We are interested in the Cauchy problem for a
function
$$u: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{r} \circ f \quad f_{r} form$$

 $\int^{n} (u, \Omega_{n}) \partial \partial v = f(u, \Omega_{n}).$
We denote $\partial u = (\partial u, \partial, u, ..., \partial_{n}u)$ and
 $\int^{r} (u, \Omega_{n}) = \int^{n} (t, x, u(t, x), \partial, u(t, x), ..., \partial_{n}u(t, x))$
and similarly for f . Here, $(t, x) = (x^{\circ}, x', ..., x^{\circ})$ are Cartesian
coordinates in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . We will be interested in the case when, for
suitable u , we have a Lonenteria metric $\partial_{\mu v}(u, 2u)$ with inverse
 $\int^{n} (u, \Omega_{n}).$ We sometimes write simply $g(u, 2u)$ with inverse
 $\int^{n} (u, \Omega_{n}).$ We notation.

Einstein's equiptions is suifable coordinates have the above form. In that care a will be the vector whose entures are the components of g thenselves. We are primarily interested in his but we been general for row.

Basic assumptions and notation
Us consider a
$$C^{k} - nr$$
, is large,
 $j: R^{nr} \times \underline{R}^{k} \times \dots \times \underline{R}^{k'} \longrightarrow L_{nr}$,
where L_{nrr} are the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ Lowerly induces $h = R^{nr}$ with
negative (00) entry. We write $j = (j_{pr})$ and $j^{nr} = (j_{pr})$. We assume
that for every multi-index $d = (d_{pr}) + \alpha + j^{nr} = (j_{pr})$. We assume
that for every multi-index $d = (d_{pr}) + \alpha + j^{nr} = (m+1)r^{nr}$. We assume
that for every multi-index $d = (d_{pr}) + \alpha + j^{nr} = (m+1)r^{nr}$. We assume
 $(nr) + nr^{nr} + nr^{nr} + j^{nr} + (nr) + (nr)$

We also assure that
$$f(t, x, p)$$
 has the property that for
any $[T_1, T_1]$, $f(t, x, p) = 0$ for $t \in [T_1, T_1]$ and x ortholds
some compact set (possibly depending on $[T_1, T_1]$)
We will use the following convention. For g and f
as above and $T = [T_1, T_1]$, we denote $F_T = F_T(g, f)$ a continuous
non-nephive map on M such that $F_T \notin F_T$, $f' T \subseteq T'$. If it is constant
we write G_T . F_T and G_T can change from line to line.
The Sobolev norm on constant to slikes, the on $\{x^0 = constant\}$
 $= \{t = constant\}$ will be denoted II. IIs. In particular, II. Il denotes

$$= \int \left(-\int_{\sigma}^{0} f_{u} - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\sigma}^{0} \int_{\sigma}^{0} \int_{\tau}^{0} f_{u} \int_{\tau}^{2} \int_{\sigma}^{0} \int_{\tau}^{0} \int_{\tau$$

$$B_{i} \int \int 2 \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \partial_{\rho} u \partial_{\mu} u = \int g_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \partial_{\mu} \partial_{\mu} u^{2} = - \int \partial_{i} g_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \partial_{\mu} u^{2}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$\int g_{\sigma}^{ij} \partial_{\mu} u \partial_{\mu} u = - \int g_{\sigma}^{ij} \partial_{\mu} u \partial_{\mu} u - \int \partial_{\mu} g_{\sigma}^{ij} \partial_{\mu} u^{2}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$R^{i}$$

$$\int (-f_{\sigma} f_{u} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_{t} g_{\sigma}^{oo} |\partial_{t} u|^{2} - \partial_{i} g_{\sigma}^{oi} |\partial_{t} u|^{2} - \partial_{j} g_{\sigma}^{ij} \partial_{i} u \partial_{j} u - \partial_{j} u d_{j} u d_{j$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{2n} & w & have: \quad \mathcal{I}_{t} \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma} = 0 \\ & \mid \mathcal{O}_{t} \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma'} \mid = \mid \mathcal{O}_{t} \left(g^{\sigma'}(\sigma, 2\sigma_{1}) \mid \leq \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{t} \mid 2^{\gamma} g^{\sigma'}(\sigma, 2\sigma_{1}) \mid 1^{\gamma} \mathcal{O}_{t} \right) \\ & \leq \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{x, \overline{z}} \left(10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \mid 0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \leq \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{z} (0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma})) \right) \\ & \leq \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{x, \overline{z}} \left(10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \mid 0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \leq \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{z} (0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma})) \right) \\ & \leq \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{x, \overline{z}} \left(10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \mid 0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \leq \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{z} (0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \right) \\ & \leq \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{x, \overline{z}} \left(10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \mid 0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}) \leq \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{z} (0^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma} (10^{\gamma}$$

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{P}_{\xi} E_{\sigma} &\leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \|\mathcal{P}_{\xi} u\|_{\sigma} + \mathcal{F}_{2} \left(\mathcal{W}(r_{1})\left(\|\mathcal{P}_{\xi} u\|_{\sigma}^{2} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n}\|_{\sigma}^{2}\right) + \|u_{n}\|_{\sigma} \|\mathcal{P}_{\ell} u\|_{\sigma}^{2} \\ &\leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \|\mathcal{P}_{\ell} u\|_{\sigma} + \mathcal{F}_{2} \left(\mathcal{W}(r_{1})\right)\left(\|\mathcal{P}_{\ell} u\|_{\sigma}^{2} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n}\|_{\sigma}^{2}\right) + \|u_{n}\|_{\sigma}^{2}\right) \\ &\text{where } \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \text{ represents specified Lexion-lines. } \mathcal{M}_{u_{n}} \quad \mathcal{F}_{u} \quad \text{house} \quad \mathcal{F}_{\ell}^{2} E_{\sigma} \leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\sigma}^{2} + \mathcal{F}_{2} \left(\mathcal{W}(r_{\ell})\right) E_{\sigma} \; . \\ &\mathcal{F}_{\ell} E_{\sigma} \leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \quad \mathrm{ess} \quad f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) + f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \mathcal{P}_{\ell}) - f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) \; . \\ &\mathcal{F}_{\ell} E_{\sigma} \leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \quad \mathrm{ass} \quad f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) + f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \mathcal{P}_{\ell}) - f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) \; . \\ &\mathcal{F}_{\ell} E_{\sigma} \leq \|f_{\sigma}\|_{\sigma} \quad \mathrm{ass} \quad f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) + f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \mathcal{P}_{\ell}) - f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) \; . \\ &\mathcal{F}_{\ell} E_{\sigma} \leq \|f_{\ell}\|_{\sigma} \leq G_{2} \; . \\ &\mathcal{F}_{\ell} = \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{\ell}(t, x, \sigma, \sigma) - f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma, \sigma) + f(t_{\ell}, x, \sigma) +$$

Thus

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{P}_{E} E_{o} \leq \left(G_{\underline{r}} + F_{\underline{r}} (\mathcal{N}_{(m)}) \right) E_{o}^{1/2} + F_{\underline{r}} (\mathcal{N}_{(m)}) E_{o} \\ \mathcal{O}_{Sc} \qquad C_{\underline{r}} E_{o}^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_{\underline{r}}^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} E_{o} \\ F_{\underline{r}} (\mathcal{N}_{(m)}) E_{o}^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{F_{\underline{r}}^{2} (\mathcal{N}_{(m)}) E_{o}}{= F_{\underline{r}} (\mathcal{N}_{(m)})} \quad \neq \quad set \\ \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{P}_{t} E_{o} & \langle C_{I} + F_{I} (\mathcal{N}(v)) E_{o} \rangle, \\ \mathcal{W}_{hich} & \mathcal{J}_{v} v^{o} > he inequality for \mathcal{P}_{t} E_{s} when s=0. \\ \mathcal{W}_{e} & next wotice fluct when our assumptions \\ & \frac{1}{C_{I}} E_{s}^{1/2} (\sigma, u) & \langle \mathcal{M}_{s}(u) \rangle & \langle C_{I} E_{s}^{1/2} (\sigma, u) \\ \mathcal{D}_{v} v^{o} d_{v} & \mathcal{H}_{e} & inequality on \mathcal{H}_{e} & for of \mathcal{H}_{s} raye by E_{o}^{1/2}: \\ & \frac{\mathcal{P}_{t} E_{o}}{E_{o}^{1/2}} & \langle C_{I} + F_{I} (\mathcal{M}(v)) \rangle + F_{I} (\mathcal{M}(v)) E_{o}^{1/2} \\ & \leq C_{I} \mathcal{M}_{o}(u) \end{array}$$

Integrating in time gives the inequality for Ms will s=0.

So

$$\int_{\Gamma}^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} \mathcal{D}^{\nu} u = \mathcal{D}^{\nu} fr + \left[\int_{\Gamma}^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu}, \mathcal{D}^{\nu} \right] u.$$
Use now apply the inqudity

$$\mathcal{D}_{\xi} E_{0} \leq \| f_{\nu} \|_{0} E_{0}^{\nu} + \frac{1}{2} (W(r)) E_{0}$$
that we obtain before with $u \mapsto \mathcal{D}^{\nu} u$, for $\mapsto \mathcal{D}^{\nu} f_{\nu} + \left[\int_{\Gamma}^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu}, \mathcal{D}^{\nu} \right]$
and sum over $(v| s = f_{0} \circ f_{0} i) E_{s} + \sum_{i \neq i \leq s} \| \left[\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu}, \mathcal{D}^{\nu} \right] u \|_{0} E_{s}^{\nu/2}$

$$Lotis analyse the commutation. All its term contain at least devivative hitting give so it will be a combination of theory.
Me form
$$\mathcal{D}_{i} \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}^{\mu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} u$$$$

with IpI + 1pI = 1xI - 1. Since goo = -1, we can assume that at most one of the indices p.v is zero. This is used below.

050

ď

$$\begin{split} & \text{Set} \quad \mathfrak{f}_{*}: \mathfrak{f}_{*}(t, s, \sigma, \sigma) \quad \text{and write} \\ & \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} (\mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} - \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p}) \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{n} + \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}_{*} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathcal{U}_{\sigma} \quad \text{have} , \\ & \text{II} \quad \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathfrak{I}_{\sigma} \mathfrak{f}_{*}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \text{II} \quad \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathcal{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{n} \\ & \mathfrak{I}^{p} \mathfrak{I}^{$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Thus} \\ & \text{II } \mathcal{P}^{2}_{i} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \right) \mathcal{P}^{2}_{\mu} \mathcal{P}^{\nu}_{\nu} u \, \|_{2} \leq G \sum_{r,\nu} || \mathcal{P}^{2}_{i} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \right) \|_{s_{r}} \, \text{W(m)} \\ & + F_{r} \left(\mathcal{W}(\sigma) \right) \mathcal{M}_{s} \left(m \right) \\ & \text{We have to estimate } || \mathcal{P}_{i} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \right) \|_{s_{r}} \leq \| \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \|_{s} \\ & \text{We constant, for islas:} \\ & \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\mathcal{P}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \right) = \mathcal{P}^{2} \int_{\sigma}^{1} \mathcal{P}^{\mu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) t \\ & \text{Ve constant, for islas:} \\ & \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\mathcal{P}^{\mu\nu} - \int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \right) = \mathcal{P}^{2} \int_{\sigma}^{1} \mathcal{P}^{\mu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) t \\ & \text{Symbolically, } \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) = \mathcal{P}^{2} \mathcal{P}^{\mu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \mathcal{P}^{2} \\ & \text{I} \left(\mathcal{P}^{\mu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, x, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & = \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right] \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{P}^{2} \left(\int_{\tau}^{\mu\nu} \left(t, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau^{2}\sigma \right) \right) \\$$

We conclude
$$f_{mf}$$

$$II \left[\int_{\sigma}^{r} \int_{\rho}^{r} 2_{\nu} \int_{\sigma}^{r} \int_{\sigma}^{r}$$

Local well-position
We now prove locd well-positions for
$$\int_{1}^{p} (v_{i} g_{i}) \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{q} u = f(u_{i} g_{i})$$
.
We will need to compare solutions, so we consider for $i = i_{1,2}$:
 $\int_{0}^{p} \frac{1}{q} \frac{1$

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \int \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{1}{2$$

Proceeding as in the zeroth order energy estimate:

$$\mathcal{P}_{E} \in \mathcal{F}_{E}(W(\sigma_{1})) \in \mathcal{F} = H f \sigma_{2}^{-} f \sigma_{1} H_{0} \in \mathcal{P}_{2}^{U} + H(f \sigma_{1}^{TV} - g \sigma_{2}^{TV}) \mathcal{P}_{2}^{T} u H e^{V_{L}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & ll(g_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu\nu} - f_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu\nu}) g_{\sigma_{2}}^{\mu\nu} u, H_{\sigma} \leq C' W(u_{1}) H_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu} - f_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu\nu} H_{\sigma} . & W_{rife} \\ & g_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu} - g_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu\nu} = \int_{\sigma}^{1} g_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu} (x, t, \tau \sigma_{1} + (1 - \tau)\sigma_{1}, \tau \sigma_{2}, \tau \sigma_{2}, t - \tau)\sigma_{2}) dx \\ & = \int_{\sigma}^{1} g_{\sigma_{1}}^{\mu\nu} (x, t, \tau \sigma_{1} + (1 - \tau)\sigma_{1}, \tau \sigma_{2}, t - \tau)\sigma_{2}^{\mu}) . (\sigma_{1} - \sigma_{2}, \sigma_{2}, -\sigma_{2}) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{split} \|g_{\sigma_1} - g_{\sigma_2} \|_{\partial} &\leq \overline{J}_{a_1 \underline{\tau}} (|\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|, |\sigma_2|) (|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|_{\partial} + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|_{\partial}) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{N}(\sigma_2)) \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\sigma)) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{N}(\sigma))) \\ & \quad (\overline{F}_{\underline{\tau}} (\mathcal{$$

We not use the above into the energy estimate (with
$$u \mapsto \sigma_0, \sigma \mapsto \sigma_{L_1}$$
):
 $M_s(\sigma_L) \in G_I = M_s(\sigma_L)(\sigma)$
 $+ \int_{\sigma}^{t} (C_I + F_I(W(\sigma_{L_1})) ((I + W(\sigma_{L_1}))M_s(\sigma_{L_1}) + M_s(\sigma_L)))$
 $\leq F_I(E) \leq S$

Gronwell fires:

$$\mathcal{M}_{s}(\sigma_{\mu}) \leq C_{\mathrm{F}}(\mathcal{M}_{s}(\sigma_{\mu})(\sigma) + \mathcal{E}F_{\mathrm{F}}(\varepsilon)) e$$

 $\leq \mathcal{K}_{o} + 1$

Choosing T small enough (depending on Ko,
$$G_{I}$$
, and the structure of F_{I} , thus ultimately depending only on Ko and I) we have that $M_{s}(\sigma_{I}) \leq \mathcal{B}, \quad \sigma \leq l \leq T, \quad for all \ l.$

To conclude the introbion, we need to verify it for k=1,2, i.e., we need Ms(vo) & &, Ms(vi) & &. For k=1, i.e., vo, we have Ms(vo) = Ms(no,o) & Ko+1, so we choose & > Ko+1. For k=2, i.e., vi, we apply the above inductive argument.

For this, we need
$$W(\sigma_0) \leq F_3(G)$$
, which above we obtained using
the hypothesis on $1-2$, which here would correspond to σ_1 (see
above where we considered two tril. However, we got $W(\sigma_0) \leq F_2(\sigma)$
directly from the field that σ_0 is constant in time and from
Soboler embedding.
Lower worm convergence
We first observe that that the solutions σ_1 are is
 $C^{\circ}(C\circ,T], H^{sy}) \cap C^{\circ}(C\circ,T], H^{s})$. This filles from the linear there,
Alternatively, recall that or solutions have the property that for any
conversed $(1, T_2)$, there is a compart $K \subseteq R^{s}$ such that $\sigma(t,R) = 0$
for $T, \leq t \leq T_2$, $x \notin K$. Smoold functions with this projectly
 $W_{c}^{\circ}(M, H^{s})$ for any f_{c} .
 $W_{c}^{\circ}(M show that for the converges is $C^{\circ}(Co,T), H(n C'(Co,T), L^{2})$.
 $M_{c}^{\circ}(M show that for the observes of solutions with $\sigma_{k} = \sigma_{k}$, $\sigma_{i} = \sigma_{k-1}$,
 $W_{a} = \sigma_{k+1}, h, = \sigma_{k}$:
 $\int_{0}^{1} F_{T}(W(\sigma_{k})), W(\sigma_{k}) W_{a}(\sigma_{k} - \sigma_{k-1})$$$

Above we should that
$$W(\sigma_{L}) \leq F_{L}(\delta) (1 + M_{L}(\sigma_{L}))_{r}$$

which implies $W(\sigma_{L}) \leq F_{L}(\delta)$ for all l in view of the
boundedness of the sequence. Thus
 $W_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L}) \leq C_{L} e^{(F_{L}(\delta))} (M_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L})(\sigma) + F_{L}(\delta) \int_{0}^{L} M_{o}(\sigma_{L} - \sigma_{L}))_{r}$
Put $a_{L} = \sup_{\sigma \in F \in T} M_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L})(t)$. We can choose T small enough
and the sequence approximating the imitial data such that $\{F_{L}(\delta)\}_{L}$
 $and C_{L} e^{(F_{L}(\delta))} M_{I}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L})(t) \leq 2^{1/2}$, thus $a_{L} \leq 2^{-l} + \frac{1}{2}a_{L+1}$.
Then $a_{L} (\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}a_{L}) = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}a_{L} \leq \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}a_{L} + \frac{1}{3}a_{L} + \frac{\alpha_{L}}{2^{L+1}}$.
Thus $M_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L}) \leq M_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{Lh}) + \dots + M_{o}(\sigma_{Lh} - \sigma_{L})$
 $\leq \frac{L+j-2}{2^{L+j-1}} + \frac{\alpha_{L}}{2^{L+j-1}} + \dots + \frac{L-1}{2^{L}} + \frac{\alpha_{L}}{2^{L+1}} = which can be made
arbitrarily small over taking l_{LI} sufficiently (arge she the series
 $\geq \frac{l}{2^{L}}$ converges (bowe its thick can be made small). We conclude
that $\eta \sigma_{L}$ is C_{Lub} in $C^{0}(Corti, H') \cap C'(Corti, L^{2})$, here its
has a L_{Lu} .$

Higher norm convergence Msing interpolation we have (cith 0 (a,b,c,d <1, a+b=1:c+d) $+ \| 2_{t} \sigma_{L+j} - 2_{t} \sigma_{L} \|_{s}^{c} \| 2_{t} \sigma_{L+j} - 2_{t} \sigma_{L} \|_{0}^{d} \leq (2 \varepsilon)^{c} \| \sigma_{L+j} - \sigma_{L} \|_{j}^{c}$ + (28) " Il 7 July - 2 July, where we used the boundedness of the sequence and Oca, b, c, l c 1, O Kres. We conclude that for is Cauchy in C°([0,T], H"") (C'([0,T], H"), OSVES Since s> 1 +1, we can take r> 1 +1, and then Soboler enselling gives that lup' converges in C°([0,T], C2) and find converges in C'([0,T], C'). From the equation, we have that The can be written in terms of J20, J7, or, and Ju, hence {2202 converges in C°([0,T], C°). We conclude that $\sum_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \leq 2}} \sup_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \sup_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_{\substack{i \in I \\ i \neq j \in 2}} \max_$ L-> o, i.e., the sequence converges is C'([?,T]x R', R"). It follows that the limit is satisfies the equation.

Set
$$w_{\mu}(\xi) = 1 h(\xi) l^{2} (11 + \xi)^{2} t^{\mu}$$
. This conveyes portative to $w_{\mu}(\xi) = x^{\mu} + y^{\mu} + y^{\mu$

$$\langle \Psi, u(t) \rangle = \langle \Psi, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle = \langle \Psi, u(t) \rangle = \langle \Psi_{j}, u(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, u(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle - \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, u(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle - \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, u(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, \sigma_{\mu}(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}, u(t) \rangle + \langle \Psi_{j}$$

For conversion, we write explicitly the expression for
$$\overline{E}_{a}$$
:
 $\overline{E}_{a} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i < l \leq s} \int_{\overline{R}^{n}} (-j_{e}^{ss} 1) g_{e}^{2} g_{a} l^{2} + j_{a}^{ij} g_{i} g_{a}^{s} h \cdot g_{i} g_{i}^{s} h + j g_{i} g_{i}^{s} h \cdot g_{i}^{s} h + j g_{i} g_{i}^{s} h \cdot g_{i}^{s} h + j g_{i} g_{i}^{s} h + j g$

So that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \to 0^{+}} \left((u - u_{0}, 2_{k}u - u_{1}), (u - u_{0}, 2_{k}u - u_{1}) \right) \\ & \in C_{i}(u_{2}, v_{e}) \left((u, 2_{k}u_{1}, (u_{1}, 2_{e})) - \overline{E}_{i}(t_{2}) \right) - \overline{E}_{i}(t_{2}) \right] \\ & C_{i}(t_{2}, v_{e}) \left((u, 2_{e}u_{1}), (u, 2_{e}u_{1}) - \overline{E}_{i}(t_{1}) - \overline{E}_{i}(t_{1}) - \overline{E}_{i}(t_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1})^{2} + 1_{i}(1^{i}(2_{i}))^{2}u_{1} - 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1})^{2} \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((2^{i}(2^{i}u_{1})^{2} + 2^{i}u_{1}(2_{i}))^{2}u_{1} - 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1})^{2} \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1})) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1})) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1})) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1})) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1})) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \frac{D_{i}}{U_{2}(s)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} \left((u^{i}(1 - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}) 2_{i}(2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1} 2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1} - 2^{i}u_{1}$$

Vext, is observe but the epictury are time variesisly, i.e., we can
equally obtain existence on an interval
$$L^{-T/2}$$
. Repeating the above we obtain
left continuity at zero, hence continuity, at zero.
To prive contraity of a $t_0 \neq 0$, consider the soldier is not pet
the section is a set of a soldier the soldier is not pet
the section is the to inder the observe arguments and solve the Confor-
problem with both the start to to a staining a solution to which by the
above with to indered of zero, is continues at the By mignons (to be
proved below) is and to coincide in a merghborhood of to, thus is is
the approximation of the formation of the solution is in
the approximation of the formation of the solution is to
where the formation of the constant of the solution of the solution
where the second of the problem
We apply the inequality
We apply the inequality
We apply the books in the formation of the and we Ground (
Energy estimate for a
We are estimate to be and the contract
 $\overline{E_s(t)} \leq (\overline{E_s(o)} + t_{C_{\rm I}}) e^{\int_0^t F_{\rm I}(V(c_{\rm I}))}$

$$\begin{split} & \int_{\Gamma} E_{s}(r, n) \notin G_{\Gamma} + F_{\Gamma} \left(\mathcal{N}(\sigma), \mathcal{N}(n) \right) \left(\mathcal{M}_{s}^{2}(\sigma) + E_{s}(\sigma, n) \right). \\ & Apply \quad flis inequality with $\sigma \mapsto \sigma_{e_{1}} \cap \mapsto \sigma_{e_{1}} \cap \cdots \cap \sigma_{e_{l}} \cap \sigma_{e_{l}}$$$

$$\begin{split} & \left[\overline{E}_{s}(v_{\ell}, v_{\ell+1})(t) - \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}, v_{\ell+1})(t) \right] \leq \left\| v_{\ell}^{-1} - \int_{u}^{-1} \right\|_{C^{\infty}} C(t) \to O \quad \text{as } L_{T^{\infty}} \\ & \text{Since } v_{\ell} \quad \text{convergent } f_{0} \quad u_{\ell} \quad \text{in } C^{2}. \quad \text{This convergence in } C^{2} \quad \text{also } inglie \\ & flat \quad W(v_{\ell}) \to W(u). \quad \text{Moreover, } \text{Since } \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}, v_{\ell+1})(v) = \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}(v), v_{\ell+1}(v)) \\ & \text{converges } f_{0} \quad \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}, u_{\ell}(v)) \quad \text{due } f_{2} \quad \text{the construction } of \quad \text{inifield } def_{a} \\ & u_{0, \lambda_{\ell}} \quad u_{\ell} \quad f_{\ell} \quad v_{\ell}, \quad u_{\ell} \quad \text{have } \overline{E}_{s}(v_{\ell}, v_{\ell+1})(v) \to \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}, u_{\ell}(v)) = \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}(v)) \\ & \text{Recall flad we also have fle bound comparing } M_{s} \quad \text{and } \overline{E}_{s}, \quad so \quad \text{flad} \\ & M_{s}(v_{\ell}) \quad \leq C_{T}^{\prime} \quad \overline{E}_{s}(u_{\ell}, v_{\ell}) \ . \end{split}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\overline{E}_{s}(u, \sigma_{s}) \right] \leq F_{\underline{v}}(w(u)) M_{s}(\sigma_{s}) \leq G'(G), \\ & \cup b v o b \quad s b o u s \not h a f \quad E_{s}(u, \sigma_{s})(t) \quad is \quad a u formely \quad b o u s d c l \quad i a t \quad o m \quad [\overline{\sigma}_{1}\overline{\tau}] \\ & H o u, \quad u c c a \quad c \not p l y \quad t b c \quad reverse \quad Falov's \quad l c u u m \quad a u d, \quad u s v y \quad t b c \quad a b v c \quad remarby, \\ & l i m s v \not E_{s}(u, \sigma_{s}) \leq \widehat{E}_{s}(u)(o) + \int_{\overline{\sigma}}^{t} l i m s v f \quad (\overline{G}_{1}) \\ & t \quad F_{\underline{v}}(W(\sigma_{s}), W(\sigma_{s+1})) \left(M_{s}^{2}(\sigma_{s}) + E_{s}(\sigma_{s}, \sigma_{s+1})\right) \\ & \leq \widehat{E}_{s}(u)(o) + \int_{\overline{\sigma}}^{t} \left(G_{1} + F_{\underline{v}}(W(u))f(u) s v \rho \quad E_{s}(u, \sigma_{s})\right) \\ & \quad L \rightarrow a \end{aligned}$$

ronwall now implies that

$$\begin{split} & \lim_{L \to \infty} \nabla \left(\left(\overline{E}_{s}(u)(o) + t C_{1} \right) \right) \right) \left(\left(\overline{E}_{s}(u)(o) + t C_{1} \right) \right) \right) \\ & L \to \infty \end{split}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{von} \quad \text{for weak convergence previously established:} \\ & \lim_{L \to \infty} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left(-2^{\circ\circ} \mathcal{H}^{2^{\circ}} \sigma_{s} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{2^{\circ}} u + 2^{\circ} \sigma_{s} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{2^$$

Similarly to clast was done before, the expression

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int \left(\int_{u}^{ij} \partial_{i} \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} \cdot \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} + \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} \cdot \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} + \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} \cdot \mathcal{I}^{i} u_{i} \right)$$

$$\frac{1}{4155} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}$$

1. We defined with involving up to two derivatives of a because
we assumed
$$g = gin, v_n$$
, so that when we need to estimate $2g$ in
 L^{or} we obtain $2g \sim 2^{2n}$ in L^{or} . If $g = gins$, as is the case for
example in Einstein's equations, then we have $2g \sim 2n$ and we have
to control only the L^{or} norm of $2n$. Thus, in this case we can
define when involving only derivatives up to first order, and the
above argument shill goes through.

2. The proof of the bond for Es cannot be obtained by a direct energy estimate on the solution n. This is because this would involve using Granuell, which requires continuity in time. But we use the the bond on Es to prove (strong) continuity in time. 3. The condition sympt was used for the Sublear endeding theorem. G. We used Sobolear's endedding in two mays. First, to

bound 1172 JII 5 G 11 22 JII ~ HUIIS, ~ HUIIS, , 112 JIIS (Using the equation for 22). These forms come from d(o).

26 SILOZ.

The convergence in
$$H^{\mu}$$
 is this case gives convergence in
 $C^{1}(r + 1 > \frac{n}{2} + 1)$. This suffices because nou
 $H \int_{n}^{1} - \int_{n}^{2} H \int_{n}^{n} C(B) \sim H Ju - Ju H C(B) \rightarrow O$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$
and $W(v_{L}) \rightarrow W(u)$ since non $W(u) \sim Ju$.
We don't necessarily obtain a C^{2} solution in this case though because
the convergence is only in C^{1} . But we shill do get a classical

almost everywhere to 2ª a (possibly after passing to a subsequence).