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#### Abstract

We consider a multi component gas mixture with translational and internal energy degrees of freedom assuming that the number of particles of each species remains constant. We will illustrate the derived model in the case of two species, but the model can be easily generalized to multiple species. The two species are allowed to have different degrees of freedom in internal energy and are modelled by a system of kinetic ES-BGK equations featuring two interaction terms to account for momentum and energy transfer between the species. We prove consistency of our model: conservation properties, positivity of the temperature, H-theorem and convergence to a global equilibrium in the form of a global Maxwell distribution. Thus, we are able to derive the usual macroscopic conservation laws. For numerical purposes we apply the Chu reduction to the developed model for polyatomic gases and give an application for a gas consisting of a mono atomic and a diatomic species.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper we shall concern ourselves with a kinetic description of gas mixtures for polyatomic molecules. In the case of mono atomic molecules and two species this is traditionally done via the Boltzmann equation for the density distributions $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$, see for example $[9,10]$. Under certain assumptions the complicated interaction terms of the Boltzmann equation can be simplified by a so called BGK approximation, consisting of a collision frequency multiplied by the deviation of the distributions from local Maxwellians. This approximation should be constructed in a way such that it has the same main properties of the Boltzmann equation namely conservation of mass, momentum and energy, further it should have an H-theorem with its entropy inequality and the equilibrium must still be Maxwellian. BGK models give rise to efficient numerical computations, which are asymptotic preserving, that is they remain efficient even approaching the hydrodynamic regime $[3,4,11-13,20]$. Evolution of a polyatomic gas is very important in applications, for instance air consists of a gas mixture of polyatomic molecules. But, most kinetic models modelling air deal with the case of a mono atomic gas consisting of only one species.

In the literature one can find two types of models for polyatomic molecules. There are models which contain a sum of collision terms on the right-hand side corresponding to the elastic and inelastic collisions. Examples are the models of Rykov [21], Holway [14] and Morse [19]. The other type of models contain only one collision term on the right-hand side taking into account both elastic and inelastic interactions. Examples for this are Bernard, Iollo, Puppo [5] or the model by Bisi and Caceres [6] modelling chemical interactions. In this paper we want to extend the model of Bernard, Iollo and Puppo [5] from one species of molecules to a gas mixture of polyatomic molecules. In contrast to mono atomic molecules, in a polyatomic gas energy is not entirely stored in the kinetic energy of its molecules but also in their rotational and vibrational modes.

[^0]For simplification we present the model in the case of two species. We allow the two species to have different degrees of freedom in internal energy. For example, we may consider a mixture consisting of a mono atomic and a diatomic gas. In addition, we want to model it via an ES-BGK approach in order to reproduce the correct Boltzmann hydrodynamic regime close to the asymptotic continuum limit. The ES-BGK approximation was suggested by Holway in the case of one species [14]. The H-Theorem of this model then was proven in [2]. Brull and Schneider relate this model to a minimization problem in [7].

The outline of the paper is as follows: in section 2 we will present the extension of the BGK model for polyatomic molecules from [5] to two species of polyatomic molecules. In section 3, we extend it to an ES-BGK model and check if it is well-defined. In sections 3.1 to 3.4 we prove the conservation properties and the H -theorem. We show the positivity of all temperatures and quantify the structure of the equilibrium. In section 4, we compare our model with an other model presented in the literature from [2] which considers an ES-BGK model for one species of polyatomic molecules. In section 5.1 we apply the method of Chu reduction to our model in order to reduce the complexity of the variables for the rotational and vibrational energy degrees of freedom for numerical purposes. In section 5.2 we give an application in the case of a mono atomic and a diatomic molecule.
2. The BGK approximation For simplicity in the following we consider a mixture composed of two different species. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, d \in \mathbb{N}$ be the phase space variables and $t \geq 0$ the time. Let $M$ be the total number of different rotational and vibrational degrees of freedom and $l_{k}$ the number of internal degrees of freedom of species $k, k=1,2$. Note that the sum $l_{1}+l_{2}$ is not necessarily equal to $M$, because the two species could both have the same internal degree of freedom. Then $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ is the variable for the internal energy degrees of freedom, $\eta_{l_{k}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ coincides with $\eta$ in the components corresponding to the internal degrees of freedom of species $k$ and is zero in the other components. For example, we can consider two species both composed of molecules consisting of two atoms, such that the molecules have rotational degrees of freedom in addition to the three translational degrees of freedom. In general, a molecule consisting of two atoms has three possible axes around which it can rotate. But since the energy needed to rotate the molecule around the axes parallel to the line connecting the two atoms is very high (see for example [15]), this does not occur, so we have two rotational degrees of freedom. In this example we have $M=l_{1}=l_{2}=2$.
Since we want to describe two different species, our kinetic model has two distribution functions $f_{1}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{1}}, t\right)>0$ and $f_{2}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{2}}, t\right)>0$. Furthermore we relate the distribution functions to macroscopic quantities by mean-values of $f_{k}, k=1,2$ as follows

$$
\int f_{k}\left(v, \eta_{l_{k}}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
1  \tag{2.1}\\
v \\
\eta_{l_{k}} \\
m_{k}\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2} \\
m_{k}\left|\eta_{l_{k}}-\bar{\eta}_{k}\right|^{2} \\
m_{k}\left(v-u_{k}(x, t)\right) \otimes\left(v-u_{k}(x, t)\right)
\end{array}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}}=:\left(\begin{array}{c}
n_{k} \\
n_{k} u_{k} \\
n_{k} \bar{\eta}_{k} \\
d n_{k} T_{k}^{t} \\
l_{k} n_{k} T_{k}^{r} \\
\mathbb{P}_{k}
\end{array}\right), \quad k=1,2
$$

where $n_{k}$ is the number density, $u_{k}$ the mean velocity, $T_{k}^{t}$ the mean temperature of the translation, $T_{k}^{r}$ the mean temperature of the internal energy degrees of freedom for example rotation or vibration and $\mathbb{P}_{k}$ the pressure tensor of species $k, k=1,2$. Note that in this paper we shall write $T_{k}^{t}$ and $T_{k}^{r}$ instead of $k_{B} T_{k}^{t}$ and $k_{B} T_{k}^{r}$, where $k_{B}$ is Boltzmann's constant. In the following, we will require $\bar{\eta}_{k}=0$, which means that the
energy in rotations clockwise is the same as in rotations counter clockwise. Similar for vibrations.

The distribution functions are determined by two equations to describe their time evolution. Furthermore we only consider binary interactions. So the particles of one species can interact with either themselves or with particles of the other species. In the model this is accounted for by introducing two interaction terms in both equations. These considerations allow us to write formally the system of equations for the evolution of the mixture. The following structure containing a sum of the collision operators is also given in $[9,10]$.
We are interested in a BGK approximation of the interaction terms. This leads us to define equilibrium distributions not only for each species itself but also for the two interspecies distributions. Choose the collision terms as BGK operators and denote them for future reference by $Q_{11}, Q_{12}, Q_{21}$ and $Q_{22}$. Then the model can be written as:

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t} f_{1}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(v f_{1}\right) & =\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(M_{1}-f_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left(M_{12}-f_{1}\right) \\
\partial_{t} f_{2}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(v f_{2}\right) & =\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(M_{2}-f_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

with the Maxwell distributions

$$
\begin{align*}
M_{k}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{k}}, t\right) & =\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}}\right), \\
M_{k j}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{k}}, t\right) & =\frac{n_{k j}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k j}}{m_{k}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{k j}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{k j}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{k_{j}}}{m_{k}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Theta_{k j}}{m_{k}}}\right), \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

for $j, k=1,2, j \neq k$, where $\nu_{11} n_{1}$ and $\nu_{22} n_{2}$ are the collision frequencies of the particles of each species with itself, while $\nu_{12} n_{2}$ and $\nu_{21} n_{1}$ are related to interspecies collisions. To be flexible in choosing the relationship between the collision frequencies, we now assume the relationship

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{12}=\varepsilon \nu_{21}, \quad 0<\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \varepsilon \leq 1 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The restriction $\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \varepsilon \leq 1$ is without loss of generality. If $\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \varepsilon>1$, exchange the notation 1 and 2 and choose $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. In addition, we assume that all collision frequencies are positive.

Since rotational/vibrational and translational degrees of freedom relax at a different rate, $T_{k}^{t}$ and $T_{k}^{r}$ will first relax to partial temperatures $\Lambda_{k}$ and $\Theta_{k}$ respectively. Conservation of internal energy then requires that at each time

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{2} n_{k} \Lambda_{k}=\frac{d}{2} n_{k} T_{k}^{t}+\frac{l_{k}}{2} n_{k} T_{k}^{r}-\frac{l_{k}}{2} n_{k} \Theta_{k}, \quad k=1,2 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, $\Lambda_{k}$ can be written as a function of $\Theta_{k}$. In equilibrium we expect the two temperatures $\Lambda_{k}$ and $\Theta_{k}$ to coincide, so we close the system by adding the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{t} M_{k}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} M_{k}=\frac{\nu_{k k} n_{k}}{Z_{r}^{k}} \frac{d+l_{k}}{d}\left(\widetilde{M}_{k}-M_{k}\right)+\nu_{k k} n_{k}\left(M_{k}-f_{k}\right)  \tag{2.6}\\
&+\nu_{k j} n_{j}\left(M_{k j}-f_{k}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

for $j, k=1,2, j \neq k$, where $Z_{r}^{k}$ are given parameters corresponding to the different rates of decays of translational and rotational/vibrational degrees of freedom. Here $M_{k}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{k}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{k}}, t\right)=\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}}\right), \quad k=1,2 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\widetilde{M}_{k}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{M}_{k}=\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}}{m_{k}}} d+l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{m_{k}\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 T_{k}}-\frac{m_{k}\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 T_{k}}\right), \quad k=1,2 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T_{k}$ is the total equilibrium temperature and is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{k}:=\frac{d \Lambda_{k}+l_{k} \Theta_{k}}{d+l_{k}}=\frac{d T_{k}^{t}+l_{k} T_{k}^{r}}{d+l_{k}} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second equality follows from (2.5). If we multiply (2.6) by $\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}$, integrate with respect to $v$ and $\eta_{l_{k}}$ and use (2.9), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t} \Theta_{k}+u_{k} \cdot \nabla_{x} \Theta_{k}=\frac{\nu_{k k} n_{k}}{Z_{r}^{k}}\left(\Lambda_{k}-\Theta_{k}\right) & +\nu_{k k} n_{k}\left(\Theta_{k}-T_{k}^{r}\right)  \tag{2.10}\\
& +\nu_{k j} n_{j}\left(\Theta_{k j}-T_{k}^{r}\right), \quad k=1,2
\end{align*}
$$

We obtained a macroscopic equation which describes the relaxation of the temperature $\Theta_{k}$ towards the temperature $\Lambda_{k}$ and the relaxation of $\Theta_{k}$ towards the rotational and vibrational temperature $T_{k}^{r}$ and of $T_{k}^{r}$ relaxing towards the mixture temperature $\Theta_{k j}$ in accordance with equation (2.2). Note that equation (2.10) together with mass, momentum and total energy conservation, is equivalent to (2.6). In addition, (2.2) and (2.6) are consistent. If we multiply the equations for species $k$ of (2.2) and (2.6) by $v$ and integrate with respect to $v$ and $\eta_{l_{k}}$, we get in both cases for the right-hand side

$$
\nu_{k j} n_{j} n_{k}\left(u_{j k}-u_{k}\right)
$$

and if we compute the total internal energy of both equations, we obtain in both cases

$$
\frac{1}{2} \nu_{k j} n_{k} n_{j}\left[d \Lambda_{j k}+l_{j} \Theta_{j k}-\left(d \Lambda_{j}+l_{j} \Theta_{j}\right)\right] .
$$

We will see this in section 2.2 in theorem 3.2.
We recall that we assume that the mean values of the momentum due to the internal degrees of freedom $\bar{\eta}_{1}, \bar{\eta}_{2}, \bar{\eta}_{12}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{21}$ are zero. The structure of the collision terms ensures that at equilibrium or when $\nu_{k j} \rightarrow \infty$ the distribution functions become Maxwell distributions. With this choice of the Maxwell distributions $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ have the same densities, mean velocities and internal energies as $f_{1}$ respective $f_{2}$. This guarantees the conservation of mass, momentum and energy in interactions of one species with itself. The remaining parameters $n_{12}, n_{21}, u_{12}, u_{21}, \Lambda_{12}, \Lambda_{21}, \Theta_{12}$ and $\Theta_{21}$ will be determined further down using conservation of the number of particles, total momentum and total energy, together with some symmetry considerations.
3. Extension to an ES-BGK model It is well known that a drawback of the BGK approximation is its incapability of reproducing the correct Boltzmann hydrodynamic regime in the asymptotic continuum limit. Therefore, a modified version called ES-BGK model was suggested by Holway in the case of one species [14]. In this standard ES-BGK model, in the Maxwellian $M_{k}$, the scalar temperature $T_{k}^{t}$ related to the distribution function $f_{k}$ will be replaced by a linear combination of the temperature $T_{k}^{t}$ and the pressure tensor $\mathbb{P}_{k}$. In the polyatomic case described in this paper the translational temperature $T_{k}^{t}$ is different from the temperature $\Lambda_{k}$ of the Maxwellian $M_{k}$ given by (2.7). Now, we want to extend this temperature $\Lambda_{k}$ to a tensor $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$ with $\operatorname{trace}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right)=n_{k} \Lambda_{k}$ such that again we can consider a linear combination of the temperature $\Lambda_{k}$ and the tensor $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$. In the BGK case described in the previous section we determined the time evolution of $\Theta_{k}$ by considering equation (2.6) with the Maxwellian $M_{k}$ given by (2.7) and the Maxwellian $\widetilde{M}_{k}$ given by (3.2) with the total equilibrium temperature $T_{k}$ given by (2.9) which leads to a time evolution of $\Theta_{k}$ given by (2.10). $\Lambda_{k}$ is then obtained by (2.5). Now, in the ES-BGK case we determine the time evolution of $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$ by considering equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \widehat{G}_{k}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} \widehat{G}_{k}=\frac{\nu_{k k} n_{k}}{Z_{r}^{k}} \frac{d+l_{k}}{d}\left(\widetilde{G}_{k}-\widehat{G}_{k}\right)+\nu_{k k} n_{k}\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right)+\nu_{k j} n_{j}\left(M_{k j}-f_{k}\right), \quad k=1,2 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the extended Maxwellian $\widehat{G}_{k}$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{G}_{k}=\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{r}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{m_{k}\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 T_{k}^{r}}\right), \quad k=1,2 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the extended Maxwellian $\widetilde{G}_{k}$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{G}_{k}=\frac{n_{k}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right.}\right)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{T_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{k}\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{T_{k}}\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $\widetilde{G}_{k}$ has the total equilibrium temperature $T_{k}$ and the pressure tensor of $f_{k}$ on the off-diagonals, namely

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)_{i i} & =T_{k} & \text { for } & i=1, \ldots d \\
\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)_{i j} & =\frac{d}{d+l_{k}}\left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{k}}{n_{k}}\right)_{i j} & \text { for } \quad i, j=1, \ldots d, i \neq j \tag{3.4}
\end{array}
$$

The factor $\frac{d}{d+l_{k}}$ in front of $\mathbb{P}_{k}$ in the definition of $T_{k}^{t e n}$ has the following reason. The temperature $T_{K}$ given by (2.9) is a convex combination of $T_{k}^{t}$ and $T_{k}^{r}$. Now, the offdiagonal elements of $T_{k}^{t e n}$ have the same structure. It is a convex combination of the pressure tensor $\mathbb{P}_{k}$ and the tensor corresponding to the rotational and vibrational temperature. But since the rotational effects are diagonal, we have $\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)_{i j}=\frac{d}{d+l_{k}} \mathbb{P}+\frac{l_{k}}{d+l_{k}} 0$ for $i \neq j$.

We only extended $\Lambda_{k}$ to a tensor and keep $\Theta_{k}$ as it is. This has the following reason. Since we assumed $\bar{\eta}_{l k}=0$, the microscopic velocities related to the internal degrees of
freedom are symmetric and then we do not distinguish different directions as we do in the translational degrees of freedom.

Equation (3.1) leads to a time evolution of $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$ given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right)+u_{k} \cdot \nabla_{x}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right)=\frac{\nu_{k k} n_{k}}{Z_{r}^{k}} \frac{d+l_{k}}{d}\left(T_{k}^{t e n}-\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right) & +\nu_{k k} n_{k}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}-\mathbb{P}_{k}\right)  \tag{3.5}\\
& +\nu_{k j} n_{j}\left(\Theta_{k j}-T_{k}^{r}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

The evolution of $\Theta_{k}$ is then obtained from (2.5). Then we can define a function $G_{k}$ with a linear combination $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ given by

$$
\Lambda_{k}^{E S}=\left(1-\mu_{k}\right) \Lambda_{k} \mathbf{1}_{n}+\mu_{k} \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}}{n_{k}}, \quad k=1,2
$$

with $\mu_{k} \in \mathbb{R}, k=1,2$ being free parameters which we can choose in a way to fit physical parameters in the Navier-Stokes equations like the viscosity coefficient, analogously as in the standard ES-BGK model given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{k}\left(f_{k}\right)\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{k}}, t\right)=\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}{m_{k}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{k}\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{\Theta_{k}}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k=1,2$, and we determine the time evolution of $f_{k}$ in the ES-BGK case by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} f_{k}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(v f_{k}\right)=\nu_{k k} n_{k}\left(G_{k}\left(f_{k}\right)-f_{k}\right)+\nu_{k j} n_{j}\left(M_{k j}\left(f_{k}, f_{j}\right)-f_{k}\right), \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k, j=1,2, k \neq j$. To keep it as simple as possible we only replace the collision operators which represent the collisions of a species with itself by the ES-BGK collision operator for one species suggested in [1]. Other possible extensions are illustrated in the mono atomic case for gas mixtures in [18]. For further references we denote the relaxation operators by $Q_{11}, Q_{12}, Q_{21}$ and $Q_{22}$.

Since $G_{k}$ involves the term $\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)^{-1}$ and $\widetilde{G}_{k}$ involves the term $\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)^{-1}$ we have to check if $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ and $T_{k}^{t e n}$ are invertible.
Lemma 3.1. Assume that $f_{k}$ and $\widehat{G}_{k}$ are positive solutions to (3.7) and (3.1). Then $\Lambda_{k}^{\text {ten }}$ and $T_{k}^{\text {ten }}$ have strictly positive eigenvalues. Especially $T_{k}^{t e n}$ is invertible.

Proof. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash\{0\}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle y, \Lambda_{k}^{t e n} y\right\rangle & =\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right)_{i j} y_{j}=\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i} \int\left(v_{i}-u_{k, i}\right)\left(v_{j}-u_{k, j}\right) \widehat{G}_{k} y_{j} d v \\
& =\int\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i}\left(v_{i}-u_{k, i}\right)\right)^{2} \widehat{G}_{k} d v \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

The inequality is true since we assumed that $\widehat{G}$ is a positive solution to (2.6).
If we use equation (2.9) and (2.5)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle y, T_{k}^{t e n} y\right\rangle & =\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i}\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)_{i j} y_{j}=\sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\
i \neq j}}^{d} y_{i} \int\left(v_{i}-u_{k, i}\right)\left(v_{j}-u_{k, j}\right) f_{k} y_{j} d v+\sum_{i=1}^{d} y_{i} T_{k} y_{j} \\
& =\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i} \int\left(v_{i}-u_{k, i}\right)\left(v_{j}-u_{k, j}\right) f_{k} y_{j} d v-\sum_{i=1}^{d} y_{i} T_{k}^{t} y_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{d} y_{i} \frac{d \Lambda_{k}+l_{k} \Theta_{k}}{d+l_{k}} y_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=\int\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} y_{i}\left(v_{i}-u_{k, i}\right)\right)^{2} f_{k} d v+\sum_{i=1}^{d} y_{i} T_{k}^{r} y_{i} \geq 0
$$

where $T_{k}^{r}>0$ because $T_{k}^{r}$ is defined via a positive integral of $f_{k}$, see the definition in (2.1). We even have strict inequality since $\left\{y_{i}(v-u)_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{d}$ are linearly independent.

With the previous lemma, we can prove that $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ is positive. This is the next theorem. Positivity is also proven in [1] for the one species case, but for a different variant of an ES-BGK model.
Theorem 3.1. Assume that $f_{k}>0$ and $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu_{k} \leq 1$. Then $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ has strictly positive eigenvalues. Especially $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ is invertible.

Proof. Since $\Lambda_{k}^{\text {ten }}$ is symmetric there exist an invertible matrix $S_{k}$ such that $\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{\text {ten }}}=$ $S_{k} \Lambda_{k}^{t e n} S_{k}^{-1}$ with a diagonal matrix $\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}}$. Then $\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}:=S_{k} \Lambda_{k}^{E S} S_{k}^{-1}$ is also diagonal since

$$
\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}=S_{k} \Lambda_{k}^{E S} S_{k}^{-1}=\left(1-\mu_{k}\right) \Lambda_{k} \mathbf{1}+\mu_{k} \widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{\text {ten }}}
$$

Here we can see that the eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}$ are a linear combination of $\Lambda_{k}$ and the eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\Lambda_{k}^{\text {ten }}}$ which coincide with the eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$. We denote the eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$ by $\lambda_{k, 1}, \lambda_{k, 2}, \ldots, \lambda_{k, d}$. Then by definition of $\Lambda_{k}$ and $\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}$ we have

$$
d \Lambda_{k}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{t e n}\right)=\lambda_{k, 1}+\lambda_{k, 2}+\cdots+\lambda_{k, d} .
$$

This means for the eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ denoted by $\tau_{k, i}$ :

$$
\tau_{k, i}=\frac{1-\mu_{k}}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \lambda_{k, j}+\mu_{k} \lambda_{k, i}=\frac{1+2 \mu_{k}}{d} \lambda_{k, i}+\frac{1-\mu_{k}}{d} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{d} \lambda_{k, j}, \quad i=1,2,3 .
$$

Since $\lambda_{k, 1}, \lambda_{k, 2}, \ldots, \lambda_{k, d}$ are strictly positive, the eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ are strictly positive, when $1+2 \mu_{k}$ and $1-\mu_{k}$ are positive. Since we restricted $\mu_{k}$ to $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu_{k} \leq 1, \Lambda_{k}^{E S}$ is strictly positive.
3.1. Conservation properties Conservation of the number of particles and total momentum of the model for mixtures described in subsection 1.1 are shown in the same way as in the case of mono atomic molecules. In the extension described in subsection 1.2 these conservation properties are still satisfied since $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ have the same density, mean velocity and internal energy as $f_{1}$ respective $f_{2}$. Conservation of the number of particles and of total momentum are guaranteed by the following choice of the mixture parameters:

If we assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{12}=n_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad n_{21}=n_{2}, \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have conservation of the number of particles, see Theorem 2.1 in [17]. If we further assume that $u_{12}$ is a linear combination of $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{12}=\delta u_{1}+(1-\delta) u_{2}, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we have conservation of total momentum provided that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{21}=u_{2}-\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(1-\delta)\left(u_{2}-u_{1}\right) \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

see Theorem 2.2 in [17].
In the case of total energy we have a difference for the polyatomic case compared to the monoatomic one. So we explicitly consider this in the following theorem.
Theorem 3.2 (Conservation of total energy). Assume (2.4), conditions (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10) and assume that $\Lambda_{12}$ and $\Theta_{12}$ are of the following form

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{12}=\alpha \Lambda_{1}+(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{2}+\gamma\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \gamma \geq 0 \\
& \Theta_{12}=\frac{l_{1} \Theta_{1}+l_{2} \Theta_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \tag{3.11}
\end{align*}
$$

Then we have conservation of total energy

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\int \frac{m_{1}}{2}\left(|v|^{2}+\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2}\right)\left(Q_{11}\left(f_{1}, f_{1}\right)+Q_{12}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)\right) d v d \eta_{l_{1}} \\
+\int \frac{m_{2}}{2}\left(|v|^{2}+\left|\eta_{l_{2}}\right|^{2}\right)\left(Q_{22}\left(f_{2}, f_{2}\right)+Q_{21}\left(f_{2}, f_{1}\right)\right) d v d \eta_{l_{2}}=0
\end{array}
$$

provided that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{d} \Theta_{21}=\left[\frac{1}{d} \varepsilon m_{1}(1-\delta)\left(\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(\delta-1)+\delta+1\right)-\varepsilon \gamma\right]\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}  \tag{3.12}\\
& +\varepsilon(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{1}+(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \Lambda_{2}+\frac{1}{d} \varepsilon \frac{l_{1} l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Theta_{1}+\frac{1}{d}\left(l_{2}-\varepsilon \frac{l_{1} l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\right) \Theta_{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Using the definition of the energy exchange of species 1 and equation (2.5), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{E_{1,2}} & :=\int \frac{m_{1}}{2}\left(|v|^{2}+\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2}\right)\left[Q_{11}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)+Q_{12}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)\right] d v d \eta_{l_{1}} \\
& =\varepsilon \nu_{21} \frac{1}{2} n_{2} n_{1} m_{1}\left(\left|u_{12}\right|^{2}-\left|u_{1}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Lambda_{12}-T_{1}^{t}\right)+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \varepsilon \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Theta_{12}-T_{1}^{r}\right) \\
& =\varepsilon \nu_{21} \frac{1}{2} n_{2} n_{1} m_{1}\left(\left|u_{12}\right|^{2}-\left|u_{1}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Lambda_{12}-\Lambda_{1}\right)+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \varepsilon \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Theta_{12}-\Theta_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, we will insert the definitions of $u_{12}, \Lambda_{12}$ and $\Theta_{12}$ given by (3.9) and (3.11). Analogously the energy exchange of species 2 towards 1 is

$$
F_{E_{2,1}}=\nu_{21} \frac{1}{2} n_{2} n_{1} m_{2}\left(\left|u_{21}\right|^{2}-\left|u_{2}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{d}{2} \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Lambda_{21}-\Lambda_{2}\right)+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left(\Theta_{21}-\Theta_{2}\right) .
$$

Substitute $u_{21}$ with (3.10) and $\Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{d} \Theta_{21}$ from (3.12). This permits to rewrite the energy exchange as

$$
\begin{array}{r}
F_{E_{1,2}}=\varepsilon \nu_{21} \frac{1}{2} n_{2} n_{1} m_{1}(1-\delta)\left[\left(u_{1}+u_{2}\right)-\delta\left(u_{2}-u_{1}\right)\right]\left(u_{1}-u_{2}\right) \\
+\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left[(1-\alpha) d\left(\Lambda_{2}-\Lambda_{1}\right)+\frac{l_{1} l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\left(\Theta_{2}-\Theta_{1}\right)+\gamma d\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}\right] \\
F_{E_{2,1}}=\varepsilon \nu_{21} \frac{1}{2} n_{2} n_{1} m_{1}(1-\delta)\left[\left(u_{1}+u_{2}\right)-\delta\left(u_{2}-u_{1}\right)\right]\left(u_{1}-u_{2}\right) \\
\left.+2\left(1-\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(1-\delta)\right) \frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(1-\delta) u_{1} \cdot u_{2}\right]+\frac{1}{2} \nu_{21} n_{1} n_{2}\left[\varepsilon(1-\alpha) d\left(\Lambda_{1}-\Lambda_{2}\right)+\varepsilon \frac{l_{1} l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\left(\Theta_{1}-\Theta_{2}\right)\right. \\
\left.+\left(\varepsilon m_{1}(1-\delta)\left(\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(\delta-1)+\delta+1\right)-\varepsilon \gamma d\right)\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}\right] \tag{3.14}
\end{array}
$$

Adding these two terms, we see that the total energy is conserved. $\square$
Remark 3.1. The energy flux between the two species is zero if and only if $u_{1}=u_{2}$, $\Lambda_{1}=\Lambda_{2}, \Theta_{1}=\Theta_{2}$ provided that $\alpha, \delta<1$ and $\gamma>0$. From conservation of total energy we get only one condition on $\Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{n} \Theta_{21}$ given by (3.12), but not an explicit formula for $\Lambda_{21}$ and $\Theta_{21}$. In order to keep the model symmetric we again separate the temperatures corresponding to the translational part and the one corresponding to the rotational and vibrational part and choose

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{21} & =\varepsilon(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{1}+(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \Lambda_{2} \\
& +\left[\frac{1}{d} \varepsilon m_{1}(1-\delta)\left(\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(\delta-1)+\delta+1\right)-\varepsilon \gamma\right]\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2},  \tag{3.15}\\
\Theta_{21} & =\left(1-\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\right) \Theta_{2}+\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Theta_{1} . \tag{3.16}
\end{align*}
$$

Remark 3.2. If $l_{1}=l_{2}$, we have $\Theta_{12}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\Theta_{1}+\Theta_{2}\right)$. We then find $\Theta_{21}=\Theta_{12}$ if the two species have the same interspecies collision frequency $(\varepsilon=1)$.

### 3.2. Positivity of the temperatures

Theorem 3.3. Assume that $f_{1}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{1}}, t\right), f_{2}\left(x, v, \eta_{l_{2}}, t\right)>0$. Then all temperatures $\Lambda_{1}$, $\Lambda_{2}, \Theta_{1}, \Theta_{2}$, and $\Lambda_{12}, \Theta_{12}$ given by (3.11), and $\Lambda_{21}, \Theta_{21}$ determined by (3.15), (3.16) are positive provided that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \gamma \leq \frac{m_{1}}{d}(1-\delta)\left[\left(1+\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon\right) \delta+1-\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon\right] \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. The temperatures $\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \Theta_{1}, \Theta_{2}, \Lambda_{12}, \Theta_{12}$ and $\Theta_{21}$ are positive by definition because they are integrals or convex combinations of positive functions. So the only thing to check is when the temperature $\Lambda_{21}$ in (3.15) is positive. This is done in [17] for $d=3$, so we skip the proof here. The resulting condition is given by (3.17).
Remark 3.3. Since $\gamma \geq 0$ is a non-negative number, so the right-hand side of the inequality in (3.17) must be non-negative. This condition is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon-1}{1+\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon} \leq \delta \leq 1 \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that we have to assume that the distribution function $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are positive. In [16], positivity of the distribution function for the model described in [17] for mono atomic molecules is proven. This method can be extended to the model described in this paper for polyatomic molecules.

### 3.3. The structure of equilibrium

Theorem 3.4 (Equilibrium). Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$ with $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ independent of $x$ and $t$. Assume the conditions (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), $\delta \neq 1, \alpha \neq 1, l_{1}, l_{2} \neq 0$, so that all temperatures are positive.

Then $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are Maxwell distributions with equal mean velocities $u_{1}=u_{2}=u_{12}=$ $u_{21}$ and temperatures $T_{1}^{r}=T_{2}^{r}=T_{1}^{t}=T_{2}^{t}=\Lambda_{1}=\Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{1}=\Theta_{2}=\Theta_{12}=\Theta_{21}=\Lambda_{12}=\Lambda_{21}$.

Proof.

Equilibrium means that $f_{1}, f_{2}, \Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \Theta_{1}, \Theta_{2}$ are independent of $x$ and $t$. Thus in equilibrium the right-hand side of the equations (3.7) and (3.1) have to be zero. In particular,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right) f_{1}=\nu_{11} n_{1} G_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} M_{12}  \tag{3.19}\\
& \left(\nu_{22} n_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1}\right) f_{2}=\nu_{22} n_{2} G_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1} M_{21} \tag{3.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Since the right-hand side of (3.7) and the right-hand side of (3.1) have to be zero, the difference of the right-hand side of (3.7) and the right-hand side of (3.1) has to be equal to zero. If we compute the translational temperature of this difference, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{1}^{t e n}=T_{1}^{t e n}  \tag{3.21}\\
& \Lambda_{2}^{t e n}=T_{2}^{t e n} \tag{3.22}
\end{align*}
$$

Especially, from the diagonal part of (3.21) and (3.22) we can deduce

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{1}=\Theta_{1},  \tag{3.23}\\
& \Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{2} . \tag{3.24}
\end{align*}
$$

When we consider the moment of the velocity of (3.19), we get

$$
\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right) u_{1}=\nu_{11} n_{1} u_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} u_{12}
$$

Substituting $u_{12}=\delta u_{1}+(1-\delta) u_{2}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{1}=u_{2} \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\delta \neq 1$.
Using (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25), the temperatures of the mixture Maxwellians (3.11) and (3.15), (3.16) simplify to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{12}=\alpha \Lambda_{1}+(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{2}, \quad \Theta_{12}=\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Lambda_{1}+\frac{l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Lambda_{2}  \tag{3.26}\\
& \Lambda_{21}=\varepsilon(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{1}+(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \Lambda_{2}, \quad \Theta_{21}=\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Lambda_{1}+\left(1-\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\right) \Lambda_{2} \tag{3.27}
\end{align*}
$$

When we consider the moments of the translational and the rotational and vibrational temperatures of (3.19) and (3.20), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right) T_{1}^{t}=\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \alpha\right) \Lambda_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{2}  \tag{3.28}\\
& \left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right) T_{1}^{r}=\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\right) \Lambda_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \frac{l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Lambda_{2}  \tag{3.29}\\
& \left(\nu_{22} n_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1}\right) T_{2}^{t}=\nu_{22} n_{2} \Lambda_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \Lambda_{21}  \tag{3.30}\\
& \left(\nu_{22} n_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1}\right) T_{2}^{r}=\nu_{22} n_{2} \Lambda_{2}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \Theta_{21} \tag{3.31}
\end{align*}
$$

where we used the definitions of the mixture velocities and temperatures (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and equations (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25). Analogue, equations (2.5) simplify to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d+l_{1}}{2} \Lambda_{1}=\frac{d}{2} T_{1}^{t}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} T_{1}^{r} \tag{3.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d+l_{2}}{2} \Lambda_{2}=\frac{d}{2} T_{2}^{t}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} T_{2}^{r} \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inserting (3.28) and (3.29) in (3.32), we obtain

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\frac{d}{2}\left(\frac{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \alpha}{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}} \Lambda_{1}+\frac{\nu_{12} n_{2}(1-\alpha)}{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}} \Lambda_{2}\right)+\frac{l_{1}}{2}\left(\frac{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}}{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}} \Lambda_{1}+\frac{\nu_{12} n_{2} \frac{l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}}{\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}} \Lambda_{2}\right) \\
=\frac{d+l_{1}}{2} \Lambda_{1}
\end{array}
$$

which, provided $d \alpha+l_{1} \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \neq d+l_{1}$, is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{1}=\Lambda_{2} \tag{3.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

This condition is equivalent to $d(1-\alpha)+\frac{l_{1} l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \neq 0$ which is satisfied since $\alpha \neq 1, l_{1}, l_{2} \neq 0$. With (3.34) we can deduce from (3.28) and (3.29) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{1}^{t}=\Lambda_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad T_{1}^{r}=\Lambda_{1} \tag{3.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Condition (3.27) together with (3.34) leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{21}=\Theta_{21}=\Lambda_{1} . \tag{3.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inserting (3.34) and (3.36) in (3.30) and (3.31) leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{2}^{t}=T_{2}^{r}=\Lambda_{1} \tag{3.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we compute the pressure tensor of (3.19) using that all temperatures are equal to $\Lambda_{1}$ we obtain

$$
\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right) \frac{\mathbb{P}_{1}}{n_{1}}=\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(1-\mu_{1}\right) \Lambda_{1} \mathbf{1}+\nu_{11} n_{1} \mu_{1} \Lambda_{1}^{t e n}+\nu_{12} n_{2} \Lambda_{1} \mathbf{1} .
$$

Using (3.4), (3.21) and (3.35), we have that $\left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{1}}{n_{1}}\right)_{i j}=\left(\Lambda_{1}^{\text {ten }}\right)_{i j}=\left(T_{1}^{\text {ten }}\right)_{i j}, i \neq j$ and therefore

$$
\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(1-\mu_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right)\left(\frac{d}{d+l_{1}} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{1}}{n_{1}}\right)_{i j}=\left(\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(1-\mu_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\right)\left(\Lambda_{1} \mathbf{1}\right)_{i j}
$$

for $j \neq i$, which shows that the pressure tensor of $f_{1}$ is diagonal since $\mu_{1} \leq 1$. Similar for $\frac{\mathbb{P}_{2}}{n_{2}}$ using (3.20), (3.22) and (3.35).

So all in all, in equilibrium we get that $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are Maxwell distributions with equal mean velocities $u_{1}=u_{2}=u_{12}=u_{21}$ and temperatures $T_{1}^{r}=T_{2}^{r}=T_{1}^{t}=T_{2}^{t}=\Lambda_{1}=$ $\Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{1}=\Theta_{2}=\Theta_{12}=\Theta_{21}=\Lambda_{12}=\Lambda_{21}$.
Definition 3.1. If $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are Maxwell distributions with equal mean velocities $u=u_{1}=u_{2}$ and temperatures $T=T_{1}^{r}=T_{2}^{r}=T_{1}^{t}=T_{2}^{t}=\Lambda_{1}=\Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{1}=\Theta_{2}$, then we say that $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are in local equilibrium. Note that for $\alpha=1$ or $\delta=1$, we have no exchange of momentum and energy of the tow species, so we do not expect a relaxation towards a common equilibrium. So in the following, we always assume $\alpha, \delta \neq 1$.
3.4. H-Theorem In this section we will prove that our model admits an entropy with an entropy inequality. For this, we have to prove an inequality on the term $\int \ln f_{k}\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}}$ coupled with the right-hand side of equation (3.1) and an inequality on $\nu_{12} n_{2} \int\left(M_{12}-f_{1}\right) \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \int\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right) \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}$ coupled with the right-hand side of equation (3.1). We prove the first one in subsection 3.4.1 and the second one in subsection 3.4.2.

### 3.4.1. H-Theorem for the one species relaxation terms

Remark 3.4. From the definition of the moments of $f_{k}, k=1,2$ in (2.1) and the definitions of the extended Maxwellians $G_{k}, k=1,2$ in (3.6), we see that the second moments, the temperatures, do not coincide. Now, we consider extended Maxwellians $\bar{G}_{k}, k=1,2$ which have the same moments as $f_{k}, k=1,2$. Then from the case of one species $E S$ - $B G K$ model we know that

$$
\int \bar{G}_{k} \ln \bar{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \leq \int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}
$$

for $k=1,2$, see equations (20) and (21) in [1] in the mono atomic case. The polyatomic case is analogously to the mono atomic case.
Lemma 3.2. Assume that $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. As in remark 3.4 let $\bar{G}_{k}$ be the extended Maxwellians with the same moments as $f_{k}, k=1,2$ and $\widetilde{G}_{k}$ the Maxwellians defined by (3.2). Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int \widetilde{G}_{k} \ln \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} & \leq \int \bar{G}_{k} \ln \bar{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}, \quad
\end{aligned} \quad k=1,2, ~ \begin{array}{ll}
\int \widehat{G}_{k} \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \geq \int G_{k} \ln G_{k} d v \eta_{l_{k}}, \quad & k=1,2 \\
\int G_{k} \ln G_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \geq \int M_{k} \ln M_{k} d v \eta_{l_{k}}, \quad & k=1,2
\end{array}
$$

Proof. The proof of the second inequality is analogously to the proof in the mono atomic case of equation (21) in [1]. So we only prove the first and the third one. Using

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { that } \\
& \ln M_{k}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}}\right)-\frac{\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{e_{k}}{m_{k}}}, \\
& \ln \bar{G}_{k}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\mathbb{P}_{k}}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{r}}{m_{k}} l_{k}}}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{k}}{m_{k}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{\left|\eta_{l^{\prime}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{T_{k}}{m_{k}}}, \\
& \ln \widetilde{G}_{k}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right.}\right)}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{T_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{T_{k}}{m_{k}}} \quad \text { and } \\
& \ln G_{k}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda E S}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}}\right)-\frac{1}{2} m_{k}\left(v-u_{k}\right) \cdot\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)-\frac{\left|\eta_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\theta_{k}}{m_{k}}},
\end{aligned}
$$

we compute the integrals and obtain that the required inequalities are equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{t e n}}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}}\right) & \leq \ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\mathbb{P}_{k}}{m_{k}}\right)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T_{k}^{r}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}}\right) \\
\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}{m_{k}}\right)}}\right) & \geq \ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This is equivalent to the conditions

$$
\begin{align*}
\ln \operatorname{det}\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)+l_{k} \ln T_{k} & \geq \ln \operatorname{det} \mathbb{P}_{k}+l_{k} \ln T_{k}^{r} \\
\left(\Lambda_{k}\right)^{d} & \geq \operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right) \tag{3.38}
\end{align*}
$$

We first look at the first inequality. If we insert the expression for $T_{k}$ given by (2.9) and use the concavity of $\ln$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \operatorname{det}\left(T_{k}^{t e n}\right)+l_{k} \frac{l_{k}}{d+l_{k}} \ln T_{k}^{r}+l_{k} \frac{d}{d+l_{k}} \ln T_{k}^{t} \geq \ln \operatorname{det} \mathbb{P}_{k}+l_{k} \ln T_{k}^{r} \tag{3.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we use the Brunn-Minkowsky inequality (inequality (27) in [1]) given by

$$
\operatorname{det}(a A+(1-a) B) \geq(\operatorname{det} A)^{a}(\operatorname{det} B)^{1-a}
$$

for $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $A, B$ positive symmetric matrices. Since we can write $T_{k}^{t e n}$ as

$$
T_{k}^{t e n}=\frac{d}{d+l_{k}} \mathbb{P}_{k}+\frac{l_{k}}{d+l_{k}} T_{k}^{r} \mathbf{1}_{d}
$$

we can apply the Brunn-Minkowsky inequality on (3.39) and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d+l_{k}} \ln \operatorname{det} \mathbb{P}_{k}+d \frac{l_{k}}{d+l_{k}} \ln T_{k}^{r}+l_{k} \frac{l_{k}}{d+l_{k}} & \ln T_{k}^{r}+l_{k} \frac{d}{d+l_{k}} \ln T_{k}^{t} \\
& \geq \ln \operatorname{det} \mathbb{P}_{k}+l_{k} \ln T_{k}^{r}
\end{aligned}
$$

So it remains to show that

$$
\left(T_{k}^{t}\right)^{d} \geq \operatorname{det} \mathbb{P}_{k}
$$

This inequality has the same structure as the second inequality in (3.38). So we prove only the second inequality in (3.38). We observe that trace $\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)=d \Lambda_{k}$, so we have to show

$$
\left(\frac{\operatorname{trace}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)}{d}\right)^{d} \geq \operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)
$$

Let $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{d}$ the eigenvalues of the symmetric positive matrix $\Lambda_{k}^{E S}$, then this inequality is equivalent to

$$
\left(\frac{\lambda_{1}+\cdots+\lambda_{d}}{d}\right)^{d} \geq \lambda_{1} \cdots \lambda_{d}
$$

This is true since it is the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means.
Lemma 3.3 (Contribution to the H -theorem from the one species relaxation terms). Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. Then

$$
\int \ln f_{k}\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\int \ln \widehat{G}_{k}\left(\widetilde{G}_{k}-\widehat{G}_{k}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \leq 0, \quad k=1,2
$$

with equality if and only if $M_{k}=f_{k}$ and $\Lambda_{k}=\Theta_{k}=T_{k}^{r}=T_{k}^{t}$.
Proof. Since the function $H(x)=x \ln x-x$ is strictly convex for $x>0$, we have $H^{\prime}(f)(g-f) \leq H(g)-H(f)$ with equality if and only if $g=f$. So

$$
\begin{equation*}
(g-f) \ln f \leq g \ln g-f \ln f+f-g \tag{3.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Apply (3.40) on both terms of

$$
S_{k}\left(f_{k}\right):=\int \ln f_{k}\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\int \ln \widehat{G}_{k}\left(\widetilde{G}_{k}-\widehat{G}_{k}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{k}}
$$

Then we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{k}\left(f_{k}\right) \leq \int G_{k} \ln G_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int G_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\int f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \\
& \quad+\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{k} \ln \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int \widehat{G}_{k} \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\int \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

with equality if and only if $f_{k}=G_{k}$ and $G_{k}=\widetilde{G}_{k}$ from which we can deduce $f_{k}=M_{k}$ by computing macroscopic quantities of $f_{k}=G_{k}$ and $G_{k}=\widetilde{G}_{k}$. Since $f_{k}, G_{k}, \widetilde{G}_{k}$ and $\widetilde{G}_{k}$ have the same density, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
S\left(f_{k}\right) \leq \int G_{k} \ln G_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{k} \ln \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int \widehat{G}_{k} \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}\right] \tag{3.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

According to the second part of lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
S\left(f_{k}\right) \leq \int \widetilde{G}_{k} \ln \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}-\int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \tag{3.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we have equality if and only if $G_{k}=\widetilde{G}_{k}$, which means $\Lambda_{k}=\Theta_{k}$. Now, using the first part of lemma 3.2 and remark 3.4 , we can estimate $\int \widetilde{G}_{k} \ln \widetilde{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}$ by $\int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}$. So, all in all, we obtain $S_{k}\left(f_{k}\right) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $f_{k}=M_{k}$ and $\Lambda_{k}=\Theta_{k}=$ $T_{k}^{r}=T_{k}^{t}$.

### 3.4.2. H-Theorem for mixtures of polyatomic molecules

Lemma 3.4. Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. Assume the relationship between the collision frequencies (2.4), the conditions for the interspecies Maxwellians (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) and the positivity of all temperatures, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon \frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{12}+\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{2} \ln \Theta_{12}+\frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \ln \Theta_{21} \geq \frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \ln \Lambda_{1}+\frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{2}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \varepsilon \ln \Theta_{1}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \ln \Theta_{2} \tag{3.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. First we consider the part $E_{1}:=\frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{12}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \ln \Theta_{12}$. We insert the definitions of $\Lambda_{12}$ and $\Theta_{12}$ into $E_{1}$ and use the monotonicity of $\ln$ to drop the velocity term. Then we obtain

$$
E_{1} \geq \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\alpha \Lambda_{1}+(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{2}\right)+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \ln \left(\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Theta_{1}+\frac{l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \Theta_{2}\right)
$$

Now we use that $\ln$ is concave and get

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{1} \geq \frac{d}{2} \alpha \ln \Lambda_{1}+\frac{d}{2}(1-\alpha) \ln \Lambda_{2}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \ln \Theta_{1}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \frac{l_{2}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \ln \Theta_{2} \tag{3.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

Doing the same with the second part $E_{2}:=\frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \ln \Theta_{21}$ using that $\frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \varepsilon \leq 1$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{2} \geq \frac{d}{2} \varepsilon(1-\alpha) \ln \Lambda_{1}+\frac{d}{2}(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \ln \Lambda_{2}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}} \ln \Theta_{1}+\frac{l_{2}}{2}\left(1-\varepsilon \frac{l_{1}}{l_{1}+l_{2}}\right) \ln \Theta_{2} \tag{3.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.44) by $\varepsilon$ and adding (3.45), we get

$$
\varepsilon E_{1}+E_{2} \geq \frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \ln \Lambda_{1}+\frac{d}{2} \ln \Lambda_{2}+\frac{l_{1}}{2} \varepsilon \ln \Theta_{1}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} \ln \Theta_{2}
$$

which is the required inequality.
Lemma 3.5. Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. Assume the relationship between the collision frequencies (2.4), the conditions for the interspecies Maxwellians (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) and the positivity of all temperatures. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nu_{12} n_{2} \int M_{12} \ln M_{12} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \int M_{21} \ln M_{21} d v d \eta_{l_{2}} \\
& \leq \nu_{12} n_{2} \int M_{1} \ln M_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \int M_{2} \ln M_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Using that $\left.\ln M_{12}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\theta_{12}}{m_{1}}} l_{1}}\right)-\frac{\left|v-u_{12}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\theta_{12}}{m_{1}}}\right)$,
$\left.\ln M_{21}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{21}}{m_{2}}} r_{2}}\right)-\frac{\left|v-u_{21}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}}-\frac{\left|\eta_{2}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\theta_{21}}{m_{2}}}\right)$
$\left.\ln M_{k}=\ln \left(\frac{n_{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{k}}{m_{k}}} l_{k}}\right)-\frac{\left|v-u_{k}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{k}}{m_{k}}}\right)-\frac{\left|\eta_{k_{k}}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\theta_{k}}{m_{k}}}, k=1,2$, we compute the integrals and obtain that the required inequalities are equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon \ln \left(\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{12}}{m_{1}}} l_{1}}\right)+\ln \left(\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{21}}{m_{2}}} l_{2}}\right) \\
& \leq \varepsilon \ln \left(\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{1}}{m_{1}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{1}}{m_{1}}} l_{1}}\right)+\ln \left(\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{2}}{m_{2}}} d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{2}}{m_{2}}} l^{2}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to the condition proven in Lemma 3.4.
Theorem 3.5 (H-theorem for mixture). Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. Assume $\nu_{11} n_{1} \geq \nu_{12} n_{2}$, $\nu_{22} n_{2} \geq \nu_{21} n_{1}, \alpha, \delta \neq 1, l_{1}, l_{2} \neq 0$. Assume the relationship between the collision frequencies (2.4), the conditions for the interspecies Maxwellians (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) and the positivity of all temperatures, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{2}\left[\nu_{k k} n_{k} \int\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right) \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\nu_{k k} n_{k} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{k}-\widehat{G}_{k}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{11} n_{1} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{1}-\widehat{G}_{1}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{22} n_{2} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{2}-\widehat{G}_{2}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}} \\
& +\nu_{12} n_{2} \int\left(M_{12}-f_{1}\right) \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \int\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right) \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}} \leq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

with equality if and only if $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are in local equilibrium (see definition 3.1).
Remark 3.5. The inequality in the $H$-Theorem is still true if $l_{1}=0$ or $l_{2}=0$ which means that one species is mono atomic. In this case only the equalities with $\Theta_{1}$ and $\Theta_{2}$, respectively in the local equilibrium vanish.

Proof. The fact that $\nu_{k k} n_{k} \int\left(G_{k}-f_{k}\right) \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+\nu_{k k} n_{k} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{k}-\widehat{G}_{k}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}} \leq$ $0, k=1,2$ is shown in Lemma 3.3. In both cases we have equality if and only if $f_{1}=G_{1}$
with $\Lambda_{1}=\Theta_{1}=T_{1}^{t}=T_{1}^{r}$ and $f_{2}=G_{2}$ with $\Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{2}=T_{2}^{t}=T_{2}^{r}$.
Let us define

$$
\begin{aligned}
S\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right): & =\nu_{11} n_{1} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{1}-\widehat{G}_{1}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{22} n_{2} \int\left(\widetilde{G}_{2}-\widehat{G}_{2}\right) \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}} \\
& +\nu_{12} n_{2} \int\left(M_{12}-f_{1}\right) \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\nu_{21} n_{1} \int\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right) \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

The task is to prove that $S\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right) \leq 0$. Since the function $H(x)=x \ln x-x$ is strictly convex for $x>0$, we have $H^{\prime}(f)(g-f) \leq H(g)-H(f)$ with equality if and only if $g=f$. So

$$
\begin{equation*}
(g-f) \ln f \leq g \ln g-f \ln f+f-g \tag{3.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider now $S\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ and apply the inequality (3.46) to each of the terms in $S$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & \leq \nu_{11} n_{1}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{1} \ln \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{12} n_{2}\left[\int M_{12} \ln M_{12} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int f_{1} \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int f_{1} d v \eta-\int M_{12} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{21} n_{1}\left[\int M_{21} \ln M_{21} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int f_{2} \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}+\int f_{2} d v d \eta-\int M_{21} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{22} n_{2}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{2} \ln \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}+\int \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

with equality if and only if $f_{1}=M_{12}, f_{2}=M_{21}, \widetilde{G}_{1}=\widehat{G}_{1}$ and $\widetilde{G}_{2}=\widehat{G}_{2}$. Combining this with the condition for equality of the single collision term $f_{1}=G_{1}$ with $\Lambda_{1}=\Theta_{1}=T_{1}^{t}=T_{1}^{r}$ and $f_{2}=G_{2}$ with $\Lambda_{2}=\Theta_{2}=T_{2}^{t}=T_{2}^{r}$, we get that we have equality if and only if we are in local equilibrium (see definition 3.1). Since $\widehat{G}_{1}, \widetilde{G}_{1}, f_{1}$ and $M_{12}$ have the same density and $\widehat{G}_{2}, \widetilde{G}_{2}, M_{21}$ and $f_{2}$ have the same density, too, the right-hand side reduces to

$$
\begin{array}{r}
S \leq \nu_{11} n_{1}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{1} \ln \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left[\int M_{12} \ln M_{12} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int f_{1} \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left[\int M_{21} \ln M_{21} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int f_{2} \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \\
+\nu_{22} n_{2}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{2} \ln \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right]
\end{array}
$$

According to the second part of lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S \leq \nu_{11} n_{1}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{1} \ln \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int G_{1} \ln G_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{12} n_{2}\left[\int M_{12} \ln M_{12} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int f_{1} \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{21} n_{1}\left[\int M_{21} \ln M_{21} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int f_{2} \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{22} n_{2}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{2} \ln \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int G_{2} \ln G_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

According to lemma 3.5, the last part of lemma 3.2 and the assumption that $\nu_{k k} n_{k} \geq$ $\nu_{k j} n_{j}, k, j=1,2, k \neq j$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
S \leq & \nu_{11} n_{1}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{1} \ln \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int G_{1} \ln G_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{12} n_{2}\left[\int G_{1} \ln G_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int f_{1} \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{21} n_{1}\left[\int G_{2} \ln G_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int f_{2} \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{22} n_{2}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{2} \ln \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int G_{2} \ln G_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \\
& \leq \nu_{12} n_{2}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{1} \ln \widetilde{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}-\int f_{1} \ln f_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}\right] \\
& +\nu_{21} n_{1}\left[\int \widetilde{G}_{2} \ln \widetilde{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}-\int f_{2} \ln f_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

which leads to $S \leq 0$ using the second part of lemma 3.2 and remark 3.4.
Define $\quad \frac{1}{z_{k}}:=\frac{1}{Z_{k}^{r}} \frac{d+l_{k}}{d}, \quad k=1,2 \quad$ and $\quad$ total $\quad$ entropy $\quad H\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)=\int\left(f_{1} \ln f_{1}+\right.$ $\left.2 z_{1} \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int\left(f_{2} \ln f_{2}+2 z_{2} \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{2}}$. We can compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{t} H\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)+\nabla_{x} \cdot \int\left(f_{1} \ln f_{1}+2 z_{1} \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1}\right) v d v d \eta_{l_{1}} \\
& +\nabla_{x} \cdot \int\left(f_{2} \ln f_{2}+2 z_{2} \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2}\right) v d v d \eta_{l_{2}}=S\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

by multiplying the BGK equation for species 1 by $\ln f_{1}$, the BGK equation for the species 2 by $\ln f_{2}$, equations (3.1) by $2 z_{k} \ln G_{k}$ and sum the integrals with respect to $v$ and $\eta_{l_{1}}$ and $\eta_{l_{2}}$, respectively.
Corollary 3.1 (Entropy inequality for mixtures). Assume $f_{1}, f_{2}>0$. Assume relationship (2.4), the conditions (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) and the positivity of all temperatures (3.17), then we have the following entropy inequality

$$
\left.+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\int v\left(f_{1} \ln f_{1}+2 z_{1} \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int\left(f_{2} \ln f_{2}+2 z_{2} \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2}\right) d v d \eta_{l_{2}}, f_{2}\right)\right) \leq 0
$$

with equality if and only if $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are in local equilibrium (see definition 3.1).
REMARK 3.6. By computing the integrals $\int \widehat{G}_{k} \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}$ for $k=1,2$, and $\int v \widehat{G}_{k} \ln \widehat{G}_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}$, we see that $\partial_{t}\left[\int \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right]+\nabla_{x}$. $\left[\int v \widehat{G}_{1} \ln \widehat{G}_{1} d v d \eta_{l_{1}}+\int v \widehat{G}_{2} \ln \widehat{G}_{2} d v d \eta_{l_{2}}\right] \leq 0 \quad$ is equivalent to $\quad \partial_{t}\left(\operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{1}^{t e n}\right) \Theta_{1}^{l_{1}}+\right.$ $\left.\operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{\text {ten }}\right) \Theta_{2}^{l_{2}}\right)+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(\left(\operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{1}^{\text {ten }}\right) \Theta_{1}^{l_{1}}+\operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{\text {ten }}\right) \Theta_{2}^{l_{2}}\right) u_{k}\right) \leq 0$, we could also consider the entropy $H\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)=\sum_{k=1}^{2} \int f_{k} \ln f_{k} d v d \eta_{l_{k}}+z_{1} \operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{1}^{t e n}\right) \Theta_{1}^{l_{1}}+z_{2} \operatorname{det}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}\right) \Theta_{2}^{l_{2}}$
4. Comparison with the ES-BGK model for one species of polyatomic molecules by Andries, Le Tallec, Perlat and Perthame We will now consider a different ES-BGK model for a single species ES-BGK model of polyatomic molecules. In [2], they consider a distribution function $f(t, x, v, I)$ depending on the position $x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$, the velocity $v \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and internal energy $\varepsilon(I)=I^{\frac{2}{\delta}}, I \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$at time $t$. $\delta$ denotes the number
of degrees of freedom in internal energy. The mass density $\rho$ and mean velocity $u$ are defined as in the model described in the previous subsection integrating with respect to $v$ and $I$. The energy is defined as

$$
E(x, t)=\iint\left(\frac{1}{2}|v|^{2}+I^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\right) f d v d I=\frac{1}{2} \rho|u|^{2}+\rho e
$$

The specific internal energy can be divided into

$$
\begin{gathered}
e_{t r}=\frac{1}{\rho} \iint \frac{1}{2}|v-u|^{2} f d v d I \\
e_{i n t}=\frac{1}{\rho} \iint I^{\frac{2}{\delta}} f d v d I
\end{gathered}
$$

and associate with this the corresponding temperatures

$$
\begin{gathered}
e=e_{t r}+e_{i n t}=\frac{3+\delta}{2} R T_{\text {equ }} \\
e_{t r}=\frac{3}{2} R T_{t r} \\
e_{i n t}=\frac{\delta}{2} R T_{i n t}
\end{gathered}
$$

and define $T_{\text {rel }}=\theta T_{\text {equ }}+(1-\theta) T_{\text {int }}$. They consider the generalized Gaussian for the single species ES-BGK model

$$
\widetilde{G}[f]=\frac{\rho \Lambda_{\delta}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}(2 \pi \mathcal{T})}} \frac{1}{R T_{\text {rel }}^{\frac{\delta}{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}(v-u) \cdot \mathcal{T}^{-1} \cdot(v-u)+\frac{I^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{R T_{\text {rel }}}\right)
$$

with the tensor $\mathcal{T}=(1-\theta)\left((1-\nu) R T_{t r} \mathbf{1}+\nu \Theta\right)+\theta R T_{\text {equ }} \mathbf{1}$ where only the translational part is replaced by a tensor. $\Theta$ denotes the pressure tensor, $\Lambda_{\delta}$ is a constant ensuring that the integral of $\widetilde{G}[f]$ with respect to $v$ and $I$ is equal to the density $\rho$ and $R$ is the gas constant. The convex combination in $\theta$ takes into account that $T_{t r}$ and $T_{\text {int }}$ relaxes towards the common value $T_{\text {equ }}$. In the space-homogeneous case we see that we get the following macroscopic equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_{t} T_{t r} & \left.=C\left(T_{t r}(1-\theta)+\theta T_{\text {equ }}\right)-T_{t r}\right)=C \theta\left(T_{\text {equ }}-T_{t r}\right) \\
\partial_{t} T_{\text {int }} & =C \theta\left(T_{\text {equ }}-T_{\text {int }}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with some coefficient $C$. These macroscopic equations describe a relaxation of $T_{t r}$ and $T_{i n t}$ towards $T_{\text {equ }}$.

In this paper, we took [5] as basis to extend it to mixtures. The main differences of the model in [2] and the model in [5] are the following. The model in [2] has one variable $I \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$for all degrees of freedom in internal energy and the model in [5] has one variable $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ to each degree of freedom in internal energy. Moreover, the relaxation of the translational and rotational/vibrational temperatures to a common value is done in [2] by introducing a relaxation temperature $T_{r e l}$ and in the model [5] it is done by the additional relaxation equation (3.1).

## 5. Applications

5.1. Chu reduction In order to reduce the complexity of the variable for rotational and vibrational energy degrees of freedom $\mu_{1}, \ldots . \mu_{l_{k}}$ we apply the Chu reduction proposed in [8]. It is possible to apply the Chu reduction since $\eta_{1}, \ldots \eta_{l_{k}}$ do not appear in the transport operators in (3.7). We consider the system of equations

$$
\begin{gather*}
\partial_{t} f_{1}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f_{1}=\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(G_{1}-f_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left(M_{12}-f_{1}\right) \\
\partial_{t} f_{2}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} f_{2}=\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(G_{2}-f_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right) \tag{5.1}
\end{gather*}
$$

Now, consider the reduced functions

$$
g_{1}=\int f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}}, \quad g_{2}=\int f_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}}
$$

Then they satisfy the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{t} g_{1}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} g_{1}=\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(\widetilde{G}_{1}-g_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left(\widetilde{M}_{12}-g_{1}\right)  \tag{5.2}\\
& \partial_{t} g_{2}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} g_{2}=\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(\widetilde{G}_{2}-g_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(\widetilde{M}_{21}-g_{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $\widetilde{G}_{1}, \widetilde{G}_{2}, \widetilde{M}_{12}$ and $\widetilde{M}_{21}$ are given by

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\widetilde{G}_{1}=\int G_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}}, & \widetilde{M}_{12}=\int M_{12} d \eta_{l_{1}} \\
\widetilde{G}_{2}=\int G_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}}, & \widetilde{M}_{21}=\int M_{21} d \eta_{l_{2}}
\end{array}
$$

It is possible to compute the densities

$$
\begin{gathered}
n_{1}=\iint f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}} d v=\int g_{1} d v \\
n_{2}=\iiint f_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}} d v=\int g_{2} d v
\end{gathered}
$$

the velocities

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{1}=\iiint v f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}} d v=\int v g_{1} d v \\
& u_{2}=\iiint v f_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}} d v=\int v g_{2} d v
\end{aligned}
$$

the temperatures

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Lambda_{1}=\frac{1}{n_{1}} \iint\left|v-u_{1}\right|^{2} f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}} d v=\frac{1}{n_{1}} \int\left|v-u_{1}\right|^{2} g_{1} d v \\
& \Lambda_{2}=\frac{1}{n_{2}} \int\left|v-u_{2}\right|^{2} g_{2} d v \\
& \Theta_{1}=\frac{1}{n_{1}} \iint\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2} f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}} d v=\frac{1}{n_{1}} \int\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2} h_{1} d v
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\Theta_{2}=\frac{1}{n_{2}} \int\left|\eta_{l_{2}}\right|^{2} h_{2} d v
$$

if we define the reduced functions

$$
h_{1}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2} f_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}}, \quad h_{2}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{2}}\right|^{2} f_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}}
$$

which solve the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{t} h_{1}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} h_{1}=\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{1}-h_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left(\widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{12}-h_{1}\right) \\
& \partial_{t} h_{2}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} h_{2}=\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{2}-h_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(\widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{21}-h_{2}\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{1}, \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{2}, \widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{12}$ and $\widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{21}$ are given by

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{1}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2} G_{1} d \eta_{l_{1}}, & \widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{12}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{1}}\right|^{2} M_{12} d \eta \\
\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{2}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{2}}\right|^{2} G_{2} d \eta_{l_{2}}, & \widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{21}=\int\left|\eta_{l_{2}}\right|^{2} M_{21} d \eta_{l_{2}}
\end{array}
$$

If we compute $\widetilde{G}_{k}, \widetilde{M}_{12}, \widetilde{M}_{21}, \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{k}, \widetilde{M}_{12}, \widetilde{M}_{21}$ for $k=1,2$, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \widetilde{G}_{k}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{k}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}{m_{k}}\right.}\right)} \exp \left(-m_{k}\left(v-u_{k}\right)\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)\right), \quad k=1,2 \\
& \widetilde{M}_{12}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}} n} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{12}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}}\right)  \tag{5.4}\\
& \widetilde{M}_{21}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{21}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{2}}}\right) \\
& \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}_{k}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{k}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{k}^{E S}}{m_{k}}\right.}\right)} \exp \left(-m_{k}\left(v-u_{k}\right)\left(\Lambda_{k}^{E S}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{k}\right)\right) \Theta_{k}, \quad k=1,2 \\
& \widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{12}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}} n} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{12}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}}\right) \Theta_{12}  \tag{5.5}\\
& \widetilde{\widetilde{M}}_{21}(x, v, t)=\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}} n} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{21}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}}\right) \Theta_{21}
\end{align*}
$$

We are able to compute all the six Maxwellians because we can compute all moments by the previous computation.
5.2. A mixture consisting of a mono and a diatomic gas We consider now the special case of two species, one species is mono-atomic and has only translational degrees of freedom $l_{1}=0$, the other one is diatomic and has in addition two rotational degrees of freedom $l_{2}=2$ and both have the number of degrees of freedom in translations given by $d$ with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case the total number of rotational degrees of freedom
is $M=l_{1}+l_{2}=2$ since in sum we have two possible rotations. Our variables for the rotational energy degrees of freedom are $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2}, \eta_{l_{1}}=\binom{0}{0}, \eta_{l_{2}}=\eta$, since $\eta_{l_{k}}$ coincides with $\eta$ in the components corresponding to the rotational degrees of freedom of species $k$ and is zero in the other components. So our distribution function $f_{1}(x, v, t)$ of species 1 depends on $x, v$, and $t$ and our distribution function $f_{2}(x, v, \eta, t)$ of species 2 depends on $x, v, \eta$ and $t$. The moments of $f_{1}$ are given by

$$
\int f_{1}(v)\left(\begin{array}{c}
1  \tag{5.6}\\
v \\
m_{1}\left|v-u_{1}\right|^{2} \\
m_{1}\left(v-u_{1}(x, t)\right) \otimes\left(v-u_{1}(x, t)\right)
\end{array}\right) d v=:\left(\begin{array}{c}
n_{1} \\
n_{1} u_{1} \\
d n_{1} T_{1}^{t} \\
\mathbb{P}_{1}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and the moments of species 2 are given by

$$
\int f_{2}(v, \eta)\left(\begin{array}{c}
1  \tag{5.7}\\
v \\
\eta \\
m_{2}\left|v-u_{2}\right|^{2} \\
m_{2}|\eta|^{2} \\
m_{2}\left(v-u_{2}(x, t)\right) \otimes\left(v-u_{2}(x, t)\right)
\end{array}\right) d v d \eta=:\left(\begin{array}{c}
n_{2} \\
n_{2} u_{2} \\
0 \\
d n_{2} T_{2}^{t} \\
l_{2} n_{2} T_{k}^{r} \\
\mathbb{P}_{2}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The third equality is an assumption. We could also consider a general $\bar{\eta}$. Our model reduces to

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t} f_{1}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(v f_{1}\right) & =\nu_{11} n_{1}\left(G_{1}\left(f_{1}\right)-f_{1}\right)+\nu_{12} n_{2}\left(M_{12}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)-f_{1}\right) \\
\partial_{t} f_{2}+\nabla_{x} \cdot\left(v f_{2}\right) & =\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(G_{2}\left(f_{2}\right)-f_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(M_{21}\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)-f_{2}\right) \tag{5.8}
\end{align*}
$$

with the modified Maxwellians

$$
\begin{align*}
G_{1}\left(f_{1}\right)(x, v, t) & =\frac{n_{1}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{1}^{E S}}{m_{1}}\right)}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{1}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{1}^{E S}}{m_{1}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{1}\right)\right) \\
G_{2}\left(f_{2}\right)(x, v, \eta, t) & =\frac{n_{2}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{2}^{E S}}{m_{2}}\right.}\right)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{2}}{m_{2}}} l^{\prime}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{2}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{2}^{E S}}{m_{2}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{2}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{2}|\eta|^{2}}{\Theta_{2}}\right) \\
M_{12}(x, v, t) & =\frac{n_{12}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{12}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{12}}{m_{1}}}\right) \\
M_{21}(x, v, \eta, t) & =\frac{n_{21}}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{\Theta_{21}}{m_{2}}} l_{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{\left|v-u_{21}\right|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Lambda_{21}}{m_{2}}}-\frac{|\eta|^{2}}{2 \frac{\Theta_{21}}{m_{2}}}\right) \tag{5.9}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Lambda_{1}^{E S}=\left(1-\mu_{1}\right) T_{1}^{t} \mathbf{1}_{n}+\mu_{1} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{1}}{n_{1}} \\
& \Lambda_{2}^{E S}=\left(1-\mu_{2}\right) \Lambda_{2} \mathbf{1}_{n}+\mu_{2} \frac{\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}}{n_{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\mu_{k} \in \mathbb{R}, k=1,2$. For $\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}$ we use the additional relaxation equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \widehat{G}_{2}+v \cdot \nabla_{x} \widehat{G}_{2}=\frac{\nu_{22} n_{2}}{Z_{r}^{2}} \frac{d+2}{d}\left(\widetilde{G}_{2}-\widehat{G}_{2}\right)+\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(G_{2}-f_{2}\right)+\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(M_{21}-f_{2}\right), \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\widehat{G}_{2}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{G}_{2}=\frac{n_{2}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}}{m_{2}}\right)}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{2}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}}{m_{2}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{2}\right)-\frac{m_{2}|\eta|^{2}}{2 T_{2}^{r}}\right), \quad k=1,2 \tag{5.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\widetilde{G}_{2}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{G}_{2}=\frac{n_{2}}{\left.\sqrt{\operatorname{det}\left(2 \pi \frac{T_{2}^{t e n}}{m_{2}}\right.}\right)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \frac{T}{2}_{m_{2}}}}{ }^{2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(v-u_{2}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{T_{2}^{t e n}}{m_{2}}\right)^{-1} \cdot\left(v-u_{2}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{2}|\eta|^{2}}{T_{2}}\right) \tag{5.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the components of $T_{2}^{t e n}$ are defined in the following way.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\left(T_{2}^{t e n}\right)_{i i}=T_{2}:=\frac{d}{d+2} \Lambda_{2}+\frac{2}{d+2} \Theta_{2} & \text { for } \quad i=1, \ldots d \\
\left(T_{2}^{t e n}\right)_{i j}=\frac{d}{d+2}\left(\mathbb{P}_{2}\right)_{i j} & \text { for } \quad i, j=1, \ldots d, i \neq j \tag{5.13}
\end{array}
$$

We couple this with conservation of internal energy of species 2

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{2} n_{2} \Lambda_{2}=\frac{d}{2} n_{2} T_{2}^{t}+\frac{l_{2}}{2} n_{2} T_{2}^{r}-\frac{l_{2}}{2} n_{2} \Theta_{2} . \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we multiply (5.10) by $|\eta|^{2}$ and integrate with respect to $v$ and $\eta$, this leads to the following macroscopic equation

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}\right)+u_{2} \cdot \nabla_{x}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}\right)=\frac{\nu_{22} n_{2}}{Z_{r}^{2}} \frac{d+2}{d}\left(T_{2}^{t e n}-\Lambda_{2}^{t e n}\right) & +\nu_{22} n_{2}\left(\Lambda_{2}^{E S}-\mathbb{P}_{2}\right)  \tag{5.15}\\
& +\nu_{21} n_{1}\left(\Theta_{12}-T_{2}^{r}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

If we assume that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n_{12}=n_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad n_{21}=n_{2}, \\
u_{12}=\delta u_{1}+(1-\delta) u_{2}, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{R},
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{12}=\alpha T_{1}^{t}+(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{2}+\gamma\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \gamma \geq 0 \tag{5.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have conservation of mass, total momentum and total energy provided that

$$
\begin{gather*}
u_{21}=u_{2}-\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(1-\delta)\left(u_{2}-u_{1}\right),  \tag{5.17}\\
\Lambda_{21}+\frac{l_{2}}{d} \Theta_{21}=\left[\frac{1}{d} \varepsilon m_{1}(1-\delta)\left(\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(\delta-1)+\delta+1\right)-\varepsilon \gamma\right]\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}  \tag{5.18}\\
+\varepsilon(1-\alpha) T_{1}^{t}+(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \Lambda_{2}+\frac{l_{2}}{d} \Theta_{2} .
\end{gather*}
$$

We take into account the symmetry of the temperatures and choose

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{21} & =\varepsilon(1-\alpha) \Lambda_{1}+(1-\varepsilon(1-\alpha)) \Lambda_{2} \\
& +\left[\frac{1}{d} \varepsilon m_{1}(1-\delta)\left(\frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}} \varepsilon(\delta-1)+\delta+1\right)-\varepsilon \gamma\right]\left|u_{1}-u_{2}\right|^{2}  \tag{5.19}\\
\Theta_{21} & =\Theta_{2} \tag{5.20}
\end{align*}
$$
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