

Finite-time blow-up prevention by logistic source in chemotaxis models with singular sensitivity in any dimensional setting

Halil Ibrahim Kurt and Wenxian Shen *
 Department of Mathematics and Statistics
 Auburn University
 Auburn University, AL 36849
 U.S.A.

Abstract

In recent years, it has been drawn a lot of attention to the question of whether logistic kinetics is sufficient to enforce the global existence of classical solutions or to prevent finite-time blow-up in various chemotaxis models. However, for several important chemotaxis models, only in the space two dimensional setting, it has been shown that logistic kinetics is sufficient to enforce the global existence of classical solutions (see [8] and [28]). The current paper is to give a confirmed answer to the above question for the following parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity and logistic source in any space dimensional setting,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + u(a(x, t) - b(x, t)u), & x \in \Omega \\ 0 = \Delta v - \mu v + \nu u, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, χ is the singular chemotaxis sensitivity coefficient, $a(x, t)$ and $b(x, t)$ are positive smooth functions, and μ, ν are positive constants. We prove that, for any given nonnegative initial data $0 \neq u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$, (0.1) has a unique globally defined classical solution $(u(t, x; u_0), v(t, x; u_0))$ with $u(0, x; u_0) = u_0(x)$, which shows that, in any space dimensional setting, logistic kinetics is sufficient to enforce the global existence of classical solutions and hence prevents the occurrence of finite-time blow-up even for arbitrarily large χ . In addition, the solutions are shown to be uniformly bounded under the conditions $a_{\inf} > \frac{\mu\chi^2}{4}$ when $\chi \leq 2$ and $a_{\inf} > \mu(\chi - 1)$ when $\chi > 2$.

Key words. Parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system, logistic source, singular sensitivity, blow-up prevention, classical solution, local existence, global existence, global boundedness.

*Partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1645673.

1 Introduction and Main Results

Chemotaxis refers to the movement of living organisms in response to certain chemicals in their environments, and plays a crucial role in a wide range of biological phenomena such as immune system response, embryo development, tumor growth, population dynamics, gravitational collapse, etc. (see [14, 20]). Chemotaxis models, also known as Keller-Segel models, have been widely studied since the pioneering works [16, 17] by Keller and Segel at the beginning of 1970s on the mathematical modeling of the aggregation process of *Dictyostelium discoideum*. One of the central problems studied in the literature on chemotaxis models is whether solutions blow up in finite time or exist globally.

In recent years, a large amount of research has been carried out toward the finite-time blow-up prevention by logistic source in various chemotaxis models. For example, consider the following chemotaxis model with logistic source,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a(x, t) - b(x, t)u), & x \in \Omega \\ \tau v_t = \Delta v - \mu v + \nu u, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $u(x, t)$ represents the population density of a species and $v(x, t)$ represents the population density of some chemical substance, χ is the chemotaxis sensitivity coefficient, a, b are positive continuous functions, $\tau \geq 0$ is a non-negative constant linked to the diffusion rate of the chemical substance, and μ represents the degradation rate of the chemical substance and ν is the rate at which the species produces the chemical substance. When $\tau = 0$, $a(x, t) \equiv a$, $b(x, t) \equiv b$, $\mu = \nu = 1$, it is proved in [28] that, if $N \leq 2$ or $b > \frac{N-2}{N}\chi$, then for any nonnegative initial data $u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$, (1.1) possesses a global bounded classical solution which is unique. It should be pointed out that, when $a = b = 0$ and $N \geq 2$, finite-time blow-up of positive solutions occurs under some condition on the mass and the moment of the initial data (see [12], [13], [23], [24]). Hence the finite time blow-up phenomena in (1.1) is suppressed to some extent by the logistic source. But it remains open whether in any space dimensional setting, for any nonnegative initial data $u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ (1.1) possesses a unique global classical solution for any $\chi > 0$ and any b with $\inf_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} b > 0$. The reader is referred to [4, 15, 18, 19, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34] and references therein for other studies on the global existence of nonnegative solutions of (1.1).

Consider the following chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity and logistic source,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + u(a(x, t) - b(x, t))u, & x \in \Omega \\ \tau v_t = \Delta v - \mu v + \nu u, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

When $a(x, t) \equiv a > 0$, $b(x, t) \equiv b > 0$, $\tau = 0$, and $\mu = \nu = 1$, it is proved in [8] that, if $N = 2$, then (1.2) has a unique global solution with any nonnegative initial data $0 \neq u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$. When $a(x, t) \equiv 0$, $b(x, t) \equiv 0$, $\tau = 0$, and $\mu = \nu = 1$, it is proved in [9] that, if $N = 2$, then (1.2) has a

unique global solution with any nonnegative initial data $0 \neq u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$. It should be pointed out that, when $a(x, t) \equiv 0$, $b(x, t) \equiv 0$, and $N \geq 3$, there exists some nonnegative initial data $u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that the solution of (1.2) blows up at some finite time (see [25]). It remains open whether in any space dimensional setting, for any nonnegative initial data $0 \neq u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ (1.2) possesses a unique global classical solution for any $\chi > 0$ and any b with $\inf_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} b > 0$. The reader is referred to [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 24, 35, 36, 37] and references therein for other studies on the global existence of nonnegative solutions of (1.2).

The objective of this paper is to investigate the finite-time blow-up prevention by logistic source in the chemotaxis model (1.2) with $\tau = 0$ in any space dimensional setting, that is,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + u(a(x, t) - b(x, t))u, & x \in \Omega \\ 0 = \Delta v - \mu v + \nu u, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

We will show that, for any $N \geq 1$, a logistic source is sufficient to enforce global existence of positive classical solutions of (1.3) and hence prevents the occurrence of finite-time blow-up even for arbitrarily large χ .

To be more precise, we assume throughout this paper that $\chi > 0$; $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain; the initial function $u_0(x)$ satisfies

$$u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}), \quad u_0 \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} u_0 > 0; \quad (1.4)$$

$a(x, t)$ and $b(x, t)$ are Hölder continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with exponent $\gamma > 0$ uniformly with respect to $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, continuous in $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ uniformly with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and there are positive constants α_i , A_i ($i = 1, 2$) such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 < \alpha_1 \leq a(x, t) \leq A_1 \\ 0 < \alpha_2 \leq b(x, t) \leq A_2. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

We put

$$a_{\inf} = \inf_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} a(x, t), \quad a_{\sup} = \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} a(x, t), \quad (1.6)$$

$$b_{\inf} = \inf_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} b(x, t), \quad b_{\sup} = \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in \mathbb{R}} b(x, t), \quad (1.7)$$

unless specified otherwise. By the arguments in [8, Lemma 2.2], we have the following proposition on the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (1.3) with given initial function u_0 satisfying (1.4).

Proposition 1.1. *(Local existence) Suppose that (1.4) holds. Then there are $T_{\max}(u_0) \in (0, \infty]$ such that the system (1.3) possesses a unique classical solution $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ on $(0, T_{\max}(u_0))$ satisfying that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u(\cdot, t; u_0) - u_0(\cdot)\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = 0,$$

and

$$u(\cdot, \cdot; u_0) \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max}(u_0))) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max}(u_0))). \quad (1.8)$$

Moreover if $T_{\max}(u_0) < \infty$, then

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{\max}(u_0)} \|u(\cdot, t; u_0)\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = \infty \quad \text{or} \quad \liminf_{t \nearrow T_{\max}(u_0)} \inf_{x \in \Omega} v(\cdot, t; u_0) = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

For given $u_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying (1.4), the unique solution $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; v_0))$ of (1.3) with given initial function u_0 is said to be *locally mass persistent* if for any $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\inf_{0 \leq t < \min\{T, T_{\max}(u_0)\}} \int_{\Omega} u(x, t; u_0) dx > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x \in \Omega, 0 \leq t < \min\{T, T_{\max}(u_0)\}} v(x, t; u_0) > 0, \quad (1.10)$$

and *mass persistent* if (1.10) holds for any $0 < T \leq \infty$. $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is said to be *globally defined* if $T_{\max}(u_0) = \infty$. If $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is globally defined, it is said to be *bounded* if $\sup_{t \geq 0, x \in \Omega} u(x, t; u_0) < \infty$, which implies $\sup_{t \geq 0, x \in \Omega} v(x, t; u_0) < \infty$.

By properly modified arguments of [8], we have the following proposition on the mass persistence of the unique solution of (1.3) with given initial function u_0 satisfying (1.4).

Proposition 1.2. (*Mass persistence*) Suppose that u_0 satisfies (1.4).

(1) For any $0 < T < \infty$, (1.10) holds.

(2) If

$$a_{\inf} > \begin{cases} \frac{\mu\chi^2}{4}, & \text{if } 0 < \chi \leq 2 \\ \mu(\chi - 1), & \text{if } \chi > 2 \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

holds, then (1.10) holds for any $0 < T \leq \infty$.

The first main result of this paper is on the $L^p(\Omega)$ -boundedness of the unique solution of (1.3) with given initial function u_0 satisfying (1.4).

Theorem 1.1. (*L^p -boundedness*) Suppose that u_0 satisfies (1.4).

(1) There is $p > n$ such that for any $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \min\{T, T_{\max}(u_0)\}} \|u(\cdot, t; u_0)\|_{L^p} < \infty. \quad (1.12)$$

(2) If (1.11), then (1.12) also holds for $T = \infty$.

The second main result of this paper is on the global existence and boundedness of the unique solution of (1.3) with given initial function u_0 satisfying (1.4).

Theorem 1.2. (*Global existence and boundedness*) Suppose that u_0 satisfies (1.4).

(1) (*Global existence*) $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ exists globally, that is, $T_{\max}(u_0) = \infty$.

(2) (*Boundedness*) Let $\chi > 0$ and $\mu > 0$, and assume (1.4) holds. Moreover, suppose that (1.11) holds. Then $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is bounded, i.e. there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t; u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \quad (1.13)$$

Remark 1.1. (1) Theorem 1.2(1) implies that, in any space dimensional setting, logistic source is sufficient to enforce the global existence of positive classical solutions of the chemotaxis system (1.3) with singular sensitivity and hence prevents the occurrence of finite-time blow-up even for arbitrarily large χ . Its proof heavily relies on Theorem 1.1(1). When $N = 2$, Theorem 1.2(1) recovers [8, Theorem 1.1].

(2) Theorem 1.2(2) implies that, when $a(x, t)$ is large relative to the chemotaxis sensitivity coefficient χ , the globally defined solution $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is bounded. Its proof is based on Theorem 1.1(2). When $N = 2$, Theorem 1.2(2) recovers Theorem [8, Theorem 1.2].

(3) The proof of Theorem 1.1(1) is very nontrivial. It is based on some nontrivial estimates for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx$ and $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} dx$ (see Propositions 4.1 and 4.2).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present some preliminary lemmas that will be used to prove our main results. In section 3, we study the mass persistence and prove Proposition 1.2. In section 4, we explore the L^p boundedness of positive solutions of (1.3) and prove Theorem 1.1. We study the global existence and boundedness of positive solutions of (1.3) and prove the Theorem 1.2 in section 5.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present some lemmas to be used in later sections.

Throughout this section, we assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded smooth domain. Let

$$\delta_0 := \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{n}{2}}} e^{-\left(t + \frac{(\text{diam}\Omega)^2}{4t}\right)} dt < \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\text{diam } \Omega = \max_{x, y \in \bar{\Omega}} |x - y|$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $w \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ be nonnegative function such that $\int_{\Omega} w > 0$. If z is a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta z + z = w, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial z}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then

$$z \geq \delta_0 \int_{\Omega} w > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Proof. See [7, Lemma 2.1]. □

Let $A : \mathcal{D}(A) \subset L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ be defined by $A = -\Delta + I$ with $\mathcal{D}(A) = \{u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \mid \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$. Then $-A$ generates an analytic semigroup on $L^p(\Omega)$. We denote it by e^{-tA} . Note that $\text{Re}\sigma(A) > 0$. Let A^β be the fractional power operator of A (see [11, Definition 1.4.1]). Let $X^\beta = \mathcal{D}(A^\beta)$ with graph norm $\|u\|_{X^\beta} = \|A^\beta u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ for $\beta \geq 0$ and $u \in X^\beta$ (see [11, Definition 1.4.7]).

Lemma 2.2. (i) For each $\beta \geq 0$, there is $C_\beta > 0$ such that

$$\|A^\beta e^{-At}\| \leq C_\beta t^{-\beta} e^{-\gamma t}, \quad \text{for } t > 0 \quad (2.2)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$.

(ii) If $m \in \{0, 1\}$ and $q \in [p, \infty]$ are such that $m - \frac{n}{q} < 2\beta - \frac{n}{p}$, then

$$X^\beta \hookrightarrow W^{m,q}(\Omega).$$

(iii) If $2\beta - \frac{n}{p} > \theta \geq 0$, then

$$X^\beta \hookrightarrow C^\theta(\Omega).$$

Proof. (i) It follows from [11, Theorem 1.4.3].

(ii) It follows from [11, Theorem 1.6.1].

(iii) It also follows from [11, Theorem 1.6.1]. □

Lemma 2.3. Given $1 < p < \infty$, there is $K = K(p) > 0$ such that

$$\|e^{-tA} \nabla \cdot \phi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K(p) (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\gamma t} \|\phi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad (2.3)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, all $t > 0$, and $\phi \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Consequently, for all $t > 0$, the operator $e^{-tA} \nabla \cdot$ possesses a uniquely determined extension to an operator from $L^p(\Omega)$ into $L^p(\Omega)$, with norm controlled according to (2.3).

Proof. It follows from [32, Lemma 1.3]. □

Throughout the rest of this section, we assume that $u_0(x)$ satisfies (1.4) and $(u(x, t), v(x, t)) := (u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is the unique classical solution of (1.3) on the maximal interval $(0, T_{\max}) := (0, T_{\max}(u_0))$ with the initial function u_0 . Note that

$$u(x, t), v(x, t) > 0 \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

Lemma 2.4. There exists a positive $m^* > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} u \leq m^* = \max \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_0, \frac{a_{\sup}}{b_{\inf}} |\Omega| \right\} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}),$$

where $|\Omega|$ is the Lebesgue measure of Ω .

Proof. By integrating the first equation in (1.3) with respect to x , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u &= \int_{\Omega} \Delta u - \chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + \int_{\Omega} a(x, t) u - b(x, t) u^2 \\ &= \int_{\Omega} a(x, t) u(x, t) dx - \int_{\Omega} b(x, t) u^2(x, t) dx \\ &\leq a_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u - b_{\inf} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \\ &\leq a_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u - \frac{b_{\inf}}{|\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} u \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $y(t) = \int_{\Omega} u(x, t) dx$ for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Then

$$y'(t) \leq a_{\sup} y(t) - \frac{b_{\inf}}{|\Omega|} y^2(t) \quad \text{for all } 0 < t < T_{\max}.$$

By the comparison principle for scalar ODEs,

$$y(t) \leq m^* = \max \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_0, \frac{a_{\sup}}{b_{\inf}} |\Omega| \right\} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.5. For any $t \in (0, T_{\max})$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \leq \mu |\Omega|.$$

Proof. By multiplying the second equation in (1.3) by $\frac{1}{v}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{v} \cdot (\Delta v - \mu v + \nu u) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} - \mu |\Omega| + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u}{v} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. This implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \leq \mu |\Omega| \quad \forall t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

The lemma thus follows. \square

Lemma 2.6. There exists $C = C(u_0) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, t) dx \geq -C \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

Proof. It follows from the similar arguments as those in [8, Lemma 3.2]. For the completeness, we provide a proof in the following.

Multiplying the first equation in (1.3) by $\frac{1}{u}$ and then integrating on Ω , we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \ln u \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^2} - \underbrace{\chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{\nabla u}{u} \cdot \frac{\nabla v}{v}}_I + a_{\inf} |\Omega| - b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

By Young's inequality and Lemma 2.5, we have

$$I = \chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{\nabla u}{u} \cdot \frac{\nabla v}{v} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^2} + \frac{\chi^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^2} + \frac{\mu |\Omega| \chi^2}{4}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \ln u \geq -\frac{\mu |\Omega| \chi^2}{4} + a_{\inf} |\Omega| - b_{\sup} m^* \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}),$$

which completes the proof. \square

The following lemma follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev Embedding Theorem, standard elliptic theory, and the second equation of (1.3).

Lemma 2.7. *Let $p \in (1, n)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

3 Mass persistence

In this section, we investigate the mass persistence of positive solutions of (1.3) and prove Proposition 1.2.

We first present some lemmas. We assume throughout this section that $u_0(x)$ satisfies (1.4) and $(u(x, t), v(x, t)) := (u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is the unique classical solution of (1.3) on the maximal interval $(0, T_{\max}) := (0, T_{\max}(u_0))$ with the initial function u_0 .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $R > 0$ be such that*

$$R > \begin{cases} \frac{\mu\chi^2}{4}, & \text{if } 0 < \chi \leq 2 \\ \mu(\chi - 1), & \text{if } \chi > 2. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Then there is $\beta > 0$, $\beta \neq \chi$ such that

$$\frac{(p+1)\beta\mu}{p} - R < 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where p is given by

$$p = \frac{4\beta}{(\chi - \beta)^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. First, by (3.3), (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\left(\frac{4\beta}{(\chi-\beta)^2} + 1\right)\beta\mu}{\frac{4\beta}{(\chi-\beta)^2}} - R < 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mu\beta^2 + 2\mu(2 - \chi)\beta + \mu\chi^2 - 4R < 0.$$

Let

$$f(\beta) = \mu\beta^2 + 2\mu(2 - \chi)\beta + \mu\chi^2 - 4R. \quad (3.4)$$

Then $f(\beta) = 0$ if and only if $\beta = \beta_-$ or $\beta = \beta_+$, where

$$\beta_{\pm} = \chi - 2 \pm 2\sqrt{\frac{R}{\mu} + 1 - \chi}. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, if $\chi > 2$, then $R > \mu(\chi - 1)$. This implies that β_{\pm} are real numbers, $f(\beta) < 0$ for $\beta \in (\beta_-, \beta_+)$, and

$$\beta_+ = \chi - 2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{R}{\mu} + 1 - \chi} > 0.$$

Therefore, there is $\beta \in (0, \beta_+)$ with $\beta \neq \chi$ such that (3.2) holds.

Now, if $\chi \leq 2$, then $R > \frac{\mu\chi^2}{4}$. This implies that

$$\frac{R}{\mu} + 1 - \chi > \frac{\mu\chi^2}{4} \frac{1}{\mu} + 1 - \chi = \frac{(\chi - 2)^2}{4} \geq 0,$$

and

$$\beta_+ = \chi - 2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{R}{\mu} + 1 - \chi} > \chi - 2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{(2 - \chi)^2}{4}} = 0.$$

Therefore, there is also $\beta \in (0, \beta_+)$ with $\beta \neq \chi$ such that (3.2) holds. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p > 0$. Then,*

$$p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq \mu \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} - \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Multiplying the second equation in (1.3) by $\frac{u^{-p}}{v}$ and then integrating over Ω with respect to x , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p}}{v} \cdot (\Delta v - \mu v + \nu u) \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \frac{(-p)u^{-p-1}v \nabla u - u^{-p} \nabla v}{v^2} \cdot \nabla v - \mu \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p+1}}{v} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have,

$$p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p+1}}{v} = \mu \int_{\Omega} u^{-p}$$

This together with the nonnegativity of $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p+1}}{v}$ implies (3.6). \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $p > 0$. Then for any $\beta > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (p+1)\chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v &\leq (p+1) \int_{\Omega} u^{-p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(p+1)\beta\mu}{p} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{(p+1)(\chi - \beta)^2}{4} - \frac{(p+1)\beta}{p} \right] \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$.

Proof. Note that, for any $\beta > 0$,

$$\chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \underbrace{(\chi - \beta) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v}_{I_1} + \underbrace{\beta \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v}_{I_2}$$

By Young's inequality, we have

$$I_1 = (\chi - \beta) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq \int_{\Omega} u^{-p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\chi - \beta)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \quad (3.8)$$

By Lemma 3.2, we get

$$I_2 = \beta \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq \frac{\beta\mu}{p} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} \quad (3.9)$$

Therefore (3.8) and (3.9) entail the desired inequality (3.7). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that (1.11) holds. There is $p > 0$ such that for any $\tau > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \leq C \quad \text{for all } \tau < t < T_{\max}. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. It can be proved by the similar arguments as those in Lemma 6.2 in [8]. For the self-completeness, we provide a proof in the following.

First of all, let $R = a_{\inf}$. By Lemma 3.1, there is $\beta > 0$ with $\beta \neq \chi$ such that

$$\frac{(p+1)\beta\mu}{p} - a_{\inf} < 0,$$

where p is as in (3.3). Fix such β and p .

Next, multiplying the first equation in (1.3) by u^{-p-1} and integrating over Ω , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} &= - \int_{\Omega} u^{-p-1} \Delta u + \chi \int_{\Omega} u^{-p-1} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) - \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t) u^{-p} + \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t) u^{-p+1} \\ &\leq -(p+1) \int_{\Omega} u^{-p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + (p+1)\chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{-p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - a_{\inf} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have that

$$\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \leq (p+1) \left[\frac{(\chi-\beta)^2}{4} - \frac{\beta}{p} \right] \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v^2} + \left[\frac{(p+1)\beta\mu}{p} - a_{\inf} \right] \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p+1}.$$

Now, notice that we have $\frac{(\chi-\beta)^2}{4} - \frac{\beta}{p} = 0$ and $\frac{(p+1)\beta\mu}{p} - a_{\inf} < 0$. Hence there exists $R^* = R^*(a, p, \chi, \mu, a_{\inf}) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \leq -R^* \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p+1}.$$

If $p \geq 1$, by Young's inequality, there exists $M = M(p, R^*, b_{\sup}) > 0$ such that

$$b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p+1} \leq \frac{R^*}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + M|\Omega|. \quad (3.11)$$

If $p < 1$, then by Hölder inequality and Lemma 3.1, we find that

$$b_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p+1} \leq b_{\sup} |\Omega|^p \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} u \right)^{1-p} \leq b_{\sup} |\Omega|^p (m^*)^{1-p} \quad (3.12)$$

By (3.11) and (3.12), we get that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \leq -\frac{pR^*}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{-p} + M_2$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, where $M_2 = \max \{pM|\Omega|, pb_{\sup}|\Omega|^p(m^*)^{1-p}\}$.

Finally, let $y(t) = \int_{\Omega} u^{-p}(t, x)dx$. We have

$$y'(t) \leq -M_1y(t) + M_2$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, where $M_1 = \frac{pR^*}{2}$. This implies that

$$y(t) \leq \max \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u^{-p}(x, \tau)dx, \frac{M_2}{M_1} \right\} \quad \text{for all } \tau < t < T_{\max},$$

where $\tau > 0$. The lemma thus follows. \square

Lemma 3.5 (Reverse Hölder's inequality). *Assume that $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then, for any Lebesgue measurable functions f and g on Ω with $g(x) \neq 0$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$,*

$$\|fg\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \|f\|_{L^{\frac{1}{p}}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{L^{\frac{-1}{p-1}}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. An application of Hölder's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &= \left\| |fg|^{\frac{1}{p}} |g|^{\frac{-1}{p}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \left\| |fg|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \left\| |g|^{\frac{-1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)} \\ &= \|fg\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| |g|^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^p \leq \|fg\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \left\| |g|^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{p-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|fg\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^p \left\| |g|^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{-(p-1)}.$$

The lemma follows. \square

Now, we prove Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. (1) First of all, by Lemma 2.1, it suffices to prove that

$$\inf_{0 \leq t < \min\{T, T_{\max}\}} \int_{\Omega} u(x, t)dx > 0.$$

Fix any $\tau \in (0, T_{\max})$. It is clear that

$$\inf_{0 \leq t \leq \tau} \int_{\Omega} u(x, t)dt > 0.$$

It then suffices to prove that there exist $C = C(T) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t)dx \geq C(T) \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau, \hat{T}), \quad (3.14)$$

where $\hat{T} = \min\{T, T_{\max}\}$. Note that this inequality follows from the similar arguments as those in [8, Corollary 3.3]. For the reader's convenience, we provide a proof for this inequality in the following.

Note that $L := \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, \tau) dx$ is finite. By Lemma 2.6, there exists $K = K(u_0) > 0$ such that $\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \ln u \geq -K$ for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. We thus have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, t) dx &\geq \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, \tau) dx - K \cdot (t - \tau) \\ &\geq L - K \cdot (\hat{T} - \tau) = C(K, L, \tau) \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau, \hat{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore Jensen's inequality asserts that

$$\int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, t) dx = |\Omega| \cdot \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, t) \frac{dx}{|\Omega|} \leq |\Omega| \cdot \ln \left(\int_{\Omega} u(x, t) \frac{dx}{|\Omega|} \right) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}),$$

which implies

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t) \geq |\Omega| \cdot \exp \left(\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \cdot \int_{\Omega} \ln u(x, t) dx \right) \geq |\Omega| \cdot e^{\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \cdot C(K, L, \tau)} \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau, \hat{T}).$$

(3.14) then follows.

(2) In view of the Reverse Hölder inequality, taking $f = 1$, $g = u$ and $p \rightarrow \frac{p+1}{p} > 1$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} u \geq |\Omega|^{\frac{p+1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{-p} \right)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for all } 0 < t < T_{\max}.$$

This together with Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 2.1 implies that (1.10) also holds for $T = \infty$. \square

4 L^p -Boundedness

In this section, we study the L^p -boundedness of solutions and prove Theorem 1.1. Throughout this section, we assume that $u_0(x)$ satisfies (1.4) and $(u(x, t), v(x, t)) := (u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is the unique classical solution of (1.3) on the maximal interval $(0, T_{\max}) := (0, T_{\max}(u_0))$ with the initial function u_0 .

Note that, multiplying the first equation in (1.3) by u^{p-1} and integrating over Ω with respect to x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p &= \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \Delta u - \chi \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t) u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t) u^{p+1} \\ &= -(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + (p-1) \chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t) u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t) u^{p+1} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. To get the L^p -boundedness of u , the main ingredient is to get proper estimates for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v$. Observe that if $c, d, r, l > 0$ are positive constants such that $cd - c - d > 0$ and $p - l - r - 1 > 0$, then by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v &= \int_{\Omega} u^l \nabla u \cdot u^r \frac{\nabla v}{v} \cdot u^{p-l-r-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c} \int_{\Omega} u^{lc} |\nabla u|^c + \frac{1}{d} \int_{\Omega} u^{rd} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^d + \frac{cd - c - d}{cd} \int_{\Omega} (u^{p-l-r-1})^{\frac{cd}{cd-c-d}}. \quad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

We will first prove that for properly choosing parameters c, d, r, l, p , which will be given in subsection 4.1, (4.1) implies that for any given $C_0 > 0$, $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq C_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\epsilon} + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\epsilon} \right) + C \quad (4.2)$$

(see Proposition 4.1 in subsection 4.2). We will then provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}$ (see Proposition 4.2 in subsection 4.3), which will enable us to provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\epsilon}$ in terms of $\int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\epsilon}$. Finally, using Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we prove Theorem 1.1 in subsection 4.4.

4.1 Fixing some parameters

In this subsection, we discuss the existence of the parameters c, d, r, l, p which enables us to get the estimate (4.2) for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v$ based on (4.1).

To this end, let c, h, α, λ be such that

$$1 < c < 2, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < \frac{1}{c}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$0 < \lambda < \min \left\{ 1 - \alpha, \frac{c-1}{2c-1} \right\} \quad (4.5)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda^2 + \lambda}{1 - \lambda} < h < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Let p be such that

$$p > p_*(c, h, \alpha, \lambda) := \max \left\{ 2, \frac{h}{\lambda}, \frac{1-h}{1-\alpha-\lambda}, \frac{3c-2}{2-2c\alpha} \right\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Put

$$d = \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1, \quad (4.8)$$

$$l = \alpha p, \quad (4.9)$$

$$r = \lambda p - h, \quad (4.10)$$

$$m = \frac{(2l - p + 2)c}{2}. \quad (4.11)$$

It is clear that

$$l > 0, \quad r > 0.$$

Lemma 4.1. *The following inequalities hold,*

$$p > l + r + 1, \quad (4.12)$$

$$2l - p + 2 > 0, \quad m > 0, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\frac{2m}{2-c} < p+1, \quad (4.14)$$

$$cd - c - d > 0, \quad (4.15)$$

$$p+1 - rd > 0, \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$\frac{d(p+1)}{p+1-rd} < 2p+2. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. We first prove (4.12). Note that

$$l+r+1 = (\alpha+\lambda)p - h + 1.$$

Hence

$$p - (l+r+1) = (1-\alpha-\lambda)p + h - 1.$$

By (4.5), $1-\alpha-\lambda > 0$. (4.12) then follows from (4.7).

Second, we prove (4.13). Note that

$$2l - p + 2 = 2\alpha p - p + 2 = (2\alpha - 1)p + 2.$$

By (4.4), $2\alpha - 1 > 0$. This implies (4.13).

Third, we prove (4.14). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} p+1 - \frac{2m}{2-c} &= p+1 - \frac{c(2l-p+2)}{2-c} \\ &= \frac{(p+1)(2-c) - c(2l-p+2)}{2-c} \\ &= \frac{(p+1)(2-c) - 2c\alpha p + cp - 2c}{2-c} \\ &= \frac{(2-2c\alpha)p + 2 - 3c}{2-c}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.4), $2-2c\alpha > 0$. This together with (4.7) implies (4.14).

Fourth, we prove (4.15). Note that $\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}$ decreases as λ increases. Then by (4.5), we have

$$d = \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1 = \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} > \frac{1-\frac{c-1}{2c-1}}{\frac{c-1}{2c-1}} = \frac{c}{c-1}.$$

(4.15) then follows.

We now prove (4.16). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} p+1 - rd &= p+1 - (\lambda p - h)d \\ &= p+1 - (\lambda p - h)\left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1\right) \\ &= \lambda p + 1 + \frac{h}{\lambda} - h \\ &= \lambda p + 1 + hd > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $p + 1 - rd > 0$ and (4.16) thus follows.

Finally, we prove (4.17). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(p+1)}{p+1-rd} &= \frac{(1-\lambda)(p+1)}{\lambda(p+1) - (1-\lambda)(\lambda p - h)} \\ &= \frac{(1-\lambda)(p+1)}{\lambda^2 p - \lambda h + h + \lambda} \\ &= \frac{(1-\lambda)(p+1)}{\lambda^2 p + \lambda + (1-\lambda)h}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

By (4.6),

$$h > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda^2 + \lambda}{1 - \lambda}.$$

Hence

$$2(1-\lambda)h > (1-\lambda) - 2\lambda - 2\lambda^2.$$

It then follows that

$$2[(1-\lambda)h + \lambda + \lambda^2] > 1 - \lambda.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{1-\lambda}{(1-\lambda)h + \lambda + \lambda^2 p} < \frac{1-\lambda}{(1-\lambda)h + \lambda + \lambda^2} < 2.$$

This together with (4.18) implies (4.17). \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let*

$$p^*(c, h, \alpha, \lambda) = \frac{c(1-\lambda)(2-h) - (1-\lambda + c\lambda)}{1 - c\alpha - \lambda + \alpha c\lambda + c\lambda^2}.$$

If

$$0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = 1 - c\alpha, \tag{4.19}$$

then

$$0 < \lambda < \min \left\{ 1 - \alpha, \frac{c-1}{2c-1} \right\}, \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$p_*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha) < p^*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha). \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, for any $p \in (p_(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha), p^*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha))$, there holds*

$$\frac{cd(p-l-r-1)}{cd-c-d} < p+1. \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. First of all, it is clear that (4.20) holds provided that $0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1$.

Next, we prove (4.21). Put

$$f(\lambda) := \frac{c(1-\lambda)(2-h) - (1-\lambda + c\lambda)}{1 - c\alpha - \lambda + \alpha c\lambda + c\lambda^2}.$$

Note that, if $\lambda = 1 - c\alpha$, then

$$g(\lambda) := \frac{h}{\lambda} = \frac{h}{1 - c\alpha}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda) &= \frac{c(1 - (1 - c\alpha))(2 - h) - (1 - (1 - c\alpha) + c(1 - c\alpha))}{1 - c\alpha - (1 - c\alpha) + c\alpha(1 - c\alpha) + c(1 - c\alpha)^2} \\ &= \frac{c^2\alpha(2 - h) - (c\alpha + c - c^2\alpha)}{(1 - c\alpha)(c\alpha + c(1 - c\alpha))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(\lambda)}{g(\lambda)} &= \frac{c^2\alpha(2 - h) - (c\alpha + c - c^2\alpha)}{h(c\alpha + c(1 - c\alpha))} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{c(2 - h) - 1}{h} \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow \frac{1}{c}^-, \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(\lambda)}{\frac{3c-2}{2-2c\alpha}} &= \frac{2[c^2\alpha(2 - h) - (c\alpha + c - c^2\alpha)]}{(3c - 2)(c\alpha + c(1 - c\alpha))} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{2[c(2 - h) - 1]}{3c - 2} \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow \frac{1}{c}^-. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Observe that for $0 < h < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{c(2 - h) - 1}{h} > \frac{c(2 - \frac{1}{2}) - 1}{\frac{1}{2}} = 3c - 2 > 1$$

and

$$\frac{2[c(2 - h) - 1]}{3c - 2} > \frac{2[c(2 - \frac{1}{2}) - 1]}{3c - 2} = 1.$$

It then follows from (4.23) and (4.24) that

$$f(1 - c\alpha) > \max \left\{ g(1 - c\alpha), \frac{3c - 2}{2 - 2c\alpha} \right\} \quad \text{when } 0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1.$$

Observe also that for fixed $1 < c < 2$, when $0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1$,

$$p_*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha) := \max \left\{ 2, \frac{h}{1 - c\alpha}, \frac{1 - h}{(c - 1)\alpha}, \frac{3c - 2}{2 - 2c\alpha} \right\} = \max \left\{ \frac{h}{1 - c\alpha}, \frac{3c - 2}{2 - 2c\alpha} \right\}$$

and

$$p^*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha) = f(1 - c\alpha).$$

(4.21) then follows.

We now prove (4.22). Note that (4.22) is equivalent to

$$p - l - r - 1 < (p + 1) \left(\frac{cd - c - d}{cd} \right) = p + 1 - \frac{p + 1}{c} - \frac{p + 1}{d}.$$

Since $l = \alpha p$, $r = \lambda p - h$, and $d = \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1$, to prove (4.22), it is then equivalent to prove that

$$p - \alpha p - \lambda p + h - 1 < p + 1 - \frac{p + 1}{c} - \frac{\lambda(p + 1)}{1 - \lambda},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p+1}{c} &< (\alpha + \lambda)p + 2 - h - \frac{(p+1)\lambda}{1-\lambda} \\ &= \frac{(1-\lambda)(\alpha + \lambda)p + (1-\lambda)(2-h) - (p+1)\lambda}{1-\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is equivalent to

$$(1 - \lambda + c\lambda)(p + 1) < c[(1 - \lambda)(\alpha + \lambda)p + (1 - \lambda)(2 - h)],$$

which is equivalent to

$$(1 - c\alpha - \lambda + \alpha c\lambda + c\lambda^2)p < c(1 - \lambda)(2 - h) - (1 - \lambda + c\lambda). \quad (4.25)$$

Note that

$$1 - c\alpha - \lambda + \alpha c\lambda + c\lambda^2 > 0.$$

(4.25) is then equivalent to

$$p < f(\lambda) := \frac{c(1 - \lambda)(2 - h) - (1 - \lambda + c\lambda)}{1 - c\alpha - \lambda + \alpha c\lambda + c\lambda^2}. \quad (4.26)$$

We then have (4.22) when $\lambda = 1 - c\alpha$. □

4.2 Estimates for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v$

In this subsection, we give some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let c, α, λ, h satisfy (4.3)-(4.6); d, l, r, m be as in (4.8)-(4.11); $0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1$, and $\lambda = 1 - c\alpha$. Let $p \in (p_*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha), p^*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha))$. Then for any given $C_0 > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, there is $C > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq C_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\varepsilon} \right) + C$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. First of all, by (4.14), (4.16), (4.17), and (4.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2m}{2-c} &< p+1, \\ rd &< p+1, \\ \frac{d(p+1)}{p+1-rd} &< 2p+2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{cd(p-l-r-1)}{cd-c-d} = \frac{cd((1-\alpha-\lambda)p+h-1)}{cd-c-d} < p+1,$$

respectively. Fix $C_0 > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$p + 1 - \epsilon > \max \left\{ \frac{2m}{2-c}, rd, \frac{cd(p-l-r-1)}{cd-c-d} \right\} \quad (4.27)$$

and

$$2p + 2 - \epsilon > \frac{d(p+1-\epsilon)}{p+1-\epsilon-rd}. \quad (4.28)$$

By (4.15), $cd - c - d > 0$. Then by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v &= \int_{\Omega} u^l \nabla u \cdot u^r \frac{\nabla v}{v} \cdot u^{p-l-r-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c} \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} u^{lc} |\nabla u|^c}_{I_1} + \frac{1}{d} \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} u^{rd} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^d}_{I_2} + \frac{cd-c-d}{cd} \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} (u^{p-l-r-1})^{\frac{cd}{cd-c-d}}}_{I_3} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Next, we estimate the term I_1 . By (4.13), we have $m > 0$. Applying Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{\Omega} u^{lc} |\nabla u|^c = \int_{\Omega} u^m \cdot u^{lc-m} |\nabla u|^c \\ &\leq \frac{2-c}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2C_0} \right)^{\frac{c}{2-c}} \int_{\Omega} (u^m)^{\frac{2}{2-c}} + cC_0 \int_{\Omega} \left(u^{lc-m} |\nabla u|^c \right)^{\frac{2}{c}} \\ &= \frac{2-c}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2C_0} \right)^{\frac{c}{2-c}} \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{2m}{2-c}} + cC_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{2l-\frac{2m}{c}} |\nabla u|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. By the definition of m , $2l - \frac{2m}{c} = p - 2$. By (4.27) and Young's inequality again, we have

$$I_1 \leq \frac{2-c}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2C_0} \right)^{\frac{c}{2-c}} \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{2m}{2-c}} + cC_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\epsilon} + cC_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ and some $C > 0$ (independent of u).

Now we estimate the term I_2 . Applying Young's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{\Omega} u^{rd} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^d \\ &\leq \frac{rd}{p+1-\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} (u^{rd})^{\frac{p+1-\epsilon}{rd}} + \frac{p+1-\epsilon-rd}{p+1-\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{d \frac{p+1-\epsilon}{p+1-\epsilon-rd}} \\ &= \frac{rd}{p+1-\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\epsilon} + \frac{p+1-\epsilon-rd}{p+1-\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{\frac{d(p+1-\epsilon)}{p+1-\epsilon-rd}} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Then by (4.28) and Young's inequality again,

$$I_2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\epsilon} + C \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\epsilon} + C$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ and some $C > 0$ (independent of u).

Finally we estimate the term I_3 . By (4.27) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \int_{\Omega} (u^{p-l-r-1})^{\frac{cd}{cd-c-d}} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{cd(p-l-r-1)}{cd-c-d}} \\ &\leq \frac{cd(p-l-r-1)}{(p+1-\varepsilon)(cd-c-d)} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} + C \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ and some $C > 0$ (independent of u). The proposition then follows from the above estimates for I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 . \square

4.3 Estimates for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}$

In this subsection, we provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $p \geq 3$ and $p-1 \leq k < 2p-2$. There exists positive constants $M > 0$ and $M^* > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq M \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + M^* \int_{\Omega} v^{2p-k-1} \quad (4.29)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

To prove the above proposition, we first prove some lemmas.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p \geq 3$ and $k \geq 1$. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{2\mu}{k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \quad (4.30)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. Multiplying the second equation in (1.3) by $\frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k}$ and then integrating over Ω with respect to x , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k} \cdot (\Delta v - \mu v + \nu u) \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \left[(p-1) \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla |\nabla v|^2 - k \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k+1}} \nabla v \right] - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$k \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k} = (p-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 + \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \quad (4.31)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. By Young's inequality, we have

$$(p-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{k}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{(p-1)^2}{2k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. This together with (4.31) implies that

$$\frac{k}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{2k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}.$$

(4.30) then follows by multiplying the above inequality both sides by $\frac{2}{k}$. \square

To prove Proposition 4.2, we then provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} + (k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2 - (p-3) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (p-2) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} + (k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

Note also that

$$\Delta |\nabla v|^2 = 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla (\Delta v) + 2|D^2 v|^2 = 2\nabla v \cdot \nabla (\mu v - \nu u) + 2|D^2 v|^2.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2 \\ &= -2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla v \cdot \nabla (\Delta v) - 2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} |D^2 v|^2 \\ &= -2\mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} + 2\nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - 2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} |D^2 v|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

To provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2$, we provide some estimates for $\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu}$ and $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v$ in next two lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $C_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + C_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \quad (4.34)$$

Proof. First, by [22, Lemma 4.2], there is $K_1 = K_1(\Omega) > 0$ such that for any $w \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\frac{\partial |\nabla w|^2}{\partial \nu} \leq K_1 |\nabla w|^2 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (4.35)$$

By the trace theorem (see [21, Theorem 3.37]), for any $\frac{1}{2} < \theta < 1$, there is K_2 such that

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq K_2 \|w\|_{W^{\theta,2}(\Omega)} \quad \forall w \in W^{\theta,2}(\Omega).$$

By [1, Theorem 11.6], the following interpolation holds.

$$(L^2(\Omega), W^{1,2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2} = W^{\theta,2}(\Omega).$$

By [29, Theorem 1.3.3], there is K_3 such that

$$\|w\|_{W^{\theta,2}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\theta} \|w\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}^{\theta}.$$

This together with Young's inequality and $\|w\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)} \leq \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ implies that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $C(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \epsilon \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\epsilon) \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega). \quad (4.36)$$

Next, by (4.35) and (4.36), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $C(p, \epsilon, K_1) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} &\leq K_1(\Omega) \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{4\epsilon}{(p-1)^2} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla v|^{p-1}}{v^{\frac{k-1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 + C(p, k, \epsilon, K_1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla v|^{p-1}}{v^{\frac{k-1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 &= \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{p-1}{2} \frac{|\nabla v|^{p-3}}{v^{\frac{k-1}{2}}} \nabla |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{k-1}{2} \frac{|\nabla v|^{p-1}}{v^{\frac{k+1}{2}}} \nabla v \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{(p-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{(k-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \\ &\quad - \frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

By (4.31),

$$\frac{(k-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq \frac{(k-1)^2(p-1)}{4k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 + \frac{\mu(k-1)^2}{4k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}$$

This together with (4.38) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla v|^{p-1}}{v^{\frac{k-1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 &\leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{\mu(k-1)^2}{4k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{(p-1)(k-1)}{2} \left(\frac{k-1}{2k} - 1 \right) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \\ &= \frac{(p-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{\mu(k-1)^2}{4k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\ &\quad - \frac{(p-1)(k-1)(k+1)}{4k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

By (4.31) again,

$$- \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{p-1} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}.$$

This together with (4.39) implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla v|^{p-1}}{v^{\frac{k-1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 \leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{\mu(k-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}.$$

This together with (4.37) implies that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + C_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}$$

where $C_1 = \frac{2\mu(k-1)}{(p-1)^2} + C(p, \epsilon, K_1)$. The lemma is thus proved. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $p \geq 3$ and $k \geq p-1$. For any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, there is $M_1 = M_1(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, p, k, \nu)$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq M_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + \varepsilon_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \varepsilon_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \quad (4.40)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. First, we have that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \underbrace{(k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k}}_{J_1} - \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta v}_{J_2} - \underbrace{(p-2) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2}_{J_3}.$$

Next, by Young's inequality, for any $B_1 > 0$, there exists a positive constant $A_1 = A_1(k, p, B_1) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= (k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^k} = (k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u}{v^{\frac{k-p+1}{p}}} \cdot \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{\frac{(k+1)(p-1)}{p}}} \\ &\leq A_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + B_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Now, by the fact that $\Delta v = \mu v - \nu u$, and Young's inequality, for any $B_2 > 0$, there exists a positive constant $A_2 = A_2(k, p, \nu, B_2) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= - \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta v = -\mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-2}} + \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2 |\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \\ &\leq \nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2}{v^{\frac{2(k-p+1)}{p}}} \cdot \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{\frac{(p-2)(k+1)}{p}}} \\ &\leq A_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + B_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Finally, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $B_3 > 0$, there exist positive constants $A_3 = A_3(\varepsilon_1, k, p, \nu, B_3) > 0$ and $A_4 = A_4(A_3, B_3)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= -(p-2) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u |\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \\ &\leq A_3 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^2 |\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} + \varepsilon_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 \\ &\leq A_4 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + B_3 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \varepsilon_1 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

Combining (4.41), (4.42) and (4.43) with $B_1 = B_2 = B_3 = \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_2$, we obtain (4.40) with $M_1 = M_1(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, k, p, \nu) := A_1 + A_2 + A_4$. \square

In the following lemma, we provide some estimate for $\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $p \geq 3$ and $k \geq p - 1$. For any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, there are $M_2 = M_2(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, p, k, \nu) > 0$ and $M_3 = M_3(p, k, \varepsilon_1) > 0$ such that*

$$(1 - \varepsilon_1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 \leq M_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + \left(\frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} + \varepsilon_2 \right) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{4M_3 - 8\mu}{2p-3} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \quad (4.44)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. First of all, recall (4.32), that is,

$$(p-2) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} + (k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2. \quad (4.45)$$

By Lemma 4.4, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $M_3 = M_3(p, k, \varepsilon_1) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \frac{\partial |\nabla v|^2}{\partial \nu} \leq \frac{(2p-3)\varepsilon_1}{8} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + M_3 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}. \quad (4.46)$$

By (4.33),

$$- \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2 = -2\mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} + 2\nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - 2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} |D^2 v|^2.$$

Note that

$$|\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n |\nabla v \cdot \nabla v_{x_i}|^2 \leq 4 |\nabla v|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|\nabla v_{x_i}\|^2 = 4 |\nabla v|^2 |D^2 v|^2.$$

Hence

$$-2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} |D^2 v|^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2. \quad (4.47)$$

It then follows that

$$- \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \Delta |\nabla v|^2 \leq -2\mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} + 2\nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2. \quad (4.48)$$

Next, by Young's inequality, we have that

$$(k-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^k} \nabla v \cdot \nabla |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{(2p-3)}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{(k-1)^2}{2p-3} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}. \quad (4.49)$$

Substituting (4.46), (4.48) and (4.49) into (4.45) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
(p-2) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 &\leq \frac{(2p-3)\varepsilon_1}{8} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + M_3 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\
&+ \frac{(2p-3)}{4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{(k-1)^2}{2p-3} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \\
&- 2\mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} + 2\nu \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \\
&- \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2, \tag{4.50}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}\right) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 &\leq \frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{4M_3 - 8\mu}{2p-3} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\
&+ \frac{8\nu}{2p-3} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v. \tag{4.51}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.5, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, there is $M_2 = M_2(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, p, k, \nu)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-4}}{v^{k-1}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v &\leq \frac{(2p-3)M_2}{8\nu} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + \frac{(2p-3)\varepsilon_1}{16\nu} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 \\
&+ \frac{(2p-3)\varepsilon_2}{8\nu} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}}. \tag{4.52}
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.51) yields (4.44). \square

Proof of Proposition 4.2. By Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.6, for any $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$, there are $M_2, M_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} &\leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-6}}{v^{k-1}} |\nabla |\nabla v|^2|^2 + \frac{2\mu}{k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\
&\leq \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \left[\frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} + \varepsilon_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{M_2}{1-\varepsilon_1} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4M_3 - 8\mu}{(1-\varepsilon_1)(2p-3)} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \right] + \frac{2\mu}{k} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} \\
&= \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \left[\frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} + \varepsilon_2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{M_2}{1-\varepsilon_1} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} \right] \\
&\quad + \left[\frac{2\mu}{k} + \frac{(4M_3 - 8\mu)(p-1)^2}{(1-\varepsilon_1)(2p-3)k^2} \right] \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Since $p-1 \leq k < 2p-2$, there exists positive constants $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_1} \cdot \left(\frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} + \varepsilon_2 \right) < 1.$$

Therefore, we have for some $M > 0$ and $M_4 > 0$

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq \frac{M}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + M_4 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}}.$$

An application Young's inequality on the latter integral above entails that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{k-1}} &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p-2}}{v^{\frac{(k+1)(p-1)}{p}}} \cdot \frac{1}{v^{\frac{k-2p+1}{p}}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2M_4} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} + \frac{M^*}{2} \int_{\Omega} v^{2p-k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M^* = M^*(p, k, \mu, \nu, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, M_2, M_3, M_4) > 0$. Thus we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p}}{v^{k+1}} \leq M \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{v^{k-p+1}} + M^* \int_{\Omega} v^{2p-k-1},$$

where

$$M = \frac{M_2}{1 - \varepsilon_1} \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{(p-1)^2}{k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_1} \cdot \left(\frac{4(k-1)^2}{(2p-3)^2} + \varepsilon_2 \right)}.$$

The proposition thus follows. \square

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. (1) First of all, let c, α, λ, h satisfy (4.3)-(4.6); d, l, r, m be as in (4.8)-(4.11); $0 < \frac{1}{c} - \alpha \ll 1$, and $\lambda = 1 - c\alpha$. Let $p \in (p_*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha), p^*(c, h, \alpha, 1 - c\alpha))$. By (4.7), we can choose c, h, α such that $p > \min\{n, 3\}$.

Recall that, multiplying the first equation in (1.3) by u^{p-1} and integrating over Ω with respect to x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p &= \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \Delta u - \chi \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u}{v} \nabla v \right) + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t) u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t) u^{p+1} \\ &= -(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + (p-1) \chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t) u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t) u^{p+1} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. By Proposition 1.2 (1), for any $T > 0$, there is $\delta = \delta(T) > 0$ such that

$$v(x, t) \geq \delta \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (0, \min\{T, T_{\max}\}).$$

By Proposition 4.1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$(p-1) \chi \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{v} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq (p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} + C \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\varepsilon} + C$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p &\leq C \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla v|}{v} \right)^{2p+2-\varepsilon} + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t)u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t)u^{p+1} + C \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{p+1-\varepsilon}} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v|^{2p+2-\varepsilon}}{v^{p+1}} + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega} a(\cdot, t)u^p - \int_{\Omega} b(\cdot, t)u^{p+1} + C \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\delta^{p+1-\varepsilon}} \left[M \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p+1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}}{v^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} + M^* \int_{\Omega} v^{p+1-\varepsilon} \right] + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + a_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^p - b_{\inf} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} + C \quad (\text{by Proposition 4.2}) \\
&\leq \frac{CM}{\delta^{p+1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + \frac{CM^*}{\delta^{p+1-\varepsilon}} \int_{\Omega} v^{p+1-\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + a_{\sup} \int_{\Omega} u^p + C \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} - b_{\inf} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} + C
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0, \min\{T, T_{\max}\})$.

Since $\|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ for any p , we get that

$$\frac{CM^*}{\delta^{p+1-\varepsilon}} \int_{\Omega} v^{p+1-\varepsilon} \leq C_2 \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon}. \quad (4.53)$$

By Young's inequality, there exists positive constants C_3, C_4 and C_5 such that

$$\frac{CM}{\delta^{p+1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \leq \frac{b_{\inf}}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} + C_3 |\Omega|, \quad (4.54)$$

and

$$(C + C_2) \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{b_{\inf}}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} + C_4 |\Omega|, \quad (4.55)$$

and

$$\left(a_{\sup} + \frac{1}{p} \right) \int_{\Omega} u^p \leq \frac{b_{\inf}}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} + C_5 |\Omega|, \quad (4.56)$$

for $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Hence, with the help of (4.53), (4.54), (4.55) and (4.56), we get that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p \leq - \int_{\Omega} u^p + C^*, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \min\{T, T_{\max}\})$$

where $C^* = C^*(p, \delta, \varepsilon, \chi, \mu, \nu, a_{\sup}, b_{\inf}, |\Omega|, \alpha, \lambda, c, h, M, M^*, C, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5) > 0$.

Let us denote $y(t) := \int_{\Omega} u^p(t, x) dx$. Then we obtain

$$y'(t) \leq -y(t) + C^*$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{T, T_{\max}\})$, where C^* is a certain positive constant. Thus the ODE comparison principle entails the boundedness of $y(t)$ on $(0, \min\{T, T_{\max}\})$. This completes the proof.

(2) By Proposition 1.2 (2), there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$v(x, t) \geq \delta \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

It then follows from the arguments in (1) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T_{\max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} < \infty.$$

□

5 Global existence and boundedness

In this section, we study the global existence and prove Theorem 1.2. Throughout this section, we put $u(x, t) = u(x, t; u_0)$, $v(x, t) = v(x, t; u_0)$, and $T_{\max} = T_{\max}(u_0)$, and assume that u_0 satisfies (1.4).

Proof of Theorem 1.2. (1) We prove Theorem 1.2 (1) by contradiction.

Assume that $T_{\max} < \infty$. Then by Proposition 1.2(1), there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$v(x, t) \geq \delta \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and } t \in (0, T_{\max}). \quad (5.1)$$

By Proposition 1.1, we then have

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega})} = \infty. \quad (5.2)$$

By Theorem 1.1, there is $\bar{p} > n$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T_{\max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\bar{p}}} < \infty.$$

This implies that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T_{\max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} < \infty \quad \forall 1 \leq p \leq n.$$

Fix a p such that $\frac{n}{2} < p < n$. Then one can find $q > n$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{q},$$

which allows us to find a positive constant $\hat{h} \in (1, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\hat{h}} < 1 - \frac{(n-p)q}{np}.$$

By the variation of constant formula and the comparison principle for parabolic equations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\cdot, t) \leq & \underbrace{e^{-tA}u_0}_{u_1(\cdot, t)} - \underbrace{\chi \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u(\cdot, s)}{v(\cdot, s)} \nabla v(\cdot, s) \right) ds}_{u_2(\cdot, t)} \\ & + \underbrace{\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} u(\cdot, s) \left(1 + a_{\sup} - b_{\inf} u(\cdot, s) \right) ds}_{u_3(\cdot, t)} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}), \end{aligned}$$

where $A = -\Delta + I : \mathcal{D}(A) \subset L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{D}(A) = \{u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \mid \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$, and e^{-tA} is the analytic semigroup generated by $-A$ on $L^p(\Omega)$ (see section 2).

In the following, we give estimates for $u_i(x, t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Note that

$$\|u_1(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T_{\max}). \quad (5.3)$$

Note also that there exist $c_0, c_1 > 0$ such that

$$u(x, s)(1 + a_{\text{sup}} - b_{\text{inf}}u(x, s)) \leq c_0 - c_1u^2(x, s)$$

for all $s \in (0, T_{\text{max}})$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. Therefore, we have that

$$u_3(\cdot, t) \leq c_0 \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} ds \leq c_0 \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} ds \leq c_0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T_{\text{max}}]. \quad (5.4)$$

By Hölder's inequality and (5.1), we have that

$$\left\| \frac{u(\cdot, s)}{v(\cdot, s)} \nabla v(\cdot, s) \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \|u\|_{L^{q\hat{h}}(\Omega)} \cdot \|\nabla v\|_{L^{\frac{q\hat{h}}{\hat{h}-1}}(\Omega)} \quad (5.5)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\text{max}})$. Note that

$$\frac{q\hat{h}}{\hat{h}-1} = \frac{q}{1-\frac{1}{\hat{h}}} < \frac{q}{\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{n}\right)q} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{n}} = \frac{np}{n-p}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 1.1, we have that

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\frac{q\hat{h}}{\hat{h}-1}}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\frac{qp}{n-p}}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq M_p \quad \forall t \in [0, T_{\text{max}}]. \quad (5.6)$$

By Hölder's inequality and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^{q\hat{h}}(\Omega)} &\leq \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{1-\hat{\lambda}} \cdot \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} \\ &\leq (m^*)^{1-\hat{\lambda}} \cdot \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\text{max}})$, where $\hat{\lambda} = 1 - \frac{1}{q\hat{h}} \in (0, 1)$. By (5.6) and (5.7), we have

$$\left\| \frac{u(\cdot, t)}{v(\cdot, t)} \nabla v(\cdot, t) \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C^* \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} \quad (5.8)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\text{max}})$ with some constant $C^* = C^*(M_p, m^*, C, \hat{\lambda}, \delta, q, \hat{h}, p, n) > 0$. Choose $\beta \in \left(\frac{n}{2p}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and fix any $T \in (0, T_{\text{max}})$. There are $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_2(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_1 \|A^\beta u_2(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2.2}) \\ &\leq C_1 \chi \int_0^t \left\| A^\beta e^{-(t-s)A} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u(\cdot, s)}{v(\cdot, s)} \nabla v(\cdot, s) \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_1 \chi \int_0^t \|A^\beta e^{-\frac{t-s}{2}A}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \cdot \left\| e^{-\frac{t-s}{2}A} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{u(\cdot, s)}{v(\cdot, s)} \nabla v(\cdot, s) \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 \chi \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\beta} (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\gamma(t-s)} \left\| \frac{u(\cdot, s)}{v(\cdot, s)} \nabla v(\cdot, s) \right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} ds \quad (\text{by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3}) \\ &\leq C_3 \chi \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\beta-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\gamma(t-s)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} ds \\ &\leq C_3 \chi \int_0^\infty (t-s)^{-\beta-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\gamma(t-s)} \cdot \sup_{s \in (0, T)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} ds \\ &\leq C_4 \chi \sup_{s \in (0, T)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\hat{\lambda}} \quad \forall t \in (0, T). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Note that

$$u(x, t) > 0 \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

We then have

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \left(c_0 + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right) + K \cdot \left(\sup_{s \in (0, T)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)^{\hat{\lambda}}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, where $K > 0$ is a positive constant and $\hat{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$. This implies that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \left(c_0 + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right) + K \cdot \left(\sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)^{\hat{\lambda}}$$

for any $T \in (0, T_{\max})$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\left(c_0 + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)}{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} + \frac{K}{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1-\hat{\lambda}}} \geq 1.$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty,$$

which contradicts to (5.2). Therefore, $T_{\max} = \infty$ and the theorem is proved.

(2) By (1), $T_{\max} = \infty$. By Proposition 1.2 (2), there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$v(x, t) \geq \delta \quad \forall x \in \Omega, t \in (0, \infty).$$

By Theorem 1.1(2), there is $\bar{p} > n$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\bar{p}}} < \infty.$$

It follows from the arguments in (1) that

$$\sup_{0 < t < \infty} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

□

References

- [1] H. Amann, Existence and regularity for semilinear parabolic evolution equations, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **11** (1984), no. 4, 593-676.
- [2] P. Biler, Global solutions to some parabolic-elliptic systems of chemotaxis, *Advanced Mathematics and Applications*, **9** (1999), 347-359.
- [3] T. Black, Global generalized solutions to a parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with singular sensitivity, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S* **13** (2020) 119-137.

- [4] M.A.J. Chaplain and J.I. Tello, On the stability of homogeneous steady states of a chemotaxis system with logistic growth term, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **57** (2016), 1-6.
- [5] M. Ding, W. Wang, and S. Zhou, Global existence of solutions to a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity and logistic source, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* **49** (2019), 286-311.
- [6] K. Fujie, Boundedness in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **424** (2015), 675-684.
- [7] 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)** (2015), 1212-1224.
- [8] K. Fujie, M. Winkler, and T. Yokota, Blow-up prevention by logistic sources in a parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with singular sensitivity, *Nonlinear Anal.* **109** (2014), 56-71.
- [9] K. Fujie and T. Senba, Global existence and boundedness in a parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with general sensitivity, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **21** (2016), no. 1, 81-102.
- [10] K. Fujie and T. Yokota, Boundedness in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with strongly singular sensitivity, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **38** (2014), 140-143.
- [11] D. Henry, Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1977.
- [12] M.A. Herrero, E. Medina, and J.J.L. Velzquez, Singularity patterns in a chemotaxis model, *Math. Ann.*, **306** (1996), 583-623.
- [13] M.A. Herrero and J.J.L. Velzquez, Finite-time aggregation into a single point in a reaction-diffusion system, *Nonlinearity*, **10** (1997), 1739-1754.
- [14] M. Isenbach, Chemotaxis. Imperial College Press, London (2004).
- [15] T. B. Issa and W. Shen, Dynamics in chemotaxis models of parabolic-elliptic type on bounded domain with time and space dependent logistic sources, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* **16** (2017), no. 2, 926-973.
- [16] E. F. Keller and L. A. Segel, Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability, *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **26** (1970), 399-415.
- [17] E. F. Keller and L. A. Segel, A model for chemotaxis, *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **30** (1971), 225-234.
- [18] J. Lankeit, Chemotaxis can prevent thresholds on population density. *Discr. Cont. Dyn. Syst. B*, **20** (2015), 1499-1527.

- [19] J. Lankeit, Eventual smoothness and asymptotics in a three-dimensional chemotaxis system with logistic source, *J. Differential Eq.*, **258** (2015), 1158-1191.
- [20] D. A. Lauffenburger, Quantitative studies of bacterial chemotaxis and microbial population dynamics, *Microbial. Ecol.*, **22**(1991), 175-85.
- [21] W. McLean, Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [22] N. Mizoguchi and P. Souplet, Nondegeneracy of blow-up points for the parabolic Keller-Segel system, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, **31** (2014), no. 4, 851-875.
- [23] T. Nagai, Blowup of nonradial solutions to parabolic-elliptic systems modeling chemotaxis in two-dimensional domains, *J. Inequal. Appl.*, **6** (2001), 37-55.
- [24] T. Nagai and T. Senba, Global existence and blow-up of radial solutions to a parabolic-elliptic system of chemotaxis, *Advanced Mathematics and Applications*, **8** (1998), 145-156.
- [25] T. Nagai and T. Senba, Global existence and blow-up of radial solutions to a parabolic-elliptic system of chemotaxis, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, **8** (1998), 145-156.
- [26] Y. Tao, M. Winkler Persistence of mass in a chemotaxis system with logistic source, *J. Differential Equations*, **259** (2015), 6142-6161.
- [27] J.I. Tello, Mathematical analysis and stability of a chemotaxis problem with a logistic growth term, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **27** (2004), 1865-1880.
- [28] J.I. Tello and W. Winkler M, A chemotaxis system with logistic source, *Common Partial Diff. Eq.*, **32** (2007), 849-877.
- [29] H. Triebel, Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [30] G. Vigliani, Very weak global solutions to a parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis-system with logistic source, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **439** (2016), no. 1, 197-212.
- [31] M. Winkler, Boundedness in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis system with logistic source, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **35** (2010), no. 8, 1516-1537.
- [32] M. Winkler, Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller-Segel model, *J. Differential Equations.*, **248** (2010), 2889-2905.
- [33] M. Winkler, Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **100** (2013), 748-767.
- [34] M. Winkler, Blow-up in a higher-dimensional chemotaxis system despite logistic growth restriction, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **384** (2011), 261-272.

- [35] M. Winkler, Global solutions in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **34** (2011), 176-190.
- [36] X. Zhao and S. Zheng, Global boundedness to a chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity and logistic source, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* **68** (2017), no. 1, 13 pp.
- [37] X. Zhao and S. Zheng, Global existence and boundedness of solutions to a chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity and logistic-type source, *J. Differential Equations* **267** (2019), no. 2, 826-865.