

ON THE KELLER-SEGEL SYSTEM WITH SIGNAL-DEPENDENT MOTILITY

HAI-YANG JIN AND ZHI-AN WANG

ABSTRACT. We consider the original Keller-Segel system with signal-dependent motility [24]:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (\gamma(v)\nabla u - u\phi(v)\nabla v), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with smooth boundary subject to homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, where

$$\phi(v) = (\alpha - 1)\gamma'(v).$$

When $\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma(v) = e^{-\chi v}$ with $\chi > 0$, by constructing a Lyapunov functional, we find a critical mass $m_* = \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$ such that the globally bounded solution exists if $M < m_*$ and blows up if $M > m_*$ and $M \notin \{\frac{4\pi m}{\chi} : m \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$, where \mathbb{N}^+ denotes the set of positive integers and $M = \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx$ is the initial cell mass.

1. INTRODUCTION

To describe the aggregation process of cells in response to chemical signals produced by themselves, Keller and Segel proposed the following chemotaxis model in [24]:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (\gamma(v)\nabla u - u\phi(v)\nabla v), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where Ω is a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary, u denotes the cell density and v stands for the emitted chemical concentration of the chemical. $\gamma(v) > 0$ is a motility function (coefficient) and $\phi(v)$ is called the chemotactic coefficient, where there is a correlation between them given by

$$\phi(v) = (\alpha - 1)\gamma'(v), \quad (1.2)$$

with α being the ratio of effective body length to step size (i.e. average distance between receptors). The prominent feature of Keller-Segel system (1.1) is that both diffusion coefficient $\gamma(v)$ and chemosensitivity function $\phi(v)$ depend on chemical concentration and are correlated each other. Indeed such mechanism applies to preytaxis in the predator-prey system [22, 23]. The study of Keller-Segel system (1.1) was started with some simplified cases and we shall briefly recall some relevant results below.

If $\gamma(v) = 1$ and $\phi(v) = \chi > 0$ (χ is a constant), the system (1.1) is simplified to the so-called minimal Keller-Segel (abbreviated as KS) model:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

whose solution behaviors under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions such as boundedness, blow-up and pattern formation have been extensively studied, see the review papers [7, 15–17] for more details. The mostly prominent feature of the minimal KS model is existence of critical mass phenomenon depending on the space dimensions. Precisely, the global bounded solutions exists in one dimension [28]. In space of two dimensions ($n = 2$), there exists a critical mass $m_* = \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$ such that the solution is bounded and asymptotically converges to its unique constant equilibrium if $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx < m_*$ [27, 35] and blows up if $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx > m_*$ [18], where $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx$

denotes the initial cell mass. In the higher dimensions ($n \geq 3$), for any $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx > 0$, the solution may blow up in finite time [39]. The mathematical analysis for the KS model (1.3) on the boundedness *vs.* blowup was essentially based on the following Lyapunov functional

$$F(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx - \chi \int_{\Omega} uv dx. \quad (1.4)$$

If $\gamma(v) = 1$ and $\phi(v) = \frac{\chi}{v}$, the system (1.1) becomes the so-called singular Keller-Segel system:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

and there are various results in the literature indicating the non-existence of blow-up of solutions. With homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, the existence of globally bounded solutions of (1.5) was established if $n = 2$ and $\chi < \chi_0$ for some $\chi_0 > 1$ [25] or $n \geq 3$ and $\chi < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}$ [10, 37]. Moreover, when $\chi < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}$ and $n \geq 2$, the asymptotic stability of constant steady states was obtained in [38]. More results on the radially symmetric case or weak solutions can be found in [8, 11–13, 29] and we refer to [7] for more details.

Turing to the full KS system (1.1) where $\gamma(v)$ and $\phi(v)$ are nonconstant functions satisfying (1.2), to our knowledge, the known results are only limited to the special case $\phi(v) = -\gamma'(v)$ (i.e. $\alpha = 0$ in (1.2)) which simplifies the KS system (1.1) into

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta(\gamma(v)u), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

Here the parameter $\alpha = 0$ in (1.2) means that “the distance between receptors is zero and the chemotaxis occurs because of an undirected effect on activity due to the presence of a chemical sensed by a single receptor” as stated in [24, On page 228]. Recently to describe the stripe pattern formation observed in the experiment of [26], a so-called density-suppressed motility model was proposed in [9] as follows

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta(\gamma(v)u) + \sigma u(1 - u), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

with $\gamma'(v) < 0$ and $\sigma \geq 0$ denotes the intrinsic cell growth rate. Clearly the density-suppressed motility model (1.7) with $\sigma = 0$ coincides with the simplified KS model (1.6).

When the homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions are imposed, there are some results available to (1.6) and (1.7). First for the system (1.6), it was shown that globally bounded solutions exist in two dimensional spaces by assuming that the motility function $\gamma(v) \in C^3([0, \infty) \cap W^{1, \infty}(0, \infty))$ has both positive lower and upper bounds. It turns out that the uniformly positive assumption on $\gamma(v)$ (i.e. $\gamma(v)$ has a positive lower bound) is not necessary to ensure the global boundedness of solutions. For example, if $\gamma(v) = \frac{\chi}{v^k}$ (i.e. $\gamma(v)$ decays algebraically), it has been proved that global bounded solutions exist in all dimensions provided $\chi > 0$ is small enough [40] or in two dimensional spaces for parabolic-elliptic simplification of the system (1.6) (see [3]). For the system (1.7) with $\gamma'(v) < 0$, it was shown that global bounded solutions exist in two dimensions for any $\sigma > 0$ [20] and in higher dimensions ($n \geq 3$) for large $\sigma > 0$ [33]. The results of [20] essentially rely on the assumption $\sigma > 0$. Therefore a natural question is whether the solution of (1.7) with $\sigma = 0$ (i.e. KS system (1.6) with $\gamma'(v) < 0$) is globally bounded? This question has been partially confirmed in [3, 40] for algebraically decay function $\gamma(v)$ with various conditions as mentioned above. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the same question for exponentially decay motility function $\gamma(v) = e^{-\chi v}$ with $\chi > 0$. That is we consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta(e^{-\chi v} u), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary and ν stands for the outward unit normal vector on $\partial\Omega$. Surprisingly, we find that uniform-in-time boundedness of solutions of (1.8) is no longer true and the solution may blow-up in two dimensions, which is quite different from the results of [3, 40] for algebraically decay function $\gamma(v)$. Our result indicates that the solution behavior of the system (1.6) may essentially depend on the decay rate of the motility function $\gamma(v)$. The main results of this paper are the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume that $0 \leq (u_0, v_0) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^2$ and $M = \int_{\Omega} u_0(x)dx$. Then the following results hold true.*

(i) *If $M < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, then the system (1.8) admits a unique classical solution $(u, v) \in [C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty))]^2$ satisfying*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq C,$$

where C is a constant independent of t .

(ii) *If $M > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$ and $M \notin \{\frac{4\pi m}{\chi} : m \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$ where \mathbb{N}^+ denotes the set of positive integers, then there exist initial data such that the solutions of (1.8) blow up in finite/infinite time.*

We remark that the blowup result in Theorem 1.1(ii) does not assert the finiteness or infiniteness of blowup time, which leaves out an interesting question for the future study.

One can check that the system (1.8) has the same Lyapunov functional (1.4) as for the minimal KS model (1.3), which can be used to construct some initial data with large negative energy such that the solution of (1.8) blows up for supercritical mass (i.e., $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$). Moreover, under the subcritical mass (i.e. $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$), using the same Lyapunov functional and Trudinger-Moser inequality, we can find a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|u \ln u\|_{L^1} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq c_1 \quad (1.9)$$

which has been a key to prove the boundedness of solutions of the minimal KS system (1.3). However, there are some significant differences between systems (1.3) and (1.8). For the minimal KS model (1.3), the estimate (1.9) is enough to establish the existence of global classical solutions (see [27]). However for the system (1.8), the motility coefficient e^{-xv} may touch down zero (degenerate) as $v \rightarrow \infty$, and hence the method for the constant diffusion as in [27] no longer works and new ideas are demanded. In this paper, we shall develop the weighted energy estimates based on the Lyapunov functional to establish our results. We briefly describe our ideas below.

Main ideas of the proof: Noticing that the steady state problem and Lyapunov functional of the system (1.8) are the same as for the minimal KS model (1.3), we use the well-known procedures as in [18, 19, 21] for (1.3) to prove the blow-up of solutions in the case of supercritical mass.

For the subcritical mass case, we still can obtain the same estimate (1.9) as for the minimal KS model based on the Lyapunov functional along with the Trudinger-Moser inequality, see Lemma 3.2 for details. However, due to the possible degeneracy of diffusion, the estimate (1.9) is not sufficient to derive the L^∞ estimates by the conventional bootstrap argument (cf. [27]) or boundedness criterion (cf. [7]). Inspired by some ideas in [32], though we can not obtain the boundedness of $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx ds$ with some $\tau \in (0, 1]$, we can derive that $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-xv} u^2 dx ds \leq c_1$ by fully exploiting the structure of the first equation of system (1.8) and the boundedness of $\int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx$ in the case of subcritical mass (see Lemma 3.3). Then using the direct L^2 -estimate of u as in [20], we can deduce the following estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_2(1 + \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2) \|e^{-\frac{xv}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (1.10)$$

which will give rise to the uniform-in-time estimate of $\|u\|_{L^2}$ if $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^2 dx ds \leq c_3$. However, for the system (1.8), we only can obtain $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-xv} u^2 dx ds \leq c_1$, which is not enough to obtain

the uniform estimate of $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_\Omega |\Delta v|^2 dx ds$. To overcome this barrier, we shall use the second equation of system (1.8) to derive that

$$\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_4(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and hence the estimate (1.10) can be reformulated as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_5(1 + \|e^{-\frac{xv}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2) \|u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which under the integrability of $\|e^{-\frac{xv}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + 1$ gives the L^2 estimate of u . Then applying the parabolic regularity theory to the second equation of system (1.8), one obtains the uniform-in-time boundedness of $\|v\|_{L^\infty}$ for any $t \in (0, T_{max})$, which rules out the possible degeneracy of diffusion. Then the conventional bootstrap argument [27] becomes applicable to obtain the boundedness of $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$, which along with the local existence results in Lemma 2.1 leads to the global existence classical solutions.

2. LOCAL EXISTENCE AND BASIC INEQUALITIES

Using Amann's theorem [5, 6] (cf. also [34, Lemma 2.6]) or the well-established fixed point argument together with the parabolic regularity theory [20, 31], we can show the existence and uniqueness of local solutions of (1.8). We omit the details of the proof for brevity.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume that $0 \leq (u_0, v_0) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^2$. Then there exists $T_{max} \in (0, \infty]$ such that the problem (1.8) has a unique classical solution $(u, v) \in [C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\Omega \times (0, T_{max}))]^2$. Moreover $u, v > 0$ in $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$ and*

$$\text{if } T_{max} < \infty, \text{ then } \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \nearrow T_{max}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *If (u, v) is a solution of (1.8) in $\Omega \times (0, T)$ for some $T > 0$, then*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \|u_0\|_{L^1} := M, \text{ for all } t \in (0, T) \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^1} + \|v_0\|_{L^1}, \text{ for all } t \in (0, T). \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. Integrating the first equation of (1.8) and using the Neumann boundary conditions, we obtain (2.1) directly. On the other hand, integrating the second equation of (1.8) with respect to x over Ω , one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega v dx + \int_\Omega v dx = \int_\Omega u dx = \int_\Omega u_0 dx,$$

which immediately gives (2.2). \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume \mathcal{A} is a self-adjoint realization of $-\Delta$ defined on $D(\mathcal{A}) := \{\psi \in W^{2,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega) \mid \int_\Omega \psi = 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$. Then for any $L > 0$ and a nonnegative function f satisfying*

$$\int_\Omega f \ln f dx \leq L, \quad (2.3)$$

it holds that

$$\int_\Omega |\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(f - \bar{f})|^2 dx \leq C(L), \quad (2.4)$$

where $\bar{f} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega f dx$.

Proof. Using (2.3) and noting the fact $z \ln z \geq -\frac{1}{e}$ for all $z > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^1} &= \int_{f \geq e} f dx + \int_{f < e} f dx \\ &\leq \int_{f \geq e} f \ln f dx + \int_{f < e} f dx = \int_\Omega f \ln f - \int_{f < e} f \ln f dx + \int_{f < e} f dx \\ &\leq L + \frac{|\Omega|}{e} + e|\Omega|, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\|f - \bar{f}\|_{L^1} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^1} \leq 2L + \frac{2|\Omega|}{e} + 2e|\Omega|. \quad (2.5)$$

Next, we consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\phi = f - \bar{f}, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

Let G denote the Green's function of $-\Delta$ in Ω with the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition. From (2.6), one has

$$\phi(x) = \int_{\Omega} G(x-y)(f(y) - \bar{f})dy. \quad (2.7)$$

Then using the similar argument as in [30, Lemma A.3] along with (2.5), from (2.7) one can find a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{\kappa|\phi|} dx \leq c_1. \quad (2.8)$$

Recall a result (see [30, Lemma A.2]): for $\kappa > 0$, it holds

$$XY \leq \frac{1}{\kappa}X \ln X + \frac{1}{\kappa e}e^{\kappa Y} \text{ for all } X \geq 0 \text{ and } Y \geq 0.$$

Then multiplying the first equation of (2.6) by ϕ , and integrating it by parts, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} f\phi - \bar{f} \int_{\Omega} \phi dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} f|\phi| + \int_{\Omega} \bar{f}|\phi| dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_{\Omega} f \ln f dx + \frac{2}{\kappa e} \int_{\Omega} e^{\kappa|\phi|} dx + \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_{\Omega} \bar{f} \ln \bar{f} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_{\Omega} f \ln f dx + \frac{2}{\kappa e} \int_{\Omega} e^{\kappa|\phi|} dx + \frac{|\Omega|}{\kappa} \bar{f} \ln \bar{f}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Substituting (2.3) and (2.8) into (2.9), and using the boundedness of $\bar{f} \ln \bar{f}$, one has

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx \leq c_2 \quad (2.10)$$

where c_2 depends on L . Using the definition of \mathcal{A} and the elliptic theory guarantees the existence of a self-adjoint fractional powers $\mathcal{A}^{-\delta}$ for any $\delta > 0$, then from (2.6) we have $\phi = \mathcal{A}^{-1}(f - \bar{f})$ and hence

$$\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(f - \bar{f})|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{-1}(f - \bar{f})(f - \bar{f}) dx = \int_{\Omega} \phi(-\Delta\phi) dx = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx \leq c_2, \quad (2.11)$$

which gives (2.4). □

Lemma 2.4. *Let (u, v) be a solution of the system (1.8). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t such that*

$$\|\Delta v\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|v_t\|_{L^2}). \quad (2.12)$$

Proof. Noting that v satisfies the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + v = u - v_t, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial\nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

Then applying the Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg L^p estimates(see [1, 2]) to the system (2.13), we can find a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|v\|_{W^{2,2}} \leq c_1\|(u - v_t)\|_{L^2} \leq 2c_1(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|v_t\|_{L^2}),$$

which gives (2.12). □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 1.1, which includes the global existence of classical solutions for subcritical mass and blowup of solutions for supercritical mass.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F(u, v)$ be defined in (1.4). Then the solutions of (1.8) satisfy*

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(u, v) + G(u, v) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$G(u, v) = \chi \int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u |\nabla(\ln u - \chi v)|^2 dx.$$

Proof. We multiply the first equation of (1.8) by $(\ln u - \chi v)$ and integrate the result with respect to x over Ω to have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u_t (\ln u - \chi v) dx &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (e^{-\chi v} \nabla u - \chi e^{-\chi v} u \nabla v) (\ln u - \chi v) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u |\nabla(\ln u - \chi v)|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

On the other hand, using the fact that $\int_{\Omega} u_t dx = 0$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} u_t (\ln u - \chi v) dx = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx - \chi \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u v dx + \chi \int_{\Omega} u v_t dx. \quad (3.3)$$

From the second equation of (1.8), one has $u = v_t - \Delta v + v$, which gives

$$\int_{\Omega} u v_t dx = \int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} v^2 dx. \quad (3.4)$$

Then the combination of (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) gives (3.1). \square

3.1. Global existence with subcritical mass. In this subsection, we first prove the existence of global classical solutions if $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx \leq C \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \quad (3.6)$$

as well as

$$\int_0^t \|v_t(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq C. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. From (1.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F(u, v) &= \int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx - (\chi + \eta) \int_{\Omega} u v dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} u v dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} u \ln \frac{e^{(\chi+\eta)v}}{u} dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} u v dx \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Noting that $-\ln z$ is a convex function for all $z \geq 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u}{M} dx = 1$, which allows us to use the Jensen's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln \left(\frac{1}{M} \int_{\Omega} e^{(\chi+\eta)v} dx \right) &= -\ln \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{e^{(\chi+\eta)v}}{u} \frac{u}{M} dx \right) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(-\ln \frac{e^{(\chi+\eta)v}}{u} \right) \frac{u}{M} dx = -\frac{1}{M} \int_{\Omega} u \ln \frac{e^{(\chi+\eta)v}}{u} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Then the combination of (3.8) and (3.9) gives

$$F(u, v) \geq -M \ln \left(\frac{1}{M} \int_{\Omega} e^{(\chi+\eta)v} dx \right) + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} uv dx. \quad (3.10)$$

Noting the fact $\|v\|_{L^1} \leq c_1$, and using the Trudinger-Moser inequality in two dimensional spaces [27], one has

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{(\chi+\eta)v} dx \leq c_2 e^{(\frac{1}{8\pi} + \varepsilon)(\chi+\eta)^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2}, \quad (3.11)$$

which substituted into (3.10) gives

$$F(u, v) \geq \left[\frac{\chi}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{8\pi} + \varepsilon \right) (\chi + \eta)^2 M \right] \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} v^2 dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} uv dx - c_3, \quad (3.12)$$

where $c_3 := M \ln \frac{c_2}{M}$. Since $M = \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, it holds that

$$\frac{\chi}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{8\pi} + \varepsilon \right) (\chi + \eta)^2 M > 0, \quad (3.13)$$

by choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ small enough. Substituting (3.13) into (3.12), one has

$$F(u, v) \geq \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} v^2 dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} uv dx - c_3, \quad (3.14)$$

which gives $F(u, v) \geq -c_3$ and $\int_{\Omega} uv dx \leq \frac{F(u_0, v_0) + c_3}{\eta}$ by the fact $F(u, v) \leq F(u_0, v_0)$. Then using the definition of $F(u, v)$ in (1.4) and the fact $F(u, v) \leq F(u_0, v_0)$ again, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx \leq F(u, v) + \chi \int_{\Omega} uv dx \leq \left(1 + \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right) F(u_0, v_0) + \frac{\chi c_3}{\eta}, \quad (3.15)$$

and hence (3.5) follows. Moreover, we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx &\leq F(u, v) + \chi \int_{\Omega} uv dx - \int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx \\ &\leq F(u, v) + \chi \int_{\Omega} uv dx + \frac{|\Omega|}{e} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right) F(u_0, v_0) + \frac{\chi c_3}{\eta} + \frac{|\Omega|}{e}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.6). Integrating (3.1) and using the fact $F(u, v) \geq -c_3$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx dt + \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u |\nabla(\ln u - \chi v)|^2 dx dt &\leq F(u_0, v_0) - F(u, v) \\ &\leq F(u_0, v_0) + c_3, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\int_0^t \int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx dt \leq \frac{F(u_0, v_0) + c_3}{\chi},$$

and then (3.7) follows. The proof of this lemma is completed. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let (u, v) be a solution of (1.8). If $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t such that the following inequality holds*

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 dx ds \leq C, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \tilde{T}_{max}). \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$\tau := \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{2}T_{max}\right\} \text{ and } \tilde{T}_{max} = \begin{cases} T_{max} - \tau & \text{if } T_{max} < \infty, \\ \infty & \text{if } T_{max} = \infty. \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. Using the definition of \mathcal{A} in Lemma 2.3, we can rewrite the system (1.8) as follows

$$\begin{cases} (u - \bar{u})_t = -\mathcal{A}(e^{-\chi v}u - \overline{e^{-\chi v}u}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

Then multiplying (3.18) by $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(u - \bar{u})$ and integrating the result by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u - \bar{u})|^2 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{-1}(u - \bar{u}) \cdot \mathcal{A}(e^{-\chi v}u - \overline{e^{-\chi v}u}) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) \cdot (e^{-\chi v}u - \overline{e^{-\chi v}u}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

On the other hand, with some direct calculations and noting that $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} u = \frac{M}{|\Omega|}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) \cdot (e^{-\chi v}u - \overline{e^{-\chi v}u}) dx &= - \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) (e^{-\chi v}(u - \bar{u}) + e^{-\chi v}\bar{u} - \overline{e^{-\chi v}u}) dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v}(u - \bar{u})^2 dx + \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u} - u) e^{-\chi v} dx \\ &\leq - \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v}(u - \bar{u})^2 dx + \frac{M^2}{|\Omega|}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Then we substitute (3.20) into (3.19) to get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u - \bar{u})|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v}(u - \bar{u})^2 dx \leq \frac{2M^2}{|\Omega|}. \quad (3.21)$$

Since $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, then from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 2.3, we can find a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u - \bar{u})|^2 dx \leq c_1. \quad (3.22)$$

Then integrating (3.21) over $(t, t + \tau)$ and using (3.22), one has

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v}(u - \bar{u})^2 dx ds \leq \frac{M^2}{|\Omega|} \tau \leq \frac{M^2}{|\Omega|},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 dx ds &= \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} (u - \bar{u} + \bar{u})^2 dx ds \\ &\leq 2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} (u - \bar{u})^2 dx ds + 2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 dx ds \leq \frac{4M^2}{|\Omega|}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence (3.16) follows. Then we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose the conditions in Lemma 3.3 hold. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t such that*

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \|v(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty} ds \leq C, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \tilde{T}_{max}). \quad (3.23)$$

where τ is defined by (3.17).

Proof. Using the Sobolev embedding theorem and applying the Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg L^p estimates (see [1, 2]) to the system (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^\infty} &\leq c_1 \|v\|_{W^{2, \frac{3}{2}}} \leq c_2 \|(u - v_t)\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\leq 2c_2 (\|u\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \|v_t\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}) \\ &\leq 2c_2 \left(\int_{\Omega} u^2 e^{-\chi v} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} e^{3\chi v} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{6}} + 2c_2 \left(\int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{6}} \\ &\leq c_2^2 \int_{\Omega} u^2 e^{-\chi v} dx + \left(\int_{\Omega} e^{3\chi v} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} + c_2^2 \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

On the other hand, using the fact $\|v\|_{L^1} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \leq c_3$ (see Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 2.3) and applying the Trudinger-Moser inequality in two dimensional spaces [27], one has

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{3\chi v} dx \leq c_4, \quad (3.25)$$

which, substituted into (3.25) and combined with (3.16) and (3.7), gives

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \|v(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty} ds \leq c_2^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 e^{-\chi v} dx + c_2^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|v_t(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + c_4 \leq c_5,$$

which yields (3.23). \square

With the above results in hand, we shall show that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2} \leq C$ for any $t \in (0, T_{max})$, which will be used to rule out the possibility of degeneracy. Precisely, we have the following results.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $\int_{\Omega} u_0 dx < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$. If (u, v) is a solution of system (1.8) in $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$, then there exists a positive constant C independent of t such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. We multiply the first equation of (1.8) by u and integrate the result by parts with respect to x . Then using the Hölder inequality and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} |\nabla u|^2 dx &= \chi \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx \\ &\leq \chi \left(\int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{\chi^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \chi^2 \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx. \quad (3.27)$$

On the other hand, using the fact $|X + Y|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}X^2 - Y^2$ and

$$e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} \nabla u = \nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} u) + \frac{\chi}{2} e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} u \nabla v,$$

we have

$$e^{-\chi v} |\nabla u|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} |\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} u)|^2 - \frac{\chi^2}{4} e^{-\chi v} u^2 |\nabla v|^2,$$

which substituted into (3.27) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} u)|^2 dx &\leq \frac{5\chi^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{5\chi^2}{4} \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v} u\|_{L^4}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Moreover, the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality along with the facts $\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \leq c_1$ and $\|\nabla v\|_{L^4} \leq c_2(\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2})$ (see [20, Lemma 2.5]) entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{5\chi^2}{4}\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^4}^2 \\
& \leq c_3(\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2)(\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2} + \|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \leq c_1c_3\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2} + c_1c_3\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \quad + c_1^2c_3\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2} + c_1^2c_3\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2c_1^2c_3^2\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1+4c_1^4c_3^2}{4}\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}^2 + c_4(\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 + 1)\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (2.12) and the fact $e^{-\chi v} \leq 1$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{5\chi^2}{4}\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^4}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}^2 + c_5(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + 1)\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla(e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u)\|_{L^2}^2 + c_5\left(\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + 1\right)\|u\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Substituting (3.29) into (3.28), one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_5\left(\|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + 1\right)\|u\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.30}$$

For any $t \in (0, T_{max})$ and in the case of either $t \in (0, \tau)$ or $t \geq \tau$ with $\tau = \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{2}T_{max}\right\}$, from (3.16) we can find a $t_0 = t_0(t) \in ((t - \tau)_+, t)$ such that $t_0 \geq 0$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v(x, t_0)} u^2(x, t_0) dx \leq c_6,$$

which, along with (3.23), implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} u^2(x, t_0) dx \leq c_7. \tag{3.31}$$

Integrating (3.30) over (t_0, t) and noting the fact $t \leq t_0 + \tau \leq t_0 + 1$, then we can use (3.7), (3.16) and (3.31) to obtain

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|u(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 e^{c_5 \int_{t_0}^t \|e^{-\frac{\chi}{2}v}u\|_{L^2}^2 ds + c_5 \int_{t_0}^t \|v_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds + c_5} \leq c_8 \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which gives (3.26). □

Lemma 3.6. *Let the conditions in Lemma 3.5 hold. Suppose (u, v) is a solution of (1.8) in $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$, then one has*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C, \text{ for all } t \in (0, T_{max}), \tag{3.32}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of t .

Proof. By the variation-of-constant formula, it follows from the second equation of (1.8) that

$$v(x, t) = e^{(\Delta-1)t}v_0(x) + \int_0^t e^{(\Delta-1)(t-s)}u(x, s)ds. \tag{3.33}$$

Then applying the well-known smoothing estimates for the heat semigroup $(e^{\Delta t})_{t \geq 0}$ on homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions and using (3.26), one has from (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq e^{-t} \|v_0\|_{L^\infty} + c_1 \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-(t-s)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq \|v_0\|_{L^\infty} + c_1 c_2 \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-(t-s)} ds \\ &\leq c_3 \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v\|_{L^4} &\leq \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^4} + c_4 \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{-(t-s)} ds \\ &\leq c_5. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

The estimate (3.34) implies that

$$e^{-\chi v} \geq e^{-\chi c_3} := d_1 > 0. \quad (3.36)$$

Then multiplying the first equation of (1.8) by u^{p-1} with $p \geq 3$ and integrating the result by parts, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx + (p-1) \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &= -(p-1) \chi \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx \\ &\leq \frac{p-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{(p-1)\chi^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u^p |\nabla v|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (3.36) and the fact $e^{-\chi v} \leq 1$, gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx + \frac{2(p-1)d_1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx \leq \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 dx. \quad (3.37)$$

Then with (3.26) and (3.35), we can use the Hölder inequality and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{p(p-1)\chi^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2}{2} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{2p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^4 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2}{2} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2}{2} c_5^2 c_6 (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\frac{1}{p})} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{4}{p}}}^{\frac{2}{p}} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{4}{p}}}^2) \\ &\leq d_2 \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\frac{1}{p})} + d_3 \\ &\leq \frac{(p-1)d_1}{p} \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{d_1}{p} \left(\frac{d_2}{d_1} \right)^p + d_3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where

$$d_2 := \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2 c_2^2 c_5^2 c_6}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad d_3 := \frac{p(p-1)\chi^2 c_2^p c_5^p c_6}{2}.$$

On the other hand, using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality again, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx &= \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_7 (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\frac{2}{p})} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{4}{p}}}^{\frac{4}{p}} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{4}{p}}}^2) \\ &\leq c_7 c_2^2 \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\frac{2}{p})} + c_7 c_2^p \\ &\leq \frac{(p-1)d_1}{p} \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2}^2 + c_8. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

Then substituting (3.38) and (3.39) into (3.37), and integrating the result with respect to t , we have for all $t \in (0, T)$ that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p}^p \leq \|u_0\|_{L^p}^p + c_9, \quad (3.40)$$

where $c_9 > 0$ is constant depending on p but independent of t . Applying the parabolic regularity theory to the second equation of (1.8), and choosing $p = 4$ in (3.40), one can find a positive constant d_4 independent of p such that $\|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq d_4$. Then by the well-known Moser iteration [4](or see [20]), we can show (3.32). \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume that $0 \leq (u_0, v_0) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^2$ and $M = \int_{\Omega} u_0(x)dx$, then if $M < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, the system (1.8) admits a unique classical solution $(u, v) \in [C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty))]^2$ with uniform-in-time bound.*

Proof. Using Lemma 3.6, we have $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1$. Then applying the parabolic regularity to the second equation of (1.8), one has $\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq C_2$. Hence Lemma 3.7 follows directly by using Lemma 2.1. \square

3.2. Blowup for supercritical mass. In this subsection, we shall construct some initial data such that the corresponding solution of (1.8) blows up with supercritical mass. The proof is based on some ideas in [18, 21] by using the Lyapunov functional $F(u, v)$ defined in (1.4). Precisely, the proof consists of the following steps:

Step 1: If $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x)dx \neq \frac{4\pi m}{\chi}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then we find a constant $K > 0$ such that $F(u_\infty, v_\infty) \geq -K$, where (u_∞, v_∞) is the steady of (1.8).

Step 2: If $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x)dx > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, we construct some initial data $(u_0, v_0) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^2$ such that $F(u_0, v_0) < -K$.

Step 3: By supposing (u, v) is a global and bounded solution of (1.8), we can find a time sequence $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(u(\cdot, t_k), v(\cdot, t_k)) \rightarrow (u_\infty, v_\infty)$ satisfying

$$F(u_\infty, v_\infty) \leq F(u_0, v_0),$$

which raises the following contradiction

$$-K \leq F(u_\infty, v_\infty) \leq F(u_0, v_0) < -K.$$

The stationary solution of system (1.8) satisfies the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v + v = \frac{Me^{xv}}{\int_{\Omega} e^{xv} dx}, & x \in \Omega, \\ u = \frac{Me^{xv}}{\int_{\Omega} e^{xv} dx}, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \int_{\Omega} u dx = \int_{\Omega} v dx = M. \end{cases} \quad (3.41)$$

For convenience, we introduce the following change of variable: $V = v - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} v dx = v - \frac{M}{|\Omega|}$. Then the system (3.41) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta V + V = \frac{Me^{xV}}{\int_{\Omega} e^{xV} dx} - \frac{M}{|\Omega|}, & x \in \Omega, \\ U = \frac{Me^{xV}}{\int_{\Omega} e^{xV} dx}, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \int_{\Omega} U dx = M, \int_{\Omega} V dx = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.42)$$

We point out that the steady state problem (3.42) and the Lyapunov function (1.4) for (1.8) are the same as those for the minimal Keller-Segel system (1.3) whose blow-up of solutions has been studied in [18, 19]. Hence we use the same arguments as in [18, Lemma 3.5] to establish the lower bound for the steady-state energy when $\int_{\Omega} u_0(x)dx \neq \frac{4\pi m}{\chi}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For convenience, we cite the results without proof.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose $M \neq \frac{4\pi m}{\chi}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$F(U, V) \geq -K \quad (3.43)$$

holds for any solution (U, V) of the system (3.42).

Next, we show that there exist some initial data with supercritical mass such that the energy is below any prescribed bound. To this end, we first prove that there is a sequence $(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$ satisfying $\int_\Omega V_\varepsilon(x) dx = 0$ and $\int_\Omega U_\varepsilon dx = M$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon) = -\infty$. Let $(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon)$ be defined as follows:

$$V_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\chi} \left[\ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x - x_0|^2)^2} \right) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x - x_0|^2)^2} \right) dx \right], \quad (3.44)$$

and

$$U_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{M e^{\chi V_\varepsilon(x)}}{\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon(x)} dx}, \quad (3.45)$$

where x_0 is an arbitrary point on $\partial\Omega$. One can easily check that $\int_\Omega V_\varepsilon(x) dx = 0$ and $\int_\Omega U_\varepsilon dx = M$. Next, we shall show that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon) = -\infty$ in the case of supercritical mass.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$ be defined by (3.44) – (3.45) and $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. If $M > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, then it holds that*

$$F(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.46)$$

Proof. Since x_0 is an arbitrary point on $\partial\Omega$, we assume $x_0 = 0$ without loss of generality. With the definition of $F(u, v)$ and (3.45), one has

$$\begin{aligned} F(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon) &= \int_\Omega U_\varepsilon \ln U_\varepsilon dx - \chi \int_\Omega U_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla V_\varepsilon|^2 dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega V_\varepsilon^2 dx \\ &= M \ln M - M \ln \left(\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx \right) + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla V_\varepsilon|^2 dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega V_\varepsilon^2 dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

where we have used the fact

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega U_\varepsilon \ln U_\varepsilon dx - \chi \int_\Omega U_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon dx \\ &= \frac{M}{\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx} \int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} \left[\ln M + \chi V_\varepsilon - \ln \left(\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx \right) \right] dx - \frac{\chi M}{\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx} \int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon dx \\ &= M \ln M - M \ln \left(\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we use (3.44) and the polar coordinates around origin $0 \in \partial\Omega$, with R denoting the maximum distance between the pole and boundary of Ω , to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla V_\varepsilon|^2 dx &\leq \frac{8\pi^2}{\chi} \int_0^\pi \int_0^{\frac{R}{\varepsilon}} \frac{r^3}{(1 + \pi r^2)^2} dr d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{4\pi}{\chi} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + \ln(\varepsilon^2 + \pi R^2) - 1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon^2 + \pi R^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{8\pi}{\chi} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O_1(1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

where $|O_1(1)| \leq C$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, direct calculations give

$$\frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega V_\varepsilon^2 dx = \frac{1}{2\chi} \int_\Omega (\ln(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2))^2 dx - \frac{1}{2\chi|\Omega|} \left(\int_\Omega \ln(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2) dx \right)^2 = O_2(1), \quad (3.49)$$

where $|O_2(1)| \leq C$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, it has that

$$\ln \left(\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\varepsilon} dx \right) = \ln \left(|\Omega| \int_\Omega \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} dx \right) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} \right) dx, \quad (3.50)$$

and

$$1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\pi R_1^2 + \varepsilon^2} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} dx \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\pi R_2^2 + \varepsilon^2},$$

where R_1 and R_2 denote the maximum and minimum distance between the pole and the boundary of Ω . Then from (3.50), one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & -M \ln \left(\int_{\Omega} e^{\chi V_{\varepsilon}} dx \right) \\ &= -M \left[\ln \left(|\Omega| \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} dx \right) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} \right) dx \right] \\ &= \frac{M}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \ln \varepsilon^2 dx + \frac{M}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \ln(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2 dx - M \ln \left(|\Omega| \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \pi|x|^2)^2} dx \right) \\ &= 2M \ln \varepsilon + O_3(1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

with $|O_3(1)| \leq C$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Finally substituting (3.48), (3.49) and (3.51) into (3.47) gives

$$F(U_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}) \leq 2 \left(\frac{4\pi}{\chi} - M \right) \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O(1), \tag{3.52}$$

where $O(1) = O_1(1) + O_2(1) + O_3(1)$ and $|O(1)| \leq C$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since $M > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$, (3.46) follows directly from (3.52). \square

Next, we shall establish the connection between the energy of steady states and the initial data. More precisely, we have the following results.

Lemma 3.10. *Let (u, v) be a global-in-time bounded solution of (1.8). Then there exist a sequence of times $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ and nonnegative function $(U_{\infty}, V_{\infty}) \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2$ such that $(u(\cdot, t_k), v(\cdot, t_k)) \rightarrow (U_{\infty}, V_{\infty})$ in $[C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, (U_{∞}, V_{∞}) is a solution of (3.42) satisfying*

$$F(U_{\infty}, V_{\infty}) \leq F(u_0, v_0). \tag{3.53}$$

Proof. Since (u, v) is the global classical solution with uniform-in-time bound of system (1.8), we can use the Schauder regularity theory (e.g. see [14]), to show that $(u(\cdot, t), v(\cdot, t))_{t>1}$ is relatively compact in $[C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2$. Hence there exists a suitable time sequence $(t_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that $(u(\cdot, t_k), v(\cdot, t_k)) \rightarrow (U_{\infty}, V_{\infty})$ in $[C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2$ as $t_k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, using the boundedness of (u, v) , we can find a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$F(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} u \ln u dx + \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) dx - \chi \int_{\Omega} uv dx \geq -c_1,$$

which combined with Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$\chi \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} v_t^2 dx d\tau + \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\chi v} u |\nabla(\ln u - \chi v)|^2 dx ds < \infty.$$

Then applying the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we can find a time sequence, still denoted by $(t_k)_{k \geq 1}$, such that

$$v_t(\cdot, t_k) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)$$

and

$$e^{-\chi v(\cdot, t_k)} u(\cdot, t_k) |\nabla(\ln u(\cdot, t_k) - \chi v(\cdot, t_k))|^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. in } \bar{\Omega} \tag{3.54}$$

as $t_k \rightarrow \infty$. We evaluate the second equation of (1.8) at $t = t_k$ and let $k \rightarrow \infty$ to have

$$-\Delta V_{\infty} + V_{\infty} = U_{\infty} - \bar{u}. \tag{3.55}$$

Using (3.54) and taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$U_{\infty} |\nabla(\ln U_{\infty} - \chi V_{\infty})|^2 = 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

By using the same argument as in [36, Lemma 3.1], one can show that $U_{\infty} > 0$ for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, and hence

$$\nabla(\ln U_{\infty} - \chi V_{\infty}) = 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}.$$

which gives

$$U_\infty = \frac{Me^{\chi V_\infty}}{\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_\infty} dx}. \quad (3.56)$$

Then combining (3.55) and (3.56), and using the fact $\bar{u} = \frac{M}{|\Omega|}$, we know that (U_∞, V_∞) is a solution of (3.42). Furthermore, because $(u(\cdot, t_k), v(\cdot, t_k)) \rightarrow (U_\infty, V_\infty)$ in $[C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^2$ and thus

$$F(u(\cdot, t_k), v(\cdot, t_k)) \rightarrow F(U_\infty, V_\infty), \text{ as } t_k \rightarrow \infty,$$

we have (3.53) by the fact $F(u, v) \leq F(u_0, v_0)$ from (3.1). Then, the proof of Lemma 3.10 is completed. \square

With Lemmas 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10 in hand, we now show the blowup of solutions under supercritical mass by the argument of contradiction. Precisely, we have the following results.

Lemma 3.11. *Assume $M > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$ and $M \notin \{\frac{4\pi m}{\chi} : m \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$. Then there exists an initial value (u_0, v_0) such that the corresponding solution of (1.8) blows up.*

Proof. Since $M \notin \{\frac{4\pi m}{\chi} : m \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$, then by Lemma 3.8, we can find a constant $K > 0$ such that (3.43) holds. Furthermore, using Lemma 3.9, we know that for this constant $K > 0$, if $M > \frac{4\pi}{\chi}$ there exists a small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$F(U_{\varepsilon_0}, V_{\varepsilon_0}) < -K,$$

where

$$V_{\varepsilon_0}(x) = \frac{1}{\chi} \left[\ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{(\varepsilon_0^2 + \pi|x - x_0|^2)^2} \right) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{(\varepsilon_0^2 + \pi|x - x_0|^2)^2} \right) dx \right],$$

and

$$U_{\varepsilon_0}(x) = \frac{Me^{\chi V_{\varepsilon_0}(x)}}{\int_\Omega e^{\chi V_{\varepsilon_0}(x)} dx}.$$

Moreover, we can check that $(U_{\varepsilon_0}, V_{\varepsilon_0}) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)]^2$ and $\int_\Omega U_{\varepsilon_0}(x) dx = M$. Then the solution of the system (1.8) with initial data $(u_0, v_0) = (U_{\varepsilon_0}, V_{\varepsilon_0})$ must blow up. In fact, suppose the solution (u, v) of (1.8) with the above (u_0, v_0) is uniformly bounded in time, then from Lemma 3.10, we have $F(U_\infty, V_\infty) \leq F(u_0, v_0) < -K$, where (U_∞, V_∞) is a solution of (3.42). This is a contradiction by noting $F(U_\infty, V_\infty) \geq -K$ from Lemma 3.8. Then the Lemma is proved. \square

3.2.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.11.

Acknowledgement. The research of H.Y. Jin was supported by the NSF of China No. 11871226 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities. The research of Z.A. Wang was supported by the Hong Kong RGC GRF grant PolyU 153298/16P (Project ID P0005368).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Agmon, A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. *I, Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 12:623-727, 1959.
- [2] S. Agmon, A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. *II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 17:35-92, 1964.
- [3] J. Ahn and C. Yoon, Global well-posedness and stability of constant equilibria in parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis systems without gradient sensing. *Nonlinearity*, 32(4):1327-1351, 2019.
- [4] N.D. Alikakos, L^p bounds of solutions of reaction-diffusion equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 4:827-868, 1979.
- [5] H. Amann, Dynamic theory of quasilinear parabolic equations. II. Reaction-diffusion systems. *Differ. Integral Equ.*, 3(1):13-75, 1990.

- [6] H. Amann, Nonhomogeneous linear and quasilinear elliptic and parabolic boundary value problems. *Function spaces, differential operators and nonlinear analysis. Teubner-Texte zur Math., Stuttgart-Leipzig*, 133:9-126, 1993.
- [7] N. Bellomo, A. Bellouquid, Y.S. Tao and M. Winkler, Towards a mathematical theory of Keller-Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25:1663-1763, 2015.
- [8] P. Biler, Global solutions to some parabolic-elliptic systems of chemotaxis. *Adv. Math.Sci. Appl.*, 9:347-359,1999.
- [9] X. Fu, L.H. Tang, C. Liu, J.D. Huang, T. Hwa and P. Lenz, Stripe formation in bacterial system with density-suppressed motility. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:198102, 2012.
- [10] K. Fujie, Boundedness in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 424:675-684, 2015.
- [11] K. Fujie, M. Winkler and T. Yokota, Boundedness of solutions to parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel systems with signal-dependent sensitivity. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 38(6):1212-1224, 2015.
- [12] K. Fujie and T. Senba, Global existence and boundedness in a parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with general sensitivity. *Discrete Continuous Dyn. Syst. B*, 21:81-102, 2016.
- [13] K. Fujie and T. Senba, Global existence and boundedness of radial solutions to a two dimensional fully parabolic chemotaxis system with general sensitivity. *Nonlinearity*, 29(8):2417-2450, 2016.
- [14] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [15] T. Hillen and K.J. Painter, A user's guide to PDE models for chemotaxis. *J. Math. Biol.*, 58:183-217, 2009.
- [16] D. Horstmann, From 1970 until present: the Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences. *I. Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein.*, 105(3):103-165, 2003.
- [17] D. Horstmann, From 1970 until present: the Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences. *II. Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein.*, 106(2):51-69, 2004.
- [18] D. Horstmann and G. Wang, Blow-up in a chemotaxis model without symmetry assumptions. *Euro. J. Appl. Math.*, 12:159-177, 2001.
- [19] D. Horstmann, The nonsymmetric case of the Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis: some recent results. *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications NoDEA*, 8(4):399-423, 2001.
- [20] H.Y. Jin, Y.J. Kim and Z.A. Wang, Boundedness, stabilization, and pattern formation driven by density-suppressed motility. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 78(3):1632-1657, 2018.
- [21] H.Y. Jin and Z.A. Wang, Boundedness, blowup and critical mass phenomenon in competing chemotaxis. *J. Differential Equations*, 260:162-196, 2016.
- [22] H.Y. Jin and Z.A. Wang, Global dynamics and spatio-temporal patterns of predator-prey systems with density-dependent motion. *European J. of Appl. Math.*, in press, 2019.
- [23] P. Kareiva and G. Odell, Swarms of predators exhibit "prey taxis" if individual predators use area-restricted search. *The American Naturalist*, 130(2):233-270, 1987.
- [24] E.F. Keller and L.A. Segel, Models for chemotaxis. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 30:225-234, 1971.
- [25] J. Lankeit, A new approach toward boundedness in a two-dimensional parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 39:394-404, 2016.
- [26] C. Liu et. al, Sequential establishment of stripe patterns in an expanding cell population. *Science*, 334:238-241, 2011.
- [27] T. Nagai, T. Senba and K. Yoshida, Application of the Trudinger-Moser inequality to a parabolic system of chemotaxis. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 40:411-433, 1997.
- [28] K. Osaki and A. Yagi, Finite dimensional attractor for one-dimensional Keller-Segel equations. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 44:441-469, 2001.

- [29] C. Stinner and M. Winkler, Global weak solutions in a chemotaxis system with large singular sensitivity. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 12:3727-3740, 2011.
- [30] Y.S. Tao and M. Winkler, Energy-type estimates and global solvability in a two-dimensional chemotaxis-haptotaxis model with remodeling of non-diffusible attractant. *J. Differential Equations*, 257(3):784-815, 2014.
- [31] Y. Tao and M. Winkler, Large time behavior in a multidimensional chemotaxis-haptotaxis model with slow signal diffusion. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(6):4229-4250, 2015.
- [32] Y. Tao and M. Winkler, Effects of signal-dependent motilities in a Keller-Segel-type reaction-diffusion system. *Math. Models Meth. Appl. Sci.*, 27(19):1645-1683, 2017.
- [33] J. Wang and M. Wang, Boundedness in the higher-dimensional Keller-Segel model with signal-dependent motility and logistic growth. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):011507, 2019.
- [34] Z.A. Wang and T. Hillen, Classical solutions and pattern formation for a volume filling chemotaxis model. *Chaos*, 17:037108, 2007.
- [35] J. Wang, Z.A. Wang and W. Yang, Uniqueness and convergence on equilibria of the Keller-Segel system with subcritical mass. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 44:545-572, 2019.
- [36] M. Winkler, Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller-Segel model. *J. Differential Equations*, 248:2889-2905, 2010.
- [37] M. Winkler, Global solutions in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 34:176-190, 2011.
- [38] M. Winkler and T. Yokota, Stabilization in the logarithmic Keller-Segel system. *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl.*, 170:123-141, 2018.
- [39] M. Winkler, Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 100(5):748-767, 2013.
- [40] C. Yoon and Y.J. Kim, Global existence and aggregation in a Keller-Segel model with Fokker-Planck diffusion. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 149:101-123, 2017.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTH CHINA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, GUANGZHOU 510640, CHINA
E-mail address: mahyjin@scut.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUNG HOM, HONG KONG
E-mail address: mawza@polyu.edu.hk