

# Influence of wall roughness on the slip behavior of viscous fluids

Dorin Bucur \*      Eduard Feireisl†      Šárka Nečasová‡

Laboratoire de Mathématiques, CNRS UMR 5127 , Université de Savoie  
Campus Scientifique, 73376 Le-Bourget-Du-Lac, France

Mathematical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic  
Žitná 25, 115 67 Praha 1, Czech Republic

## 1 Introduction

Recent developments in microfluidic and nanofluidic technologies have renewed interest in the influence of surface roughness on the slip behavior of viscous fluids (see the survey by PRIEZJEV and TROIAN [20] and the references cited therein). As a matter of fact, this issue have been subjected to discussion for over two centuries by many distinguished scientists who developed the foundations of fluid mechanics, including Bernoulli, Coulomb, Navier, Couette, Poisson, Stokes, to name only a few.

Consider a viscous fluid confined to a domain  $\Omega$  in the Euclidean physical space  $R^3$ , the boundary of which represents a solid wall. Assuming *impermeability of the wall* we have

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  is the fluid velocity and  $\mathbf{n}$  stands for the (outer) normal vector to  $\partial\Omega$ .

The mostly accepted hypothesis states there is no relative motion between a viscous fluid and the solid wall  $\partial\Omega$ , that means,

$$[\mathbf{u}]_\tau = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $[\mathbf{u}]_\tau$  stands for the tangential component of  $\mathbf{u}$ , provided the wall is at rest. The *no-slip* boundary condition expressed through (1.2), together with (1.1), have been the most successful hypothesis in reproducing the velocity profiles for macroscopic flows.

---

\*The work of D.B. was supported by the Nečas Center for Mathematical Modelling LC06052 financed by MSMT, and partially by CNRS - AVČR project

†The work of E.F. was supported by Grant IAA100190606 of GA ASCR in the framework of the general research programme of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Institutional Research Plan AV0Z10190503

‡The work of Š.N. supported by Grant 201/05/0005 of GA ČR in the framework of the general research programme of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Institutional Research Plan AV0Z10190503, and partially by CNRS - AVČR project

In postulating his *slip hypothesis*, Navier suggested to replace (1.2) by

$$\beta[\mathbf{u}]_\tau = [\mathbb{S}\mathbf{n}]_\tau \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\mathbb{S}$  is the deviatoric viscous stress tensor and  $\beta$  is the friction coefficient. Note that, formally, condition (1.3) reduces to (1.2) provided  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . In the presence of slip, the liquid motion is opposed by a force proportional to the relative velocity between the fluid and the solid wall.

Although it is intuitively clear that (1.3) is much closer to the observed reality than (1.2) whenever the rate of flow is sufficiently strong (turbulent regimes), there has been a common believe that even if the Navier slip conditions were correct, the corresponding slip length is likely to be too small to influence the motion of macroscopic fluids (for relevant discussion see Section 1 in PRIEZJEV and TROIAN [20]).

Recently, numerous experiments and simulations as well as theoretical studies have shown that the classical no-slip assumption can fail when the walls are sufficiently smooth (see PRIEZJEV et al. [19], QIANG and WANG [21], among others). Strictly speaking, the slip length characterizing the contact between a fluid and a solid wall in relative motion is influenced by many different factors, among which the intrinsic affinity and commensurability between the liquid and solid molecular size as well as the macroscopic surface roughness caused by imperfections and tiny asperities play a significant role.

From the purely mathematical point of view, the Navier (partial) slip boundary conditions yield a correct solution for problems on domains with sharp corners, where the no-slip condition (1.2) yields spurious solutions (see DUSSAN [7], MOFFATT [14]). Moreover, they are relevant on rough walls, where the presence of microscopic asperities reduces considerably the shear-stress leading to a perfect slip on the boundary (see JANSON [12]). Given this perspective, there have been several attempts to justify the no-slip boundary behavior (1.2) as an inevitable consequence of fluid trapping by surface roughness. RICHARDSON [22] showed the no-slip emerges as the *effective* boundary condition for a Stokes flow on domains with periodically undulated boundary (for more general results see also JANSON [12]). On the other hand, in order to avoid the complicated description of the fluid behavior in a boundary layer adjacent to a rough wall on which the no-slip condition (1.2) is imposed, the Navier law (1.3) with a variable coefficient  $\beta$  is prescribed on the mean (flat) surface to facilitate numerical computations (see JAEGER and MIKELIC [11], MOHAMMADI et al. [15]).

After a series of recent studies by AMIRAT et al. [1], [2], and CASADO-DÍAZ et al. [6], it became clear that the mathematical problems involved are intimately related to the pointwise behavior of Sobolev functions on “tiny” sets and may be studied independently of any particular system of equations. Moreover, the weak convergence methods involving the Young measures and their generalizations by GERARD [10] and TARTAR [23] turned out to be a useful tool to describe the influence of roughness on the effective boundary conditions [4], [5].

Conformably with the preferential setting used in many computational studies, we consider a fluid between two horizontal surfaces periodic with respect to the plane coordinates  $(x_1, x_2)$ . More specifically, we consider a spatial domain  $\Omega$  determined through

$$\Omega = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2, 0 < x_3 < 1 + \Phi(x_1, x_2)\}, \quad (1.4)$$

where the symbol  $\mathcal{T}^2 = ((0, 1)_{\{0,1\}})$  stands for the two-dimensional torus. We denote

the two components of the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  as

$$\Gamma_{\text{bottom}} = \{(x_1, x_2, 0) \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2\}, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\Gamma_{\text{top}} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2, x_3 = 1 + \Phi(x_1, x_2)\}. \quad (1.6)$$

We assume that the bottom wall moves with a constant velocity  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, V_2, 0)$  and that the fluid sticks to it, that means,

$$\mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = \mathbf{V}. \quad (1.7)$$

On the other hand, we assume impermeability of the upper wall

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

together with the Navier slip condition

$$\beta[\mathbf{u}]_{\tau} = [\mathbb{S}\mathbf{n}]_{\tau}|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}}, \quad (1.9)$$

where the coefficient  $\beta \geq 0$  may vary with the horizontal coordinates  $(x_1, x_2)$ .

The viscous stress tensor  $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D})$ ,

$$\mathbb{S} : R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$$

is a function of the symmetric velocity gradient

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}] = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u}), \quad (1.10)$$

satisfying the standard coercivity hypothesis

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}) : \mathbb{D} \geq d_1 |\mathbb{D}|^p, \quad d_1 > 0, \quad \text{for all } \mathbb{D} \in R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (1.11)$$

together with a technical growth restriction

$$|\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D})| \leq d_2 (1 + |\mathbb{D}|^{p-1}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbb{D} \in R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (1.12)$$

for a certain  $p \geq 2$ . In addition, we require  $\mathbb{S}$  to be strictly monotone:

$$\left(\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}_1) - \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}_2)\right) : \left(\mathbb{D}_1 - \mathbb{D}_2\right) > 0 \quad \text{for any } \mathbb{D}_1 \neq \mathbb{D}_2. \quad (1.13)$$

The best known example is the so-called linearly viscous fluid, where  $\mathbb{S}$  is determined through Newton's rheological law  $\mathbb{S} = 2\mu\mathbb{D}$ ,  $p = 2$ . More examples as well as the relevant mathematical background may be found in the monograph MÁLEK et al. [13].

If the fluid is incompressible and in a stationary (time-independent) state, the velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  and the pressure  $p$  satisfy the Navier-Stokes system of equations

$$\text{div}_x(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla_x P = \text{div}_x \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]) + \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.14)$$

supplemented with the standard incompressibility constraint

$$\text{div}_x \mathbf{u} = 0. \quad (1.15)$$

Motivated by PRIEZJEV et al. [19], QIANG and WANG [21], we consider a family of solutions  $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  of problem (1.14), (1.15), supplemented with the boundary conditions (1.7 - 1.9), posed on spatial domains  $\{\Omega_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  given through (1.4) for  $\Phi = \Phi_\varepsilon$ . The functions  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  depend only on a single spatial variable, say,  $\Phi_\varepsilon = \Phi_\varepsilon(x_1)$ ,  $x_1 \in \mathcal{T}^1 = (0, 1)|_{\{0,1\}}$ , mimicking a ribbed surface, with the amplitude and typical wavelength of oscillations approaching zero for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

We will show (see Theorem 3.1 below) that  $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  possesses a limit  $\{\mathbf{u}, p\}$  solving the Navier-Stokes system (1.14), (1.15) on the “flat” domain  $\Omega = \mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, 1)$  and satisfying the no-slip boundary conditions (1.7) on the bottom wall  $\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}$ . In addition, the tangent velocity field  $[\mathbf{u}]_\tau$  on the upper wall  $\Gamma_{\text{top}} = \{x_3 = 1\}$  is parallel to the riblets direction, that means,  $[\mathbf{u}]_\tau = (0, u_2, 0)$ , and satisfies a directional Navier slip condition

$$\tilde{\beta}u_2 = S_{2,3} \text{ on } \{x_3 = 1\}. \quad (1.16)$$

The friction coefficient  $\tilde{\beta}$  depends only on a weak limit of  $\{\beta_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ , and on  $\sigma$  - a positive quantity which can be computed explicitly in terms of a Young measure associated to horizontal deviations of the normals on  $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ . In particular we show that the concrete value and even shape of  $\tilde{\beta}$  can be “tuned” choosing a specific distribution of riblets on  $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$  as predicted for similar models by the molecular dynamics approach (cf. PRIEZJEV et al. [19], QIANG and WANG [21]). In the particular case when  $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta$  are constant, we get

$$\tilde{\beta} > \beta$$

provided the amplitude and the frequency of oscillations of  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}^\varepsilon$  are of the same order.

Our method is based on the concept of parametrized rugosity measure introduced in [5], which is nothing other than a Young measure associated to the family of gradients  $\{\nabla\Phi_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ . Furthermore, we exploit the well-developed theory of Sobolev functions, in particular, the properties of their traces on the boundary. Accordingly, we consider the weak (distributional) solutions to problem (1.14), (1.15). This so-called variational approach seems inevitable in the present situation as all the refined elliptic estimates yielding regularity of solutions are quite sensitive with respect to the topology of the boundary. Last but not least, our approach leans on the pressure estimates that can be obtained via a generalized inverse of the  $\text{div}_x$  operator. One of the fundamental issues addressed below is uniformity of these estimates with respect to the parameter  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some preliminary material, including the function spaces framework and a variational formulation of the problem. The main result illustrated by several concrete examples is formulated in Section 3. In Section 4, we introduce the concept of rugosity measure associated to the family  $\{\Omega_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  in order to identify the boundary conditions to be satisfied in the asymptotic limit for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Section 5 is devoted to the basic properties of the so-called Bogovskii operator  $\text{div}_x^{-1}$ . The proof of the main result is completed in Section 6 by means of the theory of monotone operators.

## 2 Preliminaries

To begin with, let us introduce the concept of variational solutions to the problem on  $\Omega_\varepsilon$ .

**Definition 2.1** *We shall say that functions  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $P_\varepsilon \in L^{p'}(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ ,  $1/p + 1/p' = 1$ , represent a weak solution to the Navier-Stokes system (1.14), (1.15),*

supplemented with the boundary conditions (1.7 - 1.9), if  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies (1.7), (1.8) in the sense of traces, together with the incompressibility constraints (1.15) a.a. in  $\Omega_\varepsilon$ , and the integral identity

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} + P_\varepsilon \operatorname{div}_x \vec{\varphi} \right) dx = \quad (2.1)$$

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \vec{\varphi} d\sigma - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbf{f} \cdot \vec{\varphi} dx$$

holds for any test function  $\vec{\varphi} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3)$  such that

$$\vec{\varphi}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = 0, \quad \vec{\varphi} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0.$$

Note that we have tacitly assumed that the driving force  $\mathbf{f}$  is defined on all domains  $\Omega_\varepsilon$ , say,  $\mathbf{f}$  is a restriction of a fixed function belonging to the class  $L^\infty(R^3; R^3)$ . Note as well that, by means of the classical Krasnoselskii theorem, if  $\mathbb{S} : R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$  is continuous, then the associated Nemytskii operator is continuous on the Lebesgue space  $L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$  with values in  $L^{p'}(\Omega_\varepsilon; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$  provided  $\mathbb{S}$  satisfies hypothesis (1.12). Finally, for the traces of Sobolev functions on  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}^\varepsilon$  to be well defined, we have to assume that  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  are Lipschitz functions on  $T^2$ .

Similarly, solutions of the limit problem are defined as follows.

**Definition 2.2** *A couple  $\{\mathbf{u}, P\}$  is termed a weak solution to problem (1.14), (1.15) on  $\Omega = T^2 \times (0, 1)$ , supplemented with the boundary conditions (1.7), (1.8), and*

$$u_1 = 0, \quad \tilde{\beta}u_2 = \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}])_{2,3} \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{top}} = \{x_3 = 1\} \quad (2.2)$$

if  $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3)$ ,  $P \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies (1.7),  $u_1 = u_3 = 0$  in the sense of traces on  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}$ , and the integral identity

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} + P \operatorname{div}_x \vec{\varphi} \right) dx = \quad (2.3)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]) : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\beta} \mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{\varphi} d\sigma - \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \vec{\varphi} dx$$

holds for any test function  $\vec{\varphi} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3)$  such that

$$\vec{\varphi}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = 0, \quad \varphi_1|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = \varphi_3|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0.$$

A remarkable property of both (2.1) and (2.3) is that  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  represent respectively an admissible test function. This is, of course, related to the fact that the ‘‘convective’’ terms  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}$  belong to the Lebesgue space  $L^{p'}$  provided  $p \geq 9/5$ . Here, the symbol  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  denotes a *suitable* extension on  $\Omega$  of the vector field  $\mathbf{V}$  appearing in the boundary condition (1.7). We can take

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \psi(x_3)\mathbf{V} \text{ for } \psi \in C^\infty[0, 1], \quad \psi(0) = 1, \quad \psi(1) = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

In particular, the norm of  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  can be made arbitrarily small in the Lebesgue space  $L^{p'}(\Omega; R^3)$  through a suitable choice of  $\psi$ .

### 3 Main result

The main result of the present paper reads as follows:

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $\{\Omega_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  be a family of domains given through (1.4) with  $\Phi = \Phi_\varepsilon(x_1)$ , where  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  are Lipschitz functions on  $\mathcal{T}^1$  such that*

$$0 \leq \Phi_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon, \quad |\Phi'_\varepsilon| \leq L \text{ on } \mathcal{T}^1, \quad (3.1)$$

*with the Lipschitz constant  $L$  independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Furthermore, assume that  $\mathbb{S} : R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}$  is a continuous mapping satisfying hypotheses (1.11 - 1.13), with  $p \geq 2$ . Let  $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, P_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0} \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3) \times L^{p'}(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ ,  $p \geq 2$  be a family of weak solutions to problem (1.14, 1.15; 1.7 - 1.9) specified in Definition 2.1. Finally, assume that*

$$\beta_\varepsilon \rightarrow \beta \text{ weakly-}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^2), \quad (3.2)$$

*and*

$$|\Phi'_\varepsilon| \rightarrow \overline{|\Phi'|} \text{ weakly in } L^1(\mathcal{T}^1), \text{ where } \overline{|\Phi'|} > 0 \text{ a.a. on } \mathcal{T}. \quad (3.3)$$

*Then, passing to a suitable subsequence as the case may be, we have*

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \text{ in } W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3), \quad P_\varepsilon \rightarrow P \text{ in } L^{p'}(\Omega), \quad (3.4)$$

*where  $\{\mathbf{u}, P\}$  solve problem (1.14, 1.15; 1.7, 1.8, 2.2) on  $\Omega$  in the sense of Definition 2.2, where*

$$\tilde{\beta} = L^1 - \text{weak} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta_\varepsilon \sqrt{1 + |\Phi'_\varepsilon|^2}. \quad (3.5)$$

Note that, in accordance with (3.2), (3.4), the friction coefficient  $\tilde{\beta}$  for the limit problem is always greatest that a weak limit of  $\{\beta_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ . Moreover,

$$\tilde{\beta} > \beta \text{ whenever } \beta_\varepsilon \rightarrow \beta \text{ in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (3.6)$$

As  $\Phi_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $\mathcal{T}^1$ , we have

$$\Phi'_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ weakly-}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^1), \quad (3.7)$$

while hypothesis (3.3) requires the convergence in (3.7) not to be strong on any subdomain of  $\mathcal{T}^1$ . In other words, the oscillations of the normal vectors to  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}^\varepsilon$  persist in the asymptotic limit  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

A sufficient condition for (3.3) to hold reads

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_a^b |\Phi'_\varepsilon| \, dz \geq r(b-a) \text{ for any } a \leq b, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $r > 0$  is a constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Observe that

$$\int_a^b |\Phi'_\varepsilon| \, dz = \text{Var}_a^b[\Phi_\varepsilon] = \sup_{a \leq z_1 < \dots < z_n \leq b} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |\Phi_\varepsilon(z_{i+1}) - \Phi_\varepsilon(z_i)|, \quad (3.9)$$

where the most right expression corresponds intuitively to the degree of roughness of  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}^\varepsilon$ .

Even more interesting example is provided by the co-area formula (see EVANS and GARIEPY [8, Section 3.4.2, Theorem 1]):

$$\int_a^b |\Phi'_\varepsilon| dz = \int_0^\varepsilon \#[(a, b) \cap \Phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(y)] dy, \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\#[(a, b) \cap \Phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(y)]$  denotes the number of points  $x \in (a, b)$  (non-negative integer or  $\infty$ ) where  $\Phi_\varepsilon(x) = y$ , in other words, the number of points where the graph  $(x, \Phi_\varepsilon(x))$  intersects the straight line  $(x, y)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{T}^1$ .

Formulae (3.8 - 3.10) give rise to a number of examples listed below.

- **Periodically oscillating boundaries:** The most frequently studied situation is taking

$$\Phi_{\varepsilon_k}(x_1) = \varepsilon_k \Phi\left(\frac{x_1}{\varepsilon_k}\right), \text{ with } \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \text{ a positive integer,} \quad (3.11)$$

where  $\Phi \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{T}^1)$ . It is easy to check that

$$|\Phi'_\varepsilon| \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{T}^1} |\Phi'(z)| dz \text{ weakly in } L^1(\mathcal{T}^1);$$

whence (3.3) holds unless  $\Phi$  is constant.

- **The crystalline case:** Assume that  $\Phi'_\varepsilon \in K$  a.a. on  $\mathcal{T}^1$ , where  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^1$  is a finite set  $0 \notin K$ . Then we can take

$$r = \min_K |\Phi'_\varepsilon| > 0$$

in (3.8) in order to conclude that (3.3) holds.

- **The generalized crystalline case:** As a matter of fact, we only need

$$\text{ess inf}_{\mathcal{T}^1} |\Phi'_\varepsilon| \geq r > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

to arrive at the same conclusion as in the previous case.

- **Oscillatory boundaries:** Assume that for any  $y_1, y_2$  such that  $\Phi_\varepsilon(y_1) = \Phi_\varepsilon(y_2) = 0$ ,  $y_1 < y_2$ , there exists  $y_3 \in (y_1, y_2)$  such that  $\Phi_\varepsilon(y_3) = \varepsilon$ . In agreement with (3.10), we get

$$\int_a^b |\Phi'_\varepsilon| dz = \int_0^\varepsilon \#[(a, b) \cap \Phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(y)] dy \geq \varepsilon \#[x \in (a, b), \Phi_\varepsilon(x) = 0].$$

Consequently, the family  $\{\Phi_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  satisfies (3.3) as soon as

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \varepsilon \#[x \in (a, b), \Phi_\varepsilon(x) = 0] \right\} \geq r(b-a) \text{ for any } a < b \text{ and a certain } r > 0.$$

- **Boundaries with asperities:** A function  $\mathcal{A} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{T}^1)$  is termed *asperity of amplitude*  $h > 0$  if

$$0 = \min_{\mathcal{T}^1} \mathcal{A} < \max_{\mathcal{T}^1} \mathcal{A} = h. \quad (3.12)$$

Assume that

$$\Phi_\varepsilon = \sum_i \mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon,$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon$  are asperities such that  $\text{supp}[\mathcal{A}_i] \cap \text{supp}[\mathcal{A}_j] = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ .

It is easy to check that

$$\int_a^b |\Phi'_\varepsilon| \, dz = \int_0^\varepsilon \#[(a, b) \cap \Phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(y)] \, dy \geq \sum_h h \#[\text{asperities } \mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon \text{ of amplitude } h, \text{supp}\mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon \cap (a, b) \neq \emptyset],$$

where the sum contains at most countable number of terms. Consequently, in order to obtain (3.3), we have to assume that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_h h \#[\text{asperities } \mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon \text{ of amplitude } h, \text{supp}\mathcal{A}_i^\varepsilon \cap (a, b) \neq \emptyset] \right\} \geq r(b-a)$$

for a certain  $r > 0$ .

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

## 4 Parametrized measures of rugosity

For the time being assume that we have already shown

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^p + |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^p \right) \, d\mathbf{x} < \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

Consequently, we can assume that

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3), \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies the boundary condition (1.7) on  $\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}$  in the sense of traces.

To begin with, observe that the impermeability condition (1.1) is stable with respect to a rather general families of converging domains  $\{\Omega_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ . Note that (1.1) can be restated in the form of an integral identity

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0 \quad (4.3)$$

to be satisfied for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))$ . As a matter of fact, formula (4.3) makes sense for all vector fields  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$  integrable on  $\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$  together with  $\text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ .

We get

$$0 = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x},$$

where, up to a suitable subsequence,

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \\ \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \left( \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \text{div}_x \mathbf{u} \varphi \right) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0 \text{ for } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$



provided

$$\Omega \subset \Omega_\varepsilon \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0, |\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega| \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Thus we have shown the following assertion.

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $\{\Omega_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  be a family of domains satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1. Moreover, let  $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  be vector fields on  $\Omega_\varepsilon$  satisfying (4.1), with  $p > 1$ , and (4.3) for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))$ .*

*Then, passing to a subsequence as the case may be, we have*

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3),$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies (4.3) on  $\Omega$  for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, \infty))$ .

As the target domain  $\Omega = \mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, 1)$  is smooth, the conclusion of Lemma 4.1 reads

$$u_3|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

provided (4.1) holds.

Let us try to formulate, first intuitively, the meaning of *rugosity* of the surface  $\Gamma_\varepsilon$  in a certain (tangent) direction  $\mathbf{w}$ . Very roughly indeed, one may say that such a quantity should be proportional to *probability* that a normal vector to  $\Gamma_\varepsilon$  is parallel to  $\mathbf{w}$ . Given a measurable set  $D \subset \mathcal{T}^2$  this can be expressed as

$$\text{prob}_D^\varepsilon \approx \frac{\text{meas}\{\mathbf{y} \in D \mid \text{the normal vector at } (\mathbf{y}, \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) \text{ parallel to } \mathbf{w}\}}{\text{meas}(D)}.$$

However, the set of boundary points at which the normal is parallel to a single vector  $\mathbf{w}$  may be very small, in particular, its  $2D$ -Hausdorff measure could be zero. For this reason, it seems more convenient to replace  $\mathbf{w}$  by a *cone*  $C_w^\delta$ ,

$$C_w^\delta = \{\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{w} \geq (1 - \delta)|\mathbf{v}||\mathbf{w}|\}.$$

Accordingly, we take

$$\text{prob}_D^\varepsilon \approx \frac{\text{meas}\{\mathbf{y} \in D \mid \text{the normal vector at } (\mathbf{y}, \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) \text{ belongs to } C_w^\delta\}}{\text{meas}(D)}$$

and require this quantity to be positive uniformly with respect to  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ :

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{prob}_D^\varepsilon > 0 \text{ for any } D \subset \mathcal{T}^2. \quad (4.6)$$

Formula (4.6) is reminiscent of the definition of the Young measure associated to the family of normal vectors on  $\Gamma_\varepsilon$  (see PEDREGAL [18, Chapter 1, Section 2]). Motivated by the above discussion, we can define *parametrized rugosity measure*  $\mathcal{R}_y$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{T}^2$  as a Young measure associated to the family  $\{\nabla_y \Phi_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ , that means,  $\mathcal{R}_y$  is a probability measure on  $R^2$  defined as

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_y, G \rangle = \overline{G(\nabla_y \Phi)}(\mathbf{y}) \text{ for all } G \in C(R^2) \text{ and for a.a. } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{T}^2,$$

where  $\overline{G(\nabla_y \Phi)}$  stands for a weak limit of  $\{G(\nabla_y \Phi_\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$  in  $L^1(\mathcal{T}^2)$  (see Section 3 in [5]). As a direct consequence of (3.7), the center of gravity associated to the

parametrized rugosity measure  $\mathcal{R}_y$  is always located at the origin. Note that the vectors

$$(\nabla_y \Phi_\varepsilon, 0) = (\nabla_y \Phi_\varepsilon, -1) - (0, 0, 1) = \mathbf{n}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{n},$$

express the deviations of the normal vector fields on  $\Gamma_{\text{top}}^\varepsilon$  from the vertical direction.

A remarkable property of the parametrized rugosity measure is the following identity

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}, 1) \cdot \left( \int_{R^2} G(\mathbf{Z}) \mathbf{Z} \, d\mathcal{R}_y(\mathbf{Z}), 0 \right) = 0 \text{ for all } G \in C(R^2) \text{ and a.a. } y \in \mathcal{T}^2, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  is the weak limit appearing in (4.2). Indeed the impermeability condition (1.1) written in terms of  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  reads

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(y)) \cdot (\nabla_x \Phi_\varepsilon(y), -1) = 0 \text{ for a.a. } y \in \mathcal{T}^2,$$

in particular,

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \psi(y) G(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(y)) \cdot (\nabla_x \Phi_\varepsilon(y), -1) \, dy = 0 \quad (4.8)$$

for any  $G \in C(R^2)$  and all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2)$ . On the other hand

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}^2} |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(y)) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, 1)| \, dy \leq \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \int_1^{1+\Phi_\varepsilon(y)} |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, z)| \, dz \, dy$$

where the right-hand side tends to zero for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  as a consequence of (4.2). Consequently, it follows from (4.8) that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \psi(y) G(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(y, 1) \cdot (\nabla_x \Phi_\varepsilon(y), -1) \, dy = 0 \quad (4.9)$$

for any  $G \in C(R^2)$  and all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2)$ . As the trace operator  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3) \mapsto \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|_{\{x_3=1\}}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the topology  $L^p(\{x_3=1\})$ , relation (4.9) yields (4.7) (see also Lemma 7.1 in [5] for the case  $p=2$ ).

In particular, for the sequence of domains considered in Theorem 3.1, hypothesis (3.3) gives rise to

$$\text{supp} \mathcal{R}_y \subset \{(y_1, 0), y_1 \in R\}, \text{ supp} \mathcal{R}_y \neq (0, 0) \text{ for a.a. } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{T}^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Thus combining (4.7), (4.10), together with (4.5) we conclude that, under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1,

$$u_1|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = u_3|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0 \quad (4.11)$$

in accordance with (1.8), (2.2). However, the validity of (4.11) is conditioned by the uniform bound anticipated in (4.1). After some preliminary material presented in Section 5, a rigorous justification of (4.1) will be given in Section 6 below.

## 5 Equation $\text{div}_x \mathbf{v} = g$

### 5.1 Bogovskii's operator

For the purposes of this part, we adopt a slightly more general situation than in Theorem 3.1 assuming that  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  are effective functions of both variables  $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2$  and replacing hypothesis (3.1) by

$$\Phi_\varepsilon \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{T}_2), \quad 0 \leq \Phi_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon, \quad |\nabla_x \Phi_\varepsilon| \leq L, \quad \text{with } L \text{ independent of } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (5.1)$$

By virtue of (5.1), there exists  $\omega > 0$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  such that the interior of the cone

$$(x_1, x_2, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(x_1, x_2)) + \mathcal{K}, \quad \mathcal{K} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_3 \in (-1, 0), |(x_1, x_2)| < \omega|x_3|\}$$

is contained in  $\Omega_\varepsilon$  for any  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2$ . Consequently, there is a finite number of domains  $\Omega_\varepsilon^k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , such that

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \cup_{k=1}^m \Omega_\varepsilon^k,$$

and each  $\Omega_\varepsilon^k$  is starshaped with respect to any point of a ball of a radius  $r > 0$  contained in  $\Omega_\varepsilon^k$ , where both  $m$  and  $r$  can be chosen independent of  $\varepsilon$  (for the relevant definition of a starshaped domain see Galdi [9, Chapter III.3]).

Consider an auxiliary problem: *Given*

$$g \in L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon), \quad \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} g \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad 1 < q < \infty, \quad (5.2)$$

find a vector field  $\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon[g]$  such that

$$\mathbf{v} \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^3), \quad \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{v} = g \text{ a.a. in } \Omega_\varepsilon. \quad (5.3)$$

We report the following result (see Theorem 3.1 in Chapter III.3 in Galdi [9]).

**Proposition 5.1** *For each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a solution operator  $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$  associated to problem (5.2), (5.3) such that*

$$\|\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon[g]\|_{W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c(r, m, q) \|g\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon)}, \quad (5.4)$$

in particular, the norm of  $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$  is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

**Remark 5.1** The construction of the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  used in [9] is due to Bogovskii [3]. Clearly, the parameters  $r, m$  depend solely on the value of the Lipschitz constant  $L$  in (5.1).

## 5.2 Korn's inequality

The so-called Korn inequality yields a bound on the full velocity gradient  $\nabla_x \mathbf{u}$  in terms of its symmetric part  $\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]$  introduced in (1.10). The uniform estimates stated in Proposition 5.1 can be used in order to establish a version of Korn's inequality depending solely on the value of the Lipschitz constant  $L$  in (5.1). To this end, we adapt the approach of NEČAS [16].

To begin with, we apply the standard Korn inequality on the domain  $\Omega$  to obtain

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c(q) \|\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{v}]\|_{L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})} \leq c(q) \|\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{v}]\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})} \quad (5.5)$$

for any  $\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,  $q > 1$  such that  $\mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = 0$ .

On the other hand, it is a routine matter to express

$$\nabla_x (\partial_{x_i} v_j) = \mathcal{A}_{i,j} \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{v}] \text{ for any } i, j = 1, \dots, 3, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_{i,j}$  are linear differential operators of first order with constant coefficients.

By virtue of Proposition 5.1, any function  $h \in L^{q'}(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ ,  $1/q' + 1/q = 1$ , of zero integral mean can be expressed as a divergence of a vector field  $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon[h]$  belonging to  $W_0^{1,q'}(\Omega_\varepsilon, R^3)$ . Consequently, we deduce from (5.6) that

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})} \leq c(q, L) \left( \|\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{v}]\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})} + \|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^1(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})} \right), \quad q > 1, \quad (5.7)$$

for any  $\mathbf{v}$  as in (5.5).

Finally,

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^1(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})} = \|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^1(\Omega; R^{3 \times 3})} + \|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^1(\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega; R^{3 \times 3})}, \quad (5.8)$$

where, by means of Hölder's inequality,

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^1(\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega; R^{3 \times 3})} \leq |\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \Omega|^{1/q'} \|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})}. \quad (5.9)$$

Combining estimates (5.5), (5.7 - 5.9) we infer that

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})} \leq c(q, L) \|\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{v}]\|_{L^q(\Omega_\varepsilon; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})}, \quad 1 < q < \infty, \quad (5.10)$$

for any

$$\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3), \quad \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = 0, \quad (5.11)$$

provided  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{q,L}$  is small enough.

**Remark 5.1** The fact that the constant in Korn's inequality depends only on  $L$  was observed by NITSCHKE [17] in the case  $q = 2$ .

## 6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

### 6.1 Uniform estimates

Our first goal is to establish bounds on the solutions  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ ,  $P_\varepsilon$  independent of  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . To this end, we use the quantities  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  as test functions in (2.1), where  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  is a suitable extension of the boundary velocity field  $\mathbf{V}$  introduced in (2.4). In accordance with hypothesis (1.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 \|\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})}^p + \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, d\sigma &\leq \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon] \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, d\sigma = \\ &\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{f} \cdot (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) - (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} + \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \mathbb{D}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}] \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Seeing that

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \, dx = - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \, dx = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) : \nabla_x (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) \, dx$$

we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left( \mathbf{f} \cdot (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) - (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} + \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \mathbb{D}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}] \right) dx \right| \leq \quad (6.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \mathbf{f} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3)} \| \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^1(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3)} + \\ & \| \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^4(\Omega; R^3)} \| \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^4(\Omega; R^3)} \| \nabla_x (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) \|_{L^2(\Omega; R^{3 \times 3})} + \\ & \| \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^4(\Omega; R^3)}^2 \| \nabla_x (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) \|_{L^2(\Omega; R^{3 \times 3})} + \| \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega; R^3)} \| S(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) \|_{L^1(\Omega; R^{3 \times 3})}, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \| \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon] \|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})}^p & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \| \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon] \|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})}^p + \| \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}] \|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^{3 \times 3})}^p \right) - \\ & c(p) \| \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \|_{L^p(\Omega; R^{3 \times 3})}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

As already pointed out in (2.4), the extension  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  can be made arbitrarily small in the Lebesgue space  $L^4(\Omega; R^3)$ . Consequently, it is possible to use estimates (6.1 - 6.3), hypothesis (1.12), together with Korn's inequality (5.10) applied to  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ , in order to conclude that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^p + \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, d\sigma < \infty, \quad (6.4)$$

and, by virtue of (1.7),

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^p \, d\mathbf{x} < \infty. \quad (6.5)$$

Finally, taking  $\vec{\varphi} = \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon[h]$  for  $h \in L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon; R^3)$  as a test function in (2.1) and using (6.4), (6.5), together with Proposition 5.1, we obtain

$$\sup_\varepsilon \| P_\varepsilon \|_{L^{p'}(\Omega_\varepsilon)} < \infty \text{ provided } \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} P_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (6.6)$$

## 6.2 Weak convergence

Seeing that the family  $\{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$  satisfies (4.1) we may assume

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3), \quad (6.7)$$

where, in accordance with (4.11), the limit vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma_{\text{bottom}}} = \mathbf{V}, \quad u_1|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = u_3|_{\Gamma_{\text{top}}} = 0. \quad (6.8)$$

Similarly, in agreement with (6.6)

$$P_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup P \text{ weakly in } L^{p'}(\Omega), \quad \int_{\Omega} P \, d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (6.9)$$

In order to perform the limit  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in the variational formula (2.1), observe first that any test function for the target problem (2.3) may be used in (2.1) as well. Indeed the class of functions

$$\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3), \quad \varphi_1, \varphi_3 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega; R^3), \quad \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}^2 \times (0, \infty)), \quad (6.10)$$

form a dense subset of test functions for (2.3) in  $W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3)$ .

Plugging a function  $\vec{\varphi}$  satisfying (6.10) in (2.1) and letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} + P \operatorname{div}_x \vec{\varphi} \right) \, d\mathbf{x} = \quad (6.11)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \overline{\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}])} : \nabla_x \vec{\varphi} \, d\mathbf{x} + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \vec{\varphi} \, d\sigma - \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \vec{\varphi} \, d\mathbf{x},$$

where

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]) \rightharpoonup \overline{\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}])} \text{ weakly in } L^{p'}(\Omega; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}). \quad (6.12)$$

In order to identify the limit of the boundary term, we write

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \vec{\varphi} \, d\sigma = \int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \beta_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) \cdot \vec{\varphi}(\mathbf{y}, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) \sqrt{1 + |\Phi'_\varepsilon(y_1)|^2} \, d\mathbf{y}, \quad (6.13)$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1) = \int_1^{1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})} \partial_{x_3} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, z) \, dz \text{ for a.a. } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{T}^2.$$

Thus by virtue of Jensen's inequality, we get

$$\left| \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1) \right|^2 \leq \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}) \int_1^{1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})} |\partial_{x_3} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, z)|^2 \, dz;$$

whence

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}^2} \left| \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1 + \Phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y})) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 1) \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{y} \leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, d\mathbf{x}. \quad (6.14)$$

Relation (6.13), (6.14) give rise to

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \vec{\varphi} \, d\sigma \rightarrow \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\beta} \mathbf{u} \cdot \vec{\varphi} \, d\mathbf{y} \quad (6.15)$$

for any  $\vec{\varphi}$  satisfying (6.10), where

$$\tilde{\beta} = L^1 - \text{weak} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta_\varepsilon \sqrt{1 + |\Phi'_\varepsilon|^2}, \quad (6.16)$$

in complete agreement with (2.3), (3.5).

### 6.3 Strong convergence

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is enough to establish the strong convergence of the velocity gradients as well as of the pressure as claimed in (3.4). Note that as soon as this is achieved, we get  $\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]) = \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}])$ , which converts (6.11) to the desired identity (2.3).

To this end, we use the classical monotonicity argument. Note that, since  $p \geq 2 \geq 9/5$  we are allowed to use the quantity  $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  as a test function in (2.1), which facilitates considerably the analysis.

Accordingly, we get

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \nabla_x (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon |\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, d\sigma = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \otimes \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and using (6.14) we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \, d\mathbf{x} + \quad (6.17)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \overline{\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon])} : \nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\beta} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \, d\sigma.$$

On the other hand, setting  $\vec{\varphi} = \mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  in (6.11) we can compute the right-hand side in (6.17) in order to conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \overline{\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}])} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad (6.18)$$

in particular,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \left( \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon]) - \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}]) \right) : \left( \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) - \mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}) \right) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (6.19)$$

As  $\mathbb{S}$  satisfies hypotheses (1.11 - 1.13), relations (6.18), (6.19) imply that

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}[\mathbf{u}] \text{ in } L^p(\Omega; R_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3})$$

yielding

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{u} \text{ in } W^{1,p}(\Omega; R^3). \quad (6.20)$$

The last step is to establish the point-wise convergence of the pressure  $\{P_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ . To this end, we consider test functions of the form

$$\vec{\varphi}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B} \left[ |P_\varepsilon|^{p'-2} P_\varepsilon - \int_{\Omega} |P_\varepsilon|^{p'-2} P_\varepsilon \, d\mathbf{x} \right],$$

where  $\mathcal{B}$  is the Bogovskii operator constructed in Proposition 5.1 associated to  $\Omega$ . Note that, by virtue of (6.6),

$$|P_\varepsilon|^{p'-2} P_\varepsilon \text{ are bounded in } L^p(\Omega)$$

uniformly for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Similarly, we take

$$\vec{\varphi} = \mathcal{B} \left[ |P|^{p'-2} P - \int_{\Omega} |P|^{p'-2} P \, d\mathbf{x} \right].$$

Using  $\vec{\varphi}_\varepsilon, \vec{\varphi}$  as test functions in (2.1), (2.3, respectively, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} |P_\varepsilon|^{p'} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} P |P|^{p'-2} P \, d\mathbf{x}; \quad (6.21)$$

whence

$$P_\varepsilon \rightarrow P \text{ in } L^{p'}(\Omega).$$

Theorem 3.1 has been proved.

## References

- [1] A. A. Amirat, D. Bresch, J. Lemoine, and J. Simon. Effect of rugosity on a flow governed by stationary Navier-Stokes equations. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, **59**:768–785, 2001.

- [2] A. A. Amirat, E. Climent, E. Fernández-Cara, and J. Simon. The Stokes equations with Fourier boundary conditions on a wall with asperities. *Math. Models. Methods Appl.*, **24**:255–276, 2001.
- [3] M. E. Bogovskii. Solution of some vector analysis problems connected with operators div and grad (in Russian). *Trudy Sem. S.L. Sobolev*, **80**(1):5–40, 1980.
- [4] D. Bucur, E. Feireisl, and Nečasová. On the asymptotic limit of flows past a ribbed boundary. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 2007. To appear.
- [5] D. Bucur, E. Feireisl, Š. Nečasová, and J. Wolf. On the asymptotic limit of the Navier-Stokes system on domains with rough boundaries. *J. Differential Equations*, 2006. Submitted.
- [6] J. Casado-Díaz, E. Fernández-Cara, and J. Simon. Why viscous fluids adhere to rugose walls: A mathematical explanation. *J. Differential Equations*, **189**:526–537, 2003.
- [7] E.B. Dussan, V. Spreading of liquids on solid surfaces: static and dynamic contact lines. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **11**:371, 1979.
- [8] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.
- [9] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier - Stokes equations, I*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [10] P. Gerard. Microlocal defect measures. *Commun. Partial Differential Equations*, **16**:1761–1794, 1991.
- [11] W. Jaeger and A. Mikelić. On the roughness-induced effective boundary conditions for an incompressible viscous flow. *J. Differential Equations*, **170**:96–122, 2001.
- [12] K.M. Jansons. Determination of the macroscopic (partial) slip boundary condition for a viscous flow over a randomly rough surface with a perfect slip microscopic boundary conditions. *Phys. Fluids*, **31**:15–17, 1988.
- [13] J. Málek, J. Nečas, M. Rokyta, and M. Růžička. *Weak and measure-valued solutions to evolutionary PDE's*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1996.
- [14] H.K. Moffat. Viscous and resistive eddies near a sharp corner. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **18**:1, 1964.
- [15] B. Mohammadi, O. Pironneau, and F. Valentin. Rough boundaries and wall laws. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **27**:169–177, 1998.
- [16] J. Nečas. Sur les normes équivalentes dans  $W_p^k(\Omega)$  et sur la coercivité des formes formellement positives. In *Séminaire Equations aux Dérivées Partielles, Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal*, pages 102–128, 1966.
- [17] J.A. Nitsche. On Korn's second inequality. *RAIRO Anal. Numer.*, **15**:237–248, 1981.
- [18] P. Pedregal. *Parametrized measures and variational principles*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1997.



- [19] N. V. Priezjev, Darhuber A.A., and S.M. Troian. Slip behavior in liquid films on surfaces of patterned wettability: Comparison between continuum and molecular dynamics simulations. *Phys. Rev. E*, **71**:041608, 2005.
- [20] N. V. Priezjev and S.M. Troian. Influence of periodic wall roughness on the slip behaviour at liquid/solid interfaces: molecular versus continuum predictions. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **554**:25–46, 2006.
- [21] Teizheng Qian and Xiao-Ping Wang. Hydrodynamic slip boundary condition at chemically patterned surfaces: A continuum deduction from molecular dynamics. *Phys. Rev. E*, **72**:022501, 2005.
- [22] S. Richardson. On the no-slip boundary condition. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **59**:707–719, 1973.
- [23] L. Tartar. H-measures, a new approach for studying homogenization, oscillations and concentration effects in partial differential equations. *Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh*, **115 A**:193–230, 1990.