Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Journal of Inequalities and Applications
Volume 2011, Article ID 946208, 7 pages
doi:10.1155/2011/946208

Research Article

Global Well-Posedness for Certain Density-Dependent Modified-Leray-α Models

Wenying Chen[1] and Jishan Fan[2,3]

[1] *College of Mathematics and Computer Science, Chongqing Three Gorges University, Wanzhou, Chongqing 404000, China*
[2] *Department of Applied Mathematics, Nanjing Forestry University, Nanjing 210037, China*
[3] *Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

Correspondence should be addressed to Wenying Chen, wenyingchenmath@gmail.com

Received 3 October 2010; Accepted 16 January 2011

Academic Editor: R. N. Mohapatra

Global well-posedness result is established for both a 3D density-dependent modified-Leray-α model and a 3D density-dependent modified-Leray-α-MHD model.

1. Introduction

A density-dependent Leray-α model can be written as

$$\begin{gathered}
\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\
\rho v_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla v + \nabla \pi - \Delta v = 0, \\
v = \left(1 - \alpha^2 \Delta\right) u, \quad \text{in } (0,\infty) \times \Omega, \\
\operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{div} u = 0, \quad \text{in } (0,\infty) \times \Omega, \\
v = u = 0 \quad \text{on } (0,\infty) \times \partial\Omega, \\
(\rho, \rho v)\big|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, \rho_0 v_0) \quad \text{in } \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3,
\end{gathered} \tag{1.1}$$

where ρ is the fluid density, v is the fluid velocity field, u is the "filtered" fluid velocity, and π is the pressure, which are unknowns. α is the lengthscale parameter that represents the width of the filter, and for simplicity, we will take $\alpha \equiv 1$. $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$.

When $\rho \equiv 1$, the above system reduces to the well-known Leray-α model and has been studied in [1, 2]. When $\alpha \to 0$, the above system reduces to the classical density-dependent Navier-Stokes equation, which has received many studies [3–6]. Specifically, it is proved in [3, 4] that the density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations has a unique locally smooth solution (ρ, v) if the following two hypotheses (H1) and (H2) are satisfied:

(H1) $\rho_0 \in W^{1,q}$ for some $q \in (3,6]$, $v_0 \in H_0^1 \cap H^2$, and $\operatorname{div} v_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$,

(H2) $\exists \tilde{\pi}$ and $g \in L^2$ such that $-\Delta v_0 + \nabla\tilde{\pi} = \rho_0^{1/2} g$ in Ω.

One of the aims of this paper is to prove a global well-posedness result for the density-dependent Leray-α model (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let (H1) and (H2) be satisfied. Then the problem* (1.1) *has a unique smooth solution* (ρ, π, v) *satisfying*

$$\begin{gathered} \rho \in L^\infty\left(0,T; W^{1,q}\right), \qquad \rho_t \in L^\infty(0,T;L^q), \\ \pi \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^1\right) \cap L^2\left(0,T;W^{1,6}\right), \\ v \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^2\right) \cap L^2\left(0,T;W^{2,6}\right), \\ \sqrt{\rho} v_t \in L^\infty\left(0,T;L^2\right), \qquad v_t \in L^2\left(0,T;H_0^1\right), \end{gathered} \tag{1.2}$$

for any $T > 0$.

Next, we consider the following density-dependent modified-Leray-α-MHD model:

$$\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\rho v_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla v + \nabla\pi - \Delta v = (B_s \cdot \nabla) B, \tag{1.4}$$

$$\partial_t B_s + u \cdot \nabla B - B_s \cdot \nabla v = \Delta B, \tag{1.5}$$

$$v = \left(1 - \alpha^2 \Delta\right) u, \qquad B = \left(1 - \alpha_M^2 \Delta\right) B_s, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} B = \operatorname{div} B_s = 0, \quad \text{in } (0,\infty) \times \Omega, \tag{1.7}$$

$$v = u = 0, \quad B \cdot n = B_s \cdot n = \operatorname{curl} B \times n = \operatorname{curl} B_s \times n = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.8}$$

$$(\rho, v, B_s)\big|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, v_0, B_{s0}) \quad \textit{in } \Omega \subseteq R^3, \tag{1.9}$$

where B and B_s represent the unknown magnetic field and the "filtered" magnetic field, respectively. $\alpha_M > 0$ is the lengthscale parameter representing the width of the filter and we will take $\alpha_M = 1$ for simplicity. n is the unit outward vector to $\partial\Omega$. When $\alpha \to 0$ and $\alpha_M \to 0$, the above system (1.3)–(1.9) reduces to the well-known density-dependent MHD equations, which have been studied by many authors (see [7–9] and referees therein). When

$\rho = 1$ and $\alpha_M = 0$, the above system has been studied in [10] recently, and also modified models were analyzed in [11]. In this paper, we will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $0 < m \leq \rho_0 \leq M < \infty$, $\rho_0 \in W^{1,q}$ *with* $q \in (3,6]$, $v_0 \in H_0^1 \cap H^2$, $B_0 \in H^3$, *and* $\operatorname{div} v_0 = \operatorname{div} u_0 = \operatorname{div} B_0 = \operatorname{div} B_{s0} = 0$ *in* Ω. *Then the problem* (1.3)–(1.9) *has a unique smooth solution* (ρ, π, v, B, B_s) *satisfying*

$$\begin{gathered}
0 < m \leq \rho \leq M < \infty, \quad \rho \in L^\infty\left(0,T;W^{1,q}\right), \quad \rho_t \in L^\infty(0,T;L^q), \\
\pi \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^1\right) \cap L^2\left(0,T;W^{1,6}\right), \\
v \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^2\right) \cap L^2\left(0,T;W^{2,6}\right), \qquad v_t \in L^\infty\left(0,T;L^2\right) \cap L^2\left(0,T;H_0^1\right), \\
B \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^3\right), \qquad \partial_t B_s \in L^\infty\left(0,T;H^1\right), \qquad \partial_t B \in L^2\left(0,T;H^1\right),
\end{gathered} \tag{1.10}$$

for any $T > 0$.

For other related models, we refer to [12–16].

Since the proof of Theorem 1.1 is similar to and simpler than that of Theorem 1.2, we only prove Theorem 1.2 for concision.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

By similar argument as that in [3, 4], it is easy to prove that there are $T_0 > 0$ and a unique smooth solution (ρ, v, B, B_s) to the problem (1.3)–(1.9) in $[0, T_0]$, and we only need to establish some a priori estimates for any time. Therefore, in the following estimates, we assume that the solution (ρ, v, B, B_s) is sufficiently smooth.

First, it follows from (1.3), (1.7), and the maximum principle that

$$0 < m \leq \rho(x,t) \leq M < +\infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Testing (1.4) and (1.5) by v and B, respectively, using (1.3), (1.6), and (1.7), summing up them, we see that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho v^2 + |B_s|^2 + |\nabla B_s|^2 dx + \int |\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla B|^2 dx = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Hence

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3)} \leq C, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\|B_s\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1)} + \|B_s\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3)} \leq C, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\|B\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C. \tag{2.6}$$

Taking ∂_i to (1.3), multiplying it by $|\partial_i \rho|^{q-2}\partial_i \rho$, summing over i, using (1.7) and (2.3), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla \rho|^q dx \le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^q}^q \le C\|u\|_{H^3}\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^q}^q, \tag{2.7}$$

which yields

$$\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,q})} \le C. \tag{2.8}$$

Using (1.3), (2.3) and (2.8), we find that

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q)} \le \|u\nabla\rho\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q)} \le \|u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q)} \le C\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q)} \le C. \tag{2.9}$$

Multiplying (1.5) by $-\Delta B$, using (1.6), (1.7), (2.3), and (2.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla B_s|^2 + |\Delta B_s|^2 dx + \int |\Delta B|^2 dx \\
&\quad = \int [(u\cdot\nabla)B - (B_s\cdot\nabla)v]\Delta B\, dx \\
&\quad \le (\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla B\|_{L^2} + \|B_s\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2})\|\Delta B\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \le C(\|\nabla B\|_{L^2} + \|B_s\|_{H^2}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2})\|\Delta B\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \le C\Big(\|B\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\Delta B\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|B_s\|_{H^2}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\Big) \\
&\quad \le \frac{1}{2}\|\Delta B\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|B\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2\|B_s\|_{H^2}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

which yields

$$\|B_s\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2)} + \|B_s\|_{L^2(0,T;H^4)} \le C, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\|B\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|B\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2)} \le C. \tag{2.12}$$

Multiplying (1.4) by v_t, using (1.3), (2.11), (2.12), (2.1), (2.3), and (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla v|^2 dx + \int \rho v_t^2 dx &= \int (B_s\cdot\nabla)B\cdot v_t dx - \int \rho u\cdot\nabla v\cdot v_t dx \\
&\le \|B_s\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla B\|_{L^2}\|v_t\|_{L^2} + \|\sqrt{\rho}\|_{L^\infty}\cdot\|u\|_{L^\infty}\cdot\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\cdot\|\sqrt{\rho}v_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\le C\|\nabla B\|_{L^2}\cdot\|\sqrt{\rho}v_t\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\|\sqrt{\rho}v_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{\rho}v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla B\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

which implies

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^3)} \le C, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\|v_t\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \le C. \tag{2.15}$$

It follows from (1.4), (2.14), (2.15), (2.11), (2.12), and the H^2-theory for Stokes system that [17]

$$\|v\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^4)} \le C. \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly, it follows from (1.5), (2.11), (2.12), and (2.16) that

$$\|\partial_t B_s\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \le C. \tag{2.17}$$

Taking ∂_t to (1.5), multiplying it by $\partial_t B$, using (1.7), (1.8), (2.12), (2.11), (2.14), and (2.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\partial_t B_s|^2 + |\nabla \partial_t B_s|^2 dx + \int |\nabla B_t|^2 dx \\
&\quad = -\int u_t \cdot \nabla B \cdot B_t dx + \int \partial_t B_s \cdot \nabla v \cdot B_t dx + \int B_s \cdot \nabla v_t \cdot B_t dx \\
&\quad = \int u_t \nabla B_t \cdot B dx + \int \partial_t B_s \cdot \nabla v \cdot B_t dx - \int B_s \cdot \nabla B_t \cdot v_t dx \\
&\quad \le \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla B_t\|_{L^2} \|B\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t B_s\|_{L^3} \cdot \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \cdot \|B_t\|_{L^6} + \|B_s\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla B_t\|_{L^2} \|v_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \le C\|v_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla B_t\|_{L^2} + C\|\partial_t B_s\|_{H^1} \|\nabla B_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \le \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla B_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\partial_t B_s\|_{H^1}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

which implies

$$\|\partial_t B_s\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1)} + \|\partial_t B_s\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3)} \le C, \tag{2.19}$$

$$\|B_t\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \le C. \tag{2.20}$$

Due to (1.5), (2.3), (2.11), (2.12), (2.14), (2.19), (2.16), and the H^2-theory of the elliptic equations, we have

$$\|B\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2)} + \|B\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3)} \le C, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\|B_s\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^4)} + \|B_s\|_{L^2(0,T;H^5)} \le C. \tag{2.22}$$

Taking ∂_t to (1.4), we see that

$$\rho v_{tt} + \rho u \cdot \nabla v_t + \nabla \pi_t - \Delta v_t = \partial_t B_s \cdot \nabla B + B_s \cdot \nabla \partial_t B - \rho_t v_t - \left(\rho_t u + \rho u_t\right) \cdot \nabla v. \tag{2.23}$$

Multiplying the above equation by v_t, using (1.3), (2.19), (2.21), (2.22), (2.9), and (2.14), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho v_t^2 dx + \int |\nabla v_t|^2 dx \\
&\quad \le \|\partial_t B_s\|_{L^6} \cdot \|\nabla B\|_{L^2} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^3} \\
&\qquad + \|B_s\|_{L^\infty} \cdot \|\nabla \partial_t B\|_{L^2} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^2} + \left\|\rho_t\right\|_{L^q} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\qquad + \left\|\rho_t\right\|_{L^q} \cdot \|u\|_{L^\infty} \cdot \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}} + \left\|\rho\right\|_{L^\infty} \|u_t\|_{L^\infty} \cdot \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \cdot \|v_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \le C\|v_t\|_{L^3} + C\|\nabla \partial_t B\|_{L^2} \|v_t\|_{L^2} + C\|v_t\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}} \|v_t\|_{L^2} + C\|v_t\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}} + C\|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad \le \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla \partial_t B\|_{L^2}^2 + C,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

which gives

$$\|v_t\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|v_t\|_{L^2(0,T;H_0^1)} \le C. \tag{2.25}$$

Combining (1.4), (2.21), (2.22), (2.25), (2.14), and the regularity theory of the Stokes system [17], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2)} + \|v\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{2,6})} &\le C, \\
\|\pi\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1)} + \|\pi\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,6})} &\le C, \\
\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^4)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{4,6})} &\le C.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Similarly, one can prove that

$$\|B\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^3)} \le C. \tag{2.27}$$

This completes the proof.

Acknowledgment

This work is partially supported by ZJNSF (Grant no. R6090109) and NSFC (Grant no. 10971197).

References

[1] A. Cheskidov, D. D. Holm, E. Olson, and E. S. Titi, “On a Leray-α model of turbulence,” *Proceedings of The Royal Society of London A*, vol. 461, no. 2055, pp. 629–649, 2005.

[2] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “Regularity criteria for the viscous Camassa-Holm equations,” *International Mathematics Research Notices. IMRN*, no. 13, pp. 2508–2518, 2009.

[3] Y. Cho and H. Kim, “Unique solvability for the density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations,” *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 465–489, 2004.

[4] H. J. Choe and H. Kim, “Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for nonhomogeneous incompressible fluids,” *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 28, no. 5-6, pp. 1183–1201, 2003.

[5] R. Danchin, “Density-dependent incompressible viscous fluids in critical spaces,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh A*, vol. 133, no. 6, pp. 1311–1334, 2003.

[6] P.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics, vol. 1: Incompressible Models*, vol. 10 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1996.

[7] B. Desjardins and C. Le Bris, “Remarks on a nonhomogeneous model of magnetohydrodynamics,” *Differential and Integral Equations*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 377–394, 1998.

[8] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “A regularity criterion for the density-dependent magnetohydrodynamic equations,” *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 33, no. 11, pp. 1350–1355, 2010.

[9] J.-F. Gerbeau and C. Le Bris, “Existence of solution for a density-dependent magnetohydrodynamic equation,” *Advances in Differential Equations*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 427–452, 1997.

[10] J. S. Linshiz and E. S. Titi, “Analytical study of certain magnetohydrodynamic-α models,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 48, no. 6, Article ID 065504, p. 28, 2007.

[11] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “Global well-posedness for two modified-Leray-α-MHD models with partial viscous terms,” *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 856–862, 2010.

[12] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “A regularity criterion for the nematic liquid crystal flows,” *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, vol. 2010, Article ID 589697, 9 pages, 2010.

[13] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “Regularity criteria of strong solutions to a problem of magneto-elastic interactions,” *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 1697–1704, 2010.

[14] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “Regularity criteria for a Lagrangian-averaged magnetohydrodynamic-α model,” *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 1410–1420, 2011.

[15] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “On the Cauchy problem for a Leray-α-MHD model,” *Nonlinear Analysis. Real World Applications*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 648–657, 2011.

[16] Y. Zhou and J. Fan, “Regularity criteria for a Magnetohydrodynamic-α model,” *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 309–326, 2011.

[17] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations*, vol. 2 of *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 3rd edition, 1984.