The Boussinesq system with non-smooth boundary conditions : existence, relaxation and topology optimization.

Alexandre Vieira, Pierre-Henri Cocquet

THE BOUSSINESQ SYSTEM WITH NON-SMOOTH BOUNDARY CONDITIONS : EXISTENCE, RELAXATION AND TOPOLOGY OPTIMIZATION.

ALEXANDRE VIEIRA* AND PIERRE-HENRI COCQUET*†

Abstract. In this paper, we tackle a topology optimization problem which consists in finding the optimal shape of a solid located inside a fluid that minimizes a given cost function. The motion of the fluid is modeled thanks to the Boussinesq system which involves the unsteady Navier-Stokes equation coupled to a heat equation. In order to cover several models presented in the literature, we choose a non-smooth formulation for the outlet boundary conditions and an optimization parameter of bounded variations. This paper aims at proving existence of solutions to the resulting equations, along with the study of a relaxation scheme of the non-smooth conditions. A second part covers the topology optimization problem itself for which we proved the existence of optimal solutions and provides the definition of first order necessary optimality conditions.

Key words. Non-smooth boundary conditions, topology optimization, relaxation scheme, directional do-nothing boundary conditions

AMS subject classifications. 49K20, 49Q10, 76D03, 76D55

1. Introduction.

Directional do-nothing conditions. For many engineering applications, simulations of flows coupled with the temperature are useful for predicting the behaviour of physical designs before their manufacture, reducing the cost of the development of new products. The relevance of the model and the adequacy with the experiment therefore become important [16, 41, 46]. In this paper, we choose to model the flow with the Boussinesq system which involves the Navier-Stokes equations coupled with an energy equation. In most mathematical papers analyzing this model [8, 27, 47], homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are considered on the whole boundary. This simplifies the mathematical analysis of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation since the non-linear term vanishes after integrating by part hence simplifying the derivation of a priori estimates [7, 21, 26, 47].

However, several applications use different boundary conditions that model inlet, no-slip and outlet conditions [1]. Unlike the inlet and the no-slip conditions, the outlet conditions are more subject to modelling choices. A popular choice consists in using a do-nothing outlet condition (see e.g. [25, 34, 48]) which naturally comes from integration by parts when defining a weak formulation of the Navier-Stokes equations. However, since this outlet condition can not deal with re-entering flows, several papers use a non-smooth outlet boundary conditions for their numerical simulations (see e.g. [5, 23]). A focus on non-smooth outflow conditions when the temperature appears can be found in [12, 23, 42, 43].

In particular, directional do-nothing (DDN) boundary conditions are non-smooth boundary conditions that become popular. The idea is originally described in [13], and several other mathematical studies followed [5, 9, 11]. These conditions were considered especially for turbulent flows. In this situation, the flow may alternatively

*Physique et Ingénierie Mathématique pour l'Énergie et l'Environnement (PIMENT), Université de la Réunion, 2 rue Joseph Wetzell, 97490 Sainte-Clotilde, France. (Alexandre.Vieira@univ-reunion.fr)

†Laboratoire des Sciences de l'Ingénieur Appliquées à la Mécanique et au Génie Electrique (SIAME), E2S-UPPA, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, 64000 Pau, France (Pierre-Henri.Cocquet@univ-reunion.fr,Pierre-Henri.Cocquet@univ-pau.fr)

exit and re-enter the domain. These directional boundary conditions tries to capture this phenomenon, while limiting the reflection. It is worth noting that other boundary conditions can be used, namely the so-called local/global Bernouilli boundary conditions [12, 23, 43]. The latter implies the do-nothing boundary condition is satisfied for exiting fluid and that both the normal velocity gradient and the total pressure vanish for re-entering fluid. Nevertheless, in this paper, we are going to used non-smooth DDN boundary condition since they are easier to impose though a variational formulation.

Concerning the mathematical study of Boussinesq system with directional do-nothing conditions, the literature is rather scarce. To the best of our knowledge, we only found [6, 15], where the steady case is studied in depth, but the unsteady case only presents limited results. Indeed, while [15, p. 16, Theorem 3.2] gives existence and uniqueness of a weak solution with additional regularity to the Boussinesq system involving non-smooth boundary conditions at the inlet, it requires the source terms and the physical constants (e.g. Reynolds, Grashof numbers) to be small enough. We emphasize that these limitations comes from the proof which relies on a fixed-point strategy. The first aim of this paper will then be to fill that gap by proving existence and, in a two-dimensional setting, uniqueness of solutions for the unsteady Boussinesq system with non-smooth DDN boundary condition on the outlet.

Topology optimization. On top of the previous considerations, this paper aims at using these equations in a topology optimization (TO) framework. In fluid mechanics, the term *topology optimization* refers to the problem of finding the shape of a solid located inside a fluid that either minimizes or maximizes a given physical effect. There exist various mathematical methods to deal with such problems that fall into the class of PDE-constrained optimization, such as the topological asymptotic expansion [3, 14, 40] or the shape optimization method [24, 38, 39]. In this paper, we choose to locate the solid thanks to a penalization term added in the unsteady Navier-Stokes equations, as exposed in [4]. However, the binary function introduced in [4] is usually replaced by a smooth approximation, referred as *interpolation function* [43], in order to be used in gradient-based optimization algorithms. We refer to the review papers [1, 22] for many references that deal with numerical resolution of TO problems applied to several different physical settings. However, as noted in [1, Section 4.7], most problems tackling topology optimization for flows only focus on steady flows, and time-dependant approaches are still rare. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, no paper is dedicated to the mathematical study of unsteady TO problems involving DDN boundary conditions, even though they are already used in numerical studies [12, 23, 42, 43]. Therefore, a second goal of this paper will be to prove existence of optimal solution to a TO problem involving Boussinesq system with non-smooth DDN boundary conditions at the outlet.

First order optimality conditions. As hinted above, a gradient based method is often used in order to compute an optimal solution of a TO problem. However, the introduction of the non-smooth DDN boundary conditions implies that the control-to-state mapping is no longer differentiable. The literature presents several ways to deal with such PDE-constrained optimization problems. Most focus on elliptic equations, using subdifferential calculus [17, 30, 19] or as the limit of relaxation schemes [18, 35, 45]. We may also cite [37] for a semilinear parabolic case and [49] which involves the Maxwell equations. We emphasize that using directly a subdifferential approach presents several drawbacks: the subdifferential of composite functions may be hardly computed, and the result may be hardly enlightening nor used [17]. We will therefore use a differentiable relaxation approach, as studied in [45]. First, we will be able to use standard first order necessary optimality conditions since the relaxed control-to-state mapping will be smooth. A convergence analysis will let us design necessary optimality condition for the non-smooth problem. Secondly, we find this approach more enlightening, as it may be used as a numerical scheme for solving the TO problem.

1.1. Problem settings. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2,3\}$ be a bounded open set with Lipchitz boundary whose outward unitary normal is $\mathbf{n}$. We assume the fluid occupies a region $\Omega_f \subset \Omega$ and that a solid is defined by a region Ω_s such that $\Omega = \Omega_f \cup \Omega_s$. The penalized Boussinesq approximation (see e.g. [43] for the steady case) of the Navier-Stokes equations coupled to convective heat transfer reads:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \\
&\partial_t \theta + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}\theta) - \nabla \cdot (Ck(\alpha)\nabla\theta) = 0, && \text{a.e. in } \Omega \\
&\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u} - A\Delta\mathbf{u} + \nabla p - B\theta e_y + h(\alpha)\mathbf{u} = f, \\
&\mathbf{u}(0) = u_0(\alpha),\ \theta(0) = \theta_0(\alpha),
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1}
$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ denotes the velocity of the fluid, p the pressure and θ the temperature (all dimensionless), $u_0(\alpha), \theta_0(\alpha)$ are initial conditions. In (1.1), $A = \mathrm{Re}^{-1}$ with Re being the Reynolds number, $B = \mathrm{Ri}$ is the Richardson number and $C = (\mathrm{Re}\,\mathrm{Pr})^{-1}$ where Pr is the Prandtl number. In a topology optimization problem, it is classical to introduce a function $\alpha : x \in \Omega \mapsto \alpha(x) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ as optimization parameter (see e.g. [1, 22]). The function $h(\alpha)$ then penalizes the flow in order to mimic the presence of solid:

- if $h \equiv 0$, then one retrieves the classical Boussinesq approximation.
- if, for some $s > s_0$ and large enough $\alpha_{\max}$, $h : s \in [0, \alpha_{\max}] \mapsto h(s) \in [0, \alpha_{\max}]$ is a smooth function such that $h(s) \approx 0$ for $s \leq s_0$ and $h(s) \approx \alpha_{\max}$ for $s \geq s_0$, one retrieves the formulations used in topology optimization [1, 8, 43]. In the sequel, we work in this setting since we wish to study a TO problem.

Since the classical Boussinesq problem is retrieved when $h(\alpha) = 0$, the fluid zones $\Omega_f \subset \Omega$ and the solid ones $\Omega_s \subset \Omega$ can be defined as $\Omega_s := \{x \in \Omega \mid \alpha(x) < s_0\}$, $\Omega_f := \{x \in \Omega \mid \alpha(x) > s_0\}$, where $\alpha_{\max} > 0$ is large enough to ensure the velocity $\mathbf{u}$ is small enough for the Ω_s above to be considered as a solid. The function $k(\alpha) : x \in \Omega \mapsto k(\alpha(x))$ is the dimensionless diffusivity defined as $k(\alpha)|_{\Omega_f} = 1$ and $k(\alpha)|_{\Omega_s} = k_s/k_f$ with k_s and k_f are respectively the diffusivities of the solid and the fluid. We also assume that k is a smooth regularization of $(k_s/k_f)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_s} + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_f}$. In this framework, α is thus defined as a parameter function, which will let us control the distribution of the solid in Ω.

Let us now specify the boundary conditions. Assume $\partial\Omega = \Gamma$ is Lipschitz and we split it in three parts: $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{w}} \cup \Gamma_{\mathrm{in}} \cup \Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}$. Here, Γ_{w} are the walls, Γ_{in} the inlet/entrance and Γ_{out} is the exit/outlet of the computational domain. As exposed above, we would like to rigorously study a non-smooth outlet boundary condition. Inspired by [13], the following formulation tries to encapsulate these different approaches. Let β be a function defined on Γ_{out} and define: $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} :\ x^+ = \mathrm{pos}(x) = \max(0,x), x^- = \mathrm{neg}(x) = \max(0,-x), x = x^+ - x^-$. On top of (1.1), we impose the following boundary conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\underline{\text{On } \Gamma_{\mathrm{in}}}: && \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_{\mathrm{in}},\ \theta = 0, \\
&\underline{\text{On } \Gamma_{\mathrm{w}}}: && \mathbf{u} = 0,\ Ck\partial_n\theta = \phi, \\
&\underline{\text{On } \Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}: && A\partial_n\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{n}p = A\partial_n\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}} - \mathbf{n}p^{\mathrm{ref}} - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}), \\
& && Ck\partial_n\theta + \beta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-\theta = 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.2}
$$

with $\phi \in L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma_{\rm w}))$, $f \in L^2(0,T;H^{-1}(\Omega))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\rm in} \in L^2(0,T;H^{1/2}_{00}(\Gamma_{\rm in}))$, $\mathbf{n}$ denotes the normal vector to the boundary, $\partial_n = \mathbf{n}\cdot\nabla$ and $(\mathbf{u}^{\rm ref}, p^{\rm ref})$ denotes a reference solution. As stated in [29], this nonlinear condition is physically meaningful: if the flow is outward, we impose the constraint coming from the selected reference flow ; if it is inward, we need to control the increase of energy, so, according to Bernoulli's principle, we add a term that is quadratic with respect to velocity.

To define a weak formulation of (1.1)-(1.2), we introduce $\mathscr{V}^u = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d);\ \mathbf{u}_{|\Gamma_{\rm in}\cup\Gamma_{\rm w}} = 0\}$, and define V^u (resp H^u) as the closure of $\mathscr{V}^u$ in $(H^1(\Omega))^d$ (resp. in $(L^2(\Omega))^d$). Similarly, we define $\mathscr{V}^\theta = \{\theta \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R});\ \theta_{|\Gamma_{\rm in}} = 0\}$, and V^θ and H^θ accordingly. A weak formulation of (1.1)-(1.2) then reads as:

$$\int_\Omega \partial_t\theta\varphi - \int_\Omega \theta\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\varphi + \int_\Omega Ck\nabla\theta\cdot\nabla\varphi + \int_\Gamma (\theta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - Ck\partial_n\theta)\varphi = 0,$$

for all $\varphi \in H^\theta$. However, from (1.2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Gamma (\theta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - Ck\partial_n\theta)\varphi &= -\int_{\Gamma_{\rm w}} \phi\varphi + \int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} \left((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-\right)\theta\varphi \\ &\qquad - \int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} \left(\beta\theta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^- + Ck\partial_n\theta\right)\varphi \\ &= -\int_{\Gamma_{\rm w}} \phi\varphi + \int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} \left((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-\right)\theta\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:
(WF.1)

$$\int_\Omega \partial_t\theta\varphi - \int_\Omega \theta\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\varphi + \int_\Omega Ck\nabla\theta\cdot\nabla\varphi + \int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} \left((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-\right)\theta\varphi = \int_{\Gamma_{\rm w}} \phi\varphi.$$

Doing similar computations with the Navier-Stokes system yield:

$$\text{(WF.2)} \qquad \int_\Omega q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} = 0,\ \forall q \in L^2(\Omega),$$

$$\text{(WF.3)} \qquad \begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega (\partial_t\mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u})\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} + A\int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\boldsymbol{\Psi} - \int_\Omega B\theta e_y\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega p\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} + \int_\Omega h\mathbf{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} (\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\rm ref})\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} \\ &\quad = \int_\Omega f\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi} + \int_{\Gamma_{\rm out}} (A\partial_n\mathbf{u}^{\rm ref} - \mathbf{n}p^{\rm ref})\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi},\end{aligned}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\Psi} \in H^u$.

1.2. The topology optimization problem. A goal of this paper is to analyze the next topology optimization problem

$$\text{(OPT)} \qquad \begin{aligned}&\min \mathcal{J}(\alpha,\mathbf{u},\theta,p) \\ &\text{s.t.} \begin{cases}(\mathbf{u},\theta,p) \text{ solution of (WF) parametrized by } \alpha, \\ \alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{ad},\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is a given cost function and, for some $\kappa > 0$, we set $\mathcal{U}_{\rm ad} = \{\alpha \in {\rm BV}(\Omega) : 0 \le \alpha(x) \le \alpha_{\max}$ a.e. on Ω, , $|D\alpha|(\Omega) \le \kappa\}$. BV$(\Omega)$ stands for functions of bounded variations, as exposed in [2]. We recall that the weak-* convergence in $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ is defined as follows [2]: $(\alpha_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset \mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ weakly-* converges to $\alpha \in \mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ if (α_ε) strongly converges to α in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $(D\alpha_\varepsilon)$ weakly-* converges to $D\alpha$ in Ω, meaning:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to +\infty} \int_\Omega \nu d D\alpha_\varepsilon = \int_\Omega \nu d D\alpha, \ \forall \nu \in C_0(\Omega),$$

where $C_0(\Omega)$ denotes the closure, in the sup norm, of the set of real continuous functions with compact support over Ω. We choose $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}}$ as a subset of $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ since it is a nice way to approximate piecewise constant functions, which is close to the desired solid distribution.

It is classical for these problems to compute first order optimality conditions (see e.g. [33, 44]). This approach needs smoothness of the control-to-state mapping. However, the presence of the non-differentiable function $\mathrm{neg}(x) = x^-$ makes this approach impossible. Therefore, we adopt a smoothing approach, as studied in [35, 45], and we approximate the neg function with a C^1 positive approximation, denoted neg_ε. We suppose this approximation satisfies the following assumptions:

(**A1**) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(x) \geq \mathrm{neg}(x)$.

(**A2**) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon'(x) \leq 1$.

(**A3**) neg_ε converges to neg uniformly over $\mathbb{R}$.

(**A4**) for every $\delta > 0$, the sequence $(\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon')_{\varepsilon>0}$ converges uniformly to 1 on $[\delta, +\infty)$ and uniformly to 0 on $(-\infty, -\delta]$ as $\varepsilon \to +\infty$.

As presented in [45], we may choose:

$$\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} x^- & \text{if } |x| \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}, \\ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon x\right)^3 \left(\frac{3}{2\varepsilon} + x\right) & \text{if } |x| < \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

We thus redefine (WF) with an approximation of neg, which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega (\partial_t \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} + A \int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon : \nabla \mathbf{\Psi} - \int_\Omega B\theta e_y \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} - \int_\Omega p_\varepsilon \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{\mathrm{ref}}) \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} \\ &\quad = \int_\Omega f \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} - \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} (A\partial_n \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}} + \mathbf{n}p^{\mathrm{ref}}) \cdot \mathbf{\Psi}, \end{aligned} \tag{WFe.1}$$

$$\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla q = 0, \tag{WFe.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \partial_t \theta_\varepsilon \varphi - \int_\Omega \theta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_\Omega Ck\nabla\theta_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\varphi \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} ((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \beta \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}))\theta_\varepsilon\varphi = \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{w}}} \phi\varphi, \end{aligned} \tag{WFe.3}$$

for all $(\mathbf{\Psi}, \varphi, q) \in H^u \times H^\theta \times L^2(\Omega)$. We then define the approximate optimal control problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min \mathcal{J}(\alpha_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \\ &\text{s.t.} \begin{cases} (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon) \text{ solution of (WFe) parametrized by } \alpha_\varepsilon, \\ \alpha_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{OPTe}$$

As it will be made clear later, the control-to-state mapping in (WFe) is smooth, which will let us derive first order conditions.

1.3. Plan of the paper. The rest of this introduction is dedicated to the presentation of some notations used in this article and some important results of the literature. The core of this paper is organized in two sections. First, we will prove the existence of solutions to (WFe), which will let us prove, with a compactness argument, the existence of solutions to (WF). We then focus on the two dimensional case, where we prove uniqueness of the solutions along with stronger convergence results. This is an extension of the work done by [13], where only the pressure and the velocity where considered, and to [6, 15], where the steady case was studied in depth, but the results concerning the unsteady case were obtained using restrictive assumptions. We then study the approximate optimal control problem (OPTe), for which we will derive first order conditions. We conclude this paper with the convergence of the optimality conditions of (OPTe), which let us design first order conditions of (OPT).

Notations. We denote by $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a constant $C(\Omega) > 0$ depending only on Ω such that $a \leq C(\Omega)b$. Denote:

- $\mathcal{A} : V^u \to (V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = A\int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v}$,
- $\mathcal{B} : V^u \times V^u \to (V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{w}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_\Omega (\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}$,
- $\mathcal{T} : V^\theta \to (V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{T}\theta, \mathbf{v}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_\Omega B\theta e_y \cdot \mathbf{v}$,
- $\mathcal{P} : L^2(\Omega) \to (V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{P}p, \mathbf{w}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_\Omega p\nabla\cdot\mathbf{w}$,
- $\mathcal{N} : V^u\times V^u \to (V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{w}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \text{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w})$,
- $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon : V^u\times V^u \to (V^u)'$ given by $\langle \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})), \mathbf{w}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w})$.
- $\mathcal{C}(\alpha) : V^\theta \to (V^\theta)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{C}(\alpha)\theta, \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)',V^\theta} = \int_\Omega Ck(\alpha)\nabla\theta\cdot\nabla\varphi$,
- $\mathcal{D} : V^u \times V^\theta \to (V^\theta)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u},\theta), \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)',V^\theta} = \int_\Omega \theta\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\varphi$,
- $\mathcal{M} : V^u \times V^\theta \to (V^\theta)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{u},\theta), \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)',V^\theta} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})+ \beta\text{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}))\theta\varphi$,
- $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon : V^u \times V^\theta \to (V^\theta)'$ defined by $\langle \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{u},\theta), \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)',V^\theta} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})+ \beta\text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}))\theta\varphi$,

By a slight abuse of notation, we will still denote by σ^{ref} the element of $(V^u)'$ defined by $\langle \sigma^{\text{ref}}, \mathbf{w}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}(A\partial_n\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}} - p^{\text{ref}}\mathbf{n})\cdot\mathbf{w}$, $h(\alpha) : V^u \to (V^u)'$ the function defined by $\langle h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_\Omega h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}$, and ϕ the element of $(V^\theta)'$ defined by $\langle \phi, \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)',V^\theta} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \phi\varphi$.

Results from the literature. We now recall two results from the literature that will be heavily used throughout this paper.

PROPOSITION 1.1. *([10, Proposition III.2.35]) Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with compact boundary. Let $p \in [1, +\infty]$ and $q \in [p, p^*]$, where p^* is the critical exponent associated with p, defined as:*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{p^*} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{d} & \textit{for } p < d, \\ p^* \in [1, +\infty[& \textit{for } p = d, \\ p^* = +\infty & \textit{for } p > d. \end{cases}$$

Then, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$:

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{1+\frac{d}{q}-\frac{d}{p}} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d}{q}}.$$

PROPOSITION 1.2. *([10, Theorem III.2.36]) Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with compact boundary, and $1 < p < d$. Then for any $r \in \left[p, \frac{p(d-1)}{d-p}\right]$, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$:*

$$\|u_{|\partial\Omega}\|_{L^r(\partial\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{1-\frac{d}{p}+\frac{d-1}{r}} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d-1}{r}}.$$

In the case $p = d$, the previous result holds true for any $r \in [p, +\infty[$.

2. Existence of solutions. In this section, we will focus on proving the existence of solutions to (WFe) and prove their convergence toward the ones of (WF).

We make the following assumptions throughout this paper:

ASSUMPTIONS 2.1.
- *The source term $f \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))$.*
- *$(\mathbf{u}^{ref}, p^{ref})$ are such that:*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^{ref} \in L^r(0, T; (H^1(\Omega))^d) \cap L^\infty(0, T; (L^2(\Omega))^d) \\ \text{with } r = 2 \text{ if } d = 2 \text{ and } r = 4 \text{ if } d = 3, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{ref} = 0, \\ \partial_t \mathbf{u}^{ref} \in L^2(0, T; (L^2(\Omega))^d), \\ \mathbf{u}^{ref} = \mathbf{u}_{in} \text{ on } \Gamma_{in}. \end{cases}$$

- *There exists k_{min} such that $k(x) \geq k_{min} > 0$ and $h(x) \geq 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.*
- *The initial condition $\mathbf{u}_0$ (resp. θ_0) is a Fréchet-differentiable function from $\mathcal{U}_{ad}$ to V^u (resp. V^θ). Furthermore, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, $\mathbf{u}_0(\alpha)|_{\Gamma_{in}} = \mathbf{u}_{in}(0)$, $\mathbf{u}_0(\alpha)|_{\Gamma_w} = 0$, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_0(\alpha) = 0$ and $\theta_0(\alpha)|_{\Gamma_{in}} = 0$.*
- *$\beta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Gamma_{out}))$ such that $\beta(t, x) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, for a.e. $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \Gamma_{out}$.*

2.1. Existence in dimension 2 or 3. In this part, we work with a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and a given α_ε in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}}$.

In order to prove the existence of solutions to (WFe), we follow the classical Fadeo-Galerkin method, as used in [13, 36, 47]. By construction, V^u and V^θ are separable. Therefore, both admit a countable Hilbert basis $(w_k^u)_k$ and $(w_k^\theta)_k$. Let us construct an approximate problem, which will converge to a solution of the original problem (WFe). Denote by V_n^u (resp. V_n^θ) the space spanned by $(w_k^u)_{k\leq n}$ (resp. $(w_k^\theta)_{k\leq n}$). We consider the following Galerkin approximated problem:
find $t \mapsto \mathbf{v}_n(t) \in V_n^u$, $t \mapsto p_n(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $t \mapsto \theta_n(t) \in V_n^\theta$ such that, defining $\mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{v}_n + \mathbf{u}^{ref}$, $(\mathbf{u}_n, p_n, \theta_n)$ satisfy (WFe) for all $t \in [0, T]$ and for all $(\mathbf{\Psi}, q, \varphi) \in V_n^u \times L^2(\Omega) \times V_n^\theta$.

As done in [47], we prove that such $(\mathbf{u}_n, \theta_n, p_n)$ exist. We now prove that these solutions are bounded with respect to n and ε:

PROPOSITION 2.2. *There exist positive constants c_1^θ, c_2^θ, $c_1^{\mathbf{v}}$ and $c_2^{\mathbf{v}}$, independent of ε and n, such that:*

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|\theta_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1^\theta, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla\theta_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq c_2^\theta, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|\mathbf{v}_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1^{\mathbf{v}}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla\mathbf{v}_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq c_2^{\mathbf{v}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Taking $\varphi_n = \theta_n$ in (WFe.1) and integrating by part give:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \theta_n^2(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \int_\Omega Ck|\nabla\theta_n|^2 + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \left((\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\text{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}\right)\right)\theta_n^2 = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{w}}}\phi\theta_n.$$

Since $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and using assumption **(A1)**, one has on Γ_{out}:

$$\begin{aligned}\left((\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\text{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}\right)\right)\theta_n^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n})\theta_n^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left((\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \text{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}\right)\right)\theta_n^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n})^+\theta_n^2 \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore: $\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + Ck_{\min}\|\nabla\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{\text{w}})}\|\theta_n\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{\text{w}})}$. Using continuity of the trace operator and Young's inequality, one proves that there exists a positive constant $C(\Omega)$ such that, for any $\nu > 0$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + Ck_{\min}\|\nabla\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2\nu}\|\phi\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma_{\text{w}})} + \frac{C(\Omega)\nu}{2}(\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

Taking ν small enough, we are left with:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2\nu}\|\phi\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma_{\text{w}})} + \frac{C(\Omega)\nu}{2}\|\theta_n\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Integrating this equation and using Gronwall's lemma then give (2.1) and (2.2).

Now, take $\mathbf{\Psi}_n = \mathbf{v}_n$ in (WFe.3). After some calculations, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}|\mathbf{v}_n|^2 + A|\nabla\mathbf{v}_n|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}\text{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}\right)|\mathbf{v}_n|^2 + \int_\Omega h|\mathbf{v}_n|^2 \\ &\quad= \int_\Omega f_\theta\cdot\mathbf{v}_n - \int_\Omega \partial_t\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\cdot\mathbf{v}_n - A\int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}} : \nabla\mathbf{v}_n + \int_\Omega(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}_n\cdot\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}} \\ &\qquad - \int_\Omega h\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\cdot\mathbf{v}_n + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}(A\partial_n\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}} - \mathbf{n}p^{\text{ref}})\mathbf{v}_n\end{aligned}$$

where $f_\theta = f + B\theta_n e_y$. First, using (2.2), one has $\|f_\theta\|_{(H^u)'} \leq \|f\|_{(H^u)'} + Bc_1^\theta$. Secondly, using **(A1)** gives that $\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}\text{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n\cdot\mathbf{n}\right)|\mathbf{v}_n|^2 \geq 0$ and following then the same pattern of proof as in [13, Proposition 2], one proves (2.3) and (2.4). ∎

Following [47, 10], we need to bound the fractional derivatives of the solution in order to prove some convergence results. For any real-valued function f defined on $[0,T]$, define by $\tilde{f}$ the extension by 0 of f to the whole real line $\mathbb{R}$, and by $\mathscr{F}(\tilde{f})$ the Fourier transform of $\tilde{f}$, which we define as: $\mathscr{F}(\tilde{f})(\tau) = \int_\mathbb{R}\tilde{f}(t)e^{-it\tau}dt$. Using the Hausdorff-Young inequality [10, Theorem II.5.20] we can prove the

Proposition 2.3. *For all $\sigma \in [0, \frac{1}{6})$, there exists a constant $C(\sigma) > 0$ independent of ε and n such that:*

(2.5)
$$\int_\mathbb{R}|\tau|^{2\sigma}\left\|\mathscr{F}\left(\widetilde{\theta_n}\right)\right\|^2_{(L^2(\Omega))^d} \leq C(\sigma),$$

(2.6)
$$\int_\mathbb{R}|\tau|^{2\sigma}\|\mathscr{F}(\widetilde{\mathbf{u}_n})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\sigma).$$

Proof. We emphasize that (2.6) is proved if (2.5) holds by using [10, Proposition VII.1.3] by replacing f by $f_\theta = f + B\theta e_y$. The proof of (2.5) consists in adapting the one of [10, Proposition VII.1.3] and is thus omitted. ∎

Combining the two previous results, we can now prove the following existence theorem for (WFe).

THEOREM 2.4. *For all $(\mathbf{v}_0, \theta_0) \in H^u \times H^\theta$ and all $T > 0$, there exists $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0,T;H^u) \cap L^2(0,T;V^u)$, $\theta_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0,T,H^\theta) \cap L^2(0,T;V^\theta)$ and $p_\varepsilon \in W^{-1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ solution of (WFe) such that, defining $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{u}^{ref}(0)$ and $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{ref}$, one has for all $(\mathbf{\Psi}, \varphi) \in V^u \times V^\theta$ such that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} = 0$: $\left(\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{\Psi}\right)(0) = \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{\Psi}$, $\left(\int_\Omega \theta_\varepsilon \varphi\right)(0) = \int_\Omega \theta_0 \varphi$. Moreover, one has $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon' = \frac{d\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon}{dt} \in L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;(V^u)')$ and $\theta_\varepsilon' \in L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)')$.*

Proof. The proof of existence is similar to part (iv) of the proof of [47, Theorem 3.1] and the proof of [10, Proposition VII.1.4], where estimates (2.1)-(2.4) and (2.5)-(2.6) are used in a compactness argument.

We only add the proof that $(\mathbf{u}_n, \theta_n)$ converges to a solution of (WFe.1). Using (2.5) and [47, Theorem 2.2], one shows that, up to a subsequence, θ_n strongly converges to an element θ_ε of $L^2(0,T;H^\theta)$. The only technical points which needs more detail are the non-linear terms in (WFe.1). Using the strong convergence of $\mathbf{u}_n$ to $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ in $L^2(0,T;H^u)$ proved in [47, Eq (3.41)], one proves that $(\theta_n \mathbf{u}_n)$ strongly converges to $\theta_\varepsilon \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ in $L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Furthermore, notice that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|(\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n})\theta_n\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma)} \leq & \int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_n\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \|\theta_n\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \\
\leq & C \int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_n\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\theta_n\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\theta_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
\leq & C \|\mathbf{u}_n\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \|\theta_n\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \\
& \qquad \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \|\theta_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality together with (2.1)-(2.4) proves that $((\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n})\theta_n)_n$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma))$, which is reflexive. Therefore, it proves that, up to a subsequence, there exists a weak limit κ_1 in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma))$ of $((\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n})\theta_n)_n$. A simple adaptation of the above reasoning proves that $\left(\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n}\right)\theta_n\right)_n$ weakly converges to some κ_2 in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma))$. Using the strong convergence of θ_n in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, [10, Proposition II.2.12] implies that:

$$((\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \beta \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{n}))\theta_n \rightharpoonup ((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \beta \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}))\theta_\varepsilon \text{ in } L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^1(\Gamma))$$

obtained using the continuity of $x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(x)$. By uniqueness of the limit in the sense of distribution, we can identify $\kappa_1 + \beta\kappa_2$ with $((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \beta \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}))\theta_\varepsilon$. Therefore, $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon)$ is a solution of (WF.1).

The convergence of the weak derivative with respect to time of $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon$ in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;(V^u)')$ is proved in [10, Proposition V.1.3]. Concerning the weak derivative with respect to time of θ_ε, it follows immediately from the fact that differentiation with respect to time is continuous in the sense of distribution. Existence of the pressure p_ε follows from [10, Chapter V]. ∎

We now use the existence of solutions to the approximate problem (WFe) to prove existence of solutions to the limit problem (WF), along with the convergence of the approximate solutions to the solutions of (WF).

THEOREM 2.5. *Let $(\alpha_\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ such that $\alpha_\varepsilon \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \alpha$ in BV. Define by $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ a solution of (WFe) parametrized by α_ε, and define $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{ref}$. Then, there exists $(\mathbf{v}, \theta, p) \in L^\infty(0,T;H^u) \cap L^2(0,T;V^u) \times L^\infty(0,T,H^\theta) \cap L^2(0,T;V^\theta) \times W^{-1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that, defining $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}^{ref}$, up to a subsequence, we have*

- $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^\infty(0,T;H^u)$ *and* $\theta_\varepsilon \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \theta$ *in* $L^\infty(0,T;H^\theta)$,
- $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^2(0,T;V^u)$ *and in* $L^2(0,T;(L^6(\Omega)))$,
- $\theta_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \theta$ *in* $L^2(0,T;V^\theta)$ *and in* $L^2(0,T;(L^6(\Omega)))$,
- $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^4(0,T;(L^2(\Gamma))^d)$ *and* $\theta_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \theta$ *in* $L^4(0,T;(L^2(\Gamma)))$,
- $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^2(0,T;(L^2(\Omega))^d)$ *and* $\theta_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \theta$ *in* $L^2(0,T;(L^2(\Omega)))$,
- $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^2(0,T;(L^2(\Gamma))^d)$ *and* $\theta_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \theta$ *in* $L^2(0,T;(L^2(\Gamma)))$,
- $p_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup p$ *in* $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.

Furthermore, $(\mathbf{v}, \theta, p)$ is a solution to (WF) parametrized by α.

Proof. Using (2.1)-(2.4) and (2.5)-(2.6), we prove that there exists $\mathbf{u}$ and θ such that all the convergences above are verified in the same manner as in [10, Proposition VII.1.4]. Let us prove first that $\mathbf{u}$ is a solution of (WF.3) parametrized by α and θ. With the same pattern of proof as in Theorem 2.4, one proves immediately that $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$ in $L^1(0,T;(L^1(\Omega))^d)$, and $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}} \rightharpoonup (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}$ in $L^4(0,T;(L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma))^d)$. Regarding the penalization term:

$$\begin{aligned}\|h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^d)} \lesssim &\|h\|^2_\infty \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^d)} \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega (h(\alpha_\varepsilon) - h(\alpha))^2 |\mathbf{u}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha_\varepsilon \to \alpha$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$, $h(\alpha_\varepsilon) \to h(\alpha)$ pointwise in Ω up to a subsequence (which is not relabeled). Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem then implies: $h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(0,T;(L^2(\Omega))^d)$.

Concerning the boundary terms, we only consider the term with the approximation of the neg function. First, we claim that there exists γ such that $\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) \rightharpoonup \gamma$ in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma)^d)$. Notice that, for ε large enough and using the properties of the neg approximation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \|\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma)} &\lesssim \int_0^T \left(\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} + 1\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \int_0^T \left(\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} + C \right) \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \left(\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} + C \right) \|\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\|^{\frac{4}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{8}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} + 2\left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{8}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C.\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

In addition, from Proposition 1.2, we have $\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{8}{3}}_{L^{\frac{8}{3}}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^{\frac{2}{3}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Since $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;(L^2(\Omega))^d)$ and in $L^2(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))^d)$ as proved in Proposition 2.2, we see that $\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Gamma)^d)$ independently of ε. Since this Banach space is reflexive, it proves the claimed weak convergence. Let us now prove that γ can be identified with $(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^-(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})$.

First, since $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{u}$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma)^d)$ and $\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\cdot) \to (\cdot)^-$ uniformly, one proves that $\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}) \to (\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))$. Then, the weak convergence of $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ in $L^4(0,T;L^2(\Gamma)^d)$ and [10, Proposition II.2.12] implies that $\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon+\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}) \rightharpoonup (\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})$ weakly in $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;L^1(\Gamma)^d)$. Using [10, Proposition II.2.9], we argue that $\gamma = (\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-(\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})$.

Regarding p_ε, we use an inf-sup condition as the one introduced in the proof of [28, Theorem 5.1, eq. (5.14)], which states that

$$\|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{\Psi}\in V} \frac{\int_\Omega p\nabla\cdot\mathbf{\Psi}}{\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}}. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore, using (WFe.3), one shows that:

$$\begin{aligned}\|p_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\partial_t\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} + \|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{V'} + \|\mathcal{A}\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} + \|h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} + \|\mathcal{T}\theta\|_{V'} \\ + \|\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\|_{V'} + \|f\|_{V'} + \|\sigma^{\mathrm{ref}}\|_{V'}.\end{aligned}$$

We now bound each term depending on ε:

- Since the Stokes operator is continuous, $\|\mathcal{A}\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and therefore, $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $L^2(0,T;V')$.
- Using [10, Eq. (V.3)], we prove that $\|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{V'} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{2-\frac{d}{2}}\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{d}{2}}$, which in turn shows that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;V')$.
- Obviously, $\|h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} \leq \|h\|_\infty\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and therefore, $h(\alpha)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;V')$.

We are left with the boundary term. Let $0 \neq \mathbf{\Psi} \in V$. In a similar manner as before and using Proposition 1.2, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}}\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} |\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\mathbf{\Psi}| \lesssim \left(\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3-d}{4}}\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{d-1}{4}} + C\right)^2.$$

As proved before, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. Therefore, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is also bounded in $L^{2-\frac{2}{d}}(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. Taking the supremum over $\mathbf{\Psi}$, this proves that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;V')$. Finally, in a similar fashion as in [10, Lemma V.1.6], the above bounds prove that $\partial_t\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;V')$. These bounds prove that (p_ε) is bounded in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, and therefore (p_ε) weakly converges to some p in $L^{\frac{4}{d}}(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.

Concerning θ, the convergence is largely proved in the same way as in Theorem 2.4. The only difference concerns the convergence of $\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})\theta_\varepsilon$ to $(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})^-\theta$, which is proved in the same manner as (2.7). All these convergence results let us say that $(\mathbf{u},\theta,p)$ is a solution to (WF) in the distribution sense. ∎

2.2. Further results in dimension 2. It is notably known that the solution of the Navier-Stokes equations with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are unique in dimension 2. We prove here that uniqueness still holds with the boundary conditions (1.2). We only sketch the proof.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *Let $d = 2$. Then, the solution $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon)$ of (WFe) is unique.*

Sketch of proof First of all, note that uniqueness of $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon)$ implies the uniqueness of p_ε via the De Rham Theorem [10, Theorem IV.2.4 and Chapter V].

Let $(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 1},\theta_{\varepsilon 1})$ and $(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 2},\theta_{\varepsilon 2})$ be two solutions of (WF.1)-(WF.3). Define $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon 1} - \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon 2}$ and $\theta = \theta_{\varepsilon 1} - \theta_{\varepsilon 2}$. Slightly adapting the proof in [10, Section VII.1.2.5], one proves that:

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\mathbf{v}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + A|\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim g^v(t)|\mathbf{v}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + B|\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \nu^v|\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{2.9}$$

where ν^v is a positive constant and g^v is a function in $L^1([0,T])$.

Testing the differential equation verified by θ with θ proves that:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}|\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2C\int_\Omega k|\nabla\theta|^2 + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \theta^2\left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 1}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 1}\cdot\mathbf{n})\right)\\ = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}}\left(\beta\left(\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 1}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon 2}\cdot\mathbf{n})\right) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\right)\theta_{\varepsilon 2}\theta.\end{aligned}$$

With a similar proof as the one of Proposition 2.2, we can prove that, on Γ_{out}, $\theta^2\left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_1\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\text{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_1\cdot\mathbf{n})\right) \geq 0$. Therefore, using (**A3**), one has:

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2C\int_\Omega k|\nabla\theta|^2 \lesssim \left(|\beta|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{\text{out}})} + \frac{1}{2}\right)|\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}|\theta_{\varepsilon 2}|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}|\theta|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}. \tag{2.10}$$

Using Sobolev embeddings and Young inequality, we prove:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(|\beta|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{\text{out}})} + \frac{1}{2}\right)|\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}|\theta_{\varepsilon 2}|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}|\theta|_{L^3(\Gamma_{\text{out}})}\\ &\quad\lesssim \left(|\beta|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{\text{out}})} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^3\frac{|\theta_{\varepsilon 2}|_{L^2(\Omega)}|\nabla\theta_{\varepsilon 2}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}}{2(\nu^\theta)^3}(|\mathbf{u}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)})\\ &\qquad + \frac{(\nu^\theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2}\left(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\nabla\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where ν^θ is a positive constant. Therefore, summing (2.9) and (2.10) gives $\frac{d}{dt}(|\mathbf{u}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}) \lesssim \max(g^v_1, g^\theta)(|\mathbf{u}|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\theta|^2_{L^2(\Omega)})$, with g^v_1 and g^θ integrable. Therefore, applying Gronwall's lemma and noticing that $|\mathbf{u}(0)|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\theta(0)|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$, one shows that $\mathbf{u} = 0$ and $\theta = 0$. □

Note that we may also prove that, for $d = 2$, the solution $(\mathbf{u}, \theta, p)$ of (WF) is unique. We can also state stronger convergence (compared to the ones stated in Theorem 2.5) in dimension 2. These results will be useful in the analysis of the optimisation problems.

COROLLARY 2.7. *Suppose $d = 2$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.5, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{u}$ strongly in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^2)$, $\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \to \nabla\mathbf{u}$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^2)$, $\theta_\varepsilon \to \theta$ strongly in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $\nabla\theta_\varepsilon \to \nabla\theta$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ and $p_\varepsilon \to p$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.*

Proof. Denote $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$, $\bar{\theta} = \theta - \theta_\varepsilon$ and $\bar{p} = p_\varepsilon - p$. The variational formulation verified by $(\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{p})$ reads as: for all $\mathbf{\Psi} \in V^u$:

$$\begin{aligned}-\langle\mathcal{P}\bar{p}, \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle =&\langle\partial_t\bar{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{A}\bar{\mathbf{u}} + h(\alpha)\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} + \langle(h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_\varepsilon))\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} +\\ &\langle\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} + \langle\mathcal{T}\bar{\theta}, \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u}\\ &\frac{1}{2}\langle\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u},\end{aligned} \tag{2.11a}$$

$$0 = \langle\nabla\cdot\bar{\mathbf{u}}, q\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.11b}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =&\langle \partial_t \bar{\theta}, \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)', V^\theta} - \langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\theta}) + \mathcal{D}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \theta_\varepsilon), \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)', V^\theta} \\
&+ \langle (\mathcal{C}(\alpha) - \mathcal{C}(\alpha_\varepsilon))\theta + \mathcal{C}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\bar{\theta}, \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)', V^\theta} \\
&+ \langle \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{u}, \theta) + \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon), \varphi\rangle_{(V^\theta)', V^\theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11c}
$$

The following inequalities, valid for $d = 2$, will be useful throughout this proof:

- As proved in [10, Eq. (V.5)]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\langle \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)', V^u}}{\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}} &= \frac{\langle \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}) + \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \bar{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)', V^u}}{\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}
$$

- Concerning the boundary term in (2.11a):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\langle \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)', V^u} = \\
&\qquad \langle \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)', V^u} + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} (\text{neg}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) \cdot \mathbf{\Psi}.
\end{aligned}
$$

  We now deal with each term separately. Concerning the first term, Young's inequality and Proposition 1.1 imply:

$$
\langle \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)', V^u} \lesssim \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{2.13}
$$

  Owning to the Lipschitz behavior of the neg function, and the uniform convergence of neg_ε toward neg (see **(A3)**), there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{neg}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) =& \text{neg}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) \\
&+ \text{neg}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}) \\
\leq& |\bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \mathbf{n}| + C_\varepsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}
$$

  where $C_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \to +\infty]{} 0$. Therefore, using Proposition 1.2, we infer:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} (\text{neg}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) \cdot \mathbf{\Psi} \\
&\lesssim \|\text{neg}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \text{neg}_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n})\|_{L^4(\Gamma)} \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{L^4(\Gamma)} \\
&\lesssim \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{4}} + C_\varepsilon \right) \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\qquad \times \|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla \mathbf{\Psi}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}
$$

- The inequality proved in Proposition 1.1 shows that:

$$
\int_\Omega \theta_\varepsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta} \lesssim \|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.16}
$$

- One will need also to bound the terms involving $\mathbf{u}$ and θ on the boundary. Using once again Proposition 1.1 , one shows directly that:

$$
\int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} (\bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \theta_\varepsilon \bar{\theta} \lesssim \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\bar{\theta}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{4}}. \tag{2.17}
$$

With the same technique as for (2.15), one proves:

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} (\mathrm{neg}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}))\,\theta_\varepsilon\bar\theta \lesssim \left(\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^{\frac14}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^{\frac34}_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_\varepsilon\right)\|\theta_\varepsilon\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar\theta\|^{\frac14}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\bar\theta\|^{\frac34}_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.18}$$

Since $d=2$, one has $\bar{\mathbf{u}}' \in L^2(0,T;(V^u)')$ and we may choose $\mathbf{\Psi} = \bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)$ for fixed t in (2.11a). Using the fact that $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{\Psi}=0$ in this case, and after rearranging the terms, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2A\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\int_\Omega h(\alpha)|\bar{\mathbf{u}}|^2 + \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}\mathrm{pos}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})|\bar{\mathbf{u}}|^2 = \\
&-2\langle (h(\alpha)-h(\alpha_\varepsilon))\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \bar{\mathbf{u}}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} - \langle \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\mathbf{u}),\bar{\mathbf{u}}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} + \langle \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbf{u}},\bar{\mathbf{u}}),\mathbf{u}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} \\
&-\int_\Omega B\bar\theta e_y\cdot\bar{\mathbf{u}} - \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}(\mathrm{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\bar{\mathbf{u}} \\
&-\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\mathbf{n})\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\bar{\mathbf{u}} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (2.12), (2.15), Proposition 1.2 and Young's inequality imply there exists $C_1>0$ independent of ε such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_1\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\int_\Omega |h(\alpha)-h(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \\
&\quad + g_1^u\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + (g_2^u)^{\frac45}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^{\frac25}_{L^2(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $g_1^u = 1 + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and $g_2^u = C_\varepsilon^2\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

Using once again Young's inequality, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_1\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + (1+g_1^u)\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + 2\int_\Omega |h(\alpha)-h(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 + g_2^u.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

We now move back to (2.11c) and choose $\varphi = \bar\theta$, which gives, after some manipulation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\|\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\int_\Omega k(\alpha_\varepsilon)|\nabla\bar\theta|^2 + \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}\left(\frac12(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\mathrm{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\right)\bar\theta^2 \\
&= \int_\Omega \theta_\varepsilon\bar{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\nabla\bar\theta - C\int_\Omega (k(\alpha)-k(\alpha_\varepsilon))\nabla\theta\cdot\nabla\bar\theta \\
&\qquad - \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}[((\bar{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta(\mathrm{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) - \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}))]\,\theta_\varepsilon\bar\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Proposition 2.2, $\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}\left(\frac12(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\mathrm{neg}(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\right)\bar\theta^2$ is positive. Therefore, using (2.17), (2.18), Proposition 1.2 and Young's inequality, one proves that there exists $C_3>0, C_4>0$, such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_3\|\nabla\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_4\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \left(C\int_\Omega (k(\alpha)-k(\alpha_\varepsilon))^2|\nabla\theta|^2\right) + g_1^\theta\|\bar\theta\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + g_2^\theta,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

where $g_1^\theta = 1 + \|\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $g_2^\theta = C_\varepsilon^2\|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

Summing (2.19) and (2.20) and choosing C_4 small enough, there exists $C^* > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}(\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}) + C^*(\|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}) \lesssim g_2^u + g_2^\theta \\
&+ (1 + \|\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + g_1^u)\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + (g_1^\theta + 1)\|\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&+ \int_\Omega (k(\alpha) - k(\alpha_\varepsilon))^2|\nabla\theta|^2 + \int_\Omega |h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2\,|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

We now introduce the following functions

$$a_\varepsilon^u = (1 + \|\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + g_1^u), \qquad b_\varepsilon^u = \int_\Omega |h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2\,|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 + g_2^u,$$

$$a_\varepsilon^\theta = (1 + g_1^\theta), \qquad b_\varepsilon^\theta = \int_\Omega (k(\alpha) - k(\alpha_\varepsilon))^2|\nabla\theta|^2 + g_2^\theta.$$

Since $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ both belong to $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)^2) \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^2)$ (the same holds for θ and θ_ε), a_ε^u, b_ε^u, a_ε^θ and b_ε^θ are integrable, and so are $a_\varepsilon = \max(a_\varepsilon^u, a_\varepsilon^\theta)$ and $b_\varepsilon = b_\varepsilon^u + b_\varepsilon^\theta$. Grönwall's lemma proves that for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\theta}(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \left(\int_0^t b_\varepsilon(s)ds\right)\exp\left(\int_0^t a_\varepsilon(s)ds\right)$. Since $a_\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $b_\varepsilon \geq 0$, $t \mapsto \left(\int_0^t b_\varepsilon(s)ds\right)$ and $t \mapsto \exp\left(\int_0^t a_\varepsilon(s)ds\right)$ are non-decreasing and we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\theta}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right) \leq \left(\int_0^T b_\varepsilon(s)ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T a_\varepsilon(s)ds\right). \tag{2.22}$$

Since, on one hand, $\alpha_\varepsilon \to \alpha$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and α_ε is independent of time, and on the other hand, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{u}$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, Lebesgue's dominated convergence gives a subsequence (ε_k) such that:

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega |h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_{\varepsilon_k})|^2\,|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \xrightarrow[k\to+\infty]{} 0, \qquad \int_0^T\int_\Omega |k(\alpha) - k(\alpha_{\varepsilon_k})|^2\,|\nabla\theta|^2 \xrightarrow[k\to+\infty]{} 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Notice that, owning to the convergence of $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ and θ_ε, $\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ are bounded w.r.t ε in $L^1([0,T])$. Therefore, since $C_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} 0$, it proves that $\int_0^T(g_2^u + g_\theta^2) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon_k\to+\infty]{} 0$. Gathering the previous convergence results then prove that $\int_0^T b_{\varepsilon k}(s)ds \xrightarrow[k\to+\infty]{} 0$. In addition, thanks to the convergence proved in Theorem 2.5, we show that $\int_0^T a_\varepsilon(s)ds$ is bounded w.r.t. ε. Therefore, it proves that $\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon k}\|_{L^\infty(0,T,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\theta - \theta_{\varepsilon k}\|_{L^\infty(0,T,L^2(\Omega))} \xrightarrow[k\to+\infty]{} 0$.

We now move back to (2.21). We integrate each side of the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim & F_\varepsilon^{u,\theta} + \int_0^T (g_1^u + \|\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 1)\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& + \int_0^T (g_1^\theta + 1)\|\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

with $F_\varepsilon^{u,\theta} = \|\mathbf{u}_0(\alpha_\varepsilon) - \mathbf{u}_0(\alpha)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\theta_0(\alpha_\varepsilon) - \theta_0(\alpha)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^T(g_2^u + g_2^\theta)$ $+ \int_0^T\int_\Omega |k(\alpha) - k(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2\,|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon|^2 + \int_0^T\int_\Omega |h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_\varepsilon)|^2\,|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|^2$. From Assumptions 2.1, the initial conditions are continuous with respect to α and thus the two first terms above goes to 0 as $\varepsilon \to +\infty$. The third, forth and fifth terms have been already treated (see (2.23)). Concerning the two last terms, notice that due to the convergence of $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$, one has $\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ bounded w.r.t ε in $L^1([0,T])$. The main problem concerns the term $\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Since $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)^2)$, we only need to deal with $\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ However, as proved in Theorem 2.5, up to a subsequence, $\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ weakly converges to $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(0,T,L^2(\Omega))$ and $\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0$ in $L^\infty([0,T])$. Concerning the other terms in g_1^u, they are all independent of ε, and we mainly use the fact that $\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0$ in $L^2([0,T])$. We may do the same proof concerning $\int_0^T \|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\int_0^T \|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

Therefore, $\int_0^T(1 + \|\theta_{\varepsilon k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla\theta_{\varepsilon k}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + g_1)\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega))} \xrightarrow[\varepsilon_k\to+\infty]{} 0$ and $\int_0^T(g_1^\theta + 1)\|\bar{\theta}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \xrightarrow[\varepsilon_k\to+\infty]{} 0$. It eventually proves that $\|\nabla(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla(\theta - \theta_{\varepsilon_k})\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \xrightarrow[k\to+\infty]{} 0$.

Concerning the pressure, we use once again the inf-sup condition (2.8) on $\bar{p}$, which proves that:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{p}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim &\|\partial_t\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{V'} + \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|h\|\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|(h(\alpha)-h(\alpha_\varepsilon))\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{V'} + \\ &\|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{V'} + \|\mathcal{T}\bar{\theta}\|_{V'} + \\ &\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\|_{V'}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Most of the terms in the right hand side were proved to converge strongly to 0 in $L^2([0,T])$.

- In the same pattern of proof as in (2.23), one proves easily that $(h(\alpha) - h(\alpha_{\varepsilon_k}))\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon k}$ converges strongly to 0 in $L^2(0,T;V')$
- Using (2.12), one proves that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon k},\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon k})$ strongly converges to 0 in $L^2(0,T;V')$.
- Summing (2.13) and (2.15) prove that: $\|\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\|_{V'} \lesssim \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + C_\varepsilon$. Since $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k} \to \mathbf{u}$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ and $C_\varepsilon \to 0$, this proves that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k},\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k}-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})$ converges strongly to 0 in $L^2(0,T;V')$.
- Finally, in a similar fashion as in [10, Lemma V.1.6], the above bounds prove that $\partial_t\bar{\mathbf{u}} \to 0$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;V')$.

Therefore, all the convergence results above prove that, up to a subsequence, $p_\varepsilon \to p$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Owning to Urysohn's subsequence principle and the uniqueness of the solution to (WF), we actually obtain that the whole sequence $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon)$ strongly converges toward $(\mathbf{u},\theta,p)$. ∎

3. Optimal control and necessary conditions. We now begin the analysis of the optimal control problems (OPT) and (OPTe). Let us detail first some assumptions made on the objective functional:

ASSUMPTIONS 3.1.
- *For $d = 2$, $\mathcal{J}$ is lower semi-continuous with respect to the (weak-*, strong, strong, strong) topology of $\mathcal{U}_{ad} \times L^2(0,T;V^u) \times L^2(0,T;V^\theta) \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.*
- *In dimension 3, $\mathcal{J}$ is either lower semi-continuous with respect to the (weak-*, strong, strong, weak) topology of $\mathcal{U}_{ad} \times L^2(0,T;H^u) \times L^2(0,T;H^\theta) \times$*

$L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, *or lower semi-continuous with respect to the (weak-*, weak, weak, weak) topology of* $\mathcal{U}_{ad} \times L^2(0,T;V^u) \times L^2(0,T;V^\theta) \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.

The existence of solutions to (OPTe) and (OPT) is rather classical and we refer for instance to [20, 31, 33]. We state a first result that let us see that a solution of (OPT) can be approximated by (OPTe).

THEOREM 3.2. *Assume Assumptions 3.1 is verified. Let* $(\alpha_\varepsilon^*, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ *be a globally optimal solution of* (OPTe)*. Then* $(\alpha_\varepsilon^*) \subset \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ *is a bounded sequence. Furthermore, there exists* $(\alpha^*, \mathbf{u}^*, \theta^*, p^*) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad} \times L^2(0,T;V^u) \times L^2(0,T;V^\theta) \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ *such that a subsequence of* $(\alpha_\varepsilon^*, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, , \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ *converges to* $(\alpha^*, \mathbf{u}^*, \theta^*, p^*)$ *in the topology of Assumptions 3.1, and for all* $(\alpha, \mathbf{u}, \theta, p)$ *in* $\mathcal{U}_{ad} \times L^2(0,T;V^u) \times L^2(0,T;V^\theta) \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$*:* $\mathcal{J}(\alpha^*, \mathbf{u}^*, \theta^*, p^*) \leq \mathcal{J}(\alpha, \mathbf{u}, \theta, p)$*. Hence, any accumulation point of* $(\alpha_\varepsilon^*, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ *is a globally optimal solution of* (OPT).

Proof. The proof can be adapted from [20, Theorem 15] or [31, Theorem 3]. ◻

However, the fact that this only concerns global solutions may appear restrictive. Under an additional assumption, we can state a slightly stronger result.

COROLLARY 3.3. *Assume Assumptions 3.1 hold. Let* α^* *be a local strict solution of* (OPT)*, meaning that there exists* $\rho > 0$ *such that* $\mathcal{J}(\alpha^*, \mathbf{u}^*, \theta^*, p^*) < \mathcal{J}(\alpha, \mathbf{u}, \theta, p)$ *for all* α *such that* $\|\alpha^* - \alpha\|_{BV} < \rho$*. Then, there exists a family of local solution* (α_ε^*) *of* (OPTe) *such that* (α_ε^*) *converges weak-* to* α^*.

Proof. Similar to [35, Theorem 3.14]. ◻

3.1. First order necessary conditions for (OPTe). From now on, we set $d = 2$, in order to have uniqueness of solution of (WFe). We make the following assumption on the cost function:

ASSUMPTIONS 3.4. *Assume* $d = 2$ *and* $\mathcal{J}$ *is Fréchet-differentiable.*

We define the sets $W^u(0,T) = \{\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0,T;(V^u));\ \partial_t \mathbf{u} \in L^2(0,T;(V^u)')\}$, and $W^\theta(0,T) = \{\theta \in L^2(0,T;(V^\theta));\ \partial_t \theta \in L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)')\}$. Write, in $(V^u)' \times (V^\theta)' \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, the equation (WFe) as $e(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon, \alpha_\varepsilon) = 0$, where $e : W^u(0,T) \times W^\theta(0,T) \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \times \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}} \to L^2(0,T;(V^u)') \times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \times L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)') \times H^u \times H^\theta$ is defined as:

$$e(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon, \alpha_\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{A}\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) + h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{P}p \\ \qquad + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}) - f - \sigma^{\mathrm{ref}} \\ \mathcal{P}^* \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \\ \partial_t \theta_\varepsilon - \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{C}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\theta_\varepsilon + \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon) - \phi \\ \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(0, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}_0(\alpha_\varepsilon) \\ \theta_\varepsilon(0, \cdot) - \theta_0(\alpha_\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The operators $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon$ are Fréchet differentiable with the same smoothness as the approximation neg_ε. Their derivatives with respect to $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ are denoted by $d_u \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon : W^u(0,T)^2 \to \mathcal{L}(W(0,T), L^2(0,T;(V^u)'))$, $d_u \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon : W^u(0,T) \times W^\theta(0,T) \to \mathcal{L}(W^u(0,T), L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)'))$, defined by:

$$d_u \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathcal{N}'(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\mathbf{v},$$

$$\langle d_u \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \theta)\mathbf{v}, \varphi \rangle_{(V^\theta)', V^\theta} = \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} (1 + \beta \mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon'(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})\theta\varphi,$$

where $\mathcal{N}'(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w})$ is defined by:

$$\langle \mathcal{N}'(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w})\mathbf{v},\mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{(V^u)',V^u} = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \text{neg}'_\varepsilon\,(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n})\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n})\mathbf{w}\cdot\mathbf{\Psi}.$$

Furthermore, these operators are bounded, as proved in the following lemma:

Lemma 3.5. *Given $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon)$ solution of (WFe):*

$$\|d_u\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{ref})\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(0,T;(V^u)')} \le c(\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T;V^u)})\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(0,T;V^u)},$$

$$\|d_u\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon)\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)')} \le c(\|\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T;V^\theta)})\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(0,T;V^u)},$$

where $c(\cdot)$ is a Lipschitz function.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.5 from which we infer, for $\mathbf{\Psi}\in V$, that: $\langle \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}),\mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{V',V} \le \|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Due to **(A3)**, one has straight away the existence of a constant $C>0$ such that: $\langle \mathcal{N}'(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\mathbf{v},\mathbf{\Psi}\rangle_{V',V} \le (\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|+C)\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Adding the two inequalities and dividing by $\|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ concludes the proof. The proof of the second inequality being similar is thus omitted. ∎

Using the results of [33, Section 1.8.2], one shows easily that e is Fréchet differentiable w.r.t. $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon)$, with derivative given by:

$$e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{v}\\ \ell\\ q\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t\mathbf{v}+\mathcal{A}\mathbf{v}+\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)+\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{v})+h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{v}+\mathcal{P}q+\mathcal{T}\ell \\ +\frac{1}{2}d_u\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}})\mathbf{v} \\ \mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{v} \\ \partial_t\ell-\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\ell)-\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{v},\theta_\varepsilon)+\mathcal{C}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\ell+\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\ell) \\ +d_u\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon)\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{v}(0,\cdot) \\ \ell(0,\cdot)\end{pmatrix}.$$

For defining first order conditions (see [33]), a question of interests is to determine if, for all $g=(g^u,g^p,g^\theta,\mathbf{v}_0,\ell_0)\in L^2(0,T;(V^u)')\times L^2(0,T;(V^\theta)')\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))\times H^u\times H^\theta$, the following linearized equation

$$e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{v}\\ \ell\\ q\end{pmatrix} = g \tag{3.1}$$

admits a solution $(\mathbf{v},\ell,q)\in W^u(0,T)\times W^\theta(0,T)\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.

Theorem 3.6. *For all $\alpha_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{U}_{ad}$, Eq.* (3.1) *admits a unique solution. Therefore, $e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon)$ is invertible.*

Sketch of proof. First, notice that using [28, Corollary 2.4], there exists $\mathbf{v}^{\text{ref}}\in L^2(0,T;H^1_0(\Omega))$ such that $g^p=\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}^{\text{ref}}$. Thus, defining $\bar{\mathbf{v}}=\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}^{\text{ref}}$, we bring the system back in the framework of a solenoidal vector function $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$. Using Lemma 3.5, the proof becomes a simple adaptation of the proof of Theorem 2.5 and [32, Appendix A2]. Uniqueness is proved as for Proposition 2.6 (see also [32, Appendix A2]). ∎

A consequence of Theorem 3.6 is that for all $G=(g_1,g_2,g_3)\in W^u(0,T)'\times W^\theta(0,T)'\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, the following adjoint equation admits a unique solution $\Lambda_\varepsilon=(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon,\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,\lambda^p_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}_0}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\theta_0}_\varepsilon)\in L^2(0,T;V^u)\times L^2(0,T;V^\theta)\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))\times H^u\times H^\theta$:

$$(e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon))^*\Lambda_\varepsilon = G, \tag{3.2}$$

where $(e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon))^*$ denotes the adjoint operator of $e'_{\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon}(\alpha_\varepsilon)$.

After some calculations, equation (3.2) is equivalent to solve, for all $(\mathbf{v},\ell,q) \in W^u(0,T)\times W^\theta(0,T)\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, the following variational problem:

$$(3.3)\quad \begin{aligned}
&\langle -\partial_t\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{A}\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + (\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)^\intercal\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon) + h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{P}\lambda^p_\varepsilon - \mathcal{D}_1(\theta_\varepsilon)\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\\
&\quad + \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon) + (\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}))^*\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\\
&\quad + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon) + (d_u\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon))^*\,\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}\rangle_{W(0,T)',W(0,T)}\\
&\qquad + \langle \mathbf{v}(0,\cdot),\lambda^{u_0}_\varepsilon\rangle_H\\
&\qquad = \langle g_1,\mathbf{v}\rangle_{W^u(0,T)',W^u(0,T)},\\
&\langle \mathcal{P}^*\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon, q\rangle_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \langle g_2,q\rangle_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}\\
&\langle -\partial_t\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon + \mathcal{T}^*\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{C}(\alpha_\varepsilon)\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon - \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon + \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)^*\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,\ell\rangle_{W^\theta(0,T)',W^\theta(0,T)}\\
&\qquad = \langle g_3,\ell\rangle_{W^\theta(0,T)',W^\theta(0,T)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \mathcal{D}(\theta,\mathbf{u}),\varphi\rangle = \langle \mathcal{D}_1(\theta)\varphi,\mathbf{u}\rangle = \langle \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{u})\varphi,\theta\rangle$, $\langle \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})\theta,\varphi\rangle = \langle \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})\varphi,\theta\rangle$ $= \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}((\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}) + \beta\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{n}))\,\theta\varphi$, and $\langle \mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon),\mathbf{v}\rangle = \int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{v}$. This equation, in turn, is the weak formulation of:

$$(3.4a)\quad \begin{aligned}
&-\partial_t\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon - A\Delta\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + h(\alpha_\varepsilon)\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + \nabla\lambda^p_\varepsilon + (\nabla\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)^\intercal\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla)\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon - \theta_\varepsilon\nabla\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon = g_1\\
&\nabla\cdot\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon = g_2\\
&-\partial_t\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon + B\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\cdot e_y - \nabla\cdot(Ck(\alpha_\varepsilon)\nabla\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon) - \nabla\cdot(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon) = g_3\\
&\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon|_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{w}}\cup\Gamma_{\mathrm{in}}} = 0,\\
&\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon|_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{in}}} = 0,\\
&\partial_n\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon|_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{w}}} = 0,\\
&A\partial_n\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{n}\lambda^p_\varepsilon|_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}) + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})\right)\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + (1+\beta\mu_\varepsilon)\theta_\varepsilon\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\mathbf{n}\\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\mu_\varepsilon\left((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\right)\mathbf{n},\\
&Ck(\alpha_\varepsilon)\partial_n\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon + \beta\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\mathrm{neg}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})|_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}} = 0\\
&\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon(T) = 0, \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon(T) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$(3.4b)\quad \mu_\varepsilon = \mathrm{neg}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n})$$

and, as shown in a similar fashion in [32], $\lambda^{u_0}_\varepsilon = \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon(0,\cdot)$, $\lambda^{\theta_0}_\varepsilon = \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon(0,\cdot)$.

An other consequence of Theorem 3.6 is that we can apply [33, Corollary 1.3] which states that at any local solution $(\alpha^*_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon)$ of (OPTe), the following optimality conditions hold:

THEOREM 3.7. *Let α^*_ε be an optimal solution of* (OPTe) *with associated states $(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon)$. Then there exists adjoint states $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon,\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,\lambda^p_\varepsilon)\in L^2(0,T;V^u)\times L^2(0,T;V^\theta)$ $\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that, denoting $(\lambda^{u_0}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\theta_0}_\varepsilon) = (\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon(0,\cdot),\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon(0,\cdot))$ and $\Lambda_\varepsilon = (\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon,\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,$ $\lambda^p_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}_0}_\varepsilon,\lambda^{\theta_0}_\varepsilon)$:*

$$(3.5)\quad \begin{aligned}
&e(\alpha^*_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon) = 0,\\
&\mathcal{J}'_{\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon}(\alpha^*_\varepsilon) + (e_{\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon}(\alpha^*_\varepsilon)')^*\Lambda_\varepsilon = 0,\\
&\left\langle \mathcal{J}'_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon) + (e_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon,\theta^*_\varepsilon,p^*_\varepsilon)')^*\Lambda_\varepsilon, \alpha-\alpha^*_\varepsilon\right\rangle_{\mathcal{U}'_{ad},\mathcal{U}_{ad}} \geq 0,\ \forall\alpha\in\mathcal{U}_{ad},\\
&\alpha_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{U}_{ad}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.8. *As stated in [33, Eq. (1.89)], since e and $\mathcal{J}$ are Fréchet differentiable, the mapping $\alpha_\varepsilon \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\alpha_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{J}(\alpha_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ is Fréchet differentiable, and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}'(\alpha_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{J}'_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon, \theta^*_\varepsilon, p^*_\varepsilon) + (e_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon, \theta^*_\varepsilon, p^*_\varepsilon))^* \Lambda_\varepsilon$, which reads as:*

$$\begin{aligned}(e_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon, \theta^*_\varepsilon, p^*_\varepsilon))^* \Lambda_\varepsilon = \int_0^T &\left(h'(\alpha_\varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon + Ck'(\alpha_\varepsilon)\nabla\theta_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\right) \\ &+ \mathbf{u}'_0(\alpha_\varepsilon) \cdot \lambda^{u_0}_\varepsilon + \theta'_0(\alpha_\varepsilon)\lambda^{\theta_0}_\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

3.2. Limit adjoint system. To conclude this paper, we will now study the convergence of the adjoint states $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon, \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon, \lambda^p_\varepsilon)$ to functions $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda^\theta, \lambda^p)$. The only trouble concerns the multiplier μ_ε defined in (3.4b). We will prove that at the limit, μ is defined thanks to the convex-hull of the Heaviside function $H : \mathbb{R} \multimap [0, 1]$, defined as:

$$H(u) = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } u < 0, \\ \{1\} & \text{if } u > 0, \\ [0, 1] & \text{if } u = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

As we will prove in this section, these limit adjoint states $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda^\theta, \lambda^p)$ let us define necessary conditions of optimality for the unrelaxed problem (OPT).

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(\alpha_\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ such that $\alpha_\varepsilon \xrightharpoonup{*} \alpha$. Define by $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon, \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon, \lambda^p_\varepsilon)$ a weak solution of (3.4) parametrized by α_ε. Then, there exists $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda^\theta, \lambda^p) \in L^\infty(0, T; H^u) \cap L^2(0, T; V^u) \times L^\infty(0, T, H^\theta) \cap L^2(0, T; V^\theta) \times L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ such that, up to a subsequence:*

- $\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon \to \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}$ *in* $L^\infty(0, T; (L^2(\Omega))^2)$ *and* $\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon \to \lambda^\theta$ *in* $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$,
- $\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}$ *in* $L^2(0, T; (H^1(\Omega))^2)$ *and* $\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \lambda^\theta$ *in* $L^2(0, T; (H^1(\Omega)))$,
- $\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}$ *in* $L^2(0, T; (L^2(\Gamma))^2)$ *and* $\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to+\infty]{} \lambda^\theta$ *in* $L^2(0, T; (L^2(\Gamma)))$,
- $\lambda^p_\varepsilon \to \lambda^p$ *in* $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$.

Furthermore, there exists $\mu \in L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Gamma_{out}))$ defined by $-\mu(x) \in H(-\mathbf{u}(x) \cdot \mathbf{n}(x))$ a.e. in Γ_{out} such that $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda^\theta, \lambda^p)$ is a weak solution to (3.4a) parametrized by α and μ.

Proof. The proof is very similar to the ones presented in section 2.

- In a similar manner as for Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3, one shows that, for all $\sigma \in [0, \frac{1}{6})$, there exist constants $c^\theta_\lambda(\sigma)$ and $c^u_\lambda(\sigma)$, independent of ε, such that:

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^T \|\nabla\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tau|^{2\sigma} \left\|\mathscr{F}\left(\widetilde{\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} d\tau \le c^u_\lambda(\sigma),$$

$$\sup_{[0,T]} \|\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^T \|\nabla\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tau|^{2\sigma} \left\|\mathscr{F}\left(\widetilde{\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} d\tau \le c^\theta_\lambda(\sigma).$$

- These bounds prove a weaker set of convergence in the same manner as in Theorem 2.5. Since once again, we set $d = 2$, one proves the strong convergence stated above as in Corollary 2.7.

We only need to prove that $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda^\theta, \lambda^p)$ is a weak solution to (3.4a). The terms $\langle(\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}))^* \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon$ and $(d_u\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \theta_\varepsilon))^* \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}\rangle_{W^u(0,T)', W^u(0,T)}$ need a more thorough examination. We start with the first term for which we have

$$\langle(\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}))^* \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}\rangle_{W^u} = \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \text{neg}'_\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n}\right)\left((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}^{\text{ref}}) \cdot \lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\right)\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v}.$$

Thanks to assumptions (**A3**) and (**A4**) and $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{u}$ pointwise a.e. in Γ (due to strong convergence in $L^2([0,T]\times\Gamma)$), there is a subsequence (not relabeled) such that $\mathrm{neg}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\cdot\mathbf{n}) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu$ in $L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}))$, and such that $0\le\mu\le 1$ a.e. in Γ_{out} and

$$\mu = 1 \text{ a.e. in } \{x\in\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}},\ \mathbf{u}(x)\cdot\mathbf{n}(x)>0\},\ \mu=0 \text{ a.e. in } \{x\in\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}},\ \mathbf{u}(x)\cdot\mathbf{n}(x)<0\}.$$

Furthermore, due to the convergence presented above, $\big((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon\big)\to((\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\lambda^{\mathbf{u}})$ in $L^1(0,T;L^1(\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}))$. Therefore, it proves that:

$$\langle(\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}}))^*\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}\rangle_{W^u(0,T)',W^u(0,T)}\to\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}\mu\left((\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{ref}})\cdot\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}\right)\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{v}.$$

Similarly, one proves that:

$$\langle\left(d_u\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon)\right)^*\lambda^\theta_\varepsilon,\mathbf{v}\rangle_{W^u(0,T)',W^u(0,T)}\to\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{out}}}(1+\beta\mu)\,(\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{n})\theta\lambda^\theta.$$

All other terms in (3.3) are easily proved to converge in the same manner as in Theorem 2.5. Therefore, $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}},\lambda^\theta,\lambda^p)$ is a weak solution to (3.4a) parametrized by α and μ. ∎

We may now prove the final result of this paper ; namely the necessary optimality conditions of (OPT).

THEOREM 3.10. *Let α^* be an optimal solution of* (OPT) *with associated state $\mathbf{u}^*,\theta^*,p^*$. Then there exist a multiplier $\mu\in L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\Gamma_{out}))$ and adjoint states $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}},\lambda^\theta,\lambda^p)\in L^2(0,T;V^u)\times L^2(0,T;V^\theta)\times L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ solution of* (3.4a) *such that, denoting $(\lambda^{u_0},\lambda^{\theta_0})=(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}(0,\cdot),\lambda^\theta(0,\cdot))$ and $\Lambda=(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}},\lambda^\theta,\ \lambda^p,\lambda^{\mathbf{u}_0},\lambda^{\theta_0})$:*

$$\langle\mathcal{J}'_{\alpha^*}(\mathbf{u}^*,\theta^*,p^*)+(e_{\alpha^*}(\mathbf{u}^*,\theta^*,p^*)')^*\Lambda,\alpha-\alpha^*\rangle_{\mathcal{U}'_{ad},\mathcal{U}_{ad}}\ge 0,\ \forall\alpha\in\mathcal{U}_{ad}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the lines of [17, Theorem 4.4]. Denote by S_ε the solution operator which to α associates the solution of the relaxed equations (WFe) and by S the solution operator which to α associates the solution of (WF). For some $\rho>0$, consider the auxiliary optimal control problem:

$$\text{(3.7)}\qquad \begin{aligned}&\min\ F_\varepsilon(\alpha_\varepsilon)=\mathcal{J}(\alpha_\varepsilon,\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon)+\frac{1}{2}\|\alpha^*-\alpha_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\text{s.t.}\ \begin{cases}(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon,p_\varepsilon)=S_\varepsilon(\alpha_\varepsilon),\\ \alpha_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{U}_{ad},\\ \|\alpha_\varepsilon-\alpha^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le\rho.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Since α_ε and α^* are both in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}}$, they are both bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and therefore, $\|\alpha^*-\alpha_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is well defined. It is classical to show that (3.7) admits a global minimizer $\alpha^*_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}}$.

Using (2.22) and (2.24) (but with $\alpha_\varepsilon\equiv\alpha$), one proves that (in the norm of the topology from Assumptions 3.1 with $d=2$):

$$\text{(3.8)}\qquad \|S(\alpha)-S_\varepsilon(\alpha)\|\lesssim C_\varepsilon,\ \forall\alpha\in\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}},$$

where C_ε has been defined in (2.14).

Note that due to the Fréchet-differentiability of $\mathcal{J}$ supposed in Assumptions 3.4 and (3.8), it holds, for ε large enough:

$$|\mathcal{J}(\alpha,S(\alpha))-\mathcal{J}(\alpha,S_\varepsilon(\alpha))|\lesssim C_\varepsilon,\ \forall\alpha\in\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{ad}},\ \|\alpha-\alpha^*\|\le\rho.$$

We obtain as a consequence that $F_\varepsilon(\alpha^*) \lesssim C_\varepsilon + \mathcal{J}(\alpha^*, S(\alpha^*))$, and:

$$F_\varepsilon(\alpha) \gtrsim -C_\varepsilon + \mathcal{J}(\alpha^*, S(\alpha^*)) + \frac{1}{2}\|\alpha - \alpha^*\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \ \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}, \ \|\alpha - \alpha^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \rho.$$

Therefore, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}$ such that $\|\alpha - \alpha^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \rho$:

$$F_\varepsilon(\alpha^*) \lesssim C_\varepsilon + \mathcal{J}(\alpha^*, S(\alpha^*)) \lesssim C_\varepsilon + \mathcal{J}(\alpha, S(\alpha)) \lesssim 2C_\varepsilon + F_\varepsilon(\alpha).$$

Hence, for some constant C', and denoting $C'_\varepsilon = C'C_\varepsilon$, one has the implication:

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}, \ 2C'_\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}\|\alpha - \alpha^*\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 \implies F_\varepsilon(\alpha^*) < F_\varepsilon(\alpha).$$

One has therefore the following necessary condition of optimality:

$$\|\alpha^*_\varepsilon - \alpha^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \sqrt{4C'_\varepsilon}. \tag{3.9}$$

Hence, for ε large enough, α^*_ε is in the ρ-ball around α^* ; therefore, α^*_ε is a local solution of (OPTe). Using Theorem 3.7, one then proves that there exists adjoint states $(\lambda^{\mathbf{u}}_\varepsilon, \lambda^\theta_\varepsilon, \lambda^p_\varepsilon)$ solution of (3.4a) such that, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}$:

$$\left\langle \mathcal{J}'_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon, \theta^*_\varepsilon, p^*_\varepsilon) + (e_{\alpha^*_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{u}^*_\varepsilon, \theta^*_\varepsilon, p^*_\varepsilon)')^* \Lambda_\varepsilon, \alpha - \alpha^*_\varepsilon \right\rangle_{\mathcal{U}'_{\text{ad}}, \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}} + \langle \alpha^*_\varepsilon - \alpha^*, \alpha - \alpha^*_\varepsilon \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

From (3.9), one has $\alpha^*_\varepsilon \to \alpha^*$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$, and therefore, in $L^1(\Omega)$. Since $(\alpha^*_\varepsilon - \alpha^*)_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}$, one has also $(\alpha^*_\varepsilon - \alpha^*)_\varepsilon$ bounded in $BV(\Omega)$. Hence, $\alpha^*_\varepsilon \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \alpha^*$ in $\mathcal{U}_{\text{ad}}$. Using then Corollary 2.7, Assumptions 3.1 and Lemma 3.9, we can pass to the limit in (3.10), which concludes this proof. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] J. Alexandersen and C. S. Andreasen. A review of topology optimisation for fluid-based problems. Fluids, 5(1):29, 2020.

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara. Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems, volume 254. Clarendon Press Oxford, 2000.

[3] S. Amstutz. The topological asymptotic for the Navier–Stokes equations. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 11(3):401–425, 2005.

[4] P. Angot, C.-H. Bruneau, and P. Fabrie. A penalization method to take into account obstacles in incompressible viscous flows. Numerische Mathematik, 81(4):497–520, 1999.

[5] D. Arndt, M. Braack, and G. Lube. Finite elements for the Navier-Stokes problem with outflow condition. In Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications ENUMATH 2015, pages 95–103. Springer, 2016.

[6] R. Arndt, A. N Ceretani, and C. Rautenberg. On existence and uniqueness of solutions to a Boussinesq system with nonlinear and mixed boundary conditions. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 490(1):124201, 2020.

[7] J. Boland and W. Layton. Error analysis for finite element methods for steady natural convection problems. Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, 11(5-6):449–483, 1990.

[8] T. Borrvall and J. Petersson. Topology optimization of fluids in Stokes flow. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids, 41(1):77–107, 2003.

[9] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie. Outflow boundary conditions for the incompressible non-homogeneous Navier–Stokes equations. Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B, 7(2):pp–219, 2007.

[10] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie. Mathematical Tools for the Study of the Incompressible Navier–Stokes Equations and Related Models, volume 183. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[11] M. Braack and P. B. Mucha. Directional do-nothing condition for the Navier–Stokes equations. Journal of Computational Mathematics, pages 507–521, 2014.

[12] B. Brangeon, P. Joubert, and A. Bastide. Influence of the dynamic boundary conditions on natural convection in an asymmetrically heated channel. International Journal of Thermal Sciences, 95:64–72, 2015.
[13] C-H Bruneau and P Fabrie. New efficient boundary conditions for incompressible Navier–Stokes equations: a well-posedness result. ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 30(7):815–840, 1996.
[14] F. Caubet, C. Conca Rosende, and M. Godoy. On the detection of several obstacles in 2D Stokes flow: topological sensitivity and combination with shape derivatives. IPI : Inverse Problems and Imaging, 2016.
[15] A. Ceretani and C. Rautenberg. The Boussinesq system with mixed non-smooth boundary conditions and do-nothing boundary flow. Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik, 70(1):1–24, 2019.
[16] N. Chami and A. Zoughaib. Modeling natural convection in a pitched thermosyphon system in building roofs and experimental validation using particle image velocimetry. Energy and buildings, 42(8):1267–1274, 2010.
[17] C. Christof, C. Meyer, S. Walther, and C. Clason. Optimal control of a non-smooth semilinear elliptic equation. Mathematical Control & Related Fields, 8(1):247, 2018.
[18] C. Clason and K. Kunisch. A duality-based approach to elliptic control problems in non-reflexive banach spaces. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 17(1):243–266, 2011.
[19] C. Clason, K. Kunisch, and A. Rund. Optimal control of partial differential equations with nonsmooth cost functionals. In Proceedings of the XXIV Congress on Differential Equations and Applications / XIV Congress on Applied Mathematics, Cádiz, 2015.
[20] P.-H. Cocquet, S. Riffo, and J. Salomon. Optimization of bathymetry for long waves with small amplitude. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09135, 2020.
[21] E. Colmenares, G. N. Gatica, and R. Oyarzúa. A posteriori error analysis of an augmented fully-mixed formulation for the stationary Boussinesq model. Computers & Mathematics with Applications, 77(3):693–714, 2019.
[22] T. Dbouk. A review about the engineering design of optimal heat transfer systems using topology optimization. Applied Thermal Engineering, 112:841–854, 2017.
[23] G. Desrayaud, E. Chénier, A. Joulin, A. Bastide, B. Brangeon, J.P. Caltagirone, Y Cherif, R. Eymard, C. Garnier, S. Giroux-Julien, et al. Benchmark solutions for natural convection flows in vertical channels submitted to different open boundary conditions. International journal of thermal sciences, 72:18–33, 2013.
[24] F. Feppon, G. Allaire, F. Bordeu, J. Cortial, and C. Dapogny. Shape optimization of a coupled thermal fluid–structure problem in a level set mesh evolution framework. SeMA Journal, 76(3):413–458, 2019.
[25] L. Formaggia, J.-F. Gerbeau, F. Nobile, and A. Quarteroni. Numerical treatment of defective boundary conditions for the Navier–Stokes equations. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 40(1):376–401, 2002.
[26] G. Galdi. An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier–Stokes equations: Steady-state problems. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
[27] H. Garcke, M. Hinze, C. Kahle, and K. F. Lam. A phase field approach to shape optimization in Navier–Stokes flow with integral state constraints. Advances in Computational Mathematics, 44(5):1345–1383, 2018.
[28] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart. Finite element methods for Navier–Stokes equations: theory and algorithms, volume 5. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
[29] T. Goudon, S. Krell, and G. Lissoni. Ddfv method for Navier–Stokes problem with outflow boundary conditions. Numerische Mathematik, 142(1):55–102, 2019.
[30] F. Harder and G. Wachsmuth. Comparison of optimality systems for the optimal control of the obstacle problem. GAMM-Mitteilungen, 40(4):312–338, 2018.
[31] Jaroslav Haslinger and Raino AE Mäkinen. On a topology optimization problem governed by two-dimensional Helmholtz equation. Computational Optimization and Applications, 62(2):517–544, 2015.
[32] M. Hinze. Optimal and instantaneous control of the instationary Navier–Stokes equations. Habilitationsschrift, Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität, Berlin, 2002.
[33] M. Hinze, R. Pinnau, M. Ulbrich, and S. Ulbrich. Optimization with PDE constraints, volume 23. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
[34] S. Kračmar and J. Neustupa. Modeling of the unsteady flow through a channel with an artificial outflow condition by the Navier–Stokes variational inequality. Mathematische Nachrichten, 291(11-12):1801–1814, 2018.
[35] K. Kunisch and D. Wachsmuth. Sufficient optimality conditions and semi-smooth Newton meth-

ods for optimal control of stationary variational inequalities. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 18(2):520–547, 2012.
[36] J.L. Lions. Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires. Les Cours de référence. Dunod, 2002.
[37] C. Meyer and L. Susu. Optimal control of nonsmooth, semilinear parabolic equations. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 55(4):2206–2234, 2017.
[38] B. Mohammadi and O. Pironneau. Shape optimization in fluid mechanics. Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics, 36:255–279, 2004.
[39] B. Mohammadi and O. Pironneau. Applied shape optimization for fluids. Oxford University Press, 2010.
[40] A. A. Novotny, J. Sokołowski, and A. Żochowski. Topological derivatives of shape functionals. Part II: first-order method and applications. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 180(3):683–710, 2019.
[41] C. Popa, D. Ospir, S. Fohanno, and C. Chereches. Numerical simulation of dynamical aspects of natural convection flow in a double-skin façade. Energy and Buildings, 50:229–233, 2012.
[42] D. Ramalingom, P.-H. Cocquet, and A. Bastide. Numerical study of natural convection in asymmetrically heated channel considering thermal stratification and surface radiation. Numerical Heat Transfer, Part A: Applications, 72(9):681–696, 2017.
[43] D. Ramalingom, P.-H. Cocquet, R. Maleck, and A. Bastide. A multi-objective optimization problem in mixed and natural convection for a vertical channel asymmetrically heated. Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization, 60(5):2001–2020, 2019.
[44] Delphine Ramalingom, Pierre-Henri Cocquet, and Alain Bastide. A new interpolation technique to deal with fluid-porous media interfaces for topology optimization of heat transfer. Computers & Fluids, 168:144–158, 2018.
[45] A. Schiela and D. Wachsmuth. Convergence analysis of smoothing methods for optimal control of stationary variational inequalities with control constraints. ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis-Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique, 47(3):771–787, 2013.
[46] C. Suárez, P. Joubert, J. Molina, and F. Sánchez. Heat transfer and mass flow correlations for ventilated facades. Energy and Buildings, 43(12):3696–3703, 2011.
[47] R. Temam. Navier–Stokes equations: theory and numerical analysis, volume 343. American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
[48] Alexandre Vieira, Alain Bastide, and Pierre-Henri Cocquet. Topology optimization for steady-state anisothermal flow targeting solid with piecewise constant thermal diffusivity. hal-02569142, version 2, 2020.
[49] I. Yousept. Optimal control of non-smooth hyperbolic evolution Maxwell equations in type-II superconductivity. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 55(4):2305–2332, 2017.