Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Seminar for Applied Mathematics

Analytic regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations with mixed boundary conditions in polygons

Y. He and C. Marcati and Ch. Schwab

Research Report No. 2021-29

September 2021
Latest revision: May 2023

Seminar für Angewandte Mathematik
Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule
CH-8092 Zürich
Switzerland

ANALYTIC REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS WITH MIXED BOUNDARY CONDITIONS IN POLYGONS

YANCHEN HE*, CARLO MARCATI†, AND CHRISTOPH SCHWAB*

May 5, 2023

Abstract. We prove weighted analytic regularity of Leray-Hopf variational solutions for the stationary, incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations (NSE) in plane polygons , subject to analytic body forces. We admit mixed boundary conditions which may change type at each corner. The weighted analytic regularity results are established in scales of corner-weighted Kondrat'ev spaces of finite order. The proofs rely on a priori estimates for the corresponding linearized boundary value problem in sectors in corner-weighted Sobolev spaces and on an induction argument for the weighted norm estimates on the quadratic nonlinear term in the NSE, in a polar frame.

1. Introduction.

The regularity properties of the solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations (NSE) have attracted considerable attention since their introduction. We mention only the intense research in recent years around the Onsager conjecture and on the boundedness of the velocity field of Leray solutions in three space dimensions.

Regularity results for the weak, Leray-Hopf solutions to the NSE in scales of Sobolev and Besov spaces are crucial for the numerical analysis of the NSE. The *stationary NSE* is, for large values of the viscosity parameter, a perturbation of its linearization, the Stokes Equation. Therefore, it is an elliptic system in the sense of Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg, and hence it affords analytic regularity at the interior points of domains for analytic forcing [25, Chap. 6.7], see also [21]. This local analyticity of the velocity and the pressure extends to analytic parts of the boundary.

However, it is also classical that in the vicinity of corner points (in space dimension $d = 2$) and near edges and corners (for polyhedra in space dimension $d = 3$), regularity is lost, even if all other data of the stationary NSE are regular. See in particular [22, Chap. 10, 11] and, e.g., [5, 6, 9, 24, 27] and the references there. The reason is the appearance of *corner singularities* (in space dimension $d = 2$) and of *corner- and edge-singularities* (in polyhedra in space dimension $d = 3$). While singular solutions of the Stokes equation are well known to encode physically relevant effects (see, e.g., [23, 24]), they do obstruct large elliptic regularity shifts in standard (Besov or Triebel-Lizorkin) scales of function spaces and, consequently, high convergence rates of numerical discretizations. This failure of elliptic regularity shifts motivated the investigation of regularity of solutions in the presence of non smooth boundaries. For the mixed boundary conditions of interest here, some results on the regularity of velocity and pressure of Leray solutions in non-weighted Sobolev spaces with a possibly small range of smoothness have been obtained in [7]. It has been known for some time that, for smooth data, the velocity fields of stationary solutions for the incompressible NSE in plane, polygonal domains allow higher regularity in so-called *corner-weighted Sobolev spaces*. Here, weight functions which vanish in the corners of the polygon to a suitable power compensate for the loss of regularity in the vicinity of the corner. The corresponding Mellin calculus for the study of regularity shifts in corner-weighted Sobolev spaces originated in [16]. See, e.g., [9, 27] and the references there. In [22], an authoritative account of these results, also for the NSE in polyhedra, has been given. The results in [22, Chapter 11] establish regularity shifts for Leray-Hopf variational solutions of the NSE in edge- and corner-weighted Sobolev and Hölder spaces of *finite order*. The purpose of the present paper is to prove *corner-weighted*, *analytic regularity* for the velocity field $\boldsymbol{u}$ and the pressure field p of Leray-Hopf solutions to the stationary, incompressible NSE in a bounded polygon $\mathbb{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Specifically, we consider the analytic regularity of solutions of the viscous, incompressible NSE in $\mathbb{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ whose boundary $\partial\mathbb{P}$ consists of a finite number n of straight sides. Extending and revisiting our work [20] which addressed homogeneous Dirichlet ("no-slip") boundary conditions, we consider

*Seminar for Applied Mathematics, ETH Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland (yanchen.he@sam.math.ethz.ch, christoph.schwab@sam.math.ethz.ch).

†Dipartimento di Matematica "F. Casorati", Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy (carlo.marcati@unipv.it)

here the stationary and incompressible NSE in $\mathbb{P}$ with *mixed boundary conditions*, where now also slip and so-called "open" boundary parts are admitted. These conditions arise in numerous configurations in engineering and the sciences. Furthermore, our present proof of the weighted analytic regularity requires a proof technique which differs from the approach used in [20]. As the corresponding analysis for plane, linearized elasticity in [12], it is based on regularity results for the linearization (the Stokes problem) in a sector built on the Agranovich-Vishik theory of complex-parametric operator pencils which was already used in [12] and [13] to obtain a priori estimates and shift theorems in corner-weighted spaces. See also [18] for a general exposition of the role of operator pencils for elliptic systems in conical domains.

The present paper provides a proof of weighted analytic regularity for the velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$ and the pressure field p of the stationary, incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in a polygon $\mathbb{P}$, subject to possibly mixed boundary conditions on the sides of $\mathbb{P}$. The details of the proof are distinct from the argument in our previous work [20] even for pure Dirichlet boundary conditions. In [20], a bootstrapping argument based on local, Caccioppoli estimates on balls contained in $\mathbb{P}$ and scaling was proposed. Furthermore, the proof proposed in [20] was incomplete; the gap is closed by the argument in the present paper, which provides in particular in the case of homogeneous Dirichlet (so-called "no-slip") boundary conditions, the weighted analytic regularity result in [20]. This was used in [28] to prove exponential rates of convergence of a certain hp-DGFEM discretization of the stationary NSE in polygons.

Analytic regularity results for solutions in corner-weighted Kondrat'ev-Sobolev spaces imply, as is well-known, *exponential convergence rate bounds* for numerical approximations by so-called hp-Finite Element Methods and also by model order reduction methods. We refer to [28] and to the references there for recent results on exponential convergence for the Navier-Stokes equations, for discontinuous Galerkin discretizations, and also to the discussion in [20, Section 2.2] for exponential rates for certain model order reduction approaches to the NSE in $\mathbb{P}$.

1.1. Contributions. We establish weighted, analytic regularity results for Leray-Hopf solutions of the NSE in a bounded, connected polygonal domain $\mathbb{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with finitely many, straight sides. We generalize the analytic regularity results stated in [20] from the pure Dirichlet (also referred to as "no-slip") boundary conditions as studied in [20] to the case of mixed boundary conditions at any two sides of $\mathbb{P}$ which meet at one common corner of $\partial\mathbb{P}$. As in [20] we work under a small data hypothesis, ensuring in particular the uniqueness of weak solutions. We also develop the regularity theory based on a priori estimates of solutions for a linearization, the Stokes problem, in weighted, Hilbertian Sobolev spaces in a sector. The result contains the analytic regularity result in [20] as a special case, and its proof proceeds in a way that is fundamentally different from [20]. As mentioned, it is based on a regularity analysis in corner-weighted spaces and a novel bootstrapping argument in the quadratic nonlinearity in weighted Kondrat'ev spaces. As in [12, 13], the weighted a priori estimates for the velocity field and the bounds on the quadratic nonlinearity near corners $\mathfrak{c}$ are obtained for the projection of the velocity components in a polar frame centered at $\mathfrak{c}$, rather than for their Cartesian components.

The main result of the present paper is stated in Theorem 2.13. Specifically, under the small data hypothesis and the stated assumptions on the boundary conditions (see Assumption 1 for details), we show that there exist $A > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ (that depends on the forcing term and on Ω) such that for all $\gamma \in (\max(1-\kappa, 0), 1)$ the Leray-Hopf solutions $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ to the NSE satisfy, for all $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that for $j + k \geq 2$,

$$\left\| \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{c}\in\mathfrak{C}} |\cdot - \mathfrak{c}|^{j+k+\gamma-2} \right) \partial_{x_1}^j \partial_{x_2}^k \boldsymbol{u} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq A^{j+k+1}(j+k)!,$$

and for all $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\left\| \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{c}\in\mathfrak{C}} |\cdot - \mathfrak{c}|^{j+k+\gamma-1} \right) \partial_{x_1}^j \partial_{x_2}^k p \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq A^{j+k+1}(j+k)!.$$

Here, for any two points $\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{P}}$, $|\mathfrak{a}_1 - \mathfrak{a}_2|$ denotes the Euclidean distance between $\mathfrak{a}_1$ and $\mathfrak{a}_2$.

1.2. Layout. As is well-known (e.g. [18] and the references there) the analysis of point singularities near corners of solutions of elliptic PDEs is based on polar coordinates centered at the corner. For elliptic systems of PDEs such as those of interest here, as in [12, 13] in addition we employ projections of Cartesian components of the velocity field to a polar frame. In Section 1.3, we collect the corresponding notation for partial derivatives and solution fields. Section 2.4 presents the variational formulation, and a (classical) existence and uniqueness result. Section 2 presents strong formulations of the boundary value problems under consideration, detailing in particular also the boundary operators. Also, weak formulations are recapitulated, with statements on existence and, under small data hypothesis, uniqueness of solutions.

The corner-weighted, Kondrat'ev spaces that appear in the statement of the analytic regularity shifts are also introduced. Section 2.6 then presents a key technical step for the subsequent analytic regularity proof: a priori estimates in corner-weighted Sobolev norms in a sector for the linearized Stokes boundary value problem are recapitulated, from [13]. Importantly, they hold for several combinations of boundary conditions on the sides of the sector, and for the velocity field in a polar coordinate frame. With this in hand, Section 3 addresses the proof of the principal analytic regularity result for the NSE, Theorem 2.13, which is also the main result of the present paper. The key novel step in its proof is an inductive bootstrap argument for the quadratic nonlinear term in the NSE, in corner-weighted spaces and for the velocity field in a polar frame at each corner of $\mathbb{P}$. This is developed in Section 3.1. Conclusions and a short discussion of the results, with some consequences and possible generalizations, are presented in Section 4. An appendix contains several lengthy calculations that appear in several of the proofs.

1.3. Notation. We define $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ as the set of positive natural numbers and write $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. We refer to tuples $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ as multi-indices and we write $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we write

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \le k} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |\alpha| \le k} .$$

Given Cartesian coordinates (x_1, x_2) and polar coordinates (r, ϑ), whose origin will be clear from the context, we denote Cartesian partial derivatives as $\partial^\alpha = \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{x_2}^{\alpha_2}$ and polar derivatives as $\mathcal{D}^\alpha = \partial_r^{\alpha_1} \partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2}$. In the following, we shall always use roman letters to denote function spaces defined in terms of Cartesian derivatives and calligraphic letters to denote function spaces defined in terms of polar derivatives, see Section 2.5.

For any vector field $\boldsymbol{u}$ with components in Cartesian coordinates

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

we denote its polar coordinate frame projection as

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} := \begin{pmatrix} u_r \\ u_\vartheta \end{pmatrix} = A\boldsymbol{u} , \quad A := \begin{pmatrix} \cos\vartheta & \sin\vartheta \\ -\sin\vartheta & \cos\vartheta \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.1}$$

where A shall be referred to as "transformation matrix". Here and throughout, vector-valued quantities such as $\boldsymbol{u}$ shall be understood as column vectors, with $\boldsymbol{u}^\top$ denoting the transpose vector, which accordingly denotes a row vector. The symbol L_{St} shall denote the Stokes operator, with various super- and subscripts indicating Cartesian or polar coordinates and frame, i.e. we write $\overline{L_{\mathrm{St}}}$ for its projection onto polar coordinates acting on the corresponding velocity components.

We observe that the projection (1.1) of the velocity field into a polar frame renders certain boundary conditions particularly simple: for example, the homogeneous slip boundary condition in a sector Q will amount to requiring the angular component u_ϑ to vanish on sides of Q.

All quantities which occur in this paper are real-valued. The overline symbol which will indicate polar-coordinate representation of vectors is therefore non-ambiguous.

We denote with an underline n-dimensional tuples $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and suppose arithmetic operations and inequalities such as $\underline{\gamma} < \underline{\beta}$ are understood component-wise: e.g., $\underline{\beta}+k = (\beta_1+k, \dots, \beta_n+k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$; furthermore, we indicate, e.g., $\underline{\beta} > 0$ if $\beta_i > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Finally, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote its nonnegative real part as $[a]_+ = \max(0, a)$.

For summability index $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, the usual Lebesgue spaces in $\mathbb{P}$ shall be denoted by $L^q(\mathbb{P})$. Norms of vector-valued functions $\boldsymbol{v}$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}$ are understood component-wise, e.g., for $\boldsymbol{v} : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{P})} = \int_{\mathbb{P}} \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^q_{\ell^q}$ where $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^q}$ is the ℓ^q norm for vectors. We denote the usual Sobolev spaces of differentiation order $s > 0$ by $W^{s,q}(\mathbb{P})$; we write $H^s(\mathbb{P})$ in the Hilbertian case $q = 2$.

2. The Navier-Stokes equations, functional setting, and main result. Following the introduction of the polygonal domain in Section 2.1, in Section 2.2 we state the strong form of the boundary value problems, and of the boundary operators, in Cartesian coordinates. Section 2.3 is devoted to the saddle point variational form of the boundary value problems of interest. Section 2.4 reviews statements on existence and uniqueness of weak solutions, under the small data hypothesis. In Section 2.5 we introduce the corner-weighted spaces on which the weighted analytic regularity results will be based. Finally, we state in Section 2.7 our main result.

2.1. Geometry of the domain. Throughout, $\mathbb{P}$ denotes a polygon with $n \geq 3$ straight, open sides Γ_i and n corners $\mathfrak{C} = \{\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_n\}$ with interior opening angles $\omega_i \in (0, 2\pi)$, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ (enumerated in counterclockwise order, and modulo n, i.e. we identify Γ_n with Γ_0 and Γ_{n+1} with Γ_1, etc.), so that $\mathfrak{c}_i = \overline{\Gamma_i} \cap \overline{\Gamma_{i+1}}$. Let Γ_D, Γ_N, and Γ_G be a disjoint partition of the boundary $\Gamma = \partial\mathbb{P}$ of $\mathbb{P}$ comprising each of $n_D \geq 1$, $n_N \geq 0$ and $n_G \geq 0$ many sides of $\mathbb{P}$, respectively, with $n = n_D + n_N + n_G$. We denote by $\boldsymbol{n} : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^2$ the exterior unit normal vector to $\mathbb{P}$, defined almost everywhere on Γ, which belongs to $L^\infty(\Gamma; \mathbb{R}^2)$, and by $\boldsymbol{t} \in L^\infty(\Gamma; \mathbb{R}^2)$ correspondingly the unit tangent vector to Γ, pointing in counterclockwise tangential direction.

2.2. The Navier-Stokes boundary value problems. We assume that a kinematic viscosity $\nu > 0$ is given, which is constant throughout $\mathbb{P}$. For a velocity field $\boldsymbol{u} : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and a scalar $p : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u}) := \frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^\top\right), \qquad \sigma(\boldsymbol{u}, p) := 2\nu\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u}) - p\,\mathrm{Id}_2,$$

where Id_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix, and $\nabla\boldsymbol{u}$ denotes the 2×2 matrix of the Cartesian partial derivatives of the components of $\boldsymbol{u}$.

With this notation, we consider the stationary, incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{P}$

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla\cdot\sigma(\boldsymbol{u}, p) + (\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u} &= \boldsymbol{f} && \text{in } \mathbb{P} \\ \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{P} \\ \boldsymbol{u} &= \boldsymbol{0} && \text{on } \Gamma_D \\ \sigma(\boldsymbol{u}, p)\boldsymbol{n} &= \boldsymbol{0} && \text{on } \Gamma_N \\ (\sigma(\boldsymbol{u}, p)\boldsymbol{n})\cdot\boldsymbol{t} = 0 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_G. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here, Γ_D, Γ_N, and Γ_G correspond to so-called no-slip, open, and slip boundary conditions, respectively.

Remark 2.1. We allow interior opening angles to take values in $(0, 2\pi)$. With this setting, (2.1) includes the case of boundary conditions changing along edges of the domain $\mathbb{P}$.

Remark 2.2. From the identity

$$2\nabla\cdot\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u}) = \Delta\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u}), \tag{2.2}$$

the boundary value problem (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} -\nu\Delta\boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = \boldsymbol{f} &\quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}\\ \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u} = 0 &\quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}\\ \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{0} &\quad \text{on } \Gamma_D\\ \sigma(\boldsymbol{u},p)\boldsymbol{n} = \boldsymbol{0} &\quad \text{on } \Gamma_N\\ (\sigma(\boldsymbol{u},p)\boldsymbol{n})\cdot\boldsymbol{t} = 0 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} = 0 &\quad \text{on } \Gamma_G. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

2.3. Variational Formulation. Weak solutions of the NSE (2.1) in the sense of Leray-Hopf satisfy the NSE (2.1) in variational form. To state it, we introduce standard Sobolev spaces in $\mathbb{P}$. *Throughout the remainder of this article, we shall work under*

Assumption 1. The boundary value problems (2.1), (2.3) satisfy the following conditions.

1. $\mathbb{P}$ is a bounded, connected polygon with a finite number n of straight sides, denoted by Γ_i, $i = 1, ..., n$, and with Lipschitz boundary $\Gamma = \partial\mathbb{P}$.
2. $n_D \geq 1$.

Assumption 1 implies that the Dirichlet case considered in [20] is a special case of the present setting. It also implies that all interior opening angles ω_i at corners $\mathfrak{c}_i$ of $\mathbb{P}$ are in $(0, 2\pi)$. In particular, slit domains which correspond to the opening angle 2π are excluded. Remark also that Assumption 1, item 2. implies that we always have $|\Gamma_D| > 0$; as a consequence, the case $\Gamma = \Gamma_N \cup \Gamma_G$ is excluded from our analysis. Furthermore, Item 2 ensures that the linearization of the Navier-Stokes equations, i.e., the Stokes problem, admits unique variational velocity field solutions $\boldsymbol{u}$, possibly with pressure p unique up to constants if $\Gamma = \Gamma_D$.

We denote henceforth the space of velocity fields of variational solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations (2.1) as

$$\boldsymbol{W} = \left\{\boldsymbol{v} \in [H^1(\mathbb{P})]^2 : \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{0} \text{ on } \Gamma_D,\ \boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_G\right\}. \tag{2.4}$$

We denote by $\boldsymbol{W}^*$ its dual, with identification of $L^2(\mathbb{P})^2 \simeq [L^2(\mathbb{P})^2]^*$. We also define $Q = L^2(\mathbb{P})$ if $|\Gamma_D| < |\Gamma|$ (i.e., if not the entire boundary is a Dirichlet boundary) and set $Q = L^2_0(\mathbb{P}) := L^2(\mathbb{P})/\mathbb{R}$ in the case that $\Gamma = \Gamma_D$.

We are interested in variational solutions $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ of (2.1). To state the corresponding variational formulation, we introduce the usual bi- and trilinear forms:

$$\begin{aligned} a(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}) &:= 2\nu\int_{\mathbb{P}}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}[\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u})]_{ij}[\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{v})]_{ij}\,d\boldsymbol{x}\ ,\\ b(\boldsymbol{u},p) &:= -\int_{\mathbb{P}} p\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\,d\boldsymbol{x}\ ,\\ t(\boldsymbol{w};\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}) &:= \int_{\mathbb{P}}((\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u})\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\,d\boldsymbol{x}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

With these forms, we state the variational formulation of (2.1): find $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in \boldsymbol{W} \times Q$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}) + t(\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}) + b(\boldsymbol{v},p) &= \int_{\mathbb{P}}\boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\,d\boldsymbol{x}\ ,\\ b(\boldsymbol{u},q) &= 0\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in \boldsymbol{W}$ and all $q \in Q$.

2.4. Existence and uniqueness of solutions. We recapitulate results on existence and uniqueness of variational solutions of the NSE (2.6). As is well-known, uniqueness of such solutions in the stationary case requires a small data hypothesis. To state it, we introduce the coercivity constant of the viscous (diffusion) term

$$C_{\text{coer}} := \inf_{\substack{\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{W} \\ \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})}=1}} 2\int_{\mathbb{P}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} [\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{v})]_{ij}[\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{v})]_{ij}\, d\boldsymbol{x}$$

and the continuity constant for the trilinear transport term

$$C_{\text{cont}} := \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w}\in\boldsymbol{W} \\ \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})}=\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})}=\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})}=1}} \int_{\mathbb{P}} ((\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{v})\cdot\boldsymbol{w}\, d\boldsymbol{x}\ .$$

The following existence and uniqueness result is then classical, see e.g. [27, Theorem 3.2]. It is valid under a small data hypothesis. To state it, we introduce

$$\mathbf{M} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{W} : \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})} \le \frac{C_{\text{coer}}\nu}{2C_{\text{cont}}} \right\}\ .$$

THEOREM 2.3. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and assume that* $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{W}^*} \le \frac{C_{\text{coer}}^2\nu^2}{4C_{\text{cont}}}$. *There exists a solution* $(\boldsymbol{u},p)\in\boldsymbol{W}\times L^2(\mathbb{P})$ *to* (2.1) *with right hand side* $\boldsymbol{f}$. *The velocity field* $\boldsymbol{u}$ *is unique in* $\mathbf{M}$.

As we assumed above $n_D \ge 1$, there is always at least one side of $\mathbb{P}$ where homogeneous Dirichlet ("no-slip") BCs are imposed.

2.5. Functional setting. For $x\in\mathbb{P}$ and for $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, let $r_i(x) := \operatorname{dist}(x,\mathfrak{c}_i)$. We define the corner weight function

$$\Phi_{\underline{\beta}}(x) := \prod_{i=1}^{n} r_i^{\beta_i}(x).$$

We next introduce the corner-weighted function spaces to be used for the regularity analysis. As the notation used in the literature dealing with weighted Sobolev spaces is not always uniform, we present here several definitions of corner-weighted spaces and discuss how they relate for the range of weight exponents that is relevant to the present work.

2.5.1. Corner-weighted function spaces of finite order in $\mathbb{P}$. In the polygon $\mathbb{P}$, for $j,k\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and $\underline{\gamma}\in\mathbb{R}^n$, we introduce homogeneous corner-weighted seminorms and associated norms given by

$$(2.7)\qquad |v|^2_{K^j_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})} := \sum_{|\alpha|=j} \|\Phi_{|\alpha|-\underline{\gamma}}\partial^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}, \qquad \|v\|^2_{K^k_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})} := \sum_{j=0}^{k} |v|^2_{K^j_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})}.$$

Furthermore, we also require non-homogeneous, corner-weighted Sobolev norms. They are, for $\ell\in\mathbb{N}_0$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$ with $k>\ell$, and $\underline{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$(2.8)\qquad \|v\|^2_{H^{k,\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})} := \|v\|^2_{H^{\ell-1}(\mathbb{P})} + \sum_{\ell\le|\alpha|\le k} \|\Phi_{\underline{\beta}+|\alpha|-\ell}\partial^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{P})},$$

with the convention that the first term is omitted when $\ell = 0$. We therefore define the homogeneous, corner-weighted Sobolev spaces $K^k_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})$ and the non-homogeneous, corner-weighted Sobolev spaces $H^{k,\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})$ as the spaces of, respectively, weakly differentiable functions with bounded $K^k_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})$ and $H^{k,\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})$ norms.

2.5.2. Corner-weighted analytic classes $B^{\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})$ and $K^{\varpi}_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})$. With the weighted, Kondrat'ev-type spaces at hand, we now introduce *weighted analytic classes* which will quantify the loss of analyticity of velocity and pressure in a vicinity of the corner points. Let

$$B^{\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P}) := \Big\{ v \in \bigcap_{k\geq\ell} H^{k,\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P}) : \exists C, A > 0 \text{ s. t.} \quad \|\Phi_{\underline{\beta}+|\alpha|-\ell}\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq C A^{|\alpha|-\ell}(|\alpha|-\ell)!,\ \forall |\alpha|\geq\ell \Big\}, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$K^{\varpi}_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P}) := \left\{ v \in \bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} K^{k}_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P}) : \exists C, A > 0 \text{ s. t. } \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2_0 : \ \ \|\Phi_{|\alpha|-\underline{\gamma}}\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq C A^{|\alpha|}|\alpha|! \right\}. \tag{2.10}$$

The spaces $H^{k,\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})$ and the analytic classes $B^{\ell}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})$ are based on non-homogeneous weighted Sobolev norms, while the spaces $K^{j}_{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbb{P})$ and the classes $K^{\varpi}_{\underline{\gamma}}$ are based on homogeneous weighted Sobolev norms. For a discussion of the relation between homogeneous and non-homogeneous weighted Sobolev spaces, see [4]. Some facts from [4] required here are listed in Section 2.5.4 below. In the definitions (2.9), (2.10) of the weighted, analytic classes, the constant $C > 0$ quantifies the size of a function in terms of linear scaling of norms, whereas the constant $A > 0$ relates to the size of the domain of analyticity.

2.5.3. Corner-weighted spaces in polar coordinates and trace spaces in sectors. To recall regularity shifts near corners, we introduce corner-weighted function spaces in plane sectors $Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})$ of opening $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, radius $\delta \in (0,\infty]$ and with corner $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. They are defined using a polar coordinate system as

$$Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r(x,\mathfrak{c}) := |x-\mathfrak{c}| \in (0,\delta),\ \vartheta(x) \in (0,\omega) \right\}.$$

We do not indicate the dependence on the vertex $\mathfrak{c}$ when this is clear from the context.

Corner-weighted spaces which are defined in polar coordinates are denoted with caligraphic letters: recall that $\mathcal{D}^\alpha = \partial_r^{\alpha_1}\partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2}$ denotes the partial derivative of order $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2_0$ in polar coordinates.

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce the (homogeneous) corner-weighted, Hilbertian Kondrat'ev space $\mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ of functions v in $Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})$ with bounded norm given by

$$\|v\|^2_{\mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq k} \|r^{\beta-k+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}. \tag{2.11}$$

We write $\mathcal{L}_\beta = \mathcal{V}^0_\beta$. Norms of vector-functions $\boldsymbol{v}$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}$ are taken component-wise.

Let $\Gamma_Q \subset \partial Q_{\delta,\omega}$ be either one straight edge or the union of two straight edges of $Q_{\delta,\omega}$. We define, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta \in (0,1)$, $\mathcal{V}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}_\beta(\Gamma_Q)$ as the trace spaces of $\mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ and equip them with the norms

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{V}^{k-\frac{1}{2}}_\beta(\Gamma_Q)} = \inf_{G|_{\Gamma_Q}=g} \|G\|_{\mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})}. \tag{2.12}$$

For $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $k \geq \ell$ and for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{H}^{k,l}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ denotes the space of functions with finite norm

$$\|v\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^{k,\ell}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} := \|v\|^2_{H^{\ell-1}(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \sum_{\ell\leq|\alpha|\leq k} \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-\ell}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})},$$

where the first term is dropped if $\ell = 0$.

With the corner-weighted spaces of finite order at hand, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the corner-weighted analytic classes $\mathcal{B}^\ell_\beta$ in $Q_{\delta,\omega}$, with weak derivatives in polar coordinates, are defined by

(2.13)
$$\mathcal{B}^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}) = \left\{ v \in \bigcap_{k=\ell}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}^{k,\ell}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}) : \exists C, A > 0 \text{ s. t. } \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-\ell}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le CA^{|\alpha|-\ell}(|\alpha|-\ell)!, \forall |\alpha| \ge \ell \right\}.$$

The definition of the spaces $H^{k,\ell}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$ and $B^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$ follows from (2.9) by replacing $\Phi_{\underline{\beta}+|\alpha|-\ell}$ in (2.8) and (2.9) with $r(\cdot,\mathfrak{c})^{\beta+|\alpha|-\ell}$. Similarly, the corner-weighted spaces $K^k_\gamma(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$ and $K^\varpi_\gamma(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$ can be defined by replacing $\Phi_{|\alpha|-\underline{\gamma}}$ in (2.7) and (2.10) with $r(\cdot,\mathfrak{c})^{|\alpha|-\gamma}$.

2.5.4. Relation between corner-weighted spaces. In this section we collect results on embeddings between some of the corner-weighted spaces we introduced. They are of independent interest, and will be required at various stages in the ensuing proof of the analytic regularity shifts.

The following relations between polar frame velocity $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}$ in (1.1) and Cartesian frame velocity components $\boldsymbol{u}$ hold and shall be used in the sequel. For ease of reading, we either cite or postpone all proofs to Appendix A.

LEMMA 2.4. *For all $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, if $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathcal{B}^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))^2$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{0}$ when $\ell = 2$, then $\boldsymbol{u} \in B^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})^2$.*

The reverse implication, in the case $\ell = 0$, is treated in the following statement.

LEMMA 2.5. *For all $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, if $\boldsymbol{v} \in B^0_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))^2$ then $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \in \mathcal{B}^0_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))^2$.*

The corner-weighted spaces in Cartesian and polar frames are equivalent: the following lemmas on equivalence and embedding between weighted spaces state this formally.

LEMMA 2.6. *Let $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then the following equivalence relations hold for any $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 \ni k \ge \ell$:*

1. $v \in H^{k,\ell}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})) \iff v \in \mathcal{H}^{k,\ell}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$.
2. $v \in B^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})) \iff v \in \mathcal{B}^\ell_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$.
3. $v \in H^{1,1}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})) \iff v \in \mathcal{V}^1_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$.

LEMMA 2.7. *Let $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then the following embeddings are continuous:*

1. $\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})) \hookrightarrow H^{2,2}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})) \hookrightarrow C^0(\overline{Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})})$.
2. *If $v \in H^{2,2}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$ and $v(\mathfrak{c}) = 0$, then $v \in \mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$.*

For the proof of Lemma 2.6, see [2, Theorem 1.1, Theorem 2.1, Lemma A.2]. For the proof of Lemma 2.7, see [2, Lemma 1.1, Lemma A.1, Lemma A.2] and [3, Section 2]. The following lemma asserts that functions that belong to corner-weighted Kondrat'ev spaces with non-homogeneous weights for a certain range of orders and weight exponents, with the additional requirement of the function vanishing at the corner for second order spaces, also belong to the corresponding spaces with homogeneous weights. We refer to [17, Chapter 7] for an in-depth presentation.

LEMMA 2.8. *Let $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and $v \in H^{k,k}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$. Let furthermore $v(\mathfrak{c}) = 0$ when $k = 2$. Then, $v \in K^k_{k-\beta}(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$.*

2.6. The Stokes system in a sector. A central role in our proof of analytic regularity of the solution $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ of the Navier-Stokes equation in corner-weighted analytic classes is taken by a regularity shift for the linear principal part of the Navier-Stokes equation, the Stokes boundary value problem. We recapitulate these (known) results here, from [13, 27, 12] and [5, Sec.2] and [10, Chap.6].

Consider, for $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, the sector $Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})$. Denote by

$$\Gamma_{\vartheta=0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r(x, \mathfrak{c}) \in (0, \delta),\ \vartheta(x) = 0\}, \quad \Gamma_{\vartheta=\omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r(x, \mathfrak{c}) \in (0, \delta),\ \vartheta(x) = \omega\}$$

the two edges meeting at $\mathfrak{c}$. Let also $\breve{\Gamma}_\delta = \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_\omega$ and let $\Gamma_D^S, \Gamma_N^S, \Gamma_G^S \in \{\varnothing, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_\omega\}$ be pairwise disjoint and such that $\Gamma_D^S \cup \Gamma_N^S \cup \Gamma_G^S = \breve{\Gamma}_\delta$. As all the results in this section are independent of $\mathfrak{c}$, we omit the dependence of the sector in the notation and write $Q_{\delta,\omega} = Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})$ whenever the dependence on $\mathfrak{c}$ is not essential.

We may now formally introduce the Stokes operator L_{St} acting on a (sufficiently regular) velocity-pressure pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, q)$ via

$$L^\sigma_{\mathrm{St}}(\boldsymbol{v}, q) = \begin{pmatrix} -\nabla \cdot \sigma(\boldsymbol{v}, q) \\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.14}$$

and the associated boundary operator $B(\boldsymbol{v}, q)$, on the sides Γ_ι for $\iota \in \{0, \omega\}$, via

$$[B(\boldsymbol{v}, q)]_\iota = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{v} & \text{if } \Gamma_\iota = \Gamma_D^S\,, \\ \sigma(\boldsymbol{v}, q)\boldsymbol{n} & \text{if } \Gamma_\iota = \Gamma_N^S\,, \\ \begin{pmatrix} (\sigma(\boldsymbol{v}, q)\boldsymbol{n}) \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \\ \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } \Gamma_\iota = \Gamma_G^S\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

Our proof of the analytic regularity in corner weighted spaces is based, as in the work for the Stokes equations [11], on a basic regularity shift in corner-weighted spaces for the Stokes Operator. Such regularity shifts are by now well-known and are obtained, following the seminal work of V.A. Kondrat'ev [16], by Mellin transformation techniques in Sectors (see, e.g., the monographs [17]). For reference in the ensuing analysis of the quadratic nonlinearity $\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u}$ in Section 3 ahead, we state the following result which is used subsequently.

THEOREM 2.9. *Let $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$ and $\beta \in (1-\kappa, 1) \cap (0, 1)$ where $\kappa > 0$ is defined in (2.19) below. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{sec}} = C_{\mathrm{sec}}(\beta, \delta) > 0$ such that for all $(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{p}) \in [H^1(Q_{\delta,\omega})]^2 \times L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ satisfying, for some $\breve{\boldsymbol{f}} \in [\mathcal{L}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})]^2$ and for some $\breve{\boldsymbol{g}} \in [\mathcal{V}_\beta^{1/2}(\Gamma_N^S)]^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} L^\sigma_{\mathrm{St}}(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{p}) &= \begin{pmatrix} \breve{\boldsymbol{f}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} && \text{in } Q_{\delta,\omega} \\ \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} &= \boldsymbol{0} && \text{on } \Gamma_D^S \\ \sigma(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{p})\boldsymbol{n} &= \breve{\boldsymbol{g}} && \text{on } \Gamma_N^S \\ (\sigma(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{p})\boldsymbol{n}) \cdot \boldsymbol{t} = 0 \text{ and } \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_G^S, \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

then $(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{p}) \in [H_\beta^{2,2}(Q_{\delta,\omega})]^2 \times H_\beta^{1,1}(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ and the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\overline{\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}} - \overline{\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{c})}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta/2,\omega})} + \|\breve{p}\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_\beta(Q_{\delta/2,\omega})} \\ &\quad \le C_{\mathrm{sec}} \left(\|\overline{\breve{\boldsymbol{f}}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{H^1(Q_{\delta,\omega}\setminus Q_{\delta/2,\omega})} + \|\breve{p}\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}\setminus Q_{\delta/2,\omega})} + \|\overline{\breve{\boldsymbol{g}}}\|_{\mathcal{V}_\beta^{1/2}(\Gamma_N^S)} \right) . \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Here, the corner-weighted norms are as in (2.11), (2.12).

A proof of this result proceeds along the lines of the proof of [13, Theorem 5.2], i.e. by multiplying $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\breve{p}$ by a C^∞ cutoff function which is supported in $Q_{\delta,\omega}$ and which equals one in $Q_{\delta/2,\omega}$ and by writing a Stokes problem in the infinite sector $Q_{\infty,\omega}$. It is detailed in [14, Lemma 5.1.1] for all boundary conditions presently considered. There,

(2.14) is converted to polar frame via (1.1). Subsequently, the change of variables $t = \log(r)$ followed by an application of the Fourier transform in t results in an operator pencil $\{\mathcal{A}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ of parametrized differential operators $\widehat{L}(\lambda)$ acting on $\vartheta \in I = (0, \omega)$, and corresponding boundary operators $\widehat{B}(\lambda)$ at $\vartheta \in \{0, \omega\}$ i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda) : H^2(I)^2 \times H^1(I) \to L^2(I)^2 \times H^1(I) \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 : (\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q) \mapsto [\widehat{L}(\lambda)(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q), \widehat{B}(\lambda)(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q)]\,. \tag{2.18}$$

The operator pencil $\mathcal{A}(\lambda) : H^2(I)^2 \times H^1(I) \to L^2(I)^2 \times H^1(I) \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ in (2.18) depends polynomially on λ. We refer to Appendix B for the explicit representation of $\widehat{L}(\lambda)$ and of $\widehat{B}(\lambda)$, and to [18] for the general theory of such pencils in connection with elliptic boundary value problems in conical domains. In particular, [18, Chap. 5.1] addresses the presently considered Stokes pencil, with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

It is known (e.g., [18]) and verified (for the Stokes pencil and the boundary conditions considered here) in [14, Chapter 4.7] and [12, Section 4.5] that $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\lambda)$ is an operator-valued, meromorphic function of λ with countably many, isolated poles in $\mathbb{C}$ of finite multiplicity. For precise information on the distributions of these poles regarding different combinations of boundary conditions, see [27] or [12, Lemma 4.1], which studies the elasticity problem with Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions. The results from [12] are applicable to the Stokes problem if formally the value 0.5 of the Poisson ratio is inserted in the corresponding transcendental equations in [12]. We refer to [10, Sec. 6.2] for a justification. Define, for $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ as in (2.18),

$$\kappa = \min\{\mathrm{Im}(\mu) | \mu \text{ is a nonzero eigenvalue of } \mathcal{A}(\lambda) \text{ with positive imaginary part}\}. \tag{2.19}$$

As the parametric operator pencil $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ defined in (2.18) is Fredholm for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ [14, Chapter 4.7], it has a discrete spectrum in $\mathbb{C}$ [18, Theorem 1.1.1]. For all combinations of boundary conditions, if μ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$, then so are $\bar{\mu}$, $-\mu$, and $-\bar{\mu}$. Moreover, eigenvalues μ of $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ accumulate only at infinity, so that κ in (2.19) is well-defined. The quantity κ in (2.19) determines the range of corner-weight exponents in which the regularity shift (2.17) holds in corner-weighted Sobolev spaces.

Remark 2.10. Theorem 2.9 corresponds to the incompressible limiting case of corner-weighted regularity shift for the equations of linear elasticity obtained in [12, Thm. 5.1, Coro. 5.2], see [10, Sec. 6.2]. Unique solvability of the Stokes problem in corner-weighted spaces in the infinite sector for the indicated range of the corner-weight parameter $\beta > 1 - \kappa_1$ is shown in [12, Coro. 4.2] and [13, Thm. 5.2]. The corner-weighted a-priori estimate (2.17) can also be derived using [26, Theorem 5.1] or [18, Chapter 5.1] if only homogeneous Dirichlet (so-called "no-slip") boundary conditions are considered. For a detailed development, we refer to [13, Sec. 4] and also to [14, Lemma 5.1.1].

Remark 2.11. In Theorem 2.9, we restrict the corner-weight exponents β to the interval $(0, 1)$. In some specific combinations of ω and boundary conditions, regularity shifts like (2.17) for β belonging to intervals larger than $(0, 1)$ could be established. For example, when $\omega < \pi$ and both sides are equipped with Dirichlet boundary conditions, $\kappa > 1$ and thus β could be negative, see e.g. [13, Remark 5.6]. Nonetheless, in the present paper, we restrict corner-weight exponents to $(0, 1)$ to ensure that our analysis covers all combinations of boundary operators, and that the embedding results in Lemma 2.7 hold. Observe also that the case $\omega = \pi$ corresponds to changing boundary conditions along a straight side of the polygon; imposing $\beta > 0$ includes this case in our analysis. Finally, the exponents $\beta \in (0, 1)$ are sufficient for establishing the corner-weighted, analytic regularity results, and for the proof of exponential convergence rates of numerical discretization methods, such as, e.g., *hp*-DGFEM (see [28]).

Remark 2.12. By relation (2.2), if $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [H^{2,2}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})]^2 \times H^{1,1}_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ and $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0$, we have

$$L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}(\boldsymbol{u}, p) := \begin{pmatrix} -\nu \Delta \boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p \\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} \end{pmatrix} = L^{\sigma}_{\mathrm{St}}(\boldsymbol{u}, p). \tag{2.20}$$

Estimate (2.17) therefore also holds with L^{Δ}_{St} in place of L^{σ}_{St}.

2.7. Statement of the main result. We are ready to state our main result on the weighted analytic regularity of Leray-Hopf solutions to Navier-Stokes boundary value problem (2.1). We recall that the explicit form of the operator pencil $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ in (2.18) which arises for the presently considered Stokes problem and its boundary conditions (2.20) is detailed in Appendix B.

THEOREM 2.13. *Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in (0,1)^n$ be such that around each corner $\mathfrak{c}_i$ for $i = 1, ..., n$, $\beta_i \in (1-\kappa_i, 1) \cap (0,1)$ where κ_i is defined as in (2.19) with respect to the corner $\mathfrak{c}_i$, in the interval $I = (0, \omega_i)$, cf. Sec. 2.1 and to the operator pencil $\mathcal{A}_i(\lambda)$ for the linearized (Stokes) boundary value problem as defined in (2.18). Let further $\boldsymbol{f} \in [B^0_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \cap \boldsymbol{W}^*$ be such that $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{W}^*} \leq \frac{C^2_{\mathrm{coer}}\nu^2}{4C_{\mathrm{cont}}}$. Suppose in addition that Assumption 1 holds and let $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in \boldsymbol{W} \times Q$ be the weak solution to (2.6) with right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$.*

Then

$$(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [B^2_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \times B^1_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P}).$$

Remark 2.14. It can be shown, using the equivalence of the classes B^ℓ_β implied by [5, Remark 4.3], that, under the hypothesis of Theorem 2.13,

$$(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [B^m_{\underline{\beta}-2+m}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \times B^n_{\underline{\beta}-1+n}(\mathbb{P})$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The remainder of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.13. It is based on inductive bootstrapping elliptic regularity for the linearized boundary value problem in corner-weighted Sobolev spaces of finite order, of Kondrat'ev type. Such estimates are in principle known (e.g. [26, 22, 27, 13]). They were recapitulated for the readers' convenience in the form required in Section 2.6. The weighted a priori estimates are then combined with novel analytic estimates of the quadratic nonlinearity in polar frame in corner-weighted spaces that will be developed in Section 3.

3. Proof of the main result. We prove Theorem 2.13, which, as our main result, ensures analytic regularity in scales of weighted spaces of Leray-Hopf solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations (2.1) modelling stationary, viscous and incompressible flow in a polygon $\mathbb{P}$. We will devote our attention to analytic estimates in scales of corner-weighted Sobolev spaces for the nonlinear transport term, as treating this term is the main difference in comparison to the weighted analytic regularity proof for the linear Stokes problem in $\mathbb{P}$ in [13].

3.1. Estimate of the nonlinear term. We start by rewriting the quadratic nonlinearity $(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u}$ in polar coordinates and projecting its Cartesian components into the polar frame as in (1.1). We note here that the gradient operator in Cartesian coordinates is projected to a polar frame by (cf. the definition of A in (1.1))

$$\nabla = A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r \\ r^{-1}\partial_\vartheta \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.1}$$

LEMMA 3.1. *For any constant vector field $\mathbf{c}$ taking value $(c_1, c_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$, it holds that*

$$\overline{((\boldsymbol{u}+\mathbf{c}) \cdot \nabla)(\boldsymbol{u}+\mathbf{c})} = \begin{pmatrix} (u_r + c_r)\partial_r u_r + \frac{1}{r}((u_\vartheta + c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_r - (u_\vartheta + c_\vartheta)u_\vartheta) \\ (u_r + c_r)\partial_r u_\vartheta + \frac{1}{r}((u_\vartheta + c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_\vartheta + (u_\vartheta + c_\vartheta)u_r) \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. We calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overline{((\boldsymbol{u}+\mathbf{c})\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{u}+\mathbf{c})}\\
&\qquad = \overline{((\boldsymbol{u}+\mathbf{c})\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u}}\\
&\qquad = A\left(\left((\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}+\overline{\mathbf{c}})\cdot(A^{-\top}A^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\partial_r\\ r^{-1}\partial_\vartheta\end{pmatrix})\right)A^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\right)\\
&\qquad = A\left(\left((\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}+\overline{\mathbf{c}})\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\partial_r\\ r^{-1}\partial_\vartheta\end{pmatrix}\right)A^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\right)\\
&\qquad = A\Bigg[\begin{pmatrix}\cos\vartheta(u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_r-\sin\vartheta(u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_\vartheta\\ \sin\vartheta(u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_r+\cos\vartheta(u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_\vartheta\end{pmatrix}\\
&\qquad\quad +\frac{1}{r}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_r-\sin\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_r-\sin\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_\vartheta-\cos\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_\vartheta\\ \sin\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_r+\cos\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_r+\cos\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_\vartheta-\sin\vartheta(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_\vartheta\end{pmatrix}\Bigg]\\
&\qquad = \begin{pmatrix}(u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_r+\frac{1}{r}((u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_r-(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_\vartheta)\\ (u_r+c_r)\partial_r u_\vartheta+\frac{1}{r}((u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta u_\vartheta+(u_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)u_r)\end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

In order to treat the individual nonlinear terms arising from the polar representation of the transport term of the Navier-Stokes equation obtained above, we need a technical result on weighted interpolation estimates in plane sectors. The following statement is a variant of [20, Lemma 1.10] in polar coordinates.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $\delta,\omega\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $0<\delta\le 1$ and $\omega\in(0,2\pi)$. For all $\tilde\beta_1,\tilde\beta_2\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde\beta_2>\tilde\beta_1+1/2$, there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{int}}=C_{\mathrm{int}}(\delta,\omega,\tilde\beta_1,\tilde\beta_2)>0$ such that, for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^2$ and all functions φ such that*

$$\max_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}\varphi\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}<\infty,$$

the following bound holds:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}\varphi\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\le C_{\mathrm{int}}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}\varphi\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\
&\quad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}\varphi\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}+\alpha_1^{1/2}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}\varphi\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We set $\delta=1$. Consider the dyadic partition of $Q_{1,\omega}$ given by the sets

$$S^j:=\left\{x\in Q_{1,\omega}: 2^{-j-1}<r(x)<2^{-j}\right\},\qquad j\in\mathbb{N}_0,$$

and denote the linear maps $\Psi_j: S^j\to S^0$. Denote $\widehat\varphi_j:=\varphi\circ\Psi_j^{-1}: S^0\to\mathbb{R}$ and write $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha$ for derivation with respect to polar coordinates (r,ϑ) in S^0. Then, by scaling, for any $q\in[1,\infty)$,

$$\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}\varphi\|_{L^q(S^j)}=2^{-j(\tilde\beta_2+2/q)}\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}\widehat\varphi_j\|_{L^q(S^0)}. \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, the following interpolation inequality holds in S^0: there exists $C_0>0$ such that

$$\|v\|_{L^4(S^0)}\le C_0\|v\|^{1/2}_{H^1(S^0)}\|v\|^{1/2}_{L^2(S^0)} \tag{3.4}$$

holds for all $v\in H^1(S^0)$. In addition, by (3.1), for all $v\in H^1(S^0)$,

$$\|v\|^2_{H^1(S^0)}\le 16\left(\|v\|^2_{L^2(S^0)}+\|\partial_r v\|^2_{L^2(S^0)}+\|\partial_\vartheta v\|^2_{L^2(S^0)}\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Combining (3.4) and (3.5) and choosing $v = r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j$ gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^4(S^0)}\\
&\qquad\le 2C_0\|r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^{1/2}\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|\mathcal{D}^\eta(r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j)\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2\right)^{1/4}\\
&\qquad\le 4C_0\|r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^{1/2}\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha+\eta}\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2+\alpha_1^2\|r^{\alpha_1-1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2\right)^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, using the bound $2^{-|a|}\le r(x)^a\le 2^{|a|}$ valid for all $x\in S^0$ and all $a\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^4(S^0)} &\le 2^{|\tilde\beta_2|+|\tilde\beta_1|+1/2}4C_0\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^{1/2}\\
&\quad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha+\eta}\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2+\alpha_1^2\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2\right)^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We denote $C_1 := 2^{|\tilde\beta_2|+|\tilde\beta_1|+1/2}4C_0$. Using this last inequality and (3.3) twice,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^4(S^j)}\\
&\quad\le 2^{-j(\tilde\beta_2+1/2)}\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^4(S^0)}\\
&\quad\le 2^{-j(\tilde\beta_2+1/2)}C_1\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^{1/2}\\
&\qquad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha+\eta}\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2+\alpha_1^2\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^\alpha\widehat{\varphi}_j\|_{L^2(S^0)}^2\right)^{1/4}\\
&\quad\le C_1 2^{-j(\tilde\beta_2-\tilde\beta_1-1/2)}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^{1/2}\\
&\qquad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^2+\alpha_1^2\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^2\right)^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\tilde\beta_2-\tilde\beta_1-1/2>0$, we can conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|r^{\tilde\beta_2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^4(S^j)}^4 &\le C_1^4\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^2\right)\\
&\quad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^2+\alpha_1^2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|r^{\tilde\beta_1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha\varphi\|_{L^2(S^j)}^2\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the fourth root of both sides of the inequality above concludes the proof for the case $\delta=1$. The general case $\delta\in(0,1]$ follows by scaling (with constant C_{int} depending on δ). ∎

Using the interpolation result obtained above, we can estimate, under a regularity assumption on $\boldsymbol{u}$, the individual terms appearing in (3.2). This is done in the following Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\beta\in(0,1)$, $0<\delta\le 1$, $\omega\in(0,2\pi)$. Then, there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{d}}=C_{\mathrm{d}}(\beta,\delta,\omega)>0$ such that, for all $u\in\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ with $\|u\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\le 1$ such that there exist constants $A_u, E_u>1$, and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ satisfying*

$$\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\le A_u^{|\alpha|-2}E_u^{\alpha_2}(|\alpha|-2)!,\quad\forall\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^2: 2\le|\alpha|\le k+1, \tag{3.6}$$

it holds, for all $\alpha, \eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ such that $|\eta| \le 1$ and $|\alpha| \le k - |\eta|$, that

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^\eta u)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le C_{\mathrm{d}}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|+|\eta|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+\eta_2+1/2}[|\alpha|+|\eta|-2]_+!. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. We start by proving the theorem in the case $|\eta| = 0$. Applying Lemma 3.2 with $\tilde\beta_2 = \beta/2 - 1$ and $\tilde\beta_1 = \beta - 2$ (note that $\beta \in (0,1)$ implies $\tilde\beta_2 > \tilde\beta_1 + 1/2$), for all $|\alpha| \le k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\le C_{\mathrm{int}}\|r^{\beta-2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\ &\quad\times\left(\sum_{|\eta|\le 1}\|r^{\beta-2+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}u\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \alpha_1^{1/2}\|r^{\beta-2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|^{1/2}_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

When $|\alpha| \ge 2$, using (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\ &\quad\le C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{|\alpha|-3/2}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}(2(|\alpha|-1)!^{1/2} + (1+\alpha_1^{1/2})(|\alpha|-2)!^{1/2})(|\alpha|-2)!^{1/2}\\ &\quad\le C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{|\alpha|-3/2}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}(2(|\alpha|-1)^{1/2} + 1 + \alpha_1^{1/2})(|\alpha|-2)!\\ &\quad\le C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{|\alpha|-3/2}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}4|\alpha|^{1/2}(|\alpha|-2)!.\end{aligned}$$

If $|\alpha| \le 1$, instead, it follows from $\|u\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 1$ and (3.8) that

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le C_{\mathrm{int}}(3+\alpha_1^{1/2}) \le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}.$$

This proves (3.7) for $|\eta| = 0$, i.e., that for all $|\alpha| \le k$,

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}[|\alpha|-2]_+!. \tag{3.9}$$

Consider now the case $|\eta| = 1$. We have

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^\eta u)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le \|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \alpha_1\eta_1\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}.$$

For all $|\alpha| \le k-1$, we can apply (3.9) to the two terms in the right hand side above:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}\alpha_1[|\alpha|-2]_+!\\ &\le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-1/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+\eta_2+1/2}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}2[|\alpha|-1]_+!,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1+\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\eta}u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-1/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+\eta_2+1/2}(|\alpha|+2)^{1/2}[|\alpha|-1]_+!.\\ &\le 4C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-1/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+\eta_2+1/2}2(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}[|\alpha|-1]_+!.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $|\alpha| \le k-1$ and all $|\eta| = 1$,

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^\eta u)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 16C_{\mathrm{int}}A_u^{[|\alpha|-1/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+\eta_2+1/2}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}[|\alpha|-1]_+!,$$

which concludes the proof, with $C_{\mathrm{d}} = 16C_{\mathrm{int}}$. ∎

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\beta \in (0,1)$, $0 < \delta \le 1$, $\omega \in (0, 2\pi)$, and let $u \in \mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})$ satisfy $\|u\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 1$. Suppose that there exist $A_u, E_u > 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le A_u^{|\alpha|-2}E_u^{\alpha_2}(|\alpha|-2)!, \quad \forall\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : 2 \le |\alpha| \le k+1.$$

Then, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ such that $|\alpha| \le k$,

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(ru)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 4C_{\mathrm{d}}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-2]_+!. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. We start from the bound

$$\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(ru)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq \|r^{\beta/2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \alpha_1\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{(\alpha_1-1,\alpha_2)}u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})},$$

where the second term is absent if $\alpha_1 = 0$. From Lemma 3.3, it follows that

$$\|r^{\beta/2+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq \delta C_{\mathrm{d}}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-2]_+!$$

and that (when $\alpha_1 \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_1\|r^{\beta/2-1+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^{(\alpha_1-1,\alpha_2)}u\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\
&\quad\leq \delta\alpha_1|\alpha|^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|-5/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-3]_+!\\
&\quad\leq \max_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\left(\frac{j^{3/2}}{(j+1)^{1/2}\max(j-2,1)}\right)(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-2]_+!\\
&\quad\leq \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3}(|\alpha|+1)^{1/2}A_u^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_u^{\alpha_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-2]_+!
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (3.10) follows from the above, bounding $1+\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3} \leq 4$ for ease of notation. □

We are now in position to estimate the weighted norms of the nonlinear term in the sector $Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c})$, under the assumptions of analytic bounds on the weighted norms of $\boldsymbol{u}$. Initially, we do this under the assumption that $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))^2$ (which implies that $\boldsymbol{u}$ vanishes at the vertex of the sector) in Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 3.5 (Weighted analytic estimates for the quadratic nonlinearity in polar frame). *Assume that $\beta \in (0,1)$, $0 < \delta \leq 1$, $\omega \in (0,2\pi)$ and $c_{\max} > 0$ are given fixed.*

Then, there exists $C_{\mathrm{t}} = C_{\mathrm{t}}(\beta,\delta,\omega,c_{\max}) > 0$ such that for all constant vector fields $\mathbf{c}$ taking value $(c_1,c_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $|c_1|+|c_2| < c_{\max}$ and all $\boldsymbol{w} : Q_{\delta,\omega} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|\overline{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq 1$ such that there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and constants $A_w, E_w \geq 1$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases}\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha w_r\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq A_w^{|\alpha|-2}E_w^{\alpha_2}(|\alpha|-2)!\\ \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha w_\vartheta\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq A_w^{|\alpha|-2}E_w^{\alpha_2}(|\alpha|-2)!,\end{cases} \qquad \text{for all } 2 \leq |\alpha| \leq k+1,$$

the following inequality holds:

$$\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^2\overline{((\boldsymbol{w}+\mathbf{c})\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{w}+\mathbf{c})})\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq C_{\mathrm{t}}A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+2}|\alpha|!, \qquad \forall\alpha\in\mathbb{N}_0^2 : 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.7, there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{emb}} = C_{\mathrm{emb}}(\beta,\delta,\omega) > 0$ such that $\|\overline{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq 1$ implies $\overline{\boldsymbol{w}} \in [C^0(\overline{Q_{\delta,\omega}})]^2$ and

$$\|\overline{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq C_{\mathrm{emb}}. \tag{3.12}$$

Next, we recall from Lemma 3.1 that

$$r^2\overline{((\boldsymbol{w}+\mathbf{c})\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{w}+\mathbf{c})} = \begin{pmatrix} r^2(w_r+c_r)\partial_r w_r + r((w_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta w_r - (w_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)w_\vartheta)\\ r^2(w_r+c_r)\partial_r w_\vartheta + r((w_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)\partial_\vartheta w_\vartheta + (w_\vartheta+c_\vartheta)w_r)\end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.13}$$

We will estimate the individual terms.

Estimate of rw_ϑ^2 and rw_rw_ϑ. Let $v \in \{w_r, w_\vartheta\}$. From (3.10), Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 it follows that for any α as in (3.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(rw_\vartheta v))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\
&\quad\le \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}\|r^{\eta_1+\beta/2-1}\mathcal{D}^\eta(rv)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\|r^{\alpha_1-\eta_1+\beta/2-1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}w_\vartheta\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\
&\quad\le \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}4C_{\mathrm{d}}^2(|\eta|+1)^{1/2}A_w^{[|\eta|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\eta_2+1/2}[|\eta|-2]_+!\\
&\qquad\qquad \times(|\alpha|-|\eta|+1)^{1/2}A_w^{[|\alpha|-|\eta|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2-\eta_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-|\eta|-2]_+!\\
&\quad\le 4C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}\\
&\qquad\qquad\times\sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}j!(|\alpha|-j)!\frac{(j+1)^{1/2}(|\alpha|-j+1)^{1/2}}{\max(j(j-1),1)\max((|\alpha|-j)(|\alpha|-j-1),1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used $[|\eta|-3/2]_+ + [|\alpha|-|\eta|-3/2]_+ \le [|\alpha|-3/2]_+$ for all $\eta\le\alpha$.

Now, for all $j\in\mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\frac{(j+1)^{1/2}}{\max(j(j-1),1)} = \frac{(j+1)^{1/2}\max(j,1)^{1/2}}{\max(j-1,1)}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{3/2}} \le \sqrt{6}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{3/2}}.$$

In addition (see, e.g., [15, Proposition 2.1])

$$\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta} = \binom{|\alpha|}{j}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(rw_\vartheta v))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\\
&\quad\le 24C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}\sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}j!(|\alpha|-j)!\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{3/2}\max(|\alpha|-j,1)^{3/2}}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}.\\
&\quad\le 24C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}|\alpha|!\sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{3/2}\max(|\alpha|-j,1)^{3/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{3/2}\max(|\alpha|-j,1)^{3/2}} \le \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^3} \le 1+\zeta(3) \le \frac{5}{2}.$$

We conclude that for any α as in (3.11),

$$\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(rw_\vartheta^2))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 60C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}|\alpha|! \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(rw_\vartheta w_r))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \le 60C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}|\alpha|!. \tag{3.15}$$

Estimate of $r^2 c_r \partial_r v$, $rc_\vartheta \partial_\vartheta v$ and $rc_\vartheta v$ for $v \in \{w_r, w_\vartheta\}$. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ such that $|\xi| \leq 1$ and let $\varphi \in \{c_r, c_\vartheta\}$. Note that φ depends on the angle ϑ, but it is independent of r, since

$$c_r = c_1 \cos\vartheta + c_2 \sin\vartheta, \qquad c_\vartheta = -c_1 \sin\vartheta + c_2 \cos\vartheta.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}\varphi\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\qquad \leq \sum_{\eta=(0,j), j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{\alpha_2}{j} \|\partial_\vartheta^j \varphi\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}(r^{1+\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\qquad \leq c_{\max} \sum_{\eta=(0,j), j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{\alpha_2}{j} \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}(r^{1+\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha_1 = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}\varphi\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\leq c_{\max} \sum_{\eta=(0,j), j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{|\alpha|}{j} \|r^{\xi_1+1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}\mathcal{D}^\xi v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\leq c_{\max} \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|} \binom{|\alpha|}{j} A_w^{[|\alpha|-j-1]_+} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+\xi_2} [|\alpha|-j-1]_+! \\
&\leq c_{\max} \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|} \frac{|\alpha|!}{j!} A_w^{[|\alpha|-j-1]_+} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+\xi_2} \\
&\leq e c_{\max} A_w^{|\alpha|-1} E_w^{\alpha_2+1} |\alpha|!
\end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|} \frac{1}{j!} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{j!} = e$. If $\alpha_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}\varphi\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} &\leq c_{\max} \sum_{\eta=(0,j), j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{\alpha_2}{j} \Big(\|r^{\alpha_1+\xi_1+1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}\mathcal{D}^\xi v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\quad + (1+\xi_1)\alpha_1 \|r^{\alpha_1+\xi_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta-(1,0)}\mathcal{D}^\xi v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\quad + (1+\xi_1)\xi_1 \frac{\alpha_1(\alpha_1-1)}{2} \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta-(2,0)}\mathcal{D}^\xi v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \Big) \\
&\leq c_{\max} \sum_{\eta=(0,j), j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{\alpha_2}{j} \Big(A_w^{|\alpha|-j-1} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+\xi_2} (|\alpha|-j-1)! \\
&\quad + (1+\xi_1)\alpha_1 A_w^{[|\alpha|-j-2]_+} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+\xi_2} [|\alpha|-j-2]_+! \\
&\quad + (1+\xi_1)\xi_1 \frac{\alpha_1(\alpha_1-1)}{2} A_w^{[|\alpha|-j-3]_+} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+\xi_2} [|\alpha|-j-3]_+! \Big) \\
&\leq c_{\max} \sum_{j\in\{0,\dots,\alpha_2\}} \binom{\alpha_2}{j} 4 A_w^{|\alpha|-j-1} E_w^{\alpha_2-j+1} (|\alpha|-j)! \\
&\leq 4 c_{\max} \sum_{j=0}^{|\alpha|} \frac{|\alpha|!}{j!} A_w^{|\alpha|-1} E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2} \\
&\leq 4 e c_{\max} A_w^{|\alpha|-1} E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2} |\alpha|!.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second to last line above, we have used the inequality

$$\binom{\alpha_2}{j} \cdot (|\alpha| - j)! \leq \frac{|\alpha|!}{j!}, \qquad \forall \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2,\ \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that } j \leq \alpha_2.$$

which follows directly from $\binom{\alpha_2}{j} \leq \binom{|\alpha|}{j}$.

In conclusion, we have that for any $\varphi \in \{c_r, c_\vartheta\}$, any $v \in \{w_r, w_\vartheta\}$ and any $\xi \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\xi| \leq 1$,

$$\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}\varphi\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq 4ec_{\max} A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+1}|\alpha|!, \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k. \tag{3.16}$$

Estimate of the remaining terms. Let $v, w \in \{w_r, w_\vartheta\}$ and let $\xi \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ such that $|\xi| = 1$. We have, for any $|\alpha| > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}w\mathcal{D}^\xi v))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\ &\quad \leq \sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\leq\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}\|r^{\eta_1+\beta/2-1}\mathcal{D}^\eta(rw)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})}\|r^{\alpha_1-\eta_1+\beta/2-1}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha-\eta}(r^{\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^4(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\ &\qquad + \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-1}w\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\ &\quad = (I) + (II). \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

We bound the sum in term (I) by similar techniques as above, using Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4:

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\leq\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}4C_{\mathrm{d}}^2(|\eta|+1)^{1/2}A_w^{[|\eta|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\eta_2+1/2}[|\eta|-2]_+! \\ &\qquad\qquad \times (|\alpha|-|\eta|+1)^{1/2}A_w^{[|\alpha|-|\eta|-1/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2-\eta_2+\xi_2+1/2}[|\alpha|-|\eta|-1]_+! \\ &\leq 4C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+1+\xi_2}\sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|}\sum_{|\eta|=j,\eta\leq\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\eta}j!(|\alpha|-j)!\frac{(j+1)^{1/2}(|\alpha|-j+1)^{1/2}}{\max(j(j-1),1)\max(|\alpha|-j,1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that

$$[|\eta|-3/2]_+ + [|\alpha|-|\eta|-1/2]_+ \leq [|\alpha|-3/2]_+, \qquad \forall \eta \leq \alpha : |\eta| \geq 1.$$

By the elementary inequality

$$\frac{(j+1)^{1/2}}{\max(j,1)} = \frac{(j+1)^{1/2}}{\max(j,1)^{1/2}}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{1/2}} \leq \sqrt{2}\frac{1}{\max(j,1)^{1/2}}, \qquad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

we obtain using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\leq 8C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2+1}|\alpha|!\sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|}\frac{1}{\max(j-1,1)\max(j,1)^{1/2}\max(|\alpha|-j,1)^{1/2}} \\ &\leq 8C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2+1}|\alpha|!\sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|}\frac{1}{\max(j-1,1)^{3/2}\max(|\alpha|-j,1)^{1/2}} \\ &\leq 8C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2+1}|\alpha|!\left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|-1}j^{-2}\right)^{3/4}\left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{|\alpha|-1}j^{-2}\right)^{1/4} \\ &\leq 24C_{\mathrm{d}}^2A_w^{[|\alpha|-3/2]_+}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2+1}|\alpha|!, \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where we have used $1 + \zeta(2) \leq 3$.

We now estimate term (II) in (3.17). Remark that

$$(II) \leq \|rw\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})}. \tag{3.19}$$

In addition, $\|rw\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq \delta$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{\xi_1}\mathcal{D}^\xi v)\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\quad \leq \|r^{\alpha_1+\xi_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha+\xi}v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} + \alpha_1\xi_1\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \\
&\quad \leq A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2}(|\alpha|-1)! + \xi_1|\alpha|A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2}[|\alpha|-2]_+! \\
&\quad \leq 3A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2}(|\alpha|-1)!.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (3.12) and (3.19), for any α as in (3.11),

$$(II) \leq 3\delta C_{\mathrm{emb}} A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+\xi_2}(|\alpha|-1)!. \tag{3.20}$$

It follows from (3.17), (3.18), and (3.20) that, for any $v, w \in \{w_r, w_\vartheta\}$ and any multi-index ξ such that $|\xi| = 1$,

$$\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^{1+\xi_1}w\mathcal{D}^\xi v))\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega})} \leq (24C_{\mathrm{d}}^2 + 3C_{\mathrm{emb}})A_w^{|\alpha|-1}E_w^{\alpha_2+1+\xi_2}|\alpha|!. \tag{3.21}$$

The combination of the formula (3.13) and of the bounds (3.14), (3.15), (3.16), and (3.21) concludes the proof, with

$$C_{\mathrm{t}} = 6\max\left(60C_{\mathrm{d}}^2 + 4ec_{\max}, 24C_{\mathrm{d}}^2 + 3C_{\mathrm{emb}} + 4ec_{\max}\right).$$

□

3.2. Analytic regularity in the polygon $\mathbb{P}$. We can now prove the main result of this paper. With analyticity in the interior and up to edges of $\mathbb{P}$ being classical, we concentrate on the sectors near the corners $\mathfrak{c}_i$ of the domain $\mathbb{P}$. We define for $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$S_\delta^i \coloneqq Q_{\delta,\omega_i}(\mathfrak{c}_i), \qquad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{3.22}$$

We prepare the bootstrapping argument required for establishing analytic regularity by proving that the solution $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ as is given in Theorem 2.3 satisfies that $(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), p) \in [\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)]^2 \times \mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in (0,1)^n$ be such that $\beta_i \in (1-\kappa_i, 1) \cap (0,1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here κ_i is defined as in (2.19) with respect to the operator pencil $\mathcal{A}_i(\lambda)$ defined as in (2.18) with opening angle ω_i and boundary operators corresponding to the boundary conditions on the two edges meeting at $\mathfrak{c}_i$. Let further $\boldsymbol{f} \in [L_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \cap \boldsymbol{W}^*$ be such that $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{W}^*} \leq \frac{C_{\mathrm{coer}}^2\nu^2}{4C_{\mathrm{cont}}}$. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Let $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ be the solution to (2.1) with right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$.*

Then, the following results hold:

1. *For all $0 < \delta \leq 1$ with $\delta < \frac{1}{4}\min_{i,j}|\mathfrak{c}_j - \mathfrak{c}_i|$,*

$$(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), p) \in [\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta/2})]^2 \times \mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta/2}), \qquad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

2. *For any corner $\mathfrak{c}_i$ which touches a complete side $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_G \cup \Gamma_D$, $\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0$ where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is the unit outer normal vector to Γ.*

Proof. We start by showing the first assertion. For all $s \in (1, 2)$ and for $t = (1/s - 1/2)^{-1}$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^s(\mathbb{P})} \leq \|\Phi_{-\underline{\beta}}\|_{L^t(\mathbb{P})}\|\Phi_{\underline{\beta}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}.$$

Therefore $\boldsymbol{f} \in [L_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2$ implies

$$\boldsymbol{f} \in [L^s(\mathbb{P})]^2, \qquad \forall s \in \left[1, \frac{2}{1+\max \underline{\beta}}\right). \tag{3.23}$$

In addition, $\boldsymbol{u} \in [H^1(\mathbb{P})]^2$ implies by Sobolev embedding $\boldsymbol{u} \in [L^t(\mathbb{P})]^2$ for all $t \in [1, \infty)$. By Hölder's inequality, choosing $t \in [1, \infty)$ and $s = (1/2 + 1/t)^{-1}$,

$$\|(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^s(\mathbb{P})} \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^t(\mathbb{P})} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} < \infty$$

which implies

$$(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u} \in [L^s(\mathbb{P})]^2, \qquad \forall s \in [1, 2). \tag{3.24}$$

It follows from [27, Corollary 4.2], (3.23), and (3.24) that there exists $q > 1$ such that $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [W^{2,q}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \times W^{1,q}(\mathbb{P})$. This implies in turn, by Sobolev embedding, $\boldsymbol{u} \in [L^\infty(\mathbb{P})]^2$. Hence $(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u} \in [L^2(\mathbb{P})]^2$. We conclude by applying Theorem 2.9 to each corner sector to obtain that there exists a constant C_{sec} such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\|\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c})}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta/2})} + \|p\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta/2})} \leq C_{\mathrm{sec}} \left(\|\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)} + \|\overline{(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{P})} + \|p\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \right).$$

Now, since $\boldsymbol{f} \in [\mathcal{L}_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2$ and $(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u} \in [L^2(\mathbb{P})]^2$, it holds that $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}} \in [\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)]^2$ and $\overline{(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u}} \in [\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)]^2$; hence, the right hand side of the inequality above is bounded. Using [12, Corollary 4.2] to bound the norm of the Cartesian version of the flux concludes the proof of the regularity result.

To show the second point, we fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and assume that $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_G \cup \Gamma_D$ abuts $\mathfrak{c}_i$. Then, for any point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Gamma$ we have, due to the boundary condition, $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0$, where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is the outer normal vector to Γ. In addition, Lemma 2.7 implies that $\boldsymbol{u} \in C^0(\overline{S^i_\delta})^2$ since $\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \in \mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta/2})^2 \subset C^0(\overline{S^i_{\delta/2}})^2$. Therefore, by letting $\boldsymbol{x} \to \mathfrak{c}_i$ along Γ, we have $\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = \lim_{\boldsymbol{x} \to \mathfrak{c}_i} \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0$. ∎

We prove weighted analytic estimates for Leray-Hopf weak solutions in each corner sector.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in (0,1)^n$ be such that $\beta_i \in (1 - \kappa_i, 1) \cap (0,1)$ for $i = 1, ..., n$. Here κ_i is defined as in (2.19), with respect to the operator pencil $\mathcal{A}_i(\lambda)$, defined as in (2.18) with opening angle ω_i and boundary operators corresponding to the boundary conditions on the two edges meeting at $\mathfrak{c}_i$. Let further $\boldsymbol{f} \in [B^0_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \cap \boldsymbol{W}^*$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{W}^*} \leq \frac{C^2_{\mathrm{coer}} \nu^2}{4 C_{\mathrm{cont}}}$. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and let $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ be the solution to (2.1) with right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$.*

Then there exists $\delta_{\mathbb{P}} \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [B^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2 \times B^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$.

Remark 3.8. Lemma 3.7 implies in particular that if $\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) = \boldsymbol{0}$ (this happens when at least one straight edge of $S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}$ is a zero Dirichlet edge or both edges are equipped with homogeneous slip boundary condition and $\omega_i \neq \pi$), then $\boldsymbol{u} \in [B^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2 \subset [H^{2,2}_{\underline{\beta}}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2$ and $p \in B^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}) \subset H^{1,1}_{\underline{\beta}}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$ implies by Lemma 2.8 that $\boldsymbol{u} \in [K^2_{2-\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2$ and that $p \in K^1_{1-\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$. Furthermore, by definition $B^\ell_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}) \cap K^\ell_{\ell-\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}) = K^\varpi_{\ell-\underline{\beta}_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{u} \in [K^\varpi_{2-\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2$ and $p \in K^\varpi_{1-\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$ in this case.

Proof. Fix $0 < \delta_{\mathbb{P}} \leq 1$ such that $\delta_{\mathbb{P}} < \frac{1}{4} \min_{i,j} |\mathfrak{c}_j - \mathfrak{c}_i|$ and such that

$$\|\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \leq 1, \qquad \|p\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \leq 1, \qquad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \tag{3.25}$$

Note that this condition is meaningful thanks to Lemma 3.6. The proof proceeds by induction, in each of the corner sectors. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We write $r(x) := r_i(x) = |x - \mathfrak{c}_i|$ for compactness.

Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$. In order to set up the inductive bootstrap argument, we rewrite the NSE with $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$ in polar coordinates and rearrange the equations in the sector $S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}$ as

$$\overline{L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}}(\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}, p) = \begin{pmatrix} A\big[\boldsymbol{f} - \big((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla\big)\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)\big)\big] \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}, \tag{3.26a}$$

$$\overline{B}(\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}, p) = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \partial \mathbb{P}. \tag{3.26b}$$

The set of equations (3.26a) has the following component-wise form:

$$-\frac{1}{r^2}\begin{pmatrix} \nu((r\partial_r)^2 + \partial_\vartheta^2 - 1) & -2\nu\partial_\vartheta \\ 2\nu\partial_\vartheta & \nu((r\partial_r)^2 + \partial_\vartheta^2 - 1) \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{u}_r \\ \widetilde{u}_\vartheta \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{r}\begin{pmatrix} r\partial_r \\ \partial_\vartheta \end{pmatrix} p = \widehat{\boldsymbol{f}} \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}, \tag{3.27}$$

$$\frac{1}{r}\left((r\partial_r + 1)\,\widetilde{u}_r + \partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta\right) = 0 \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}. \tag{3.28}$$

Here $\widehat{\boldsymbol{f}} = \overline{\boldsymbol{f}} - \overline{(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))}$. The boundary conditions (3.26b) read

$$\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_D, \tag{3.29}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu(r^{-1}\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r + \partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta - r^{-1}\widetilde{u}_\vartheta) \\ -p + 2\nu r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + \widetilde{u}_r) \end{pmatrix} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_N, \tag{3.30}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{u}_\vartheta \\ \nu(\partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + \frac{1}{r}\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \frac{1}{r}\widetilde{u}_\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_G. \tag{3.31}$$

See Appendix C for details of the derivation.

The analyticity of $\boldsymbol{u}$ and p in $\overline{\mathbb{P} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}\right)}$ and the analyticity assumption on $\boldsymbol{f}$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{f} \in [B^0_{\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2$ (whence $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}} \in [\mathcal{B}^0_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})]^2$ by Lemma 2.5), imply that there exists $A_1 > 0$ such that, for all $|\alpha| \geq 1$,

$$\|r^{\beta_i + \alpha_1 - 2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^2 \overline{\boldsymbol{f}})\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \leq A_1^{|\alpha|}|\alpha|!, \tag{3.32a}$$

$$\|r^{\beta_i + \alpha_1 - 2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha(r^2 \overline{((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)))}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_1^{|\alpha|}|\alpha|!, \tag{3.32b}$$

$$\|r^{\beta_i + \alpha_1 - 1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_1^{|\alpha|-1}(|\alpha| - 1)!, \tag{3.32c}$$

and, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|r^k \partial_r^k \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{H^1(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_1^k k!. \tag{3.32d}$$

For the ensuing induction argument, we define the constants

$$E_u = \max\left(2, 8\left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu}\right)^{3/2}, (8\nu)^{3/2}\right), \tag{3.33a}$$

and

$$A_u = \max\Bigg(22 C_{\mathrm{sec}} A_1, 2C_{\mathrm{sec}}(C_{\mathrm{t}} + 9)E_u^2, \frac{4}{\nu}A_1, 4\left(\frac{1}{\nu}(C_{\mathrm{t}} + 2) + 4\right)E_u^{4/3}, \quad 4A_1, 4(C_{\mathrm{t}} + 1 + 3\nu)E_u, 2\Bigg). \tag{3.33b}$$

We now formulate our induction assumption.

Induction assumption. We say that $H_{\hat{k},k_2}$ holds for $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_2 \leq \hat{k}$, if

$$\begin{aligned} &\|r^{\beta_i+\alpha_1-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha \widetilde{u}_r\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_u^{|\alpha|-2} E_u^{[\alpha_2-4/3]_+}(|\alpha|-2)!, \\ &\|r^{\beta_i+\alpha_1-2}\mathcal{D}^\alpha \widetilde{u}_\vartheta\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_u^{|\alpha|-2} E_u^{[\alpha_2-4/3]_+}(|\alpha|-2)!, \end{aligned} \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : \begin{cases} 2 \leq |\alpha| \leq \hat{k}+1, \\ \alpha_2 \leq k_2 + 1, \end{cases} \tag{3.34a}$$

and

$$\|r^{\beta_i+\alpha_1-1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_u^{|\alpha|-1} E_u^{\alpha_2}(|\alpha|-1)!, \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : \begin{cases} 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \hat{k}, \\ \alpha_2 \leq k_2, \end{cases} \tag{3.34b}$$

where A_u and E_u are the constants in (3.33b) and (3.33a).

Strategy of the proof. We start the induction by noting that $H_{1,1}$ holds due to Lemma 3.6 and to (3.25).

The induction proof of the statement will be composed of two main steps. In the first step, we show

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad H_{k,k} \implies H_{k+1,1}. \tag{3.35}$$

Then, in the following step, we will show that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $j \leq k$,

$$H_{k,k} \text{ and } H_{k+1,j} \implies H_{k+1,j+1}. \tag{3.36}$$

Combining (3.35) and (3.36), we obtain that

$$H_{k,k} \implies H_{k+1,k+1}, \tag{3.37}$$

We infer from (3.37) that $H_{k,k}$ is verified for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This will conclude the proof.

Step 1: proof of (3.35). We fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose that $H_{k,k}$ holds. Define

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \coloneqq r^k \partial_r^k \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \qquad q \coloneqq r^k \partial_r^k p. \tag{3.38}$$

Then, for all $|\eta| \leq 2$,

$$r^{\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^\eta \overline{\boldsymbol{v}} = r^k \partial_r^k (r^{\eta_1}\mathcal{D}^\eta \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}) \tag{3.39}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r q &= r^{k-2}\partial_r^k(r^2\partial_r p) - k r^{k-1}\partial_r^k p - k(k-1)r^{k-2}\partial_r^{k-1}p, \\ \frac{1}{r}\partial_\vartheta q &= r^{k-2}\partial_r^k\left(r\partial_\vartheta p\right) - k r^{k-2}\partial_r^{k-1}\partial_\vartheta p. \end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

Furthermore, multiplying (3.28) by r and differentiating by ∂_r^k we obtain

$$(r\partial_r + (k+1))\partial_r^k \widetilde{u}_r + \partial_r^k \partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta = 0,$$

hence

$$0 = r^{k-1}(r\partial_r + (k+1))\partial_r^k \widetilde{u}_r + r^{k-1}\partial_\vartheta \partial_r^k \widetilde{u}_\vartheta = \frac{1}{r}\left((r\partial_r + 1)v_r + \partial_\vartheta v_\vartheta\right). \tag{3.41}$$

From (3.39), (3.40), and (3.41), it follows that the pair $(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q)$ as defined in (3.38) formally satisfies, with $\overline{L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}}$ and $\overline{B}$ in polar frame and acting on the velocity field $\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}$ in polar frame as defined in (3.26a) and (3.26b) the Stokes boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q) &= \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}, \\ \overline{B}(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}, q) &= \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} \\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}} \\ \boldsymbol{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{on } (\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_D) \times (\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_N) \times (\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_G), . \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Here, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ and (assuming that $\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_N \neq \varnothing$) $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}} &= r^{k-2}\partial_r^k\big(r^2\big(\overline{\boldsymbol{f}} - \overline{((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))}\big)\big) - kr^{k-2}\begin{pmatrix} r\partial_r^k p + (k-1)\partial_r^{k-1}p \\ \partial_r^{k-1}\partial_\vartheta p\end{pmatrix}, \\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ kr^{k-1}\partial_r^{k-1}p\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

Using (3.32), Lemma 3.5 with $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{u}$, the inductive hypothesis $H_{k,k}$, and the fact that for all $v \in L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})$

$$\|v\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \leq \|v\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + \|v\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})},$$

we find from (3.43)

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} &\leq \|r^{\beta_i+k-2}\partial_r^k(r^2\overline{\boldsymbol{f}})\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} + \|r^{\beta_i+k-2}\partial_r^k(r^2\overline{((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))})\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \\ &\quad + k\|r^{\beta_i+k-1}\partial_r^k p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} + k(k-1)\|r^{\beta_i+k-2}\partial_r^{k-1}p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \\ &\quad + k\|r^{\beta_i+k-2}\partial_r^{k-1}\partial_\vartheta p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \\ &\leq A_1^k k! + \left(C_{\mathrm{t}}A_u^{k-1}E_u^2 + A_1^k\right)k! + k\left(A_u^{k-1} + A_1^{k-1}\right)(k-1)! \\ &\quad + k(k-1)\left(A_u^{k-2} + A_1^{k-2}\right)(k-2)! + k\left(A_u^{k-1}E_u + A_1^{k-1}\right) \\ &\leq \left(5A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}} + 3)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k!.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{1/2}_{\beta_i}(\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_N)} &\leq k\|r^{k-1}\partial_r^{k-1}p\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \\ &\leq k\Big(\|r^{k-2+\beta}\partial_r^{k-1}p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} + \|r^{k-2+\beta}\partial_r^{k-1}\partial_\vartheta p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} + \|r^{k-1+\beta}\partial_r^k p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} \\ &\qquad + (k-1)\|r^{k-2+\beta}\partial_r^{k-1}p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})}\Big) \\ &\leq 4k\left(A_1^{k-1} + A_u^{k-1}E_u\right)(k-1)! \\ &= 4\left(A_1^{k-1} + A_u^{k-1}E_u\right)k!.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.42), Theorem 2.9, (3.32d), (3.32c), and the two inequalities above that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} - \overline{\boldsymbol{v}(\mathfrak{c}_i)}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + \|q\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\ &\quad \leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}})} + \|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{H^1(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + \|q\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \setminus S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{g}}\|_{\mathcal{V}^{1/2}_{\beta_i}(\partial S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}} \cap \Gamma_N)}\right) \\ &\quad \leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(11A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}} + 7)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k!.\end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

We claim that $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}(\mathfrak{c}_i)} = \boldsymbol{0}$. This means that this term in (3.44) could be omitted. To prove the claim, we observe that the validity of $H_{k,k}$ implies that $\|r^{k+\beta_i-2}\partial_r^k\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} < +\infty$ and thus $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\beta_i-2}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})^2$. This is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{L}_{\beta_i-2}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})^2$. Using (3.44), [12, Corollary 4.2] and Lemma 2.7 we have that $\boldsymbol{v} \in C^0(\overline{S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}})^2$. Then the condition $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{L}_{\beta_i-2}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})^2$ forces $\boldsymbol{v}$ (and $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}$) to vanish at $\mathfrak{c}_i$ since otherwise $r^{2(\beta_i-2)}v_i^2$ would not be integrable on $S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2}$.

Now, for all $|\eta| = 2$,

$$\mathcal{D}^\eta\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} = r^k\partial_r^k\mathcal{D}^\eta\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}} + \eta_1 kr^{k-1}\partial_r^{k+\eta_1-1}\partial_\vartheta^{\eta_2}\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}} + [\eta_1 - 1]_+ k(k-1)r^{k-2}\partial_r^k\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}.$$

Therefore, for all $|\eta| = 2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\beta_i+k+\eta_1-2}\partial_r^k \mathcal{D}^\eta \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\qquad \leq \|\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{\mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + \eta_1 k \|r^{\beta_i+k+\eta_1-3}\partial_r^{k+\eta_1-1}\partial_\vartheta^{\eta_2}\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + k(k-1)\|r^{\beta_i+k-2}\partial_r^k\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\qquad \leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(11A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}}+7)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k! + 2kA_u^{k-1}(k-1)! + k(k-1)A_u^{k-2}(k-2)! \\
&\qquad \leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(11A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}}+9)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k!.
\end{aligned}
$$

For all $|\eta| = 1$,

$$
\mathcal{D}^\eta q = r^k\partial_r^k\mathcal{D}^\eta q + \eta_1 k r^{k-1}\partial_r^k p,
$$

hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\beta_i+k+\eta_1-1}\partial_r^k\mathcal{D}^\eta p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} &\leq \|q\|_{\mathcal{V}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + k\|r^{\beta_i+k-1}\partial_r^k p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(11A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}}+7)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k! + kA_u^{k-1}(k-1)! \\
&\leq C_{\mathrm{sec}}\left(11A_1^k + (C_{\mathrm{t}}+8)A_u^{k-1}E_u^2\right)k!.
\end{aligned}
$$

From (3.33b) it follows that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\max_{|\eta|=2}\|r^{\beta_i+k+\eta_1-2}\partial_r^k\mathcal{D}^\eta\overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_u^k k!, \quad \max_{|\eta|=1}\|r^{\beta_i+k+\eta_1-1}\partial_r^k\mathcal{D}^\eta p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \leq A_u^k k!,
$$

i.e., that $H_{k+1,1}$ holds. We have shown implication (3.35).

Step 2: proof of (3.36). We now fix $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and we assume that $H_{k,k}$ and $H_{k+1,j}$ hold true. Multiply (3.28) by r and differentiate by $\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}$ to obtain

$$
r\partial_r^{k+1-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_r + (k+1-j)\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_r + \partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+2}\widetilde{u}_\vartheta = 0.
$$

Therefore, using $H_{k+1,j}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\beta_i+k-j-2}\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+2}\widetilde{u}_\vartheta\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\qquad \leq \|r^{\beta_i+k-j-1}\partial_r^{k+1-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_r\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} + k\|r^{\beta_i+k-j-2}\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_r\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\qquad \leq A_u^k E_u^{j-1/3}k! + kA_u^{k-1}E_u^{j-1/3}(k-1)! \\
&\qquad \leq 2A_u^k E_u^{j-1/3}k! \\
&\qquad \leq A_u^k E_u^{j+2/3}k!.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.45}
$$

This proves the estimate for $\widetilde{u}_\vartheta$.

To prove the bound on $\widetilde{u}_r$, multiply the first equation in (3.27) by r^2 and differentiate by $\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j$, to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+2}\widetilde{u}_r = &-\nu\left(r^2\partial_r^2 + (2(k-j)+1)r\partial_r + (k-j)^2 - 1\right)\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j\widetilde{u}_r - 2\nu\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_\vartheta \\
&+ (r^2\partial_r^2 + 2(k-j)r\partial_r + (k-j)(k-j-1))\partial_r^{k-j-1}\partial_\vartheta^j p \\
&- \partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j\left(r^2(\overline{\boldsymbol{f}} - \overline{((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))\cdot\nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))})_r\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\beta_i+k-j-2}\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+2}\widetilde{u}_r\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\leq \Big(A_u^2 k! + 2kA_u(k-1)! + k(k-2)(k-2)!\Big)A_u^{k-2}E_u^{[j-4/3]_+} + 2A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j-1/3}(k-1)! \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\nu}\Big(A_u^k k! + 2(k-1)A_u^{k-1}(k-1)! + (k-1)(k-2)A_u^{k-2}(k-2)!\Big)E_u^j \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\nu}A_1^k k! + \frac{1}{\nu}C_{\mathrm{t}}A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j+2}k! \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{\nu}A_1^k + \left(1+\frac{1}{\nu}\right)A_u^kE_u^j + \left(\frac{1}{\nu}(C_{\mathrm{t}}+2)+4\right)A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j+2} + \left(1+\frac{1}{\nu}\right)A_u^{k-2}E_u^j\right)k!. \\
&\leq A_u^kE_u^{j+2/3}k!
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.46}
$$

This provides the estimate for $\widetilde{u}_r$.

Last, consider the second equation of (3.27): multiplying by r^2 and differentiating by $\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
r\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}p &= \nu\left(r^2\partial_r^2 + (2(k-j)+1)r\partial_r + (k-j)^2 - 1 + \partial_\vartheta^2\right)\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j\widetilde{u}_\vartheta \\
&\quad + 2\nu\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}\widetilde{u}_r - (k-j)\partial_r^{k-j-1}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}p \\
&\quad + \partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^j\left(r^2(\overline{\boldsymbol{f} - ((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}+\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))\cdot\nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}+\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))})_\vartheta\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|r^{\beta_i+k-j-1}\partial_r^{k-j}\partial_\vartheta^{j+1}p\|_{L^2(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})} \\
&\leq \nu\Big(A_u^2k! + 2kA_u(k-1)! + k(k-2)(k-2)!\Big)A_u^{k-2}E_u^{[j-4/3]_+} \\
&\quad + \nu A_u^kE_u^{j+1/3}k! + 2\nu A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j-1/3}(k-1)! + (k-1)A_u^{k-2}E_u^{j+1}(k-2)! \\
&\quad + A_1^kk! + C_{\mathrm{t}}A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j+2}k! \\
&\leq \left(A_1^k + 2\nu A_u^kE_u^{j+1/3} + (C_{\mathrm{t}}+1+3\nu)A_u^{k-1}E_u^{j+2} + A_u^{k-2}E_u^{j+1}\right)k! \\
&\leq A_u^kE_u^{j+1}k!.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.47}
$$

Then, the estimates in (3.45), (3.46), and (3.47) imply that $H_{k+1,j+1}$ holds true. By the strategy outlined above, this shows implication (3.37) and thus verifies $H_{k,k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $(\widetilde{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}, p) \in [\mathcal{B}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2 \times \mathcal{B}^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$, which leads to $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}, p) \in [B^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})]^2 \times B^1_{\beta_i}(S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}/2})$ due to $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{c}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ and Lemma 2.4. The proof is concluded by noting that $\boldsymbol{u} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is a constant vector field. ∎

Combining the estimates in each sector with classical results on the analyticity of the solution in the interior of the domain and on regular parts of the boundary, this implies the weighted analytic regularity in $\mathbb{P}$ of solutions to the stationary, incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, stated in Theorem 2.13.

Proof of Theorem 2.13. The analyticity of weak solutions $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ in the interior and up to analytic parts of the boundary is classical, see, e.g., [25, Chap. 6.7] and [21, 8]. Furthermore, for any $\delta > 0$ and any $\underline{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a constant $\widetilde{A} > 0$ such that the weight functions $\Phi_{k+\underline{\beta}}$ satisfy

$$
\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \;\; \forall x \in \{z \in \mathbb{P} : \mathrm{dist}(z, \mathfrak{C}) > \delta\} : \quad |\Phi_{k+\underline{\beta}}(x)| \leq \widetilde{A}^{k+1}.
$$

This implies weighted analyticity of the solutions in subsets of the domain that are bounded away from corners. The weighted analytic regularity in $\{z \in \mathbb{P} : \mathrm{dist}(z, \mathfrak{C}) \leq \delta\}$ for $0 < \delta < \delta_{\mathbb{P}/2}$ is proved in Lemma 3.7. ∎

Remark 3.9. Suppose that for each corner $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}$, either

- at least one of the two sides of $\mathbb{P}$ meeting in $\mathfrak{c}$ is a Dirichlet side with no-slip BCs, or
- both sides of $\mathbb{P}$ meeting in $\mathfrak{c}$ are equipped with homogeneous slip boundary condition and the angle is different from π.

The, by repeating the argument in Remark 3.8 near each corner and using again the analyticity of $(\boldsymbol{u}, p)$ in the interior and up to analytic parts of the boundary, one can establish that

$$(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in [K^{\varpi}_{2-\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P})]^2 \times K^{\varpi}_{1-\underline{\beta}}(\mathbb{P}).$$

4. Conclusion and Discussion. We have shown analytic regularity of Leray-Hopf solutions of the stationary, viscous and incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in polygonal domains $\mathbb{P}$, subject to sufficiently small and analytic in $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ forcing. We proved analytic regularity of the velocity and pressure in scales of corner-weighted, Kondrat'ev spaces. The present setting of mixed BCs covers most examples of interest in applications, such as, e.g., channel flow with homogeneous Neumann condition at the outflow boundary. With the argument in [20] containing a gap, in the particular case of homogeneous Dirichlet ("no-slip") boundary conditions on all of $\partial\mathbb{P}$ the present result implies that the result in [28] stands under the assumptions stated in [28]. The analytic regularity in homogeneous weighted spaces implies, as explained in the discussion in [28, Section 5], corresponding bounds on n-widths of solution sets which, in turn, imply exponential convergence of reduced basis and of Model Order Reduction methods. Corresponding remarks apply also in the present, more general situation, and we do not spell them out here. The present results also imply, along the lines of [28] (where only the case of no-slip BCs on all of $\partial\mathbb{P}$ was considered), exponential rates of convergence of hp-approximations. Details on the exponential convergence rate bounds for further discretizations in the case of the presently considered mixed boundary conditions shall be elaborated elsewhere.

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to the referees for their thorough and constructive comments which have contributed to the improvement of the paper.

Appendix A. Proofs of Section 2.5.4.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. The third item of Lemma 2.6 and the second item of Lemma 2.7 give that for any $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ there exists a constant $A_0 > 1$ such that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$,

$$\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-\ell}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \leq A_0^{|\alpha|+1}|\alpha|!.$$

Then we have

$$\|r^{\beta-\ell}\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \leq 4\|r^{\beta-\ell}\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))},$$

and for all $|\alpha| \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-\ell}\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}u_1\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \leq & \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}\binom{\alpha_2}{j}\|\partial_\vartheta^j \cos\vartheta\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-\ell}\partial_r^{\alpha_1}\partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2-j}u_r\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \\
& + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}\binom{\alpha_2}{j}\|\partial_\vartheta^j \sin\vartheta\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\|r^{\beta+\alpha_1-\ell}\partial_r^{\alpha_1}\partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2-j}u_\vartheta\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \\
\leq & \, 2A_0^{|\alpha|+1}|\alpha|!\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}A_0^{-j}\binom{\alpha_2}{j} \leq 2(2A_0)^{|\alpha|+1}|\alpha|!.
\end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate holds for u_2. By the above results and using the third item of Lemma 2.6 and the first item of Lemma 2.7 we have $\boldsymbol{u} \in [\mathcal{B}^{\ell}_{\beta}(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))]^2$, which, by the second item of Lemma 2.6, is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{u} \in [B^{\ell}_{\beta}(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))]^2$. ∎

Proof of Lemma 2.5. From $\boldsymbol{v} \in [B^0_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))]^2$ it follows that $\boldsymbol{v} \in [\mathcal{B}^0_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))]^2$ by [2, Theorem 1.1]. Then, there exists $A_0 > 1$ such that, for all $|\alpha| \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v_r\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}\binom{\alpha_2}{j}\|\partial_\vartheta^j \cos\vartheta\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta}\partial_r^{\alpha_1}\partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2-j}v_1\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}\binom{\alpha_2}{j}\|\partial_\vartheta^j \sin\vartheta\|_{L^\infty(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\|r^{\alpha_1+\beta}\partial_r^{\alpha_1}\partial_\vartheta^{\alpha_2-j}v_2\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\\
&\leq 2A_0^{|\alpha|}|\alpha|!\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_2}A_0^{-j}\binom{\alpha_2}{j} \leq 2(2A_0)^{|\alpha|}|\alpha|!.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate for v_ϑ follows by the same argument. □

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Lemma 2.7 implies that $v \in \mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$. Elementary calculus yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{x_1} &= \cos\vartheta\partial_r - \frac{\sin\vartheta}{r}\partial_\vartheta,\\
\partial_{x_2} &= \sin\vartheta\partial_r + \frac{\cos\vartheta}{r}\partial_\vartheta,\\
\partial^2_{x_1} &= \cos^2\vartheta\partial^2_r + \frac{2\cos\vartheta\sin\vartheta}{r^2}\partial_\vartheta + \frac{\sin^2\vartheta}{r}\partial_r - \frac{2\cos\vartheta\sin\vartheta}{r}\partial_{r\vartheta} + \frac{\sin^2\vartheta}{r^2}\partial^2_\vartheta,\\
\partial^2_{x_2} &= \sin^2\vartheta\partial^2_r - \frac{2\cos\vartheta\sin\vartheta}{r^2}\partial_\vartheta + \frac{\cos^2\vartheta}{r}\partial_r + \frac{2\cos\vartheta\sin\vartheta}{r}\partial_{r\vartheta} + \frac{\cos^2\vartheta}{r^2}\partial^2_\vartheta,\\
\partial_{x_1}\partial_{x_2} &= \cos\vartheta\sin\vartheta\partial^2_r + \frac{\sin^2\vartheta-\cos^2\vartheta}{r^2}\partial_\vartheta + \frac{\cos^2\vartheta-\sin^2\vartheta}{r}\partial_{r\vartheta} - \frac{\sin\vartheta\cos\vartheta}{r}\partial_r - \frac{\sin\vartheta\cos\vartheta}{r^2}\partial^2_\vartheta.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists $C > 0$ ($C = 7$ when $k = 2$ and $C = 2$ when $k = 1$ will suffice) such that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| \leq k$,

$$\|r^{\beta-k+|\alpha|}\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))} \leq C\left(\sum_{|\alpha|\leq k}\|r^{\beta-k+\alpha_1}\mathcal{D}^\alpha v\|^2_{L^2(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}\right)^{1/2} = C\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}^k_\beta(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))}.$$

By definition, it follows that $v \in K^k_{k-\beta}(Q_{\delta,\omega}(\mathfrak{c}))$. □

Appendix B. Parametric Operator Pencil for Stokes-Problem. In this appendix, we give details about the parametrized system (2.18). Recall that $r \in (0,\infty)$ and $\vartheta \in (0,\omega)$ are polar coordinates in the sector $Q_{\infty,\omega}$. Set $D = -i\partial_\vartheta$. The parametric differential operator $\widehat{L}(\lambda)$ in (2.18) reads in components

(B.1)
$$\widehat{L}(\lambda)(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}},q) = \left(\begin{pmatrix}\nu D^2 + 2\nu(1+\lambda^2) & \nu(3+i\lambda)iD & -(1+i\lambda)\\ -\nu(3-i\lambda)iD & \nu 2D^2+\nu(1+\lambda^2) & iD\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}v_r\\ v_\vartheta\\ q\end{pmatrix},\ \begin{pmatrix}1-i\lambda & iD\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}v_r\\ v_\vartheta\end{pmatrix}\right).$$

We define the parametric boundary operator $\widehat{B}(\lambda)$ in (2.18) as

$$\widehat{B}(\lambda)(\overline{\boldsymbol{v}},q) = \left(A_0(\lambda)\begin{pmatrix}v_r\\ v_\vartheta\\ q\end{pmatrix},\ A_\omega(\lambda)\begin{pmatrix}v_r\\ v_\vartheta\\ q\end{pmatrix}\right). \tag{B.2}$$

Here, for $\bar{\vartheta} \in \{0, \omega\}$, the parametric boundary operator $A_{\bar{\vartheta}}(\lambda)$ is defined in components as

$$A_{\bar{\vartheta}}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \{\vartheta = \bar{\vartheta}\} \text{ corresponds to a Dirichlet edge,} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \nu i D & -\nu(1+i\lambda) & 0 \\ 2\nu & 2\nu i D & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \{\vartheta = \bar{\vartheta}\} \text{ corresponds to a Neumann edge,} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ iD & -(1+i\lambda) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } \{\vartheta = \bar{\vartheta}\} \text{ corresponds to a Slip edge.} \end{cases} \tag{B.3}$$

For the derivation of this parametric system, see [14, Chapter 4.2].

Appendix C. Stokes operator in polar coordinates. In this appendix we provide the elementary calculations to verify (3.27)-(3.31), which describe the NSE with boundary conditions in polar coordinates and polar components. We recall the representation of the NSE in the Cartesian reference frame

$$L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}(\boldsymbol{u}, p) = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{f} - (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}, \tag{C.1}$$

$$B(\boldsymbol{u}, p) = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\delta. \tag{C.2}$$

Using $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)$ we rewrite this set of equations as

$$L^{\Delta}_{\mathrm{St}}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}, p) = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{f} - ((\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \cdot \nabla)(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} + \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{in } S^i_{\delta_{\mathbb{P}}}, \tag{C.3}$$

$$B(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}, p) = -B(\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), 0) = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\delta. \tag{C.4}$$

(C.3) follows directly from (C.1). We justify that the right-hand side of (C.4) is a zero vector. To this end, we note firstly that due to Lemma 3.6, $\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) \in \mathcal{V}^2_{\beta_i}(S^i_\delta)^2 \subset C^0(\overline{S^i_\delta})^2$ and thus $\boldsymbol{u} \in C^0(\overline{S^i_\delta})^2$, which implies the continuity of $\boldsymbol{u}|_{\overline{\Gamma}_\delta}$ along $\overline{\Gamma}_\delta$. On a Dirichlet side, we use the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition and the continuity of $\boldsymbol{u}$ to derive $\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i) = \boldsymbol{0}$, which implies $B(\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), 0) = \boldsymbol{0}$ on this side. On a Neumann side, $B(\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), 0) = \boldsymbol{0}$ as all entries of $\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i))$ equal zero. For a side equipped with slip boundary condition, Lemma 3.6 shows that the first component of $B(\boldsymbol{u}(\mathfrak{c}_i), 0)$ equals 0 and the second component also vanishes with the same reasoning as in the case of a Neumann side. The right-hand sides of (3.29), (3.30) and (3.31) are thus verified.

The vector Laplacian in a polar reference frame reads [1, Equation (3.151)]

$$\overline{\Delta \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}} = \frac{1}{r^2} \begin{pmatrix} (r\partial_r)^2 + \partial^2_\vartheta - 1 & -2\partial_\vartheta \\ 2\partial_\vartheta & (r\partial_r)^2 + \partial^2_\vartheta - 1 \end{pmatrix} \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}$$

and [19, Equation (II.4.C3)]

$$\overline{\nabla p} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r p \\ r^{-1}\partial_\vartheta p \end{pmatrix}.$$

The divergence of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$, which equals to $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u}$, is [19, Equation (II.4.C5)] $\nabla \cdot \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \frac{1}{r}\left((r\partial_r + 1)\,\widetilde{u}_r + \partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta\right)$, whence (3.27) and (3.28).

Regarding the boundary conditions (C.4), we start from the expression of the stress tensor in polar coordinates and polar frame, see [19, Equation (II.4.C9)],

$$\overline{\varepsilon(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r u_r & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta)) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta)) & r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + \widetilde{u}_r) \end{pmatrix} \tag{C.5}$$

hence the stress tensor in a polar reference frame reads

$$\overline{\sigma(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}},p)} = 2\nu\overline{\varepsilon(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}})} - p\,\mathrm{Id}_2 = \nu \begin{pmatrix} 2\partial_r \widetilde{u}_r & \partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta) \\ \partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta) & 2r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + \widetilde{u}_r) \end{pmatrix} - p\,\mathrm{Id}_2\,. \tag{C.6}$$

We have furthermore

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{n}} = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \bar{\boldsymbol{t}} = \mp \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the sign depends on the side of the sector being considered. Then, by matrix-vector multiplication,

$$\overline{\sigma(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}},p)\boldsymbol{n}} = \pm\nu \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta) \\ 2r^{-1}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_\vartheta + \widetilde{u}_r) - p \end{pmatrix}$$

and consequently

$$(\sigma(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}},p)\boldsymbol{n})\cdot\boldsymbol{t} = \overline{\sigma(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}},p)\boldsymbol{n}}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{t}} = -\partial_r \widetilde{u}_\vartheta - \frac{1}{r}(\partial_\vartheta \widetilde{u}_r - \widetilde{u}_\vartheta).$$

Also, it follows from the definition that $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} = \overline{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\cdot\overline{\boldsymbol{n}} = \pm\widetilde{u}_\vartheta$, thus verifying (3.29), (3.30), and (3.31).

REFERENCES

[1] G. B. Arfken, H. J. Weber, and F. E. Harris, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists (Seventh Edition)*, Academic Press, Boston, 2013, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-384654-9.00032-3, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123846549000323.

[2] I. Babuška and B. Q. Guo, *Regularity of the solution of elliptic problems with piecewise analytic data. I. Boundary value problems for linear elliptic equation of second order*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 19 (1988), pp. 172–203, https://doi.org/10.1137/0519014, https://doi.org/10.1137/0519014.

[3] I. Babuška, R. B. Kellogg, and J. Pitkäranta, *Direct and inverse error estimates for finite elements with mesh refinements*, Numer. Math., 33 (1979), p. 447–471, https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01399326, https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01399326.

[4] M. Costabel, M. Dauge, and S. Nicaise, *Mellin analysis of weighted Sobolev spaces with nonhomogeneous norms on cones*, in Around the research of Vladimir Maz'ya. I, vol. 11 of Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), Springer, New York, 2010, pp. 105–136.

[5] M. Costabel, M. Dauge, and S. Nicaise, *Analytic regularity for linear elliptic systems in polygons and polyhedra*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 22 (2012), pp. 1250015, 63, https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202512500157, https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202512500157.

[6] M. Dauge, *Stationary Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems on two- or three-dimensional domains with corners. I. Linearized equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 20 (1989), pp. 74–97, https://doi.org/10.1137/0520006, https://doi.org/10.1137/0520006.

[7] C. Ebmeyer and J. Frehse, *Steady Navier-Stokes equations with mixed boundary value conditions in three-dimensional Lipschitzian domains*, Math. Ann., 319 (2001), pp. 349–381, https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00004438, https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00004438.

[8] Y. Giga, *Time and spatial analyticity of solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 8 (1983), pp. 929–948.

[9] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, vol. 24 of Monographs and Studies in Mathematics, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985.

[10] P. Grisvard, *Singularities in boundary value problems*, vol. 22 of Recherches en Mathématiques Appliquées [Research in Applied Mathematics], Masson, Paris; Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[11] B. Guo, *Approximation theory for the p-version of the finite element method in three dimensions. I. Approximabilities of singular functions in the framework of the Jacobi-weighted Besov and Sobolev spaces*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 44 (2006), pp. 246–269.

[12] B. Q. Guo and I. Babuška, *On the regularity of elasticity problems with piecewise analytic data*, Adv. in Appl. Math., 14 (1993), pp. 307–347, https://doi.org/10.1006/aama.1993.1016, https://doi.org/10.1006/aama.1993.1016.

[13] B. Q. Guo and C. Schwab, *Analytic regularity of Stokes flow on polygonal domains in countably weighted Sobolev spaces*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 190 (2006), pp. 487–519.

[14] Y. He, *Analytic regularity and hp-Discontinuous Galerkin Approximation of viscous, incompressible flow in a polygon*, master's thesis, ETH Zurich, 2021.

[15] K. Kato, *New idea for proof of analyticity of solutions to analytic nonlinear elliptic equations*, SUT J. Math., 32 (1996), pp. 157–161.

[16] V. A. Kondrat'ev, *Boundary value problems for elliptic equations in domains with conical or angular points*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč., 16 (1967), pp. 209–292.

[17] V. A. Kozlov, V. G. Maz'ya, and J. Rossmann, *Elliptic boundary value problems in domains with point singularities*, vol. 52 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/052, https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/052.

[18] V. A. Kozlov, V. G. Maz'ya, and J. Rossmann, *Spectral problems associated with corner singularities of solutions to elliptic equations*, vol. 85 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001, https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/085, https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/085.

[19] L. E. Malvern, *Introduction to the mechanics of of a continuous medium*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1969.

[20] C. Marcati and C. Schwab, *Analytic regularity for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in polygons*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 52 (2020), pp. 2945–2968, https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1247334, https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1247334.

[21] K. Masuda, *On the analyticity and the unique continuation theorem for solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation*, Proc. Japan Acad., 43 (1967), pp. 827–832.

[22] V. Maz'ya and J. Rossmann, *Elliptic Equations in Polyhedral Domains*, vol. 162 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2010.

[23] H. K. Moffatt, *Viscous eddies near a sharp corner*, Arch. Mech. Stos., 16 (1964), pp. 365–372.

[24] H. K. Moffatt, *The asymptotic behaviour of solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations near sharp corners*, in Approximation methods for Navier-Stokes problems (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Paderborn, Paderborn, 1979), vol. 771 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1980, pp. 371–380.

[25] C. B. Morrey, Jr., *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69952-1, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69952-1. Reprint of the 1966 edition [MR0202511].

[26] S. Nazarov and B. A. Plamenevsky, *Elliptic Problems in Domains with Piecewise Smooth Boundaries*, De Gruyter, 2011, https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/9783110848915, https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848915.

[27] M. Orlt and A.-M. Sändig, *Regularity of viscous Navier-Stokes flows in nonsmooth domains*, in Boundary value problems and integral equations in nonsmooth domains (Luminy, 1993), vol. 167 of Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, New York, 1995, pp. 185–201.

[28] D. Schötzau, C. Marcati, and C. Schwab, *Exponential convergence of mixed hp-DGFEM for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, IMA Journ. Numerical Analysis, (2020), https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/draa055.