && \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^s), \\ \partial_t U_{n(j)} &\rightharpoonup \partial_t U && \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (10.2)$$

In consequence, by the lower semicontinuity of the norms,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U\|_{L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^s)}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \\ \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|U_{n(j)}\|_{L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^s)}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha v_{n(j)}(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right) \leq M^2 \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

and

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\partial_t U\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|\partial_t U_{n(j)}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq M_1^2. \quad (10.4)$$

Moreover, the weak* convergence in (10.2) implies that

$$U_{n(j)} \rightharpoonup U \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^s). \quad (10.5)$$

Now, let B_N be a ball of radius $N \in \mathbb{N}$ centered at zero and consider the compact embedding $H^s(B_N) \hookrightarrow H^{s-1}(B_N)$. By the Aubin-Lions lemma, there is a sub-sequence $\{U_{n(k)}^1\}_k \subset \{U_{n(j)}\}$ such that

$$U_{n(k)}^1 \rightarrow U \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}(B_1)),$$

by the uniqueness of the weak limit and (10.5). Then, we apply the Aubin-Lions lemma to $\{U_{n(k)}^1\}$ to extract a second sub-sequence $\{U_{n(k)}^2\}_k \subset \{U_{n(k)}^1\}_k$ with the property that

$$U_{n(k)}^2 \rightarrow U \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}(B_2)).$$

Therefore, a combination between the Aubin-Lions lemma and a diagonal argument yield the existence of a sub-sequence $\{U_{n(k)}\} \subset \{U_{n(j)}\}$ such that,

$$\text{for any } N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}(B_N)) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (10.6)$$

Let us show that $U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; L^2)$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be equal to 1 on the unit ball $B_1(0)$ and, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\phi_N(x) = \phi(\frac{x}{N})$ and $U_{k,N} = (1 - \phi_N)U_{n(k)}$. Since $U_{n(k)} = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\partial_t U_{n(k)} + A^j(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\partial_j U_{n(k)} + D(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})U_{n(k)} \\ + B(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{n(k)} + H(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})]\mathcal{L}U_{n(k)} = 0, \\ U_{n(k)}|_{t=0} = U_0. \end{aligned}$$

For any matrix coefficient A , we introduce the notation, $A_k = A(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})$ and $A_{k,N} = (1 - \phi_N)A_k$. Multiplying the above equation by $1 - \phi_N \geq 0$ and use the decomposition $U_{n(k)} = U_{k,N} + \phi_N U_{n(k)}$ in every term except $\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{n(k)}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_k^0\partial_t U_{k,N} + A_{k,N}^j\partial_j U_{k,N} + D_{k,N}U_{k,N} + B_k(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{n(k)} + H_k(1 - \phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}U_{k,N} \\ = -(1 - \phi_N)A_k^j\partial_j(\phi_N U_{n(k)}) - (1 - \phi_N)D_k(\phi_N U_{n(k)}) \\ - (1 - \phi_N)H_k[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U_{n(k)}). \end{aligned} \quad (10.7)$$

Before applying the energy method to this equation, observe that the coefficient $(1 - \phi_N)B_k$ no longer satisfies the structural assumptions of condition 1. To recover the required form of the diffusion term, we apply (10.1) with $\omega = 1 - \phi_N$ and $V = U_{n(k)}$, so that

$$(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{n(k)} = \Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{k,N} - \mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N, U_{n(k)}) - \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}U_{n(k)}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}U_{k,N} = [\Lambda^{2\alpha}, (1 - \phi_N)G_k]\mathcal{L}U_{k,N} + \mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N, G_k\mathcal{L}U_{k,N}) \\ - \sum_{0 < \beta \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}(G_k\mathcal{L}U_{k,N}). \end{aligned}$$

By using these identities in (10.7) we conclude that $U_{k,N}$ satisfies the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} A_k^0\partial_t U_{k,N} + A_{k,N}^j\partial_j U_{k,N} + D_{k,N}U_{k,N} + B_k\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_{k,N} + H_k[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_{k,N}]\mathcal{L}U_{k,N} = F_{k,N} + W_{k,N}, \\ U_{k,N}|_{t=0} = (1 - \phi_N)U_0, \end{aligned} \quad (10.8)$$

with,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k,N} := -(1 - \phi_N)A_k^j(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\partial_j(\phi_N U_{n(k)}) - (1 - \phi_N)D(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})(\phi_N U_{n(k)}) \\ - (1 - \phi_N)H(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U_{n(k)}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{k,N} := B_k\mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N, U_{n(k)}) + H_k\mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N, G_k\mathcal{L}U_{k,N}) \\ + B_k \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}U_{n(k)} + H_k \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}(G_k\mathcal{L}U_{k,N}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the L^2 energy estimate (7.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{k,N}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha v_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\|(1 - \phi_N)U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|W_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.9)$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& \leq 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)A^j(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\partial_j(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)A^j(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\partial_j(\phi_N U(\tau))\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& + 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)D(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)D(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\phi_N U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& + 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)H(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& + 2 \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)H(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U(\tau))\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau
\end{aligned}$$

and since $\tilde{U}_{n(k)} \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the Sobolev product estimates imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left[\int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)\nabla(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)\nabla(\phi_N U(\tau))\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right. \\
& + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)\phi_N U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\
& \left. + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1-\phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U(\tau))\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{10.10}$$

In particular, observe that, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the Sobolev product estimates together with the fractional Leibniz rule and the Sobolev embedding yield,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(1-\phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U_{n(k)} - \phi_N U)(\tau)\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \begin{cases} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)\|_{L^2} & 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\|_{L^2} \|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha-1}(\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U))\|_{L^2} & \frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1 \end{cases} \\
& \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \begin{cases} \|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)\|_{L^2} & 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha-1}(\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U))\|_{L^2} & \frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{10.11}$$

In order to estimate the last term in (10.10) we first apply the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(1-\phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U)\|_{L^2} & \leq \|(1-\phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_k\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U))\|_{L^2} + \|(1-\phi_N)G_k\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U)\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \|(1-\phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_k\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U))\|_{L^2} + C(\mathcal{O}_1, M)\|(1-\phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}(\phi_N U)\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For each term in the right hand side of the last inequality we apply (10.1) and then, as a consequence of lemma 4 and the Sobolev product estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}(G_k\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U))\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}((1 - \phi_N)G_k\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U))\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbb{K}_{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N, G_k\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U))\|_{L^2} \\ &+ \left\| \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2\alpha} \frac{1}{\beta!} D^\beta (1 - \phi_N) \Lambda^{2\alpha, \beta}(G(\tilde{U}_{n(k)})\phi_N U) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|(1 - \phi_N)\phi_N U\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{H^1}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|(1 - \phi_N)\Lambda^{2\alpha}(\phi_N U)\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|(1 - \phi_N)\phi_N U\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{H^1}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \phi_N)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G_k]\mathcal{L}(\phi_N U)\|_{L^2} \\ \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) (\|(1 - \phi_N)\phi_N U\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} \|\phi_N U\|_{H^1}). \end{aligned} \quad (10.12)$$

Now, take the $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty}$ in (10.10) and observe that, as a consequence of (10.6), (10.11) and (10.12),

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla(\phi_N U(\tau))\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)\phi_N U(\tau)\|_{H^2}^2 d\tau \right. \\ &\left. + \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^{T_0} \|\phi_N U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^{T_0} \|\phi_N U(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 d\tau \right) \end{aligned}$$

holds for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. By expanding the derivative $\nabla(\phi_N U)$ and using the formulas,

$$\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} = N^{-2\alpha} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}\phi\|_{L^\infty} = \frac{N^{-2\alpha}}{(2\pi)^d} \|\cdot\|^{2\alpha} \widehat{\phi}\|_{L^1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty} = N^{-1} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (10.13)$$

we find a constant $C_4 = C_4(\mathcal{O}_1, M, d, \phi, \alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq C_4 \left[\int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right. \\ &+ \int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)D^2 U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D^2(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \\ &\left. + \left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} \right) \int_0^{T_0} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 d\tau \right] \\ &\leq C_4 \left[\int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)D^2 U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right. \\ &\left. + \left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^4} \right) \int_0^{T_0} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 d\tau \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as a consequence of (10.3), for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|F_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq C_4 \left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^4} \right) T_0 M^2 \\ &+ C_4 \left[\int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)D^2U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.14)$$

Similarly, by lemma 4 and the Sobolev product estimates it follows that

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|W_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{n(k)}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla(1 - \phi_N)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{n(k)}(\tau)\|_{H^1}^2 d\tau \right).$$

Therefore, by using (10.13) and that $\{U_{n(k)}\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M)$ we conclude that, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ the estimate

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|W_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq C_4 M^2 T_0 \left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^4} \right) \quad (10.15)$$

holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by using (10.14) and (10.15), in estimate (10.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq C_4 \int_0^{T_0} (\|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)D^2U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) d\tau \\ &+ C_4 \left[\left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^4} \right) T_0 M^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)U_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.16)$$

Now, let us show that $U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; L^2)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For every $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{n(k)}(\tau) - U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq 2 \int_0^{T_0} (\|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) d\tau \\ &\leq 2 \left[\int_0^{T_0} \|\phi_N(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{k,N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau + \int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right] \end{aligned}$$

In particular, (10.6) implies that, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\phi_N U_{n(k)} \rightarrow \phi_N U$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; L^2)$ and therefore, by (10.16),

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{n(k)}(\tau) - U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq C_4 \int_0^{T_0} (\|(1 - \phi_N)U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)\nabla U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)D^2U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) d\tau \\ &+ C_4 \left[\left(\frac{1}{N^{4\alpha}} + \frac{1}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^4} \right) T_0 M^2 + \|(1 - \phi_N)U_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

which is valid for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $U \in L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^s)$ and $s \geq 2$, the dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|(1 - \phi_N)D^\ell U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \ell = 0, 1, 2,$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Likewise,

$$\|(1 - \phi_N)U_0\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, given $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $N \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large so that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{T_0} \|U_{n(k)}(\tau) - U(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq \epsilon. \quad (10.17)$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that $U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; L^2)$.

Next, we upgrade the convergence to the space $L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Let $\theta = \frac{s-1}{s}$. By interpolating between L^2 and H^s , we have

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq \int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\theta)} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{H^s}^{2\theta} d\tau.$$

Applying Hölder's inequality and using (10.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right)^\theta \\ &\leq (4T_0 M^2)^\theta \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|(U_{n(k)} - U)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1-\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (10.17) implies that $U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Finally, let us consider the sequence $\{\Lambda^\alpha v_{n(k)}\}$, where $U_{n(k)} = (u_{n(k)}, v_{n(k)})$. Interpolating between the homogeneous Sobolev spaces $\dot{H}^{-\alpha}$ and \dot{H}^{s-1} , with $\theta = \frac{\alpha}{s-1+\alpha}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau &\leq \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha}}^{2(1-\theta)} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}^{2\theta} d\tau \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right)^\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Using again (10.3) together with (10.17), we deduce that $\Lambda^\alpha v_{n(k)} \rightarrow \Lambda^\alpha v$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; L^2)$. Finally, interpolation between L^2 and $H^{s-1+\alpha}$ shows that the convergence actually shows in $L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Indeed, choosing $\theta = \frac{s-1}{s-1+\alpha}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau &\leq \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\theta)} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1+\alpha}}^{2\theta} d\tau \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha(v_{n(k)} - v)(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \right)^\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (10.3) and the previous convergence result gives $\Lambda^\alpha v_{n(k)} \rightarrow \Lambda^\alpha v$ in $L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Therefore, $U_{n(k)} \rightarrow U$ in Y_{s-1, α, T_0} . Consequently, $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(X_{s, \alpha, T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1))$ is relatively compact in Y_{s-1, α, T_0} , which completes the proof. \square

11. LOCAL EXISTENCE: THE FIXED POINT ARGUMENT

In this section we use Schauder's fixed point theorem to deduce the local existence of solutions for the Cauchy problem (1.1). However, this theorem cannot be applied directly to $\mathcal{T}_\alpha : X_{s-1, \alpha, T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1) \rightarrow X_{s-1, \alpha, T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ because X_{s-1, α, T_0} is not a closed set with respect to the topology of Y_{s-1, α, T_0} . Therefore, we show that \mathcal{T}_α can be extended to the closure of its domain and then apply Schauder's fixed point theorem to this extension. Finally, we recover the required regularity for the solution by using the energy estimate.

Definition 11.1. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Assume that \mathcal{O}_1 and M are defined by (8.6) and (8.7), respectively and that $T_0 > 0$ and M_1 satisfy the conditions of theorem 8.1. Define X_∞ as the set of all functions $V = (w, z)^\top$ of $(x, t) \in Q_{T_0}$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} V &\in L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^s), \quad z \in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s+\alpha}), \\ \partial_t V &\in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}), \quad V(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}_1 \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in Q_{T_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.1)$$

and for all $t \in [0, T_0]$,

$$E_{s,\alpha}^2(V(t)) \leq M^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^t \|\partial_t V(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \leq M_1^2. \quad (11.2)$$

Proposition 3. The set X_∞ is the closure of $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with respect to the topology of Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . Furthermore, X_∞ can be characterized as the set of all vectors $U \in Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}$ for which there is a sequence $\{U_k\} \subset X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ and $V \in Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}$ such that

$$U_k \rightarrow U \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_k) \rightarrow V \quad \text{in } Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}. \quad (11.3)$$

Proof. Let $V \in \overline{X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)}$. Then, there is $\{V_k\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ such that $V_k \rightarrow V$ in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . Since $\{V_k\}$ is bounded and satisfies (8.1) and (8.2), we can extract a subsequence $\{V_{k(j)}\} \subset \{V_k\}$ that satisfies (10.2), (10.3) and (10.4) with V replacing U . Since T_0 satisfies theorem 8.1, it follows that $V(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}_1$ for all $(x, t) \in Q_{T_0}$. Hence, $V \in X_\infty$. On the other hand, let $V \in X_\infty$. Consider the sequence $V_k := \mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_k} V$ with $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$. Since $\partial_t V \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s-1})$ it follows that $V \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Consequently, $V_k \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^s)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to verify that $\{V_k\}$ satisfies (11.1) and (11.2). Therefore, $\{V_k\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$. Moreover, by the standard properties of the mollifier $\mathbb{J}_{\epsilon_k} V$, combined with the dominated convergence theorem it follows that $V_k \rightarrow V$ in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . Thus, $X_\infty = \overline{X_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)}$.

In order to prove the second statement, let X_0 be the set of vectors in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} that satisfies (11.3). Then, by the first part of the proposition and the definition of X_0 , we have that $X_0 \subset X_\infty$. On the other hand, let $V \in X_\infty$. Then, there is $\{V_k\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ such that $V_k \rightarrow V$ in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . Then, by the Hölder continuity described in (9.6) and the embedding, $L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}) \hookrightarrow L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$, we deduce that $\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha(V_k)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . In consequence, there is $V \in Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}$ such that (11.3) holds and thus, $X_\infty \subset X_0$. This concludes the proof. \square

In the next result we establish the existence of an extension of \mathcal{T}_α to the closure of its domain.

Proposition 4. There is an extension $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}$ of \mathcal{T}_α to the set X_∞ defined as $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(U) = V$, where U and V satisfy (11.3) with the following properties:

- (1) The mapping $U \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}} V$ is well defined in the sense that it is independent of the Cauchy sequence that satisfies $U_k \rightarrow U$. Moreover, U and V satisfy the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U)\partial_t V + A^j(U)\partial_j V + D(U)V + B(U)\Lambda^{2\alpha}V + H(U)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U)]\mathcal{L}V &= 0, \\ V|_{t=0} &= U_0. \end{aligned} \quad (11.4)$$

- (2) There is a positive constant $C_5(\mathcal{O}_1, M, T_0)$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(U_1) - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(U_2)\|_{Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}}^2 \leq C_5(\mathcal{O}_1, M, T_0)\|U_1 - U_2\|_{Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}} \quad \text{for all } U_1, U_2 \in X_\infty. \quad (11.5)$$

- (3) $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(X_\infty) \subset X_\infty$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(U) = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(U)$ for all $U \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$.
(4) $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(X_\infty)$ is relatively compact with respect to the topology of Y_{s-1,α,T_0} .

Proof. Let $U \in X_\infty$. Then, there is $\{U_k\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}$ and V in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} such that $U_k \rightarrow U$ and $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_k) \rightarrow V$ in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . By the definition of \mathcal{T}_α , if we set $V_k := \mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_k)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U_k)\partial_t V_k + A^j(U_k)\partial_j V_k + D(U_k)V_k + B(U_k)\Lambda^{2\alpha}V_k + H(U_k)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U_k)]\mathcal{L}V_k &= 0, \\ V_k|_{t=0} &= U_0, \end{aligned} \quad (11.6)$$

holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By taking the limit when $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using the convergence in (11.3) we find that V satisfies the Cauchy problem (11.4). If there is another sequence $\{\tilde{U}_k\} \subset X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ such that $\tilde{U}_k \rightarrow U$ and $\tilde{V}_k := \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\tilde{U}_k) \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ in Y then, as in the previous lines, \tilde{V} satisfies (11.4). Since $V, \tilde{V} \in X_\infty$, we can apply the energy method to conclude that $E_{s,\alpha,T_0}(V - \tilde{V}) = 0$. Therefore, $\tilde{V} = V$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}$ is well-defined. This concludes (1).

Next, we prove statement (2). Let $U_1, U_2 \in X_\infty$. Then, there are sequences $\{U_{1,k}\}$ and $\{U_{2,k}\}$ in $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ and vectors $V_1, V_2 \in Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}$ such that $U_{1,k} \rightarrow U_1$, $U_{2,k} \rightarrow U_2$, $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_{1,k}) \rightarrow V_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_{2,k}) \rightarrow V_2$. As a consequence of (9.6) and the embedding $L^\infty([0, T_0]; H^{s-1}) \hookrightarrow L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$, it holds that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_{1,k}) - \mathcal{T}_\alpha(U_{2,k})\|_{Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}} \leq C_5(\mathcal{O}_1, M, T_0)\|U_{1,k} - U_{2,k}\|_{Y_{s-1,\alpha,T_0}} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By taking the limit when $k \rightarrow \infty$, (11.5) follows.

The proof of statement (3) follows immediately from the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}$ and proposition 3.

Finally, we prove statement (4). Observe that, $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(X_\infty) \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}_\alpha(X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1))}$ holds as a consequence of (11.3). Therefore, lemma 8 implies that the closure of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(X_\infty)$ is contained in a compact set in Y_{s-1,α,T_0} . The result follows. \square

Theorem 11.1 (Local existence). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer. Assume that condition 1 is satisfied with one of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3). Assume that $U_0 \in H^s$ satisfies condition 3. Then, there is $T_0 > 0$ and solution $U = (u, v)$ to the Cauchy problem (1.1) in the set $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$.*

Proof. First, define \mathcal{O}_1 and M as in (8.6) and (8.7), respectively. By theorem 8.1, there is $T_0 > 0$ such that the solution map $\mathcal{T}_\alpha : X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1) \rightarrow X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ is well defined. Consider the extension $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}$ of \mathcal{T}_α to the set X_∞ defined in proposition 4. It is easy to verify that X_∞ is a convex set. Consequently, by proposition 4, we can apply Schauder's fixed point theorem to conclude the existence of a fixed point $U_\infty \in X_\infty$ of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}$. Thus, $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\infty}(U_\infty) = U_\infty$ and, as a consequence of statement (1) in proposition 4, U_∞ satisfies the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U_\infty)\partial_t U_\infty + A^j(U_\infty)\partial_j U_\infty + D(U_\infty)U_\infty + B(U_\infty)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U_\infty + H(U_\infty)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U_\infty)]\mathcal{L}U_\infty &= 0, \\ U_\infty|_{t=0} &= U_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $U_\infty \in X_\infty$, theorem 7.5 implies that $U_\infty \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^s)$. Hence, $U_\infty \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$. \square

12. UNIQUENESS

Given the lack of a contraction type inequality for the solution map associated with system (1.1), we can only show uniqueness of solutions under the assumption of smallness of the initial data.

Theorem 12.1. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ be an integer and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Assume that condition 1 is satisfied with a constant matrix $H = H_c$. Let $U_0 \in H^s$ satisfy condition 3 and define \mathcal{O}_1 , M and M_1 as in section 8. Then, there is $T_0 > 0$, such that the Cauchy problem (1.1) has a unique solution $U = (u, v)$ in $X_{s,\alpha,T_1}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ if one of the following conditions holds true:*

- (i) $H_c = \mathbb{O}_N$.

- (ii) One of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3) is satisfied with the constant matrices $H_c \neq \mathbb{O}_N$ and $A^0 = A_c^0 > 0$. Moreover, let $\kappa_{\sigma,d}$ be the norm of the embedding $H^\sigma \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ whenever $\sigma > \frac{d}{2}$ and define the constant

$$\kappa(\alpha, s, d) := \begin{cases} \kappa_{s-\alpha,d} & \text{if (E1) holds,} \\ \kappa_{s-s_\alpha,d} & \text{if (E2) or (E3) holds.} \end{cases}$$

Assume the following condition is satisfied,

$$0 < \omega_0 := 2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1)|H_c|^2 C_G^2(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha) \kappa^2(\alpha, s, d) |\mathcal{L}|^2 M^2 < 1, \quad (12.1)$$

where $C(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha)$ is the constant in (14.2) with $\sigma = s - 1 - \alpha$.

In particular, the solution satisfies the energy estimate,

$$\|U(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 d\tau \leq 2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) \|U_0\|_{H^s}^2 \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T_0]. \quad (12.2)$$

Proof. Define \mathcal{O}_1 , M and M_1 as in section 8. Then, by theorem 11.1, there exists $T_0 > 0$ and a solution $U = (u, v) \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ of (1.1) that satisfies (12.2) for all $t \in [0, T_0]$. It remains to show the uniqueness. Let U^1 and U^2 be two different solutions of the Cauchy problem (1.1) in $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$. Then, as in (9.2) and (9.3), $U := U^1 - U^2$ satisfies the equation

$$A^0(U^1) \partial_t U + A^j(U^1) \partial_j U + D(U^1)U + B(U^1) \Lambda^{2\alpha} U + H_c[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(\tilde{U}^1)] \mathcal{L}U = F_{1,2} + Q_{1,2},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} (A^0(U^1))^{-1} F^{1,2} &:= - \left[\bar{A}^j(U^1) - \bar{A}^j(U^2) \right] \partial_j U^2 - \left[\bar{D}(U^1) - \bar{D}(U^2) \right] U^2 - \left[\bar{B}(U^1) - \bar{B}(U^2) \right] \Lambda^{2\alpha} U^2 \\ (A^0(U^1))^{-1} Q^{1,2} &:= -\bar{H}_c[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)] \mathcal{L}U^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, by the block structure in condition (C5), we have that $F^{1,2} = (A^0(U^1))^{-1} (f_1^{1,2}, f_2^{1,2})$ where $(f_1^{1,2}, f_2^{1,2}) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Therefore, by the energy estimates with $m = s - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha (v^1 - v^2)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} d\tau \\ \leq 2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) \int_0^t \left(\|f_1^{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|f_2^{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}}^2 + \|Q^{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}}^2 \right) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (12.3)$$

Since $U^1, U^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$, the Sobolev product estimates imply that,

$$\|f_1^{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) M \|U^1 - U^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \quad (12.4)$$

and

$$\|f_2^{1,2}\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \left(M \|U^1 - U^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|[\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1)] \Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \right).$$

The last term requires the fractional Leibniz rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1)] \Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ \leq C \left(\|\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1)\|_{L^\infty} \|v^2\|_{H^s} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and since, $s - 2 - \alpha > 0$, we have

$$\|\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}}^2 \leq C \|\nabla(\bar{B}_0(U^2) - \bar{B}_0(U^1))\|_{H^{s-2}}^2.$$

By the embedding $H^{s-\alpha} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ we obtain the estimate

$$\|f_2^{1,2}\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \|U^1 - U^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \left(M + \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2\|_{H^s} \right). \quad (12.5)$$

If we assume (i), $Q^{1,2} = 0$ and thus, by using (12.4) and (12.5) in (12.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(v^1 - v^2)(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} d\tau \\ & \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}^2 \left[t + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 d\tau \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 d\tau = 0$, there is $0 < T_1 \leq T_0$ such that

$$0 < \sup_{t \in [0, T_1]} \left[t + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 d\tau \right] < 1.$$

Therefore, it follows that $U^1 \equiv U^2$ on $[0, T_1]$. Then, by the uniform continuity of $f(t) = \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{\dot{H}^s} d\tau$, we can iterate the argument with initial data in $t = T_1, 2T_1, \dots$ and thus, uniqueness follows in $[0, T_0]$.

Now assume that (ii) holds. Then, $A^0(U^1) = A_c^0$ and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^{1,2}\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} & \leq |H_c| \left(\|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^2} + \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \right) \\ & \leq |H_c| \left(\|(G(U^1) - G(U^2))\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{H^2} + \|(G(U^1) - G(U^2))\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $s - 1 \geq 2$ and $U^2 \in X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ we have

$$\|Q^{1,2}\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \leq |H_c| (C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M)M\|U^1 - U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}}).$$

By using the identity

$$\Lambda^{s-1-\alpha}[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2 = [\Lambda^{s-1+\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2 - [\Lambda^{s-1-\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2,$$

together with condition (C6) and fractional Leibniz rule we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ & \leq C \left(\|\nabla(G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2))\|_{L^4} \|\Lambda^{s-2+\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^4} + \|G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1+\alpha}} \|\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\nabla(G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2))\|_{L^4} \|\Lambda^{s-2-\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^4} + \|G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the embeddings $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^4$ and $H^s \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ & \leq \|G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2)\|_{H^2} \|\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{H^s} + \|G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1+\alpha}} \|\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{H^s} \\ & \quad + \|G_0(v^1) - G_0(v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow H^2$ and estimate (14.2) yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ & \leq C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha) (\|U^1 - U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} |\mathcal{L}|M + \|\Lambda^\alpha(v^1 - v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} |\mathcal{L}|M + \|U^1 - U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} \|\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty}). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, under any of the hypotheses (E1)-(E3), the following bound is true,

$$\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa(\alpha, d) |\mathcal{L}| \left(\|\Lambda^\alpha v^2\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|U^2\|_{\dot{H}^s} \right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U^1) - G(U^2)]\mathcal{L}U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ & \leq C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha) \kappa(\alpha, d) |\mathcal{L}| \left([M + \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2\|_{\dot{H}^s}] \|U^1 - U^2\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} + \|\Lambda^\alpha(v^1 - v^2)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}} M \right) \end{aligned}$$

and the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^{1,2}\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}} &\leq |H_c|C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha) (M + \kappa(\alpha, s, d)|\mathcal{L}[M + \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2\|_{H^s}] \|U^1 - U^2\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\quad + |H_c|C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, s, \alpha)\kappa(\alpha, s, d)|\mathcal{L}M\|\Lambda^\alpha(v^1 - v^2)\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) \int_0^t \|Q^{1,2}(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1-\alpha}}^2 d\tau &\leq C_1(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left[t + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha v^2(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \omega_0 \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\alpha(v^1 - v^2)(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (12.6)$$

By using estimates (12.4), (12.5) and (12.6) in (12.3) together with the assumption (12.1), we conclude that

$$\sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|U(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left[t + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{2\alpha} v^2(\tau)\|_{H^s}^2 \right].$$

Then, as in case (i), uniqueness follows. \square

13. APPLICATIONS TO FRACTIONAL COMPRESSIBLE FLUID DYNAMICS

13.1. Hypo-dissipative isentropic Navier-Stokes equations. In this section we apply the previous results to fractional regularizations of physical examples provided that the initial data U_0 differs from a constant state U_c by an H^s function.

Consider the following system of equations,

$$\tilde{A}^0(V)\partial_i V + \tilde{A}^j(V)\partial_j V + \tilde{D}(V)V + \tilde{B}(V)\Lambda^{2\alpha}V = 0 \quad (13.1)$$

with initial data satisfying that,

$$V(0) - U_c \in H^s$$

for some constant state $U_c \in \mathcal{O}$ for which, we assume the condition,

Condition (W). $\tilde{D}(V)U_c = 0$ for all $V \in \mathcal{O}$.

Typically, such system is not given in symmetric form, that is, it does not satisfy the assumption of symmetry in conditions (C2), (C3) and (C5). Nonetheless, if the system corresponds to a fractional regularization of a hyperbolic system of balance laws, a Friedrichs' symmetrizer might exist. That is, a smooth symmetric matrix function $S = S(V) > 0$ such that, $S(V)A^0(V)$, $S(V)A^j(V)$ and $S(V)B(V)$ are symmetric and $S(V)A^0(V) > 0$ for all $V \in \mathcal{O}$. Then, by introducing the variable $U = V - U_c$ and defining,

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U) &:= S(U + U_c)\tilde{A}^0(U + U_c), \quad A^j(U) := S(U + U_c)\tilde{A}^j(U + U_c), \quad D(U) := D(U + U_c) \\ &\text{and } B(U) := B(U + U_c), \end{aligned} \quad (13.2)$$

a quasilinear system of the form (13.8) that satisfies condition 1 is obtained. Let us consider the fractional regularization of the three dimensional compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equations given by (1.3). We make the following assumption,

Condition (T). *The pressure field p varies within the domain $\mathcal{D} = \{\rho \in \mathbb{R} \mid \rho > 0\}$, $p > 0$ and $p \in C^\infty(\mathcal{D})$. The fluid satisfies that, $p'(\rho) > 0$.*

Consider the vector state of variables $V = (\rho, v)^\top \in \mathcal{O}_V \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ where \mathcal{O}_V is an open convex set defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_V = \{(\rho, v)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \rho > 0 \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{R}^3\}.$$

Assume that $U_c = (\rho_c, 0) \in \mathcal{O}_V$. Then, the variable $U = (\eta, v)^\top$, defined as $U = V - U_c$ takes values in the open convex set

$$\mathcal{O} = \{(\eta, v)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \eta > -\rho_c \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{R}^3\}.$$

In order to obtain the quasilinear form (13.1), we first provide the coefficients $\tilde{A}^0(V)$, $\tilde{B}(V)$ and the symbol, $\tilde{A}(\xi; V) := \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{A}^j(V)\xi_j$ for any $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $V = U + U_c$ with $U \in \mathcal{O}$. We have that,

$$\tilde{A}^0(U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & (\eta + \rho_c)\mathbb{I}_3 & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B}(U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \mu_0\mathbb{I}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13.3)$$

where \mathbb{I}_d denotes the identity matrix of order $d \times d$, and all the empty spaces refer to zero block matrices of appropriate sizes, and

$$\tilde{A}(\xi; U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} \xi \cdot v & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi_1 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi_2 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi_3 \\ \xi_1 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v & 0 & 0 \\ \xi_2 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & 0 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v & 0 \\ \xi_3 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & 0 & 0 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13.4)$$

Furthermore, the diagonal matrix function

$$S(U + U_c) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \mathbb{I}_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13.5)$$

is a Friedrichs' symmetrizer for system (1.3) and thus, by (13.2), its quasilinear symmetric form is determined by the following coefficients,

$$A^0(U) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & & \\ & & \\ & & (\eta + \rho_c)\mathbb{I}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B(U) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \mu_0\mathbb{I}_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13.6)$$

and

$$A(\xi; U) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} \xi \cdot v & \xi_1 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & \xi_2 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & \xi_3 p'(\eta + \rho_c) \\ \xi_1 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v & 0 & 0 \\ \xi_2 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & 0 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v & 0 \\ \xi_3 p'(\eta + \rho_c) & 0 & 0 & (\eta + \rho_c)\xi \cdot v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13.7)$$

Thus, the quasilinear form of (1.3)-(1.4) is

$$A^0(U)\partial_t U + A^j(U)\partial_j U + B(U)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U = 0 \quad (13.8)$$

with coefficients given by (13.6) and (13.7). As a consequence of theorem 11.1 and statement (i) in theorem 12.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 13.1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ and assume that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is given. Let condition **(T)** hold true. Suppose that the initial data satisfies $U_0 = (\rho_0 - \rho_c, v_0) \in H^s$ and $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \rho_0(x) > 0$. Then, there are positive constants $T_0 > 0$, M and M_1 , and an open convex bounded set \mathcal{O}_1 compactly contained in \mathcal{O} such that the Cauchy problem for the quasilinear form of (1.3)-(1.4), that is, (13.8) with coefficients (13.6) and (13.7), has a unique solution $U = (\rho - \rho_c, v) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^s)$ with $v \in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s+\alpha})$ in the*

set $X_{s,\alpha,T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with $\partial_t \rho \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$ and $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-2\alpha})$. In particular, the solution satisfies the energy estimate

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \|(\rho - \rho_c)(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \leq M^2.$$

Moreover, if $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have that $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$.

□

13.2. Compressible Euler system with singular velocity alignment. Let us consider system (1.5) with kernel given by (1.6) with $d = 3$ and $N = 4$. As in the previous example, we consider a constant state of mass density $\rho_c > 0$ and the change of variables $\eta = \rho - \rho_c$. Then, by using (1.2), the non-local velocity alignment term can be reformulated as

$$-\rho(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x-y)(v(x) - v(y))\rho(y)dy = -\rho_c(\eta(x) + \rho_c)\Lambda^{2\alpha}v(x) - (\eta(x) + \rho_c)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, v]\eta.$$

Consequently, system (1.5) takes the quasilinear form

$$\tilde{A}^0(V)\partial_t V + \tilde{A}^j(V)\partial_j V + \tilde{D}(V)V + \tilde{B}(V)\Lambda^{2\alpha}V + \tilde{H}(V)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, \tilde{G}(V)]\mathcal{L}_4 V = 0 \quad (13.9)$$

where $V = U + U_c$ with $U_c = (\rho_c, 0)^\top$. In this case, the coefficient $\tilde{A}^0(U + U_c)$ and the first order symbol $\tilde{A}(\xi; U + U_c)$ coincide with those given in (13.3) and (13.4). The remaining coefficients are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}(U + U_c) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & \rho_c(\eta + \rho_c)\mathbb{I}_3 & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{H}(U + U_c) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & (\eta + \rho_c)\mathbb{I}_3 & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{G}(U + U_c) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & v_3 \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{D}(U + U_c) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & \beta(\eta + \rho_c)\mathbb{I}_3 & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and the constant matrix \mathcal{L}_4 is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_4 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13.10)$$

In particular, notice that U_c satisfies condition **(R)**.

Although (13.5) is a Friedrichs's symmetrizer for system (13.9), it does not place the system within the framework of condition 1. Indeed, the matrix product $S(U + U_c)\tilde{H}(U + U_c)$ fails to satisfy condition (C6), since its nontrivial block depends on the hyperbolic variable η . In order to correct this problem we propose the symmetrizer as the following diagonal matrix function

$$S(U + U_c) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{(\eta + \rho_c)^2} & & & \\ & \frac{1}{(\eta + \rho_c)}\mathbb{I}_3 & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, system (1.5) can be written in the quasilinear symmetric form

$$A^0(U)\partial_t U + A^j(U)\partial_j U + B(U)\Lambda^{2\alpha}U + H(U)[\Lambda^{2\alpha}, G(U)]\mathcal{L}_4 U = 0 \quad (13.11)$$

with coefficients given by

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(U) &:= \mathcal{S}(U + U_c) \tilde{A}^0(U + U_c) = \mathbb{I}_4, & B(U) &:= \mathcal{S}(U + U_c) \tilde{B}(U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & \rho_c \mathbb{I}_3 & & \end{pmatrix} \\ D(U) &:= \mathcal{S}(U + U_c) \tilde{D}(U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & \beta \mathbb{I}_3 & & \end{pmatrix}, & H(U) &:= \mathcal{S}(U + U_c) \tilde{H}(U + U_c) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \mathbb{I}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ G(U) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & v_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (13.12)$$

and

$$A(\xi; U) := \mathcal{S}(U + U_c) \tilde{A}(\xi; U + U_c) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{(\eta + \rho_c)^2} \xi \cdot v & \xi_1 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & \xi_2 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & \xi_3 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} \\ \xi_1 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & \xi \cdot v & 0 & 0 \\ \xi_2 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & 0 & \xi \cdot v & 0 \\ \xi_3 \frac{p'(\eta + \rho_c)}{\eta + \rho_c} & 0 & 0 & \xi \cdot v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13.13)$$

In particular, notice that $B_0(U) := \rho_c \mathbb{I}_3$ and thus, for any $v \in H^\alpha$ we have

$$\langle B_0(U) \Lambda^{2\alpha} v, v \rangle_{L^2} \geq \rho_c \|\Lambda^\alpha v\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (13.14)$$

Therefore, with these coefficients, condition 1 is satisfied. Hence, we have the following result.

Theorem 13.2. *Assume that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is given and set $s_\alpha := \max\{1, 2\alpha\}$. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $s > \frac{d}{2} + s_\alpha$. Let condition **(T)** hold true. Suppose that the initial data satisfies $U_0 = (\rho_0 - \rho_c, v_0) \in H^s$ and $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \rho_0(x) > 0$. Then, there are positive constants $T_0 > 0$, M and M_1 , and an open convex bounded set \mathcal{O}_1 compactly contained in \mathcal{O} such that the Cauchy problem for the quasilinear symmetric form of (1.5), that is, (13.11) with coefficients given by (13.12) and (13.13), has a solution $U = (\rho - \rho_c, v) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^s)$ with $v \in L^2([0, T_0]; H^{s+\alpha})$ in the set $X_{s, \alpha, T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with $\partial_t \rho \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$ and $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-2\alpha})$. In particular, the solution satisfies the energy estimate*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_0]} \|(\rho - \rho_c)(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \int_0^{T_0} \|\Lambda^\alpha v(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \leq M^2.$$

Additionally, if $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have that $\partial_t v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T_0]; H^{s-1})$. Furthermore, there is a small parameter $\eta_0 > 0$, such that if

$$\|(\rho_0 - \rho_c, v_0)\|_{H^s} \leq \eta_0, \quad (13.15)$$

the solution is unique among all solutions in $X_{s, \alpha, T_0}(\mathcal{O}_1, M, M_1)$ with the same initial data.

Proof. The existence statement follows directly from theorem 11.1. Thus, it remains to verify the uniqueness criterion given by condition (12.1) in statement (ii) of theorem 12.1.

Observe that, since $A^0 = \mathbb{I}_4$ we may choose $a_0(\mathcal{O}_1) = a_1(\mathcal{O}_1) = 1$ and, by (13.14), $\mu_0 = \rho_c$. Consequently, from (7.16) and (8.7), we obtain

$$C_0(\mathcal{O}_1) = \frac{1}{\min\{1, \frac{\rho_c}{2}\}} \quad \text{and} \quad M := \sqrt{\frac{2}{\min\{1, \frac{\rho_c}{2}\}}} \|(\rho_0 - \rho_c, v_0)\|_{H^s}.$$

Moreover, $|H| = |\mathcal{L}| = \sqrt{3}$. Therefore, in this case, the parameter ω_0 in (12.1) is given by

$$\omega_0 = 18 \left(\frac{1}{\min \{1, \frac{\rho_c}{2}\}} \right)^{3/2} C_G^2(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \kappa^2(\alpha, s, d) \|(\rho_0 - \rho_c, v_0)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2.$$

Next, observe that $\|DG(v)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$ and $D^k G(v) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. Then, $\|DG\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[s-1-\alpha]}} \leq 1$ and, by the chain rule estimates and theorem 8.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|DG(v)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} &\leq C \|DG\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[s-1-\alpha]}} (1 + \|v\|_{L^\infty}^{s-1-\alpha}) \|v\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}} \\ &\leq C (1 + (\kappa_{s,d} \|U\|_{H^s})^{s-1-\alpha}) \|U\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq C (1 + (\kappa_{s,d} M)^{s-1-\alpha}) M. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as a consequence of (14.6), we can take

$$C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M) := \max\{\|DG(v)\|_{L^\infty}, \|DG(v)\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1-\alpha}}\}.$$

We now choose

$$\eta_0 := \left(\frac{2}{\min \{1, \frac{\rho_c}{2}\}} \right)^{-1/2} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2C}, \frac{1}{2\kappa_{\sigma,d}}, \frac{1}{18\kappa^2(\alpha, s, d)} \left(\frac{1}{\min \{1, \frac{\rho_c}{2}\}} \right)^{-1} \right\}$$

so that $C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M) \leq 1$. Substituting this bound into the expression for ω_0 , we obtain $0 < \omega_0 < 1$. Therefore, condition (12.1) is satisfied, and the uniqueness statement follows from theorem 12.1. \square

14. APPENDIX

Lemma 9. *Assume that condition 2 is satisfied. Let G be a smooth function of $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{O}$.*

(a) *Let $r > 0$ be given. There is a positive constant C , depending on $d = 2, 3$ and r such that*

$$\text{for any } t \in [0, T], \quad \int_{B_r(0)} \left| \mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t))) (\xi) \right| d\xi \leq C(d, r) \|\tilde{U}\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)}.$$

(b) *For every $0 < \sigma \leq s$, it holds that $G(\tilde{U}) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \dot{H}^\sigma)$.*

(c) *Moreover, if $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ we have that, $\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; L^\infty)$ and there are two positive constants $C_1 = C_1(d)$ and $C_2 = C_2(d, s, \sigma)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 \|G(\tilde{U})\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \dot{H}^\sigma)} + C_2 \|G(\tilde{U})\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \dot{H}^s)}. \quad (14.1)$$

(d) *Assume that $G = G(\tilde{v})$ and let $\sigma \in [0, s + \alpha]$. Let $\tilde{U}^1 = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}^1)^\top$ and $\tilde{U}^2 = (\tilde{u}^2, \tilde{v}^2)^\top$ satisfy condition 2. Then, there is a positive constant $C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, \sigma)$ such that*

$$\|G(\tilde{v}^1) - G(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C_G(\mathcal{O}_1, M, \sigma) (\|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{H^\sigma} + \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{L^\infty}). \quad (14.2)$$

Proof. Since $U \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s)$ for $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, the fractional chain rule estimates 5 assure that, for any $\sigma \in (0, s]$, there is a constant $C = C(\sigma, \|G\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[\sigma]}}) > 0$ such that

$$\text{for all } t \in [0, T], \quad \|G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq C(\sigma, \|G\|_{\mathcal{C}^{[\sigma]}}) \|\tilde{U}\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \dot{H}^s)}.$$

Then, for any $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(0)} \left| \mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t)))(\xi) \right| d\xi &= \int_{B_r(0)} \left| \mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t))) \right| |\xi|^\delta |\xi|^{-\delta} d\xi \\ &\leq C(\delta, \|G\|_{C^{[\delta]}}) \|\tilde{U}\|_{C([0,T];H^s)} \left(\int_{B_r(0)} |\xi|^{-2\delta} d\xi \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $d = 3$ take $\delta = 1$ and for $d = 2$, $\delta = 1/2$ and assertion (a) follows.

In order to prove the continuity of the mapping $G(\tilde{U}) : [0, T] \rightarrow \dot{H}^\sigma$ we consider the following formula,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0)) &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\tau} G\left(\tilde{U}(t_0) + \tau(\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}(t_0))\right) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \left[\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}(t_0) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0) := \tilde{U}(t_0) + \tau(\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}(t_0))$. Then, by (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} &\leq \left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \right\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}(t_0)\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \right\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \|\tilde{U}(t) - \tilde{U}(t_0)\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned} \tag{14.3}$$

Observe that $DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) \in L^\infty([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$ and thus, the first term in the right hand side of (14.3) goes to zero if $t \rightarrow t_0$ in $[0, T]$. Since $\tilde{U} \in C([0, T]; H^s)$, it is enough to obtain a uniform bound on the term

$$\left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \right\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma},$$

in order to conclude. First, observe that, for any t, t_0 and $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $|\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)| \leq 2\|\tilde{U}\|_{C([0,T];H^s)}$ so that, the range of the function $[0, 1] \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)$ lies within a compact set of \mathbb{R}^N . Hence, for any $\delta > 0$, there is a positive constant $M(\delta) > 0$ such that $\|DG\|_{C^{[\delta]}} \leq M(\delta)$ when restricted to $R(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0))$. Therefore, by the fractional chain rule estimates, for any $\delta > 0$ there are positive constants $C(\delta)$ and $M(\delta)$ such that,

$$\text{for all } t, t_0 \in [0, T] \text{ and } \tau \in [0, 1], \quad \|DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^\delta} \leq C(\delta)M(\delta)\|\tilde{U}\|_{C([0,T];H^s)}. \tag{14.4}$$

Now, it is easy to show that

$$\mathcal{F} \left(\int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \right) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{F}(DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0))) d\tau.$$

Therefore, by Jensen's inequality and (14.4) it follows that, for any $\sigma \in (0, s]$ there are two positive constants $C(\sigma)$ and $M(\sigma)$ such that for any $t, t_0 \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)) d\tau \right\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma}^2 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^1 |\xi|^{2\sigma} |\mathcal{F}(DG(\mathcal{U}(\tau; t, t_0)))(\xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ &\leq C(\sigma)^2 M(\sigma)^2 \|\tilde{U}\|_{C([0,T];H^s)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{14.5}$$

In consequence, by taking the limit when $t \rightarrow t_0$ in the right hand side of (14.3), the result follows.

Now assume that $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. By the continuity of $\mathcal{F} : L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ and Hölder's inequality, for any $t \in [0, T]$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\mathcal{F}(\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t)))\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} |\xi|^\sigma |\mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t)))(\xi)| d\xi + \int_{|\xi| \geq 1} |\xi|^\sigma |\mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t)))(\xi)| |\xi|^{s-\sigma} |\xi|^{-(s-\sigma)} d\xi \\ &\leq \lambda_d (B_1(0))^{1/2} \|G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} + \left(\int_{|\xi| \geq 1} |\xi|^{-2(s-\sigma)} d\xi \right)^{1/2} \|G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{\dot{H}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $s - \sigma > \frac{d}{2}$, the last integral is finite and (14.1) follows. Moreover, by the fractional chain rule estimates, there is a constant $C = C(\sigma, s, d) > 0$ satisfying that,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t))\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\sigma, s, d) \|\tilde{U}\|_{C([0, T]; H^s)}.$$

In the same manner, for any $t, t_0 \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t)) - \Lambda^\sigma G(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t))) - \mathcal{F}(G(\tilde{U}(t_0)))\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C(\sigma, s, d) \left(\|G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} + \|G(\tilde{U}(t)) - G(\tilde{U}(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the continuity proven in (b), we reach the conclusion.

Finally, to prove (d) let $\tilde{U}^1, \tilde{U}^2 \in \mathcal{O}_1$ be arbitrary states with second components \tilde{v}^1 and \tilde{v}^2 , respectively. By using the same argument that lead us to (14.3) we obtain the estimate

$$\|G(\tilde{v}^1) - G(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \leq \left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{V}(\tau)) d\tau \right\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} + \left\| \int_0^1 DG(\mathcal{V}(\tau)) d\tau \right\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma} \|\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (14.6)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(\tau) = \tilde{v}^2 + \tau(\tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{v}^2)$. The result is now a consequence of the fact that $DG(\mathcal{V}(\tau)) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \times [0, 1])$ and (14.5). \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to Professors Ramón Plaza and Luis López for their encouragement and support during the preparation of this manuscript. This work was supported by Cátedra IIMAS from August 2024 to December of the same year and by Estancias Posdoctorales por México 2024 SECIHTI, grant 589929, from February 2025 to August of the same year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Felipe Angeles. The cauchy problem for a quasilinear system of equations with coupling in the linearization. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 22(10):2960–2999, 2023.
- [2] Hajer Bahouri. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*. Springer, 2011.
- [3] Li Chen, Changhui Tan, and Lining Tong. On the global classical solution to compressible euler system with singular velocity alignment. *Methods and Applications of Analysis*, 28(2):153–172, 2022.
- [4] Pascal Cherrier and Albert Milani. *Linear and quasi-linear evolution equations in Hilbert spaces*, volume 125. American Mathematical Society Providence, 2012.
- [5] Felipe Cucker and Steve Smale. Emergent behavior in flocks. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 52(5):852–862, 2007.
- [6] S. Kawashima. *Systems of a hyperbolic parabolic type with applications to the equations of magnetohydrodynamics*. PhD thesis, Kyoto University, 1983.
- [7] Pierre Gilles Lemarié-Rieusset. *The Navier-Stokes problem in the 21st century*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2023.
- [8] Dong Li. On kato–ponce and fractional leibniz. *Revista matemática iberoamericana*, 35(1):23–100, 2019.

- [9] Sebastien Motsch and Eitan Tadmor. A new model for self-organized dynamics and its flocking behavior. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 144(5):923, 2011.
- [10] Thomas C Sideris, Becca Thomases, and Dehua Wang. Long time behavior of solutions to the 3d compressible euler equations with damping, 2003.
- [11] Shu Wang and Shuzhen Zhang. The initial value problem for the equations of motion of fractional compressible viscous fluids. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 377:369–417, 2023.
- [12] Shu Wang and Shuzhen Zhang. The global classical solution to compressible system with fractional viscous term. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 75:103963, 2024.

(F. Angeles) INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES EN MATEMÁTICAS APLICADAS Y EN SISTEMAS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO, CIRCUITO ESCOLAR S/N, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, C.P. 04510, CD. DE MÉXICO (MEXICO)
Email address: felipe.angeles@iimas.unam.mx