arXiv:2402.18067v1 [math.OC] 28 Feb 2024

A gradient flow method for smooth splines versus least-squares fitting on Riemannian manifolds

Chun-Chi Lin * and Dung The Tran †

February 17, 2024

Keywords: higher-order Riemannian spline, geometric k-spline, spline interpolation, least-squares fitting
MSC(2020): primary 35K52, 49J20; secondary 41A15, 35K25

Abstract

This article presents a novel resolution to the problem of spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting on smooth Riemannian manifolds utilizing the method of gradient flows of networks. This approach represents a contribution to both geometric control theory and statistical shape data analysis. Our work encompasses a rigorous proof for the existence of global solutions in Hölder spaces for the gradient flow. The asymptotic limits of these solutions establish the existence of the spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting problem on smooth Riemannian manifolds, offering a comprehensive solution. Notably, the constructive nature of the proof suggests potential numerical schemes for finding solutions.

1 Introduction

Riemannian splines play an important role in various fields of physical and applied sciences, with applications spanning from Riemannian cubics for rigid body control [21, 22] to geometric k-splines for computational anatomy [9, 10]. These splines extend the concept of polynomial splines from Euclidean spaces to Riemannian manifolds, defined as critical points of the higher-order energy functional

$$\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l}\left\langle \frac{D^{k-1}}{dx^{k-1}}\gamma_x, \frac{D^{k-1}}{dx^{k-1}}\gamma_x\right\rangle dx, \tag{1.1}$$

when $q=1$ and $\gamma:[x_0,x_q]\to M$. Here, γ_x is the tangent vector of the map γ, $\frac{D}{dx}$ is the (directional) covariant differentiation on M, and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the inner product induced from the metric of M. The spline interpolation problem on a Riemannian manifold entails identifying critical points of the higher-order energy functional when $q>1$ and $\gamma:[x_0,x_q]\to M$ is a sufficiently smooth map satisfying $\gamma(x_j)=p_j$ for all j, with $\{p_0,\cdots,p_q\}\subset M$ representing an ordered set of points.

*Department of Mathematics, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 116 Taiwan, chunlin@math.ntnu.edu.tw
†Current Address: University of Science, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam, tranthedung56@gmail.com

In the spline interpolation problem on a smooth Riemannian manifold, the requirement that the curves or maps must pass through prescribed points can be adjusted. Instead, it can be specified that the curves or maps should originate from p_0, terminate at p_q, and closely traverse the designated points $\{p_1, \ldots, p_{q-1}\}$. This variation is referred to as the problem of spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting on manifolds and can be seen as a complementary problem to the spline interpolation issue. It has applications in geometric mechanics and statistical shape analysis, where it involves finding critical points or minimizers of the higher-order energy functional (1.1) along with the term

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \operatorname{dist}_M^2(p_j, \gamma(x_j)), \tag{1.2}$$

which serves as a penalization factor for a small $\sigma > 0$. The combination of Riemannian splines and least-squares fitting is valuable for accurately representing data on smooth curved surfaces.

Building upon pioneering research with spherical smoothing splines in statistical analysis, there is a growing recognition of the complexities involved in interpreting functions defined on non-Euclidean spaces for accurate data analysis [13, 14]. Data-fitting problems in curved spaces have become a rising interest in addressing data-fitting challenges for statistical data situated on manifolds [23, 12, 4]. This interest has sparked investigations into fitting data on manifolds using smooth Riemannian splines, which are designed to capture specific expected shapes without necessarily matching the data on the manifolds precisely. This challenge has reverberated across various research domains, including image processing and statistical shape data analysis. Consequently, researchers have explored alternative approaches to extend interpolation and approximation methods to the Riemannian setting. Meanwhile, such problems initially found motivation in mechanical control theory, e.g., trajectory planning. More recently, these problems have emerged in the context of quantum computing. Due to the constraints imposed by the laws of quantum mechanics, these problems are often framed as least-squares fitting challenges [2].

1.1 Previous results

The groundwork for the generalization of splines from Euclidean spaces to Riemannian manifolds was laid by Gabriel and Kajiya in [8]. Subsequently, Noakes, Heinzinger, and Paden extended this to cubic splines ($k = 2$) in [22], while Camarinha, Silva Leite, and Crouch further expanded the concept to polynomial splines for arbitrary $k \geq 2$ in [3]. In optimal control theory, proving the existence of Riemannian cubics typically involves working with Euler-Lagrange equations and applying Pontryagin's maximum principle. However, existing results on global solutions for Riemannian splines are limited and often come with specific assumptions. A very brief overview on the existence of classical solutions for Riemannian spline interpolation and a new method of gradient flow for the existence of solutions to Riemannian spline interpolation problem was introduced in our recent work [17].

In contrast to the spline interpolation problem in Riemannian manifolds, it seems that there remains a scarcity of rigorous proofs concerning the existence of solutions to the problem of spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting on manifolds. The exploration of this problem has been undertaken in several studies with slightly varied setups, as evidenced by works such as [13, 18, 2, 23, 9, 10, 12, 4, 19, 1, 14]. These investigations often introduce penalization techniques aimed at minimizing the discrepancy between predefined points and the optimized trajectory. While certain works delve into the necessary or sufficient conditions for spline existence [18, 19], others concentrate on developing numerical algorithms and offering practical solutions [2, 23, 19, 1, 14]. The authors in [18] addressed the problem of solution existence by investigating a limiting process involving smoothing geometric splines when the manifold M is Euclidean. Numerical algorithms outlined in [23, 19] rely on gradient steepest descent methods utilizing the Palais metric within the infinite-dimensional space of admissible curves.

1.2 Contributions and approaches of the current paper

This article presents an innovative approach to the problem, utilizing gradient flows of networks to establish solution existence. Notably, our method builds upon the framework introduced in [17] for spline interpolation on Riemannian manifolds, integrating gradient flows of specific networks connecting designated points. Our approach offers a constructive strategy for addressing these challenges, furnishing a rigorous proof for the existence of classical global solutions to the gradient flow. These solutions' asymptotic limits align with variational Riemannian polynomial splines or geometric k-splines, incorporating least-squares fitting considerations. Consequently, our approach provides a rigorous solution to the problem of higher-order spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting on Riemannian manifolds, addressing a gap in the existing literature.

It is noteworthy that the constructive nature of our proof implies potential numerical schemes for finding solutions. Furthermore, our work in this article introduces an additional challenge: the design of alternative numerical algorithms based on the gradient flow we have examined, specifically crafted for generating higher-order Riemannian splines.

We delineate the approaches in this article below. When addressing the relaxed spline interpolation problem on Riemannian manifolds, where curves or maps are meant to closely traverse prescribed points, this can be accomplished by integrating suitable penalty terms, as depicted in (1.2), into the energy functional. This modification ensures the continued applicability of the method of variational splines or gradient flows, as exemplified in [2]. Instead of utilizing distance as the penalization metric, we introduce the Dirichlet integral for maps connecting knot points and 'interior' points of splines, as depicted in (2.1). It is noteworthy that a map connecting two points is critical to the Dirichlet energy if and only if it is critical to the length functional with a constant speed parametrization. Moreover, the Dirichlet integral equals the square of the length of minimal curves connecting the two points (up to a multiple of a fixed constant). Therefore, given that χ_l is a harmonic map for all l, the summation of their Dirichlet integrals equates to the penalty term in (1.2).

In our approach, we substitute the length functional with the Dirichlet energy functional to overcome challenges related to singularity in curve shortening flow. The induced gradient

flow of (2.1) yields a combination of higher-order gradient flow and harmonic map heat flow of networks on Riemannian manifolds. The existence of global solutions to such gradient flows is established in Theorem 1, and the asymptotic limits of these solutions furnish classical solutions to the interpolation problems on smooth Riemannian manifolds. These solutions are referred to as higher-order Riemannian splines or simply geometric k-splines. Additionally, we demonstrate C^{2k-2}-smoothness for the geometric k-splines at the inner-boundary points, surpassing the expectation of C^1 at the inner-boundary points when $k = 2$ as mentioned in [9, p. 419]. Notice that due to the failure of the existence of weak solutions for Riemannian cubics in the Sobolev space $W^{2,2}$ through energy-minimizing sequences in [11], we insert the tension energy functional $\mathcal{T}$ of maps in the total energy functional so that Riemannian splines are defined as the critical points to the energy functional (see the formulation of the problem below).

1.3 The structure of this paper

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: In §2, we delve into the study and establishment of the existence of Riemannian splines for the problem of spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting on Riemannian manifolds (refer to Theorem 1). In §3, we formulate the problem of spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting as a gradient flow problem, expressed as a nonlinear parabolic system. In §4, we address the existence problem of the linear parabolic system derived from the nonlinear one. Finally, in §5, we demonstrate the existence of classical solutions to the nonlinear parabolic system, thereby concluding the proof of the main result in this article. To ensure self-containment, we present some notations and technical lemmas from the literature in §6.

2 The spline interpolation versus least-squares fitting

Let M be an m-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold, and let T_pM denote the tangent space of M at $p \in M$ equipped with the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_p$. The Levi-Civita connection associated with M is denoted by D. Consider smooth vector fields X, Y, and Z on M, and define the covariant derivative of Y with respect to X as D_XY. The Riemannian curvature tensors, denoted as $R(\cdot,\cdot)\cdot : TM \times TM \times TM \to TM$, are defined by the identity $R(X,Y)Z = D_XD_YZ - D_YD_XZ - D_{[X,Y]}Z$, where $[X,Y]$ denotes the Lie bracket of the vector fields X and Y. Thanks to Nash's embedding theorem, we may assume that $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is isometrically embedded for some $n > m$. Let $T_pM \subset T_p\mathbb{R}^n$ be the m-dimensional tangent space to M at a point $p \in M$. Additionally, we make the assumption that the Riemannian curvature tensors R and the second fundamental form II_M of the immersed Riemannian manifold $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are smooth and uniformly bounded in a C^∞-norm. Note, $\gamma \in C^m(\bar{I})$ means that $\partial_x^\ell\gamma$ are continuous up to the boundary ∂I, $\forall\, \ell \in \{0, 1, \cdots, m\}$, where $I = (x_0, x_q)$. The induced tangent map $\partial_x\gamma : I \subset \mathbb{R} \to T_\gamma M$ and $\partial_x\gamma_l : I_l \subset \mathbb{R} \to T_\gamma M$ may be denoted as γ_x and $\gamma_{l,x}$, respectively.

For a given set of ordered points in M,

$$\mathcal{P} = \{p_0, \cdots, p_q\} \subset M,$$

let the set of admissible maps be

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\mathcal{P}} =&\big\{(\gamma,\chi)|\gamma:[x_0,x_q]\to M,\chi_l:[x_{l-1},x_l]\to M,\forall\, l=1,\cdots,q-1,x_l=l,\forall\, l\in\mathbb{Z};\\ &\gamma\in C^{2k-2}([x_0,x_q]),\gamma_l\in C^{2k,\alpha}([x_{l-1},x_l]),\forall\, l=1,\cdots,q,\gamma(x_0)=p_0,\gamma(x_q)=p_q;\\ &\chi_l\in C^{2,\alpha}([x_{l-1},x_l]),\chi_l(x_{l-1})=p_l,\chi_l(x_l)=\gamma_l(x_l),l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

whose images represent networks connecting the ordered points in $\mathcal{P}$. Define the functional $\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}:\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}\to[0,\infty)$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma,\chi)]=\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda}[\gamma]+\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\cdot\mathcal{T}[\chi], \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda}[\gamma]=\mathcal{E}_k[\gamma]+\lambda\cdot\mathcal{T}[\gamma],$$

$$\mathcal{E}_k[\gamma]=\sum_{l=1}^{q}\frac{1}{2}\int_{I_l}|D_x^{k-1}\gamma_{l,x}(x)|^2\,dx,$$

$$\mathcal{T}[\gamma]=\sum_{l=1}^{q}\frac{1}{2}\int_{I_l}|\gamma_{l,x}(x)|^2\,dx,\qquad \mathcal{T}[\chi]=\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\frac{1}{2}\int_{I_l}|\chi_{l,x}(x)|^2\,dx,$$

$D_x:=D_{\partial_x\gamma}$, $|\cdot|=\sqrt{\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_p}$ represents the norm of the fiber of T_pM, and $\lambda,\sigma\in(0,\infty)$ are constants.




Figure 1: The orientation of g and h as $q=3$.

Observe from (2.1) and the admissible class of maps $\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$, γ and χ have their own energy functionals and are only coupled through their (interior) boundary points. Hence, as $(\gamma,\chi)\in\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a critical point of the functional $\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}$, then, by applying the first variation

formulae in Lemma 6.1 and the boundary conditions, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}_{|\varepsilon=0}\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[\gamma]=\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\langle-\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_l),W\rangle\,dx+\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l}\langle-D_x\partial_x\chi_l,W\rangle\,dx=0,$$

for any suitable smooth tangent vector field W, induced from the admissible class of maps $\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$, on the neighborhood of the image of (γ,χ) in M.

$$\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_l):=(-1)^{k+1}D_x^{2k-1}\gamma_{l,x}+\sum_{\mu=2}^{k}(-1)^{\mu+k+1}R\left(D_x^{2k-\mu-1}\gamma_{l,x},D_x^{\mu-2}\gamma_{l,x}\right)\gamma_{l,x}+\lambda\cdot D_x\gamma_{l,x}. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus, if (γ,χ) is the critical point, then

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_l)=0 \text{ (intrinsic formulation)} \quad \text{or } \mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_l)\perp T_{\gamma_l}M \text{ (extrinsic formulation)},\\ D_x\partial_x\chi_l=0 \text{ (intrinsic formulation)} \quad \text{or } D_x\partial_x\chi_l\perp T_{\chi_l}M \text{ (extrinsic formulation)}.\end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

From (2.3) or the first variation formulae in Lemma 6.1, we let the gradient flow of $\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}$ be

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t\gamma_l= & \mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_l), & \forall\, l\in\{1,\cdots,q\},\\ \partial_t\chi_l= & D_x\partial_x\chi_l, & \forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

with the initial-boundary conditions :

(initial datum)

$$(\gamma,\chi)(0,\cdot)=(\gamma_0(\cdot),\chi_0(\cdot))\in\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}, \tag{2.5}$$

(Dirichlet boundary conditions)

$$\gamma(t,x_l)=p_l, \qquad l\in\{0,q\},\ \ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.6}$$

$$D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_l(t,x^*)=v_{x^*}^{\mu} \qquad (l,x^*)\in\{(1,x_0),(q,x_q)\},\ 1\le\mu\le k-1,\ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.7}$$

$$\chi_l(t,x_{l-1})=p_l, \qquad l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\ \ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.8}$$

(concurrency conditions at the junction points)

$$\gamma_l(t,x_l)=\chi_l(t,x_l)=\gamma_{l+1}(t,x_l) \qquad l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\ \ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.9}$$

(regularity conditions at the junction points)

$$\Delta_l D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma(t)=0, \qquad l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\ \ 1\le\mu\le 2k-2,\ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.10}$$

(balancing conditions at the junction points)

$$\Delta_l D_x^{2k-2}\partial_x\gamma(t)+\frac{(-1)^k}{\sigma^2}\partial_x\chi_l(t,x_l)=0, \qquad l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\ \ t\in[0,T], \tag{2.11}$$

where the boundary data $\{v_{x^*}^{\mu}\}$ consists of prescribed constants and

$$\Delta_l D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma(t):=D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_{l+1}(t,x_l^+)-D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_l(t,x_l^-). \tag{2.12}$$

From (2.4), and the boundary conditions (2.6)∼(2.11), we derive the energy identity,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma,\chi)] = -\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}|\partial_t\gamma_l|^2\,dt - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l}|\partial_t\chi_l|^2\,dt.$$

As $\lambda,\sigma>0$, we derive from the energy identity that, for any $t\geq t_0$,

$$\begin{cases}\sum\limits_{l=1}^{q}\|\gamma_{l,x}\|^2_{L^2(I_l)}(t)\leq\frac{1}{\lambda}\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot),\chi(t_0,\cdot)],\\ \sum\limits_{l=1}^{q-1}\|\chi_{l,x}\|^2_{L^2(I_l)}(t)\leq\sigma^2\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot),\chi(t_0,\cdot)].\end{cases}\tag{2.13}$$

Definition 1 (The geometric compatibility conditions of order 0 to (2.4)∼(2.11)). *Let $x_l=l$, $l\in\{0,\dots,q\}\subset\mathbb{Z}$, and (γ_0,χ_0) be the initial datum with the smoothness $\gamma_0\in C^{2k-2}([x_0,x_q])$, $\gamma_{0,l}\in C^{2k,\alpha}([x_{l-1},x_l])$, $\chi_{0,l}\in C^{2,\alpha}([x_{l-1},x_l])$. The initial datum (γ_0,χ_0) is said to fulfill the geometric compatibility conditions of order 0 to the parabolic system (2.4)∼(2.11) if the followings hold.*

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_0)(x_l)=0, & l\in\{0,q\},\\ \mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_{0,l})(x_l)=D_x\partial_x\chi_{0,l}(x_l)=\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_{0,l+1})(x_l), & l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\ \gamma_0(x_l)=p_l, & l\in\{0,q\},\\ \chi_{0,l}(x_{l-1})=p_l, & l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\ D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_{0,l}(x^*)=v^\mu_{x^*} & 1\leq\mu\leq k-1,\ (l,x^*)\in\{(1,x_0),(q,x_q)\},\\ \gamma_{0,l}(x_l)=\chi_{0,l}(x_l)=\gamma_{0,l+1}(x_l) & l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\ \Delta_l D_x^{\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_0=0, & 1\leq\mu\leq 2k-2,\ l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\ \Delta_l D_x^{2k-2}\partial_x\gamma_0+\frac{(-1)^k}{\sigma^2}\partial_x\chi_{0,l}(x_l)=0, & l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\end{cases}\tag{2.14}$$

where the boundary datum $\{v^\mu_{x^*}\}$ are constants.

The theorem below is the main result of this article.

Theorem 1. *Let $\lambda,\sigma\in(0,\infty)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Assume that M is an m-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold immersed in $\mathbb{R}^n$, for some $n>m$, and its second fundamental form II_M and Riemannian curvature tensors R are smooth and uniformly bounded with respect to a C^∞-topology. Suppose that $(\gamma_0,\chi_0)\in\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ is an initial datum fulfilling the compatibility conditions of order 0 in Definition 1. Then, there exists a global solution (γ,χ) to (2.4)∼(2.11) with the regularity*

$$\begin{cases}\gamma_l\in C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k},2k+\alpha}\left([0,\infty)\times[x_{l-1},x_l]\right)\bigcap C^\infty\left((0,\infty)\times[x_{l-1},x_l]\right), & \forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\ \chi_l\in C^{\frac{2+\alpha}{2},2+\alpha}\left([0,\infty)\times[x_{l-1},x_l]\right)\bigcap C^\infty\left((0,\infty)\times[x_{l-1},x_l]\right), & \forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\ \gamma(t,\cdot)\in C^{2k-2}([x_0,x_q]), & \forall\, t\in[0,\infty).\end{cases}$$

Moreover, there exists $(\gamma_\infty,\chi_\infty)\in\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ with the regularity $\gamma_\infty\in C^{2k-2,1}([x_0,x_q])$, obtained from some convergent subsequences, $\gamma_\infty(\cdot)=\lim\limits_{t_j\to\infty}\gamma(t_j,\cdot)$, $\chi_{\infty,l}(\cdot)=\lim\limits_{t_j\to\infty}\chi_l(t_j,\cdot)$, such that $\gamma_{\infty,l}$ is a Riemannian spline fulfilling (2.2), and $\chi_{\infty,l}$ is a geodesic (map), $\forall\, l$.

The proof of the main theorem relies on Solonnikov's theory of parabolic partial differential systems and L^2-estimates of curvature, utilizing Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities.

The short-time existence of solutions is achieved by applying Solonnikov's theory to the linearized parabolic systems and employing a fixed-point argument in a suitable Banach space. Considering that the mathematical objects involved are interconnected curves or networks (represented as a collection of maps) satisfying certain parabolic equations on each piece of the curve or map, it becomes necessary to reformulate the problem by adjusting the domain and initial-boundary conditions. This adjustment is crucial for the application of Solonnikov's theory to linear parabolic systems.

In comparison with works such as [15, 16], where the verification of sufficient conditions for applying Solonnikov's theory is required, the complementary conditions at the boundaries in this article are significantly more intricate due to the higher order of the gradient flow.

To establish the long-time existence of solutions, it is crucial to derive uniform bounds for a specific sequence of L^2-norms of higher-order derivatives, facilitating the application of a contradiction argument. In the proof of Theorem 1, our objective is to attain that, for any fixed $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) := \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l(t,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(I_l)} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\chi_l(t,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(I_l)} \tag{2.15}$$

is uniformly bounded for all t. Afterward, we utilize Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequalities and Gronwall inequalities to establish a uniform bound for $\mathcal{Z}_\mu$ for any μ. The difficulty arises in estimating the boundary terms resulting from integration by parts in the higher-order energy estimates. Here the key is to apply the boundary conditions to decrease the order of derivatives, enabling the use of Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequalities and subsequently obtaining Gronwall inequalities.

3 The nonlinear parabolic systems for the networks

In order to apply Solonnikov's theory of linear parabolic systems effectively, we find it beneficial to rewrite the system (2.4)∼(2.11) in an extrinsic formulation.

Suppose $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open interval, $\gamma : I \to M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth map, and $V : I \to T_\gamma M \subset T_\gamma\mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth vector field along γ. Then, the directional covariant differentiation, denoted as D_{γ_x} or simply as D_x, associated with the Levi-Civita connection D, can be expressed as

$$D_x V = \partial_x V - \Pi_\gamma(V, \partial_x\gamma), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\Pi_\gamma(\cdot,\cdot) : T_\gamma M \times T_\gamma M \to (T_\gamma M)^\perp$ is the second fundamental form at $\gamma \in M \subset \mathbb{R}^n = \{(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}\}$. When M is isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can use (3.1) to convert covariant differentiation D_x into partial differentiation ∂_x. In fact, from (3.1), we can inductively deduce

$$D_x^i\gamma_{l,x} = \partial_x^{i+1}\gamma_l + W_i(\partial_x^i\gamma_l, \ldots, \partial_x\gamma_l, \gamma_l), \tag{3.2}$$

where $W_i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^n \times M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ fulfills

$$\|W_i\|_{C^{\ell-i+1}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^n \times M)} \leq C \cdot \|\Pi_M\|_{C^\ell(M)}, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\|\Pi_M\|_{C^\ell(M)} := \sum_{0 \leq |\sigma| \leq \ell} \|\nabla^\sigma \Pi_M(\gamma_l)\|_{C^0(M)}, \qquad \nabla^\sigma := \partial_{u_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots \partial_{u_n}^{\sigma_n} \text{ as } \sigma = (\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n).$$

Consequently, after converting the covariant differentiation using equations (3.1) and (3.2), equation (2.4) and the boundary conditions can be expressed as partial differential equations. Thus, we reformulate equations (2.4)–(2.11) in an extrinsic formulation as follows,

$$\partial_t \gamma_l = (-1)^{k+1} \partial_x^{2k} \gamma_l + F_l(\partial_x^{2k-1}\gamma_l, \ldots, \partial_x \gamma_l, \gamma_l) \qquad \text{in } (0,T) \times I_l,\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q\}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\partial_t \chi_l = \partial_x^2 \chi_l + W_1(\partial_x \chi_l, \chi_l) \qquad \text{in } (0,T) \times I_l,\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\gamma_l(0,x) = \gamma_{0,l}(x), \qquad x \in I_l,\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q\}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\chi_l(0,x) = \chi_{0,l}(x), \qquad x \in I_l,\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\gamma(t, x_l) = p_l, \qquad l \in \{0, q\},\ \ t \in [0,T], \tag{3.8}$$

$$\chi_l(t, x_{l-1}) = p_l, \qquad l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\},\ \ t \in [0,T], \tag{3.9}$$

$$\partial_x^\mu \gamma_l(t, x^*) = b^\mu_{l,x^*}, \qquad t \in [0,T],\ \mu \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\},\ (l, x^*) \in \{(1, x_0), (q, x_q)\}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\gamma_l(t, x_l) = \chi_l(t, x_l) = \gamma_{l+1}(t, x_l) \qquad l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\},\ \ t \in [0,T], \tag{3.11}$$

$$\partial_x^\mu \gamma_{l+1}(t, x_l^+) - \partial_x^\mu \gamma_l(t, x_l^-) = 0,\ t \in [0,T],\ \mu \in \{1, \ldots, 2k-2\},\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\partial_x^{2k-1} \gamma_{l+1}(t, x_l^+) - \partial_x^{2k-1} \gamma_l(t, x_l^-) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2} \partial_x \chi_{l+1}(t, x_l^+) = 0, \qquad t \in [0,T],\ l \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}, \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_l(\partial_x^{2k-1}\gamma_l, \ldots, \gamma_l) &= (-1)^{k+1} W_{2k-1}(\partial_x^{2k-1}\gamma_l, \ldots, \gamma_l) \\ &+ \sum_{\mu=2}^{k} (-1)^{\mu+k+1} R\left(\partial_x^{2k-\mu}\gamma_l + W_{2k-\mu-1}(\partial_x^{2k-\mu-1}\gamma_l, \ldots, \gamma_l), \right. \\ &\qquad \left. \partial_x^{\mu-1}\gamma_l + W_{\mu-2}(\partial_x^{\mu-2}\gamma_l, \ldots, \gamma_l)\right) \partial_x \gamma_l \\ &+ \lambda \cdot \left(\partial_x^2 \gamma_l + W_1(\partial_x \gamma_l, \gamma_l)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

By utilizing the assumption $x_l = l$ for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the parametrization as follows,

$$g_l(t,y) = \gamma_l\left(t, (-1)^{l-1} y + x_{2\left[\frac{l}{2}\right]}\right), \quad g_{0,l}(y) = \gamma_{0,l}\left((-1)^{l-1} y + x_{2\left[\frac{l}{2}\right]}\right), \tag{3.15}$$

$$h_l(t,y) = \chi_l(t, (-1)^{l-1} y + x_{2\left[\frac{l}{2}\right]}), \quad h_{0,l}(y) = \chi_{0,l}((-1)^{l-1} y + x_{2\left[\frac{l}{2}\right]}), \tag{3.16}$$

where $t \in [0,T]$, $y \in [0,1]$, and $[A]$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to A. This transformation facilitates the application of Solonnikov's theory and the Banach fixed-point argument, enabling us to obtain short-time solutions.

- **The case when q is even.**

The evolution equations of (γ, χ) in (2.4)$\sim$(2.11) are converted into the parabolic system of (g,h) by applying (3.15) and (3.16), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g_l = (-1)^{k+1} \cdot \partial_y^{2k} g_l + G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1} g_l, \dots, \partial_y g_l, g_l) & l \in \{1,\dots,q\}, \\ \partial_t h_l = \partial_y^2 h_l + W_1(\partial_y h_l, \partial_y h_l) & l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}, \end{cases} \tag{3.17}$$

with initial-boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \text{(initial conditions)} \\ g_l(0,y) = g_{0,l}(y), & l \in \{1,\dots,q\}, \\ h_l(0,y) = h_{0,l}(y), & l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}, \\ \text{(boundary conditions)} \\ g_1(t,0) = p_0, \quad g_q(t,0) = p_q, \\ h_{2l-y^*-1}(t,y^*) = p_{2l-y^*-1} & l \in \{1,\dots,\frac{q}{2}-1+y^*\}, \\ \partial_y^\mu g_l(t,0) = b_{l,0}^\mu, & \mu \in \{1,\dots,k-1\},\ l \in \{1,q\}, \\ g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*) = h_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*) = g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*), & l \in \{1,\dots,\frac{q}{2}-1+y^*\}, \\ \partial_y^\mu g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*) + (-1)^{\mu-1}\partial_y^\mu g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*) = 0, \\ \qquad \mu \in \{1,\dots,2k-2\},\ l \in \{1,\dots,\frac{q}{2}-1+y^*\}, \\ \partial_y^{2k-1} g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2}\partial_y h_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*) + \partial_y^{2k-1} g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*) = 0, \\ \qquad l \in \{1,\dots,\frac{q}{2}-1+y^*\}, \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

where $t \in [0,T]$, $y \in [0,1]$, $y^* \in \{0,1\}$,

$$G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1} g_l, \dots, g_l) := F_l\left((-1)^{(l-1)(2k-1)}\partial_y^{2k-1} g_l, \dots, (-1)^{(l-1)\mu}\partial_y^\mu g_l, \dots, g_l\right), \tag{3.19}$$

and the boundary datum of g_l, $b_{1,0}^\mu = b_{1,x_0}^\mu$, $b_{q,0}^\mu = (-1)^{(q-1)\mu} b_{q,x_q}^\mu$, $\{b_{l,x^*}^\mu\}$, are constants determined by the constant Dirichlet boundary data of γ_l, $l \in \{1,q\}$.

Let

$$\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{n(2q-1)}) := (g_1, h_1, g_2, h_2, \dots, g_q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2q-1)}, \tag{3.20}$$

where

$$g_\nu = (g_\nu^1, \dots, g_\nu^n), \quad \nu = 1,\dots,q, \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_\nu = (h_\nu^1, \cdots, h_\nu^n), \quad \nu = 1,\dots,q-1. \tag{3.21}$$

The boundary conditions in (3.18) can be formally written as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n(2q-1)} \mathcal{B}_{ij}\,(y,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)\,\Gamma_j(t,y^*) = \Phi_i(t,y^*), \quad i \in \{1,\dots,kn(2q-1)\}, \quad y^* \in \{0,1\},$$

or simply as

$$\mathcal{B}(y^*, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)\Gamma^t(t, y^*) = \Phi(t, y^*), \quad y^* \in \{0, 1\},$$

where the diagonal block matrices $\mathcal{B}(y^*, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)$ are given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}(y^* = 0, t, \partial_y, \partial_t) = \mathrm{diag}(B_0, \overbrace{Id_{n\times n}, B_2, Id_{n\times n}, B_2, \ldots, Id_{n\times n}}^{\frac{q}{2} \text{ times } Id_{n\times n} \text{ and } \frac{q}{2}-1 \text{ times } B_2}, B_0), \\ \mathcal{B}(y^* = 1, t, \partial_y, \partial_t) = \mathrm{diag}(\overbrace{B_2, Id_{n\times n}, B_2, Id_{n\times n}, \ldots, Id_{n\times n}, B_2}^{\frac{q}{2} \text{ times } B_2 \text{ and } \frac{q}{2}-1 \text{ times } Id_{n\times n}}), \end{cases}$$

with

$$B_0 = B_0(y^*, t, \partial_y, \partial_t) = \begin{pmatrix} Id_{n\times n} \\ \partial_y \cdot Id_{n\times n} \\ \vdots \\ \partial_y^{k-1} \cdot Id_{n\times n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$B_2 = B_2(y^*, t, \partial_y, \partial_t) = \begin{pmatrix} Id_{n\times n} & -Id_{n\times n} & 0 \\ 0 & Id_{n\times n} & -Id_{n\times n} \\ \partial_y \cdot Id_{n\times n} & 0 & \partial_y \cdot Id_{n\times n} \\ \partial_y^2 \cdot Id_{n\times n} & 0 & -\partial_y^2 \cdot Id_{n\times n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \partial_y^{2k-2} \cdot Id_{n\times n} & 0 & -\partial_y^{2k-2} \cdot Id_{n\times n} \\ \partial_y^{2k-1} \cdot Id_{n\times n} & \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2}\partial_y \cdot Id_{n\times n} & \partial_y^{2k-1} \cdot Id_{n\times n} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.23}$$

Notice that $B_2(y^* = 0, t, \partial_y, \partial_t) = B_2(y^* = 1, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)$.




Figure 2: The matrix $\mathcal{B}(y^* = 0, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)$ when $q = 2$ or $q = 4$.

- **The case when q is odd.**




Figure 3: The matrix $\mathcal{B}(y^*=1,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)$ when $q=2$ or $q=4$.

Similarly, as q is odd, (2.4)$\sim$(2.11) can be converted into the parabolic system (3.17) with the initial-boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \text{(initial conditions)} \\ g_l(0,y)=g_{0,l}(y), & l\in\{1,\dots,q\}, \\ h_l(0,y)=h_{0,l}(y), & l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}, \\ \text{(boundary conditions)} \\ g_1(t,0)=p_0, \quad g_q(t,1)=p_q, \\ h_{2l-y^*-1}(t,y^*)=p_{2l-y^*-1}, & l\in\{1,\dots,\frac{q-1}{2}\}, \\ \partial_y^\mu g_1(t,0)=b_{1,0}^\mu, \quad \partial_y^\mu g_q(t,1)=b_{q,1}^\mu, & \mu\in\{1,\dots,k-1\}, \\ g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*)=h_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*)=g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*), & l\in\{1,\dots,\frac{q-1}{2}\}, \\ \partial_y^\mu g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*)+(-1)^{\mu-1}\partial_y^\mu g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*)=0, & \\ \qquad\qquad \mu\in\{1,\dots,2k-2\},\ l\in\{1,\dots,\frac{q-1}{2}\}, & \\ \partial_y^{2k-1} g_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*)+\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2}\partial_y h_{2l-y^*}(t,y^*)+\partial_y^{2k-1} g_{2l-y^*+1}(t,y^*)=0, & \\ \qquad\qquad l\in\{1,\dots,\frac{q-1}{2}\}. & \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

where $t\in[0,T]$, $y\in[0,1]$, $y^*\in\{0,1\}$, and $b_{1,0}^\mu=b_{1,x_0}^\mu$,$b_{q,0}^\mu=(-1)^{(q-1)\mu}b_{q,x_q}^\mu$, $\{b_{l,x^*}^\mu\}$ are constants depending on the constant Dirichlet boundary data of γ_l, $l\in\{1,q\}$.

Similarly, the boundary conditions in (3.24) can be written formally as

$$\mathcal{B}(y^*,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)\Gamma^t(t,y^*)=\Phi(t,y^*),\quad y^*\in\{0,1\},$$

where the diagonal block matrices $\mathcal{B}(y^*,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)$ are given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}(y^*=0,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)= & \mathrm{diag}(B_0,\overbrace{B_2,Id_{n\times n},B_2,Id_{n\times n},\dots,B_2,Id_{n\times n}}^{\frac{q-1}{2}\text{ times }B_2\text{ and }\frac{q-1}{2}\text{ times }Id_{n\times n}}), \\ \mathcal{B}(y^*=1,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)= & \mathrm{diag}(\overbrace{Id_{n\times n},B_2,Id_{n\times n},B_2,\dots,Id_{n\times n},B_2}^{\frac{q-1}{2}\text{ times }Id_{n\times n}\text{ and }\frac{q-1}{2}\text{ times }B_2},B_0), \end{cases}$$

with B_0 and B_2 given in (3.22) and (3.23) respectively.




Figure 4: The matrix $\mathcal{B}(y^* = 0, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)$ when $q = 5$.




Figure 5: The matrix $\mathcal{B}(y^* = 1, t, \partial_y, \partial_t)$ when $q = 5$.

Definition 2 (The compatibility conditions of order 0 to (3.17))**.** *We say that the initial datum (g_0, h_0) with the regularity, $g_{0,l} \in C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])$ and $h_{0,l} \in C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])$, is said to fulfill the compatibility conditions of order 0 to the nonlinear parabolic system (3.17) and (3.18) (or (3.17) and (3.24)), if*

$$\partial_t^p \sum_{j=1}^{n(2q-1)} \mathcal{B}_{ij}\left(y, t, \partial_y, \partial_t\right) \Gamma_j(t, y^*)\Big|_{t=0} = \partial_t^p \Phi_i(t, y^*)\Big|_{t=0} \tag{3.25}$$

hold for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, kn(2q-1)\}$ and $p \in \{0, 1\}$ such that after converting ∂_t into ∂_y by (3.17) the order of ∂_y in $\partial_t^p \sum_{j=1}^{n(2q-1)} \mathcal{B}_{ij}\Gamma_j$ is less than or equal to $2k$ as $\Gamma_{2(\nu-1)n+\ell} = g_\nu^\ell$, and less than or equal to 2 as $\Gamma_{(2\nu-1)n+\ell} = h_\nu^\ell$, where $\Gamma_{(2\nu-1)n+\ell}$, g_ν^ℓ, and h_ν^ℓ are defined in (3.20) and (3.21).

Since the map g and h are obtained from γ and χ by reversing the parametrization of γ_l and χ_l, for some l, respectively, and the compatibility conditions in Definition 2 have been adjusted from the geometric compatibility conditions in Definition 1 accordingly, we simply conclude that the initial datum (g_0, h_0) converted from (γ_0, χ_0) fulfills the compatibility conditions of order 0 in Definition 2, if (γ_0, χ_0) fulfills the geometric compatibility conditions in Definition 1.

4 The induced linear problem

Let

$$Z := \left(C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k}, 2k+\alpha}[0,T] \times [0,1]\right)^q \times \left(C^{\frac{2+\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}[0,T] \times [0,1]\right)^{q-1}$$

be the Banach space associated with the norm

$$\|(g,h)\|_Z := \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_l\|_{C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k}, 2k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_l\|_{C^{\frac{2+\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}$$

(see [20, Theorems 1.8.2 and 1.8.6]). Let (g_0, h_0) be obtained from modifying the orientation of $(\gamma_0, \chi_0) \in \Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$, as defined in (3.15) and (3.16). For any $T > 0$, define $X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \subset Z$ by

$$X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} := \big\{(g,h) \in Z : g_l(0,\cdot) = g_{0,l}(\cdot), h_l(0,\cdot) = h_{0,l}(\cdot), \forall\, l\big\}.$$

Let the subset $B_K \subset X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}$ be

$$B_K = \{(g,h) \in X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} : \|(g,h)\|_Z \le K\}.$$

Note that B_K is a bounded, closed, and convex subset of the Banach space Z.

In the following, we linearize the nonlinear parabolic systems and verify the sufficient conditions outlined in [24, Theorem 4.9]. This allows us to apply Solonnikov's theory, thereby obtaining the existence of solutions to the linear parabolic systems. To verify these conditions, we rearrange the maps $(g,h) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(2q-1)}$ as shown in (3.20). It is important to note the canonical correspondence between Γ and (g,h). Therefore, we treat Γ as an element in the Banach space Z and apply the topology of Z to the space of Γ, because of the canonical correspondence.

Note that the initial-boundary conditions, (3.18) and (3.24), are linear equations. We linearize the parabolic system in (3.17) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g_l + (-1)^k \cdot \partial_y^{2k} g_l = G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l, \dots, \partial_y \bar{g}_l, \bar{g}_l) & l \in \{1,\dots,q\}, \\ \partial_t h_l - \partial_y^2 h_l = W_1(\partial_y \bar{h}_l, \bar{h}_l) & l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $(\bar{g}, \bar{h}) \in X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}$. Hence, the linearized system, (3.17)$\sim$(3.18) is (4.1) and (3.18), while the linearized system, (3.17) and (3.24) is (4.1) and (3.24).

Now we follow the same procedure as the previous section to verify the required sufficient conditions in Solonnikov's theory. Observe that the left-hand side of the linear

parabolic system (4.1) can be written as a matrix multiplication $\mathcal{L}(y,t,\partial_y,\partial_t)\Gamma^t$, where $\mathcal{L}(y,t,\partial_y,\partial_t) = \text{diag}\ (\mathcal{L}_{\ell\ell})_{\ell=1}^{n(2q-1)}$ is a diagonal $n(2q-1)\times n(2q-1)$ matrix, and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\ell\ell}(y,t,\partial_y,\partial_t) = \begin{cases} \partial_t + (-1)^k\partial_y^{2k}, & \ell = (2l-2)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\ \partial_t - \partial_y^2, & \ell = (2l-1)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\ell\ell}(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p) = \begin{cases} p+\xi^{2k}, & \ell = (2l-2)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\ p+\xi^2, & \ell = (2l-1)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$L(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p) := \det\mathcal{L}(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p) = \left(p+\xi^{2k}\right)^{nq}\left(p+\xi^2\right)^{n(q-1)},$$

and

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p) := L(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)\mathcal{L}^{-1}(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p) = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\ell\ell})_{\ell=1}^{n(2q-1)},$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\ell\ell} = \begin{cases} (p+\xi^{2k})^{nq-1}(p+\xi^2)^{n(q-1)}, & \ell = (2l-2)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\ (p+\xi^{2k})^{nq}(p+\xi^2)^{n(q-1)-1}, & \ell = (2l-1)n+j, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}. \end{cases}$$

- **The smoothness of coefficients.**

By the assumption on the smoothness of $\bar{g}$, $\bar{h}$, and Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3, the coefficients in the linear systems (4.1) fulfill

$$G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l,\dots,\bar{g}_l)\in C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2k},1+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])\subset C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1]),\qquad \forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q\},$$

and

$$\Pi_{\bar{h}_l}(\partial_y\bar{h}_l,\partial_y\bar{h}_l)\in C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2},1+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])\subset C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1]),\qquad \forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}.$$

- **The parabolicity condition.**

From its definition, the roots of the polynomial $L(x,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ satisfy

$$p = -\xi^{2k}\quad \text{with multiplicity } nq,\qquad \xi\in\mathbb{R},$$

or

$$p = -\xi^2\quad \text{with multiplicity } n(q-1),\quad \xi\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Hence, the uniform parabolicity holds (see [24, page 8]).

- **The complementary conditions of the initial datum.**

Following the definition in [24, page 12], the matrix associated with the initial condition has the form

$$\mathcal{C}_0(y,\partial_y,\partial_t) = Id_{n(2q-1)\times n(2q-1)}.$$

It follows from the definition of $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ that the rows of matrix

$$\mathcal{D}(y,p)=\mathcal{C}_0(y,0,p)\hat{\mathcal{L}}(y,0,0,p)=\mathrm{diag}(p^{n(2q-1)-1})$$

are linearly independent modulo $p^{n(2q-1)}$. Hence, the complementary conditions of the initial datum (g_0,h_0) are fulfilled.

- **The compatibility conditions of the initial datum at the boundaries.**

The verification of the compatibility conditions is almost the same as those in §2. Namely, since the boundary operators for g in either (3.18) or (3.24) are linear and $g_l(0,\cdot)=\bar{g}_l(0,\cdot)=g_{0,l}$, $h_l(0,\cdot)=\bar{h}_l(0,\cdot)=h_{0,l}$, $\forall\, l$, we may conclude that (g_0,h_0) also fulfills the the compatibility conditions of order 0 to the linear equation (See [24, page 98]) if g_0 also fulfills the the compatibility conditions of order 0 to the nonlinear parabolic system in Definition 2.

- **The polynomial M^+ defined in [24, page 11].**

As Re $p\geq 0$, $p\neq 0$, we write

$$p=|p|e^{\mathrm{i}\theta_p},\qquad \text{with } -\frac{1}{2}\pi\leq\theta_p\leq\frac{1}{2}\pi,$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_\mu(y^*,p)=&d_p\cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\mu}{k}\pi}, && \mu\in\{1,\dots,2k\},\\
\zeta_\mu(y^*,p)=&\left(d_p\cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\mu}{k}\pi}\right)^k, && \mu\in\{1,2\},\\
d_p=&|p|^{\frac{1}{2k}}\cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\theta_p-\pi}{2k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe from its definition that the polynomial $L=L(y,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ in variable ξ has $knq+n(q-1)$ roots with positive real parts and $knq+n(q-1)$ roots with negative real parts. The roots with positive real parts are $\{\xi_\mu(y^*,p):\mu=1,\dots,k\}$ with multiplicity nq for each fixed μ, and $\zeta_1(y^*,p)$ with multiplicity $n(q-1)$. The roots with negative real parts are $\{\xi_\mu(y^*,p):\mu=k+1,\dots,2k\}$ with multiplicity nq for each fixed μ, and $\zeta_2(y^*,p)$ with multiplicity $n(q-1)$. Thus, we obtain

$$L=\prod_{\mu=1}^{2k}\left(\xi-\xi_\mu(y^*,p)\right)^{nq}\cdot\prod_{\nu=1}^{2}\left(\xi-\zeta_\nu(y^*,p)\right)^{n(q-1)}.$$

From the definition of polynomial $M^+(y^*,\xi,p)$, we have

$$M^+(y^*,\xi,p)=\prod_{\mu=1}^{k}\left(\xi-\xi_\mu(y^*,p)\right)^{nq}\cdot\left(\xi-\zeta_1(y^*,p)\right)^{n(q-1)}.$$

- **The complementary conditions along the boundaries $[0,T]\times\partial I$.**

To verify the complementary conditions as defined in Solonnikov's theory (see [24, page 11]), we need to show that the rows of the matrix

$$\mathcal{A}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)=\mathcal{B}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)\hat{\mathcal{L}}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$$

are linearly independent modulo $M^+(y^*,\xi,p)$, where $\mathrm{Re}\{p\}\geq 0$, $p\neq 0$. Since no matter when q is even or odd, the matrices $\mathcal{B}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ consist of block matrices, it is sufficient to verify the complementary conditions for each block matrix at the boundaries.

Observe that $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ is also a diagonal block matrix, since $\hat{\mathcal{L}}=\hat{\mathcal{L}}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ is a diagonal matrix, and $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$ is a diagonal block matrix with three different types of block matrices, $B_0(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$, $Id_{n\times n}$, and $B_2(y^*,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)$. Thus, it is sufficient to verify the complementary conditions at $y^*=0$ (or at $y^*=1$) separately on the block matrices, $\mathcal{A}_0:=B_0\cdot\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11}Id_{n\times n}$, $\mathcal{A}_1:=\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1}Id_{n\times n}$, and

$$\mathcal{A}_2:=B_2\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11}Id_{n\times n}\\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1}Id_{n\times n}\\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11}Id_{n\times n}\end{pmatrix}.$$

To verify the linear independence of the rows of matrix $\mathcal{A}_0$ modulo $M^+(y^*=0,\xi,p)$, we need to show that

$$\omega\mathcal{A}_0(y^*=0,t,\mathrm{i}\xi,p)=0\mod M^+(y^*=0,\xi,p)\implies\omega=(\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{kn})=0. \tag{4.2}$$

The equation (4.2) is equivalent to

$$\left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{k-1}(\mathrm{i}\xi)^\mu\cdot\omega_{\mu n+j}\right)(p+\xi^{2k})^{nq-1}=0\mod M^+(y^*=0,\xi,p),\quad\forall\, j\in\{1,\ldots,n\},$$

which is also equivalent to

$$\omega_j+\mathrm{i}\xi\omega_{n+j}+(\mathrm{i}\xi)^2\omega_{2n+j}+\cdots+(\mathrm{i}\xi)^{k-1}\omega_{(k-1)n+j}=0\mod\prod_{\mu=1}^{k}\left(\xi-\xi_\mu(y^*=0,p)\right),\ \forall\, j, \tag{4.3}$$

by applying the same argument in [15, Theorem 2.4]. By letting $\xi=\xi_\mu$ in (4.3), we obtain

$$C\cdot\bar{\omega}_j^t=0 \tag{4.4}$$

where $\bar{\omega}_j=(\omega_j,\omega_{n+j},\omega_{2n+j},\cdots,\omega_{(k-1)n+j})$ and

$$C=\begin{pmatrix}1&\mathrm{i}\xi_1&(\mathrm{i}\xi_1)^2&\cdots&(\mathrm{i}\xi_1)^{k-1}\\ 1&\mathrm{i}\xi_2&(\mathrm{i}\xi_2)^2&\cdots&(\mathrm{i}\xi_2)^{k-1}\\ 1&\mathrm{i}\xi_3&(\mathrm{i}\xi_3)^2&\cdots&(\mathrm{i}\xi_3)^{k-1}\\ \vdots&\vdots&\vdots&\ddots&\vdots\\ 1&\mathrm{i}\xi_k&(\mathrm{i}\xi_k)^2&\cdots&(\mathrm{i}\xi_k)^{k-1}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that the matrix C is the so-called Vandermonde matrix with the property,

$$\det C=\prod_{1\leq\mu<\nu\leq k}(\mathrm{i}\xi_\nu-\mathrm{i}\xi_\mu)\neq 0.$$

This implies that any solution to (4.4) is trivial, i.e., $\bar{\omega}_j=0$, $\forall\, j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$. Thus, (4.2) holds.

To verify the linear independence of the rows of matrix $\mathcal{A}_1 := \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1} Id_{n\times n}$, we need to show that

$$\omega \cdot \mathcal{A}_1 = 0 \mod M^+(y^* = 0, \xi, p) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n) = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

The sufficient conditions in (4.5) is equivalent to

$$\omega_j (p + \xi^{2k})^{nq} (p + \xi^2)^{n(q-1)-1} = 0 \mod M^+(y^* = 0, \xi, p), \quad \forall\, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{4.6}$$

By taking off the common factors from $(p + \xi^{2k})^{nq}(p + \xi^2)^{n(q-1)-1}$ and $M^+(y^* = 0, \xi, p)$ (see [15, Theorem 2.4]), we see that (4.6) is equivalent to

$$\omega_j = 0 \quad \mod (\xi - \zeta_1(y^* = 0, p)).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\omega_j = 0, \quad \forall\, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Since $\xi - \zeta_1(y^* = 0, p)$ is a polynomial of degree 1 in the variable ξ and ω_j is a constant (polynomial of degree 0 in the variable ξ), we conclude that (4.5) must hold.

Next, we show that

$$\omega \cdot \mathcal{A}_2 = 0 \mod M^+(y^* = 0, \xi, p) \implies \omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{(2k+1)n}) = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} Id_{n\times n}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} & -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1} Id_{n\times n} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1} Id_{n\times n} & -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} \\ \mathrm{i}\xi \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} & 0 & \mathrm{i}\xi \cdot Id_{n\times n}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} \\ (\mathrm{i}\xi)^2 \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} & 0 & -(\mathrm{i}\xi)^2 \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ (\mathrm{i}\xi)^{2k-2} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} & 0 & -(\mathrm{i}\xi)^{2k-2} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} \\ (\mathrm{i}\xi)^{2k-1} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} & \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2} \mathrm{i}\xi \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n+1\,n+1} Id_{n\times n} & (\mathrm{i}\xi)^{2k-1} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{11} Id_{n\times n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

From the same argument as above, the sufficient conditions in (4.7) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \omega_j + \sum\limits_{\mu=1}^{2k-1} (\mathrm{i}\xi)^\mu \cdot \omega_{(\mu+1)n+j} = 0 & \mod \prod\limits_{\mu=1}^{k} (\xi - \xi_\mu(y^* = 0, p)), \\ (-\omega_j + \omega_{n+j}) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2} \mathrm{i}\xi \omega_{2kn+j} = 0 & \mod (\xi - \zeta_1(y^* = 0, p)), \\ -\omega_{n+j} + \sum\limits_{\mu=1}^{2k-1} (-1)^{\mu-1} (\mathrm{i}\xi)^\mu \cdot \omega_{(\mu+1)n+j} = 0 & \mod \prod\limits_{\mu=1}^{k} (\xi - \xi_\mu(y^* = 0, p)), \end{cases}$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \omega = 0, \\ \forall\, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}. \end{cases}$$

By substituting $\xi = \xi_1, \cdots, \xi_k$ or $\xi = \zeta_1$ in the corresponding equations, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \omega_j + \sum\limits_{\mu=1}^{2k-1} (\mathrm{i}\xi_r)^\mu \cdot \omega_{(\mu+1)n+j} = 0, \\ (-\omega_j + \omega_{n+j}) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}\mathrm{i}\zeta_1}{\sigma^2} \omega_{2kn+j} = 0, \\ -\omega_{n+j} + \sum\limits_{\mu=1}^{2k-1} (-1)^{\mu-1} (\mathrm{i}\xi_r)^\mu \cdot \omega_{(\mu+1)n+j} = 0, \end{cases} \qquad \forall\, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

By subtraction and addition between the first and the third equations, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \omega_j + \omega_{n+j} + 2\sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1} (\mathrm{i}\cdot\xi_r)^{2\mu}\cdot\omega_{(2\mu+1)n+j} = 0, \\ (-\omega_j + \omega_{n+j}) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}\mathrm{i}\zeta_1}{\sigma^2}\omega_{2kn+j} = 0, \\ \omega_j - \omega_{n+j} + 2\sum_{\mu=1}^{k} (\mathrm{i}\cdot\xi_r)^{2\mu-1}\cdot\omega_{2\mu n+j} = 0, \end{cases} \qquad \forall\, r\in\{1,\dots,k\}, \forall\, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}. \tag{4.8}$$

The first equation in (4.8) can be written as

$$D\cdot\bar{\omega}_j^t = 0$$

where

$$\bar{\omega}_j = (\omega_j + \omega_{n+j},\quad 2\mathrm{i}^2\cdot\omega_{3n+j},\quad 2\mathrm{i}^4\cdot\omega_{5n+j},\dots,\quad 2\mathrm{i}^{2(k-1)}\cdot\omega_{(2k-1)n+j}),$$

and

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \xi_1^2 & \xi_1^4 & \cdots & \xi_1^{2k-2} \\ 1 & \xi_2^2 & \xi_2^4 & \cdots & \xi_2^{2k-2} \\ 1 & \xi_3^2 & \xi_3^4 & \cdots & \xi_3^{2k-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \xi_k^2 & \xi_k^4 & \cdots & \xi_k^{2k-2} \end{pmatrix},$$

is the so-called Vandermonde matrix with the property,

$$\det D = \prod_{1\le\mu<\nu\le k} \left(\xi_\nu^2 - \xi_\mu^2\right). \tag{4.9}$$

Since $\xi_\mu \neq \xi_\nu$, as $\mu \neq \nu$, we derive

$$\det D \neq 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that the first equation in (4.8) can be solved and gives

$$\omega_j + \omega_{n+j} = 0, \qquad \omega_{(2\mu+1)n+j} = 0, \qquad \forall\,\mu\in\{1,\dots,k-1\},\, j\in\{1,\dots,n\}.$$

By letting $\omega_j = -\omega_{n+j}$ in the second and the third equations of (4.8), the two equations can be written as

$$E\cdot\tilde{\omega}^t = 0, \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\tilde{\omega} = \left(\omega_j,\quad \mathrm{i}\omega_{2n+j},\quad \mathrm{i}^3\omega_{4n+j},\quad \dots,\quad \mathrm{i}^{2k-1}\omega_{2kn+j}\right),$$

and

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \xi_1 & \xi_1^3 & \cdots & \xi_1^{2k-3} & \xi_1^{2k-1} \\ 1 & \xi_2 & \xi_2^3 & \cdots & \xi_2^{2k-3} & \xi_2^{2k-1} \\ 1 & \xi_3 & \xi_3^3 & \cdots & \xi_3^{2k-3} & \xi_3^{2k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \xi_k & \xi_k^3 & \cdots & \xi_k^{2k-3} & \xi_k^{2k-1} \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\zeta_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Below, we should show that $\det E \neq 0$, which implies $\omega_j = \omega_{2n+j} = \cdots = \omega_{2kn+j} = 0$. Let F_μ be the matrix obtained from E by taking off the first and last column and the μ-th and last row. Then, for fixed μ,

$$\det F_\mu = \det \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & \xi_1^3 & \cdots & \xi_1^{2k-5} & \xi_1^{2k-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \xi_{\mu-1} & \xi_{\mu-1}^3 & \cdots & \xi_{\mu-1}^{2k-5} & \xi_{\mu-1}^{2k-3} \\ \xi_{\mu+1} & \xi_{\mu+1}^3 & \cdots & \xi_{\mu+1}^{2k-5} & \xi_{\mu+1}^{2k-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \xi_k & \xi_k^3 & \cdots & \xi_k^{2k-5} & \xi_k^{2k-3} \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{\substack{1\le\nu\le k \\ \nu\neq\mu}} \xi_\nu \cdot \prod_{\substack{1\le r<s\le k \\ r,s\neq\mu}} \left(\xi_s^2 - \xi_r^2\right).$$

By expanding the determinant of the matrix E along the last row then along the first column and using (4.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det E =& (-1)^{k+3} \cdot \left(\prod_{1\le\nu\le k} \xi_\nu \right) \cdot \det D + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \zeta_1 \cdot \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^{k} (-1)^{\mu-1} \det F_\mu \right) \\ =& (-1)^{k+3} \cdot \left(\prod_{1\le\nu\le k} \xi_\nu \right) \cdot \det D + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \zeta_1 \cdot \sum_{\mu=1}^{k} (-1)^{\mu-1} \prod_{\substack{1\le\nu\le k \\ \nu\neq\mu}} \xi_\nu \cdot \prod_{\substack{1\le r<s\le k \\ r,s\neq\mu}} \left(\xi_s^2 - \xi_r^2\right) \\ =& \left(\prod_{1\le\nu\le k} \xi_\nu \right) \cdot \det D \cdot H, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H := (-1)^{k+3} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \zeta_1 \cdot \sum_{\mu=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{\mu-1}}{\xi_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{1\le\nu<\mu} (\xi_\mu^2 - \xi_\nu^2)} \cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{\mu<\nu\le k} (\xi_\nu^2 - \xi_\mu^2)}.$$

From the definition of ξ_μ and a simple calculation, we obtain

$$\xi_r^2 - \xi_s^2 = 2\mathrm{i} \cdot (d_p)^2 \cdot \sin\frac{(r-s)\pi}{k} \cdot e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}(r+s)\pi}{k}}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H =& (-1)^{k+3} \\ &+ \frac{\zeta_1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{\mu=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{\mu-1}}{d_p e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{1\le\nu<\mu\le k} 2\mathrm{i}(d_p)^2 \sin\frac{(\mu-\nu)\pi}{k} e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}(\nu+\mu)\pi}{k}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{1\le\mu<\nu\le k} 2\mathrm{i}\cdot(d_p)^2 \sin\frac{(\nu-\mu)\pi}{k} e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}(\nu+\mu)\pi}{k}}} \\ =& (-1)^{k+3} + \frac{\zeta_1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \sum_{\mu=1}^{k} A_\mu \cdot C_\mu \cdot K_\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_\mu := \frac{(-1)^{\mu-1}}{d_p \cdot [2\mathrm{i}\cdot(d_p)^2]^{k-1}}, \qquad C_\mu := \frac{1}{\prod_{1\le\nu<\mu\le k} \sin\frac{(\mu-\nu)\cdot\pi}{k}} \frac{1}{\prod_{\mu<\nu\le k} \sin\frac{(\nu-\mu)\cdot\pi}{k}} > 0,$$

and

$$K_\mu := e^{-\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{1\le\nu\le k\\ \nu\neq\mu}} e^{-\frac{\mathrm{i}(\nu+\mu)\pi}{k}} = e^{-\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{1\le\nu\le k\\ \nu\neq\mu}} e^{-\frac{\mathrm{i}\nu\pi}{k}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{1\le\nu\le k\\ \nu\neq\mu}} e^{-\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}} = (-\mathrm{i})^{k+1} \cdot (-1)^{\mu} \cdot e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}}.$$

Thus, we simply obtain that

$$H = (-1)^{k+1} \cdot \left(\frac{\zeta_1}{2^{k-1} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot (d_p)^{2k-1}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{k} C_\mu \cdot e^{\frac{\mathrm{i}\mu\pi}{k}} + 1 \right).$$

From a direct computation, we derive

$$\frac{\zeta_1}{2^{k-1} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot (d_p)^{2k-1}} = \mathrm{i} \cdot \frac{|p|^{\frac{1}{2k}-\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{k-1} \cdot \sigma^2} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\cdot(\frac{\theta_p}{2} - \frac{(2k-1)(\theta_p-\pi)}{2k})}.$$

Since $C_\mu > 0$ is independent of p, we conclude that H can't be identically null. Since it is easy to see from the definition of ξ_ν that $\prod_{1\le\nu\le k} \xi_\nu \neq 0$, we finally conclude that $\det E \neq 0$, which implies the required nullity $\omega_j = \omega_{2n+j} = \cdots = \omega_{2kn+j} = 0$. Thus, the complementary conditions at the boundaries hold.

We are now ready to derive the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\lambda, \sigma \in (0,\infty)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, and $\{x\} = x - [x]$. Suppose that (g_0, h_0), $g_{0,l}, h_{0,l} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$, is an initial datum to the linear problem (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions (3.18) as q is even or those of (3.24) as q is odd. Assume that (g_0, h_0) with the regularity, $g_{0,l} \in C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1]), \forall\, l \in \{1,\dots,q\}$, $h_{0,l} \in C^{2,\alpha}([0,1]), \forall\, l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}$ fulfills the compatibility conditions of order 0 to the linear parabolic problem (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions. Then, for any $T > 0$ and $(\bar{g}, \bar{h}) \in X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}$, there is a unique solution $(g,h) \in X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}$ to the linear parabolic problem (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions and the induced map γ, defined in (3.15), fulfills $\gamma(t,\cdot) \in C^{2k-2}([x_0,x_q])$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned}\|(g,h)\|_{X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}} \le & C_0(n) \cdot \Bigg(\sum_{l=1}^{q} \big\| G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) \big\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \big\| W_1(\partial_y \bar{h}_l, \bar{h}_l) \big\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q} (|p_{l-1}| + |p_l|) \\ & + \sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1} \Big(|b^\mu_{1,0}| + |b^\mu_{q,2\{\frac{q}{2}\}}| \Big) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])} \Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since we have now verified all the sufficient conditions in [24, Theorem 4.9], the theorem is the direct result by applying [24, Theorem 4.9]. □

5 The proof of our main result

5.1 The local solutions

The proof is obtained from applying Theorem 4.1 and Banach fixed point Theorem.

Theorem 5.1 (The short-time existence)**.** *Assume that* (g_0, h_0) *is the initial datum of the nonlinear problem* (3.17) *with the initial-boundary conditions* (3.18) *as* q *is even or* (3.24) *as* q *is odd. Suppose that* $g_{0,l} \in C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])$ *and* $h_{0,l} \in C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])$, $\forall\, l$, *fulfill the compatibility conditions of order* 0 *in Definition 2. Then, there exists a positive number* $t_0 = t_0\left(m, n, \alpha, \lambda, \sigma, \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right)$ *so that* $(g, h) \in X^{t_0}_{(g_0,h_0)}$ *is the unique solution and fulfills the regularity*

$$\begin{cases} g_l \in C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k},2k+\alpha}\left([0,t_0]\times[0,1]\right)\bigcap C^{\infty}\left((0,t_0]\times[0,1]\right), & l \in \{1,\dots,q\}, \\ h_l \in C^{\frac{2+\alpha}{2},2+\alpha}\left([0,t_0]\times[0,1]\right)\bigcap C^{\infty}\left((0,t_0]\times[0,1]\right), & l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}$ *is the* C^1*-norm of the Riemannian curvature tensors of manifold* M, $\|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}$ *is the* C^{2k-1}*-norm of the second fundamental form* Π_M *of* $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, *and*

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 = 2C_0(n)\cdot\Bigg(&\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}g_{0,l},\dots,g_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\|W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l}, h_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{q}(|p_{l-1}| + |p_l|) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1}(|b^{\mu}_{1,0}| + |b^{\mu}_{q,2\{\frac{q}{2}\}}|) + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])}\Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the induced map $\gamma : [x_0, x_q] \to M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *defined by* (3.15) *fulfills* $\gamma(t,\cdot) \in C^{2k-2}([x_0, x_q])$, $\forall\, t \in [0, t_0]$.

Proof. By applying Theorem 4.1 to the linear system (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions (3.18) or (3.24), we introduce the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} : X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_K &\to X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_K \\ (\bar{g}, \bar{h}) &\mapsto (g, h), \end{aligned}$$

where (g, h) is a solution to (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions for any sufficiently small $T > 0$.

• **Self-maps. i.e.,** $\exists\, t_2 > 0$ **so that** $\mathcal{G}\left(X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}\right) \subset X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}$, $\forall\, T \in (0, t_2)$**.**

We will show the self-map property of $\mathcal{G}$ on B_{K_0} by choosing a proper $K_0 > 0$ below. We use the notation

$$R_M(\gamma)(\cdot,\cdot)_{\cdot} = (R \circ \gamma)(\cdot,\cdot)_{\cdot}$$

to represent the Riemannian curvature tensors of M. By applying the triangle inequalities in the Hölder spaces, (3.3), and the technical lemmas, Lemmas 6.2∼6.3, and Lemma 6.4 with $v = \bar{g}_l - g_{0,l}$ or $v = \bar{h}_l - h_{0,l}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_M(\bar{g}_l) - R_M(g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \leq& \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}\|\bar{g}_l - g_{0,l}\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\ \leq& C\left(m, n, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}\right)\cdot T^{\beta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - W_i(\partial_y^i g_{0,l}, \dots, g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C(m,n,K_0)\cdot \|W_i\|_{C^1(\mathbb{R}^n\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^n\times M)}\cdot \sum_{j\le i}\|\partial_y^j \bar{g}_l - \partial_y^j g_{0,l}\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C(m,n,K_0,\|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)})T^{\beta_1}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|W_1(\partial_y \bar{h}_l, \bar{h}_l) - W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l}, g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C(m,n,K_0)\cdot \|W_1\|_{C^1(\mathbb{R}^n\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^n\times M)}\cdot \sum_{j\le 1}\|\partial_y^j \bar{g}_l - \partial_y^j g_{0,l}\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C(m,n,K_0,\|\Pi_M\|_{C^1(M)})T^{\beta_2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\beta_1 = \min\left\{\frac{\alpha}{2k}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2k}\right\}$, $\beta_2 = \min\left\{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right\}$, $\forall\, i \le 2k-1$. Thus, by applying (3.3), (3.19), the triangle inequalities in the Hölder spaces, the technical lemmas, Lemmas 6.2∼6.4, and the algebraic identity

$$
a^p - b^p = (a-b)(a^{p-1} + a^{p-2}b + \cdots + ab^{p-2} + b^{p-1}), \qquad p\in\mathbb{N},\ p\ge 2, \tag{5.1}
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1} g_{0,l}, \dots, g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C\left(\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right)\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|R_M(\bar{g}_l) - R_M(g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&+ C\left(\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}\right)\times \\
&\quad\times\sum_{i\le 2k-1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - W_i(\partial_y^i g_{0,l}, \dots, g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\quad + C\left(\lambda, \sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}, \|R_M\|_{C^0(M)}\right)\times \\
&\qquad\qquad\times\sum_{i\le 2k-2}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l - \partial_y^i g_{0,l}\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C\left(m,n,\lambda, \sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right)T^{\beta_1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Drawing on the inequality established in Theorem 4.1 from the theory of linear parabolic

systems and utilizing the triangle inequalities within the Hölder spaces, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(g,h)\|_{X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}} \leq\, & C_0 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l,\dots,\bar{g}_l) - G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}g_{0,l},\dots,g_{0,l})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
& + C_0 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \big\|W_1(\partial_y\bar{h}_l,\bar{h}_l) - W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l},h_{0,l})\big\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
& + C_0 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}g_{0,l},\dots,g_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} + C_0 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l},h_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} \\
& + C_0 \cdot \bigg(\sum_{l=1}^{q}(|p_{l-1}| + |p_l|) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1}(|b^{\mu}_{1,0}| + |b^{\mu}_{q,2\{\frac{q}{2}\}}|) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])} \bigg) \\
\leq & C_1 T^{\beta} \\
& + C_0 \cdot \bigg(\sum_{l=1}^{q} \big\|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}g_{0,l},\dots,g_{0,l})\big\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l},h_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} \\
& + \sum_{l=1}^{q}(|p_{l-1}| + |p_l|) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1}\Big(|b^{\mu}_{1,0}| + |b^{\mu}_{q,2\{\frac{q}{2}\}}|\Big) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])} \bigg),
\end{aligned}$$

for any sufficiently small $T > 0$, where

$$C_1 = C_1\left(\lambda, m, n, \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right),$$

and $\beta = \min\{\beta_1,\beta_2\} = \min\left\{\frac{1-\alpha}{2k}, \frac{\alpha}{2k}\right\}$. Now, we may conclude that $\|(g,h)\|_{X^{t_2}_{(g_0,h_0)}} \leq K_0$ by choosing $K_0 \in (0,\infty)$ fulfilling

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{K_0}{2} =& C_0 \cdot \bigg(\sum_{l=1}^{q} \|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}g_{0,l},\dots,g_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|W_1(\partial_y h_{0,l},g_{0,l})\|_{C^{0,\alpha}([0,1])} \\
& + \sum_{l=1}^{q}(|p_{l-1}| + |p_l|) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{k-1}(|b^{\mu}_{1,0}| + |b^{\mu}_{q,2\{\frac{q}{2}\}}|) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])} + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])} \bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

and by choosing $t_2 > 0$ fulfilling

$$C_1 t_2^{\beta} \leq \frac{K_0}{2}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{G}\left(X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}\right) \subset X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}, \qquad \forall\, T \in (0,t_2].$$

• **Contraction-maps.** Below, we prove that $\mathcal{G} : X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0} \to X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}$ is a contraction-map for some $T > 0$ by proving the existence of $t_0 \in (0,t_2]$ such that

$$\|(g,h) - (e,f)\|_{X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}} \leq C_2\, T^{\beta}\, \big\|(\bar{g},\bar{h}) - (\bar{e},\bar{f})\big\|_{X^T_{g_0}} < \big\|(\bar{g},\bar{h}) - (\bar{e},\bar{f})\big\|_{X^T_{g_0}}, \qquad (5.2)$$

$\forall\, T\in(0,t_0]$, $\forall\ (\bar g,\bar h),(\bar e,\bar f)\in X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}\cap B_{K_0}$, and $(g,h)=\mathcal{G}\big((\bar g,\bar h)\big)$, $(e,f)=\mathcal{G}\big((\bar e,\bar f)\big)$, and

$$C_2=C_2\left(\lambda,m,n,\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])},\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])},K_0,\|R_M\|_{C^1(M)},\|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right)$$

is a positive constant.

Observe from (3.1), (3.2), (3.18), (3.24), (4.1) that the difference $(g,h)-(e,f)$ fulfills the linear system

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t(g_l-e_l)+(-1)^k\partial_y^{2k}(g_l-e_l)=G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar g_l,\dots,\bar g_l)-G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar e_l,\dots,\bar e_l)\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\text{in } (0,T)\times(0,1),\ l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\
\partial_t(h_l-f_l)-\partial_y^2(h_l-f_l)=W_1(\partial_y\bar h_l,\bar h_l)-W_1(\partial_y\bar f_l,\bar f_l)\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\text{in } (0,T)\times(0,1),\ l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\
(g_l-e_l)(0,y)=0,\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\forall\, y\in[0,1],l\in\{1,\dots,q\},\\
(h_l-f_l)(0,y)=0,\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\forall\, y\in[0,1],l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\},\\
(g_1-e_1)(t,0)=0,\quad (g_q-e_q)\big(t,2\{\tfrac{q}{2}\}\big)=0\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad t\in[0,T]\\
(h_{2l-y^*-1}-f_{2l-y^*-1})(t,y^*)=0\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad l\in\{1,\dots,\big[\tfrac{q-1}{2}\big]+\big(1-2\{\tfrac{q}{2}\}\big)\,y^*\},\\
\partial_y^\mu(g_1-e_1)(t,0)=0,\quad \partial_y^\mu(g_q-e_q)\big(t,2\{\tfrac{q}{2}\}\big)=0\qquad t\in[0,T],\ \ \mu\in\{1,\dots,k-1\}\\
(g_{2l-y^*}-e_{2l-y^*})(t,y^*)=(h_{2l-y^*}-f_{2l-y^*})(t,y^*)=(g_{2l-y^*+1}-e_{2l-y^*+1})(t,y^*),\\
\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad l\in\{1,\dots,\big[\tfrac{q-1}{2}\big]+\big(1-2\{\tfrac{q}{2}\}\big)\,y^*\}\\
\partial_y^\mu\left(g_{2l-y^*}-h_{2l-y^*}\right)(t,y^*)+(-1)^{\mu-1}\partial_y^\mu\left(g_{2l-y^*+1}-h_{2l-y^*+1}\right)(t,y^*)=0,\\
\qquad\qquad (t,y^*)\in[0,T]\times\{0,1\},\ \ 1\le\mu\le 2k-2,\ \ l\in\{1,\dots,\big[\tfrac{q-1}{2}\big]+\big(1-2\{\tfrac{q}{2}\}\big)\,y^*\}\\
\partial_y^{2k-1}(g_{2l-y^*}-e_{2l-y^*})(t,y^*)+\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma^2}\partial_y(h_{2l-y^*}-f_{2l-y^*})(t,y^*)\\
\qquad\qquad +\partial_y^{2k-1}(g_{2l-y^*+1}-e_{2l-y^*+1})(t,y^*)=0,\qquad\qquad l\in\{1,\dots,\tfrac{q}{2}-1+y^*\},
\end{cases}\tag{5.3}$$

Given that $(g,h)=\mathcal{G}\big((\bar g,\bar h)\big)$, $(e,f)=\mathcal{G}\big((\bar e,\bar f)\big)$, and their initial data $\bar g_l(0,\cdot)=g_{0,l}(\cdot)$, $\bar e_l(0,\cdot)=g_{0,l}(\cdot)$, $\bar h_l(0,\cdot)=h_{0,l}(\cdot)$, $\bar f_l(0,\cdot)=h_{0,l}(\cdot)$ satisfy the compatibility conditions of order 0 to (4.1) with the initial-boundary conditions (3.18) or (3.24) (for q odd), the initial datum of $(g,h)-(e,f)$ is null and adheres to the compatibility conditions of order 0 for the linear parabolic system (5.3). As a result, we can employ the theory of linear parabolic systems as outlined in [24, Theorem 4.9] to (5.3), establishing that $(g,h)-(e,f)$ represents the unique solution to the linear system with the provided estimate,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(g,h)-(e,f)\|_{X^T_{(g_0,h_0)}}\\
&\le C_0\cdot\left(\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar g_l,\dots,\bar g_l)-G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar e_l,\dots,\bar e_l)\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}\right)\\
&+C_0\cdot\left(\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\|W_1(\partial_y\bar h_l,\bar h_l)-W_1(\partial_y\bar f_l,\bar f_l)\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by applying the algebraic identity (5.1), the triangle inequality in the Hölder spaces, (3.3), and leveraging the technical lemmas, Lemmas 6.2∼6.3, and Lemma 6.4 with either

$v = \bar{g}_l - \bar{e}_l$ or $v = \bar{h}_l - \bar{f}_l$, we can establish the following estimates,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|R_M(\bar{g}_l) - R_M(\bar{e}_l)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\qquad \le C\left(m, n, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}\right) \cdot T^{\beta_1} \cdot \|\bar{g}_l - \bar{e}_l\|_{C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k},2k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{e}_l, \dots, \bar{e}_l)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\qquad \le C(m, n, K_0) \cdot \|W_i\|_{C^1(\mathbb{R}^n\times\cdots\times\mathbb{R}^n\times M)} \cdot \sum_{j\le i} \|\partial_y^j \bar{g}_l - \partial_y^j \bar{e}_l\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\qquad \le C\left((m, n, K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right) \cdot T^{\beta_1} \cdot \|\bar{g}_l - \bar{e}_l\|_{C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k},2k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|W_1(\partial_y \bar{h}_l, \bar{h}_l) - W_1(\partial_y \bar{f}_l, \bar{f}_l)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\qquad \le C\left((m, n, K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^1(M)}\right) \cdot T^{\beta_2} \cdot \|\bar{h}_l - \bar{f}_l\|_{C^{\frac{2+\alpha}{2},2+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}. \qquad (5.4)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by applying (3.14), (3.3), and the technical lemmas, Lemmas 6.2∼6.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - G_l(\partial_y^{2k-1}\bar{e}_l, \dots, \bar{e}_l)\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C\left(K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right) \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|R_M(\bar{g}_l) - R_M(\bar{e}_l)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\quad + C\left(K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}\right) \sum_{i\le 2k-1} \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l, \dots, \bar{g}_l) - W_i(\partial_y^i \bar{e}_l, \dots, \bar{e}_l)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\quad + C\left(\lambda, K_0, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}, \|R_M\|_{C^0(M)}\right) \sum_{i\le 2k-2} \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|\partial_y^i \bar{g}_l - \partial_y^i \bar{e}_l\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2k},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \\
&\le C\left(m, n, \lambda, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right) \cdot T^{\beta_1} \cdot \|\bar{g}_l - \bar{e}_l\|_{C^{\frac{2k+\alpha}{2k},2k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (5.4), we may choose a sufficiently small

$$t_0 = t_0\left(\alpha, \lambda, n, \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|g_{0,l}\|_{C^{2k,\alpha}([0,1])}, \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \|h_{0,l}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}([0,1])}, K_0, \|R_M\|_{C^1(M)}, \|\Pi_M\|_{C^{2k-1}(M)}\right)$$

such that $t_0 \in (0, t_2)$ and the term $C_2 T^\beta$ in (5.2) fulfills

$$C_2 T^\beta < 1, \ \forall\, T \in (0, t_0].$$

With the existence of such $t_0 > 0$, the operator

$$\mathcal{G} : X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0} \to X^T_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}$$

not only represents a self-map but also serves as a strict contraction map for any $T \in (0, t_0]$.

By applying the Banach fixed-point theorem to the set $X^{t_0}_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}$, we conclude that there exists a *unique* fixed point $(g, h) \in X^{t_0}_{(g_0,h_0)} \cap B_{K_0}$, which is also a solution to (3.17) with the initial-boundary conditions (3.18) or (3.24).

• **Smoothing, i.e.,** $g_l \in C^\infty((0,t_0]\times[0,1])$**,** $\forall\, l$**.** The approach mirrors that of the proof outlined in [15, Theorem 2.2]. It involves constructing smooth cut-off functions with null initial data, verifying the compatibility conditions of higher-order linear parabolic partial differential equations (PDEs) as per [24, Theorem 4.9], and employing bootstrapping techniques to enhance regularity. Essentially, the regularity of g and h can be improved by demonstrating that

$$\begin{cases} g_l \in \bigcap\limits_{\ell=1}^{\infty} C^{\frac{2k+\ell+\alpha}{2k},2k+\ell+\alpha}\left(\left[\frac{2\ell-1}{2\ell}\varepsilon,t_0\right]\times[0,1]\right), \\ h_l \in \bigcap\limits_{\ell=1}^{\infty} C^{\frac{2+\ell+\alpha}{2},2+\ell+\alpha}\left(\left[\frac{2\ell-1}{2\ell}\varepsilon,t_0\right]\times[0,1]\right), \end{cases}$$

for arbitrary $\varepsilon\in(0,t_0)$. For more details, the reader is referred to [15, 24].

□

5.2 The global solutions and the asymptotics

We introduce terminology that specifically addresses polynomials of covariant derivatives of tensors, particularly those associated with the tangent vector γ_x. For tangent vector fields $v, v_1, \ldots, v_k$ on M, we denote by $v_1 * \cdots * v_k$ a term of the type

$$v_1 * \cdots * v_k = \begin{cases} \langle v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}\rangle \cdots \langle v_{i_{k-1}}, v_{i_k}\rangle & \text{, for } k \text{ even,} \\ \langle v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}\rangle \cdots \langle v_{i_{k-2}}, v_{i_{k-1}}\rangle \cdot v_{i_k} & \text{, for } k \text{ odd,} \end{cases}$$

where $i_1,\ldots,i_k$ is any permutation of $1,\ldots,k$, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle = \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_g$, and g is the Riemannian metric of M. In a slightly more general context, we permit some of the tangent vector fields v_i to be scalar functions, where the $*$-product simplifies to multiplication. The notation $P_b^{a,c}(v)$ represents the summation of finitely many terms $D_x^{\mu_1}v * \cdots * D_x^{\mu_b}v$ with $\mu_1+\cdots+\mu_b = a$, $\max\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_b\}\le c$, and with universal coefficients, depending on the derivatives of finite or zero order of Riemannian curvature tensor R and Riemannian metric g, where D_x is the covariant differential operator. The universal coefficients and the numbers of terms in $P_b^{a,c}(v)$ are assumed to be bounded from above and below by constants depending only on a, b, K_0, where K_0 is determined by the C^∞-norm of the Riemannian curvature tensor R. It is easy to verify the following:

$$\begin{cases} D_x\left(P_{b_1}^{a_1,c_1}(v) * P_{b_2}^{a_2,c_2}(v)\right) = D_xP_{b_1}^{a_1,c_1}(v) * P_{b_2}^{a_2,c_2}(v) + P_{b_1}^{a_1,c_1}(v) * D_xP_{b_2}^{a_2,c_2}(v), \\ P_{b_1}^{a_1,c_1}(v) * P_{b_2}^{a_2,c_2}(v) = P_{b_1+b_2}^{a_1+a_2,max\{c_1,c_2\}}(v),\ D_xP_{b_2}^{a_2,c_2}(v) = P_{b_2}^{a_2+1,c_2+1}(v). \end{cases}$$

We introduce the notation $Q_b^{a,c}(\gamma_x)$ to streamline the summation of polynomials. Namely,

$$Q_b^{a,c}(\gamma_x) := \sum_{\substack{[\![\mu,\nu]\!]\le[\![a,b]\!] \\ \xi\le c}} P_\nu^{\mu,\xi}(\gamma_x) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{a}\sum_{\nu=1}^{2a+b-2\mu}\sum_{\xi=0}^{c} P_\nu^{\mu,\xi}(\gamma_x),$$

where $[\![\mu,\nu]\!] := 2\mu+\nu$, and $a,c\in\mathbb{N}_0$, $b\in\mathbb{N}$. For simplicity, we also use the notation $P_b^a(\gamma_x)$ and $Q_b^a(\gamma_x)$, to represent $P_b^{a,a}(\gamma_x)$ and $Q_b^{a,a}(\gamma_x)$, respectively. The notations $D_x^0\gamma_l = \gamma_l$ and $D_x^0\chi_l = \chi_l$ are introduced for simplicity, enabling the use of the covariant differentiation

notation D_x in a manner where $D_x\gamma_l = \gamma_{l,x}$ and $D_x\chi_l = \chi_{l,x}$, respectively. Similarly, this extension applies to covariant differentiation with respect to t, denoted as D_t.

Below is a technical lemma on converting higher-order covariant derivatives into covariant derivatives w.r.t. space variable x of parametrization of the map γ.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $(\gamma, \chi) \in \Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ fulfills the parabolic system (2.4). Then, for any $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we obtain*

$$D_t^\mu D_x^\ell \gamma_l = (-1)^{(k+1)\mu} D_x^{2k\mu+\ell-1}\gamma_{l,x} + Q_3^{2k\mu+\ell-3}(\gamma_{l,x}), \tag{5.5}$$

$$D_t^\mu D_x^\ell \chi_l = D_x^{2\mu+\ell-1}\chi_{l,x} + Q_3^{2\mu+\ell-3}(\chi_{l,x}). \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. We prove (5.5) inductively on μ. For $\mu = 1$ and $\ell = 0$, it follows directly from applying (2.4). Now, consider the case where $\mu = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$. We apply (6.1) and (2.4), resulting in

$$\begin{aligned} D_t D_x^\ell \gamma_l =& D_t D_x^{\ell-1}\gamma_{l,x} = D_x^{\ell-1} D_t \gamma_{l,x} + \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} D_x^{\ell-1-r}\left[R(\gamma_{l,t}, \gamma_{l,x}) D_x^{r-1}\gamma_{l,x}\right] \\ =& D_x^\ell \gamma_{l,t} + \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} D_x^{\ell-1-r}\left[R(\gamma_{l,t}, \gamma_{l,x}) D_x^{r-1}\gamma_{l,x}\right] \\ =& (-1)^{k+1} D_x^{2k+\ell-1}\gamma_{l,x} + Q_3^{2k+\ell-3}(\gamma_{l,x}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Hence, (5.5) holds for $\mu = 1$. By applying (5.7) and the definition of $P_b^{a,c}(\gamma_{l,x})$, along with an induction argument, we obtain

$$D_t P_b^{a,c}(\gamma_{l,x}) = Q_b^{a+2k,c+2k}(\gamma_{l,x}). \tag{5.8}$$

Using (5.7) and (5.8), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^\mu D_x^\ell \gamma_l =& D_t(D_t^{\mu-1} D_x^\ell \gamma_l) = D_t\left((-1)^{(k+1)(\mu-1)} D_x^{2k(\mu-1)+\ell-1}\gamma_{l,x} + Q_3^{2k(\mu-1)+\ell-3}(\gamma_{l,x})\right) \\ =& (-1)^{(k+1)\mu} D_x^{2k\mu+\ell-1}\gamma_{l,x} + Q_3^{2k\mu+\ell-3}(\gamma_{l,x}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

The identity (5.6) is proved inductively on μ. As $\mu = 1$ and $\ell = 0$, it follows from applying (2.4). As $\mu = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$, we apply (6.1) and (2.4) to have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t D_x^\ell \chi_l =& D_t D_x^{\ell-1}\chi_{l,x} = D_x^{\ell-1} D_t \chi_{l,x} + \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} D_x^{\ell-1-r}\left[R(\chi_{l,t}, \chi_{l,x}) D_x^{r-1}\chi_{l,x}\right] \\ =& D_x^\ell \chi_{l,t} + \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} D_x^{\ell-1-r}\left[R(\chi_{l,t}, \chi_{l,x}) D_x^{r-1}\chi_{l,x}\right] \\ =& D_x^{\ell+1}\chi_{l,x} + Q_3^{\ell-1}(\chi_{l,x}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Hence, (2.4) holds as $\mu = 1$. By applying (5.9) and (5.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^\mu D_x^\ell \chi_l =& D_t(D_t^{\mu-1} D_x^\ell \chi_l) = D_t\left(D_x^{2(\mu-1)+\ell-1}\chi_{l,x} + Q_3^{2(\mu-1)+\ell-3}(\chi_{l,x})\right) \\ =& D_x^{2\mu+\ell-1}\chi_{l,x} + Q_3^{2\mu+\ell-3}(\chi_{l,x}) \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1. Based on the short-time existence result in Theorem 5.1, we only need to prove the long-time existence. The proof is by contradiction. Namely, assume on the contrary that any solution to (2.4)$\sim$(2.11) only exists up to $t_{max} \in [t_0, \infty)$, i.e., either $\gamma_l(t_{max}, \cdot)$ or $\chi_l(t_{max}, \cdot)$ fails to be smooth for the first time at $t = t_{max}$ some l. Then, we show that $\mathcal{Z}_\mu(t)$, defined in (2.15), remains uniformly bounded up to t_{max} for any $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$. This gives the contradiction.

From differentiating the first term on the R.H.S. of (2.15) by ∂_t and from applying Lemmas 5.2 and 6.6, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\|D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\|^2_{L^2(I_l)} = I_1 + I_2 + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx, \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} I_1 = (-1)^{k+1}\sum\limits_{l=1}^{q}\int\limits_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-1}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx, \\ I_2 = \sum\limits_{l=1}^{q}\sum\limits_{r=2}^{k-1}(-1)^{r+k+1}\int\limits_{I_l}\left\langle R\left(D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-r-1}\gamma_{l,x}, D_x^{r-2}\gamma_{l,x}\right)\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx, \end{cases} \tag{5.11}$$

are terms involving the highest-order derivatives. We will apply integration by parts to these terms so that the Gronwall inequalities can be obtained from using interpolation inequalities. By letting $V = D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}$ in (6.3) of Lemma 6.6, by applying Lemma 5.2, together with using integration by parts and (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 =& (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l} \\ &-(-1)^{k+1}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_xD_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx - \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu-1}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Similarly, by letting $V = D_x^{2k-3}\gamma_{l,x}$ in (6.3) of Lemma 6.6, and by applying Lemma 5.2, together with using integration by parts and (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_xD_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx \\ =&\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-3}\gamma_{l,x}, D_xD_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l} \\ &\quad -\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-3}\gamma_{l,x}, D_x^2D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx \\ =&-\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-3}\gamma_{l,x}, D_x^2D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the boundary terms vanish by applying Lemma 6.7, i.e.,

$$\left\langle D_t^{\mu}(\Delta_l D_x^{2k-3}\partial_x\gamma)(t), D_xD_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l(t, x_l^-)\right\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall\, l = 1, \cdots, q-1.$$

Hence,

$$I_1 = (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-3}\gamma_{l,x}, D_x^2 D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\,dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx$$
$$+ (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l}.$$

By the same procedure as above, i.e., by applying Lemmas 5.2, 6.7, and integration by parts to the main terms in I_1 inductively, we finally derive

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 =& -\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{k-1}\gamma_{l,x}, D_x^k D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\,dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx \\ &+ (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l} \\ =& -\sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l}|D_x^{2k\mu+k-1}\gamma_{l,x}|^2\,dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx \\ &+ (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{q}\left\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l\right\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

From the symmetry of the Riemannian curvature tensors, we may re-write I_2 as

$$I_2 = \sum_{l=1}^{q}\sum_{r=2}^{k-1}(-1)^{r+k+1}\int_{I_l}\left\langle R\left(D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\gamma_l, \gamma_{l,x}\right)D_x^{r-2}\gamma_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu}D_x^{2k-r-1}\gamma_{l,x}\right\rangle\,dx$$

so that we can apply integration by parts, and Lemmas 5.2 and 6.7 inductively to expressed I_2 as

$$I_2 = \sum_{l=1}^{q}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x})\,dx. \tag{5.14}$$

By applying (5.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^{\mu}D_x^2\chi_l =& D_x^{2\mu+1}\chi_{l,x} + Q_3^{2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}) = D_x\left(D_t^{\mu}\chi_l - Q_3^{2\mu-2}(\chi_{l,x})\right) + Q_3^{2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}) \\ =& D_x D_t^{\mu}\chi_l + Q_3^{2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}). \end{aligned}$$

From differentiating the second term on the R.H.S. of (2.15) by ∂_t and from applying integration by parts, and Lemma 5.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 :=& \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l}\langle D_t^{\mu}D_x\chi_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\chi_l\rangle\,dx \qquad (5.15)\\ =& \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\langle D_t^{\mu}\chi_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\chi_l\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l}\langle D_t^{\mu}\chi_{l,x}, D_x D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\chi_l\rangle\,dx \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4\mu-2,2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x})dx \\ =& \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\langle D_t^{\mu}\chi_{l,x}, D_t^{\mu-1}\partial_t\chi_l\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l}|D^{2\mu}\chi_{l,x}|^2\,dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1}\int_{I_l} Q_4^{4\mu-2,2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x})dx. \end{aligned}$$

Observe from the boundary conditions (2.6), (2.8), (2.9), and (2.11) that the boundary terms in (5.13) and (5.15) vanish. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 + I_3 = &- \sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} |D_x^{2k\mu+k-1}\gamma_{l,x}|^2 \, dx - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} |D^{2\mu}\chi_{l,x}|^2 \, dx \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu-1}(\gamma_{l,x}) \, dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4\mu-2,2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

From these identities, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) + \mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) + 2\sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} |D_x^{2k\mu+k-1}\gamma_{l,x}|^2 \, dx + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} |D_x^{2\mu}\chi_{l,x}|^2 \, dx \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x}) \, dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4\mu-2,2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}) \, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

By applying Lemmas 6.8 and 6.5 to the terms on the R.H.S. of (5.17), we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4k\mu+2k-4,2k\mu+k-1}(\gamma_{l,x}) \, dx + \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} Q_4^{4\mu-2,2\mu-1}(\chi_{l,x}) \, dx \\ \leq &\varepsilon \left(\sum_{l=1}^{q} \int_{I_l} |D_x^{2k\mu+k-1}\gamma_{l,x}|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} \int_{I_l} |D_x^{2\mu-1}\chi_{l,x}|^2 \, dx \right) \\ &+ C\left(k, \lambda, n, \sigma, K_{2k\mu+k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot), \chi(t_0,\cdot)]\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is any arbitrary small number and $\{K_0, K_1, \ldots, K_m, \ldots\}$ is a given sequence of positive numbers such that $\|R_M\|_{C^m} \leq K_m$, $\forall\, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. From (5.17) and choosing $\varepsilon = 1$ in (5.18), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) + \mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) \leq C\left(k, \lambda, n, \sigma, K_{2k\mu+k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot), \chi(t_0,\cdot)]\right). \tag{5.19}$$

By applying Gronwall inequality to (5.19), we obtain

$$\mathcal{Z}_\mu(t) \leq C\left(k, \lambda, n, \mu, K_{2k\mu+k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot), \chi(t_0,\cdot)], \mathcal{Z}_\mu(t_0)\right). \tag{5.20}$$

By applying Lemmas 5.2, 6.8, and 6.5 to (5.20), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \sum\limits_{l=1}^{q} \|D_x^{2k\mu-1}\gamma_{l,x}\|_{L^2(I_l)}^2 \leq C\left(k, \lambda, n, K_{2k\mu+k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot), \chi(t_0,\cdot)], \mathcal{Z}_\mu(t_0,\cdot)\right), \\ \sum\limits_{l=1}^{q-1} \|D_x^{2\mu-1}\chi_{l,x}\|_{L^2(I_l)}^2 \leq C\left(k, \lambda, n, \sigma, K_{2k\mu+k-1}, \mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot), \chi(t_0,\cdot)], \mathcal{Z}_\mu(t_0,\cdot)\right). \end{cases} \tag{5.21}$$

Thus, the required uniform estimates for (2.15) are derived for any $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$.

The asymptotic behavior of the global solutions is established by using a similar argument to that found in [15, 16]. For the sake of completeness, we restate the proof below, albeit concisely. From the uniform bounds in (5.21), we may choose a subsequence of

$\gamma(t_j,\cdot)$, which converges smoothly to $\gamma_\infty(\cdot)$ as $t_j\to\infty$. Let $u(t):=\mathcal{Z}_1(t)$, which is given in (2.15). From (5.20), we obtain

$$u(t)\le C\left(k,\lambda,n,K_{2k\mu+k-1},\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot),\chi(t_0,\cdot)]\right),$$

which implies $u\in L^1([t_0,\infty))$. Together with (5.19), we obtain

$$|u'(t)|\le C\left(k,\lambda,n,K_{2k\mu+k-1},\mathcal{E}_k^{\lambda,\sigma}[(\gamma(t_0,\cdot),\chi(t_0,\cdot)]\right)$$

Hence $u(t)\to 0$ as $t\to\infty$. Together with the regularity of (γ,χ), this implies that $(\gamma_\infty(\cdot),\chi_\infty(\cdot))\in\Theta_{\mathcal{P}}$, γ_∞ fulfills $\mathcal{L}_x^{2k}(\gamma_{\infty,l})=0$ on (x_{l-1},x_l), $\forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q\}$, and χ_∞ fulfills $D_x\partial_x\chi_{\infty,l}=0$ on (x_{l-1},x_l), $\forall\, l\in\{1,\dots,q-1\}$.

The proof for showing $\gamma_\infty\in C^{2k-2,1}([x_0,x_q])$ simply follows from the smoothness of $\gamma_{\infty,l}\in C^\infty([x_{l-1},x_l)]$, and the uniformly bounds of $\|\gamma_{\infty,l}\|_{W^{\mu,2}([x_{l-1},x_l])}$, for any $\mu\in\mathbb{N}$. □

6 Appendix

Lemma 6.1. *([18, (3.5)]) Let $0=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_q=1$, $I_l=(x_{l-1},x_l)$, and Ω denote the set of all C^{2k-2} paths $\gamma:[0,q]\to M$ such that $\gamma_l:=\gamma_{|\bar I_l}$ is smooth C^∞. We define the tangent space of Ω at a path γ, $T_\gamma\Omega$, as the set of all C^{k-1} vector fields $W:[0,q]\to TM$ such that $W_{|_{[x_{l-1},x_l]}}$ is smooth. If $\alpha:(-a,a)\times[0,q]\to M$ is a one-parameter variation of $\gamma\in\Omega$ is defined by*

$$\alpha(\varepsilon,x)=exp_\gamma(\varepsilon W(x))$$

and $W\in T_\gamma\Omega$ is the variational vector field associated to α, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\big|_{\varepsilon=0}\mathcal{E}_k[\alpha(\varepsilon,x)]=&(-1)^k\sum_{l=1}^q\int_{I_l}\Big\langle D_x^{2k-1}\partial_x\gamma_l\\&\qquad+\sum_{\mu=2}^k(-1)^\mu R\left(D_x^{2k-\mu-1}\partial_x\gamma_l,D_x^{\mu-2}\partial_x\gamma_l\right)\partial_x\gamma_l,W\Big\rangle\,dx\\&+\sum_{\ell=1}^k\sum_{l=1}^q(-1)^{\ell-1}\Big\langle D_x^{k-\ell}W,D_x^{k+\ell-2}\partial_x\gamma_l\Big\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}^+}^{x_l^-}\\&+\sum_{\mu=2}^{k-1}\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-j}\sum_{l=1}^q(-1)^{\ell-1}\Big\langle D_x^{k-\mu-\ell}R(W,\partial_x\gamma_l)D_x^{\mu-2}\partial_x\gamma_l,D_x^{k+\ell-2}\partial_x\gamma_l\Big\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}^+}^{x_l^-},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\big|_{\varepsilon=0}\mathcal{T}[\alpha(\varepsilon,x)]=-\sum_{l=1}^q\int_{I_l}\langle D_x\partial_x\gamma_l,W\rangle\,dx+\sum_{l=1}^q\langle W,\partial_x\gamma_l\rangle\Big|_{x_{l-1}}^{x_l}.$$

For readers' convenience, we recall some notation for parabolic Hölder spaces from [24, page 66]. For any $g : [0,T] \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, and $\rho \in (0,1)$, let

$$[g]_{\rho,y} = \sup_{(t,y),(t,y') \in [0,T]\times[0,1]} \frac{|g(t,y) - g(t,y')|}{|y-y'|^\rho},$$
$$[g]_{\rho,t} = \sup_{(t,y),(t',y) \in [0,T]\times[0,1]} \frac{|g(t,y) - g(t',y)|}{|t-t'|^\rho}.$$

Let

$$C^{\frac{\ell+\alpha}{2k},\ell+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1]), \qquad \text{for } \alpha \in (0,1) \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

represent the set of functions $g : [0,T] \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, which have continuous derivatives $\partial_y^\mu \partial_t^\nu g$ for all $\nu, \mu \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $2\nu + \mu \le \ell$, and with the finite norm

$$\|g\|_{C^{\frac{\ell+\alpha}{2k},\ell+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} = \sum_{2k\nu+\mu=0}^{\ell} \sup_{(t,y)\in[0,T]\times[0,1]} |\partial_y^\mu \partial_t^\nu g(t,y)| + \sum_{2k\nu+\mu=\ell} [\partial_y^\mu \partial_t^\nu g]_{\alpha,y}$$
$$+ \sum_{0<\ell+\alpha-2k\nu-\mu<2k} [\partial_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu g]_{\frac{\ell+\alpha-2k\nu-\mu}{2k},t}.$$

Lemma 6.2. *([6, Remark B.1]) From the definition, it follows that, for $m \le k$ and $m, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have*

$$C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1]) \subset C^{\frac{m+\alpha}{4},m+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1]).$$

Moreover, if $v \in C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])$, then $\partial_x^l v \in C^{\frac{k-l+\alpha}{4},k-l+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])$ for all $0 \le l \le k$ so that

$$\|\partial_x^l v\|_{C^{\frac{k-l+\alpha}{4},k-l+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])} \le \|v\|_{C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])}.$$

In particular at each fixed $x \in [0,1]$, we have $\partial_x^l v(\cdot,x) \in C^{s,\beta}([0,T])$ with $s = [\frac{k-l+\alpha}{4}]$ and $\beta = \frac{k-l+\alpha}{4} - s$.

Lemma 6.3. *([6, Lemma B.2]) For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$ and $T > 0$, we have*

1. *if $v, w \in C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])$, then*

$$\|vw\|_{C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}} \le C\|v\|_{C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}} \|w\|_{C^{\frac{k+\alpha}{4},k+\alpha}},$$

   with $C = C(k) > 0$;

2. *if $v \in C^{\frac{\alpha}{4},\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])$, $v(t,x) \ne 0$ for all (t,x), then*

$$\left\|\frac{1}{v}\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{4},\alpha}} \le \left\|\frac{1}{v}\right\|^2_{C^0([0,T]\times[0,1])} \|v\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{4},\alpha}}.$$

Similar statements are true for functions in $C^{k,\beta}([0,T])$ and $C^{k,\beta}([0,1])$.

Lemma 6.4. *([6, Lemma B.5]) Let $T < 1$ and $v \in C^{\frac{4+\alpha}{4},4+\alpha}([0,T]\times[0,1])$ such that $v(0,x) = 0$, for any $x \in [0,1]$ then*

$$\|\partial_x^l v\|_{C^{\frac{m+\alpha}{4},m+\alpha}} \le C(m)T^\beta \|v\|_{C^{\frac{4+\alpha}{4},4+\alpha}}$$

for all $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $l + m < 4$. Here $\beta = \max\{\frac{1-\alpha}{4}, \frac{\alpha}{4}\} \in (0,1)$; more precisely for $l \ge 1$ then $\beta = \frac{\alpha}{4}$. In particular, for each $x \in [0,1]$ fixed

$$\|\partial_x^l v(\cdot,x)\|_{C^{0,\frac{m+\alpha}{4}}([0,T])} \le C(m)T^\beta \|v\|_{C^{\frac{4+\alpha}{4},4+\alpha}}$$

for all $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $l + m < 4$.

Lemma 6.5. *([5, Lemma A.1]) Let $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be positive numbers and assume $0 < i_1 + \cdots + i_n < 2$, where $i_\mu > 0$ for all $\mu = 1, \dots, n$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$a_1^{i_1} \cdot a_2^{i_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot a_n^{i_n} \le \varepsilon(a_1^2 + \ldots + a_n^2) + C_\varepsilon.$$

For simplicity, we follow [7] and our previous papers to define the Sobolev norms,

$$\|g\|_{k,p} := \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \|D_x^\ell g\|_p \quad \text{with} \quad \|D_x^\ell g\|_p := \Big(\int_I |D_x^\ell g|^p dx\Big)^{1/p},$$

which are not the same as the scale-invariant Sobolev norms in [7].

Lemma 6.6. *([17, Lemma 2.3]) Let $\gamma : (t_0,t_1)\times(0,1) \to M$ be a smooth map, and $V : (t_0,t_1)\times(0,1) \to T_\gamma M$ be a smooth vector field associated with γ. Then,*

$$D_t D_x \gamma = D_x D_t \gamma, \tag{6.1}$$

$$D_t D_x^\mu V = D_x^\mu D_t V + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\mu} D_x^{\mu-\nu}\left[R(\gamma_t,\gamma_x) D_x^{\nu-1} V\right], \quad \forall\, \mu \ge 1, \tag{6.2}$$

$$D_t^\mu D_x V = D_x D_t^\mu V + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\mu} D_t^{\mu-\nu}\left[R(\gamma_t,\gamma_x) D_t^{\nu-1} V\right], \quad \forall\, \mu \ge 1. \tag{6.3}$$

Lemma 6.7. *([17, Lemma 2.5]) Let $\gamma_l : (t_0,t_1)\times I_l \to M$ be a smooth solution to (2.4) for any $l \in \{1,\cdots,q\}$. Then, we have the followings.*

(i)

$$D_x^\mu D_t^\ell \gamma_1(t,x_0) = 0,\ D_x^\mu D_t^\ell \gamma_q(t,x_q) = 0,\ \forall\, \mu \in \{0,\dots,k-1\},\ \ell \in \mathbb{N},\ t \in (t_0,t_1). \tag{6.4}$$

(ii) As $l \in \{1,\dots,q-1\}$,

$$D_x^\mu D_t^\ell \partial_t \gamma_{l+1}(t,x_l^+) = D_x^\mu D_t^\ell \partial_t \gamma_l(t,x_l^-),\ \forall\, \mu \in \{0,\dots,2k-2\},\ \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ t \in (t_0,t_1). \tag{6.5}$$

Proof. The proof mirrors that found in [17, Lemma 2.5] due to the identical boundary conditions on γ_l. Consequently, we omit the intricacies of the proof. □

Lemma 6.8. *([17, Lemma 2.6]) Let $\gamma : [t_0, t_1) \times I \to M$ be a smooth map and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume that the Riemannian curvature tensor R is smooth and uniformly bounded in C^∞-norm. If $A, B \in \mathbb{N}$ with $B \geq 2$ and $A + \frac{1}{2}B < 2\ell + 5$, then we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{[[a,b]] \leq [[A,B]] \\ c \leq \ell+2, 2 \leq b}} \int_I \left| P_b^{a,c}(\gamma_x) \right| \, dx \leq C \cdot \|\gamma_x\|_{\ell+2,2}^{\alpha} \, \|\gamma_x\|_{L^2(I)}^{B - \frac{A}{\ell+2}} \tag{6.6}$$

where $\alpha = (A + \frac{1}{2}B - 1)/(\ell + 2)$ and $C = C(n, \ell, A, B, N_m)$ for some constant $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\|R_M\|_{C^m} \leq N_m$.

Acknowledgement. During the period working on this project, C.-C. L has been partially supported by the research grant (NSTC 112-2115-M-003-002) of the National Science and Technology Council of Taiwan, and the iCAG program of Higher Education Sprout Project of National Taiwan Normal University and the Ministry of Education (MoE) of Taiwan; T.D.T. has been partially supported by the grant (MoST 111-2115-M-003-014) of National Science and Technology Council of Taiwan.

Data availability. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations. The authors have no conflict of interests related to this publication.

References

[1] L. Abrunheiro, M. Camarinha, J. C. Cuchi, and P. Santos, A general framework for quantum splines. *Int. J. Geom. Methods. Mod. Phys.* 15 (2018), no. 09, 1850147.

[2] D. C. Brody, D. D. Holm, and D. M. Meier, Quantum splines, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* , 109, 100501 (2012).

[3] M. Camarinha, F. Silva Leite, and P. Crouch, Splines of class C^k on non-Euclidean spaces. *IMA J. Math. Control Inform.* 12 (1995), no. 4, 399–410.

[4] E. Cornea, H. Zhu, P. Kim, J. G. Ibrahim, Regression models on Riemannian symmetric spaces, *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 79 (2017), no. 2, 463–482.

[5] A. Dall'Acqua, C.-C. Lin, and P. Pozzi, Flow of elastic networks: long time existence results, *Geom. Flows.* 4 (2019), no. 1, 83–136.

[6] A. Dall'Acqua, C.-C. Lin, and P. Pozzi, Elastic flow of networks: short-time existence result. *J. Evolution Eq.* 21 (2021), no. 2, 1299–1344.

[7] A. Dall'Acqua, and P. Pozzi, A Willmore-Helfrich L^2-flow of curves with natural boundary conditions, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 22 (2014), no. 4, 617–669.

[8] S. A. Gabriel, and J. T. Kajiya, Spline interpolation in curved space, *State of the Art in Image Synthesis, SIGGRAPH'85 Course Notes*, vol. 11, ACM Press, New York, 1985, pp. 1–14.

[9] F. Gay-Balmaz, D. D. Holm, D. M. Meier, T. S. Ratiu, and F.-X. Vialard, Invariant higher-order variational problems, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 309 (2012), 413–458.

[10] F. Gay-Balmaz, D. D. Holm, D. M. Meier, T. S. Ratiu, and F.-X. Vialard, Invariant higher-order variational problems II, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 22 (2012), 553–597.

[11] B. Heeren, M. Rumpf, and B. Wirth, Variational time discretization of Riemannian splines. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 39 (2019), no. 1, 61–104.

[12] J. Hinkle, P. T. Fletcher, S. Joshi, Intrinsic polynomials for regression on Riemannian manifolds, *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, 50 (2014), no. 1-2, 32–52.

[13] P. E. Jupp and J. T. Kent, Fitting smooth paths to spherical data, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. C* 36 (1987), no. 1, 34–46.

[14] K.-R. Kim, I. L. Dryden, H. Le, K. E. Severn, Smoothing splines on Riemannian manifolds, with applications to 3D shape space. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 83 (2021), no.1, 108–132.

[15] C.-C. Lin, H. R. Schwetlick, and D. T. Tran, An elastic flow for nonlinear spline interpolations in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 375 (2022), no. 7, 4893–4942.

[16] C.-C. Lin, Y.-K. Lue, and D. T. Tran, A second-order elastic flow for path planning in $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, (2023) Published online. https://worldscientific.com/doi/10.1142/S0219199722500808

[17] C.-C. Lin and D. T. Tran, Higher-order Riemannian splines and the interpolation problem: an approach of gradient flows, Preprint ArXiv (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10513v2

[18] L. Machado, F. Silva Leite, and K. Krakowski, Higher-order smoothing splines versus least squares problems on Riemannian manifolds. *J. Dyn. Control Syst.* 16 (2010), no. 1, 121–148.

[19] L. Machado, T. Teresa, and M. Monteiro, A numerical optimization approach to generate smoothing spherical splines. *J. Geom. Phys.* 111 (2017), 71–81.

[20] R. E. Megginson, An introduction to Banach space theory. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 183. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[21] L. Noakes, Null cubics and Lie quadratics. *J. Math. Phys.* 44 (2003), no. 3, 1436–1448.

[22] L. Noakes, G. Heinzinger, and B. Paden, Cubic splines on curved spaces. *IMA J. Math. Control Inform.* 6 (1989), no. 4, 465–473.

[23] C. Samir, P.-A. Absil, A. Srivastava, and E. Klassen, A gradient-descent method for curve fitting on Riemannian manifolds. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 12 (2012), no.1, 49–73.

[24] V. A. Solonnikov, Boundary Value Problems of Mathematical Physics. III, *Proceedings of the Steklov institute of Mathematics (1965), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I.*, No. 83, 1967.