A New Approach to Non-Isothermal Models for Nematic Liquid Crystals

EDUARD FEIREISL, MICHEL FRÉMOND, ELISABETTA ROCCA
& GIULIO SCHIMPERNA

Communicated by F. LIN

Abstract

We introduce a new class of non-isothermal models describing the evolution of nematic liquid crystals and prove their consistency with the fundamental laws of classical thermodynamics. The resulting system of equations captures all essential features of physically relevant models; in particular, the effect of stretching of the director field is taken into account. In addition, the associated initial-boundary value problem admits global-in-time weak solutions without any essential restrictions on the size of the initial data.

1. Introduction

The celebrated Leslie–Ericksen model of liquid crystals, introduced by ERICKSEN [7] and LESLIE [15], is a system of partial differential equations coupling the Navier–Stokes equations governing the time evolution of the fluid velocity $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t, x)$ with a Ginzburg–Landau type equation describing the motion of the director field $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}(t, x)$, representing the preferred orientation of molecules in a neighborhood of any point of a reference domain.

A considerably simplified version of the Leslie–Ericksen model was proposed by LIN and LIU [16,17], and subsequently analyzed by many authors, see [21,22],

among others. The simplified model completely ignores the stretching and rotation effects of the director field induced by the straining of the fluid, which can be viewed as a serious violation of the underlying physical principles.

Such a stretching term was subsequently treated by Coutand and Shkoller [5], who proved a local well-posedness result for the corresponding model without thermal effects. The main peculiarity of this model is that the presence of the stretching term causes the loss of the the total energy balance, which, indeed, ceases to hold. In order to prevent this failure, Sun and Liu [24] introduced a variant of the model proposed by Lin and Liu, where the stretching term is included in the system and a new component is added to the stress tensor in order to save the total energy balance. A related isothermal model accounting for the stretching contribution has been recently analyzed in [3] and in [20]. In [3], the existence of a global solution is proved in the case of homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions for **u** and Neumann or non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions for $\boldsymbol{d}$, while in [20] the long time behaviour of solutions is investigated in the three dimensional case without assuming any restriction on the size of the viscosity coefficient μ and possibly considering a non-analytic nonlinearity $\boldsymbol{f}$. A result similar to the one obtained in [3] is also proved in [4], where, however, only formal estimates are proved and no rigorous existence statement is provided. The results in [3,4,20] generalize the ones previously obtained in [26], where the two-dimensional case and the three-dimensional case with large viscosity μ are dealt with. Finally, it is worth observing that a more general class of models based on the so-called "Q-tensor formulation" has been recently introduced in [2,19] in an isothermal setting.

Motivated by these considerations, in the the present contribution we propose a new approach to the modeling of non-isothermal liquid crystals based on the principles of classical thermodynamics which accounts for stretching and rotation effects of the director field. To this end, we incorporate the dependence on temperature into the model, obtaining a complete energetically closed system, where the total energy is conserved, while entropy is being produced as the system evolves in time. We apply here the mechanical methodology of [11], which basically consists in deriving the equations of the model by means of a generalized variational principle. This states that the free energy of the system, Ψ, depending on the proper *state variables*, tends to decrease in a way that is prescribed by the expression of a second functional, called the pseudopotential of dissipation, which depends (in a convex way) on a set of *dissipative variables*. In this approach, the stress tensor σ, the density of energy vector **B** and the energy flux tensor $\mathbb{H}$ are decoupled into their *non-dissipative* and *dissipative* components, whose precise form is prescribed by proper constitutive equations (see below for details). It is interesting to note that the form of the extra stress in the Navier–Stokes system obtained by this method coincides with the formula derived from different principles by Sun and Liu [24].

The system of partial differential equations resulting from this approach couples the incompressible Navier–Stokes system for the velocity **u**, with a Ginzburg–Landau type equation for the director field $\boldsymbol{d}$ and a total energy balance, together with an entropy inequality governing the dynamics of the absolute temperature θ of the system.

Leaving to the next Section 2 the complete derivation of the model, let us just briefly introduce here the PDE system we deal with. The Navier–Stokes system couples the incompressibility condition

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

with the conservation of momentum

$$\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x p = \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S} + \operatorname{div} \sigma^{nd} + \mathbf{g}, \tag{1.2}$$

where p is the pressure, and the stress is decomposed in a dissipative and non dissipative part, respectively given by

$$\mathbb{S} = \frac{\mu(\theta)}{2}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u}), \quad \sigma^{nd} = -\lambda \nabla_x \mathbf{d} \odot \nabla_x \mathbf{d} + \lambda(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}) - \Delta \mathbf{d}) \otimes \mathbf{d}, \tag{1.3}$$

where we have set $\nabla_x \mathbf{d} \odot \nabla_x \mathbf{d} := \sum_k \partial_i d_k \partial_j d_k$.

The director field equation has the form

$$\mathbf{d}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} = \gamma(\Delta \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})), \tag{1.4}$$

where $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}) = \partial_\mathbf{d} F(\mathbf{d})$ and F penalizes the deviation of the length $|\mathbf{d}|$ from the value 1. It is a quite general function of $\mathbf{d}$ that can be written as a sum of a convex (possibly non smooth) part, and a smooth, but possibly non-convex one. A typical example is $F(\mathbf{d}) = (|\mathbf{d}|^2 - 1)^2$.

Finally, the total energy balance

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + e \right) + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + e \right) + \operatorname{div}(p\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \sigma^{nd}\mathbf{u})$$
$$= \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{u} + \lambda\gamma \operatorname{div}(\nabla_x \mathbf{d} \cdot (\Delta \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}))), \tag{1.5}$$

with the internal energy and the flux

$$e = \frac{\lambda}{2}|\nabla_x \mathbf{d}|^2 + \lambda F(\mathbf{d}) + \theta, \quad \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^d - \lambda \nabla_x \mathbf{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{d},$$
$$\mathbf{q}^d = -k(\theta)\nabla_x \theta - h(\theta)(\mathbf{d} \cdot \nabla_x \theta)\mathbf{d},$$

is coupled with the entropy inequality

$$H(\theta)_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x H(\theta) + \operatorname{div}(H'(\theta)\mathbf{q}^d)$$
$$\geqq H'(\theta)(\mathbb{S} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \lambda\gamma|\Delta \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})|^2) + H''(\theta)\mathbf{q}^d \cdot \nabla_x \theta, \tag{1.6}$$

holding true for any smooth non-decreasing concave function H. The derivation of the above system will be detailed in the next Section 2, while the remainder of the paper will be devoted to the proof of a global existence result for the corresponding initial-boundary value problem in the framework of weak solutions in $\Omega \times (0, T)$, with Ω being a bounded and sufficiently regular subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$ and T a given final time.

Let us note that the model obtained here looks quite different from the one obtained in [10]. This is mainly due to the presence in the internal energy e of the quadratic term $|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}|^2$ (which is related to the expression (2.1) of the free energy functional) and to the stretching term $\boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}$ in (1.4) which produces, in order that the principles of thermodynamics are respected, two new nondissipative contributions in the stress tensor $\mathbb{S}$ in (1.3) and in the flux $\mathbf{q}$. Actually, the latter is given here by the sum of a standard heat flux and of an elastic part given by the term $-\lambda \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{d}$ (see the next Section 2 for further details on this point).

Indeed, in contrast with [10], the presence of the stretching term $\boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}$ in the director field equation prevents us from applying any form of the maximum principle to (1.4). Hence, we cannot recover an L^∞-bound on $\boldsymbol{d}$ (which we obtained, instead, in [10]). However, we can still get the global existence of weak solutions to the initial boundary value problem coming from the PDE system (1.1–1.6) without imposing any restriction on the space dimension, on the size of the initial data or on the viscosity coefficient μ (such a restriction was taken in the paper [24], devoted to an *isothermal* model closely related to ours). In this sense, our results can be seen as a generalization of those obtained in [24].

The compatibility of the model with *First and Second laws* of thermodynamics turns out to be the main source of a priori bounds that can be used, in combination with compactness arguments, to ensure stability of the family of approximate solutions. The key point of this approach is replacing the heat equation, commonly used in models of heat conducting fluids, by the total energy balance (1.5). Accordingly, the resulting system of equations is free of dissipative terms that are difficult to handle, due to the low regularity of the weak solutions. In contrast with the standard theory of Navier–Stokes equations, however, we have to control the pressure appearing explicitly in the total energy flux, and in order to do that we will need to assume the complete slip boundary conditions on the velocity filed $\mathbf{u}$ (see (3.1)). Note that a similar method applied to different models has been used recently in [1,8,10].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give a detailed derivation of the model and discuss its compatibility with the basic laws of thermodynamics. In Section 3, we introduce some technical hypotheses and formulate the main result concerning existence of global-in-time weak solutions to the resulting PDE system. Finally, the last two Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proof of the existence result via approximation, a-priori estimates and passage to the limit techniques based on lower semicontinuity and convexity arguments. As already pointed out, the energy balance is written in the form of a conservation law for the total energy rather than for the temperature, where the highly non-linear terms dissipative terms are absent. The price to pay is the explicit appearance of the *pressure* in the global energy balance determined implicitly by the Navier–Stokes system.

2. Mathematical Model

We suppose that the fluid occupies a bounded spatial domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, with a sufficiently regular boundary, and denote by $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(t, x)$ the associated *velocity*

field in the Eulerian reference system. Moreover, we introduce the *absolute temperature* $\theta(t, x)$ and the *director field* $\boldsymbol{d}(t, x)$, representing the preferred orientation of molecules in a neighborhood of any point of the reference domain. Furthermore, we denote

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}t} = \dot{w} = w_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x w,$$

the *material derivative* of a generic function w, while w_t (or also $\partial_t w$) denotes the partial derivative with respect to t.

Finally, the quantity

$$\frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t} = \boldsymbol{d}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}$$

characterizes the total transport of the orientation vector $\boldsymbol{d}$. Note that the last term accounts for stretching of the director field induced by the straining of the fluid.

2.1. Free-Energy and Pseudopotential of Dissipation

Following the general approach proposed in the monograph [11], we start by specifying, in agreement with the principles of classical thermodynamics, the free-energy and the pseudopotential of dissipation. The interested reader may consult [11, Chapters 2,3] for details.

We begin by introducing the set of *state variables*, describing the actual configuration of the material, specifically,

$$E = (\boldsymbol{d}, \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}, \theta).$$

Next, the set of the *dissipative variables* describing the evolution of the system and, in particular, the way it dissipates energy, is given by

$$\delta E = \left(\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}), \frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}, \nabla_x \theta \right),$$

where

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) := \frac{(\nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u})}{2}$$

denotes the symmetric gradient of $\mathbf{u}$.

Motivated by the original (isothermal) theory proposed by ERICKSEN [6] and LESLIE [14], we choose the free energy functional in the form

$$\Psi(E) = \frac{\lambda}{2} |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}|^2 + \lambda F(\boldsymbol{d}) - \theta \log \theta, \tag{2.1}$$

where λ is a positive constant. The function F in (2.1) penalizes the deviation of the length $|\boldsymbol{d}|$ from its natural value 1; generally, F is assumed to be a sum of a dominating convex (and possibly non smooth) part and a smooth non-convex perturbation of controlled growth. A typical example is $F(\boldsymbol{d}) = (|\boldsymbol{d}|^2 - 1)^2$. For

the sake of simplicity, we have assumed that the thermal and elastic effects are uncoupled in Ψ.

The evolution of the system is characterized by a second functional Φ, called *pseudopotential of dissipation*, assumed to be nonnegative and convex with respect to the dissipative variables. Specifically, we consider Φ in the form

$$\Phi(\delta E, E) = \frac{\mu(\theta)}{2}|\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})|^2 + I_0(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}) + \frac{k(\theta)}{2\theta}|\nabla_x\theta|^2 + \frac{\eta}{2}\left|\frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}\right|^2 + \frac{h(\theta)}{2\theta}|\boldsymbol{d}\cdot\nabla_x\theta|^2,$$

where $\mu = \mu(\theta) > 0$ is the viscosity coefficient, $\eta > 0$ is a constant, and k, h represent the heat conductivity coefficients—positive functions of the temperature. The *incompressibility* of the fluid is formally enforced by I_0—the indicator function of $\{0\}$ (given by $I_0 = 0$ if $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u} = 0$ and $+\infty$ otherwise).

2.2. Constitutive Relations

We start by introducing the stress tensor σ, the density of energy vector $\mathbf{B}$, and the energy flux tensor $\mathbb{H}$; all assumed to be the sums of their non-dissipative and dissipative components, namely, $\sigma = \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}} + \sigma^d$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{nd}} + \mathbf{B}^d$, $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}^{\mathrm{nd}} + \mathbb{H}^d$, where

$$\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{nd}} = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\boldsymbol{d}} = \lambda\frac{\partial F}{\partial\boldsymbol{d}} =: \lambda\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathbf{B}^d = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}} = \eta\frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\mathbb{H}^{\mathrm{nd}} = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\nabla_x\boldsymbol{d}} = \lambda\nabla_x\boldsymbol{d}. \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover, we set $\mathbb{H}^d \equiv 0$.

The heat and entropy fluxes (denoted respectively by $\mathbf{q}^d$ and $\mathbf{Q}$), are

$$\mathbf{q}^d = \theta\mathbf{Q} = -\theta\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\nabla_x\theta} = -k(\theta)\nabla_x\theta - h(\theta)(\boldsymbol{d}\cdot\nabla_x\theta)\boldsymbol{d}. \tag{2.5}$$

The stress tensor σ consists of two parts: the dissipative part

$$\sigma^d = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\varepsilon(\mathbf{u})} = \mu(\theta)\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) - p\mathbb{I} =: \mathbb{S} - p\mathbb{I},$$
$$-p \in \partial I_0(\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}), \quad \mathbb{S} = \mu(\theta)\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}), \tag{2.6}$$

and the non dissipative part σ^{nd} to be determined below (see (2.10) and (2.12)).

The entropy of the system is given by

$$s = -\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\theta} = 1 + \log\theta \tag{2.7}$$

and, finally, the internal energy e reads

$$e = \Psi + \theta s = \theta + \lambda F(\boldsymbol{d}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}|\nabla_x\boldsymbol{d}|^2. \tag{2.8}$$

2.3. Field Equations

In accordance with *Newton's second law*, the balance of momentum reads

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) = \mathrm{div}\,\sigma + \mathbf{g}, \tag{2.9}$$

where $\mathbf{g}$ is a given external force.

The entropy balance can be written in the form

$$s_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x s + \mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{\theta}\left(\sigma^d : \varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{B}^d \cdot \frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t} - \mathbf{Q} \cdot \nabla_x \theta\right) \tag{2.10}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\theta\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} + \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{q}^d = \sigma^d : \varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{B}^d \cdot \frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}. \tag{2.11}$$

In agreement with the *second law of thermodynamics*, the right-hand side of (2.10) is non-negative.

The balance of internal energy reads

$$e_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x e + \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{q} = \sigma : \varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{B} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t} + \mathbb{H} : \nabla_x \frac{\mathrm{D}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{D}t}, \tag{2.12}$$

with the internal energy flux $\boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{q}^d + \boldsymbol{q}^{\mathrm{nd}}$, where the dissipative part $\boldsymbol{q}^d$ is given by (2.5), while the non-dissipative component will be determined below.

Finally, the equation which rules the evolution of the orientation vector $\boldsymbol{d}$ is derived from the principle of virtual powers (see [11, Chap. 2]), and it takes the form

$$\mathrm{div}\,\mathbb{H} - \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{2.13}$$

specifically,

$$\boldsymbol{d}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} = \gamma(\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})), \quad \gamma = \lambda/\eta. \tag{2.14}$$

The non-dissipative component of the stress σ^{nd} and of the flux $\boldsymbol{q}^{\mathrm{nd}}$ are determined by means of (2.10), (2.12), and the constitutive relations derived above. Indeed, computing $\frac{\mathrm{d}e}{\mathrm{d}t}$ by means of the standard Helmholtz relations, we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}e}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\Psi}{\mathrm{d}t} + \theta\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\mathrm{d}t}s = \Psi_{\boldsymbol{d}} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} + \Psi_{\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}} : \frac{\mathrm{d}(\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d})}{\mathrm{d}t} + \theta\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t}, \tag{2.15}$$

whereas

$$\Psi_{\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}} : \frac{\mathrm{d}(\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d})}{\mathrm{d}t} = \mathbb{H}^{\mathrm{nd}} : \left(\nabla_x \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} - \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}\right). \tag{2.16}$$

Thus, rewriting (2.15) with help of (2.16), and expressing $\theta\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{d}t}$ by means of (2.11), we get, thanks also to (2.2–2.6),

$$\mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{q}^{\mathrm{nd}} - \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} = -\lambda(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} - \lambda\sum_{i,j,k} \partial_{x_k} d_i (\partial^2_{x_j,x_k} u_i)d_j. \tag{2.17}$$

Therefore,

$$\sigma^{\mathrm{nd}} = -\lambda \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \odot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} + \lambda(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \Delta \boldsymbol{d}) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}, \quad \boldsymbol{q}^{\mathrm{nd}} = -\lambda \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{d}. \tag{2.18}$$

Summing up the previous discussion, we arrive at the following system of equations:

<div align="center">INCOMPRESSIBILITY:</div>

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0; \tag{2.19}$$

<div align="center">CONSERVATION OF MOMENTUM:</div>

$$\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x p = \operatorname{div} \mathbb{S} + \operatorname{div} \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}} + \boldsymbol{g}, \tag{2.20}$$

where p is the pressure, and

$$\mathbb{S} = \frac{\mu(\theta)}{2}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u}), \quad \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}} = -\lambda \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \odot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} + \lambda(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}) - \Delta \boldsymbol{d}) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}; \tag{2.21}$$

<div align="center">DIRECTOR FIELD EQUATION:</div>

$$\boldsymbol{d}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} = \gamma(\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})); \tag{2.22}$$

<div align="center">TOTAL ENERGY BALANCE:</div>

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + e \right) + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + e \right) + \operatorname{div}(p\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{q} - \mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}}\mathbf{u})$$
$$= \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \mathbf{u} + \lambda\gamma \operatorname{div}(\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \cdot (\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}))), \tag{2.23}$$

with the internal energy

$$e = \frac{\lambda}{2}|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}|^2 + \lambda F(\boldsymbol{d}) + \theta$$

and the flux

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^d + \mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{nd}} = -k(\theta)\nabla_x \theta - h(\theta)(\boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \theta)\boldsymbol{d} - \lambda \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{d};$$

together with

<div align="center">ENTROPY INEQUALITY:</div>

$$H(\theta)_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x H(\theta) + \operatorname{div}(H'(\theta)\boldsymbol{q}^d)$$
$$\geqq H'(\theta)(\mathbb{S} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \lambda\gamma|\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})|^2) + H''(\theta)\boldsymbol{q}^d \cdot \nabla_x \theta, \tag{2.24}$$

holding for any smooth, non-decreasing and concave function H.

Actually, the total energy balance (2.23) follows easily from (2.9) and (2.12) combined with (2.13). It is remarkable that Equations (2.19–2.22) in the isothermal case reduce to the model derived by Sun and Liu [24] by means of a different method.

3. Main Results

3.1. Initial and Boundary Conditions

In view of a rigorous mathematical study, system (2.19–2.22) must be supplemented by suitable boundary conditions. Actually, to avoid the effect of the boundary layer on the motion, we assume *complete slip* boundary conditions for the velocity:

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \left[(\mathbb{S} + \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}})\mathbf{n}\right] \times \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, we consider *no-flux* boundary conditions for the temperature

$$\mathbf{q}^{d} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

and Neumann boundary conditions for the director field

$$\nabla_x d_i \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{3.3}$$

The last relation accounts for the fact that there is no contribution to the surface force from the director $\mathbf{d}$. Note that the above conditions are also suitable for the implementation of a numerical scheme (see [18] for further comments on this point).

Of course, we also need to assume the initial conditions

$$\mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \mathbf{d}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{d}_0, \quad \theta(0, \cdot) = \theta_0. \tag{3.4}$$

In the remaining part of the paper, our aim will be that of showing existence of global-in-time solutions to system (2.19–2.24), coupled with the above initial and boundary conditions and without assuming any essential restriction on the data.

3.2. Weak Formulation

In the weak formulation, the momentum equation (2.20), together with the incompressibility constraint (2.19), and the boundary conditions (3.1), are replaced by a family of integral identities

$$\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi = 0 \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in (0, T), \tag{3.5}$$

for any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$, and

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega (\mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \varphi + \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} : \nabla_x \varphi + p \operatorname{div} \varphi)$$
$$= \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\mathbb{S} + \sigma^{\mathrm{nd}}) : \nabla_x \varphi - \int_\Omega \mathbf{g} \cdot \varphi - \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \varphi(0, \cdot), \tag{3.6}$$

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T) \times \overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\varphi \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Note that (3.6) also includes the initial condition $\mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) = \mathbf{u}_0$.

Equation (2.22) describing the evolution of the director field $\mathbf{d}$ will be satisfied in the strong sense, more specifically,

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{d} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{d} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u} = \gamma (\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})) \quad \text{almost everywhere in } (0, T) \times \Omega,$$
(3.7)

together with

$$\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \boldsymbol{d}(0, \cdot) = \boldsymbol{d}_0.$$

Similarly, the weak formulation of the total energy balance (2.23) reads

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{u}|^2 + e \right) \partial_t \varphi \right) + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{u}|^2 + e \right) \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla_x \varphi \right)$$
$$+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega (p\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{q} - \mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \sigma^{\text{nd}}\mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi$$
$$= \lambda\gamma \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \cdot (\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}))) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi$$
$$- \int_0^T \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \mathbf{u}\varphi - \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{u}_0|^2 + e_0 \right) \varphi(0, \cdot),$$
(3.8)

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T) \times \overline{\Omega})$, where $e_0 = \frac{\lambda}{2}|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_0|^2 + \lambda F(\boldsymbol{d}_0) + \theta_0$.

Finally, the entropy inequality (2.24) is replaced by

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega H(\theta)\partial_t \varphi + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (H(\theta)\mathbf{u} + H'(\theta)\boldsymbol{q}^d) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi$$
$$\leqq - \int_0^T \int_\Omega (H'(\theta)(\mathbb{S} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u} + \lambda\gamma|\Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})|^2) + H''(\theta)\boldsymbol{q}^d \cdot \nabla_x \theta)\varphi$$
$$- \int_\Omega H(\theta_0)\varphi(0, \cdot),$$
(3.9)

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T) \times \overline{\Omega})$, $\varphi \geqq 0$, and for any smooth, non-decreasing and concave function H.

A *weak solution* is a triple $(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{d}, \theta)$ satisfying (3.5–3.9).

3.3. Main Existence Theorem

Before formulating the main result of this paper, we list the hypotheses imposed on the constitutive functions. Specifically, we assume that

$$F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad F \geqq 0, \quad F \text{ convex for all } |\boldsymbol{d}| \geqq D_0, \quad \lim_{|\boldsymbol{d}| \to \infty} F(\boldsymbol{d}) = \infty,$$
(3.10)

for a certain $D_0 > 0$.

The transport coefficients μ, k, and h are continuously differentiable functions of the absolute temperature satisfying

$$0 < \underline{\mu} \leqq \mu(\theta) \leqq \overline{\mu}, \quad 0 < \underline{k} \leqq k(\theta), \quad h(\theta) \leqq \overline{k} \quad \text{for all } \theta \geqq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

for suitable constants $\underline{k}, \overline{k}, \underline{\mu}, \overline{\mu}$.

Our main result reads as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *be a bounded domain of class* $C^{2+\nu}$ *for some* $\nu > 0$, $\boldsymbol{g} \in L^2((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$. *Assume that hypotheses* (3.10)*,* (3.11) *are satisfied. Finally, let the initial data be such that*

$$\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \quad \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{u}_0 = 0, \quad \boldsymbol{d}_0 \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \quad F(\boldsymbol{d}_0) \in L^1(\Omega),$$
$$\theta_0 \in L^1(\Omega), \quad \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\Omega} \theta_0 > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Then, problem (3.5–3.9) *possesses a weak solution* $(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{d}, \theta)$ *in* $(0, T) \times \Omega$ *belonging to the class*

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{3.13}$$
$$\boldsymbol{d} \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{3.14}$$
$$F(\boldsymbol{d}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)) \cap L^{5/3}((0, T) \times \Omega), \tag{3.15}$$
$$\theta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)) \cap L^p(0, T; W^{1,p}(\Omega)),$$
$$1 \leqq p < 5/4, \quad \theta > 0 \text{ almost everywhere in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \tag{3.16}$$

with the pressure p,

$$p \in L^{5/3}((0, T) \times \Omega). \tag{3.17}$$

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

4. A Priori Bounds

In this section, we collect the available a priori estimates. These will assume a rigorous character in the framework of the approximation scheme presented in Section 5 below.

Integrating (2.23) over Ω and using Gronwall's lemma, we immediately obtain the following bounds:

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{4.1}$$
$$\theta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)), \tag{4.2}$$
$$\boldsymbol{d} \in L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \quad F(\boldsymbol{d}) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega)), \tag{4.3}$$

where we have used hypotheses (3.10), (3.11).

Similarly, integrating (2.24) with $H(\theta) = \theta$, and using (4.2), we obtain

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) \in L^2((0, T) \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}), \quad \Delta \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}) \in L^2((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{4.4}$$

yielding, by virtue of (4.1) and Korn's inequality,

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^{10/3}((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3). \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, it follows from (4.4) and convexity of F [see hypothesis (3.10)] that

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}) \in L^2((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3); \tag{4.6}$$

therefore, using (4.4) again we infer that

$$\boldsymbol{d} \in L^2(0, T; W^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)). \tag{4.7}$$

Interpolating (4.3) and (4.7) we get

$$\boldsymbol{d} \in L^{10}((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \quad \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d} \in L^{10/3}((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}),$$

whence [see (2.21)]

$$\sigma^{\text{nd}} \in L^{5/3}((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}). \tag{4.8}$$

By the same token, by means of convexity of F [see (3.10)], we have

$$|F(\boldsymbol{d})| \leqq c(1 + |\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d})||\boldsymbol{d}|),$$

yielding

$$F(\boldsymbol{d}) \in L^{5/3}((0, T) \times \Omega). \tag{4.9}$$

As the velocity satisfies the slip boundary conditions (3.1), the pressure p can be "computed" directly from (2.20) as the unique solution of the elliptic problem

$$\Delta p = \text{div div}\,(\mathbb{S} + \sigma^{\text{nd}} - \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}) + \text{div}\,\boldsymbol{g},$$

supplemented with the boundary condition

$$\nabla_x p \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = (\text{div}\,(\mathbb{S} + \sigma^{\text{nd}} - \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}) + \boldsymbol{g}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

To be more precise, the last two relations have to be interpreted in a "very weak" sense. Namely, the pressure p is determined through a family of integral identities:

$$\int_\Omega p \Delta\varphi = \int_\Omega (\mathbb{S} + \sigma^{\text{nd}} - \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}) : \nabla_x^2\varphi - \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \nabla_x\varphi, \tag{4.10}$$

for any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$, $\nabla_x\varphi \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Consequently, the bounds established in (4.5) and (4.8) may be used, together with the standard elliptic regularity results, to conclude that

$$p \in L^{5/3}((0, T) \times \Omega). \tag{4.11}$$

Finally, the choice $H(\theta) = (1 + \theta)^\eta$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, in (2.24), together with the uniform bounds obtained in (4.1–4.5), yields

$$\nabla_x(1 + \theta)^\nu \in L^2((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for any } 0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.12}$$

Now, we apply an interpolation argument already exploited in [1]. Using (4.2) and (4.12) and interpolating between $\theta \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega))$ and $\theta^\nu \in L^1(0, T; L^3(\Omega))$, for $\nu \in (0, 1)$, we immediately get

$$\theta \in L^q((0, T) \times \Omega) \quad \text{for any } 1 \leqq q < 5/3. \tag{4.13}$$

Furthermore, seeing that

$$\int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} |\nabla_x\theta|^p \leqq \left(\int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} |\nabla_x\theta|^2\theta^{\nu-1}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} \theta^{(1-\nu)\frac{p}{2-p}}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}},$$

for all $p \in [1, 5/4)$ and $\nu > 0$, we conclude from (4.12) and (4.13) that

$$\nabla_x\theta \in L^p((0,T)\times\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for any } 1 \leqq p < 5/4. \tag{4.14}$$

Finally, the same argument and $H(\theta) = \log\theta$ in (2.24) give rise to

$$\log\theta \in L^2((0,T); W^{1,2}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0,T; L^1(\Omega)), \tag{4.15}$$

where we have used (4.2).

The a priori estimates derived in this section comply with the regularity class (3.13–3.17). Moreover, it can be shown that the solution set of (3.5–3.9) is weakly stable (compact) with respect to these bounds, namely, any sequence of (weak) solutions that satisfies the uniform bounds established above has a subsequence that converges to some limit that still solves the system. Leaving the proof of weak sequential stability to the interested reader, we pass directly to the proof of Theorem 3.1 constructing a suitable family of *approximate* problems.

5. Approximations

For the sake of simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case $\boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{0}$ and $\lambda = \gamma = 1$. Solutions to the Navier–Stokes system (3.5), (3.6) will be constructed by means of the nowadays standard Faedo–Galerkin approximation scheme, see TEMAM [25]. Let $W_{n,\sigma}^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ be the Sobolev space of solenoidal functions satisfying the impermeability boundary condition, specifically,

$$W_{n,\sigma}^{1,2} = \{\boldsymbol{v} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \mid \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{v} = 0 \quad \text{almost everywhere in } \Omega, \quad \boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}.$$

Since $\partial\Omega$ is of class $C^{2+\nu}$, there exists an orthonormal basis $\{\boldsymbol{v}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of the Hilbert space $W_{n,\sigma}^{1,2}$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}_n \in C^{2+\nu}$, see [9, Theorem 10.13]. We take $M \leqq N$ and denote $X_N = \operatorname{span}\{\boldsymbol{v}_n\}_{n=1}^N$, and $[\boldsymbol{v}]_M$-the orthogonal projection onto the space $\operatorname{span}\{\boldsymbol{v}_n\}_{n=1}^M$.

The approximate velocity fields $\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \in C^1([0,T]; X_N)$ solve the Faedo–Galerkin system

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}\cdot\boldsymbol{v} &= \int_\Omega [\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}]_M \otimes \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} : \nabla_x\boldsymbol{v} - \frac{1}{M}\int_\Omega |\nabla_x\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^{r-2}\nabla_x\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} : \nabla_x\boldsymbol{v} \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \frac{\mu(\theta_{N,M})}{2}(\nabla_x\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} + \nabla_x^t\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}) : \nabla_x\boldsymbol{v} + \int_\Omega \nabla_x\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}\odot\nabla_x\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} : \nabla_x\boldsymbol{v} \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}) - \Delta\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})\otimes\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} : \nabla_x\boldsymbol{v}, \\
\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}(0,\cdot)\cdot\boldsymbol{v} &= \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{u}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{v}, \tag{5.1}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{v} \in X_N$, where $r \in (3, 10/3)$. The extra term $\frac{1}{M}|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^{r-2}\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}$ guarantees sufficient regularity for the velocity field needed in the director equation. Our strategy is to pass to the limit first for $N \to \infty$ and then for $M \to \infty$.

The functions $\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}$ are determined in terms of $\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}$ as the unique solution of the parabolic system

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} + \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} = \Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}), \quad (5.2)$$

supplemented with

$$\nabla_x(d_{N,M})_i \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \qquad (5.3)$$

$$\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}(0, \cdot) = \boldsymbol{d}_{0,M}, \qquad (5.4)$$

where $\boldsymbol{d}_{0,M}$ is a suitable smooth approximation of $\boldsymbol{d}_0$.

Next, given $\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}, \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}$, the temperature $\theta_{N,M}$ is determined as the unique solution to the heat equation (see LADYZHENSKAYA et al. [12, Chapter V, Theorem 8.1]):

$$\partial_t \theta_{N,M} + \text{div}\,(\theta_{N,M} \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}) + \text{div}\,\boldsymbol{q}^d_{N,M} \qquad (5.5)$$

$$= \mathbb{S}_{N,M} : \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} + \frac{1}{M}|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^r + |\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})|^2,$$

$$\boldsymbol{q}^d_{N,M} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \qquad (5.6)$$

$$\theta_{N,M}(0, \cdot) = \theta_{0,M}, \qquad (5.7)$$

where $\mathbb{S}_{N,M} = \frac{\mu(\theta_{N,M})}{2}(\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M} + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u}_{N,M})$, and

$$\boldsymbol{q}^d_{N,M} = -k(\theta_{N,M})\nabla_x \theta_{N,M} - h(\theta_{N,M})\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \theta_{N,M}).$$

Actually, relation (5.5) is just an explicit reformulation of (2.11).

Finally, the pressure $p_{N,M}$ is found as before as the (unique) solution to a system of integral identities:

$$\int_\Omega p_{N,M}\Delta\varphi = \int_\Omega (\mathbb{S}_{N,M} - \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \odot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - (\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})$$

$$-[\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}]_M \otimes \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}) : \nabla_x^2\varphi + \frac{1}{M}\int_\Omega |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^{r-2}\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} : \nabla_x^2\varphi, \qquad (5.8)$$

satisfied for any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$, $\nabla_x\varphi \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

Regularizing the convective terms in (5.1) is in the spirit of Leray's original approach [13] to the Navier–Stokes system. As a result, we recover the internal energy *equality* at the level of the limit $N \to \infty$. This fact, in turn, enables us to replace the internal energy equation (5.5) by the total energy balance before performing the limit $M \to \infty$. For fixed M, N, problem (5.1–5.8) can be solved by means of a simple fixed point argument, exactly as in [9, Chapter 3]. Note that all the a priori bounds derived formally in Section 4 apply to our approximate problem. Thus, given $\boldsymbol{u} \in C([0, T]; X_N)$, we can find $\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{d}[\boldsymbol{u}]$ solving (5.2–5.4), and then $\theta = \theta[\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{d}]$ and the pressure p satisfying (5.5–5.8). Plugging these functions $\boldsymbol{d}, \theta$ into (5.1), the corresponding solution $\mathcal{T}[\boldsymbol{u}]$ then defines a mapping $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto \mathcal{T}[\boldsymbol{u}]$. By

the a priori bounds obtained in Section 4, we can easily show that $\mathcal{T}$ possesses a fixed point by means of the classical Schauder's argument, at least on a possibly short time interval. However, using the a priori estimates once more, we easily conclude that the approximate solutions can be extended to any fixed time interval $[0, T]$, see [9, Chapter 6] for details.

5.1. Passage to the Limit as $N \to \infty$

Having constructed the approximate solutions $\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}, \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}, \theta_{N,M}$, and $p_{N,M}$, we let $N \to \infty$. To take the limit, we need to modify a bit the formal estimates obtained in Section 4, taking care of the regularizing terms added in (5.1) and (5.5). Indeed, from the energy estimate we now additionally obtain

$$M^{-1}\|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}\|^r_{L^r((0,T)\times\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{3\times3})} \leqq C, \tag{5.9}$$

whence we infer that $|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^{r-2}\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}((0,T)\times \Omega)$ for fixed M. Moreover, in place of (4.11) we deduce from (5.8) the estimate

$$\|p_{N,M}\|_{L^{r/r-1}((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leqq C(M), \tag{5.10}$$

where we observe that

$$\frac{r}{r-1} \in \left(\frac{10}{7}, \frac{3}{2}\right), \quad \text{since } r \in \left(3, \frac{10}{3}\right). \tag{5.11}$$

Note that, at least at the level of approximate solutions, relation (2.24) holds true as an equality. Hence, taking $H(\theta) = (1 + \theta)^\eta$, with $\eta \in (0, 1)$, in (2.24), we get

$$\|\partial_t \theta^\nu_{N,M}\|_{(C^0([0,T];W^{1,s}(\Omega)))^*} \leqq C\|\partial_t \theta^\nu_{N,M}\|_{L^1((0,T)\times\Omega)} \leqq C,$$

where C is a positive constant independent of N and M, with $s \in (3, +\infty)$, $\nu \in (0, 1/2)$. This leads to the convergence relations:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \to \boldsymbol{u}_M \quad \text{weakly-(*) in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \to \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^r(0, T; L^r(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.13}$$

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \to \partial_t \boldsymbol{u}_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; (W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3))^*)$$
$$+ L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}(0, T; W^{-1,r/r-1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.14}$$

$$p_{N,M} \to p_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^{r/r-1}((0, T) \times \Omega), \tag{5.15}$$

$$\theta^\nu_{N,M} \to \theta^\nu_M \quad \text{weakly-(*) in } L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^{1/\nu}(\Omega)), \tag{5.16}$$

$$\partial_t \theta^\nu_{N,M} \to \partial_t \theta^\nu_M \quad \text{weakly-(*) in } (C_0(0, T; W^{1,s}(\Omega)))^*, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\log \theta_{N,M} \to \log \theta_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega)), \tag{5.18}$$

$$\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \to \boldsymbol{d}_M \quad \text{weakly-(*) in } L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3))$$
$$\cap L^2(0, T; W^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.19}$$
$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \to \partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^{5/3}(0, T; L^{5/3}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.20}$$

for any $\nu \in (0, 1/2), s > 3$, where (5.15) follows from (5.10). Note that the M-projection is kept in the convective term in the limit $N \to \infty$.

Applying the Aubin–Lions compactness lemma (see [23]), we deduce that

$$\theta_{N,M} \to \theta_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^p((0, T) \times \Omega), \tag{5.21}$$

for any $p \in [1, 5/3)$.

Moreover, using (5.19), (5.20), a simple interpolation argument and the Aubin–Lions lemma, we obtain that

$$\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \to \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^\eta((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}) \quad \text{for } \eta \in [1, 10/3). \tag{5.22}$$

Next, using (5.12), (5.13), standard interpolation and embedding properties of Sobolev spaces and the Aubin–Lions lemma, we arrive at

$$\mathbf{u}_{N,M} \to \mathbf{u}_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^s((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{5.23}$$

for some $s > 5$. Combining this with (5.22), we finally obtain

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \to \boldsymbol{u}_M \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^q((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{5.24}$$

for some $q > 2$. Moreover, from (5.13) and (5.19), we have

$$\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M} \to \boldsymbol{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^p((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \tag{5.25}$$

for some $p > 2$, whence

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \to \partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_M \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)). \tag{5.26}$$

Finally, we have that

$$|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M}|^{r-2} \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M} \to \overline{|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^{r-2} \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M} \quad \text{weakly in } L^{r/r-1}\big((0, T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}\big).$$

We conclude that the limit quantities $\boldsymbol{u}_M, \boldsymbol{d}_M, \theta_M$ and p_M solve the problem

$$\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{u}_M(t, \cdot) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi = 0 \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in (0, T), \tag{5.27}$$

for any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$;

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{u}_M \cdot \partial_t \varphi + [\boldsymbol{u}_M]_M \otimes \boldsymbol{u}_M : \nabla_x \varphi) + p_M \text{div } \varphi = \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\mathbb{S}_M + \sigma_M^{\text{nd}}) : \nabla_x \varphi$$
$$- \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{u}_0 \cdot \varphi(0, \cdot) + \frac{1}{M} \int_\Omega \overline{|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M|^{r-2} \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M} : \nabla_x \varphi, \tag{5.28}$$

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\varphi \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, where

$$\sigma_M^{\text{nd}} = -(\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M \odot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M) - (\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_M - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_M)) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}_M \tag{5.29}$$

and

$$\mathbb{S}_M = \mu(\theta_M) \left(\frac{\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M + \nabla_x^t \mathbf{u}_M}{2} \right). \tag{5.30}$$

Letting $N \to \infty$ in the equation for $\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}$ we get

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{d}_M + \mathbf{u}_M \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M - \boldsymbol{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M$$
$$= \Delta \boldsymbol{d}_M - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_M), \quad \text{almost everywhere in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \tag{5.31}$$

supplemented with

$$\nabla_x (d_M)_i \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{5.32}$$
$$\boldsymbol{d}_M(0, \cdot) = \boldsymbol{d}_{0,M}. \tag{5.33}$$

The passage to the limit in (5.5) is more delicate. Actually, the weak lower semi-continuity of convex functionals on the right-hand side gives rise to

$$\partial_t \theta_M + \text{div}(\theta_M \mathbf{u}_M) + \text{div} \boldsymbol{q}_M^d \geqq \frac{1}{M} |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^r + \mathbb{S}_M : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M + |\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_M - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_M)|^2 \tag{5.34}$$

satisfied in the sense of distributions, with

$$\boldsymbol{q}_M^d \cdot \boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \tag{5.35}$$
$$\theta_M(0, \cdot) = \theta_{0,M}, \tag{5.36}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{q}_M^d = -k(\theta_M)\nabla_x \theta_M - h(\theta_M)\boldsymbol{d}_M(\boldsymbol{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \theta_M).$$

Next, we claim that the total energy is conserved, namely

$$\partial_t \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}_M|^2 + \theta_M + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_M|^2 + F(\boldsymbol{d}_M) \right) = 0. \tag{5.37}$$

Indeed, combining (5.1) with $\boldsymbol{v} = \mathbf{u}_{N,M}$ and (5.5–5.6), we obtain

$$\partial_t \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}_{N,M}|^2 + \theta_{N,M} \right)$$
$$= \int_\Omega ((\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \odot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}) \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M}$$
$$+ ((\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})) \otimes \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}) : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M}$$
$$+ |\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})|^2),$$

whence, by virtue of (5.2) and after a straightforward manipulation, we get

$$\partial_t \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} |\boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^2 + \theta_{N,M} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}|^2 + F(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}) \right) = 0,$$

yielding, by passing to the limit as $N \to \infty$, the desired conclusion (5.37).

Now, we want to show that (5.34) is actually an equality. Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_{N,M}$ in (5.1) we get

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{N,M}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mu(\theta_{M,N}) |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M} + \nabla_x^t \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^2$$

$$+ \frac{2}{M} \int_0^T \int_\Omega |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}|^r$$

$$= \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \sigma_{N,M}^{\text{nd}} : \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_{N,M}. \tag{5.38}$$

Next, thanks to (5.12–5.14), we can take $\mathbf{u}_M$ as a test function in (5.28). Actually, the L^r-regularity of $\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M$ is essential at this level since the term σ_M^{nd} [see (5.29)] does not necessarily belong to L^2 [actually, the best we can conclude it is that it lies in $L^{5/3}$, see (5.19) and (5.22)]. Then, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{u}_M(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mu(\theta_M) |\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M + \nabla_x^t \boldsymbol{u}_M|^2$$

$$+ \frac{2}{M} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \overline{|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M|^{r-2} \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M} : \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M$$

$$= \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \sigma_M^{\text{nd}} : \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}_M. \tag{5.39}$$

Now, multiplying (5.2) by $\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})$, we obtain

$$\|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \int_\Omega F(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})(t) + 2 \int_0^T \int_\Omega |\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})|^2$$

$$= \|\nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \int_\Omega F(\boldsymbol{d}_0)$$

$$+ 2 \int_0^T (\mathbf{u}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M}, \Delta \boldsymbol{d}_{N,M} - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_{N,M})). \tag{5.40}$$

Analogously, we multiply (5.31) by $\Delta \boldsymbol{d}_M - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{d}_M)$. Note that this is possible since (5.31) makes sense as a relation in L^2 [see (5.24–5.26)], thanks to the higher

regularity of $\mathbf{u}_M$ and $\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M$ guaranteed by the extra term $\frac{1}{M}|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^{r-2}\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M$ in the momentum equation. Hence, we get

$$\|\nabla_x \mathbf{d}_M(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\int_\Omega F(\mathbf{d}_M)(t) + 2\int_0^T \int_\Omega |\Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M)|^2$$
$$= \|\nabla_x \mathbf{d}_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\int_\Omega F(\mathbf{d}_0) + 2\int_0^T (\mathbf{u}_M \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M, \Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M)).$$
(5.41)

Taking the sum of (5.38) with (5.40) and of (5.39) with (5.41), and, finally, passing to the limit as $N \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M}|^r \to \int_0^T \int_\Omega \overline{|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^{r-2}\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M} : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M,$$
$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega |\Delta \mathbf{d}_{N,M} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_{N,M})|^2 \to \int_0^T \int_\Omega |\Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M)|^2,$$

entailing, by means of the standard Minty's trick and a monotonicity argument,

$$\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_{N,M} \to \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^r((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}),$$
$$\Delta \mathbf{d}_{N,M} \to \Delta \mathbf{d}_M \quad \text{strongly in } L^2((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Consequently, the inequality (5.34) may be replaced by the equality

$$\partial_t \theta_M + \text{div}\,(\theta_M \mathbf{u}_M) + \text{div}\, \mathbf{q}_M^d = \frac{1}{M}|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^r + \mathbb{S}_M : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M + |\Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M)|^2.$$
(5.42)

Taking $\mathbf{u}_M \varphi$, with $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}((0,T) \times \Omega)$, as a test function in (5.28), testing (5.31) by $\frac{D\mathbf{d}_M}{Dt}\varphi$, adding both relations to (5.42) multiplies by φ, and using (2.17), we get an M-analogue of (3.8), namely:

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}_M|^2 + e_M\right) + \text{div}\,\left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}_M|^2[\mathbf{u}_M]_M + e_M \mathbf{u}_M\right) + \text{div}\,(p_M \mathbf{u}_M$$
$$+ \mathbf{q}_M - \mathbb{S}_M \mathbf{u}_M - \sigma_M^{nd}\mathbf{u}_M) = \text{div}\,(\nabla_x \mathbf{d}_M \cdot (\Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M))), \quad (5.43)$$

with the internal energy

$$e_M = \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_x \mathbf{d}_M|^2 + F(\mathbf{d}_M) + \theta_M$$

and the flux

$$\mathbf{q}_M = -k(\theta_M)\nabla_x \theta_M - h(\theta_M)(\mathbf{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \theta_M)\mathbf{d}_M - \lambda \nabla_x \mathbf{d}_M \cdot \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M \cdot \mathbf{d}_M.$$

Finally, we can multiply (5.5) by $H'(\theta_M)\varphi$, obtaining

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega H(\theta_M)\partial_t \varphi + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (H(\theta_M)\mathbf{u}_M + H'(\theta_M)\mathbf{q}_M^d) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi$$
$$\leqq - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(H'(\theta_M) \left(\mathbb{S}_M : \nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M + \frac{1}{M}|\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M|^r \right. \right.$$
$$\left. + |\Delta \mathbf{d}_M - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}_M)|^2 \right) + H''(\theta_M)\mathbf{q}_M^d \cdot \nabla_x \theta_M \Bigg) \varphi$$
$$- \int_\Omega H(\theta_{0,M})\varphi(0,\cdot), \tag{5.44}$$

for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0,T) \times \overline{\Omega})$, $\varphi \geqq 0$, and any smooth, non-decreasing and concave function H. To be precise, however, we must remark that, at this level, we do not have sufficient regularity in (5.5) to use $H'(\theta_M)\varphi$ directly as a test function. Nevertheless, the procedure could be justified by a standard regularization argument and then taking the (supremum) limit. This is also the reason we get the $\leqq$ sign, rather than the equality, in (5.44). This concludes the passage to the limit for $N \to \infty$.

5.2. Passage to the Limit as $M \to \infty$

Our final goal is to let $M \to \infty$ in (5.27–5.33), (5.43), and (5.44). We notice that the limits in (5.12), (5.16–5.22) still hold when letting $M \to \infty$. On the other hand, we now have

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_M \to \partial_t \mathbf{u} \quad \text{weakly in } L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}(0,T; W^{-1,\frac{r}{r-1}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.45}$$
$$p_M \to p \quad \text{weakly in } L^{\frac{r}{r-1}}((0,T) \times \Omega), \tag{5.46}$$
$$\partial_t \mathbf{d}_M \to \partial_t \mathbf{d} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T; L^{3/2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)), \tag{5.47}$$

and, obviously,

$$M^{-1/(r-1)}\nabla_x \mathbf{u}_M \to 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^{r-1}((0,T) \times \Omega). \tag{5.48}$$

The above relations are sufficient to pass to the limit $M \to \infty$ in (5.27–5.33) to recover (3.5–3.7). In addition, by (5.11) and the previous estimates, we get

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{|\mathbf{u}_M|^2}{2} + p_M \right) \mathbf{u}_M \right\}_{M>0} \quad \text{bounded in } L^\iota((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for some } \iota > 1,$$

$$\{\theta_M \mathbf{u}_M\}_{M>0} \quad \text{bounded in } L^q((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{for any } q \in [1, 10/9),$$

$$\{\sigma_M^{\text{nd}}\mathbf{u}_M\}_{M>0} \quad \text{bounded in } L^\iota((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for some } \iota > 1,$$

$$\mathbf{q}_M \quad \text{bounded in} \quad \text{bounded in } L^\iota((0,T) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad \text{for some } \iota > 1.$$

Notice that we used here, in an essential way, the fact that $r/(r-1) > 10/7$.

As a consequence, we can pass to the limit in (5.43) and to the lim sup in (5.44) [thanks also to the positivity and convexity of the terms on the last line of (5.44)] to deduce the desired conclusions (3.8) and (3.9). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

To conclude, we remark that the above estimates *are not* sufficient for passing to the limit in (5.42) with respect to $M \to \infty$, due to the lack of strong convergences of the terms appearing on the right-hand side.

References

1. BULÍCEK, M., FEIREISL, E., MÁLEK, J.: A Navier-Stokes-Fourier system for incompressible fluids with temperature dependent material coefficients. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* **10**, 992–1015 (2009)
2. BALL, J.M., ZARNESCU, A.: Orientability and energy minimization in liquid crystal models. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **202**, 493–535 (2011)
3. CAVATERRA, C., ROCCA, E.: On a 3D isothermal model for nematic liquid crystals accounting for stretching terms. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* (2011, to appear)
4. CLIMENT-EZQUERRA, B., GUILLÉN-GONZÁLES, F., RODRÍGUEZ-BELLIDO, M.A.: Stability for nematic liquid crystals with stretching terms. *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos* **20**, 2937–2942 (2010)
5. COUTAND, D., SHKOLLER, S.: Well posedness of the full Ericksen–Leslie model of nematic liquid crystals. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Sér. I* **333**, 919–924 (2001)
6. ERICKSEN, J.L.: Conservation laws for liquid crystals. *Trans. Soc. Rheol.* **5**, 23–34 (1961)
7. ERICKSEN, J.L.: Equilibrium theory of liquid crystals. *Advances in Liquid Crystals*, Vol. 26, 233–398 (ed. G. Brown). Academic Press, New York, 1976
8. FEIREISL, E., MÁLEK, J.: On the Navier-Stokes equations with temperature-dependent transport coefficients. *Differ. Equ. Nonlinear Mech.* Art. ID 90616 (2006)
9. FEIREISL, E., NOVOTNÝ, A.: Singular limits in thermodynamics of viscous fluids. *Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009
10. FEIREISL, E., ROCCA, E., SCHIMPERNA, G.: On a non-isothermal model for nematic liquid crystals. *Nonlinearity* **24**, 243–257 (2011)
11. FRÉMOND, M.: *Non-Smooth Thermomechanics*. Springer, Berlin, 2002
12. LADYŽENSKAJA, O.A., SOLONNIKOV, V.A., URALTSEVA, N.N.: Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type. *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, Vol. 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1967
13. LERAY, J.: Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. *Acta Math.* **63**, 193–248 (1934, in French)
14. LESLIE, F.M.: Some constitutive equations for liquid crystals. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **28**, 265–283 (1963)
15. LESLIE, F.: Theory of flow phenomena in liquid crystals. *Advances in Liquid Crystals*, Vol. 4, 1–81 (ed. G. Brown). Academic Press, New York, 1978
16. LIN, F.-H., LIU, C.: Nonparabolic dissipative systems modeling the flow of liquid crystals. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **48**, 501–537 (1995)
17. LIN, F.-H., LIU, C.: Static and dynamic theories of liquid crystals. *J. Partial Differ. Equ.* **14**, 289–330 (2001)
18. LIU, C., SHEN, J.: On liquid crystal flows with free-slip boundary conditions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **7**, 307–318 (2001)
19. MAJUMDAR, A., ZARNESCU, A.: Landau-De Gennes theory of nematic liquid crystals: the Oseen–Frank limit and beyond. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **196**, 227–280 (2010)
20. PETZELTOVÁ, H., ROCCA, E., SCHIMPERNA, G.: On the long-time behavior of some mathematical models for nematic liquid crystals. *Calc. Var. PDE*. doi:10.1007/s00526-012-0496-1
21. SEGATTI, A., WU, H.: Finite dimensional reduction and convergence to equilibrium for incompressible Smectic-A liquid crystal flows. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **43**, 2445–2481 (2011)
22. SHKOLLER, S.: Well-posedness and global attractors for liquid crystals on Riemannian manifolds. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.* **27**, 1103–1137 (2002)
23. SIMON, J.: Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* **146**, 65–96 (1987)
24. SUN, H., LIU, C.: On energetic variational approaches in modeling the nematic liquid crystal flows. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **23**, 455–475 (2009)
25. TEMAM, R.: Navier–Stokes equations. *Theory and Numerical Analysis*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, 2001

26. Wu, H., Xu, X., Liu Ch.: Asymptotic behavior for a nematic liquid crystal model with different kinematic transport properties (2009, preprint). arXiv:0901.1751v2

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences,
Žitná 25, 115 67 Praha 1, Czech Republic
e-mail: feireisl@math.cas.cz

and

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile,
Università di Roma "Tor Vergata",
Via del Politecnico, 1, 00133 Rome, Italy
e-mail: Michel.Fremond@uniroma2.it

and

Dipartimento di Matematica,
Università degli Studi di Milano,
Via Saldini 50, 20133 Milan, Italy
e-mail: elisabetta.rocca@unimi.it

and

Dipartimento di Matematica,
Università degli Studi di Pavia,
Via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy
e-mail: giusch04@unipv.it