

Shock Formation for Compressible Euler Equations on \mathbb{S}^2

Xinliang An*, Haoyang Chen†, Fulin Qi‡, and Wenze Su§

December 29, 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we prove the finite-time shock formation for the compressible Euler equations on the two-dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . In contrast to the flat Euclidean case \mathbb{R}^2 , the geometry of \mathbb{S}^2 imposes new difficulties, and the fluid dynamics are affected by the curved background. To overcome these challenges, we modify the existing modulation method and employ a set of carefully constructed, time-dependent coordinates that precisely track the shock formation on \mathbb{S}^2 . In particular, we first perform a time-dependent rotation of \mathbb{S}^2 , then apply the stereographic projection to the sphere, straighten the steepening shock front, and finally construct shock-adapted coordinates. In the shock-adapted coordinates, the compressible Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 can be recast into a form suitable for self-similar analysis. Within this framework, we implement a detailed bootstrap argument and establish global well-posedness for the self-similar system. After transferring these results back to the original physical system, we thereby demonstrate the finite-time shock formation on \mathbb{S}^2 .

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Main Results	4
1.2	Related Literature	5
1.2.1	Shock Formation for the Euler Equations	5
1.2.2	Fluid Mechanics on Manifolds	6
1.3	Proof Strategy for the Main Theorem	7
1.4	Organization of the Paper	14
1.5	Notation	15
1.6	Acknowledgements	16
2	Preliminaries	16
2.1	Rescaled Time and Sound Speed	16
2.2	Rotation and Stereographic Projection	16
2.3	Reformulation as a Symmetric Hyperbolic System	17
2.4	Coordinates Adapted to the Shock	18
2.5	Riemann Variables	19
2.6	Self-Similar Transformation	20

*National University of Singapore, Singapore. matax@nus.edu.sg

†National University of Singapore, Singapore. hychen@nus.edu.sg

‡National University of Singapore, Singapore. fulin_qi@u.nus.edu

§Tsinghua University, China. wenzesu@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

2.7	Blow-up Profile	23
2.8	Perturbation Equation	24
2.9	Modulation ODEs	25
3	Initial Setup and Main Theorem	27
3.1	Initial Data	27
3.2	Statement of the Main Theorem	30
3.3	Framework of Bootstrap Argument	31
3.4	Outline for closing the bootstrap argument	34
3.5	Immediate Corollaries of Bootstrap Assumptions	35
4	Estimates for Transport Equations	40
4.1	Estimates for Transport Terms	40
4.2	Estimates for Forcing Terms	43
4.3	Estimates Near the Origin	46
5	Estimates for Modulation Variables	49
5.1	Estimates on κ	49
5.2	Estimate on τ	49
5.3	Estimate on Q	50
5.4	Estimate on ψ	50
6	Estimates for Z and A	50
7	Estimates for W and \widetilde{W}	53
7.1	Estimates Near the Origin	53
7.2	Estimates Away from the Origin	54
7.2.1	Estimates in $\{ y \geq l\}$	55
7.2.2	Estimates in $\{ y \geq L\}$	56
8	Top Order Energy Estimates	57
8.1	Equation for P	58
8.2	Useful Lemmas	58
8.3	Proof of the Energy Estimate	61
A	Shock Formation for Equivariant Euler Equations	63
A.1	Preliminaries	63
A.1.1	The Equivariant Euler's Equations	64
A.1.2	Co-moving Coordinates	64
A.1.3	Riemann variables	65
A.1.4	Self-similar transformations	65
A.1.5	1D self-similar Burgers profile	65
A.1.6	Evolution of <u>unknowns</u>	66
A.1.7	Evolution of \widetilde{W}	66
A.2	Main results	66
A.2.1	Initial conditions	66
A.2.2	Main theorem	67

A.3	Bootstrap argument	68
A.3.1	Bootstrap assumptions	68
A.3.2	Bootstrap procedure	69
A.4	Immediate corollaries of bootstrap assumptions	69
A.4.1	Relation between $\langle y \rangle$, ξ_0 , and $\mathcal{X}(s)$	69
A.4.2	Absence of Vacuum	70
A.4.3	Estimates of $\partial_y^k F_W$ at $y = 0$	70
A.4.4	Evolution equations of modulation variables	70
A.4.5	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on κ	71
A.4.6	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on τ	71
A.4.7	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on ξ	71
A.5	A priori estimates	71
A.5.1	Estimates on the transport term	72
A.5.2	Estimates on the derivative of forcing terms	72
A.5.3	Estimates on forcing terms	74
A.6	Estimates on Lagrangian Trajectory	75
A.6.1	Lagrangian trajectories	75
A.6.2	Lower bound of Φ_W	75
A.6.3	Lower bound of Φ_Z	75
A.7	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on W and \widetilde{W}	77
A.7.1	Estimates of $ \partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0 $	77
A.7.2	Estimates of $\partial_y^k \widetilde{W} \mathbb{1}_{ y \leq l}$	77
A.7.3	$\langle y \rangle^\mu$ -weighted estimates	78
A.7.4	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on $ \partial_y^k \widetilde{W} \mathbb{1}_{ y \leq L}$	79
A.7.5	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on W	80
A.8	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on Z	82
A.8.1	Decay estimates for $\partial_y^k Z$	82
A.8.2	Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on Z	83
A.9	Proof of the main theorem	84
A.9.1	Blow-up speed estimate	84
A.9.2	Blow-up location estimate	84
A.9.3	Blow-up time estimate	84
A.9.4	Proof of 1/3-Hölder continuity	85

1 Introduction

One central question in the mathematical theory of compressible fluids is the shock-formation problem for the compressible Euler equations. While shock formation for the Euler equations has been extensively studied in flat Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , much less is known about the dynamics of compressible flows on curved manifolds. At the same time, fluid equations posed on curved surfaces, such as the rotating sphere, are relevant in modeling atmospheric and oceanic phenomena on planetary scales, where curvature plays an important role in shaping large-scale flow behavior. One notable example is the tropical cyclone, whose horizontal dynamics can be effectively approximated by compressible flows on \mathbb{S}^2 . To advance our understanding of the Euler equations on non-flat manifolds, it is important to develop a systematic framework that accurately captures the curvature effects and clarifies how the

underlying geometry influences the fluid dynamics at each stage of the analysis. As such, the problem addressed in this paper is both mathematically challenging and physically rich.

In this paper, we prove the *first* shock formation result for the compressible Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 . As pointed out by Arnold and Khesin in the book [12] (Chapter VI, §2), the isentropic compressible Euler equations on a Riemannian manifold (M, g) take the form:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}}\rho + \nabla_v \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}}v + \nabla_v v + \frac{\nabla p}{\rho} = 0, \\ p = \frac{1}{\gamma}\rho^\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here, $\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the physical time, ∇_v stands for the covariant derivative on M along the direction of the vector field v , and ∇p is the gradient of the pressure p . The unknowns of the system are the velocity field $v \in \Gamma(TM)$, the density function $\rho \in C^\infty(M)$, and the pressure function $p \in C^\infty(M)$. The parameter $\gamma > 1$ is a physical constant known as the adiabatic index. We refer interested readers to [12] for a derivation of the above system.

Throughout the paper, for a fixed $r_0 > 0$, we set $M = \mathbb{S}^2 = \{\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\dot{x}| = r_0\}$, and we use the standard spherical metric g on \mathbb{S}^2 . Our result below establishes shock formation for system (1.1) on manifold (\mathbb{S}^2, g) . It marks the *first* rigorous result of shock formation for compressible Euler equations on a curved manifold. In addition, accurate descriptions of the blow-up time, the blow-up location, and the regularity of the resulting shock solution are provided. Owing to the physical interest and other potential applications, we also independently investigate shock formation for equivariant Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 using different coordinates and modulation variables. The detailed proofs are provided in Appendix A¹.

1.1 Main Results

The rough version of our main theorem is stated below. For the detailed version, readers are referred to Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 1.1 (Shock Formation for Compressible Euler Equations on \mathbb{S}^2). *Consider the isentropic compressible Euler equations (1.1) on the 2-dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^2*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}}\rho + \nabla_v \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}}v + \nabla_v v + \frac{\nabla p}{\rho} = 0, \\ p = \frac{1}{\gamma}\rho^\gamma, \end{cases}$$

where the adiabatic index $\gamma > 1$. There exists a family of compactly supported smooth initial data, given as perturbations around the self-similar Burgers profile, such that the corresponding solutions develop a point shock in finite time T_* .

At the shock point, the first derivatives of ρ and v blow up at the rate $\frac{1}{T_* - t}$, while the fluid variables themselves remain bounded. In particular, the solution exhibits $C^{1/3}$ regularity at the shock. Moreover, the vorticity is bounded up to the shock and is allowed to be non-trivial.

Remark 1.2. We obtain detailed information about the shock singularity formed, including precise descriptions of the blow-up location and time, the blow-up rate, and the regularity of the shock solution. Compared to the Euclidean case, the isentropic Euler equations on the sphere contain additional terms arising from the curved geometry, and the lack of a global Cartesian structure precludes the use of standard translations to construct co-moving coordinates.

¹The proofs presented in this appendix are based on Fulin Qi's *Undergraduate Research Opportunities Programme in Science* (UROPS) research project.

Moreover, the natural choice of spherical coordinates can lead to expressions that are prohibitively complicated for our analysis. To overcome these difficulties, we employ an approach that combines time-dependent rotations with stereographic projection, thereby establishing a suitable coordinate system well adapted to the shock.

Remark 1.3. Our theorem also fits into the broader perspective that background geometry can strongly influence shock formation in compressible fluids. In expanding cosmological spacetimes, sufficiently fast expansion induces a damping effect that suppresses shock formation and yields global regularity. This stabilization was established for relativistic Euler equations with the equation of state $p = K\rho$, $0 < K < 1/3$, on linearly expanding backgrounds $a(t) = t$ by Fajman–Ofner–Oliynyk–Wyatt [32] and was further extended in [31]. Numerical experiments in [30] suggest a sharp transition between stability and shock formation for general power-law expansions $a(t) = t^\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, depending on the competition between the expansion rate and the sound speed: stability is observed when $K < K_{\text{crit}}(\alpha) = 1 - \frac{2}{3\alpha}$ and shock formation occurs when $K > K_{\text{crit}}(\alpha)$. The endpoint instability for radiation fluids ($K = 1/3$) on $a(t) = t$ was rigorously proved earlier by Speck [52]. In contrast, the static geometry of \mathbb{S}^2 provides no expansion-induced damping. Our result shows that without cosmological expansion, curvature alone cannot prevent shock formation.

Owing to the physical interest and other potential applications, we also provide an independent and different proof of shock formation for equivariant flows on \mathbb{S}^2 . In this case, the fluid variables depend only on the latitude (i.e., the angle from the symmetry axis) and are invariant under longitude rotations. In this proof, we employ a different coordinate system on \mathbb{S}^2 and design a different set of modulation variables. The statement of this result is as follows.

Theorem 1.4 (Equivariant Shock Formation for Compressible Euler Equations on \mathbb{S}^2). *For the isentropic compressible Euler equations (1.1), there exists a family of equivariant initial data that evolve to solutions ceasing to be smooth in a finite time T_* . At $t = T_*$, they develop $C^{1/3}$ shock singularities equipped with C^1 blow-up at speed $O(\frac{1}{T_* - t})$.*

Remark 1.5. Physically speaking, this class of equivariant solutions captures the structure of axisymmetric flows with no swirl, i.e., flows exhibiting no rotation about the axis of symmetry. Such flows serve as an idealized physical model for the zonally symmetric motion of atmosphere.

1.2 Related Literature

In this section, we review relevant works on both the mathematical theory of shock formation for the Euler equations and the study of fluid mechanics on curved manifolds.

1.2.1 Shock Formation for the Euler Equations

In what follows, we provide a brief survey of key results and developments concerning shock formation for the compressible Euler equations.

In one-dimensional flows, shock formation rests on a well-established theoretical foundation and is extensively explored via the method of characteristics. The foundational work is due to Riemann [47], who introduced the powerful method of Riemann invariants for the 1D isentropic Euler equations (a 2×2 system); these invariants remain constant along characteristic curves. Using Riemann invariants, Lax [35] proved finite-time shock formation for general 2×2 strictly-hyperbolic genuinely-nonlinear systems, which in particular covers the small data scenarios for the 1D isentropic Euler equations. For a comprehensive bibliography and review of the early developments in the 1D setting, we refer readers to the monograph by Dafermos [28].

The situation becomes substantially more complex for multi-dimensional flows. In [49–51], Sideris proved finite-time blowup of smooth solutions to the compressible Euler equations for certain classes of small initial data. By using

virial-type integral inequalities, Sideris derived upper bounds of the lifespan of smooth solutions, which qualitatively indicates that breakdown must occur in finite time. In [4, 5], Alinhac developed a more constructive approach to show shock formation for irrotational flows, for which the compressible Euler equations can be reduced to a single scalar quasilinear wave equation for the velocity potential. Without any symmetry assumption, Alinhac also proved that an isolated shock singularity can form from smooth initial data satisfying a non-degeneracy condition via Nash-Moser iteration.

A significant breakthrough was later achieved by Christodoulou in [23] regarding the 3D *irrotational* ($\nabla \times v = 0$) relativistic Euler equations, which introduced robust energy methods applicable to a broader class of shock singularities. For the corresponding non-relativistic result, see Christodoulou-Miao [24]. The key innovation in [23] was the introduction of a fully geometric framework, which precisely characterizes shock formation via the vanishing inverse foliation density. For the compressible Euler equations with non-trivial vorticity, Luk and Speck [37] proved shock formation for the 2D isentropic case with spacetime decompositions. This result was later extended to three dimensions, allowing for entropy variations, in [39]. Their analysis builds on a reformulation of the compressible Euler equations developed in [38, 55], which features favorable null structures relative to the acoustic geometry and yields refined regularity properties for vorticity and entropy. For recent developments in this direction, we refer the reader to Abbrescia-Speck [1–3], Holzegel-Klainerman-Speck-Wong [34], Luo-Yu [40, 41], Miao-Yu [44], Speck [53, 54], and Speck-Holzegel-Luk-Wong [56]. For the elastic waves and the ideal MHD system, An-Chen-Yin [6–10] further employed this geometric shock formation mechanism to establish low-regularity ill-posedness. We also refer to the ill-posedness works by Bourgain-Li [13–15] for the incompressible Euler equations.

Meanwhile, an independent and inspiring self-similar framework for proving shock formation was developed by Buckmaster, Shkoller, and Vicol, which focuses on constructing solutions arising from well-prepared initial data that are close to the self-similar Burgers blow-up profile. In self-similar variables, their formulation can be viewed as a renormalized evolution around the Burgers profile, where several modulation variables are used to adjust shifts and scalings dynamically to track the self-similar dynamics. With this approach, a detailed description of the shock-type singularity can be obtained: the (first) shock is shown to be asymptotically self-similar. Furthermore, associated stability properties can also be established (e.g., the construction of stable shocks with $C^{1/3}$ Hölder continuity). In [17], they implemented this self-similar approach and proved shock formation for the 2D isentropic Euler equations under azimuthal symmetry. They subsequently extended the self-similar method to prove shock formation for open sets of initial data in 3D without symmetry assumptions in [18], and for the full (non-isentropic) Euler equations in [19]. This self-similar framework has also motivated further developments, including the unstable shock formation result by Buckmaster and Iyer [16], the works on damped Euler equations by Chen [21], on the fractal Burgers equation by Chickering-Moreno-Vasquez-Pandya [22], on the general dispersive or dissipative perturbations of the Burgers equation by Oh-Pasqualotto [45], on the Euler-Poisson equations by Qiu-Zhao [46], on the compressible 2D Euler equations by Su [57], and on the Burgers-Hilbert equation by Yang [61].

1.2.2 Fluid Mechanics on Manifolds

We also review relevant works studying fluid dynamics on curved manifolds.

The validity of the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, which govern fluid motions, can be extended to the setting of a curved background. This generalization is motivated by applications in atmospheric and oceanic sciences, where fluids exhibit spherical dynamics. For example, stationary solutions of the Euler equations on a rotating sphere provide building blocks for traveling-wave models that describe stratospheric flows on Earth and giant planets such as Jupiter and Saturn. Constantin-Germain [26] studied such stationary solutions and proved rigidity and stability results. In addition, Constantin-Germain-Lin-Zhu [27] analyzed the instability of 3-jet zonal flows on a rotating sphere.

To formulate fluid equations on a manifold, one needs to interpret each term in the fluid equations by its

corresponding analogue on manifolds. In this paper, we adopt the formulation of the compressible Euler equations for barotropic fluids in [12]:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho v) = 0, \\ \rho \partial_t v + \rho \nabla_v v + \nabla h(\rho) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where the pressure function $h(\rho)$ depends on the physical properties of the fluid. For further insights and discussions, see Schutz [48], Arnold-Khesin [12], and Taylor [60]. Extending this approach to the Navier-Stokes equations requires choosing an appropriate version of the Laplace operator on the manifold, for which several alternatives exist. We do not delve into these technical details here, and we refer interested readers to Chan-Czubak-Disconzi [20] and the references therein.

In a landmark paper by Arnold [11], he observed that the incompressible Euler equations on a manifold M can be interpreted as geodesic equations. See also the work of Ebin and Marsden [29]. An analogous geometric formulation for the compressible Euler equations was developed in Guillemin-Sternberg [33] and Marsden-Ratiu-Weinstein [43]. This geometric point of view was also applied by Lin-Zeng [36] in the study of unstable manifolds of the Euler equations in a fixed bounded domain.

The study of fluid equations on manifolds has also led to intriguing and impactful mathematical discoveries. For instance, Tao [58, 59] proved the universality of the incompressible Euler equation on compact manifolds, showing that any finite-dimensional dynamical system satisfying a certain cancellation property can be embedded within the incompressible Euler equation.

1.3 Proof Strategy for the Main Theorem

In this section, we present the main ideas behind the proof of Theorem 1.1. We employ the framework by Buckmaster-Shkoller-Vicol [18] in Euclidean space and extend it to the setting of \mathbb{S}^2 , which requires new geometric insights and analytical adaptations. In the following, we outline the key steps of the proof.

Step 1. Construction of geometrically adapted moving coordinates:

To analyze how a point shock forms on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , we use the modulation technique. This involves constructing a suitable moving coordinate system that tracks the evolution toward the singularity. This framework enables us to capture the dynamics near the point of steepest gradient.

Modulation variables. Before giving the coordinates, we first introduce the modulation variables, which trace various properties of the shock. In the subsequent construction of coordinates, we will appeal to these modulation variables.

Let $w(\tilde{t}, p)$ be a time-dependent scalar function on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 (in this paper, it will be one of the Riemann variables defined in Section 2.5). Assume that w develops an increasingly steep gradient, indicating the formation of the first shock. To analyze the behavior of this emerging singularity, it is essential to introduce coordinates that are centered at the point of maximal gradient $\xi(\tilde{t})$ and adapted to the level set of w passing through $\xi(\tilde{t})$. This requires tracking several dynamical geometric quantities:

- The *predicted shock location* $\xi(\tilde{t}) \in \mathbb{S}^2$: the point where the gradient magnitude $|\nabla w|$ attains its maximum.
- The *predicted shock amplitude* $\kappa(\tilde{t})$: a time-dependent function $\kappa(\tilde{t}) = w(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))$ obtained by evaluating w at $\xi(\tilde{t})$.
- The *predicted shock normal* $n(\tilde{t}) \in T_{\xi(\tilde{t})}\mathbb{S}^2$: a unit vector at $\xi(\tilde{t})$ pointing in the direction of the gradient $\nabla w(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))$, perpendicular to the level set $\Gamma(\tilde{t})$ of w which passes through $\xi(\tilde{t})$.

- The *level set curvature* $\psi(\tilde{t})$: a scalar function quantifying the curvature of the level set $\Gamma(\tilde{t})$ at the point $\xi(\tilde{t})$.
- The *predicted blow-up time* $\tau(\tilde{t})$:

$$\tau(\tilde{t}) = \underbrace{\tilde{t}}_{\text{current time}} + \underbrace{|\nabla w(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))|^{-1}}_{\text{estimated remaining time}}.$$

The quantity $\tau(\tilde{t})$ plays a crucial role in the self-similar rescaling.

Construction of shock-adapted coordinates. Our approach integrates the aforementioned time-dependent modulation variables into the construction of a dynamically adapted coordinate system:

1. **Co-moving coordinates:** We begin by constructing a time-dependent coordinate system that evolves with the shock formation and is centered at the point where the Riemann variable w has the steepest gradient.

- **Time-dependent rotation of the sphere:** We apply a time-dependent rotation $O(\tilde{t}) \in SO(3)$ to the sphere, mapping the original Cartesian coordinates $\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (restricted to \mathbb{S}^2) to new coordinates $x = O(\tilde{t})^T \dot{x}$. The rotation is chosen so that the critical point $\xi(\tilde{t})$ maps to a fixed reference location (e.g., the south pole $(0, 0, -r_0)$), and the normal vector $n(\tilde{t})$ aligns with a fixed direction (e.g., the $(1, 0, 0)$ direction on the tangent plane at the south pole).
- **Stereographic projection of the rotated sphere:** From the rotated frame x , we then employ stereographic projection (from the north pole $(0, 0, r_0)$ onto the tangent plane at the south pole $\{x_3 = -r_0\}$) to define a planar coordinate system $u = (u_1, u_2)$. Direct calculation shows

$$u_1 = \frac{2r_0 x_1}{r_0 - x_3}, \quad u_2 = \frac{2r_0 x_2}{r_0 - x_3}.$$

By construction, the origin $u = 0$ now corresponds to the predicted shock location $\xi(\tilde{t})$, and the u_1 -axis aligns with the predicted shock normal $n(\tilde{t})$. This setup simplifies the spatial derivatives of the Riemann variable w at the origin:

$$w|_{u=0} = *, \quad \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial u_1}, \frac{\partial w}{\partial u_2} \right) \Big|_{u=0} = (*, 0), \quad \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial u_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial u_1 \partial u_2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial u_1 \partial u_2} & \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial u_2^2} \end{array} \right) \Big|_{u=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, the symbol $*$ denotes that the corresponding quantity (specifically, w , $\partial_{u_1} w$, and $\partial_{u_2}^2 w$ evaluated at the origin) is not fixed at this stage.

2. **Level set straightening:** To further adapt the coordinates to the geometry of the shock, we perform a coordinate transformation $(u_1, u_2) \rightsquigarrow (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$, realized by a quadratic adjustment incorporating the curvature $\psi(\tilde{t})$ of the level set:

$$\tilde{u}_1 = u_1 - \frac{1}{2} \psi(\tilde{t}) u_2^2, \quad \tilde{u}_2 = u_2.$$

This transformation flattens the level set geometry near the origin in the \tilde{u} coordinates, achieving full normalization of the second derivatives:

$$w|_{\tilde{u}=0} = *, \quad \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial \tilde{u}_1}, \frac{\partial w}{\partial \tilde{u}_2} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{u}=0} = (*, 0), \quad \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \tilde{u}_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \tilde{u}_1 \partial \tilde{u}_2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \tilde{u}_1 \partial \tilde{u}_2} & \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \tilde{u}_2^2} \end{array} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{u}=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The sequence of coordinate transformations described above can be illustrated in the following figure:





Figure 1.1: Coordinate transformations

For clarity, the transformation chain can be schematically expressed as follows:



For technical convenience, we take the rotation $O(\tilde{t})$ itself as the modulation variable, rather than separately tracking the shock location $\xi(\tilde{t})$ and normal direction $n(\tilde{t})$. This choice streamlines the expression of coordinate transformations, which would otherwise lead to more complicated formulations in terms of $\xi(\tilde{t})$ and $n(\tilde{t})$.

Step 2. Symmetrization and diagonalization of the system:

To match the transport speed with that of the standard Burgers equation, we set $\alpha = \frac{\gamma-1}{2}$, and rescale the original time \tilde{t} by defining $\tilde{t} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\tilde{t}$.

Expressing the Euler equations (1.1) directly in the co-moving stereographic u -coordinates yields a system (2.8) that is not symmetric, risking derivative loss in H^k energy estimates. To address this, we introduce an orthonormal frame E_i (see Section 2.3), and decompose the velocity field as $v = \sum_i V_i E_i$. Denoting $P = (V_1, V_2, \sigma)$, where $\sigma = \frac{1}{\alpha}\rho^\alpha$ is the rescaled sound speed, we obtain a symmetric hyperbolic system:

$$\partial_{\tilde{t}} P + D_P P + A_{P,u_1} \partial_{u_1} P + A_{P,u_2} \partial_{u_2} P = F_P.$$

Here, the coefficient of the damping term D_P is given by (2.10), the coefficients of the transport terms A_{P,u_1} and A_{P,u_2} are given by (2.11) and (2.12), and the forcing term F_P is defined in (2.13). We see that A_{P,u_1} and A_{P,u_2} are symmetric matrices. This symmetric hyperbolic structure is preserved under the coordinate transformation $u \rightsquigarrow \tilde{u}$.

To effectively analyze shock formation, we further diagonalize the system by introducing Riemann variables $R = (w, z, a)$ (defined in Section 2.5). In these variables, the system becomes

$$\partial_{\tilde{t}} R + D_R R + A_{R,\tilde{u}_1} \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} R + A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} R = F_R,$$

where the coefficient matrix in the \tilde{u}_1 -direction is diagonal:

$$A_{R,\tilde{u}_1} = J \text{diag}(w + \beta_2 z, \beta_2 w + z, \beta_1 w + \beta_1 z) + \left(g_1 - \lambda g_2 - \frac{1}{2}\psi \tilde{u}_2^2 \right) I_3.$$

The matrix A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} and the forcing term F_R are given by

$$A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} = (2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_2 + g_2) I_3 + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda & -1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_R = & \left(\begin{array}{l} -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} |V|^2 (u_1 - \lambda u_2) - \frac{\varphi(V_1 - \lambda V_2)}{2r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) + \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \\ -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} |V|^2 (u_1 - \lambda u_2) - \frac{\varphi(V_1 - \lambda V_2)}{2r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) - \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \\ -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} |V|^2 (\lambda u_1 + u_2) - \frac{\varphi(\lambda V_1 + V_2)}{2r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \end{array} \right) \\
& + \left(\begin{array}{l} -[2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} (V_2 - \alpha \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S) + g_2] a + \beta_3 \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S (w + z) \\ -[2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} (V_2 + \alpha \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S) - g_2] a - \beta_3 \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S (w + z) \end{array} \right) \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} \lambda \\
& + \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} -a \\ -a \\ \frac{w+z}{2} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_2 \partial_{\tilde{t}} \psi.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, The scalar equation for w is

$$\boxed{\tilde{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} w} + [J(\boxed{w} + \beta_2 z) + g_1 - \lambda g_2 - \frac{1}{2} \psi \tilde{u}_2^2] \boxed{\partial_{\tilde{u}_1} w} + \dots = F_R^1,$$

where F_R^1 denotes the first component of the vector F_R . The boxed terms coincide with those appearing in the one-dimensional inviscid Burgers equation and will dominate the dynamics near the singularity. Moreover, we will see that $J = 1 + o(1)$ in the bootstrap analysis, and therefore the factor does not interfere with the dominant Burgers-type dynamics.

Step 3. Self-similar transformation and modulation ODEs:

To analyze the singularity, we employ a self-similar transformation, which dynamically rescales the solution and effectively “zooms in” on the singularity. The solution is expected to remain regular in the self-similar coordinates.

We define the self-similar coordinates and the self-similar variables as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
s &= -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t}), \quad y_1 = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \tilde{u}_1, \quad y_2 = e^{\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{u}_2. \\
W(s, y) &= e^{\frac{s}{2}} (w(\tilde{t}, \tilde{u}) - \kappa(\tilde{t})), \quad Z(s, y) = z(\tilde{t}, \tilde{u}), \quad A(s, y) = a(\tilde{t}, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

This transformation yields a system of three transport-type equations for the variables W , Z , and A in the self-similar coordinate system:

$$\begin{cases} \left(\partial_s - \frac{1}{2} \right) W + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau JW + G_W \right) \partial_{y_1} W + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_W \right) \partial_{y_2} W = F_W - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa, \\ \partial_s Z + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_2 \beta_\tau JW + G_Z \right) \partial_{y_1} Z + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_Z \right) \partial_{y_2} Z = F_Z, \\ \partial_s A + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_1 \beta_\tau JW + G_A \right) \partial_{y_1} A + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_A \right) \partial_{y_2} A = F_A. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

For any given variable $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, Z, A\}$, the coefficients of $\partial_{y_1} \mathcal{R}$ and $\partial_{y_2} \mathcal{R}$ in the transport equations are given by

$$\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_{\mathcal{R}} \beta_\tau JW + G_{\mathcal{R}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_{\mathcal{R}},$$

respectively, where $\beta_W = 1$, $\beta_Z = \beta_2$, and $\beta_A = \beta_1$. The term $F_{\mathcal{R}}$ denotes the corresponding forcing term.

In our analysis, the shock formation roots in the self-similar type blow-up for Burgers equation of W . To capture this mechanism, we employ the following self-similar profile \bar{W} , which solves the two-dimensional self-similar Burgers equation:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\bar{W} + \left(\frac{3}{2}y_1 + \bar{W}\right)\partial_{y_1}\bar{W} + \frac{1}{2}y_2\partial_{y_2}\bar{W} = 0.$$

In particular, we select the following \bar{W} as the blow-up profile:

$$\bar{W}(y_1, y_2) = \langle y_2 \rangle \bar{W}_{1d}(\langle y_2 \rangle^{-3} y_1),$$

where $\langle y_2 \rangle = \sqrt{1 + y_2^2}$, and $\bar{W}_{1d}(y)$ is implicitly defined by the relation $y = -\bar{W}_{1d}(y) - \bar{W}_{1d}(y)^3$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

In our construction, we normalize W at the origin $y = 0$ up to its second derivatives such that

$$W|_{y=0} = 0, \quad \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial y_1}, \frac{\partial W}{\partial y_2}\right)\bigg|_{y=0} = (-1, 0), \quad \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y_1 \partial y_2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y_1 \partial y_2} & \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y_2^2} \end{array}\right)\bigg|_{y=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These values are identical to those of the profile \bar{W} :

$$W(s, 0) = \bar{W}(0), \quad \nabla_y W(s, 0) = \nabla_y \bar{W}(0), \quad \nabla_y^2 W(s, 0) = \nabla_y^2 \bar{W}(0).$$

This normalization is a direct consequence of our selection of modulation variables. These constraints, in turn, enable the derivation of the evolution ODEs for the parameters κ, τ, ψ , and O . These equations are enumerated in (2.46)(2.47)(2.49)(2.51)(2.52).

We now arrive at a system of three PDEs for W , Z , and A , coupled with six ODEs for the modulation variables κ, τ, ψ , and O . Provided that the self-similar transformation remains non-degenerate, this system is equivalent to the compressible Euler's equations on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 .

Step 4. Global well-posedness of the self-similar system:

Our aim is to prove the global well-posedness of the self-similar system. Since the self-similar coordinates become singular in finite time, establishing global existence in this frame implies finite-time shock formation when translated back to the original physical coordinates.

To achieve this, we employ a bootstrap argument. The bootstrap assumptions are organized into four categories, asserting that

1. The modulation variables behave similarly to those of the classical Burgers equation.
2. The dominant Riemann variable W remains close to a known blow-up profile \bar{W} .
3. The secondary Riemann variable Z and the tangential velocity component A stay sufficiently small, allowing them to be treated perturbatively.
4. The energy of W, Z , and A are appropriately controlled.

In what follows, we outline the main ideas on how to close these bootstrap assumptions.

Step 4a. Estimates for the modulation variables:

We use the bootstrap assumptions to estimate each term on the right-hand side of the modulation ODEs (2.46)(2.47)(2.49)(2.51)(2.52), thereby improving the assumptions for the modulation variables:

$$|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\kappa| \lesssim (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau| \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{4}}e^{-s}, \quad \left|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\psi - \left(2\psi^2 + \frac{3}{r_0^2}\right)\beta_3\kappa_0\right| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}\ln M,$$

$$|Q_{12}| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad |Q_{23}| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \left| Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3 \kappa_0}{r_0} \right| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}.$$

See Section 5 for the details.

Step 4b. Estimates for W and \widetilde{W} :

This step forms the centerpiece of the analysis, as the behavior of W governs the shock formation process. We focus on improving the bootstrap assumptions for the dominant Riemann variable W , and its deviation from the explicit blow-up profile \bar{W} . The primary goal is to control the perturbation $\tilde{W} = W - \bar{W}$, such that the solution remains close to the known self-similar profile.

Our method centers on a detailed analysis of the transport equations for W , \widetilde{W} , and their derivatives. Indeed, for $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, \widetilde{W}\}$ and $\gamma \geq 0$, we can systematically write that

$$\partial_s \partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R} + D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} \partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla_y \partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R} = F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}.$$

Since these transport equations share the same transport coefficients, it is convenient to define the Lagrangian trajectories (or characteristics) Φ_W :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s \Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0) = \mathcal{V}_W(s, \Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)), \\ \Phi_W(s_1; s_1, y_0) = y_0. \end{cases}$$

By integrating along these characteristics, we establish pointwise bounds on $\partial^\gamma W$ or $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}$. An important property of Φ_W is that if the starting point (s_1, y_0) is slightly away from the origin, i.e. $|y_0| \geq l$ for a small constant $l = (\ln M)^{-5}$, then $|\Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)|$ grows exponentially:

$$|\Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)| \geq |y_0| e^{\frac{s-s_1}{5}}.$$

This enables us to carry out analysis separately in two distinct spatial regions, distinguishing the dominant dynamics near the origin ($y = 0$) from those farther away:

- Estimates in $\{|y| \leq l\}$: In this neighborhood of $y = 0$, the choice of modulation variables ensures that W remains close to \bar{W} by enforcing the constraints

$$W(s, 0) = \bar{W}(0), \quad \nabla_y W(s, 0) = \nabla_y \bar{W}(0), \quad \nabla_y^2 W(s, 0) = \nabla_y^2 \bar{W}(0).$$

Furthermore, the damping term for $D^4 \widetilde{W}$ admits a positive lower bound:

$$D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}(s, y) \geq \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{for } |\gamma| = 4 \text{ and } |y| \leq l,$$

which contributes to maintaining this closeness. We show that the derivatives $\partial^\gamma W$ remain close to $\partial^\gamma \bar{W}$ for all multi-indices $|\gamma| \leq 4$, enabling us to improve the bootstrap assumptions in this region.

- Estimates in $\{|y| > l\}$: In the far-field, we perform weighted L^∞ estimates for $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, \widetilde{W}\}$ by employing a weighted function of the form $q = \eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R}$, which satisfies a transport equation

$$\partial_s q + D_q q + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla_y q = F_q.$$

Solving q along the Lagrangian trajectories Φ_W , we find

$$\eta^{(\gamma)}(y) |\partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R}(s, y)| \leq \underbrace{\eta^{(\gamma)}(y_0) |\partial_y^\gamma \mathcal{R}(s_1, y_0)| \exp \left(\int_{s_1}^s D_q(s', \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds' \right)}_{\text{contributions from the initial data or the boundary values at } \{|y| = l\}}$$

$$+ \underbrace{\int_{s_1}^s |F_q(s', \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0))| \exp \left(\int_{s_1}^s D_q(s'', \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0)) ds'' \right) ds'}_{\text{contributions from the forcing term}}.$$

Here, (s_1, y_0) is the starting point of the trajectory $\Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)$, and $\Phi(s; s_1, y_0) = y$. Due to the property of Φ_W , we can require either $s_1 = s_0$ or $|y_0| = l$. The critical insight is that the smallness of \tilde{W} in the inner region $\{|y| \leq l\}$ is propagated outward along these trajectories. The exponential growth of $|\Phi_W|$ then converts the spatial decay of the forcing terms $|F_W^{(\gamma)}|$ into rapid time decay, ensuring their contributions remain dominated by boundary values at $|y| = l$. This behavior contrasts with the estimates for Z and A , where the bootstrap assumptions are primarily determined by the magnitude of the forcing terms themselves. Consequently, the main analytical task reduces to establishing sharp, pointwise estimates for these forcing terms $F_W^{(\gamma)}$. As detailed in Section 4, these forcing terms are complicated functions of the primary variables and the geometric quantities, and controlling their derivatives is a crucial part of the process.

By systematically combining the estimates from both the inner and outer regions, we successfully improve the bootstrap assumptions (3.20) and (3.23) for W and \tilde{W} , respectively. The rigorous derivations for these bounds are presented in detail in Section 7.

Step 4c. Estimates for Z and A :

In contrast to the dominant variable W , the secondary Riemann variable Z and the tangential velocity component A are treated as perturbations that are expected to remain small throughout the evolution. The primary strategy for controlling these variables and their derivatives is to analyze their respective transport equations, as given in system (2.22).

The main idea of this step is to integrate the equations for $\partial_y^\gamma Z$ and $\partial_y^\gamma A$ along their Lagrangian trajectories. As in Step 4b, the main task is to estimate the forcing terms, $F_Z^{(\gamma)}$ and $F_A^{(\gamma)}$. This is detailed in Section 4. This approach successfully establishes bounds on Z , A , and all of their derivatives required by the bootstrap assumptions, with the exception for $\partial_{y_1} A$.

However, an exception occurs for the normal derivative of the tangential velocity $\partial_{y_1} A$. For this term, direct analysis via using the transport equation fails to close the bootstrap argument. Additionally, one of the bootstrap assumptions—specifically the estimate of the tangential velocity derivative $\partial_1 A$ (where A denotes the tangential velocity component, and ∂_1 indicates differentiation in the normal direction \tilde{u}_1)—cannot be closed via directly using transport estimates and the main energy estimates. To overcome this, we analyze the evolution of the *vorticity*. Following [60], we define the vorticity scalar ω on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 as:

$$\omega = *dv^\flat = \epsilon^{ab} \nabla_a v_b. \quad (1.3)$$

Here, $*$ is the Hodge dual operator, d denotes the exterior derivative, and $\flat : TM \rightarrow T^*M$ is the musical isomorphism induced by the metric g . The tensor ϵ_{ab} represents the volume form associated with g . Then we derive that ω satisfies the evolution equation:

$$\partial_t \omega + \nabla_v \omega + \omega \operatorname{div} v = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

This equation indicates that vorticity is not merely transported by the flow, but is also affected by compressibility through the divergence term. In contrast, the *specific vorticity*, defined as $\zeta = \omega/\rho$ (where ρ is the density), satisfies a pure transport equation:

$$\partial_t \zeta + \nabla_v \zeta = 0. \quad (1.5)$$

To effectively utilize the vorticity equation, we need to express the vorticity ω in terms of the variables we are working with. We derive the following key identity:

$$\omega = \varphi^{-2} [\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} a - \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (\varphi V_1)],$$

where a is the tangential velocity component, V_1 is the velocity component in the E_1 direction (aligned with \tilde{u}_1), and $\varphi, \langle \lambda \rangle$ are auxiliary quantities determined by the coordinate system and metric, which are explicitly defined in Section 2.

This identity connects the vorticity ω (whose associated specific vorticity ζ satisfies a favorable transport equation) to the term $\partial_{\tilde{u}_1} a$, which corresponds to $\partial_1 A$ under self-similar scaling. By exploiting the transport structure of equation (1.5), we gain control on $\|\zeta\|_{L^\infty}$, and hence $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty}$ via using bounds on ρ . Together with the above identity and estimates on additional terms like $\partial_{\tilde{u}_2}(\varphi V_1)$, we can finally close the problematic bootstrap assumption for $\partial_1 A$.

Step 4d. Energy estimates:

As mentioned above, most bootstrap assumptions impose L^∞ -type bounds on the solution and its derivatives, which are typically closed via transport equations. However, since

$$A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} = (2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_2 + g_2)I_3 + 2\beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1}S \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda & -1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is not diagonal, the equation of w includes the term $2\beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1}\sigma\partial_{\tilde{u}_2}a$. This term involves the derivative of a , resulting in a loss of derivatives in the L^∞ estimates. To address this difficulty, we supplement the L^∞ analysis with H^k energy estimates:

$$e^{-s}\|W\|_{\dot{H}_y^k}^2 + \|Z\|_{\dot{H}_y^k}^2 + \|A\|_{\dot{H}_y^k}^2 \lesssim M^{3k-5}e^{-s}.$$

Step 5. Recovering the physical variables and proving the main theorem:

With the bootstrap argument successfully completed in self-similar coordinates, the final step is to translate the resulting estimates in the original physical coordinates, thereby proving the main theorem. Specifically, we have:

$$\partial_{u_1} w|_{u=0} = \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} w|_{\tilde{u}=0} = e^s \partial_{y_1} W|_{y=0} = -e^s = -\frac{1}{\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t}} \approx -\frac{1}{\tilde{T}_* - \tilde{t}},$$

where \tilde{T}_* is the blow-up time. This computation highlights that the shock formation roots in the singularity of the self-similar coordinate transformation. The full procedure for this translation, together with the final argument, is detailed in Section 3.3.

1.4 Organization of the Paper

The rest of the paper is structured as follows:

- In Section 2, we perform a sequence of coordinate transformations, deriving the governing equations at each step. Then, we introduce the Riemann variables, and define the self-similar transformation. Finally, we present the blow-up profile and derive the modulation ODEs that govern the evolution of its parameters.
- In Section 3, we specify the initial data, including the initial values of the modulation variables and the initial data for self-similar Riemann variables. We then state the main theorem, formulate the bootstrap assumptions, and outline the strategy for closing the argument.
- In Section 4, we employ the bootstrap assumptions to establish estimates on various terms appearing in the transport equations. These estimates lay the groundwork for subsequent analysis.

- Sections 5, 6, and 7 are devoted to improving the L^∞ -bounds in the bootstrap argument. Specifically, Section 5 focuses on the estimates of modulation variables. Sections 6 and 7 address the estimates for self-similar variables Z , A , and W , respectively.
- Section 8 completes the argument by establishing energy estimates that allow us to prevent derivative loss and complete the analysis.

1.5 Notation

For the reader's convenience, we record below the key notation that will be employed repeatedly in the remainder of this work:

- The Greek indices μ, ν, \dots range over 1, 2, 3, while the Latin indices a, b, c, i, j, \dots range over 1, 2.
- Physical constants: $\alpha = \frac{\gamma-1}{2} > 0$, $\beta_1 = \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$, $\beta_2 = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}$, $\beta_3 = \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$.
- Rescaled sound speed: $\sigma = \frac{1}{\alpha} \rho^\alpha$; steady-state value outside its support: σ_∞ .
- Original time-space coordinates: $(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3$; rescaled time: $\tilde{t} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \hat{t}$.
- Stereographic projection coordinates: u_i ; Shock-adapted coordinates: \tilde{u}_i .
- Metric factor: $\varphi(u) = \frac{4r_0^2}{u_1^2 + u_2^2 + 4r_0^2}$; sphere metric: $g_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \varphi(u)^2 \sum_i du_i \otimes du_i$.
- Modulation variables: $O(\tilde{t})$, $\psi(\tilde{t})$, $\tau(\tilde{t})$, $\kappa(\tilde{t})$.
- Time derivatives: $\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} = (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_{\hat{x}}$ (for fixed \hat{x}), $\partial_{\tilde{t}} = (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_{x, u}$ (for fixed x, u), $\tilde{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} = (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_{\tilde{u}}$ (for fixed \tilde{u}).
- Auxiliary quantities: $\lambda = \psi \tilde{u}_2$, $\langle \lambda \rangle = \sqrt{1 + \lambda^2}$, $J = |\nabla \tilde{u}_1| = \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle$.
- Vector fields: $N = \frac{E_1 - \lambda E_2}{\langle \lambda \rangle}$, $T = \frac{\lambda E_1 + E_2}{\langle \lambda \rangle}$ with $E_i = \varphi^{-1} \partial_{u_i}$.
- Multi-index notations: for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$, we denote $|\gamma| = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ and define $\partial_{\tilde{u}}^\gamma = \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^{\gamma_1} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^{\gamma_2}$. In self-similar coordinates (y -coordinates), we set $\partial^\gamma = \partial_{y_1}^{\gamma_1} \partial_{y_2}^{\gamma_2} = e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}s} \partial_{\tilde{u}}^\gamma$. For brevity, we also adopt the notation $\partial_{12} = \partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_2}$, $\partial_{11} = \partial_{y_1}^2$, etc.
- Velocity fields: $v = v_1 \partial_{u_1} + v_2 \partial_{u_2} = V_1 E_1 + V_2 E_2$.
- Riemann variables: $w = v \cdot N + \sigma$, $z = v \cdot N - \sigma$, $a = v \cdot T$.
- Self-similar coordinates: $s = -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t})$, $y_1 = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \tilde{u}_1$, $y_2 = e^{\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{u}_2$.
- Self-similar variables: $w = e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa(\tilde{t})$, $z = Z$, $a = A$; and $\sigma = S$.
- Vector notation: $P = (V_1, V_2, \sigma) = (V_1, V_2, S)$, $\tilde{P} = (V_1, V_2, \sigma - \sigma_\infty) = (V_1, V_2, S - \sigma_\infty)$, $R = (w, z, a)$.
- We use calligraphic letters (e.g., \mathcal{R}) to represent a generic self-similar variable among W, Z and A .
- Superscript “0” denotes evaluation at $y = 0$, for example: $Z^0 := Z(s, 0)$, $G_W^0 := G_W(s, 0)$, $\partial_1 F_W^0 := \partial_1 F_W(s, 0)$, etc.

1.6 Acknowledgements

Xinliang An is supported by MOE Tier 1 grants A-0004287-00-00, A-0008492-00-00, A-8002933-00-00, and MOE Tier 2 grant A-8000977-00-00. Haoyang Chen is supported by MOE Tier 1 grant A-0008492-00-00, Tier 2 grant A-8000977-00-00, and NSFC (Grant No. 12171097).

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the equations, coordinate systems, and transformations used throughout the paper. We begin with the Euler equations in their original form and introduce a sequence of coordinate transformations—as illustrated in Figure 1.1—to track shock formation. These include a time rescaling aligned with the Burgers equation, a rotation of the sphere, a stereographic projection, an adaptation to shock geometry. We then define the Riemann variables, apply a self-similar ansatz to capture the blow-up structure, and identify the modulation parameters to formulate the transformed system.

2.1 Rescaled Time and Sound Speed

First, we introduce the rescaled time and the sound speed variable, and rewrite the system with respect to them. Setting $\alpha = \frac{\gamma-1}{2}$, we define the rescaled time \tilde{t} by $\tilde{t} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\tilde{t}$, which yields $\partial_{\tilde{t}} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\partial_{\tilde{t}} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}} = \frac{1}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}}$. To simplify the notation, we also define the following three constants

$$\beta_1 = \frac{1}{1+\alpha}, \quad \beta_2 = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}, \quad \beta_3 = \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}. \quad (2.1)$$

After rescaling time, the Euler equations take the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}}\rho + \nabla_v\rho + \rho \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}}v + \nabla_vv + \frac{\nabla p}{\rho} = 0, \\ p = \frac{1}{\gamma}\rho^\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Similarly, we introduce the rescaled sound speed $\sigma = \frac{1}{\alpha}\rho^\alpha$ to rewrite the above equations as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}}\sigma + \nabla_v\sigma + \alpha\sigma \operatorname{div} v = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2\beta_1}\partial_{\tilde{t}}v + \nabla_vv + \alpha\sigma\nabla\sigma = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Rotation and Stereographic Projection

In this section, we first perform an appropriate rotation of the sphere and then apply stereographic projection to construct the time-dependent coordinates. Suppose the original spatial variables of \mathbb{R}^3 are \dot{x} , and consider the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2 = \{\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\dot{x}| = r_0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. We introduce a time-dependent rotation matrix $O(\tilde{t}) = (O_{\mu\nu}) \in SO(3)$, which transforms the original coordinates \dot{x} into $x = O(\tilde{t})^T\dot{x}$ (in components, $x_\mu = O_{\nu\mu}\dot{x}_\nu$). Next, we define the 3×3 skew-symmetric matrix $Q = \dot{O}(\tilde{t})^T O(\tilde{t})$ (equivalently, $Q_{\mu\nu} = \dot{O}_{\delta\mu} O_{\delta\nu}$), which represents the angular velocity

of the rotation. This yields the relations $\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}x_\mu = Q_{\mu\nu}x_\nu$ and $\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} = Q_{\mu\nu}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\nu}$. Here, we distinguish $\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} := (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_{\dot{x}}$, the time derivative holding \dot{x} fixed, from $\partial_{\tilde{t}} := (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_x$, the time derivative holding x fixed.

We then map \mathbb{S}^2 onto the plane $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = -r_0\}$ via stereographic projection from the north pole $(0, 0, r_0)$. Specifically, for each $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we define $q(p)$ as the intersection of the line connecting p to the north pole with this plane. By setting $u_i(p) = x_i(q)$, we obtain a coordinate chart on \mathbb{S}^2 . Straightforward calculations show that

$$u_i = \frac{2r_0x_i}{r_0 - x_3} = \frac{x_i}{\varphi(u)}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\varphi(u) := \frac{4r_0^2}{|u|^2 + 4r_0^2} = \frac{4r_0^2}{u_1^2 + u_2^2 + 4r_0^2}. \quad (2.5)$$

The metric on \mathbb{S}^2 is then given by

$$g_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \sum_{\mu} dx_{\mu} \otimes dx_{\mu}|_{T\mathbb{S}^2} = \varphi(u)^2 \sum_i du_i \otimes du_i.$$

Moreover, we deduce

$$g_i := \mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}u_i = -\frac{1}{2r_0}(Q_{13}u_1 + Q_{23}u_2)u_i + Q_{ij}u_j + Q_{i3}r_0(\varphi^{-1} - 2), \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}\frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} = h_{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} h_{11} &= h_{22} = \frac{1}{2r_0}(Q_{13}u_1 + Q_{23}u_2), \\ h_{12} &= -h_{21} = Q_{12} + \frac{1}{2r_0}(Q_{13}u_2 - Q_{23}u_1). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

The operator $\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}$ relates to $\partial_{\tilde{t}}$ through

$$\mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} = \partial_{\tilde{t}} + \mathring{\partial}_{\tilde{t}}u_j \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j} = \partial_{\tilde{t}} + g_j \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j}.$$

Now, we can express the Euler equations in the u_i coordinates as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}}v_i + h_{ji}v_j + (2\beta_1v_j + g_j)\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial u_j} + 2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}\left(2v_iv_j\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial u_j} - \sum_j v_j^2\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial u_i}\right) + 2\beta_3\varphi^{-2}\sigma\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial u_i} = 0, \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}}\sigma + (2\beta_1v_j + g_j)\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial u_j} + 2\beta_3\sigma\left(\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial u_j} + 2\varphi^{-1}v_j\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial u_j}\right) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

2.3 Reformulation as a Symmetric Hyperbolic System

To avoid loss of derivatives in the energy estimates, we reformulate the system into symmetric hyperbolic form.

At $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we define an orthonormal frame $E_i = \varphi^{-1}\partial_{u_i}$ for the tangent space $T_p\mathbb{S}^2$. A velocity vector $v \in T_p\mathbb{S}^2$ can then be expanded as $v = V_iE_i = v_i\partial_{u_i}$, so that

$$V_i = \varphi v_i.$$

We also introduce the notation

$$S = \sigma, \quad P = (V_1, V_2, S)^T.$$

The system (2.8) can then be rewritten as

$$\partial_{\tilde{t}} P + D_P P + A_{P,u_1} \partial_{u_1} P + A_{P,u_2} \partial_{u_2} P = F_P, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$D_P = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & h_{21} & 0 \\ h_{12} & h_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$A_{P,u_1} = (2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_1 + g_1) I_3 + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} S \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$A_{P,u_2} = (2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_2 + g_2) I_3 + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} S \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_P &= \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^{-1} V_1 (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_j} + 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-2} |V|^2 \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_1} \\ \varphi^{-1} V_2 (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_j} + 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-2} |V|^2 \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_2} \\ -2\beta_3 \varphi^{-2} S V_j \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_j} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2} u_1 |V|^2 - \frac{\varphi}{2r_0^2} V_1 u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \\ -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2} u_2 |V|^2 - \frac{\varphi}{2r_0^2} V_2 u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \\ \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Here, I_3 denotes the 3×3 identity matrix, and $|V|^2 = V_1^2 + V_2^2$.

2.4 Coordinates Adapted to the Shock

To track the evolution of the shock more effectively in the u_i coordinate system, we introduce a new set of coordinates \tilde{u}_i adapted to the shock formation. Let $\psi(\tilde{t}) \in \mathbb{R}$ be a time-dependent parameter controlling the curvature of the shock front. The new coordinates are defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_1 = u_1 - \frac{1}{2} \psi(\tilde{t}) u_2^2, \\ \tilde{u}_2 = u_2. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Here, $\psi(\tilde{t})$ adjusts the transformation dynamically. The corresponding differential operators become

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}} = \tilde{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi} \tilde{u}_2^2 \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}, \\ \partial_{u_1} = \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}, \\ \partial_{u_2} = \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} - \psi \tilde{u}_2 \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\partial}_{\tilde{t}} := (\partial_{\tilde{t}})_{\tilde{u}}$ denotes the time derivative with \tilde{u}_i fixed.

Next, we introduce auxiliary quantities to describe the geometry of the shock. Define $\langle a \rangle = \sqrt{1 + a^2}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and set

$$\lambda = \psi \tilde{u}_2, \quad J = |\nabla \tilde{u}_1| = \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle, \quad N = J^{-1} \nabla \tilde{u}_1 = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (E_1 - \lambda E_2), \quad T = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (\lambda E_1 + E_2).$$

Note that $\{N, T\}$ forms an orthonormal frame, with N aligned to the gradient of \tilde{u}_1 and T orthogonal to it. Moreover, by defining the 1-form $\theta(X) = \langle \nabla_X N, T \rangle_g$, one can verify that

$$\nabla_N N = \theta(N)T, \quad \nabla_N T = -\theta(N)N, \quad \nabla_T N = \theta(T)T, \quad \nabla_T T = -\theta(T)N, \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\theta(N) = -\frac{u_2 + \lambda u_1}{2r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} + \frac{\lambda \psi}{\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle^3}, \quad \theta(T) = \frac{u_1 - \lambda u_2}{2r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} + \frac{\psi}{\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle^3}. \quad (2.16)$$

Applying these transformations, we rewrite system (2.9) in the \tilde{u}_i coordinates as

$$\tilde{\partial}_t P + D_P P + A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} P + A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} P = F_P, \quad (2.17)$$

where the coefficient matrices are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} &= A_{P, u_1} - \lambda A_{P, u_2} - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi} \tilde{u}_2^2 I_3 \\ &= \left[2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) + (g_1 - \lambda g_2) - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi} \tilde{u}_2^2 \right] I_3 + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} S \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda \\ 1 & -\lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

and

$$A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} = A_{P, u_2} = (2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_2 + g_2) I_3 + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} S \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.19)$$

2.5 Riemann Variables

Building on the reformulated system in \tilde{u}_i coordinates, we now introduce Riemann variables to diagonalize the equations. We define the Riemann variables as below:

$$\begin{cases} w = v \cdot N + \sigma = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) + S, \\ z = v \cdot N - \sigma = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) - S, \\ a = v \cdot T = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (\lambda V_1 + V_2), \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

or equivalently

$$R := (w, z, a)^T = BP,$$

where

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & -\lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & 1 \\ \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & -\lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & -1 \\ \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Riemann variables satisfy the following system:

$$\tilde{\partial}_t R + D_R R + A_{R, \tilde{u}_1} \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} R + A_{R, \tilde{u}_2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} R = F_R. \quad (2.21)$$

Here, the damping term is

$$D_R = BD_P B^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + h_{12} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The transport terms are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{R,\tilde{u}_1} &= BA_{P,\tilde{u}_1}B^{-1} \\ &= \left[2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}(V_1 - \lambda V_2) + (g_1 - \lambda g_2) - \frac{1}{2}\psi\tilde{u}_2^2 \right] I_3 + 2\beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle\lambda\rangle S \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= J\text{diag}(w + \beta_2 z, \beta_2 w + z, \beta_1 w + \beta_1 z) + \left(g_1 - \lambda g_2 - \frac{1}{2}\psi\tilde{u}_2^2 \right) I_3, \\ A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} &= BA_{P,\tilde{u}_2}B^{-1} = (2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_2 + g_2)I_3 + 2\beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda & -1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

And the forcing term is

$$\begin{aligned} F_R &= BF_P + (\tilde{\partial}_t B + A_{R,\tilde{u}_1} \underbrace{\partial_{\tilde{u}_1} B}_{=0} + A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} B)P \\ &= BF_P + \langle\lambda\rangle^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} -a \\ -a \\ \frac{w+z}{2} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_2 \partial_t \psi + \langle\lambda\rangle^{-2} A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} \begin{pmatrix} -a \\ -a \\ \frac{w+z}{2} \end{pmatrix} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} \lambda \\ &= \left(\begin{array}{l} -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} |V|^2 (u_1 - \lambda u_2) - \frac{\varphi(V_1 - \lambda V_2)}{2r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_j) + \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \\ -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} |V|^2 (u_1 - \lambda u_2) - \frac{\varphi(V_1 - \lambda V_2)}{2r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_j) - \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \\ -\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} |V|^2 (\lambda u_1 + u_2) - \frac{\varphi(\lambda V_1 + V_2)}{2r_0^2\langle\lambda\rangle} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_j) \end{array} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\begin{array}{l} -[2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}(V_2 - \alpha\lambda\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S) + g_2] a + \beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S(w+z) \\ -[2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}(V_2 + \alpha\lambda\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S) - g_2] a - \beta_3\varphi^{-1}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S(w+z) \\ (2\beta_1\varphi^{-1}V_2 + g_2) \frac{w+z}{2} \end{array} \right) \langle\lambda\rangle^{-2} \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} \lambda \\ &\quad + \langle\lambda\rangle^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} -a \\ -a \\ \frac{w+z}{2} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_2 \partial_t \psi. \end{aligned}$$

2.6 Self-Similar Transformation

We now introduce the self-similar coordinates to resolve the shock formation. Let $\tau(\tilde{t}) > 0$ be a modulation variable representing the expected blow-up time. The self-similar coordinates are defined by

$$s = -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t}), \quad y_1 = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \tilde{u}_1, \quad y_2 = e^{\frac{s}{2}} \tilde{u}_2.$$

In the self-similar coordinates, the system (2.21) becomes

$$\partial_s R + \beta_\tau e^{-s} D_R R + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} A_{R,\tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_1 R + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} A_{R,\tilde{u}_2} \right) \partial_2 R = \beta_\tau e^{-s} F_R,$$

Next, we define the self-similar Riemann variables as

$$\begin{cases} w = e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa(\tilde{t}), \\ z = Z, \\ a = A. \end{cases}$$

Then, we derive the transport equations for W , Z and A :

$$\begin{cases} \left(\partial_s - \frac{1}{2} \right) W + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + g_W \right) \partial_1 W + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_W \right) \partial_2 W = F_W - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa, \\ \partial_s Z + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + g_Z \right) \partial_1 Z + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_Z \right) \partial_2 Z = F_Z, \\ \partial_s A + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + g_A \right) \partial_1 A + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + h_A \right) \partial_2 A = F_A. \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

Here $\beta_\tau := \frac{1}{1-\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau}$, and $\partial_i := \partial_{y_i}$. The transport terms are

$$\begin{cases} g_W = \beta_\tau JW + G_W = \beta_\tau JW + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} [J(\beta_2 Z + \kappa) + G], \\ g_Z = \beta_2 \beta_\tau JW + G_Z = \beta_2 \beta_\tau JW + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} [J(Z + \beta_2 \kappa) + G], \\ g_A = \beta_1 \beta_\tau JW + G_A = \beta_1 \beta_\tau JW + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} [\beta_1 J(Z + \kappa) + G], \end{cases} \quad (2.23)$$

where

$$G := g_1 - \lambda g_2 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi} \tilde{u}_2^2, \quad (2.24)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} h_W = \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} [2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} (V_2 - \alpha \varphi^{-1} \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S) + g_2], \\ h_Z = \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} [2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} (V_2 + \alpha \varphi^{-1} \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S) + g_2], \\ h_A = \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_2 + g_2). \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

The forcing terms take the form

$$\begin{cases} F_W = -\beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \left[\frac{\beta_1 |V|^2}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} (u_1 - \lambda u_2) + \frac{V_1 - \lambda V_2}{2r_0^2 J} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) - \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \right] \\ \quad - e^{\frac{s}{2}} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} [\beta_\tau e^{-s} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \psi \tilde{u}_2 A + h_W A \partial_2 \lambda - e^{-\frac{s}{2}} h_{W,A} v \cdot N \partial_2 \lambda] \\ \quad - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} [h_{11} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa) - h_{12} A] - h_{W,A} \partial_2 A, \\ F_Z = -\beta_\tau e^{-s} \left[\frac{\beta_1 |V|^2}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} (u_1 - \lambda u_2) + \frac{V_1 - \lambda V_2}{2r_0^2 J} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) - \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_j V_j S \right] \\ \quad - \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} [\beta_\tau e^{-s} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \psi \tilde{u}_2 A + h_Z A \partial_2 \lambda - h_{Z,A} v \cdot N \partial_2 \lambda] \\ \quad - \beta_\tau e^{-s} (h_{22} Z - h_{12} A) - h_{Z,A} \partial_2 A, \\ F_A = -\beta_\tau e^{-s} \left[\frac{\beta_1 |V|^2}{r_0^2 \langle \lambda \rangle} (\lambda u_1 + u_2) + \frac{\lambda V_1 + V_2}{2r_0^2 J} u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j) \right] \\ \quad - \beta_\tau e^{-s} h_{12} v \cdot N - h_{A,W} \partial_2 W - h_{A,Z} \partial_2 Z + \beta_\tau \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} e^{-s} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \psi \tilde{u}_2 v \cdot N, \end{cases} \quad (2.26)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} h_{W,A} = 2\beta_3\beta_\tau\varphi^{-1}\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S, & h_{Z,A} = -e^{\frac{s}{2}}h_{W,A}, \\ h_{A,W} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-s}h_{W,A}, & h_{A,Z} = -e^{\frac{s}{2}}h_{A,W} = h_{Z,A}. \end{cases} \quad (2.27)$$

For each $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, Z, A\}$, by introducing the notation $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{R}^1, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{R}^2) = (\frac{3}{2}y_1 + g_\mathcal{R}, \frac{1}{2}y_2 + h_\mathcal{R})$, we can write the equation of \mathcal{R} in a compact form:

$$\partial_s \mathcal{R} + D_\mathcal{R} \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{R} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{R} = F_\mathcal{R} - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}=W} \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa, \quad (2.28)$$

where $D_\mathcal{R} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}=W}$ denotes the damping term. Here, the indicator function is defined by

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}=W} = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathcal{R} = W, \\ 0, & \mathcal{R} = Z \text{ or } A. \end{cases}$$

For any multi-index $\gamma > 0$, by applying $\partial^\gamma = \partial_1^{\gamma_1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2}$ to both side of (2.22), we get

$$\begin{cases} \left(\partial_s + \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + \beta_\tau (1 + \gamma_1 \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2}) J \partial_1 W \right) \partial^\gamma W + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma W = F_W^{(\gamma)} \\ \left(\partial_s + \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} + \beta_2 \beta_\tau \gamma_1 J \partial_1 W \right) \partial^\gamma Z + \mathcal{V}_Z \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma Z = F_Z^{(\gamma)} \\ \left(\partial_s + \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} + \beta_1 \beta_\tau \gamma_1 J \partial_1 W \right) \partial^\gamma A + \mathcal{V}_A \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma A = F_A^{(\gamma)}, \end{cases} \quad (2.29)$$

with the forcing terms being

$$\begin{aligned} F_W^{(\gamma)} = & \partial^\gamma F_W - \beta_\tau \partial_1 W [\partial^\gamma, J] W - \gamma_2 \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} W \\ & - \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta W - \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} (\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W \partial_1 \partial^\beta W + \partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W \partial_2 \partial^\beta W), \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_Z^{(\gamma)} = & \partial^\gamma F_Z - \gamma_2 \beta_2 \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} Z \\ & - \beta_2 \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta Z - \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} (\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_Z \partial_1 \partial^\beta Z + \partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_Z \partial_2 \partial^\beta Z), \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_A^{(\gamma)} = & \partial^\gamma F_A - \gamma_2 \beta_1 \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} A \\ & - \beta_2 \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta A - \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} (\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_A \partial_1 \partial^\beta A + \partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_A \partial_2 \partial^\beta A). \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

Here and hereafter, we use several different abbreviations for the indicator function. For example, we write

$$\mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} := \mathbb{1}_{\{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |\beta| \geq 2\}}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} 1, & |\gamma| \geq 2, \\ 0, & |\gamma| < 2. \end{cases}$$

For $\gamma \geq 0$, the equations for higher-order derivatives of $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, Z, A\}$ can be systematically written as follows:

$$\partial_s \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} + D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} = F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}.$$

Here, we have for any multi-index $\gamma \geq 0$ that

$$D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} = \begin{cases} \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + \beta_\tau (\mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| > 0} + \gamma_1 \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2}) J \partial_1 W, & \mathcal{R} = W, \\ \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} + \beta_2 \beta_\tau \gamma_1 J \partial_1 W, & \mathcal{R} = Z, \\ \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} + \beta_1 \beta_\tau \gamma_1 J \partial_1 W, & \mathcal{R} = A. \end{cases} \quad (2.33)$$

For $\gamma > 0$, the forcing terms $F_W^{(\gamma)}$, $F_Z^{(\gamma)}$, and $F_A^{(\gamma)}$ are defined in (2.30), (2.31), and (2.32), respectively. For the case $\gamma = 0$, we set

$$F_W^{(0,0)} := F_W - \beta_\tau e^{-s/2} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(0,0)} := F_{\mathcal{R}} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{R} \in \{Z, A\}.$$

We also record the following relations:

$$\begin{cases} V_1 = \frac{1}{2} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa + Z) + \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} A, \\ V_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa + Z) + \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} A, \\ S = \frac{1}{2} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa - Z), \\ v \cdot N = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa + Z), \end{cases} \quad (2.34)$$

$$\begin{cases} W = e^{\frac{s}{2}} [\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) + S - \kappa], \\ Z = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (V_1 - \lambda V_2) - S, \\ A = \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} (\lambda V_1 + V_2), \end{cases} \quad (2.35)$$

along with the equation of $P = (V_1, V_2, S)^T$ in self-similar coordinates:

$$\partial_s P + \beta_\tau e^{-s} D_P P + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_1 P + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_2 P = \beta_\tau e^{-s} F_P. \quad (2.36)$$

2.7 Blow-up Profile

In this section, we analyze the blow-up profile by closely following the construction introduced in [25]. While our profile largely builds upon this prior work, we adapt it to suit the self-similar framework developed in the previous sections and emphasize its relevance to our shock formation scenario.

We first introduce the 1D self-similar Burgers profile

$$\overline{W}_{1d}(y_1) = \left(-\frac{y_1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{27} + \frac{y_1^2}{4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - \left(\frac{y_1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{27} + \frac{y_1^2}{4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

which solves the 1D self-similar Burgers equation:

$$-\frac{1}{2} \overline{W}_{1d} + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \overline{W}_{1d} \right) \partial_{y_1} \overline{W}_{1d} = 0.$$

Then, define $\bar{W}(y_1, y_2) = \langle y_2 \rangle \bar{W}_{1d}(\langle y_2 \rangle^{-3} y_1)$, where $\langle y_2 \rangle = \sqrt{1 + y_2^2}$. One can verify that \bar{W} is a solution to the 2D self-similar Burgers equation:

$$-\frac{1}{2} \bar{W} + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \bar{W} \right) \partial_{y_1} \bar{W} + \frac{1}{2} y_2 \partial_{y_2} \bar{W} = 0, \quad (2.37)$$

and it serves as the shock profile in this paper. From the definition of \bar{W} , one can verify that

$$\bar{W}(0) = 0, \quad \nabla \bar{W}(0) = (-1, 0)^T, \quad \nabla^2 \bar{W}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nabla^2 \partial_1 \bar{W}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 6 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.38)$$

Furthermore, the profile \bar{W} satisfies the following estimates:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\eta(y) = 1 + y_1^2 + y_2^6$, then we have*

$$|\bar{W}| \leq \eta^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\partial_1 \bar{W}| \leq \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad |\partial_2 \bar{W}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}. \quad (2.39)$$

For any multi-index $\gamma \geq 0$, it holds that

$$|\partial^\gamma \bar{W}| \lesssim_\gamma \eta^{\frac{1}{6} - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} - \frac{\gamma_2}{6}}. \quad (2.40)$$

Proof. Note that $t = -\bar{W}_{1d}(t) - \bar{W}_{1d}^3(t)$. Using this identity, we deduce that $|\bar{W}_{1d}(t)| \leq \min(|t|, |t|^{\frac{1}{3}})$ and $\bar{W}'_{1d} = -\frac{1}{1+3\bar{W}_{1d}^2}$. It then follows that

$$\bar{W} \leq \langle y_2 \rangle \min(\langle y_2 \rangle^{-3} |y_1|, \langle y_2 \rangle^{-1} |y_1|^{\frac{1}{3}}) \leq |y_1|^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \eta^{\frac{1}{6}},$$

and

$$|\partial_2 \bar{W}| = 2|y_2| \langle y_2 \rangle^{-1} \frac{|\bar{W}_{1d}|}{1 + 3\bar{W}_{1d}^2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}.$$

To estimate $\partial_1 \bar{W}$, we employ the identity $\partial_1 \bar{W} = -\frac{1}{\langle y_2 \rangle^2 + 3\bar{W}^2}$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\eta^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \langle y_2 \rangle^2 + 3\bar{W}^2$, which is equivalent to $1 + (\bar{W}_{1d} + \bar{W}_{1d}^3)^2 + y_2^6 \leq (1 + y_2^2)^3 (1 + 3\bar{W}_{1d}^2)^3$. Expanding the left-hand side and moving all terms to the right-hand side, we obtain a polynomial in y_2^2 and \bar{W}_{1d}^2 with positive coefficients, thus confirming the inequality.

Using the formula $\partial_2 \bar{W} = 2y_2 \bar{W} \partial_1 \bar{W}$, one can then show the estimate for higher derivatives $|\partial^\gamma \bar{W}| \lesssim_\gamma \eta^{\frac{1}{6} - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} - \frac{\gamma_2}{6}}$, proceeding by first induction on $|\gamma|$ and for each fixed $|\gamma|$, then by induction on γ_2 . \square

2.8 Perturbation Equation

To control the deviation of W from the profile \bar{W} , we derive the perturbation equation. Let $\widetilde{W} = W - \bar{W}$ denote the error between W and the blow-up profile \bar{W} . We can thus deduce the equation of \widetilde{W} :

$$\left(\partial_s - \frac{1}{2} + \beta_\tau J \partial_1 \bar{W} \right) \widetilde{W} + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla \widetilde{W} = F_{\widetilde{W}}, \quad (2.41)$$

where

$$F_{\widetilde{W}} = F_W + [(1 - \beta_\tau J) \bar{W} - G_W] \partial_1 \bar{W} - h_W \partial_2 \bar{W} - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_t \kappa. \quad (2.42)$$

The higher derivatives of \widetilde{W} satisfy

$$\left[\partial_s + \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + \beta_\tau J(\partial_1 \overline{W} + \gamma_1 \partial_1 W) \right] \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W} + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W} = F_{\overline{W}}^{(\gamma)}, \quad (2.43)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\overline{W}}^{(\gamma)} = & \partial^\gamma F_{\overline{W}} - \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \left[\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W} + \partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W \partial_2 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W} + \beta_\tau \partial^{\gamma-\beta} (J \partial_1 \overline{W}) \partial^\beta \widetilde{W} \right] \\ & - \gamma_2 \beta_\tau \partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} \widetilde{W} - \gamma_1 \beta_\tau \partial_1 JW \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W} - \beta_\tau \mathbf{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

2.9 Modulation ODEs

In this section, we provide the ordinary differential equations that the modulation variables satisfy. Using modulation variables, we can match the values of $\partial^\gamma W$ and $\partial^\gamma \overline{W}$ ($|\gamma| \leq 2$) at the origin. Specifically, we impose

$$W(0, s) = \overline{W}(0) = 0, \quad \nabla W(0, s) = \nabla \overline{W}(0) = (-1, 0)^T, \quad \nabla^2 W(0) = \nabla^2 \overline{W}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.45)$$

The values of modulation variables are determined based on these conditions.

To derive the evolution equations of the modulation variables, we evaluate the equation of $\partial^\gamma W$, as well as the auxiliary quantities, at the origin. For convenience, throughout the paper, we adopt the convention that superscript 0 denotes the values of the corresponding quantities at $y = 0$:

$$Z^0 := Z(0, s), \quad G_W^0 := G_W(0, s), \quad \partial_1 F_W^0 := \partial_1 F_W(0, s) \dots$$

In particular, there holds

Proposition 2.2. *At $y = 0$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} u_1^0 &= 1, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} u_1^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 u_1^0 = \psi, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} u_2^0 = 1, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} \lambda^0 = \psi; \\ \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} (u_1^2)^0 &= 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 (u_1^2)^0 = 2, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (u_1^2)^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 (u_1^2)^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 (u_1^2)^0 = 0; \\ \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} (|u|^2)^0 &= \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (|u|^2)^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 (|u|^2)^0 = 2, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 (|u|^2)^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 (|u|^2)^0 = 2; \\ (\varphi^{-1})^0 &= 1, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} (\varphi^{-1})^0 = \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} (\varphi^{-1})^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 (\varphi^{-1})^0 = \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 (\varphi^{-1})^0 = \frac{1}{2r_0^2}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 (\varphi^{-1})^0 = 0; \\ \langle \lambda \rangle^0 &= 1, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} \langle \lambda \rangle^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 \langle \lambda \rangle^0 = \psi^2; \\ J^0 &= 1, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} J^0 = \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} J^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 J^0 = \frac{1}{2r_0^2}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 J^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 J^0 = \frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2; \\ g_1^0 &= -r_0 Q_{13}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} g_1^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} g_1^0 = Q_{12}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 g_1^0 = -\frac{Q_{13}}{2r_0}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 g_1^0 = -\frac{Q_{23}}{2r_0}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 g_1^0 = \frac{Q_{13}}{2r_0}; \\ g_2^0 &= -r_0 Q_{23}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} g_2^0 = -Q_{12}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} g_2^0 = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 g_2^0 = \frac{Q_{23}}{2r_0}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 g_2^0 = -\frac{Q_{13}}{2r_0}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 g_2^0 = -\frac{Q_{23}}{2r_0}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= -r_0 Q_{13}, & \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= 0, & \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= Q_{12} + \psi r_0 Q_{23}, \\
\partial_{\tilde{u}_1}^2 (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= -\frac{Q_{23}}{2r_0}, & \partial_{\tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_2}^2 (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= \psi Q_{12} - \frac{Q_{23}}{2r_0}, & \partial_{\tilde{u}_2}^2 (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0 &= \frac{Q_{13}}{2r_0}; \\
h_{11}^0 &= 0, & h_{12}^0 &= Q_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to derive the evolution equations for modulation variables.

By setting $y = 0$ in the equation of W , we have that

$$\boxed{\partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa = \frac{e^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau} (G_W^0 + F_W^0).} \quad (2.46)$$

Evaluating the equation of $\partial_1 W$ at $y = 0$, we deduce that

$$\boxed{\partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau = \frac{1}{\beta_\tau} (\partial_1 F_W^0 + \partial_1 G_W^0).} \quad (2.47)$$

In a similar fashion, for $\partial_2 W$, we obtain

$$\partial_2 F_W^0 + \partial_2 G_W^0 = 0. \quad (2.48)$$

Note that by Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_2 G_W^0 &= \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} (\beta_2 \partial_2 Z^0 + \partial_2 (g_1 - \lambda g_2)^0) \\
&= \beta_2 \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 Z^0 + \beta_\tau (Q_{12} + \psi r_0 Q_{23}).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the evolution equation of Q_{12} is

$$\boxed{Q_{12} = -\frac{1}{\beta_\tau} \partial_2 F_W^0 - \beta_2 e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 Z^0 - \psi r_0 Q_{23}.} \quad (2.49)$$

Setting $y = 0$ in the equation of $\partial_1 \nabla W$, we get

$$\begin{cases} G_W^0 \partial_{111} W^0 + h_W^0 \partial_{112} W^0 = F_W^{(2,0),0} \\ G_W^0 \partial_{112} W^0 + h_W^0 \partial_{122} W^0 = F_W^{(1,1),0}. \end{cases}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_W^0 \\ h_W^0 \end{pmatrix} = (\nabla^2 \partial_1 W^0)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} F_W^{(2,0),0} \\ F_W^{(1,1),0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.50)$$

provided that the matrix $\nabla^2 \partial_1 W^0$ is invertible. Observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
G_W^0 &= \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} (\beta_2 Z^0 + \kappa - r_0 Q_{13}), \\
h_W^0 &= \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (2\beta_1 V_2^0 + g_2^0) = \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (2\beta_1 A^0 - r_0 Q_{23}),
\end{aligned}$$

we get the equation for Q_{13} and Q_{23} :

$$\boxed{
\begin{aligned}
Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3 \kappa}{r_0} &= -\frac{e^{-\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau r_0} G_W^0 + \frac{\beta_2}{r_0} (Z^0 + \kappa), \\
Q_{23} &= -\frac{e^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau r_0} h_W^0 + \frac{2\beta_1}{r_0} A^0.
\end{aligned}
} \quad (2.51)$$

Finally, for $\partial_{22}W$, we evaluate its equation at $y = 0$ as below:

$$G_W^0 \partial_{122}W^0 + h_W^0 \partial_{222}W^0 = F_W^{(0,2),0} = \partial_{22}F_W^0 + \partial_{22}G_W^0.$$

Direct computation yields that

$$\partial_{22}G_W^0 = \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} \left[\beta_2 \left(\partial_{22}Z^0 + \left(\frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2 \right) e^{-s} Z^0 \right) + \kappa \left(\frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2 \right) e^{-s} + \frac{Q_{13}e^{-s}}{2r_0} - e^{-s} \partial_t \psi \right].$$

Therefore, we derive the equation of ψ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \psi - 2\beta_3 \kappa \left(\psi^2 + \frac{1}{r_0^2} \right) &= \frac{e^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau} (\partial_{22}F_W^0 - G_W^0 \partial_{122}W^0 - h_W^0 \partial_{222}W^0) + \beta_2 e^s \partial_{22}Z^0 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2 \right) \beta_2 (Z^0 + \kappa) + \frac{1}{r_0} \left(Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3 \kappa}{r_0} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

3 Initial Setup and Main Theorem

In this section, we specify the initial data and formulate the main theorem in detail. The proof of the main theorem builds on a bootstrap argument, whose resolution is carried out across the subsequent sections.

We introduce two parameters $\tau_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $M > 1$. The parameter M is chosen sufficiently large to dominate all constants arising from the initial data and the subsequent analysis, while the parameter τ_0 is then taken sufficiently small so that τ_0^{-1} dominates all quantities depending solely on M . This choice yields the following hierarchy:

$$1 \ll \ln M \ll M \ll e^M \ll e^{e^M} \ll \tau_0^{-1}. \tag{3.1}$$

Based on these, we further define two constants:

$$l = (\ln M)^{-5} \ll 1, \quad L = \tau_0^{-\frac{1}{10}} \gg 1. \tag{3.2}$$

3.1 Initial Data

We now prescribe the initial data that lead to shock formation. These conditions are given by assigning initial values for the modulation variables, which determine the coordinate transformations, and for the unknowns W, Z, A in the self-similar coordinates. This equivalence holds since the transformation from the original coordinates to the self-similar coordinates is entirely governed by the modulation variables.

Initial Data of the Modulation Variables Let us first prescribe initial data for the modulation variables. At $\tilde{t} = 0$, we set

$$O(0) = I_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tau(0) = \tau_0, \quad \kappa(0) = \kappa_0, \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0. \tag{3.3}$$

Assume that the constants τ_0, κ_0, ψ_0 satisfy

$$0 < \tau_0 \ll 1, \quad |\kappa_0 - \sigma_\infty| \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}, \quad |\psi_0| \leq 10, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\sigma = \sigma_\infty$ is the background steady state with

$$\sigma_\infty \geq \beta_3^{-1} = \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}. \quad (3.5)$$

The smallness of τ_0 will be used to suppress M , κ_0 , σ_∞ , ψ_0 , α , β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , and any other constants appearing in the proof. We also assume that

$$r_0 + r_0^{-1} \leq 100, \quad \sigma_\infty \leq (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Initial Data of the unknowns Suppose the initial data of (2.3) are given by

$$\sigma(0, p) = \sigma_0(p), \quad v(0, p) = v_0(p), \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Using the modulation variables, whose initial data have been assigned, we now specify the initial self-similar coordinates. First, the choice of the rotation matrix $O(0)$ ensures that the co-moving coordinates coincide with the original coordinates at $\tilde{t} = 0$. Specifically, we have

$$u_i = \frac{2r_0 x_i}{r_0 - x_3} = \frac{2r_0 \dot{x}_i}{r_0 - \dot{x}_3}.$$

We then introduce the frame $E_i = \partial_{u_i}/|\partial_{u_i}| = \varphi^{-1} \partial_{u_i}$, and expand the vector field v as

$$v_0(p) = V_{0i}(p)E_i(p).$$

Next, we define the shock-adapted coordinates by

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_1 = u_1 - \frac{1}{2}\psi_0 u_2^2, \\ \tilde{u}_2 = u_2. \end{cases}$$

In addition, we introduce the following auxiliary quantities

$$\lambda_0 = \psi_0 u_2, \quad J_0 = \varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda_0 \rangle, \quad N = \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-1} (E_1 - \lambda_0 E_2), \quad T = \langle \lambda_0 \rangle^{-1} (\lambda_0 E_1 + E_2).$$

Now we define the Riemann variables at the initial time as

$$w_0 = v_0 \cdot N + \sigma, \quad z_0 = v_0 \cdot N - \sigma, \quad a_0 = v_0 \cdot T. \quad (3.7)$$

Subsequently, we set the initial value of the self-similar time as $s_0 = -\ln \tau_0$, and define the self-similar coordinates at the initial time by $y_1 = \tilde{u}_1 e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0}$ and $y_2 = \tilde{u}_2 e^{\frac{s_0}{2}}$. Now we prescribe the initial data for the self-similar Riemann variables W , Z and A by

$$w_0 = e^{-\frac{s_0}{2}} W_0 + \kappa_0, \quad z_0 = Z_0, \quad a_0 = A_0. \quad (3.8)$$

We then state the initial conditions of W , Z and A , at $\tilde{t} = 0$, or equivalently, at $s = s_0$. Regarding the spatial support of these unknowns, we assume at the initial time that

$$\text{supp}_y (\nabla_y W_0, \nabla_y Z_0, \nabla_y A_0) \subset \left\{ |y_1| \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{3}{2}s}, |y_2| \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{\frac{s}{2}} \right\}. \quad (3.9)$$

To state the initial condition for W_0 , we define the quantity $\mu(\gamma)$ for multi-index γ with $|\gamma| \leq 3$ as follows:

$$\mu(\gamma) := \begin{cases} \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{6}, & |\gamma| \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{3}, & 2 \leq |\gamma| \leq 3, \gamma_1 > 0 \\ \frac{1}{6}, & 2 \leq |\gamma| \leq 3, \gamma_1 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Recall that $\eta(y) := 1 + y_1^2 + y_2^6$. We choose $W_0(y)$ such that

$$|\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma W_0(y)| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{201}{200}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ 16, & |\gamma| = 1, \\ \ln M, & |\gamma| = 2, 3. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

For $\widetilde{W}_0 = W_0 - \overline{W}$, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0^0| &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall |\gamma| = 3; \\ |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \forall |\gamma| \leq 4; \\ \eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+15}}, \quad \forall |\gamma| \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Here, the constants l and L are defined in (3.2). The notation $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0^0$ represents $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0(0)$, i.e. the value of $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}_0$ at $y = 0$. We then assign the initial data of Z and A such that

$$e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s_0} (|\partial^\gamma (Z_0 + \sigma_\infty)| + |\partial^\gamma A_0|) \leq \tau_0. \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, for a fixed integer $k \geq 34$, we assume at $\tilde{t} = 0$ (equivalently, at $s = s_0$) that

$$\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|D^k W_0\|_{L^2} + \|D^k Z_0\|_{L^2} + \|D^k A_0\|_{L^2} \leq M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Remark 3.1. *The imposed initial conditions are admissible in the sense that there exist such data that simultaneously satisfy all the requirements. In particular, one can construct such initial data explicitly by choosing $O(0) = I_3$, $\kappa_0 = \sigma_\infty$, $\psi_0 = 0$, $\tau_0 > 0$, and*

$$W_0(y) = \chi(\tau_0 y_1, \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} y_2) \overline{W}(y), \quad Z_0(y) + \sigma_\infty = A_0(y) = 0.$$

Here, the bump function $\chi \in C_c^\infty([-1, 1]^2)$ satisfies $\chi = 1$ on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2$, $|\nabla \chi| \leq 10$, and $|\partial^\gamma \chi| \leq 100$ for any $|\gamma| = 2$. One can verify that

$$|W_0(y)| \leq \eta^{\frac{1}{6}}(y), \quad |\partial_1 W_0(y)| \leq 15\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(y), \quad |\partial_2 W_0(y)| \leq 15,$$

and

$$|\partial^\gamma W_0(y)| \lesssim_\gamma \eta^{\frac{1}{6} - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} - \frac{\gamma_2}{6}}, \quad \text{for any } \gamma \geq 0,$$

provided that the parameter τ_0 is sufficiently small. For \widetilde{W}_0 , it holds that

$$|\widetilde{W}_0(y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} = 0.$$

The \dot{H}^k norm can be estimated using the pointwise bound, yielding that

$$\|D^k W_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\eta^{\frac{1-k}{3}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim_k 1 \leq M.$$

Next, we verify the conditions for the modulation variables. Using (2.46)(2.47)(2.49)(2.51)(2.52), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa(0) &= -\frac{2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \tau_0^2}{12r_0^2 - \tau_0^3}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau(0) = Q_{12}(0) = Q_{23}(0) = 0, \quad Q_{13}(0) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau_0^3}{12r_0^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty}{r_0}, \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}} \psi(0) - \frac{2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty}{r_0^2} &= \left(1 + \frac{\tau_0}{12r_0^3}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\tau_0^3}{12r_0^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \tau_0^2}{3r_0^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing τ_0 to be sufficiently small, the initial conditions for the modulation variables can be fulfilled.

3.2 Statement of the Main Theorem

Now we state the detailed version of the main theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider the system (2.3) on $\mathbb{S}^2 = \{\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\dot{x}| = r_0\}$, where the radius satisfies $r_0 + r_0^{-1} \leq 100$. For any background steady state obeying $\sigma_\infty \geq \beta_3^{-1} = \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}$, suppose the initial data (σ_0, v_0) satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) *The modulation variables satisfy the initial conditions (3.3)(3.4), and $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\alpha, \sigma_\infty) \ll 1$ is sufficiently small.*
- (2) *The functions W_0, Z_0 and A_0 , defined by (3.7)(3.8) using (σ_0, v_0) , are subject to the conditions (3.9)(3.11)(3.12)(3.13)(3.14).*

Then, the following conclusions hold:

- (1) *Finite time \dot{C}^1 norm blow-up: The solution (σ, v) blows up at $\tilde{t} = \tilde{T}_*$:*

$$\lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{T}_*} (\|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}) = \infty.$$

Moreover, there exists a time-dependent position $\xi(\tilde{t}) \in \mathbb{S}^2$ such that the solution becomes unbounded along its trajectory:

$$|\nabla \sigma(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| + |\nabla v(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| \gtrsim \frac{1}{\tilde{T}_* - \tilde{t}}.$$

Meanwhile, \dot{C}^1 norm of the solution remains uniformly bounded slightly away from $\xi(\tilde{t})$. More precisely, for any $\delta \in (0, \pi r_0/1000)$, it holds that

$$\|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^\circ)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^\circ)} \lesssim_{\sigma_\infty, r_0} \delta^{-2} + M.$$

Here, $B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t})) = \{p \in \mathbb{S}^2 : d(p, \xi(\tilde{t})) < \delta\}$, and d is the distance induced by the Riemann metric on \mathbb{S}^2 .

- (2) *Blow-up time: The blow-up time \tilde{T}_* is characterized by $\tau(\tilde{T}_*) = \tilde{T}_*$, and it satisfies the estimate*

$$\tilde{T}_* = \tau_0 + O_{\sigma_\infty, r_0}(\tau_0^2).$$

- (3) *Blow-up location: Let (\dot{u}_1, \dot{u}_2) denote the stereographic projection coordinates relative to the original Cartesian frame $(\dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2, \dot{x}_3)$. Along the trajectory, we have the estimates*

$$\dot{u}_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = 2\beta_3 \kappa_0 \tilde{t} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}), \quad \dot{u}_2(\xi(\tilde{t})) = \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}). \quad (3.15)$$

- (4) *Blow-up direction and C^1 norm estimates: The normal vector field N fully characterizes the direction of shock formation. In particular, there holds:*

$$\|\nabla_N \sigma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla_N \sigma\|_{L^\infty} \approx \frac{1}{\tilde{T}_* - \tilde{t}}, \quad \|\nabla_T \sigma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla_T \sigma\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1.$$

- (5) *No appearance of vacuum: The density remains strictly positive:*

$$\inf_{(\tilde{t}, p) \in [0, \tilde{T}_*] \times \mathbb{S}^2} \sigma(\tilde{t}, p) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\infty.$$

- (6) *Uniform-in-time $\dot{C}^{1/3}$ regularity: The Riemann variable $w = v \cdot N + \sigma$ satisfies the following Hölder estimate:*

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty_{\tilde{t}}([0, \tilde{T}_*]; \dot{C}^{1/3}(\mathbb{S}^2))} \lesssim 1.$$

3.3 Framework of Bootstrap Argument

Recall from Section 1.3 that the shock formation is attributed to the singularity of self-similar coordinate transformation. And the problem hence reduces to proving global well-posedness for the system governing self-similar variables. To this end, we appeal to a bootstrap argument. We begin by stating the bootstrap assumptions.

For the modulation variables, we assume that

$$|Q_{12}| \leq M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad \left|Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3\kappa}{r_0}\right| \leq M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |Q_{23}| \leq M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\kappa| \leq M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\kappa - \kappa_0| \leq \tau_0, \quad |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau| \leq M^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-s}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\left|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\psi - 2\beta_3\kappa\left(\psi^2 + \frac{1}{r_0^2}\right)\right| \leq M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\psi - \psi_0| \leq M\tau_0. \quad (3.18)$$

Regarding the spatial support of the unknowns, we impose the following condition:

$$\text{supp}_y(\nabla_y W, \nabla_y Z, \nabla_y A) \subset \left\{ |y_1| \leq 2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\frac{3}{2}s}, |y_2| \leq 2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}e^{\frac{s}{2}} \right\} =: \mathcal{X}(s). \quad (3.19)$$

We now proceed to state the assumptions on W :

$$|\eta^{\mu(\gamma)}\partial^{\gamma}W| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{101}{100}, & \gamma = (0,0) \\ 20, & |\gamma| = 1 \\ M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-5}{8}}, & |\gamma| = 2,3 \end{cases}. \quad (3.20)$$

For Z , we assume that

$$e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s}|\partial^{\gamma}(Z + \sigma_{\infty})| \leq \begin{cases} M\tau_0, & \gamma = (0,0) \\ \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 = 0 \\ M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (3.21)$$

For A , we require that

$$e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s}|\partial^{\gamma}A| \leq \begin{cases} M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{|\gamma|+1}}, & |\gamma| \leq 1 \text{ and } \gamma_1 = 0 \\ M, & \gamma \in \{(1,0), (0,2)\} \end{cases}. \quad (3.22)$$

The assumption on \widetilde{W} , is that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^{\gamma}\widetilde{W}^0| &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad \forall |\gamma| = 3; \\ |\partial^{\gamma}\widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}(\ln M)^{|\gamma|}, \quad \forall |\gamma| \leq 4; \\ \eta^{\mu(\gamma)}|\partial^{\gamma}\widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+16}}, \quad \forall |\gamma| \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Finally, for a fixed integer $k \geq 34$, we impose that

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\|D^k W\|_{L^2} + \|D^k Z\|_{L^2} + \|D^k A\|_{L^2} \leq M^{\frac{3k}{2}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (3.24)$$

Provided that all the above bootstrap assumptions (3.16)–(3.24) can be improved, we are able to prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We proceed by verifying each conclusion of the theorem, leveraging the bootstrap assumptions and the definitions provided in the setup.

First, we verify the absence of vacuum:

$$\sigma = S \stackrel{(2.34)}{=} \sigma_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \left(\underbrace{e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W}_{(3.27)} + \underbrace{(\kappa - \sigma_\infty)}_{(3.4)(3.17)} - \underbrace{(Z + \sigma_\infty)}_{(3.21)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\infty > 0.$$

Next, we estimate the \dot{C}^1 norm of (v, σ) . We begin by computing the covariant derivatives of the velocity v . From (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_N v &= (\nabla_N(v \cdot N) - \theta(N)A)N + (\theta(N)v \cdot N + \nabla_N A)T, \\ \nabla_T v &= (\nabla_T(v \cdot N) - \theta(T)A)N + (\theta(T)v \cdot N + \nabla_T A)T. \end{aligned}$$

If the bootstrap assumptions hold, by (2.16), the 1-form θ satisfies that

$$|\theta(N)| = o_{\tau_0}(1), \quad |\theta(T)| = |\psi| + o_{\tau_0}(1).$$

Next, we bound the terms involving $v \cdot N$ and A using (2.34):

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_N(v \cdot N)| &= \frac{J}{2} |e^s \partial_1 W + e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1 Z| + o_{\tau_0}(1) \stackrel{(3.21)(3.28)(3.32)}{\leq} \left(\frac{1}{2} + o_{\tau_0}(1) \right) e^s, \\ |\nabla_T(v \cdot N)| &= \frac{J}{2\langle \lambda \rangle^2} |\partial_2 W + e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 Z| \stackrel{(3.20)(3.21)(3.32)}{\leq} 10 + o_{\tau_0}(1), \\ |\nabla_N A| &= J |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} A - \lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 A| \stackrel{(3.22)(3.32)}{\leq} M + o_{\tau_0}(1), \\ |\nabla_T A| &= \frac{J}{\langle \lambda \rangle^2} |\lambda e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 A| \stackrel{(3.22)(3.32)}{=} o_{\tau_0}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates, for sufficiently small τ_0 , we obtain:

$$|\nabla_N v| \leq e^s, \quad |\nabla_N \sigma| \leq e^s, \quad |\nabla_T v| \leq 11, \quad |\nabla_T \sigma| \leq 11.$$

The blow-up criterion for classical solutions to the Euler equations (see [42]) then guarantees that the solution in the original coordinates remains regular as long as s is finite.

Moreover, we claim that if $s(\tilde{t})$ blows up at $\tilde{t} = \tilde{T}_*$, so does the solution. This is shown by establishing a lower bound for the \dot{C}^1 norm of the solution. At the point $\xi(\tilde{t})$ where $\tilde{u}_1 = \tilde{u}_2 = 0$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_N v(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| &= \left| -\frac{1}{2} (e^s - e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1 Z^0) N^0 + e^{\frac{3}{2}s} s \partial_1 A^0 T^0 \right| \stackrel{(3.21)(3.22)}{\geq} \left(\frac{1}{2} - o_{\tau_0}(1) \right) e^s, \\ |\nabla_N \sigma(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| &= \left| -\frac{1}{2} (e^s + e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1 Z^0) \right| \stackrel{(3.22)}{\geq} \left(\frac{1}{2} - o_{\tau_0}(1) \right) e^s. \end{aligned}$$

The following estimates then follow:

$$\frac{1}{3} e^s \leq \|\nabla_N v\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^s, \quad \frac{1}{3} e^s \leq \|\nabla_N \sigma\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^s$$

Since $\{N, T\}$ are orthonormal, there holds

$$|\nabla v|^2 = |\nabla_N v|^2 + |\nabla_T v|^2, \quad |\nabla \sigma|^2 = |\nabla_N \sigma|^2 + |\nabla_T \sigma|^2,$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{3}e^s \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2e^s, \quad \frac{1}{3}e^s \leq \|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2e^s.$$

This proves the claim and concludes the blow-up of the C^1 norm and the estimates in (5).

Noting by (3.17) that $\frac{d}{dt}(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t}) = \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau - 1 \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, and $\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t} = \tau_0 > 0$ at $\tilde{t} = 0$, there exists a finite time $\tilde{T}_* > 0$ such that $\lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{T}_*} \tau(\tilde{t}) = \tilde{T}_*$. By the definition $s = -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t})$, we have $\lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{T}_*} s(\tilde{t}) = \infty$. Thus, the solution blows up at a finite time \tilde{T}_* . Moreover, we obtain the following estimate for the blow-up time:

$$|\tilde{T}_* - \tau_0| = |\tau(\tilde{T}_*) - \tau(0)| \leq \int_0^{\tilde{T}_*} \underbrace{|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau(\tilde{t})|}_{(3.17)} d\tilde{t} \stackrel{s = -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t})}{\leq} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \beta_\tau M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-2s} ds \stackrel{(3.26)}{\leq} M\tau_0^2.$$

At the blow-up location $\xi(\tilde{t})$, the following estimates result from the above:

$$|\nabla_N v(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| + |\nabla_N \sigma(\tilde{t}, \xi(\tilde{t}))| \gtrsim e^s \gtrsim \frac{1}{\tilde{T}_* - \tilde{t}}.$$

We now consider the estimates slightly away from $\xi(\tilde{t})$. In this case, any point $p \in B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^c$ satisfies either $|y_1| \gtrsim \delta e^{\frac{3}{2}s}$ or $|y_2| \gtrsim \delta e^{\frac{s}{2}}$. For such p , we derive

$$|\nabla_N v| \lesssim e^s \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} + M \lesssim \delta^{-2} + M.$$

The proof of $\|\nabla_N \sigma\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^c)} \lesssim \delta^{-2} + M$ follows similarly.

For the behavior of $\xi(\tilde{t})$, we first recall that it corresponds to the origin of the $(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ coordinates: $\tilde{u}_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = \tilde{u}_2(\xi(\tilde{t})) = 0$. From the coordinate transformations (2.14) and (2.4), we find $u_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = u_2(\xi(\tilde{t})) = 0$, and $x_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = x_2(\xi(\tilde{t})) = 0$, $x_3(\xi(\tilde{t})) = -r_0$. Since $x = O(\tilde{t})\hat{x}$ (see Section 2.2) and $\dot{u}_i = \frac{2r_0\dot{\hat{x}}_i}{r_0 - \hat{x}_3}$, we derive

$$\dot{u}_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = -\frac{2r_0 O_{13}(\tilde{t})}{1 + O_{33}(\tilde{t})}, \quad \dot{u}_2(\xi(\tilde{t})) = -\frac{2r_0 O_{23}(\tilde{t})}{1 + O_{33}(\tilde{t})}.$$

From $\dot{O}^T = QO^T$ and (3.16), we have $O = I + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0)$. Invoking $\dot{O}^T = QO^T$ one more time, we see that

$$\dot{O}^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{2\beta_3\kappa}{r_0} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{2\beta_3\kappa}{r_0} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}).$$

Since $O(\tilde{t}) = I + \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \dot{O}(\tilde{t}') d\tilde{t}'$, we obtain more accurate estimates for O_{13} , O_{23} , and O_{33} using (3.17):

$$O_{13}(\tilde{t}) = -\frac{2\beta_3\kappa_0\tilde{t}}{r_0} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}), \quad O_{23}(\tilde{t}) = \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}), \quad O_{33}(\tilde{t}) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}).$$

Therefore, we derive

$$\dot{u}_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = -2r_0 \left(-\frac{2\beta_3\kappa_0\tilde{t}}{r_0} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}) \right) = 2\beta_3\kappa_0\tilde{t} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}),$$

and

$$\dot{u}_1(\xi(\tilde{t})) = -2r_0 \cdot \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} + \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}})\right) = \mathcal{O}(M\tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}}).$$

Finally, we estimate the $\dot{C}^{1/3}$ norm of the Riemann variable w . For any $p, q \in \text{supp } \nabla w$, note that

$$d(p, q) \approx |u(p) - u(q)| \approx |\tilde{u}(p) - \tilde{u}(q)|.$$

Employing this relation, we derive the following (uniformly in \tilde{t}) estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|w(\tilde{t}, p) - w(\tilde{t}, q)|}{d(p, q)^{\frac{1}{3}}} &\lesssim \frac{|w(\tilde{t}, \tilde{u}(p)) - w(\tilde{t}, \tilde{u}(q))|}{|\tilde{u}(p) - \tilde{u}(q)|^{\frac{1}{3}}} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{s}{2}}|W(s, y(p)) - W(s, y(q))|}{[e^{-3s}(y_1(p) - y_1(q))^2 + e^{-s}(y_2(p) - y_2(q))^2]^{1/6}} \\ &\leq \frac{|W(s, y_1(p), y_2(p)) - W(s, y_1(q), y_2(p))|}{|y_1(p) - y_1(q)|^{\frac{1}{3}}} + e^{-\frac{s}{3}} \frac{|W(s, y_1(q), y_2(p)) - W(s, y_1(q), y_2(q))|}{|y_2(p) - y_2(q)|^{\frac{1}{3}}} \\ &\stackrel{(3.20)}{\leq} \frac{\int_{y_1(q)}^{y_1(p)} (1+z^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} dz}{|y_1(p) - y_1(q)|^{\frac{1}{3}}} + e^{-\frac{s}{3}} |y_2(p) - y_2(q)|^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\stackrel{p, q \in \text{supp } \nabla w}{\lesssim} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|w\|_{L_t^\infty([0, \tilde{T}_*); \dot{C}^{1/3}(\mathbb{S}^2))} \lesssim 1.$$

This completes the proof of all conclusions. \square

3.4 Outline for closing the bootstrap argument

In the following, we sketch the process to close the aforementioned bootstrap argument.

Most of our bootstrap assumptions are L^∞ -type bounds for W , Z , A , and \tilde{W} . Improvements of these assumptions except $\partial_1 A$) are achieved by solving the unknowns along the Lagrangian trajectories of the transport equations. In this process, it is crucial to establish estimates for the transport and forcing terms. Typically, the upper bounds take the form of a linear combination of monomials structured as $\eta^{p_1} M^{p_2} (\ln M)^{p_3} \tau_0^{p_4} e^{p_5 s}$. For instance, estimate (4.9) yields

$$|\partial_{11} F_W| \lesssim (\ln M)^7 M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{8}} e^{-s} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}).$$

Hence, comparing such “monomials”—terms of the form $\eta^{p_1} M^{p_2} (\ln M)^{p_3} \tau_0^{p_4} e^{p_5 s}$ —over the domain $\mathcal{X}(s)$ becomes essential, which motivates the following comparison lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *On $\mathcal{X}(s)$, the inequality*

$$\eta^{p_1} M^{p_2} (\ln M)^{p_3} \tau_0^{p_4} e^{p_5 s} \lesssim \eta^{q_1} M^{q_2} (\ln M)^{q_3} \tau_0^{q_4} e^{q_5 s}$$

holds if and only if the following two conditions are verified:

1. $p_5 - q_5 + 3(p_1 - q_1)^+ \leq 0$.
2. $(2(p_1 - q_1)^+ + p_5 - q_5 - p_4 + q_4, p_2 - q_2, p_3 - q_3) \leq_{\text{lex}} (0, 0, 0)$ in lexicographic order.

Proof. It suffices to determine the necessary and sufficient conditions under which the following inequality

$$\eta^{p_1-q_1} M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4} e^{(p_5-q_5)s} \lesssim 1$$

hold on $\mathcal{X}(s)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta^{p_1-q_1} M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4} e^{(p_5-q_5)s} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}(s)} \lesssim 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \sup_{y \in \mathcal{X}(s)} \eta^{p_1-q_1}(y) M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4} e^{(p_5-q_5)s} \lesssim 1 \\ \stackrel{\text{Prop 3.5}}{\Leftrightarrow} & M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4+(p_1-q_1)^+} e^{[p_5-q_5+3(p_1-q_1)^+]s} \lesssim 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow & p_5 - q_5 + 3(p_1 - q_1)^+ \leq 0 \text{ and } M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4+(p_1-q_1)^+} e^{[p_5-q_5+3(p_1-q_1)^+]s_0} \lesssim 1 \\ \stackrel{e^{s_0} = \tau_0^{-1}}{\Leftrightarrow} & p_5 - q_5 + 3(p_1 - q_1)^+ \leq 0 \text{ and } M^{p_2-q_2} (\ln M)^{p_3-q_3} \tau_0^{p_4-q_4-p_5+q_5-2(p_1-q_1)^+} \lesssim 1 \\ \stackrel{(3.1)}{\Leftrightarrow} & p_5 - q_5 + 3(p_1 - q_1)^+ \leq 0 \text{ and } (2(p_1 - q_1)^+ + p_5 - q_5 - p_4 + q_4, p_2 - q_2, p_3 - q_3) \leq_{\text{lex}} (0, 0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

To bound $\partial_1 A$ requires a distinct approach, as it cannot be closed via transport equation estimates. Instead, its control is closely related to the estimate of vorticity ω . In fact, the quantity ω/ρ is purely transported by the velocity field v , and this conservation along particle paths allows us to close the bootstrap assumption for $\partial_1 A$.

However, pure L^∞ -type estimates do not close the full bootstrap argument due to a loss of derivatives. To address this issue, we leverage the symmetric hyperbolic structure of the system and utilize complementary energy estimates to recover the lost derivatives.

3.5 Immediate Corollaries of Bootstrap Assumptions

The bootstrap assumptions lead to several immediate corollaries. These preliminary results, requiring little beyond the stated assumptions, form the groundwork for the more delicate estimates developed in subsequent sections. We begin with establishing the following proposition:

Proposition 3.4. *We have that*

$$|\psi| \lesssim 1, \quad |\partial_{\bar{t}}\psi| + |\kappa| + |Q_{13}| \lesssim (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$|1 - \beta_\tau| \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s}. \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. By (3.4)(3.18), we deduce that

$$|\psi| \leq |\psi_0| + M\tau_0 \leq 10 + M\tau_0 \lesssim 1.$$

Employing (3.18)(3.17)(3.16), we obtain

$$|\partial_{\bar{t}}\psi| + |\kappa| + |Q_{13}| \lesssim (1 + r_0^{-1} + r_0^{-2})\kappa_0 \stackrel{(3.4)(3.6)}{\lesssim} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Finally, by (3.17), we get

$$|1 - \beta_\tau| = \frac{|\partial_{\bar{t}}\tau|}{|1 - \partial_{\bar{t}}\tau|} \lesssim |\partial_{\bar{t}}\tau| \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s}.$$

\square

Proposition 3.5. *On $\mathcal{X}(s)$, the inequality $\eta \lesssim \tau_0 e^{3s}$ holds.*

Proof. By definition of η , we observe that $\eta = 1 + y_1^2 + y_2^6 \leq 1 + C\tau_0 e^{3s} \lesssim \tau_0 e^{3s}$. \square

Using Proposition 3.5 and the assumptions that $|W| \lesssim \eta^{\frac{1}{6}}$ and $\text{supp } W \subset \mathcal{X}(s)$, we have the following estimate.

Proposition 3.6. *W satisfies the inequality:*

$$|W| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (3.27)$$

Another important property of W is as follows:

Proposition 3.7. *The following inequality holds:*

$$|\partial_1 W| \leq 1 + o_{\tau_0}(1), \quad (3.28)$$

where $o_{\tau_0}(1)$ denotes a quantity that vanishes as $\tau_0 \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. If $|y| \leq L$, we have that

$$|\partial_1 W| \leq |\partial_1 \overline{W}| + |\partial_1 \widetilde{W}| \stackrel{(2.39)(3.23)}{\leq} 1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{17}}.$$

Note that $\eta(y) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + |y|^2)$. If $|y| \geq L$, we thus deduce

$$|\partial_1 W| \stackrel{(3.20)}{\leq} 20\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \lesssim (1 + L^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \ll 1.$$

\square

We also derive an estimate for the deviation of Z from $-\kappa$:

Proposition 3.8. *If the bootstrap assumptions are verified, the following estimate holds:*

$$|Z + \kappa| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}. \quad (3.29)$$

Proof. This follows from

$$|Z + \kappa| \lesssim |Z + \sigma_\infty| + |\kappa_0 - \sigma_\infty| + |\kappa - \kappa_0| \stackrel{(3.4)(3.17)(3.21)}{\lesssim} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}.$$

\square

For higher order derivatives of self-similar variables, we show the proposition below:

Proposition 3.9. *Given the bootstrap assumptions, we have*

$$|D^j W| \stackrel{3 \leq j \leq 5}{\lesssim} M^{2(j-1)}. \quad (3.30)$$

For $\mathcal{R} \in \{Z, A\}$, there holds

$$|D^j \mathcal{R}| \stackrel{3 \leq j \leq 5}{\lesssim} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, \quad |D^j \partial_1 \mathcal{R}| \stackrel{2 \leq j \leq 4}{\lesssim} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}. \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. Since DW is compactly supported, by Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality, for $2 \leq j \leq k-1$, one can verify that,

$$\|D^j W\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|D^k W\|_{L^2}^{\frac{j-1}{k-2}} \|DW\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{k-j-1}{k-2}} \stackrel{(3.20)(3.24)}{\lesssim} M^{\frac{3k}{2} \cdot \frac{j-1}{k-2}} \stackrel{k \geq 34}{\lesssim} M^{2(j-1)}.$$

Here, we utilize the largeness of M in the last inequality.

For $\mathcal{R} \in \{Z, A\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq 4 < k-2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^j \partial_1 \mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|D^{k-1} \partial_1 \mathcal{R}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{j}{k-2}} \|\partial_1 \mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{k-j-2}{k-2}} \lesssim \left(M^{\frac{3}{2}k} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\right)^{\frac{j}{k-2}} \left(M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}\right)^{\frac{k-j-2}{k-2}} \\ &\lesssim M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\left(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{j}{k-2}\right)s} \lesssim M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $|D^2 \mathcal{R}| \lesssim M e^{-s}$. Then, by Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^j \mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty} &\stackrel{3 \leq j \leq 5}{\lesssim} \|D^k \mathcal{R}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{j-2}{k-3}} \|D^2 \mathcal{R}\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{k-j-1}{k-3}} \lesssim \left(M^{\frac{3}{2}k} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\right)^{\frac{j-2}{k-3}} \left(M e^{-s}\right)^{\frac{k-j-1}{k-3}} \\ &\lesssim M^3 e^{-\left(1-\frac{j-2}{2(k-3)}\right)s} \lesssim M^3 e^{-\left(1-\frac{3}{62}\right)s} \leq e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we estimate the auxiliary quantities associated with coordinate transformations. These quantities are determined by the modulation variables. To state the resulting inequalities more conveniently, we first define several operations on sets of multi-indices.

Definition 3.10. For any two sets of multi-indices $E, F \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$, we define

$$\text{cone } E = \left\{ \sum c_i v_i : c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, v_i \in E \right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cone}^+ E &= \left\{ \sum c_i v_i : c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \sum c_i > 0, v_i \in E \right\}, \\ E + F &= \{v_1 + v_2 : v_1 \in E, v_2 \in F\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now state the estimates for auxiliary quantities.

Proposition 3.11 (Estimates for auxiliary quantities). *Suppose that the bootstrap assumptions are valid, the following inequalities hold on the region $\mathcal{X}(s)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_u^\gamma (\psi \tilde{u}_2^2)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\gamma \leq 2e_2} \tau_0^{\frac{2-\gamma_2}{6}} \ln M, \quad |\partial_u^\gamma u_1| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{e_1}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{2-\gamma_2}{6}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma \leq 2e_2}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma \lambda| &\lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1-\gamma_2}{6}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma \leq e_2}, \quad |\partial_u^\gamma (\lambda^2)| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{2-\gamma_2}{6}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma \leq 2e_2}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (u_1^2)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{2e_1, (1,2), 4e_2\}}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\partial_u^\gamma (u_2^2)| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{2e_2}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (u_1 u_2)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{(1,1), 3e_2\}}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad |\partial_u^\gamma (|u|^2)| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{2e_1, (1,2), 2e_2, 4e_2\}}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (\varphi^{-1} - 1)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{2e_1, (1,2), 2e_2, 4e_2\}}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (\varphi - 1)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\text{cone}^+ \{2e_1, (1,2), 2e_2, 4e_2\}}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (\langle \lambda \rangle - 1)| + |\partial_u^\gamma (\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} - 1)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\gamma=0} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + \mathbb{1}_{\text{cone}^+ (e_2)}(\gamma) \tau_0^{\frac{1-(-1)^{\gamma_2}}{12}}, \\ |\partial_u^\gamma (J - 1)| + |\partial_u^\gamma (\beta_\tau J - 1)| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{0, 2e_1, (1,2)\} + \text{cone}(e_2) \setminus \{0\}}(\gamma) \tau_0^{\frac{1-(-1)^{\gamma_2}}{12}} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Additionally, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_u^\gamma h_{11}| &\lesssim (\mathbb{1}_{e_1}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}})(\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\
|\partial_u^\gamma h_{12}| &\lesssim (\mathbb{1}_{e_1}(\gamma) + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}})(\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
|\partial_u^\gamma (g_1 + r_0 Q_{13})| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{2e_1, 2e_2\}}(\gamma)(\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\
|\partial_u^\gamma g_2| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{e_1+e_2}(\gamma) \ln M + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \\
|\partial_u^\gamma (g_1 - \lambda g_2 + r_0 Q_{13})| &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{\{2e_1, 2e_2\}}(\gamma)(\ln M)^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Here, both $\mathbb{1}_A(\gamma)$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\gamma \in A}$ denote the indicator function, which takes the value 1 when $\gamma \in A$, and 0 otherwise.

Proof. These bounds follow directly from the definitions of u_i , \tilde{u}_i , φ , λ , $\langle \lambda \rangle$, J , β_τ , h_{ij} , and g_i , along with the bootstrap assumptions (3.17), (3.18), and (3.16) for the modulation variables. \square

Next, we consider the lower order estimates on the physical variable $P = (V_1, V_2, S)^T$. We introduce the shifted variables $\tilde{P} = (V_1, V_2, S - \sigma_\infty)^T = (\tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_2, \tilde{P}_3)^T = P - (0, 0, \sigma_\infty)^T$. Based on the support condition (3.19) and the finite speed of propagation property of the system, we have that $\text{supp}_y \tilde{P} \subset \mathcal{X}(s)$. This compactly supported property allows us to use the Poincaré inequality to estimate their L^2 -norm. The pointwise estimates for the shifted variables \tilde{P} are given below.

Proposition 3.12. *We have the following estimates for \tilde{P} on $\mathcal{X}(s)$:*

$$|\partial^\gamma V_1| \lesssim \begin{cases} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 0) \\ e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (1, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 2), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (3, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 1), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 2), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{7}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & \gamma = (0, 3), \\ M^6 e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 4, \\ M^8 e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 5, \end{cases} \tag{3.34}$$

$$|\partial^\gamma V_2| \lesssim \begin{cases} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 0), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 2), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (3, 0), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (2, 1), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 2), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{7}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & \gamma = (0, 3), \\ M^6 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 4, \\ M^8 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 5, \end{cases} \quad (3.35)$$

$$|\partial^\gamma(v \cdot N)| + |\partial^\gamma(S - \sigma_\infty))| \lesssim \begin{cases} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (2, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 2), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (3, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 1), \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (1, 2), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{7}{8}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & \gamma = (0, 3), \\ M^6 e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 4, \\ M^8 e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & |\gamma| = 5. \end{cases} \quad (3.36)$$

Proof. These inequalities are derived via using (2.34) and (3.20)(3.21)(3.22)(3.30)(3.31)(3.32). Indeed, from (2.34), one can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\gamma V_1| &\stackrel{(2.34)}{\lesssim} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} W)|}_{(3.32)(3.20)(3.30)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1}(Z + \kappa))|}_{(3.32)(3.21)(3.29)(3.31)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} A)|}_{(3.32)(3.22)(3.31)}, \\ |\partial^\gamma V_2| &\stackrel{(2.34)}{\lesssim} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} W)|}_{(3.32)(3.20)(3.30)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\lambda \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1}(Z + \kappa))|}_{(3.32)(3.21)(3.29)(3.31)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} A)|}_{(3.32)(3.22)(3.31)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\partial^\gamma(v \cdot N)| + |\partial^\gamma(S - \sigma_\infty))| \stackrel{(2.34)}{\lesssim} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma W|}_{(3.32)(3.20)(3.30)} + \underbrace{\mathbb{1}_{\gamma=(0,0)} |\kappa - \sigma_\infty|}_{(3.4)(3.17)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(Z + \sigma_\infty)|}_{(3.21)(3.31)}.$$

Using the prior estimates indicated under the brackets yields the desired bounds for V_1 , V_2 , $v \cdot N$, and $S - \sigma_\infty$. \square

Then, we have the following corollary, which is useful in the top-order energy estimates.

Corollary 3.13. *For $\mu = 1, 2, 3$, there hold the following estimates:*

$$\|\widetilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}, \quad \|P_\mu\|_{L^\infty} \leq \ln M, \quad \|D^2 P_\mu\|_{L_y^6} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}}.$$

Proof. First, it follows from Proposition 3.12 that $|\widetilde{P}| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}$, and $|D^2 P| \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}}$. These imply $|P| \leq |\widetilde{P}| + \sigma_\infty \leq \ln M$, and $\|D^2 P\|_{L^6} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|\eta^{-\frac{1}{6}}\|_{L^6} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}}$. \square

In the energy estimates, we also require the following sharper bounds on $|\partial_j P| := \sqrt{\sum_\mu |\partial_j P_\mu|^2}$.

Proposition 3.14. *Provided that the bootstrap assumptions are valid, it holds on $\mathcal{X}(s)$ that*

$$\max(|\partial_1 V_1|, |\partial_1 S|) \leq (\frac{1}{2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)) e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad \max(|\partial_2 V_1|, |\partial_2 S|) \leq (10 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |DV_2| \leq o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (3.37)$$

In addition, we have the following upper bound estimates for the derivatives of P :

$$|\partial_1 P| \leq (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)) e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\partial_2 P| \leq (10\sqrt{2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)) e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (3.38)$$

Proof. The upper bounds in (3.37) can be derived using (2.34) and the bootstrap assumptions. Then, (3.38) follows from the definition of the vector norm. \square

4 Estimates for Transport Equations

In this section, we estimate each part of the transport equations satisfied by $\partial^\gamma \mathcal{R}$ with $\mathcal{R} \in \{\widetilde{W}, W, Z, A\}$. A key observation we make here is that both the transport terms and the forcing terms can be expressed as polynomials of \widetilde{W}, W, Z, A , and certain auxiliary quantities.

4.1 Estimates for Transport Terms

In this section, we estimate the transport terms in the equation of W, Z and A . We begin with a proposition controlling $e^{-\frac{s}{2}} G_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $\mathcal{X}(s)$.

Proposition 4.1. *It holds on $\mathcal{X}(s)$ that*

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}} G_{\mathcal{R}} = O(M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}) - \begin{cases} 0, & \mathcal{R} = W, \\ 4\beta_3 \kappa_0, & \mathcal{R} = Z, \\ 2\beta_3 \kappa_0, & \mathcal{R} = A. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

The same conclusion also applies to for $e^{-\frac{s}{2}} g_{\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, Z, A\}$.

Proof. From (3.17) and Lemma 3.11, we derive that

$$G = g_1 - \lambda g_2 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi} \tilde{u}_2^2 = -2\beta_3 \kappa_0 + O(M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}).$$

Moreover, combining (3.17)(3.29)(3.26) and Proposition 3.11, we obtain

$$Z = \kappa_0 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}), \quad \kappa = \kappa_0 + O(\tau_0), \quad \beta_\tau = 1 + O(M\tau_0), \quad J = 1 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}).$$

Then, for any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows from direct calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\tau [J(c_1 Z + c_2 \kappa) + G] &= (1 + O(M\tau_0)) \left\{ (1 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}})) \left[c_1(-\kappa_0 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}})) + c_2(\kappa_0 + O(\tau_0)) \right] - 2\beta_3 \kappa_0 + O(M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}) \right\} \\ &= (-c_1 + c_2 - 2\beta_3) \kappa_0 + O(M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, employing the expression (2.23) of G_R , we obtain the desired result. The behavior of g_R then follows directly from (3.27). \square

For the derivatives of G_R , we have the following pointwise bounds.

Proposition 4.2. *For $R \in \{W, Z, A\}$, we have the following estimates for higher order derivatives of the transport terms on $\mathcal{X}(s)$:*

$$|\partial^\gamma G_R| \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{|\gamma|-1}{2}s} \tau_0^{\frac{2-|\gamma|}{6}} \ln M, & 1 \leq |\gamma| \leq 2 \text{ and } \gamma_1 = 0, \\ M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}} e^{-s}, & 1 \leq |\gamma| \leq 2 \text{ and } \gamma_1 > 0, \\ e^{-\frac{2}{5}s}, & 3 \leq |\gamma| \leq 5 \text{ and } \gamma_1 = 0, \\ M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{7}{8}s}, & 3 \leq |\gamma| \leq 5 \text{ and } \gamma_1 > 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$|\partial^\gamma h_R| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s}, & |\gamma| = 2. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Via using (2.23), we have

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |\partial^\gamma G_R| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(JZ)|}_{(3.21)(3.31)(3.32)} + \underbrace{|\kappa||\partial^\gamma J| + |\partial^\gamma(g_1 - \lambda g_2)| + |\dot{\psi}||\partial^\gamma(\tilde{u}_2^2)|}_{(3.17)(3.32)}.$$

Using the prior estimates indicated under the brackets yields the desired bounds in (4.2). For h_R , invoking (2.25), one can see that

$$e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial^\gamma h_R| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1}V_2)| + |\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-2}\lambda\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1}S)|}_{(2.34)(3.20)(3.21)(3.22)(3.30)(3.31)(3.32)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma g_2|}_{(3.32)}.$$

Substituting the estimates indicated under the bracket leads to the estimates for $|\partial^\gamma h_R|$. \square

To investigate the transport equations, we introduce the Lagrangian trajectory $\Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0)$ originating from $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ at initial time $s_1 \geq s_0$, defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s \Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0) = \mathcal{V}_R(s, \Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0)), \\ \Phi_R(s_1; s_1, y_0) = y_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

We will see that Φ_W evolves outward exponentially, as long as the starting point is slightly away from the origin. The trajectories Φ_Z and Φ_A exhibit different behavior: although they may pass through the origin for certain initial

data, they generally move away from the origin at an exponential rate. Although the trajectory intersects the origin, it remains in its vicinity only for a short time, after which the distance increases exponentially.

The following proposition provides a lower bound on the growth rate of $|\Phi_W|$.

Proposition 4.3. *For any $s \geq s_1 \geq s_0$ and $|y_0| \geq l = (\ln M)^{-5}$, we have $|\Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)| \geq |y_0|e^{\frac{s-s_1}{5}}$.*

Proof. The proof follows the approach in [19]. For the reader's convenience, we provide a brief sketch here. From (2.23)(4.3)(4.15), we deduce $|G_W| \lesssim o_{\tau_0}(1) + o_{\tau_0}(1)|y|$ and $|h_W| \lesssim o_{\tau_0}(1)$, which hence imply $y \cdot \mathcal{V}_W(s, y) \geq (\frac{1}{2} - o_{\tau_0}(1))|y|^2 + y_1^2 - (1 + o_{\tau_0}(1))|y_1 W|$. For $l \leq |y| \leq L$, noting that $\bar{W}(0, y_2) = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |y_1 W(s, y)| &\leq |y_1| \underbrace{|\bar{W}(s, y)|}_{(3.23)} + |y_1| \underbrace{|\bar{W}(y_1, y_2) - \bar{W}(0, y_2)|}_{(2.38)} \\ &\leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} |y_1| (1 + |y_1|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |y_2|) + y_1^2 \leq o_{\tau_0}(1)|y|^2 + y_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the condition $|y| \geq l$ in the last inequality. If $|y| \geq L = \tau_0^{-\frac{1}{10}}$, via using (3.20), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |y_1 W(s, y)| &\leq \frac{101}{100} |y_1| (1 + |y_1|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |y_2|) \\ &\leq o_M(1)y_1^2 + \frac{101}{100} |y_1 y_2| \leq \left(o_M(1) + \frac{101}{100} \right) y_1^2 + \frac{101}{400} y_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we have $y \cdot \mathcal{V}_W \geq \frac{1}{5}|y|^2$. Since $\partial_s |\Phi_W(s)|^2 = (y \cdot \mathcal{V}_W)(s, \Phi_W(s))$, it follows that $|\Phi(s; s_1, y_0)| \geq |y_0|e^{\frac{s-s_1}{5}}$ for $s \geq s_1$. \square

The above growth estimate of $|\Phi_W|$ implies the following upper bound for the integral of η^{-p} along Φ_W :

Lemma 4.4. *For any $p \in (0, 10)$, $s_1 \geq s_0$ and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, there holds*

$$\int_{s_1}^s \eta^{-p}(\Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds' \lesssim_p \begin{cases} \ln \ln M, & |y_0| \geq l, \\ \tau_0^{\frac{p}{5}}, & |y_0| \geq L. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Note that $\eta(y) = 1 + y_1^2 + y_2^6 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + |y|^2)$. Setting $\tilde{s} = 2 \ln |y_0| + \frac{2}{5}(s' - s_1)$, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_1}^s \eta^{-p}(\Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds' &\leq 2^p \int_{s_1}^s (1 + |\Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)|^2)^{-p} ds' \\ &\stackrel{\text{Prop 4.3}}{\leq} 2^p \int_{s_1}^s (1 + |y_0|^2 e^{\frac{2}{5}(s' - s_1)})^{-p} ds' \\ &\leq 5 \cdot 2^{p-1} \int_{2 \ln |y_0|}^{\infty} (1 + e^{\tilde{s}})^{-p} d\tilde{s} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} 5 \cdot 2^{p-1} \left(\int_{-10 \ln \ln M}^0 + \int_0^{\infty} \right) (1 + e^{\tilde{s}})^{-p} d\tilde{s}, & |y_0| \geq l \\ 5 \cdot 2^{p-1} \int_{-\frac{1}{5} \ln \tau_0}^{\infty} (1 + e^{\tilde{s}})^{-p} d\tilde{s}, & |y_0| \geq L \end{cases} \\ &\stackrel{M \gg 1}{\leq} \begin{cases} 30 \cdot 2^p \ln \ln M, & |y_0| \geq l, \\ \frac{5 \cdot 2^{p-1}}{p} \tau_0^{\frac{p}{5}}, & |y_0| \geq L. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Next, we control the integral of η^{-p} along Φ_Z and Φ_A .

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{Z, A\}$. Suppose the bootstrap assumptions hold on $[s_0, s]$ and $\beta_3 \kappa_0 \geq 1$. Then, for any $p \in (0, 10)$, it holds that*

$$\int_{s_0}^s \eta^{-p}(\Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_0, y_0)) ds' \lesssim_p 1. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. According to Proposition 4.1, in the region $\Omega(s) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y_1 \leq \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}\}$, the trajectories move leftward with speed bounded by $\partial_s \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}^1(s; s_0, y_0) \leq \beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}} - (2\beta_3 \kappa_0 - O(M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}})) e^{\frac{s}{2}} \leq -\frac{1}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}$. By adapting the argument from [19, Lemma 8.3], we obtain $|\Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s; s_0, y_0)| \geq \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 \min(|e^{\frac{s}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|, e^{\frac{s}{2}})$ for some $s_* = s_*(s_0, y_0)$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_0}^s \eta^{-p}(\Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s')) ds' &\leq \int_{s_0}^s (1 + (\Phi_{\mathcal{R}}^1(s'))^2)^{-p} ds' \\ &\lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 \min(|e^{\frac{s'}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|, e^{\frac{s'}{2}})\right)^{-2p} ds' \\ &\lesssim \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \max \left[\left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 |e^{\frac{s'}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|\right)^{-2p}, \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s'}{2}}\right)^{-2p} \right] ds' \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\int_{s_0}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 |e^{\frac{s'}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|\right)^{-2p} ds'}_{r=e^{\frac{s'}{2}}} + \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}\right)^{-2p} ds' \\ &\lesssim \int_{\tau_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 |r - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|\right)^{-2p} r^{-1} dr + \tau_0^p (\beta_3 \kappa_0)^{-2p} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Young}}{\lesssim} \int_{\tau_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}}^{\infty} r^{-(1+2p)} dr + p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\beta_3 \kappa_0 |r - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}|\right)^{-(1+2p)} dr + \tau_0^p (\beta_3 \kappa_0)^{-2p} \\ &\lesssim \tau_0^p \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{(\beta_3 \kappa_0)^{2p}}\right) + \frac{1}{\beta_3 \kappa_0} \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 Estimates for Forcing Terms

In this section, we establish estimates for the forcing terms F_W , F_Z , F_A , and their derivatives on $\mathcal{X}(s)$. We follow a unified approach: we apply Leibniz's rule to expand derivatives of products, control the terms individually by applying the previously established estimates, and select the maximal terms.

We first give upper bound estimates for the derivatives of F_W , F_Z , and F_A .

Proposition 4.6. *On the domain $\mathcal{X}(s)$, the forcing terms F_W , F_Z , and F_A obey the following estimates:*

$$|\partial^\gamma F_W| + e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial^\gamma F_Z| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\log M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + \eta^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s}), & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} e^{-s}), & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & 2 \leq |\gamma| \leq 4, \gamma_1 = 0, \\ (\ln M)^7 M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1+\gamma_2}{8}} e^{-s} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}), & |\gamma| = 2, \gamma_1 > 0, \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{4+\gamma_2}{8}} e^{-s}), & |\gamma| = 3, \gamma_1 > 0, \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^6 e^{-s}, & |\gamma| = 4, \gamma_1 > 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$|\partial^\gamma F_A| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{7}{8}} e^{-s} + e^{-\frac{7}{5}s}), & \gamma = (0, 2). \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Starting from the definitions of the forcing terms (cf. (2.26) and (2.27)), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\gamma F_W| + e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial^\gamma F_Z| &\lesssim e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{(|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} |V|^2 (u_1 - \lambda u_2))| + |\partial^\gamma(J^{-1}(V_1 - \lambda V_2) u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j))| + |\partial^\gamma(u_j V_j S)|)}_{(3.32)(3.33)(3.34)(3.35)(3.36)} \\ &\quad + e^{\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} h_W A \partial_2 \lambda)| + |\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-3} \varphi^{-1} v \cdot N \partial_2 \lambda)|}_{(3.32)(4.3)(3.22)(3.31)} + e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{(|\partial^\gamma(h_{11} v \cdot N)| + |\partial^\gamma(h_{12} A)|)}_{(3.33)(3.36)(3.22)(3.31)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S \partial_2 A)|}_{(3.32)(3.36)(3.22)(3.31)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\gamma F_A| &\lesssim e^{-s} \underbrace{(|\partial^\gamma(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} |V|^2 (\lambda u_1 + u_2))| + |\partial^\gamma(J^{-1}(\lambda V_1 + V_2) u_j (g_j - 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} V_j))|)}_{(3.32)(3.33)(3.34)(3.35)} \\ &\quad + e^{-s} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(h_{12} v \cdot N)|}_{(3.33)(3.36)} + e^{-s} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S \partial_2 W)|}_{(3.32)(3.36)(3.20)(3.30)} + e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S \partial_2 Z)|}_{(3.32)(3.36)(3.21)(3.31)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we can expand each term above using Leibniz's rule, and bound it by plugging in the corresponding previous estimates indicated under the braces. As an example, we have

$$|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1} \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1} S \partial_2 Z)| \lesssim \sum_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4 = \gamma} \underbrace{|\partial^{\beta_1}(\varphi^{-1})|}_{(3.32)} \underbrace{|\partial^{\beta_2}(\langle \lambda \rangle^{-1})|}_{(3.32)} \underbrace{|\partial^{\beta_3} S|}_{(3.36)} \underbrace{|\partial^{\beta_4} \partial_2 Z|}_{(3.21)(3.31)}.$$

This process yields expressions that are “polynomials” in η , M , $\ln M$, τ_0 , and e^s , with each “monomial” representing an individual bound. Finally, we compare these “monomials” on $\mathcal{X}(s)$ using Lemma 3.3 and discard all non-dominant terms, thereby arriving at the desired bounds in (4.7) and (4.8). \square

Next, we estimate the full forcing terms $F_W^{(\gamma)}$, $F_Z^{(\gamma)}$, and $F_A^{(\gamma)}$.

Proposition 4.7. *We have the following inequalities for $F_W^{(\gamma)}$, $F_Z^{(\gamma)}$, and $F_A^{(\gamma)}$ on the domain $\mathcal{X}(s)$:*

$$|F_W^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\log M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + \eta^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s}), & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \ln M, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ (\ln M)^7 M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{8}}, & \gamma = (1, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & \gamma = (0, 2), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{7}{8}s} + \eta^{-\frac{2}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (3, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \gamma = (2, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{8}}, & \gamma = (1, 2), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}, & \gamma = (0, 3), \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

$$|F_Z^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\log M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} e^{-s} + \eta^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}), & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} (\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{15}{8}s}), & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ (\ln M)^7 M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{15}{8}s}, & \gamma = (2, 0), \\ M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, & \gamma = (1, 1), \\ (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{7}{5}s}, & \gamma = (0, 2), \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

$$|F_A^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{\frac{3}{8}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 1), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{\frac{7}{8}} e^{-s} + M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (0, 2). \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. Using the definitions of the forcing terms, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |F_W^{(\gamma)}| &\stackrel{(2.30)}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_W|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|\partial_1 W[\partial^\gamma, J]W| + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} |\partial_2(JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} W|}_{(3.20)(3.30)(3.32)} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta}(JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta W|}_{(3.20)(3.30)(3.32)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \underbrace{(|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W \partial_1 \partial^\beta W| + |\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W \partial_2 \partial^\beta W|)}_{(3.20)(3.30)(4.2)(4.3)}, \\ |F_Z^{(\gamma)}| &\stackrel{(2.31)}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_Z|}_{(4.7)} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \underbrace{|\partial_2(JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} Z|}_{(3.20)(3.21)(3.31)(3.32)} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta}(JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta Z|}_{(3.20)(3.21)(3.30)(3.31)(3.32)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \underbrace{(|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_Z \partial_1 \partial^\beta Z| + |\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_Z \partial_2 \partial^\beta Z|)}_{(3.21)(3.31)(4.2)(4.3)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_A^{(\gamma)}| &\stackrel{(2.32)}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_A|}_{(4.8)} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \underbrace{|\partial_2(JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} A|}_{(3.20)(3.22)(3.31)(3.32)} \\
&+ \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta}(JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta A|}_{(3.20)(3.22)(3.30)(3.31)(3.32)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \underbrace{(|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_A \partial_1 \partial^\beta A| + |\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_A \partial_2 \partial^\beta A|)}_{(3.22)(3.31)(4.2)(4.3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We bound each term using the prior estimates noted under the braces. Then, we identify the maximal terms on $\mathcal{X}(s)$ using Lemma 3.3, producing the desired bounds. \square

For convenience, we rewrite the bounds from Proposition 4.7 as the following simplified form:

Corollary 4.8. *The following inequalities hold on $\mathcal{X}(s)$:*

$$\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |F_W^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} o_{\tau_0}(1) \eta^{-\frac{1}{12}}, & |\gamma| \leq 1, \\ M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-6}{8}} \eta^{-\frac{2}{15}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1=0}, & |\gamma| = 2, 3, \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

$$|F_Z^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}-\frac{1}{8}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}} \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=1}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 > 0, \\ M e^{-\frac{2}{5}s} e^{-\frac{|\gamma|}{2}s}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

$$|F_A^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{1+|\gamma|}} e^{-\frac{|\gamma|}{2}s}, & |\gamma| \leq 1, \gamma_1 = 0, \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}} M^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-s}, & \gamma = (0, 2). \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

4.3 Estimates Near the Origin

Building on the global bounds obtained in the previous section, we refine estimates for the transport and forcing terms near the origin, particularly in the regions $\{|y| \leq L\}$ and $\{|y| \leq l\}$. We begin with improving bounds for G_W^0 and h_W^0 derived from (2.50).

Proposition 4.9. *The transport terms G_W and h_W satisfy the following estimates at the origin:*

$$|G_W^0| + |h_W^0| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-s}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$|\partial_2 G_W^0| \lesssim (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}. \quad (4.16)$$

Proof. First, by (2.50) and (2.38)(3.23), we have that $\partial_1 \nabla^2 W^0$ is invertible, and $|G_W^0| + |h_W^0| \lesssim |F_W^{(2,0),0}| + |F_W^{(1,1),0}|$.

For $|F_W^{(2,0),0}|$, it follows directly from (4.9) that $|F_W^{(2,0),0}| \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s}$. For $|F_W^{(1,1),0}|$, evaluating (2.30) at $y = 0$, there holds $F_W^{(1,1),0} = \partial_{12}^2 F_W^0 + \partial_{12}^2 G_W^0$. Then, using (4.2) and (4.7), we deduce $|F_W^{(1,1),0}| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-s}$. Combining these estimates, we obtain $|G_W^0| + |h_W^0| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-s}$.

Finally, from (2.48), we conclude

$$|\partial_2 G_W^0| = \underbrace{|\partial_2 F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} \lesssim (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} e^{-\frac{9}{10}s}.$$

\square

By integrating from the origin, we have the following upper bounds for G_W near the origin.

Corollary 4.10. *Near the origin, the transport term G_W verifies the following estimates:*

$$\mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} |G_W| \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}} \ln M, \quad (4.17)$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} |\partial^\gamma G_W| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{-9} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ (\ln M)^{-4} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, & \gamma = (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. Employing the fundamental theorem of calculus, for $|y| \leq L$, we have that

$$|G_W| \lesssim \underbrace{|G_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{(\|\partial_1 G_W\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_2 G_W\|_{L^\infty}) \cdot L}_{(4.2)} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}} \ln M.$$

In a similar manner, for $|y| \leq l$, we derive that

$$|\partial_2 G_W| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial_2 G_W^0|}_{(4.16)} + \underbrace{(\|\partial_{12} G_W\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_{22} G_W\|_{L^\infty}) \cdot l}_{(4.2)} \lesssim (\ln M)^{-4} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad (4.19)$$

$$|G_W| \lesssim \underbrace{|G_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{(\|\partial_1 G_W\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_2 G_W\|_{L^\infty}) \cdot l}_{(4.2)} \lesssim (\ln M)^{-9} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \quad (4.19)$$

□

Next, we consider the forcing term in the equation of $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}$.

Proposition 4.11. *We have the following bounds for $\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}$ on the region $\{|y| \leq L\}$:*

$$\mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} |\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}| \lesssim \begin{cases} \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \ln M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}} + M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + \eta^{-\frac{2}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} + \eta^{-\frac{5}{6}} \ln M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (1, 0), \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \ln M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ln M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}}, & \gamma = (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (4.20)$$

In addition, on $\{|y| \leq l\}$, we have the estimates:

$$\mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} |\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}| \lesssim \begin{cases} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\gamma| \leq 4, \gamma_1 \text{ is odd and } \gamma_2 \text{ is even,} \\ (\ln M)^{-5} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\gamma| \leq 4, \gamma_1 \text{ is even or } \gamma_2 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. For $|y| \leq L$, we have

$$|\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_W|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma [(1 - \beta_\tau J) \overline{W} \partial_1 \overline{W}]|}_{(3.32)(2.40)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma (G_W \partial_1 \overline{W})|}_{(4.17)(2.40)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma (h_W \partial_2 \overline{W})|}_{(4.3)(2.40)} + e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{|\partial_t \kappa|}_{(3.17)} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma=(0,0)}.$$

Substituting the prior estimates indicated under the braces yields (4.20). For the case $|y| \leq l$, notice that for any multi-index $\gamma \geq 0$, we have

$$|\partial^\gamma \overline{W}| \lesssim \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{-5}, & \gamma_1 \text{ is even or } \gamma_2 \text{ is odd,} \\ 1, & \gamma_1 \text{ is odd and } \gamma_2 \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

Subsequently, employing (2.42), we derive that

$$\mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} |\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}| \stackrel{|\gamma| \leq 4}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_W|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma [(1 - \beta_\tau J) \overline{W} \partial_1 \overline{W}]|}_{(3.32)(4.22)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma (G_W \partial_1 \overline{W})|}_{(4.2)(4.18)(4.22)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma h_W \partial_2 \overline{W}|}_{(4.3)(4.22)}.$$

The stated bounds then follow by substituting the brace-marked estimate and applying Lemma 3.3 to compare monomials. \square

Building upon the above proposition, we have the following estimates for the full forcing term $F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}$.

Proposition 4.12. *On the region $\{|y| \leq L\}$, it holds for $F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}$ that*

$$|F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}| \lesssim \begin{cases} \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{15}} \ln M + M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{6}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & \gamma = (0, 0) \\ \eta^{-\frac{2}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{16}} + (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} M^{1+\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{11}{8}s}, & \gamma = (1, 0) \\ \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{17}}, & \gamma = (0, 1) \end{cases} \quad (4.23)$$

While on $\{|y| \leq l\}$, we have that

$$|F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}| \stackrel{|\gamma|=4}{\lesssim} (\ln M)^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (4.24)$$

Moreover, at the origin $y = 0$, there holds

$$|F_W^{(\gamma),0}| \stackrel{|\gamma|=3}{\lesssim} e^{-\frac{2}{5}s}. \quad (4.25)$$

Proof. For $|y| \leq l$ and $|\gamma| \leq 4$, we note that

$$|\partial^\gamma W| \leq \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma \overline{W}|}_{(4.22)} + \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}|}_{(3.23)} \stackrel{|\gamma|=4}{\lesssim} \begin{cases} (\ln M)^{-5}, & \gamma_1 \text{ is even or } \gamma_2 \text{ is odd,} \\ 1, & \gamma_1 \text{ is odd and } \gamma_2 \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (4.26)$$

Then, by (2.44) and (2.30), we derive the following expansions, adapted to the cases $\{|y| \leq L\}$, $\{|y| \leq l\}$, and $y = 0$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}| &\stackrel{|y| \leq L, |\gamma| \leq 1}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}|}_{(4.20)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \left(\underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.2)(4.17)(3.23)} + \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W \partial_2 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.3)(3.23)} + \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} (J \partial_1 \overline{W}) \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(2.40)(3.32)(3.23)} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_2 > 0} \underbrace{|\partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} \widetilde{W}|}_{(3.20)(3.23)(3.32)} + \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1 > 0} \underbrace{|\partial_1 JW \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}|}_{(3.20)(3.19)(3.32)} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(3.20)(3.23)(3.32)} \\ |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}| &\stackrel{|y| \leq l, |\gamma| = 4}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_{\widetilde{W}}|}_{(4.21)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \left(\underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.2)(4.18)(3.23)} + \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W \partial_2 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.3)(3.23)} + \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} (J \partial_1 \overline{W}) \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(2.40)(3.32)(3.23)} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_2 > 0} \underbrace{|\partial_2 (JW) \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.26)(3.23)(3.32)} + \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1 > 0} \underbrace{|\partial_1 JW \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.26)(3.19)(3.32)} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma| \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} (JW) \partial_1 \partial^\beta \widetilde{W}|}_{(4.26)(3.23)(3.32)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_W^{(\gamma),0}| &\stackrel{|\gamma|=3}{\lesssim} \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|([\partial^\gamma, J]W)^0|}_{(2.45)(3.32)} + \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_2 > 0} \underbrace{|\partial_2(JW)^0 \partial_1^{\gamma_1+1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2-1} W^0|}_{(2.45)(3.32)(4.26)} \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\beta| \leq |\gamma|-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta}(JW)^0 \partial_1 \partial^\beta W^0|}_{(2.45)(3.32)} + \sum_{0 \leq \beta < \gamma} \left(\underbrace{|\partial^{\gamma-\beta} G_W^0 \partial_1 \partial^\beta W^0|}_{(2.45)(4.2)(4.3)(4.16)(4.26)} + |\partial^{\gamma-\beta} h_W^0 \partial_2 \partial^\beta W^0| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

We then bound the corresponding terms with the indicated estimates, and apply Lemma 3.3 to get the stated results. \square

For convenience, we rewrite the bounds of $|F_W^{(\gamma)}|$ in the following simplified form.

Corollary 4.13. *The following estimates hold for $|F_W^{(\gamma)}|$:*

$$\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |F_W^{(\gamma)}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \stackrel{|\gamma| \leq 1}{\lesssim} \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+15}} \ln M. \quad (4.27)$$

5 Estimates for Modulation Variables

In this section, we bound the modulation variables, and improve the corresponding bootstrap assumptions (3.16)(3.17)(3.18).

5.1 Estimates on κ

By (2.46), we have that

$$|\partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa| \lesssim e^{\frac{s}{2}} \left(\underbrace{|G_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{|F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} \right) \lesssim (\ln M)^{\frac{1}{10}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}},$$

and

$$|\kappa - \kappa_0| \leq \int_{s_0}^s |\partial_s \kappa| ds' \leq \int_{s_0}^s \beta_\tau e^{-s'} \underbrace{|\partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa|}_{(3.17)} ds' \lesssim \int_{s_0}^s M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-s'} ds' \lesssim M \tau_0^{\frac{7}{6}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0.$$

5.2 Estimate on τ

Using (2.47), we deduce that

$$|\partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial_1 F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|\partial_1 G_W^0|}_{(4.2)} \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-s}.$$

5.3 Estimate on Q

Via using (2.49), we obtain that

$$|Q_{12}| \lesssim \underbrace{|\partial_2 F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial_2 Z^0|}_{(3.21)} + \underbrace{|\psi r_0 Q_{23}|}_{(3.6)(3.16)(3.18)} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (5.1)$$

Then, it follows from (2.51) that

$$|Q_{23}| \lesssim \underbrace{e^{\frac{s}{2}} |h_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{|A^0|}_{(3.22)} \lesssim M \tau_0 + M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\left| Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3 \kappa_0}{r_0} \right| \lesssim \underbrace{e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |G_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{|Z^0 + \kappa|}_{(3.21)(3.17)(3.4)} + \underbrace{|\kappa - \kappa_0|}_{(3.17)} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}. \quad (5.3)$$

5.4 Estimate on ψ

Employing (2.52), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_{\bar{t}} \psi - \left(2\psi^2 + \frac{3}{r_0^2} \right) \beta_3 \kappa_0 \right| &\lesssim e^{\frac{s}{2}} \left(\underbrace{|\partial_{22} F_W^0|}_{(4.7)} + \underbrace{|G_W^0| |\partial_{122} W^0| + |h_W^0| |\partial_{222} W^0|}_{(2.38)(3.23)(4.15)} \right) + e^s \underbrace{|\partial_{22} Z^0|}_{(3.21)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2 \right)}_{(3.18)} \left[\underbrace{|Z^0 + \kappa|}_{(3.21)(3.29)} + \underbrace{|\kappa - \kappa_0|}_{(3.17)} \right] + \underbrace{\left| Q_{13} - \frac{2\beta_3 \kappa_0}{r_0} \right|}_{(5.3)} \\ &\lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \ln M \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the facts that $|\psi_0| \leq 10$ and $\left(\frac{1}{2r_0^2} + \psi^2 \right) \leq \ln M$. The above estimate for $\partial_{\bar{t}} \psi$ also implies $|\partial_{\bar{t}} \psi| \leq \ln M$. Therefore, for ψ itself, we have that

$$|\psi - \psi_0| \leq \int_{s_0}^s \ln M e^{-s'} ds' \lesssim \tau_0 \ln M \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0.$$

6 Estimates for Z and A

In this section, we improve the bootstrap assumptions (3.21) and (3.22) for Z and A . Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{Z, A\}$. We define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = \begin{cases} Z + \sigma_\infty, & \mathcal{R} = Z, \\ A, & \mathcal{R} = A. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

From (2.29), $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ with $\gamma \geq 0$ solves the transport-type equation

$$\partial_s \partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} + D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} + \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}.$$

By solving this equation along the characteristic, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s, \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s; s_1, y_0)) &= \partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s_1, y_0) \exp \left(- \int_{s_1}^s D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds' \right) \\ &\quad + \int_{s_1}^s F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_1, y_0)) \exp \left(- \int_{s'}^s D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s'', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s''; s_1, y_0)) ds'' \right) ds'.\end{aligned}$$

Note that by (2.33), (3.20) and (3.32), we have $D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} = \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} + O_\gamma(\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}})$, where the notation $f = O_\gamma(\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}})$ means that $|f| \leq C_\gamma \eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, with constant C_γ depending on γ . Hence, by invoking Lemma 4.6, and setting $s_1 = s_0$, we obtain

$$|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s, \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s; s_0, y_0))| \lesssim |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s_0, y_0)| e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}(s-s_0)} + \int_{s_0}^s |F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}(s-s')} ds'.$$

Since the map $y_0 \mapsto \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s; s_0, y_0)$ is a bijection on \mathbb{R}^2 , the above identity implies that

$$\|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}(s-s_0)} + \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s |F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}(s-s')} ds',$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}e^{(3\mu(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2})s} \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}}_{(3.13)} \tau_0^{-(3\mu(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2})} \underbrace{e^{(3\mu(\gamma) - \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2})(s-s_0)}}_{\leq 1, \text{ see (3.10)}} \\ &\quad + e^{(3\mu(\gamma) - \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2})s} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s |F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}s'} ds' \\ &\lesssim \tau_0 + e^{(3\mu(\gamma) - \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2})s} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s |F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_{\mathcal{R}}(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2}s'} ds'.\end{aligned}\tag{6.2}$$

The second term, representing the contribution of the forcing term, is now the primary concern.

Proposition 6.1. *We have the following estimates for Z and A :*

$$e^{(3\mu(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma (Z + \sigma_\infty)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \times \begin{cases} M\tau_0, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 = 0, \\ M^{\frac{|\gamma| + \gamma_2}{4}}, & |\gamma| = 1, 2, \gamma_1 > 0, \end{cases}\tag{6.3}$$

$$e^{(3\mu(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma A| \leq \frac{1}{2} \times \begin{cases} M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{|\gamma|+1}}, & |\gamma| \leq 1 \text{ and } \gamma_1 = 0, \\ M, & \gamma = (0, 2). \end{cases}\tag{6.4}$$

Proof. We deal with Z first. From (6.2), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}|Z + \sigma_\infty| &\lesssim \tau_0 + \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_Z^{(0,0)}(s', \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0))|}_{(4.13)} ds' \lesssim \tau_0 + \int_{s_0}^s e^{-s'} ds' \lesssim \tau_0 \leq \frac{1}{2} M\tau_0, \\ e^{(3\mu(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma Z| &\stackrel{|\gamma|=1,2, \gamma_2=0}{\lesssim} \tau_0 + \underbrace{e^{(3\mu(\gamma) - \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2})s}}_{=1, \text{ see (3.10)}} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0))|}_{(4.13)} e^{\frac{\gamma_2}{2}s'} ds' \\ &\lesssim \tau_0 + \int_{s_0}^s M e^{-\frac{2}{5}s'} ds' \lesssim M\tau_0^{\frac{2}{5}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma Z| &\stackrel{|\gamma|=1,2}{\lesssim} \tau_0 + \underbrace{e^{(3\mu(\gamma)-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2})s}}_{(3.10)} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2}{2}s'} ds' \\
&\lesssim \tau_0 + e^{-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-3}{2}s} \int_{s_0}^s M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}-\frac{1}{8}} e^{\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-3}{2}s'} \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}\mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=1}}(\Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0)) ds' \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.5}}{\lesssim} \tau_0 + M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}-\frac{1}{8}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{|\gamma|+\gamma_2}{4}},
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate derivatives of A . Using (6.2) again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma A| &\stackrel{|\gamma|\leq 1, \gamma_1=0}{\lesssim} \tau_0 + \underbrace{e^{(3\mu(\gamma)-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2})s}}_{=1, \text{ see (3.10)}} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_A^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_A(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2}{2}s'} ds' \\
&\lesssim \tau_0 + \int_{s_0}^s M^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{s'}{1+|\gamma|}} e^{-\frac{|\gamma|}{2}s'} e^{\frac{|\gamma|}{2}s'} ds' \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{s'}{1+|\gamma|}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0^{\frac{s'}{1+|\gamma|}}, \\
e^{(3\mu(\gamma)+\frac{1}{2})s} |\partial^\gamma A| &\stackrel{\gamma=(0,2)}{\lesssim} \tau_0 + \underbrace{e^{(3\mu(\gamma)-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2})s}}_{=1, \text{ see (3.10)}} \sup_{y_0} \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_A^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi_A(s'; s_0, y_0))| e^{\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2}{2}s'} ds' \\
&\lesssim \tau_0 + \int_{s_0}^s M^{\frac{15}{16}} \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}}(\Phi_A(s'; s_0, y_0)) e^{-s'} e^{s'} ds' \stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.5}}{\lesssim} M^{\frac{15}{16}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We have now improved the bootstrap assumptions (3.21) and (3.22), except for the bound on $\partial_1 A$. This remaining estimate builds on the analysis of the vorticity ω .

Proposition 6.2. *The vorticity ω satisfies the identity:*

$$\omega = \varphi^{-2} [\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} a - \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (\varphi V_1)],$$

Furthermore, it admits the estimate:

$$|\omega| \approx e^{\frac{3}{2}s} |\partial_1 A| + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

where \approx denotes equivalence up to multiplicative constants, i.e.

$$|\omega| \lesssim e^{\frac{3}{2}s} |\partial_1 A| + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\frac{3}{2}s} |\partial_1 A| \lesssim |\omega| + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. In terms of the definition of $\omega := \epsilon^{12}(\nabla_{u_1} v_2^b - \nabla_{u_2} v_1^b)$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega &= \epsilon^{12}(\nabla_{u_1} v_2^b - \nabla_{u_2} v_1^b) = \epsilon^{12}(\partial_{u_1} v_2^b - \partial_{u_2} v_1^b) = \varphi^{-2}(\partial_{u_1}(\varphi^2 v_2) - \partial_{u_2}(\varphi^2 v_1)) = \varphi^{-2}(\partial_{u_1}(\varphi V_2) - \partial_{u_2}(\varphi V_1)) \\
&= \varphi^2 \left[\partial_{\tilde{u}_1} \left(-\frac{\lambda}{2J}(w+z) + \frac{a}{J} \right) - (\partial_{\tilde{u}_2} - \lambda \partial_{\tilde{u}_1}) \left(\frac{w+z}{2J} + \frac{\lambda}{J} a \right) \right] \\
&= \varphi^{-2} [\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle \partial_{\tilde{u}_1} a - \partial_{\tilde{u}_2} (\varphi V_1)].
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the relations $\partial_{\tilde{u}_1} = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1$ and $\partial_{\tilde{u}_2} = e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega &= \underbrace{\varphi^{-2} [\varphi \langle \lambda \rangle e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1 A]}_{(3.32) (3.32)} - \underbrace{e^{\frac{s}{2}} \partial_2 (\varphi V_1)}_{(3.32), \text{ Corollary 3.13}} \\
&= \left(1 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}) \right) \left[\left(1 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}}) \right) e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_1 A + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which yields $|\omega| \lesssim e^{\frac{3}{2}s}|\partial_1 A| + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $e^{\frac{3}{2}s}|\partial_1 A| \lesssim |\omega| + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$. \square

Now, we are ready to estimate $\partial_1 A$.

Proposition 6.3. *The quantity $e^{\frac{3}{2}s}\partial_1 A$ is almost conserved. Specifically, we have*

$$e^{\frac{3}{2}s}\|\partial_1 A(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0}\|\partial_1 A(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. From (1.5), we note that $\frac{\omega}{\rho} = \frac{\omega}{(\alpha S)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}$ is transported by the velocity field, and hence $\|\frac{\omega}{\rho}(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} = \|\frac{\omega}{\rho}(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}$.

By taking τ_0 small enough and employing Corollary 3.13, we have $|S| \approx \sigma_\infty$. Therefore, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{3}{2}s}\|\partial_1 A(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\omega(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\rho(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \frac{\omega}{\rho}(s, \cdot) \right\|_{L^\infty} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim (\alpha\sigma_\infty)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\omega(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\rho(s_0, \cdot)} \right\|_{L^\infty} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim (\alpha\sigma_\infty)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} \|\partial_1 A(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (\alpha\sigma_\infty)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} \|\partial_1 A(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Using the above lemma and the initial condition on $\partial_1 A$, we deduce that

$$\|\partial_1 A(s, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\partial_1 A(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} e^{\frac{3}{2}(s-s_0)} + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \leq \frac{1}{2} M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}.$$

This improves the bootstrap assumption for $\partial_1 A$.

7 Estimates for W and \widetilde{W}

This section is devoted to improving the bootstrap assumptions for the Riemann variable W and its deviation \widetilde{W} , i.e., (3.20) and (3.23).

Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, \widetilde{W}\}$. Via using (2.22)(2.29)(2.41)(2.43), the equation for $\partial^\gamma \mathcal{R}$ can be written in the form

$$\partial_s \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} + D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R} = F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)},$$

with $D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} = \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + O_{\mathcal{R}, \gamma}(\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}})$.

7.1 Estimates Near the Origin

We begin with the estimates for W at $y = 0$. By letting $|\gamma| = 3$ and $y = 0$ in the equation (2.29) of $\partial^\gamma W$, we obtain

$$\partial_s \partial^\gamma W^0 + (1 + \gamma_1)(1 - \beta_\tau) \partial^\gamma W^0 + G_W^0 \partial_1 \partial^\gamma W + h_W^0 \partial_2 \partial^\gamma W = F_W^{(\gamma), 0}.$$

It follows from (3.23) that $|\partial^\beta W^0| \leq |\partial^\beta W^0| + |\partial^\beta \bar{W}^0| \lesssim 1$ for $|\beta| \leq 4$. Thus, $|\partial_s \partial^\gamma W^0|$ is bounded as below:

$$|\partial_s \partial^\gamma W^0| \lesssim \underbrace{|1 - \beta_\tau|}_{(3.26)} + \underbrace{|G_W^0| + |h_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{|F_W^{(\gamma),0}|}_{(4.25)} \lesssim e^{-\frac{2}{5}s},$$

and $|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0|$ is controlled in the following manner:

$$|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0(s)| \leq \underbrace{|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0(s_0)|}_{(3.12)} + \int_{s_0}^s |\partial_s \partial^\gamma W^0(s')| ds' \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{2}{5}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Here, we use the fact $\partial_s \partial^\gamma W^0 = \partial_s \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0$. This closes the bootstrap argument for $|D^3 \widetilde{W}^0|$.

Next, we deal with \widetilde{W} in the region $\{|y| \leq l\}$. For $|\gamma| = 4$, we derive a lower bound estimate for the damping term $D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}$ in $\{|y| \leq l\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)} &\stackrel{(2.43)}{=} \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + \beta_\tau J(\partial_1 \bar{W} + \gamma_1 \partial_1 W) \\ &= \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + \underbrace{\beta_\tau J \underbrace{((1 + \gamma_1) \partial_1 \bar{W} + \gamma_1 \partial_1 \widetilde{W})}_{(2.39)(3.23)}}_{(3.32)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} + (1 + \gamma_1) - \gamma_1 o_{\tau_0}(1) \geq \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 4.3 and a contradiction argument, we conclude that $|\Phi(s'; s, y)| \leq l$ for $s' \in [s_0, s]$ and $|y| \leq l$. Hence, by solving along trajectories, we obtain for $|\gamma| = 4$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s, y)| &\stackrel{|y| \leq l}{\leq} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s_0, \Phi(s_0; s, y))| e^{-\frac{s-s_0}{2}} + \int_{s_0}^s \underbrace{|F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}(s', \Phi(s'; s, y))|}_{(4.24)} e^{-\frac{s-s'}{2}} ds' \\ &\lesssim \underbrace{\|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \leq l)}}_{(3.12)} + \int_{s_0}^s e^{-\frac{s-s'}{2}} (\ln M)^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} ds' \\ &\lesssim (\ln M)^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\ln M)^4 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $|\gamma| = 3$ and $|y| \leq l$, we have

$$|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \lesssim |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0| + l \cdot \|D^4 \widetilde{W}\|_{L^\infty(|y| \leq l)} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + (\ln M)^{-5} \cdot (\ln M)^4 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\ln M)^3 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

For $|\gamma| \leq 2$, since $\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}^0 = 0$, we derive consecutively that

$$|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \stackrel{|y| \leq l}{\lesssim} l \cdot \|D^{|\gamma|+1} \widetilde{W}\|_{L^\infty(|y| \leq l)} \lesssim l \cdot (\ln M)^{|\gamma|+1} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\ln M)^{|\gamma|} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

7.2 Estimates Away from the Origin

In this section, we continue to improve (3.20) and (3.23) outside $\{|y| \leq l\}$. Recall that $\mu = \mu(\gamma)$ was defined in (3.10). Let $q = \eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma \mathcal{R}$, where $\mathcal{R} \in \{W, \widetilde{W}\}$. Then, q solves the equation

$$\partial_s q + D_q q + \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla q = F_q,$$

with $D_q = D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} - \mu \eta^{-1} \mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla \eta$ and $F_q = \eta^\mu F_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)}$.

Lemma 7.1. *For the damping term, it holds that*

$$D_q = \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} - 3\mu + O(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}) + O_\gamma(\eta^{-\frac{1}{6}}).$$

Proof. Since $D_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\gamma)} = \frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + O_\gamma(\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}})$, it suffices to show that $\mu\eta^{-1}\mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla\eta = 3\mu + O(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}) + O(\eta^{-\frac{1}{6}})$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |G_W| &\lesssim \underbrace{|G_W^0|}_{(4.15)} + \underbrace{\|\partial_1 G_W\|_{L^\infty} |y_1| + \|\partial_2 G_W\|_{L^\infty} |y_2|}_{(4.2)} \\ &\lesssim M e^{-s} + e^{-s} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{6}} \lesssim M e^{-s} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \eta^{\frac{1}{6}}, \end{aligned}$$

and that $|h_W| \lesssim e^{-\frac{s}{2}}$ by (4.3). Therefore, using the assumption $|W| \lesssim \eta^{\frac{1}{6}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\eta^{-1}\mathcal{V}_W \cdot \nabla\eta &= \mu\eta^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{3}{2}y_1 + \beta_\tau JW + G_W \right) \cdot 2y_1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}y_2 + h_W \right) \cdot 6y_2^5 \right] \\ &= \mu\eta^{-1} \left[3\eta - 3 + O(\eta^{\frac{2}{3}}) + O(M e^{-s} \eta) + o_{\tau_0}(1) \eta^{\frac{5}{6}} \right] \\ &= 3\mu + O(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}) + O(\eta^{-\frac{1}{6}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Combining the above lemma and (4.5), one can immediately obtain that

Corollary 7.2. *There exists a universal constant C , such that for any $s' \geq s_1 \geq s_0$ and any $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\exp \left(- \int_{s'}^s D_q(s'', \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0)) ds'' \right) \leq e^{(-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + 3\mu)(s-s')} \times \begin{cases} (\ln M)^C, & |y_0| \geq l, \\ (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}), & |y_0| \geq L. \end{cases}$$

Next, we consider the cases $|y_0| \geq l$ and $|y_0| \geq L$ separately.

7.2.1 Estimates in $\{|y| \geq l\}$

We aim to estimate $|q(s, y)|$ for $|y| \geq l$. By tracing the flow backward in time, we assume $y = \Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)$. In view of Proposition 4.3, we further assume that either $s_1 = s_0$ or $|y_0| = l$. Solving along the trajectories then yields the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |q(s, y)| &\leq (\ln M)^C \max \left(\|q(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \geq l)}, \sup_{|y'|=l} |q(s_1, y')| \right) \\ &\quad + (\ln M)^C \int_{s_1}^s |F_q(s', \Phi_W(s', s_1, y_0))| e^{(-\frac{3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1}{2} + 3\mu)(s-s')} ds'. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

In the following proposition, we control the lower order derivatives of W .

Proposition 7.3. *For $|\gamma| \leq 1$ and $l \leq |y| \leq L$, there holds*

$$\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2 + 16}}. \tag{7.2}$$

Proof. By (7.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^{\mu(\gamma)}(y)|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s, y)| &\leq (\ln M)^C \max \left(\underbrace{\|\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \geq l)},}_{(3.12)} \sup_{|y'|=l} \underbrace{\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma \widetilde{W}(s_1, y')|}_{(3.23)} \right) \\
&\quad + (\ln M)^C \underbrace{\int_{s_1}^s (\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(\gamma)}|)(s', \Phi(s'; s_1, y_0)) e^{(-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2}+3\mu)(s-s')} ds'}_{(4.27)} \\
&\leq (\ln M)^C \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+15}} + (\ln M)^C \int_{s_1}^s \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+15}} \eta^{-\frac{1}{8}}(s', \Phi(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds \\
&\stackrel{(4.5)}{\leq} (\ln M)^C \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+15}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma_1+2\gamma_2+16}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we prove the following estimates for higher order derivatives:

Proposition 7.4. *For $|y| \geq l$ and $|\gamma| = 2, 3$, we have the estimates*

$$\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma W(s, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-5}{8}}. \quad (7.3)$$

Proof. Direct computation using (7.1) leads us to

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma W(s, y)| &\leq (\ln M)^C \max \left(\underbrace{\|\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma W(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \geq l)},}_{(3.11)} \underbrace{\sup_{|y'|=l} |\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma W(s_1, y')|}_{W=\widetilde{W}+W, (2.40)(3.23)} \right) \\
&\quad + (\ln M)^C \underbrace{\int_{s_1}^s (\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |F_W^{(\gamma)}|)(s', \Phi(s', s_1, y_0)) e^{(-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2}+3\mu)(s-s')} ds'}_{(4.12)} \\
&\leq (\ln M)^C + (\ln M)^C \int_{s_1}^s M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-6}{8}} \eta^{-\frac{2}{15}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1=0} e^{-(\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2}-1+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1=0})(s-s')} ds' \\
&\stackrel{|\gamma|=2,3}{\leq} (\ln M)^C + (\ln M)^C M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-6}{8}} \int_{s_1}^s \eta^{-\frac{2}{15}} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1=0} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(s-s')} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma_1>0} ds' \\
&\stackrel{(4.5)}{\leq} (\ln M)^C + (\ln M)^C M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-6}{8}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{3|\gamma|+\gamma_2-5}{8}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

7.2.2 Estimates in $\{|y| \geq L\}$

We proceed to estimates in the region $\{|y| \geq L\}$. According to Proposition 4.3, we can require either $s_1 = s_0$ or $|y_0| = L$ in this case. Consequently, we gain the bound on $q(s, y)$ for $|y| \geq L$:

$$\begin{aligned}
|q(s, y)| &\leq (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \max \left(\|q(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \geq L)}, \sup_{|y'|=L} |q(s_1, y')| \right) \\
&\quad + (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \int_{s_1}^s |F_q(s', \Phi(s', s_1, y_0))| e^{(-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2}+3\mu)(s-s')} ds'.
\end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

Proposition 7.5. For $|\gamma| \leq 1$ and $|y| \geq L$, we derive the following estimates:

$$\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma W| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{151}{150}, & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ 18, & |\gamma| = 1. \end{cases} \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. Using (7.4), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma W(s, y)| &\leq (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \max \left(\underbrace{\|\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma W(s_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(|y| \geq l)},}_{(3.11)} \underbrace{\sup_{|y'|=L} |\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} \partial^\gamma W(s_1, y')|}_{W=\bar{W}+\widetilde{W}, \text{ (2.39)(3.23)}} \right) \\ &\quad + (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \underbrace{\int_{s_1}^s (\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |F_W^{(\gamma)}|)(s', \Phi(s', s_1, y_0)) e^{\underbrace{(-\frac{3\gamma_1+\gamma_2-1}{2}+3\mu)(s-s')}_{=1, \text{ see (3.10)}}} ds'}_{(4.12)} \\ &\leq (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \max \left(\frac{201}{200} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma=0} + 16 \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=1}, 1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{18}} \right) \\ &\quad + (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \int_{s_1}^s o_{\tau_0}(1) \eta^{-\frac{1}{12}}(s', \Phi(s', s_1, y_0)) ds' \\ &\stackrel{(4.5)}{\leq} (1 + C\tau_0^{\frac{1}{30}}) \left(\frac{201}{200} \mathbb{1}_{\gamma=0} + 16 \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=1} \right) + o_{\tau_0}(1) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \frac{201}{200} + o_{\tau_0}(1), & \gamma = (0, 0), \\ 16 + o_{\tau_0}(1), & |\gamma| = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This yields the desired bounds for $\eta^{\mu(\gamma)} |\partial^\gamma W(s, y)|$. \square

8 Top Order Energy Estimates

In this section, we conclude our proof by improving the bootstrap assumption (3.24) on the top order \dot{H}^k norm. For a fixed integer $k \geq 34$, define the energy $E_k(s)$ for the physical variable $P = (V_1, V_2, S)^T$ as

$$E_k^2(s) := \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} (\|\partial^\gamma V_1(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^\gamma V_2(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^\gamma S(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2).$$

This energy is equivalent to the \dot{H}^k -norm of the unknowns as follows:

$$E_k^2 \leq \|P\|_{\dot{H}^k}^2 = \|\partial^\gamma V_1(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^\gamma V_2(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^\gamma S(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq (k!)^2 E_k^2. \quad (8.1)$$

We will establish the following energy estimate in this section:

Lemma 8.1 (\dot{H}^k bound). *Let $k \geq 34$ be a fixed integer. Then, we have the following energy inequality:*

$$E_k^2(s) \lesssim M^{3k-5} e^{-s}.$$

Here, the implicit constant is universal, and the large constant $M \gg 1$ depends on k .

8.1 Equation for \tilde{P}

First, we derive the governing equations for the physical variables \tilde{P} . Recall that $\tilde{P} = (V_1, V_2, S - \sigma_\infty)^T = P - (0, 0, \sigma_\infty)^T$. To derive the equations of \tilde{P} , we note that the third row of D_P vanishes and $\partial P = \partial \tilde{P}$. Together with (2.36), this leads us to the governing equation of \tilde{P} as below:

$$\partial_s \tilde{P} + \beta_\tau e^{-s} D_P \tilde{P} + \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_1 \tilde{P} + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} \right) \partial_2 \tilde{P} = \beta_\tau e^{-s} F_P. \quad (8.2)$$

To facilitate the proof of energy estimates, we analyze in detail the structures of the damping, transport, and forcing terms. Here, Greek indices μ, ν range over 1, 2, 3, and Latin indices i, j range over 1, 2.

1. From the definitions (2.10) of D_P and (2.7) of h_{ij} , the damping term $D_P \tilde{P}$ contains solely linear terms with the form $\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu$, where $\Lambda \in \{h_{11}, h_{12}\}$.
2. From the expression (2.18)(2.19) of A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} and A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} , the transport terms $A_{P, \tilde{u}_j} \partial_j \tilde{P}$ consist of
 - Linear terms $\Lambda D \tilde{P}_\mu$ with $\Lambda \in \{g_1 - \lambda g_2, g_2, \frac{1}{2} \psi \tilde{u}_2^2, 2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \lambda \varphi^{-1}\}$;
 - Quadratic terms $\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu D \tilde{P}_\nu$ with $\Lambda \in \{2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_1 \lambda \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \lambda \varphi^{-1}\}$.
3. By (2.13), F_P is composed of
 - Linear terms $\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu$ with $\Lambda \in \{\frac{\varphi}{2r_0^2} u_j g_j, \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} \sigma_\infty u_i\}$;
 - Quadratic terms $\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu \tilde{P}_\nu$ with $\Lambda \in \{\frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2} u_i, \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2} u_i\}$.

The auxiliary quantities mentioned above obey the bounds: $|\Lambda| \leq \ln M$ and $\|\Lambda\|_{C_{\tilde{u}}^k} \leq M^2$.

8.2 Useful Lemmas

Before establishing the energy estimates, we present several auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose the auxiliary quantities Λ satisfy the estimates $\|\Lambda\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}(s))} \leq A_0$, $\|\Lambda\|_{C_{\tilde{u}}^k(\mathcal{X}(s))} \leq M^2$ (which yields $\|D_y^j \Lambda\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}(s))} \leq M^2 e^{-\frac{j}{2}s}$ for $0 \leq j \leq k$). Then, for $1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq 3$, we have:*

1. *k-th order estimates for linear terms:*

$$\|\Lambda \partial^\gamma \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} \leq A_0 \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2}, \quad \|D^j \Lambda D^{k-j} \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} \stackrel{1 \leq j \leq k}{\lesssim} o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k, \quad (8.3)$$

which further implies that

$$\|\partial^\gamma (\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^2} \stackrel{|\gamma|=k}{\leq} A_0 \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k. \quad (8.4)$$

2. *(k + 1)-th order estimates for linear terms:*

$$\|D^j \Lambda D^{k+1-j} \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} \stackrel{2 \leq j \leq k+1}{\lesssim} o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k. \quad (8.5)$$

3. k -th order estimates for quadratic terms:

$$\|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu) D^{k-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2} \stackrel{0 \leq j \leq k}{\lesssim_k} (A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) \ln M \cdot E_k. \quad (8.6)$$

This implies that

$$\|D^k(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu \widetilde{P}_\nu)\|_{L^2} \lesssim_k (A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) \ln M \cdot E_k. \quad (8.7)$$

4. $(k+1)$ -th order estimates for quadratic terms:

$$\|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu) D^{k+1-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2} \stackrel{2 \leq j \leq k-1}{\lesssim_k} (1 + A_0)^2 M^{1+\frac{2}{3k-8}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{2}{3k-8})s} E_k^{1-\frac{2}{3k-8}}. \quad (8.8)$$

Proof. (1) The $j = 0$ case is trivial. For $j \geq 1$, noticing the fact that $\text{supp } \widetilde{P} \subset \mathcal{X}(s)$, we obtain that

$$\|D^j \Lambda D^{k-j} \widetilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} \leq M^2 e^{-\frac{j}{2}s} \left(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{\frac{s}{2}}\right)^j E_k \leq M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} E_k = o_{\tau_0}(1) \|D^k \widetilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus, (8.4) can be obtained by applying Leibniz rule.

(2) Via direct computation, we arrive at:

$$\|D^j \Lambda D^{k+1-j} \widetilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 e^{-\frac{j}{2}s} \left(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{\frac{j}{2}s}\right)^{k-(k+1-j)} E_k \stackrel{2 \leq j \leq k+1}{\lesssim} o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k.$$

(3) Employing Hölder inequality and Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu) D^{k-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2} &\stackrel{0 \leq j \leq k}{\lesssim} \|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^{\frac{2k}{j}}} \|D^{k-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^{\frac{2k}{k-j}}} \\ &\lesssim_k \|\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^\infty}^{1-\frac{j}{k}} \|D^k(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{j}{k}} \|\widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{j}{k}} \|D^k \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{j}{k}} \\ &\lesssim (A_0 \ln M)^{1-\frac{j}{k}} ((A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) E_k)^{\frac{j}{k}} (\ln M)^{\frac{j}{k}} E_k^{1-\frac{j}{k}} \\ &\lesssim (A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) \ln M \cdot E_k. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (8.7) hence follows via using Leibniz rule.

(4) Leveraging Corollary 3.13 and Leibniz rule, one can deduce that $\|D^2(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^6} \lesssim (A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1)) M e^{-\frac{s}{2}}$. For $2 \leq j \leq k-1$, we define

$$p_k(j) := \left(\frac{j-2}{3(k-2)} + \frac{1}{12} \right)^{-1}, \quad a_k(j) := \frac{\frac{j-2}{2} + \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{p_k(j)}}{\frac{k-3}{2} + \frac{1}{6}}.$$

It follows directly that $\frac{1}{p_k(j)} + \frac{1}{p_k(k+1-j)} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $a_k(j) + a_k(k+1-j) = 1 - \frac{2}{3k-8}$. By Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu) D^{k+1-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2} &\leq \|D^j(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^{p_k(j)}} \|D^{k+1-j} \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^{p_k(k+1-j)}} \\ &\lesssim_k \|D^2(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^6}^{1-a_k(j)} \|D^k(\Lambda \widetilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^2}^{a_k(j)} \|D^2 \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^6}^{1-a_k(k+1-j)} \|D^k \widetilde{P}_\nu\|_{L^2}^{a_k(k+1-j)} \\ &\stackrel{(8.4)}{\lesssim} (A_0 + o_{\tau_0}(1))^{1-a_k(j)} (M e^{-\frac{s}{2}})^{1+\frac{2}{3k-8}} ((1 + A_0) E_k)^{1-\frac{2}{3k-8}} \\ &\lesssim (1 + A_0)^2 M^{1+\frac{2}{3k-8}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{2}{3k-8})s} E_k^{1-\frac{2}{3k-8}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 8.3. *Let $\Lambda, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3$ be auxiliary quantities satisfying $|\Lambda_\mu| \leq 1 + o_{\tau_0}(1)$ for some $1 \leq \mu \leq 3$, $|\Lambda_\nu| \leq o_{\tau_0}(1)$ for $\nu \neq \mu$, and $\|\Lambda\|_{C_{\tilde{u}}^k} + \sum_\nu \|\Lambda_\nu\|_{C_{\tilde{u}}^k} \leq M^2$. Then, for any multi-index γ with order k , the following estimate holds:*

$$\left\| \sum_\nu \partial^\gamma (\Lambda_\nu \tilde{P}_\nu) + \partial^\gamma \Lambda \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X}(s))} \leq \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-\frac{k-2}{2}s}. \quad (8.9)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 8.2, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_\nu \partial^\gamma (\Lambda_\nu \tilde{P}_\nu) + \partial^\gamma \Lambda \right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X}(s))} &\leq \underbrace{\|\partial^\gamma (\Lambda_\nu \tilde{P}_\mu)\|_{L^2}}_{(8.4)} + \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \underbrace{\|\partial^\gamma (\Lambda_\nu \tilde{P}_\nu)\|_{L^2}}_{(8.4)} + \|\partial^\gamma \Lambda\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}(s))} |\mathcal{X}(s)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}_\mu\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k + CM^2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}e^{-\frac{k-2}{2}s}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the desired inequality. \square

Referring to Lemma 8.2, along with the previous discussion on the structures of the damping, transport, and forcing terms, we conclude the following inequality:

Corollary 8.4. *For any multi-index γ with $|\gamma| = k$, we have the following estimates for the forcing term and the damping term:*

$$\|\partial^\gamma F_P\|_{L^2} + \|\partial^\gamma (D_P \tilde{P})\|_{L^2} \lesssim \ln M \cdot E_k.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.11, for $\Lambda \in \{h_{11}, h_{12}, \frac{\varphi}{2r_0^2}u_j g_j, \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2}\sigma_\infty u_i, \frac{\beta_1}{r_0^2}u_i, \frac{\beta_3}{r_0^2}u_i\}$, it holds that $|\Lambda| \leq \ln M$ and $\|\Lambda\|_{C_{\tilde{u}}^k}^k \leq M^2$. Hence, the desired result follows from Lemma 8.2. \square

For the transport terms, we prove the following estimates:

Lemma 8.5. *For $i = 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| = k$, there holds that*

$$\|\partial^\gamma A_{P, \tilde{u}_i}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X}(s))} := \|\partial^\gamma A_{P, \tilde{u}_i}\|_F \leq 4\|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-\frac{k-2}{2}s}. \quad (8.10)$$

Here, $\|(a_{\mu\nu})\|_F := (\sum_{\mu, \nu} a_{\mu\nu}^2)^{1/2}$ is the Frobenius norm of a matrix. Moreover, for $1 \leq j \leq k-2$, the following estimate holds:

$$\|D^{k-j} A_{P, \tilde{u}_i} D^{j+1} \tilde{P}\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^{1+\frac{2}{3k-8}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{2}{3k-8})s} E_k^{1-\frac{2}{3k-8}} + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k. \quad (8.11)$$

Proof. Employing (2.18)(2.24)(8.4) and Proposition 3.11, we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\gamma A_{P, \tilde{u}_1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X}(s))}^2 &\leq 3\| [2\beta_1(\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1}V_1) - \partial^\gamma(\lambda\varphi^{-1}V_2)) + \partial^\gamma G] \|_{L^2}^2 + 8\beta_3^2(\|\partial^\gamma(\varphi^{-1}S)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial^\gamma(\lambda\varphi^{-1}S)\|_{L^2}^2) \\ &\stackrel{(8.9)}{\leq} 12\beta_1^2\|\partial^\gamma V_1\|_{L^2}^2 + 8\beta_3^2\|\partial^\gamma S\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-(k-2)s} \\ &\leq 16\|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-(k-2)s}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (2.19), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\gamma A_{P, \tilde{u}_2}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq 12\beta_1^2\|\partial^\gamma V_2\|_{L^2}^2 + 8\beta_3^2\|\partial^\gamma S\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-(k-2)s} \\ &\leq 16\|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-(k-2)s}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, (8.10) follows from the elementary inequality $(\sum_i a_i)^{1/2} \leq \sum_i a_i^{1/2}$ for finite sums. To prove (8.11), note that $D^{k-j} A_{P, \tilde{u}_i} D^{j+1} \tilde{P}$ consists of linear terms $D^{k-j} \Lambda D^{j+1} \tilde{P}_\mu$ with $\Lambda \in \{g_1 - \lambda g_2, g_2, \frac{1}{2}\psi \tilde{u}_2^2, 2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \sigma_\infty \lambda \varphi^{-1}\}$, and quadratic terms $D^{k-j} (\Lambda \tilde{P}_\mu) D^{j+1} \tilde{P}_\nu$ with $\Lambda \in \{2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_1 \lambda \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1}, 2\beta_3 \lambda \varphi^{-1}\}$. Via applying Proposition 3.11 and (8.5)(8.8), these terms can be bounded by $M^{1+\frac{2}{3k-8}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{2}{3k-8})s} E_k^{1-\frac{2}{3k-8}} + o_{\tau_0}(1)e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k$. \square

Lemma 8.6. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and Latin indices $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$|a^T \partial_1 A_{P, \tilde{u}_i} b| \leq (1 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}}|a||b|, \quad |a^T \partial_2 A_{P, \tilde{u}_i} b| \leq (20 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}}|a||b|.$$

Proof. According to the definition (2.18) of A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} , by using bootstrap assumptions on Z and A , and Proposition 3.14, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |a^T \partial_j A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} b| &\leq 2\beta_1 \varphi^{-1} |\partial_j V_1| |a^T b| + 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} |\partial_j S| |a_1 b_3 + a_3 b_1| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| \\ &\stackrel{(3.32)(3.37)}{\leq} \begin{cases} \beta_1 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a^T b| + \beta_3 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 1 \\ 20\beta_1 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a^T b| + 20\beta_3 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 2 \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} (1 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 1 \\ (20 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 2 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by definition (2.19), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |a^T \partial_j A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} b| &\leq 2\beta_3 \varphi^{-1} |\partial_j S| |a_2 b_3 + a_3 b_2| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| \\ &\stackrel{(3.32)(3.37)}{\leq} \begin{cases} \beta_3 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 1 \\ 20\beta_3 e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b| + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 2 \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} (1 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 1 \\ (20 + o_{\tau_0}(1))e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |a||b|, & j = 2 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we use the fact that $0 \leq \beta_1, \beta_3 \leq 1$. \square

8.3 Proof of the Energy Estimate

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 8.1.

Proof of Lemma 8.1. By applying ∂^γ to (8.2), left-multiplying by $\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}^T$, summing over $|\gamma| = k$ with the weight $(\gamma_2!)^{-2}$, and then integrating over \mathbb{R}^2 , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{ds} E_k^2 + \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \tilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma \left[\left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_1 \tilde{P} + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} A_{P, \tilde{u}_2} \right) \partial_2 \tilde{P} \right] dy \\ = \beta_\tau e^{-s} \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \tilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma (F_P - D_P \tilde{P}) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Damping and forcing terms. From Corollary 8.4 and Hölder inequality, the right-hand side is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\tau e^{-s} \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int |\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma (F_P - D_P \tilde{P})| dy &\lesssim e^{-s} E_k \sum_{|\gamma|=k} \underbrace{(\|\partial^\gamma F_P\|_{L^2} + \|\partial^\gamma (D_P \tilde{P})\|_{L^2})}_{\text{Corollary 8.4}} \\ &\stackrel{(3.1)}{\lesssim} o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

Transport terms. Integration by part yields that

$$\sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \tilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma \left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 \partial_1 \tilde{P} + \frac{1}{2} y_2 \partial_2 \tilde{P} \right) dy = \left(\frac{k}{2} - 1 \right) E_k^2 + \sum_{|\gamma|=k} \gamma_1 (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \|\partial^\gamma \tilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma (A_{P,\tilde{u}_i} \partial_i \widetilde{P}) dy &= \left(\gamma_i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial_i A_{P,\tilde{u}_i} \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P} dy + \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma_j \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial_j A_{P,\tilde{u}_i} \partial^{\gamma - e_j + e_i} \widetilde{P} dy \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\beta| \leq k-2 \\ \beta \leq \gamma}} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^{\gamma - \beta} A_{P,\tilde{u}_i} \partial_i \partial^\beta \widetilde{P} dy + \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma A_{P,\tilde{u}_i} \partial_i \widetilde{P} dy \\
&= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8.6, we have

$$|I_1| \leq \begin{cases} (\gamma_i + \frac{1}{2}) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2, & i = 1 \\ o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k^2, & i = 2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$|I_2| \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma_j \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} \|\partial^{\gamma - e_j + e_i} \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2, & i = 1 \\ o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k^2, & i = 2 \end{cases}$$

By using (8.11) and the notation $\delta := \frac{2}{3k-8}$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_3| &\lesssim M^{1+\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\delta)s} E_k^{2-\delta} + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\ln M} e^{-\frac{2-\delta}{4}s} E^{2-\delta} \right)^{\frac{2}{2-\delta}} + \left(e^{-\frac{3}{4}\delta s} M^{1+\delta} \ln M \right)^{\frac{2}{\delta}} + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2 \\
&\lesssim o_{\tau_0,M}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2 + (\ln M)^{3k-8} M^{3k-6} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $o_{\tau_0,M}(1)$ denotes a positive quantity that tends to zero as $\tau_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, it follows from (3.38) and (8.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_4| &\leq \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \|\partial^\gamma A_{P,\tilde{u}_i}\|_F \|\partial_i \widetilde{P}\|_{L^1} \\
&\leq \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} \|\partial^\gamma A_{P,\tilde{u}_i}\|_{L^2} \|\partial_i \widetilde{P}\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} (4 \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} + o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{k-2}{2}s}) \|\partial_i \widetilde{P}\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} 4e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-\frac{s}{2}} E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-(k-2)s}, & i = 1 \\ o_{\tau_0}(1) E_k^2 + o_{\tau_0}(1) e^{-(k-2)s}, & i = 2 \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\beta_\tau = 1 + o_{\tau_0}(1)$ (see (3.26)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma (A_{P,\tilde{u}_1} \partial_1 \widetilde{P}) dy \\
&\geq - \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \gamma_1 \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \gamma_2 \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} \|\partial^{\gamma - e_2 + e_1} \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{9}{2} E_k^2 - o_{\tau_0,M}(1) E_k^2 - C (\ln M)^{3k-8} M^{3k-6} e^{-s} \\
&\stackrel{\text{AM-GM}}{\geq} - \left(\frac{13}{2} + o_{\tau_0,M}(1) \right) E_k^2 - \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \gamma_1 \|\partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2}^2 - M^{3k-5} e^{-s},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma (A_{P,\tilde{u}_2} \partial_1 \widetilde{P}) dy \geq -o_{\tau_0,M}(1) E_k^2 - M^{3k-5} e^{-s}.$$

Invoking all the bounds on transport terms, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma|=k} (\gamma_2!)^{-2} \int \partial^\gamma \widetilde{P}^T \partial^\gamma \left[\left(\frac{3}{2} y_1 + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} A_{P,\tilde{u}_1} \right) \partial_1 \widetilde{P} + \left(\frac{1}{2} y_2 + \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} A_{P,\tilde{u}_2} \right) \partial_2 \widetilde{P} \right] dy \\ & \geq \left(\frac{k-15}{2} - o_{\tau_0,M}(1) \right) E_k^2 - CM^{3k-5} e^{-s}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, gathering all terms in the energy estimate, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{ds} E_k^2 + (k-15 - o_{\tau_0,M}(1)) E_k^2 \leq M^{3k-4} e^{-s}.$$

Since $k-15 - o_{\tau_0,M}(1) \geq 1$, via using Grönwall's inequality, we have

$$E_k^2(s) \leq e^{-(s-s_0)} E_k^2(s_0) + M^{3k-4} e^{-s}.$$

Plugging in the initial condition (3.14), we conclude that $E_k^2(s_0) \lesssim M\tau_0$ and $E_k^2(s) \lesssim M^{3k-4} e^{-s}$. \square

Closure of bootstrap assumption (3.24). Notice that $\|D^k \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2} \lesssim E_k(s) \lesssim M^{\frac{3k-4}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}$, it suffices to show

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|D^k W\|_{L^2} + \|D^k Z\|_{L^2} + \|D^k A\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|D^k \widetilde{P}\|_{L^2}.$$

By (2.35), this is an immediately follows from (8.4). Therefore, we obtain

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|D^k W\|_{L^2} + \|D^k Z\|_{L^2} + \|D^k A\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^{\frac{3k}{2}-2} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{3k}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}.$$

This completes the proof of the energy estimate. \square

A Shock Formation for Equivariant Euler Equations

In the appendix², we present a proof of shock formation for the compressible Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 under equivariant symmetry, that is, under the assumptions $v_\phi = 0$ and $\partial_\phi \mathcal{W} = 0$ for $\mathcal{W} \in \{v_\theta, v_\phi, \rho\}$. From a physical perspective, the equations considered in the appendix describe axisymmetric flows without swirl, a regime of significant physical relevance. While the methods parallel to those in the main text, the coordinate choice and the modulation variables differ herehere. The appendix also provides a streamlined illustration of the core ideas developed in the paper.

A.1 Preliminaries

In this section, we derive the Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 under equivariant symmetry, introduce the co-moving coordinates, define the Riemann variables, and perform the self-similar transformations.

²The proofs of this appendix are based on Fulin Qi's UROPS college research project.

A.1.1 The Equivariant Euler's Equations

We begin with the derivation of equivariant Euler's equations on \mathbb{S}^2 . To capture the equivariant motion of fluids, we adopt the spherical coordinates on \mathbb{S}^2 , instead of the stereographic coordinates used in the previous argument. Setting $\mathcal{R} := (0, 2\pi) \times (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, the standard spherical coordinates are given by

$$(\phi, \theta) \in \mathcal{R} \mapsto (\cos \phi \cos \theta, \sin \phi \cos \theta, \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^2.$$

The isentropic compressible Euler equations can then be written in spherical coordinates as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \frac{1}{\cos \theta} (\partial_\phi \rho)(v_\phi) + (\partial_\theta \rho)(v_\theta) + \frac{\rho}{\cos \theta} \partial_\phi v_\phi + \rho \partial_\theta v_\theta - \rho \tan \theta v_\theta = 0, \\ \partial_t v_\phi + \left(\frac{v_\phi \partial_\phi v_\phi}{\cos \theta} - v_\phi v_\theta \tan \theta + v_\theta \partial_\theta v_\phi \right) + \frac{\rho^{\gamma-2}}{\cos \theta} \partial_\phi \rho = 0, \\ \partial_t v_\theta + \left(\frac{v_\phi \partial_\phi v_\theta}{\cos \theta} + v_\phi^2 \tan \theta + v_\theta \partial_\theta v_\theta \right) + \rho^{\gamma-2} \partial_\theta \rho = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $v = v_\theta \mathbf{e}_\theta + v_\phi \mathbf{e}_\phi$, with \mathbf{e}_θ and \mathbf{e}_ϕ being unit vectors defined by $\mathbf{e}_\theta := \partial_\theta / |\partial_\theta|$ and $\mathbf{e}_\phi := \partial_\phi / |\partial_\phi|$.

Assuming that the flow is equivariant (i.e., $v_\phi = 0$ and $\partial_\phi \mathcal{W} = 0$ for $\mathcal{W} \in \{v_\theta, v_\phi, \rho\}$), we abuse the notation and write v_θ as v for simplicity. Denote the rescaled sound speed as $\sigma = \frac{1}{\alpha} \rho^\alpha$ with $\alpha = \frac{\gamma-1}{2} > 0$. The system (A.1) is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \sigma + v \partial_\theta \sigma + \alpha \sigma \partial_\theta v = \alpha \sigma v \tan \theta, \\ \partial_t v + v \partial_\theta v + \alpha \sigma \partial_\theta \sigma = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Although the spherical coordinates do not cover the line $\{\phi = 0\}$ on \mathbb{S}^2 , this poses no issue under the equivariant assumptions since all unknowns are independent of ϕ .

A.1.2 Co-moving Coordinates

In the following, we introduce the co-moving coordinates. To keep track of the shock, we first define three time-dependent modulation variables. Namely, we use $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ to trace the location of the shock formation, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ to track the slope of the Riemann invariant w (defined in (A.4)) at $x = \xi(t)$, and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ to record the value of w at $x = \xi(\tilde{t})$. Since the slope of w is approximately $\frac{c}{T^* - t}$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, τ can also be understood as a variable tracking the time of shock formation. With these modulation variables, we can define the co-moving coordinates as

$$\tilde{\theta} := \theta - \xi(\tilde{t}), \quad \tilde{t} := \frac{1+\alpha}{2} t.$$

Under the co-moving coordinates, the governing equations of (v, σ) become

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}} v + (2\beta_1 v - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi) \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} v + 2\alpha \beta_1 \sigma \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \sigma = 0, \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}} \sigma + (2\beta_1 v - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi) \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \sigma + 2\alpha \beta_1 \sigma \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} v = 2\alpha \beta_1 \sigma v \tan(\tilde{\theta} + \xi), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the constants β_1, β_2 and β_3 are defined in (2.1).

A.1.3 Riemann variables

We define Riemann variables by

$$w := v_\theta + \sigma, \quad z := v_\theta - \sigma. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The system (A.3) can then be rewritten in (w, z) as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tilde{t}} w + (w + \beta_2 z - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi) \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} w = \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 (w^2 - z^2) \tan(\tilde{\theta} + \xi), \\ \partial_{\tilde{t}} z + (\beta_2 w + z - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi) \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} z = \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 (z^2 - w^2) \tan(\tilde{\theta} + \xi). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

A.1.4 Self-similar transformations

We now introduce the self-similar coordinates

$$y := \tilde{\theta} e^{\frac{3}{2}s}, \quad s := -\ln(\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t}),$$

together with the corresponding self-similar variables

$$W(s, y) := e^{\frac{s}{2}} (w(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\theta}) - \kappa(\tilde{t})), \quad Z(s, y) := z(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\theta}).$$

Letting $\beta_\tau = (1 - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau)^{-1}$, we can then reformulate the system (A.5) as

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_s - \frac{1}{2}) W + (\frac{3}{2}y + g_W) \partial_y W = F_W - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa, \\ \partial_s Z + (\frac{3}{2}y + g_Z) \partial_y Z = F_Z. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The transport and forcing terms in the above system (A.6) are

$$\begin{cases} g_W = \beta_\tau W + G_W = \beta_\tau W + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} (\kappa + \beta_2 Z - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi), \\ g_Z = \beta_2 \beta_\tau W + G_Z = \beta_2 \beta_\tau W + \beta_\tau e^{\frac{s}{2}} (\beta_2 \kappa + Z - \partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\begin{cases} F_W = \frac{\beta_\tau \beta_3}{2} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \tan(y e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \xi) ((e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa)^2 - Z^2), \\ F_Z = \frac{\beta_\tau \beta_3}{2} e^{-s} \tan(y e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \xi) (Z^2 - (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa)^2). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

A.1.5 1D self-similar Burgers profile

The profile we use is the one-dimensional self-similar Burgers profile introduced in Section 2.7. For convenient reference, we restate some of its key properties here.

First, \bar{W} satisfies the following estimates:

$$\begin{cases} |\bar{W}| \leq |y|^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\partial_y \bar{W}| \leq \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad |\partial_y^2 \bar{W}| \leq \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{5}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 \bar{W}| \leq 6 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{8}{3}}, & |\partial_y^4 \bar{W}| \leq 35 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{11}{3}}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $\langle y \rangle = \sqrt{1 + y^2}$. At the origin $y = 0$, we also have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{W}(0) = 0, & \partial_y \bar{W}(0) = -1, \\ \partial_y^2 \bar{W}(0) = 0, & \partial_y^3 \bar{W}(0) = 6. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

A.1.6 Evolution of unknowns

For $k \geq 1$, the evolution equations for $(\partial_y^k W, \partial_y^k Z)$ are given by

$$\begin{cases} \left(\partial_s + \frac{3k-1}{2} + (1 + \mathbb{1}_{k \geq 2} k) \beta_\tau \partial_y W \right) \partial_y^k W + (\beta_\tau W + \frac{3}{2} y + G_W) \partial_y^{k+1} W = F_W^{(k)}, \\ \left(\partial_s + \frac{3k}{2} + \beta_2 \beta_\tau k \partial_y Z \right) \partial_y^k Z + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + \beta_2 \beta_\tau W + G_Z \right) \partial_y^{k+1} Z = F_Z^{(k)}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function, and the corresponding forcing terms take the following form:

$$\begin{cases} F_W^{(k)} = \partial_y^k F_W - \mathbb{1}_{k \geq 3} \beta_\tau \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} W \partial_y^{j+1} W \right) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} G_W \partial_y^{j+1} W, \\ F_Z^{(k)} = \partial_y^k F_Z - \mathbb{1}_{k \geq 2} \beta_2 \beta_\tau \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} W \partial_y^{j+1} Z \right) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} G_Z \partial_y^{j+1} Z, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_y^k F_W = \frac{\beta_\tau \beta_3}{2} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} \tan(ye^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \xi) \left(\partial_y^j (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa)^2 - \partial_y^j Z^2 \right), \\ \partial_y^k F_Z = \frac{\beta_\tau \beta_3}{2} e^{-s} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} \tan(ye^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + \xi) \left(\partial_y^j Z^2 - \partial_y^j (e^{-\frac{s}{2}} W + \kappa)^2 \right). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

A.1.7 Evolution of \widetilde{W}

We define $\widetilde{W} := W - \overline{W}$, and one can check that \widetilde{W} satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \left(\partial_s - \frac{1}{2} + \beta_\tau \partial_y \overline{W} \right) \widetilde{W} + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) \partial_y \widetilde{W} = F_{\widetilde{W}}, \\ F_{\widetilde{W}} = F_W - G_W \partial_y \overline{W} + (1 - \beta_\tau) \overline{W} \partial_y \overline{W} - \beta_\tau e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \partial_t \kappa. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For $k \geq 1$, the evolution equation of $\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}$ can be deduced from (A.11), (A.12), and (A.13):

$$\left(\partial_s + \frac{3k-1}{2} + \beta_\tau (\partial_y \overline{W} + k \partial_y W) \right) \partial_y^k \widetilde{W} + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + \beta_\tau W + G_W \right) \partial_y^{k+1} \widetilde{W} = F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(k)}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where the forcing term is defined by

$$\begin{cases} F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(k)} = \partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}} - \beta_\tau \Sigma_1 - \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}_{k \geq 2} \Sigma_2, \\ \Sigma_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \left(\partial_y^{k-j+1} \overline{W} \partial_y^j \widetilde{W} + \partial_y^{k-j} G_W \partial_y^{j+1} \widetilde{W} \right), \\ \Sigma_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \binom{k}{j} \partial_y^{k-j} W \partial_y^{j+1} \widetilde{W}, \\ \partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}} = \partial_y^k F_W + \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} ((1 - \beta_\tau) \partial_y^{k-j} \overline{W} - \partial_y^{k-j} G_W) \partial_y^{j+1} \overline{W}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

A.2 Main results

In this section, we present the main shock formation result for the 2D equivariant compressible Euler equations on \mathbb{S}^2 .

A.2.1 Initial conditions

We begin by specifying the initial state. We take the initial time t_0 to be 0, and we set the initial values of modulation variables as

$$\kappa(0) = \kappa_0 = \sigma_\infty > 0, \quad \xi(0) = \xi_0 \in \left[\frac{\pi}{16}, \frac{\pi}{8} \right], \quad \tau(0) = \tau_0 > 0. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Furthermore, we require σ_∞ to satisfy

$$\kappa_0 = \sigma_\infty > \frac{\xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}}}{2\beta_3}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Remark A.1. Note that the choice of ξ_0 here is made for technical convenience. With modified bootstrap arguments, this interval can be further enlarged.

We now prescribe the initial data of (v, σ) in the $\tilde{\theta}$ -coordinate as below

$$v(0, \tilde{\theta}) := v_0(\tilde{\theta}), \quad \sigma(0, \tilde{\theta}) := \sigma_0(\tilde{\theta}),$$

where v_0, σ_0 are to be carefully chosen such that the Riemann variables satisfy the conditions stated in this section.

The initial data of the Riemann variables are denoted as

$$w_0(\tilde{\theta}) := v_0(\tilde{\theta}) + \sigma_0(\tilde{\theta}), \quad z_0(\tilde{\theta}) := v_0(\tilde{\theta}) - \sigma_0(\tilde{\theta}).$$

Furthermore, we assume at the initial time that

$$\text{Supp}_{\tilde{\theta}}(w_0 - \sigma_\infty, z_0 + \sigma_\infty) \subseteq \left(-\frac{1}{10}\xi_0, \frac{1}{10}\xi_0\right),$$

which corresponds to

$$\text{Supp}_\theta(\tilde{w}_0 - \sigma_\infty, z + \sigma_\infty) \subseteq \left(\frac{9}{10}\xi_0, \frac{11}{10}\xi_0\right).$$

The self-similar Riemann variables would initially verify that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{cases} |W(s_0, y)| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{200}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}})\langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\partial_y W(s_0, y)| \leq 12\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 W(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{10}M^{\frac{1}{8}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, & |\partial_y^3 W(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^4 W(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M^{\frac{9}{10}}, & \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB0-}W) \\ & \begin{cases} |\widetilde{W}(s_0, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{4}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y \widetilde{W}(s_0, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{4}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}(s_0, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{4}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0(s_0)| \leq \frac{1}{10}\tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}, \\ |\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(s_0, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq \frac{1}{10}M^2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}|y|^{4-k} + \frac{1}{10}\tau_0^{\frac{3}{5}}|y|^{3-k} \mathbb{1}_{k \leq 3}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB0-}\widetilde{W}) \\ & \begin{cases} |Z(s_0, y) + \sigma_\infty| \leq \frac{1}{4}M\tau_0, & |\partial_y Z(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 Z(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M^{\frac{4}{3}}\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}, & |\partial_y^3 Z(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M^6\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y^4 Z(s_0, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4}M^7\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}}. & \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB0-}Z) \end{aligned}$$

The choice of constants M and τ_0 follows Section 3.1. In principle, M is a large constant that dominates all universal constants and initial conditions on physical variables, while τ_0 is set to be small enough so that its reciprocal can suppress the largeness resulting from M .

A.2.2 Main theorem

We now state the main theorem.

Theorem A.2. Consider the equivariant compressible Euler equations (A.3). Assume that the following conditions hold:

1. For any κ_0 satisfying (A.18), the initial data of $(\tilde{v}_\theta, \tilde{\sigma})$ is smooth, and the corresponding self-similar variables satisfy (IB0-Z), (IB0-W), and (IB0- \widetilde{W});
2. The parameter τ_0 satisfies $0 < \tau_0 \leq \epsilon$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Then, the corresponding solution $(\tilde{v}_\theta, \tilde{\sigma})$ to (A.3) blows up at a finite time $\tilde{T}^* < +\infty$. Furthermore, the solution exhibits the following properties:

1. Blow-up speed: The following estimates for $(\partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{v}_\theta, \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{\sigma})$ holds:

$$\frac{c}{\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}} \leq \max(\|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{v}_\theta\|_\infty, \|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{\sigma}\|_\infty) \leq \frac{C}{\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

2. Blow-up time: The maximal lifespan \tilde{T}^* satisfies

$$|\tau_0 - \tilde{T}^*| \leq 2M\tau_0^2. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

3. Blow-up location: For $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C(\delta)$ such that

$$\|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{v}_\theta(\tilde{t}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^c)} + \|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}} \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{t}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^c)} \leq M + 2\delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

while the gradient is unbounded along $\xi(\tilde{t})$ as shown in (1). Here, $B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))$ is the ball centered at $\xi(\tilde{t})$ with radius δ , and $B_\delta(\xi(\tilde{t}))^c$ denotes its set complement. Moreover, the limit $\lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{T}^*} \xi(\tilde{t}) = \xi_*$ exists.

4. 1/3-Hölder continuity: The solution admits a uniform-in-time $C^{\frac{1}{3}}$ bound. More precisely, we have

$$(\tilde{v}_\theta, \tilde{\sigma}) \in L_t^\infty([0, T^*]) \cap C_{\tilde{\theta}}^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

A.3 Bootstrap argument

In this section, we set up the bootstrap argument, by which the global well-posedness in self-similar ansatz can be established.

A.3.1 Bootstrap assumptions

We first state the bootstrap assumptions. For the modulation variables, we assume that

$$\begin{cases} |\kappa - \kappa_0| \leq M\tau_0, & |\partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa| \leq M, \\ |\xi - \xi_0 - 2\beta_3 \kappa_0 \tilde{t}| \leq M^2 \tau_0^2, & |\partial_{\tilde{t}} \xi - 2\beta_3 \kappa_0| \leq M^2 \tau_0, \\ |\tau - \tau_0| \leq 2M\tau_0^2, & |\partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau| \leq 2M e^{-s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{BA-M})$$

For spatial support, we define $\mathcal{X}(s) := \left\{ e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \left(\frac{\xi_0}{2} - \xi(\tilde{t}) \right) \leq y \leq e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \left(\frac{3\xi_0}{2} - \xi(\tilde{t}) \right) \right\}$ and assume that

$$\text{supp}(\partial_y W, \partial_y Z) \subseteq \mathcal{X}(s). \quad (\text{BA-Supp})$$

For W and \widetilde{W} , we impose that

$$\begin{cases} |W| \leq (1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}) \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\partial_y W| \leq 15 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 W| \leq M^{\frac{1}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, & |\partial_y^3 W| \leq M^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y^4 W| \leq M, & \end{cases} \quad (\text{BA-W})$$

$$\begin{cases} |\widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0| \leq \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}, \\ |\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq 10M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |y|^{4-k} + \tau_0^{\frac{3}{5}} |y|^{3-k} \mathbb{1}_{k \leq 3}, \quad (k \leq 4), \end{cases} \quad (\text{BA-}\widetilde{W})$$

where quantities with a superscript 0 should be understood as their values at $y = 0$.

For Z , we require that

$$\begin{cases} |Z + \sigma_\infty| \leq M\tau_0, & |\partial_y Z| \leq M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \\ |\partial_y^2 Z| \leq M^{\frac{4}{3}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, & |\partial_y^3 Z| \leq M^6 e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \\ |\partial_y^4 Z| \leq M^7 e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{BA-}Z)$$

A.3.2 Bootstrap procedure

We now state the improved bootstrap inequalities (IB), which will be later deduced from bootstrap assumptions and initial conditions:

$$\begin{cases} |\kappa - \kappa_0| \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0, & |\partial_t \kappa| \leq M^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\xi - \xi_0 - 2\beta_3 \kappa_0 \tilde{t}| \leq M^{\frac{7}{4}} \tau_0^2, & |\partial_t \xi - 2\beta_3 \kappa_0| \leq M^{\frac{3}{2}} \tau_0, \\ |\tau - \tau_0| \leq \frac{3}{2} M \tau_0^2, & |\partial_t \tau| \leq M e^{-s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB-M})$$

$$\text{Supp}(\partial_y W, \partial_y Z) \subseteq \frac{7}{8} \mathcal{X}(s), \quad (\text{IB-Supp})$$

$$\begin{cases} |W| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}) \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, & |\partial_y W| \leq 13 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 W| \leq M^{\frac{1}{8}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, & |\partial_y^3 W| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y^4 W| \leq \frac{1}{2} M, & \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB-}W)$$

$$\begin{cases} |\widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0| \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}, \\ |\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |y|^{4-k} + \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}} |y|^{3-k} \mathbb{1}_{k \leq 3}, \quad (k \leq 4). \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB-}\widetilde{W})$$

$$\begin{cases} |Z + \sigma_\infty| \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0, & |\partial_y Z| \leq \frac{1}{2} M e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \\ |\partial_y^2 Z| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{4}{3}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, & |\partial_y^3 Z| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^6 e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \\ |\partial_y^4 Z| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^7 e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{IB-}Z)$$

A.4 Immediate corollaries of bootstrap assumptions

In this section, we will present some immediate results derived from the bootstrap assumptions.

A.4.1 Relation between $\langle y \rangle$, ξ_0 , and $\mathcal{X}(s)$

We define $\mathcal{X}(s) := \left\{ e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \left(\frac{\xi_0}{2} - \xi(\tilde{t}) \right), e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \left(\frac{3\xi_0}{2} - \xi(\tilde{t}) \right) \right\}$, on which we assume the supports of $\partial_y W$ and $\partial_y Z$ lie. When $y \in \mathcal{X}(s)$, by our choice of τ_0 and ξ_0 , and the bootstrap assumption (BA-M) on ξ , we derive the following relationship between $\langle y \rangle$ and ξ_0 :

$$\langle y \rangle = \sqrt{1 + y^2} \leq \sqrt{1 + \xi_0^2 e^{3s}} \leq (\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}} + \xi_0) e^{\frac{3s}{2}}, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

which immediately implies

$$\langle y \rangle \leq (\tau_0^{\frac{3}{2}} + \xi_0) e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \lesssim \xi_0 e^{\frac{3}{2}s}, \quad e^{-s} \lesssim \xi_0^{\frac{2}{3}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}.$$

A.4.2 Absence of Vacuum

Using (A.4) and bootstrap assumptions, we estimate the deviation of σ from the background state σ_∞ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma - \sigma_\infty| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\underbrace{e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |W|}_{(\text{BA-}W)(\text{A.23})} + \underbrace{|\kappa - \sigma_\infty|}_{(\text{A.17})(\text{BA-M})} + \underbrace{|Z + \sigma_\infty|}_{(\text{BA-}Z)} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows from (A.18) that

$$\sigma \geq \sigma_\infty - |\sigma - \sigma_\infty| \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \xi^{\frac{1}{3}} - O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}) \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \xi^{\frac{1}{3}} > 0.$$

A.4.3 Estimates of $\partial_y^k F_W$ at $y = 0$

Appealing to bootstrap assumptions, (A.8) and (A.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |F_W^0| &\leq M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y F_W^0| &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s}, \\ |\partial_y^2 F_W^0| &\lesssim \tan(\xi) e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \lesssim M^{\frac{5}{4}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}. \end{aligned}$$

A.4.4 Evolution equations of modulation variables

We first derive the equations governing the modulation variables. By evaluating (A.6) and (A.11) at $y = 0$ for $k = 1, 2$, and invoking the boundary conditions of W , we have

$$(\text{A.6}) \implies \partial_{\tilde{t}} \kappa = \frac{e^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau} (F_W^0 + G_W^0), \quad (\text{A.24})$$

$$((\text{A.11}), k = 1) \implies \partial_{\tilde{t}} \tau = \frac{1}{\beta_\tau} (\partial_y F_W^0 + \partial_y G_W^0), \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$$((\text{A.11}), k = 2) \implies G_W^0 = (\partial_y^3 W^0)^{-1} (\partial_y^2 F_W^0 + \partial_y^2 G_W^0). \quad (\text{A.26})$$

The last equation, along with (A.7), gives

$$\partial_{\tilde{t}}\xi = \kappa + \beta_2 Z^0 - \frac{1}{\beta_\tau} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (\partial_y^3 W^0)^{-1} (\partial_y^2 F_W^0 + \partial_y^2 G_W^0). \quad (\text{A.27})$$

We remark that, since $\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0 = \mathcal{O}(\tau_0^{1/4})$ and $\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}(0) = 6$, it follows from (A.26) that

$$|G_W^0| \leq M^{\frac{4}{3}} e^{-s}. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

A.4.5 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on κ

Using the estimates obtained and bootstrap assumptions, for all $T \in [0, T^*]$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\kappa| &\leq \frac{e^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\beta_\tau} (|F_W^0| + |G_W^0|) \leq 2M^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2}M, \\ |\kappa - \kappa_0| &\leq \int_0^T |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\kappa| \, dt' \leq \frac{1}{2}MT < \frac{1}{2}M\tau_0. \end{aligned}$$

A.4.6 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on τ

Similarly, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau| &\leq \frac{1}{\beta_\tau} (|\partial_y F_W^0| + |\partial_y G_W^0|) \lesssim (1 + \epsilon) (M^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} + e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial_y Z^0|) \lesssim M e^{-s}, \\ |\tau - \tau_0| &\leq \int_0^{T_*} M e^{-s} \, dt' \leq \frac{3}{2} M T_* \tau_0 < 2M\tau_0^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon, \tau_0 \ll 1$.

A.4.7 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on ξ

By direct computation and the previous estimates, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\xi - 2\beta_3\kappa_0| &= \left| (\kappa - \kappa_0) + \beta_2(Z^0 + \kappa_0) - \frac{1}{\beta_\tau} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} (\partial_y^3 W^0)^{-1} (\partial_y^2 F_W^0 + \partial_y^2 G_W^0) \right| \\ &\lesssim M\tau_0 + M\tau_0 + e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \left| (\partial_y^3 W^0)^{-1} \right| (M^{\frac{5}{4}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + M^{\frac{4}{3}} e^{-s}) \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{2}}\tau_0 < M^2\tau_0, \\ |\xi - \xi_0 - \beta_3\kappa_0 \tilde{t}| &\leq \int_0^{T^*} |\xi - \xi_0 - \beta_3\kappa_0| \, dt' \leq M^{\frac{3}{2}} T^* \tau_0 \leq M^{\frac{7}{4}} \tau_0^2 < M^2\tau_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have improved all bootstrap assumptions on modulation variables.

A.5 A priori estimates

In this section, we derive the estimates of transport terms and forcing terms step by step for the equations of W , Z , and \widetilde{W} . These estimates will be used to close the bootstrap arguments on W , Z , and \widetilde{W} .

A.5.1 Estimates on the transport term

We first provide estimates on transport terms and their derivatives.

Lemma A.3. *There hold the following estimates for $|G_W|$ and $|G_Z|$:*

$$|G_W^0| \lesssim M^{\frac{4}{3}}e^{-s}, \quad (\text{A.29})$$

$$|G_W| \lesssim \begin{cases} \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}, & |y| \leq L = \tau_0^{-\frac{1}{10}}; \\ M\xi_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}, & y \in \mathcal{X}(s); \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

$$e^{-\frac{s}{2}}G_Z = -4\beta_3\kappa_0 + \mathcal{O}(M^2\tau_0), \quad y \in \mathcal{X}(s); \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Proof. Regarding G_W as a function of y , we obtain

$$|G_W| \leq |G_W^0| + |y||\partial_y G_W| \lesssim M e^{-s} + |y|M e^{-s}.$$

When $|y| \leq L = \tau_0^{-\frac{1}{10}}$, we have the following estimates:

$$|G_W| \leq M e^{-s} + \tau_0^{-\frac{1}{10}}M e^{-s} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{9}{10}s} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}.$$

When $y \in \mathcal{X}(s)$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |G_W| &\leq M e^{-s} + C \left(\frac{3}{2}\xi_0 - \xi \right) e^{\frac{3}{2}s} (M e^{-s}) \leq M e^{-s} + C \left(\frac{\xi_0}{2} + |\xi_0 - \xi| \right) M e^{\frac{s}{2}} \\ &\leq M e^{-s} + C \left(\frac{51\xi_0}{100} \right) M e^{\frac{s}{2}} \lesssim M\xi_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (A.31) then proceeds in a similar manner as that for Proposition 4.1, and we omit the details here. \square

Lemma A.4. *For $1 \leq k \leq 4$, the following estimates on $|\partial_y^k G_W|$ and $|\partial_y^k G_Z|$ hold:*

$$\begin{cases} |\partial_y G_W| \lesssim M e^{-s}, & |\partial_y^2 G_W| \lesssim M^{\frac{4}{3}}e^{-s}, \\ |\partial_y^3 G_W| \lesssim M^6 e^{-s}, & |\partial_y^4 G_W| \lesssim M^7 e^{-s}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

and

$$\begin{cases} |\partial_y G_Z| \lesssim M e^{-s}, & |\partial_y^2 G_Z| \lesssim M^{\frac{4}{3}}e^{-s}, \\ |\partial_y^3 G_Z| \lesssim M^6 e^{-s}, & |\partial_y^4 G_Z| \lesssim M^7 e^{-s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Proof. The estimates follow from the relation $|\partial_y^k G_W| \approx |\partial_y^k G_Z| \approx e^{\frac{s}{2}} |\partial_y^k Z|$ and (BA-Z). \square

A.5.2 Estimates on the derivative of forcing terms

In this section, we will provide estimates on derivatives of forcing terms, namely $\partial_y^k F_W$, $\partial_y^k F_Z$, and $\partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}}$. We start by introducing the estimates of several recurring terms in these three derivatives.

Lemma A.5. *The following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{cases} |e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa| \leq M^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ |\partial_y(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)| \leq e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad |\partial_y^2(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)| \leq e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)| \leq M^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\partial_y^4(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)| \leq M^5e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

$$\begin{cases} (e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)^2 \leq M^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ |\partial_y(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)^2| \leq 2M^{\frac{1}{4}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad |\partial_y^2(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)^2| \leq M^{\frac{1}{3}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)^2| \leq M^{\frac{11}{16}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \quad |\partial_y^4(e^{-\frac{s}{2}}W + \kappa)^2| \leq M^{\frac{19}{16}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

$$\begin{cases} |Z|^2 \lesssim M^{\frac{9}{8}}, \\ |\partial_y Z^2| \lesssim M^{\frac{13}{8}}e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \quad |\partial_y^2 Z^2| \lesssim M^2e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \\ |\partial_y^3 Z^2| \lesssim M^7e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \quad |\partial_y^4 Z^2| \lesssim M^{7+\frac{1}{6}}e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

Proof. These estimates follow directly from (BA-W) and (BA-Z). \square

Then, we prove the estimates for $\partial_y^k F_W$ and $\partial_y^k F_Z$:

Lemma A.6. *The derivatives of forcing terms, namely $\partial_y^k F_W$ and $\partial_y^k F_Z$, obey the bounds below:*

$$\begin{cases} |F_W| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}}e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \\ |\partial_y F_W| \lesssim M^2e^{-2s} + M^{\frac{1}{3}}e^{-s}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad |\partial_y^2 F_W| \lesssim M^{\frac{17}{8}}e^{-2s} + M^{\frac{2}{3}}e^{-s}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 F_W| \lesssim M^3e^{-s}, \quad |\partial_y^4 F_W| \lesssim M^{\frac{19}{16}}e^{-s}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.37})$$

$$\begin{cases} |F_Z| \lesssim M^{\frac{3}{4}}e^{-s}, \\ |\partial_y F_Z| \lesssim M^2e^{-\frac{5s}{2}} + M^{\frac{1}{3}}e^{-\frac{3s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \quad |\partial_y^2 F_Z| \lesssim M^{\frac{17}{8}}e^{-\frac{5s}{2}} + M^{\frac{2}{3}}e^{-\frac{3s}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 F_Z| \lesssim M^3e^{-\frac{3s}{2}}, \quad |\partial_y^4 F_Z| \lesssim M^{\frac{19}{16}}e^{-\frac{3s}{2}}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Proof. Estimates in (A.37) can be deduced from (A.13), (BA-W), and lemma A.5, while estimates in (A.38) follows directly from (A.37) and the relation $F_Z = -e^{-\frac{s}{2}}F_W$. \square

We now proceed to estimates of $|F_{\widetilde{W}}|$, which will be carried out in two regions $\{|y| \leq l\}$ and $\{|y| \leq L\}$ separately. We also present an estimate for $|\partial_y^3 F_{\widetilde{W}}^0|$, which is crucial for closing the bootstrap argument on \widetilde{W} later.

Lemma A.7. *For $1 \leq k \leq 4$, we have for $\partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}}$ that*

$$\begin{cases} |F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + 10M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim 2M^2e^{-s}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{5}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim M^{\frac{9}{4}}e^{-s}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{8}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^3 F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim M^{6+\frac{1}{8}}e^{-s} + \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}}\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{11}{3}}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.39})$$

$$|\partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \lesssim M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\text{A.40})$$

$$|\partial_y^3 F_{\widetilde{W}}^0| \lesssim M^{\frac{13}{2}}e^{-s}. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Proof. Notice that by (A.16), the equation of $\partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}}$ contains $\partial_y^k F_W$, $\partial_y^k \overline{W}$, and $\partial_y G_W$, which are controlled in (A.9), (A.30), (A.32), and (A.37) respectively. With these estimates, (A.39) can be verified. For $1 \leq k \leq 4$ and $|y| < l$, we employ (A.9), (A.30) and (A.32), and (A.37) to get

$$\left| \partial_y^k F_{\widetilde{W}} \right| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq \left(\left| \partial_y^k F_W \right| + \sum_{j=0}^k \left| \binom{k}{j} ((1 - \beta_\tau) \partial_y^{k-j} \overline{W} - \partial_y^{k-j} G_W) \partial_y^{j+1} \overline{W} \right| \right) \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \lesssim 2M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where the last inequality holds because all terms decay with respect to s for y being small. For the last inequality (A.41), it follows from (A.29), (A.33), and (BA-M) that

$$\left| \partial_y^3 F_{\widetilde{W}}^0 \right| \lesssim \left| \partial_y^3 F_W^0 \right| + \left| \partial_y^3 G_W^0 \right| + 9 \left| \partial_y^3 G_W^0 \right| + 18 \left| G_W^0 \right| + 12\beta_\tau |\partial_t \tau| \lesssim M^{\frac{13}{2}} e^{-s}.$$

□

A.5.3 Estimates on forcing terms

In this section, we estimate the forcing terms in the evolution equations of self-similar Riemann invariants.

Lemma A.8. *For $0 \leq k \leq 4$, we have estimates for $|F_W^{(k)}|$ in the following sense:*

$$\begin{cases} |F_W| \leq M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-\frac{s}{2}}, \\ |F_W^{(1)}| \lesssim M^{2+\frac{1}{8}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |F_W^{(3)}| \lesssim M^{6+\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} + M^{\frac{5}{12}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}}, \end{cases} \begin{cases} |F_W^{(2)}| \lesssim M^2 e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |F_W^{(4)}| \lesssim M^{7+\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} + M^{\frac{5}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.42})$$

Proof. From the expression of $F_W^{(k)}$ in (A.12), we observe that $F_W^{(k)}$ only depends on $\partial_y^k F_W$, $\partial_y^k G_W$, and $\partial_y^k W$, which are controlled in (A.37), (A.29) and (A.32), and (BA-W). The estimates in (A.42) follow then. □

Lemma A.9. *For $0 \leq k \leq 4$, the following estimates for $|F_Z^{(k)}|$ hold:*

$$\begin{cases} |F_Z| \leq M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-s}, \\ |F_Z^{(1)}| \lesssim M^2 e^{-\frac{5}{2}s} + M^{\frac{1}{3}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |F_Z^{(3)}| \lesssim M^{\frac{7}{2}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s}, \end{cases} \begin{cases} |F_Z^{(2)}| \lesssim M^{\frac{11}{4}} e^{-\frac{5}{2}s} + M^{\frac{5}{4}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |F_Z^{(4)}| \lesssim M^2 e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} + M^{6+\frac{1}{5}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} e^{-\frac{3s}{2}}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

Proof. From (A.12), the expression of $F_Z^{(k)}$ only involves $\partial_y^k F_Z$, $\partial_y^k G_Z$, $\partial_y^k W$, and $\partial_y^k Z$, whose estimates have been obtained in (A.38), (A.31) and (A.33), (BA-W), and (BA-Z). This then leads to the desired estimates. □

Lemma A.10. *There holds for $|F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(k)}|$ that:*

$$\begin{cases} |F_{\widetilde{W}}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim M e^{-\frac{s}{2}} + 10M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(1)}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim M^{\frac{9}{4}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{7}{24}} + M e^{-s} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(2)}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \lesssim \tau_0^{\frac{9}{40}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{7}{3}} + M^{\frac{5}{2}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + M^{\frac{1}{6}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}}, \\ |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(4)}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \lesssim M^2 l \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Proof. Invoking (BA- \widetilde{W}), (BA-W), (A.9), (A.29), (A.32), and (A.39) into the expression of $F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(k)}$ in (A.16), we obtain the above estimates of $|F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(k)}|$. □

A.6 Estimates on Lagrangian Trajectory

In this section, we define the Lagrangian trajectories Φ_W and Φ_Z , and establish their lower bound estimates. We also compute the boundary values of higher-order derivatives of W .

A.6.1 Lagrangian trajectories

We first define Lagrangian trajectories. For a general transport equation

$$\partial_s R + D_R R + \mathcal{V}_R \partial_y R = F_R, \quad (\text{A.45})$$

with R depending on s , y , and D_R , \mathcal{V}_R depending on s , y , and lower order terms, given an initial point y_0 and an initial time $s_1 \geq s_0$, we can define the Lagrangian trajectory $\Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0)$ by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0) = \mathcal{V}_R(s, \Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0)), \\ \Phi_R(s_1; s_1, y_0) = y_0. \end{cases}$$

Then, the solution to (A.45) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R \circ \Phi_R(s; s_1, y_0) = & R(s_1, y_0) \exp \left(- \int_{s_1}^s D_R(s', \Phi_R(s'; s_1, y_0)) ds' \right) \\ & + \int_{s_1}^s F_R(s', \Phi_R(s'; s_1, y_0)) \exp \left(- \int_{s'}^s D_R(s'', \Phi_R(s''; s_1, y_0)) ds'' \right) ds'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

A.6.2 Lower bound of Φ_W

Recall that $\mathcal{V}_W = \frac{3}{2}y + g_W$ in (A.45). We now state a lower bound estimate for $\Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)$ (Lemma A.11), in the region $|y_0| \geq l$, together with its corollary (Lemma A.12). These propositions will be used to improve the bootstrap assumptions on W and \tilde{W} later. Since the arguments are analogous to those in Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, we omit the details and refer the reader to the proofs given there.

Lemma A.11. *If $|y_0| \geq l$ and $s_0 \geq -\ln \epsilon$, then we have for all $s \geq s_0$ that*

$$|\Phi_W(s; s_1, y_0)| \geq |y_0| e^{\frac{s-s_1}{3}}. \quad (\text{A.47})$$

Lemma A.12. *For any $p \in (\frac{1}{10}, 10)$, $s_1 > s_0$, and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\int_{s_1}^s \langle y \rangle^{-p} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \leq \begin{cases} -4 \ln l, & |y_0| \geq l, \\ \tau_0^{\frac{p}{11}}, & |y_0| \geq L. \end{cases}$$

A.6.3 Lower bound of Φ_Z

In this section, we derive a lower bound for Φ_Z , where \mathcal{V}_Z is $\frac{3}{2}y + g_Z$. The derivation is based on Lemma 8.3 in [18], and we reproduce it here for completeness.

Proposition A.13 ([18], Lemma 8.3). *If $\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \leq \beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}$, then it holds that $\frac{d}{ds} \Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}$.*

Proof. By (A.18) and (A.31), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) &= \frac{3}{2}\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) + \beta_2\beta_\tau W \circ \Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) + G_Z \circ \Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\beta_3\kappa_0 + \beta_2\xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} - 4\beta_3\kappa_0 + O(\tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}})\right)e^{\frac{s}{2}} \leq -\frac{1}{2}\beta_3\kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

This leads us to the desired conclusion. \square

Proposition A.14 ([18], Lemma 8.3). *For all $y_0 \in \mathcal{X}_0$ and $s_1 \geq s_0$, there exists $s_*(s_1, y_1) \geq s_0$ such that*

$$|\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0)| \geq \beta_3\kappa_0 \min\left(\left|e^{\frac{s}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}\right|, e^{\frac{s}{2}}\right). \quad (\text{A.48})$$

Proof. We first notice that if $\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \leq 0$ for all $s \in [s_0, \infty)$, then Proposition A.13 suggests that

$$\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \leq \Phi_Z(s_1; s_1, y_0) - \frac{1}{2}\beta_3\kappa_0 \int_{s_1}^s e^{\frac{s'}{2}} ds' \leq -\beta_3\kappa_0 \left(e^{\frac{s}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_1}{2}}\right), \quad (\text{A.49})$$

which yields the desired result by taking $s_* = s_1$. Therefore, we can assume $\Phi_Z^{y_0}(s) > 0$ for certain $s \in [s_0, \infty)$.

Consider the set

$$S_Z^{y_0} := \{s \in [s_0, \infty) : \Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) < \beta_3\kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}\}.$$

If $S_Z^{y_0}$ is empty, then (A.48) holds trivially. Thus, we can assume $S_Z^{y_0}$ is nonempty.

Since $S_Z^{y_0}$ is nonempty and bounded below, the quantity $\bar{s} := \inf S_Z^{y_0}$ is well defined. We then have:

1. $0 < \Phi_Z(\bar{s}; s_1, y_0) \leq \beta_3\kappa_0 e^{\frac{\bar{s}}{2}}$ by continuity of Φ_Z and the assumption that Φ_Z is not always non-positive.
2. $\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) > \beta_3\kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}$ for all $s \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$.
3. $\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) < \beta_3\kappa_0 e^{\frac{s}{2}}$ and $\frac{d}{ds}\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) \leq 0$ for all $s \in (\bar{s}, \infty)$ by Proposition A.13.

We note that the interval $[s_0, \bar{s}]$ might be empty. From 1 and 3, by continuity of $\Phi_Z^{y_0}(s)$, there exists a unique $s_* > \bar{s}$ such that $\Phi_Z^{y_0}(s_*) = 0$. Consequently, in view of Proposition A.13, we obtain for $s > s_*$ that

$$\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) = \Phi_Z(s_*; s_1, y_0) + \int_{s_*}^s \Phi_Z(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \leq -\beta_3\kappa_0 \left(e^{\frac{s}{2}} - e^{\frac{s_*}{2}}\right),$$

and for $\bar{s} \leq s < s_*$,

$$\Phi_Z(s; s_1, y_0) = \Phi_Z(s_*; s_1, y_0) - \int_s^{s_*} \frac{d}{ds}\Phi_Z(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \leq -\beta_3\kappa_0 \left(e^{\frac{s_*}{2}} - e^{\frac{s}{2}}\right).$$

We therefore conclude the estimate (A.48). \square

The above proposition results in the following estimate for the integral of $\langle y \rangle^{-p}$ along Φ_Z , which plays a crucial role in improving the bootstrap assumptions on Z . As the proof closely follows that of Lemma 4.5, we omit it here for brevity.

Lemma A.15. *For any $p > \frac{1}{10}$, $s_1 \geq s_0$, and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{-p} \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \lesssim_p 1. \quad (\text{A.50})$$

A.7 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on W and \widetilde{W}

In this section, we provide improved bootstrap estimates for W , \widetilde{W} , and their derivatives. Since the transport terms in the equation for W coincide with those in the equation for \widetilde{W} , one can verify that $\Phi_W = \Phi_{\widetilde{W}}$. For notational convenience, we will therefore use Φ_W only.

A.7.1 Estimates of $|\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0|$

We first improve the bootstrap assumption on $|\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0|$.

Lemma A.16. *There holds the following inequality:*

$$|\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0| \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{3}{5}}.$$

Proof. We first derive a “good” equation satisfied by $\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}$. By directly computing (A.15, $k = 3$) at $y = 0$, we get

$$\partial_s \partial_y^3 W^0 = \partial_s \partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0 = \partial_y^3 F_W^0 + \partial_y^3 G_W^0 - G_W^0 \partial_y^4 W^0 - 3 \partial_y G_W^0 \partial_y^3 W^0 - 4(1 - \beta_\tau) \partial_y^3 W^0, \quad (\text{A.51})$$

which, by (BA- W), (A.29), (A.32), and (A.37), implies

$$|\partial_s \partial_y^3 W^0| \leq \frac{1}{100} M^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-s} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}} + M^3 e^{-s} + M^6 e^{-s} + 3M^2 M^5 e^{-s} + 4\beta_\tau |\partial_t \tau| \partial_y^3 W^0 \lesssim M^{7+\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s}.$$

Hence, we can conclude that

$$|\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0(s)| \lesssim |\partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0(s_0)| + C \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} |\partial_s \partial_y^3 W^0(s')| \, ds' \leq \frac{1}{10} \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}} + C M^{\frac{29}{4}} \tau_0 \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}},$$

where the last inequality holds for a sufficiently small τ_0 . \square

A.7.2 Estimates of $\partial_y^k \widetilde{W} \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l}$

We proceed to establish the improved bootstrap bounds for $\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}$ in the region $\{|y| \leq l\}$.

Lemma A.17. *For $0 \leq k \leq 4$, the following estimate holds:*

$$|\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |y|^{4-k} + \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}} |y|^{3-k} \mathbb{1}_{k \leq 3}.$$

Proof. When $k = 4$, by setting $D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(4)} := \frac{11}{2} + \beta_\tau (\partial_y \widetilde{W} + 4\partial_y W)$, we obtain

$$D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(4)} \geq \frac{11}{2} - \beta_\tau \left(5 + 4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{3}.$$

Hence, from (A.46), by setting $R = \partial_y^4 \widetilde{W}$, we derive

$$|\partial_y^4 \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq |\partial_y^4 \widetilde{W}(y_0, s_0)| e^{-\int_{s_0}^s \frac{1}{3} \, ds'} + e^{-\int_{s_0}^s \frac{1}{3} \, ds'} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\int_{s'}^s \frac{1}{3} \, ds''} |F_{\widetilde{W}}^{(4)}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \circ \Phi_W^{y_0}(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds'$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \left| \partial_y^4 \widetilde{W}(s_0, y_0) \right| e^{-\frac{s-s_0}{3}} + e^{-\frac{s-s_0}{3}} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\frac{s'-s_0}{3}} \left(M^2 l \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) ds' \\
&\leq \frac{1}{10} M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + 100 M^2 l \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the case of $k = 3$, it follows that

$$\left| \partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}(s, y) \right| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq \left| \partial_y^3 \widetilde{W}^0(s) \right| + \left\| \partial_y^4 \widetilde{W} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} |y| \leq \tau_0^{\frac{4}{5}} + M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |y| < 10 M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |y| + \tau_0^{\frac{3}{5}}.$$

The case of $0 \leq k \leq 2$ follows recursively by employing

$$\left| \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(s, y) \right| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} \leq \left| \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(0, s) \right| + \left\| \partial_y^{k+1} \widetilde{W} \right\|_{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l} |y|,$$

together with the fact that $\partial_y^k W(0, s) = \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(0, s)$, i.e., $\left| \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}(0, s) \right| = 0$, for $0 \leq k \leq 2$. \square

A.7.3 $\langle y \rangle^{\mu}$ -weighted estimates

In this section, we derive weighted estimates for W and \widetilde{W} . Notice that the equations of $R \in \{\partial_y^k W, \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}\}$ take the form of

$$\partial_s R + D_R R + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) \partial_y R = F_R.$$

Defining $q := \langle y \rangle^{\mu} R$ with μ being a constant, we have

$$\partial_s q + D_R q + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) \partial_y q - \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) (\partial_y \langle y \rangle^{\mu}) R = \langle y \rangle^{\mu} F_R.$$

Namely, q satisfies the system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s q + D_q q + \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) \partial_y q = F_q, \\ D_q = D_R - \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) (\partial_y \langle y \rangle^{\mu}) \langle y \rangle^{-\mu}, \\ F_q = \langle y \rangle^{\mu} F_R. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.52})$$

We start by controlling the transport term D_R .

Lemma A.18. *The transport term D_q satisfies the following estimate:*

$$D_q \geq D_R - \frac{3}{2} \mu - 6 |\mu| \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Via direct computation, one can rewrite D_q as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_q &= D_R - \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) (\partial_y \ln(\langle y \rangle^{\mu})) = D_R - \mu \left(\frac{3}{2} y + g_W \right) \left(\frac{y}{1+y^2} \right) \\
&= D_R - \frac{3}{2} \mu - \mu g_W y \langle y \rangle^{-2} + \frac{3}{2} \mu \langle y \rangle^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate $D_\eta := y\langle y \rangle^{-2}g_W$. Using (BA-W), (A.29), and (A.32), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |D_\eta| &\leq |y|\langle y \rangle^{-2} (\beta_\tau|W| + |G_W^0| + |\partial_y G_W| |y|) \\ &\leq |y|\langle y \rangle^{-2} \left(\beta_\tau \left(1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}} \right) \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^{\frac{3}{2}}e^{-s} + M e^{-s} |y| \right) \leq 4\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired inequality as $\langle y \rangle^{-2}$ decays faster than $\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. \square

This immediately implies the following estimate for q :

Corollary A.19. *The quantity q is bounded from above as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} |q(s, y)| &\leq |q(s_1, y_0)| \exp \left(- \int_{s_1}^s \left(D_R - \frac{3}{2}\mu - 6|\mu|\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \right) \\ &\quad + \int_{s_1}^s [\langle y \rangle^\mu F_R \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)] \exp \left(- \int_{s'}^s \left(D_R - \frac{3}{2}\mu - 6|\mu|\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) \, ds'' \right) \, ds'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.53})$$

Proof. One can verify that $\Phi_q = \Phi_W$. The corollary then follows from Lemma A.18 and (A.46) for $R = q$. \square

In the following sections, we will make use of this corollary to derive weighted estimates for $R \in \{\partial_y^k W, \partial_y^k \widetilde{W}\}$ in the regions $\{l \leq |y| \leq L\}$ and $\{|y| \geq L\}$. For the region $\{l \leq |y| \leq L\}$, in view of the trajectory estimates in Lemma A.12, if we start from a point (s, y) and trace the flow backwards in time, there are two possible scenarios. First, the trajectory may reach (s_0, y_0) with $|y_0| > l$. Second, before the time reaches s_0 , the trajectory may intersect the boundary $|y_0| = l$. Consequently, when performing estimates in the region $\{l \leq |y| \leq L\}$, we assume either $s_1 = s_0$ or $|y_0| = l$. Similarly, when estimating in the region $\{|y| \geq L\}$, we assume either $s_1 = s_0$ or $|y_0| = L$.

A.7.4 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on $|\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L}$

Since we have improved the bootstrap assumptions on $|\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq l}$, we only consider the region $\{l \leq |y| \leq L\}$.

Lemma A.20. *For $|y_0| \geq l$, it holds that:*

$$\begin{cases} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} < \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} < \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}, \\ \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} < \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. When $k = 0$, $D_R = -\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\tau \partial_y \overline{W}$. Let $q = \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L}$. Employing (A.9), (A.44), Lemma A.12, and Corollary A.19 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\widetilde{W}(s, y)| \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq L} \\ &\leq \langle y_0 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} \left| \widetilde{W}(s_1, y_0) \right| \exp \left(-\beta_\tau \int_{s_1}^s \partial_y \overline{W} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' + 2 \int_{s_1}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \right) \\ &\quad + \int_{s_1}^s [\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} F_{\widetilde{W}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0)] \exp \left(-\beta_\tau \int_{s'}^s \partial_y \overline{W} \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) \, ds'' + 2 \int_{s'}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) \, ds'' \right) \, ds' \\ &\stackrel{|y_0| \geq l}{\leq} l^{-16} M^2 \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + l^{-100} M \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

When $k = 1$, D_R is given by $D_{\widetilde{W}}^{(1)} = 1 + \beta_\tau(\partial_y \overline{W} + \partial_y W)$. Then, for $q = \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y \widetilde{W}(s, y)|$, using (A.9), (A.44), (BA- W), Corollary A.19, and Lemma A.12, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y \widetilde{W}(s, y)| &\leq l^{-4} \langle y_0 \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} \left| \partial_y \widetilde{W}(s_1, y_0) \right| \exp \left(3\beta\tau \int_{s_1}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \right) \\ &\quad + l^{-8} \int_{s_1}^s \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(M^{\frac{9}{4}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \tau_0^{\frac{7}{24}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}} + M\tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\leq 2l^{-8} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + l^{-8} \left(M^{\frac{9}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \xi_0^{\frac{2}{5}} l^{-4} + \tau_0^{\frac{7}{24}} l^{-4} + M\tau_0^{\frac{5}{4}} \right) < \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, we derive for $k = 2$ and $q = \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}|$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y^2 \widetilde{W}| &\leq l^{-8} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} + l^{-8} \int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(M^{\frac{5}{2}} e^{-s} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \tau^{\frac{9}{40}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{7}{3}} + M^{\frac{1}{6}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}} \right) \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\leq l^{-8} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} + l^{-8} \left(M^{\frac{5}{2}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \xi_0^{\frac{2}{9}} l^{-4} + \tau_0^{\frac{9}{40}} l^{-4} + M^{\frac{1}{6}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} l^{-4} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{5}}. \end{aligned}$$

We hence conclude the estimates stated in the lemma. \square

A.7.5 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on W

To close the bootstrap argument on W , we investigate the estimates of $\partial_y^k W$, $0 \leq k \leq 4$, on three regions: $\{|y| < l\}$, $\{l \leq |y| < L\}$, and $\{|y| \geq L\}$:

1. In the region $\{|y| < l\}$, since $W = \widetilde{W} + \overline{W}$, we can directly close the bootstrap argument by combining the estimates of $|\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}| \mathbb{1}_{|y| < l}$ and the estimates of $|\partial_y^k \overline{W}|$.
2. In the region $\{l \leq |y| < L\}$, the bootstrap assumptions of $\partial_y^k W$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ can be directly improved by using the bootstrap assumptions on $\partial_y^k \widetilde{W}$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and (A.9).

Hence, it remains to address the bootstrap assumptions of $\partial_y^k W$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ on $\{|y| \geq L\}$ and the bootstrap assumptions of $\partial_y^k W$, $k \in \{3, 4\}$ on $\{|y| \geq l\}$.

Lemma A.21. *For $\partial_y^k W$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ on $\{|y| \geq L\}$, we have the following estimates:*

$$\begin{cases} |W| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}) \langle y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y W| \leq 13 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \\ |\partial_y^2 W| \leq M^{\frac{1}{8}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the case of $k = 0$, D_W is given by $D_W = -\frac{1}{2}$. Hence, by setting $q = \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |W(s, y)|$, and combining (A.42), Lemma A.12, and Corollary A.19, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |W(s, y)| &\stackrel{|y_0| \geq L}{\leq} e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |W(s_1, y_0)| + e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \int_{s_1}^s \left| \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} F_W \right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\leq e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} |W(s_1, y_0)| + e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \int_{s_1}^s \xi_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \, ds' \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \left(1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}\right) + e^{2\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} M^{\frac{3}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \xi_0^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{1}{66}}} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}.$$

For $k = 1$, we take $q = \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y W|$, and $D_W^{(1)} = 1 + \beta_\tau \partial_y W$. Hence, with a similar approach, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |q(s, y)| &\leq e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y W(s_1, y_0)| \exp\left(\beta_\tau \int_{s_1}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds'\right) \\ &\quad + e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \int_{s_1}^s \exp\left(\beta_\tau \int_{s'}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) ds''\right) \left|\langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} F_W^{(1)}\right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\leq 12e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{2}{34}}} + e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{1}{34}}} M^{\frac{17}{8}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \int_{s_1}^s \xi_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' < 13. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 2$ and $q = \langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y^2 W|$, direct computation yields $D_W - \frac{3}{2}\mu = 3\beta_\tau \partial_y W + \frac{3}{2}$ and

$$D_q \geq \frac{3}{2} + 3\beta_\tau \partial_y W - 10\langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Utilizing (BA-W), (A.42), Lemma A.12, and Corollary A.19 then leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |q(s, y)| &\leq e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} |\partial_y^2 W(s_1, y_0)| \exp\left(3\beta_\tau \int_{s_1}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds'\right) e^{-\frac{3}{2}(s-s_0)} \\ &\quad + e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \int_{s_1}^s \exp\left(3\beta_\tau \int_{s'}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) ds'\right) \left|\langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} F_W^{(2)}\right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\leq e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{10}} \langle y_0 \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{2}{34}}} + e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{2}{34}}} \int_{s_1}^s \left|\langle y \rangle^{\frac{2}{3}} M^2 \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} e^{-s'}\right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{9}} + M^2 e^{4\tau_0^{\frac{1}{22}}} e^{\tau_0^{\frac{2}{34}}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \int_{s_1}^s \xi_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \leq M^{\frac{1}{8}}. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore conclude our proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma A.22. For $\partial_y^k W$, $k \in \{3, 4\}$ on $\{|y| \geq l\}$, we have the following estimates:

$$|\partial_y^3 W| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\partial_y^4 W| \leq \frac{1}{2} M.$$

Proof. For the case of $k = 3$, we define $q = |\partial_y^3 W(s, y)|$. By (BA-W), (A.42), Lemma A.12, and Corollary A.19, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_y^3 W(s, y)| &\stackrel{|y_0| \geq l}{\leq} |\partial_y^3 W(s_1, y_0)| \exp^{-4(s-s_1)} \exp\left(4\beta_\tau \int_{s_1}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds'\right) \\ &\quad + \int_{s_1}^s e^{-4(s-s')} \left|F_W^{(3)}\right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) \exp\left(4\beta_\tau \int_{s'}^s |\partial_y W| \circ \Phi_W(s''; s_1, y_0) ds''\right) ds' \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} M^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^4 + 2^4 \int_{s_1}^s \left|M^{\frac{25}{4}} e^{-s'} + M^{\frac{5}{12}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}}\right| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} M^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^4 + 16M^{\frac{25}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}} \int_{s_1}^s \xi_0^{\frac{1}{6}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' + 16M^{\frac{5}{12}} \int_{s_1}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{4}{3}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{3}{8}M^{\frac{1}{3}} + 16M^{\frac{25}{4}}\tau_0^{\frac{1}{4}}l^{-4} + 16M^{\frac{5}{12}}l^{-4} \leq \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similarly, for the case of $k = 4$, we define $q = |\partial_y^4 W(s, y)|$. Direct computation gives

$$D_W^{(4)} \geq \frac{11}{2} - 5(1 + 4M\tau_0) \left(1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}\right) > \frac{1}{3}.$$

Then, using (BA-W), (A.42), Corollary A.19, and Lemma A.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_y^4 W(s, y)| &\stackrel{|y_0| \geq l}{\leq} |\partial_y^4 W(s_1, y_0)| e^{-\frac{s-s_1}{3}} + \int_{s_1}^s e^{-\frac{s-s'}{3}} |F_W^{(4)}| \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\leq |\partial_y^4 W(s_1, y_0)| e^{-\frac{s-s_1}{3}} + e^{-\frac{s}{3}} M^{\frac{29}{4}} \int_{s_1}^s e^{-\frac{2s'}{3}} ds' + e^{-\frac{s}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{6}} \int_{s_1}^s e^{\frac{s'}{3}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \circ \Phi_W(s'; s_1, y_0) ds' \\ &\leq |\partial_y^4 W(s_1, y_0)| e^{-\frac{s-s_1}{3}} + \tau_0 M^{\frac{29}{4}} \xi_0^{\frac{4}{9}} l^{-4} + e^{-\frac{s}{3}} M^{\frac{5}{6}} 2^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_{s_1}^s l^{-\frac{1}{3}} e^{-\frac{2}{9}(s'-s_1) + \frac{s'}{3}} ds' \leq \frac{1}{2}M. \end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof of the lemma. \square

A.8 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on Z

In this section, we improve the bootstrap assumptions posed on Z and its higher-order derivatives.

A.8.1 Decay estimates for $\partial_y^k Z$

Lemma A.23. *For $1 \leq k \leq 4$, the following decay estimates on $\partial_y^k Z$ hold:*

$$\left| e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^k Z(s, y) \right| \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)(s-s_0)} e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} \left| \partial_y^k Z(s_0, y_0) \right| + e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\frac{3}{2}ks'} |F_Z^{(k)}(s')| \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) ds'. \quad (\text{A.54})$$

Proof. We define $q = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^k Z$ for $0 \leq k \leq 4$. It can be verified that q satisfies the system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s q + D_q q + \left(\frac{3}{2} + g_Z\right) \partial_y q = F_q, \\ F_q = e^{\frac{3}{2}s} F_Z, \\ D_q = D_Z - \frac{3}{2} = \frac{3}{2}(k-1) + k\beta_2\beta_\tau \partial_y W. \end{cases}$$

In terms of the equation of D_q , via direct computation and using (BA-W), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(-\int_{s'}^s D_q \circ \Phi_Z(s''; s_0, y_0) ds''\right) &= e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)(s-s')} \exp\left(-k\beta_2\beta_\tau \int_{s'}^s \partial_y W \circ \Phi_Z(s''; s_0, y_0) ds''\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)(s-s')} \exp\left(2(k+1) \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) ds'\right) \\ &= e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)(s-s')} \exp\left(2(k+1) \int_{s_0}^{+\infty} (1 + |\Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0)|^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} ds'\right) \\ &\leq C_k e^{-\frac{3}{2}(k-1)(s-s')}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_k is a constant only depending on k . The last inequality holds because of (A.50). Combining this with the general solution (A.46), we conclude the desired inequality. \square

A.8.2 Improvement of bootstrap assumptions on Z

We first close the bootstrap argument on Z . When $k = 0$, we put $\mu = 0$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} |(Z + \sigma_\infty)(s, y)| &\leq |(Z + \sigma_\infty)(y_0, s_0)| + C \int_{s_0}^s M^{\frac{3}{4}} e^{-s'} \, ds' \\ &\stackrel{(IB0-Z)}{\leq} \frac{1}{4} M \tau_0 + M^{\frac{3}{4}} \tau_0 \leq \frac{1}{2} M \tau_0. \end{aligned}$$

The improved bootstrap estimates for the remaining cases are stated in the following lemma.

Lemma A.24. *For $1 \leq k \leq 4$, we have the following estimates on $|e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^k Z|$:*

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y Z(s, y)| &\leq \frac{1}{2} M, \quad |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^2 Z(s, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{4}{3}}, \\ |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^3 Z(s, y)| &\leq \frac{1}{2} M^4, \quad |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^4 Z(s, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^4. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. All estimates follow directly from Lemma A.23 and the forcing estimates (A.43). In particular, when $k = 1$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y Z(s, y)| &\lesssim e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} |\partial_y Z(s_0, y_0)| + \int_{s_0}^{s_0} e^{\frac{3}{2}s'} |F_Z^{(1)}(s')| \circ \Phi_Z^{y_0}(s') \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \circ \Phi_Z^{y_0}(s') \, ds' + M^2 \int_{s_0}^s e^{-s} \circ \Phi_Z^{y_0}(s') \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^2 \xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} \circ \Phi_Z^{y_0}(s') \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}} + M^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^2 \xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M. \end{aligned}$$

When $k = 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{\frac{3}{2}} \partial_y^2 Z(s, y)| &\lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{2}(s-s_0)} e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} |\partial_y^2 Z(s_0, y_0)| + e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{3s'} |F_Z^{(2)}(s')| \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{2}{3}} + M^{\frac{11}{4}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s} e^{3s-2s} \xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds' + M^{\frac{5}{4}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s+3s-\frac{3}{2}s} \int_{s_0}^s \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^{\frac{11}{4}} \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi_0^{\frac{1}{3}} + M^{\frac{5}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{\frac{4}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case of $k = 3$, one can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^3 Z(s, y)| &\lesssim e^{-3(s-s_0)} e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} |\partial_y^3 Z(s_0, y_0)| + e^{-3s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\frac{9}{2}s'} |F_Z^{(3)}(s')| \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^3 + e^{-3s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{\frac{9}{2}s'} |M^{\frac{7}{2}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}s'}| \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds' \\ &\lesssim M^3 + e^{-3s} M^{\frac{7}{2}} (e^{3s} - e^{-3s_0}) < M^3 + M^{\frac{7}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} M^4. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $k = 4$, the following estimate can be derived:

$$|e^{\frac{3}{2}s} \partial_y^4 Z(s, y)| \lesssim e^{-\frac{9}{2}(s-s_0)} e^{\frac{3}{2}s_0} |\partial_y^4 Z(s_0, y_0)| + e^{-\frac{9}{2}s} \int_{s_0}^s e^{12s} |F_Z^4(s')| \circ \Phi_Z(s'; s_0, y_0) \, ds'$$

$$\lesssim M^3 + e^{-\frac{9}{2}s} \left(e^{\frac{9}{2}s} - e^{\frac{9}{2}s_0} \right) M^2 \lesssim M^3 + M^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} M^4.$$

We therefore finish the proof of the lemma. \square

A.9 Proof of the main theorem

In this section, we prove Theorem A.2. To show that the blow-up must happen in finite time, we use bootstrap assumptions on τ . To demonstrate that \tilde{v}_θ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ remain bounded, it suffices to verify that W stays bounded near the origin ($\tilde{\theta} = 0$).

A.9.1 Blow-up speed estimate

Building upon the bootstrap assumptions on modulation variables (BA-M), we know that $|1 - \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau|$ is bounded. Hence, from the equation $\tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t} = \int_{\tilde{t}}^{\tilde{T}^*} (1 - \partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau(t')) dt'$, we can conclude that

$$c(\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}) \leq \tau(\tilde{t}) - \tilde{t} = e^{-s} \leq C(\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}).$$

$$W(s, y) := e^{\frac{s}{2}} (\tilde{w}(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{t}) - \kappa(\tilde{t})), \quad Z(s, y) := \tilde{z}(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{t})$$

Using (BA-W), (BA-Z), and the definition of y , we get

$$|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{w}| = e^s |\partial_y W| \leq (1 + \tau_0^{\frac{1}{23}}) \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} e^s \leq C_1 e^s, \quad |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{z}| \leq e^{\frac{3s}{2}} |\partial_y Z| \leq M,$$

which then implies that

$$\frac{C_2}{\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}} \leq |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{w}| - |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{z}| \leq |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}R| \leq |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{w}| + |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{z}| \leq \frac{C_3}{\tilde{T}^* - \tilde{t}},$$

where $R \in \{\tilde{v}_\theta, \tilde{\sigma}\}$. Here, we use the fact that $|\partial_y W| \leq 2$.

A.9.2 Blow-up location estimate

The limit ξ_* exists since by (BA-M), $|\partial_{\tilde{t}}\xi|$ is bounded. To prove (A.21), we first notice that close to $\theta = \xi(\tilde{t})$, we have for $|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{v}_\theta|$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{v}_\theta| &\lesssim \frac{1}{2} \|e^s \partial_y W\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta^c(\xi(t)))} + \frac{1}{2} \|e^{\frac{3}{2}} \partial_y Z\|_{L^\infty(B_\delta^c(\xi(t)))} \\ &\leq e^s \left\| \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\{|y| \geq e^{\frac{3s}{2}} \delta\})} + \frac{1}{4} M \leq \frac{1}{4} M + \delta^{-\frac{2}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\delta \in (0, 1)$. The bound for $|\partial_{\tilde{\theta}}\tilde{\sigma}|$ can be derived similarly.

A.9.3 Blow-up time estimate

To establish the blow-up time estimate, since $\tilde{T}^* = \tau(\tilde{T}^*)$, we have

$$|\tau_0 - \tilde{T}^*| = |\tau_0 - \tau(\tilde{T}^*)| = \int_0^{\tilde{T}^*} |\partial_{\tilde{t}}\tau| ds \leq \int_0^{\tilde{T}^*} 2M\tau_0 ds \leq 2M\tau_0^2.$$

A.9.4 Proof of 1/3-Hölder continuity

We first show that $\tilde{w} \in C_{\tilde{\theta}}^{1/3}$. Via direct calculation, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ (which makes sense as we can assume \tilde{w} and \tilde{z} to be 2π -periodic in θ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\tilde{w}(\tilde{t}, x_1) - \tilde{w}(\tilde{t}, x_2)|}{|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{1}{3}}} &= e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \frac{|W(s, (x_1 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}) - W(s, (x_2 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s})|}{|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{1}{3}}} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_{(x_1 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}}^{(x_2 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}} |\partial_y W(s, y)| dy \\ &\lesssim e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_0^{|x_1 - x_2| e^{\frac{3}{2}s}} |y|^{-\frac{2}{3}} dy \\ &\lesssim e^{-\frac{s}{2}} |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} (|x_1 - x_2| e^{\frac{3s}{2}})^{-\frac{1}{3}} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can conclude that $\tilde{z} \in C_{\tilde{\theta}}^{1/3}$ as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\tilde{z}(\tilde{t}, x_1) - \tilde{z}(\tilde{t}, x_2)|}{|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{1}{3}}} &= \frac{|Z(s, (x_1 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}) - Z(s, (x_2 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s})|}{|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{1}{3}}} \\ &\leq |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_{(x_1 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}}^{(x_2 - \xi) e^{\frac{3}{2}s}} |\partial_y Z(s, y)| dy \\ &\lesssim |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_0^{|x_1 - x_2| e^{\frac{3}{2}s}} M e^{-\frac{3s}{2}} dy \\ &\lesssim |x_1 - x_2|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_0^{|x_1 - x_2| e^{\frac{3}{2}s}} M e^{-\frac{s}{2}} \xi_0^{\frac{3}{2}} \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} dy \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since \tilde{v}_θ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are linear combinations of two $C_{\tilde{\theta}}^{1/3}$ functions, it follows that they also belong to $C_{\tilde{\theta}}^{1/3}$.

References

- [1] Leonardo Abbrescia and Jared Speck. The emergence of the singular boundary from the crease in 3D compressible Euler flow, 2022. arXiv:2207.07107.
- [2] Leonardo Abbrescia and Jared Speck. The relativistic Euler equations: ESI notes on their geo-analytic structures and implications for shocks in 1D and multi-dimensions. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 40(24):Paper No. 243001, 79, 2023.
- [3] Leonardo Abbrescia and Jared Speck. Remarkable localized integral identities for 3D compressible Euler flow and the double-null framework. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 249(1):Paper No. 10, 137, 2025.
- [4] Serge Alinhac. Blowup of small data solutions for a class of quasilinear wave equations in two space dimensions. II. *Acta Math.*, 182(1):1–23, 1999.

- [5] Serge Alinhac. Blowup of small data solutions for a quasilinear wave equation in two space dimensions. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 149(1):97–127, 1999.
- [6] Xinliang An, Haoyang Chen, and Silu Yin. Low regularity ill-posedness and shock formation for 3D ideal compressible MHD, 2021. arXiv:2110.10647 (to appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.).
- [7] Xinliang An, Haoyang Chen, and Silu Yin. The Cauchy problems for the 2D compressible Euler equations and ideal MHD system are ill-posed in $H^{7/4}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, 2022. arXiv:2206.14003.
- [8] Xinliang An, Haoyang Chen, and Silu Yin. Low regularity ill-posedness for non-strictly hyperbolic systems in three dimensions. *J. Math. Phys.*, 63(5):Paper No. 051503, 16, 2022.
- [9] Xinliang An, Haoyang Chen, and Silu Yin. Low regularity ill-posedness for elastic waves driven by shock formation. *Amer. J. Math.*, 145(4):1111–1181, 2023.
- [10] Xinliang An, Haoyang Chen, and Silu Yin. $H^{\frac{11}{4}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ ill-posedness for 2D elastic wave system. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 20(4):1859–1894, 2024.
- [11] Vladimir I. Arnold. Sur la géométrie différentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infinie et ses applications à l’hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 16:319–361, 1966.
- [12] Vladimir I. Arnold and Boris A. Khesin. *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*, volume 125 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [13] Jean Bourgain and Dong Li. Strong ill-posedness of the incompressible Euler equation in borderline Sobolev spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 201(1):97–157, 2015.
- [14] Jean Bourgain and Dong Li. Strong illposedness of the incompressible Euler equation in integer C^m spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 25(1):1–86, 2015.
- [15] Jean Bourgain and Dong Li. Strong ill-posedness of the 3D incompressible Euler equation in borderline spaces. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):12155–12264, 2021.
- [16] Tristan Buckmaster and Sameer Iyer. Formation of unstable shocks for 2D isentropic compressible Euler. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 389(1):197–271, 2022.
- [17] Tristan Buckmaster, Steve Shkoller, and Vlad Vicol. Formation of shocks for 2D isentropic compressible Euler. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 75(9):2069–2120, 2022.
- [18] Tristan Buckmaster, Steve Shkoller, and Vlad Vicol. Formation of point shocks for 3D compressible Euler. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 76(9):2073–2191, 2023.
- [19] Tristan Buckmaster, Steve Shkoller, and Vlad Vicol. Shock formation and vorticity creation for 3D Euler. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 76(9):1965–2072, 2023.
- [20] Chi Hin Chan, Magdalena Czubak, and Marcelo M. Disconzi. The formulation of the Navier-Stokes equations on Riemannian manifolds. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 121:335–346, 2017.
- [21] Zhendong Chen. Formation of shifted shocks for the 3D compressible Euler equations with damping. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 64(9):Paper No. 274, 2025.
- [22] Kyle R. Chickering, Ryan C. Moreno-Vasquez, and Gavin Pandya. Asymptotically self-similar shock formation for 1D fractal Burgers’ equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 55(6):7328–7360, 2023.

- [23] Demetrios Christodoulou. *The formation of shocks in 3-dimensional fluids*. EMS Monographs in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2007.
- [24] Demetrios Christodoulou and Shuang Miao. *Compressible flow and Euler's equations*, volume 9 of *Surveys of Modern Mathematics*. International Press, Somerville, MA; Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2014.
- [25] Charles Collot, Tej-Eddine Ghoul, and Nader Masmoudi. Singularity formation for Burgers' equation with transverse viscosity. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 55(4):1047–1133, 2022.
- [26] A. Constantin and P. Germain. Stratospheric planetary flows from the perspective of the Euler equation on a rotating sphere. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 245(1):587–644, 2022.
- [27] Adrian Constantin, Pierre Germain, Zhiwu Lin, and Hao Zhu. The onset of instability for zonal stratospheric flows, 2025. arXiv:2503.14191.
- [28] Constantine M. Dafermos. *Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics*, volume 325 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, fourth edition, 2016.
- [29] David G. Ebin and Jerrold Marsden. Groups of diffeomorphisms and the motion of an incompressible fluid. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 92:102–163, 1970.
- [30] David Fajman, Maciej Maliborski, Maximilian Ofner, Todd Oliynyk, and Zoe Wyatt. Phase transition between shock formation and stability in cosmological fluids. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 42(14):Paper No. 14LT01, 9, 2025.
- [31] David Fajman, Maximilian Ofner, Todd A. Oliynyk, and Zoe Wyatt. The stability of relativistic fluids in linearly expanding cosmologies. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (5):4328–4383, 2024.
- [32] David Fajman, Todd A. Oliynyk, and Zoe Wyatt. Stabilizing relativistic fluids on spacetimes with non-accelerated expansion. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 383(1):401–426, 2021.
- [33] Victor Guillemin and Shlomo Sternberg. The moment map and collective motion. *Ann. Physics*, 127(1):220–253, 1980.
- [34] Gustav Holzegel, Sergiu Klainerman, Jared Speck, and Willie Wai-Yeung Wong. Small-data shock formation in solutions to 3D quasilinear wave equations: an overview. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 13(1):1–105, 2016.
- [35] Peter D. Lax. Development of singularities of solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 5:611–613, 1964.
- [36] Zhiwu Lin and Chongchun Zeng. Unstable manifolds of Euler equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(11):1803–1836, 2013.
- [37] Jonathan Luk and Jared Speck. Shock formation in solutions to the 2D compressible Euler equations in the presence of non-zero vorticity. *Invent. Math.*, 214(1):1–169, 2018.
- [38] Jonathan Luk and Jared Speck. The hidden null structure of the compressible Euler equations and a prelude to applications. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 17(1):1–60, 2020.
- [39] Jonathan Luk and Jared Speck. The stability of simple plane-symmetric shock formation for three-dimensional compressible Euler flow with vorticity and entropy. *Anal. PDE*, 17(3):831–941, 2024.

[40] Tian-Wen Luo and Pin Yu. On the stability of multi-dimensional rarefaction waves I: the energy estimates. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 202(2):631–752, 2025.

[41] Tian-Wen Luo and Pin Yu. On the stability of multi-dimensional rarefaction waves II: existence of solutions and applications to the Riemann problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 202(2):753–855, 2025.

[42] A. Majda. *Compressible fluid flow and systems of conservation laws in several space variables*, volume 53 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[43] Jerrold E. Marsden, Tudor S. Ratiu, and Alan Weinstein. Semidirect products and reduction in mechanics. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 281(1):147–177, 1984.

[44] Shuang Miao and Pin Yu. On the formation of shocks for quasilinear wave equations. *Invent. Math.*, 207(2):697–831, 2017.

[45] Sung-Jin Oh and Federico Pasqualotto. Gradient blow-up for dispersive and dissipative perturbations of the Burgers equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 248(3):Paper No. 54, 61, 2024.

[46] Yiya Qiu and Lifeng Zhao. Shock formation of 3D Euler-Poisson system for electron fluid with steady ion background. 2021. arXiv:2108.09972.

[47] Bernhard Riemann. Über die fortpflanzung ebener luftwellen von endlicher schwingungsweite. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 8:43–66, 1860.

[48] Bernard F. Schutz. *Geometrical Methods of Mathematical Physics*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.

[49] Thomas C. Sideris. Formation of singularities in solutions to nonlinear hyperbolic equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 86(4):369–381, 1984.

[50] Thomas C. Sideris. Formation of singularities in three-dimensional compressible fluids. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 101(4):475–485, 1985.

[51] Thomas C. Sideris. Delayed singularity formation in 2D compressible flow. *Amer. J. Math.*, 119(2):371–422, 1997.

[52] Jared Speck. The stabilizing effect of spacetime expansion on relativistic fluids with sharp results for the radiation equation of state. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 210(2):535–579, 2013.

[53] Jared Speck. *Shock formation in small-data solutions to 3D quasilinear wave equations*, volume 214 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.

[54] Jared Speck. Shock formation for 2D quasilinear wave systems featuring multiple speeds: blowup for the fastest wave, with non-trivial interactions up to the singularity. *Ann. PDE*, 4(1):Paper No. 6, 131, 2018.

[55] Jared Speck. A new formulation of the 3D compressible Euler equations with dynamic entropy: remarkable null structures and regularity properties. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(3):1223–1279, 2019.

[56] Jared Speck, Gustav Holzegel, Jonathan Luk, and Willie Wong. Stable shock formation for nearly simple outgoing plane symmetric waves. *Ann. PDE*, 2(2):Art. 10, 198, 2016.

[57] Wenzhe Su. Shock formation for 2D isentropic Euler equations with self-similar variables. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 45(3):349–412, 2024.

- [58] Terence Tao. On the universality of the incompressible Euler equation on compact manifolds. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38(3):1553–1565, 2018.
- [59] Terence Tao. On the universality of the incompressible Euler equation on compact manifolds, II. Non-rigidity of Euler flows. *Pure Appl. Funct. Anal.*, 5(6):1425–1443, 2020.
- [60] Michael E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations III. Nonlinear equations*, volume 117 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, Cham, third edition, [2023] ©2023.
- [61] Ruoxuan Yang. Shock formation of the Burgers-Hilbert equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(5):5756–5802, 2021.