

Spreading speeds of a parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis model with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N

Wenxian Shen and Shuwen Xue
 Department of Mathematics and Statistics
 Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, U.S.A.

Dedicated to Professor Georg Hetzer on the occasion of his 75th Birthday

Abstract

The current paper is concerned with the spreading speeds of the following parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis model with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N ,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ v_t = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (0.1)$$

where χ, a, b, λ, μ are positive constants. Assume $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$. Among others, it is proved that $2\sqrt{a}$ is the spreading speed of the global classical solutions of (0.1) with nonempty compactly supported initial functions, that is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq ct} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0 \quad \forall c > 2\sqrt{a}$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq ct} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0 \quad \forall 0 < c < 2\sqrt{a}.$$

where $(u(x, t; u_0, v_0), v(x, t; u_0, v_0))$ is the unique global classical solution of (0.1) with $u(x, 0; u_0, v_0) = u_0, v(x, 0; u_0, v_0) = v_0$, and $\text{supp}(u_0), \text{supp}(v_0)$ are nonempty and compact. It is well known that $2\sqrt{a}$ is the spreading speed of the following Fisher-KPP equation,

$$u_t = \Delta u + u(a - bu), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Hence, if $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$, the chemotaxis neither speeds up nor slows down the spatial spreading in the Fisher-KPP equation.

Key words. Parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis system, logistic source, classical solution, spreading speeds.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35B40, 35K57, 35Q92, 92C17.

1 Introduction and the Statements of Main results

Chemotaxis is referred to the directed movement of cells and organisms in response to chemical gradients and plays a crucial role in a wide range of biological phenomena [9]. Positive chemotaxis

occurs if the movement is toward a higher concentration of the chemical substance in question. Conversely, negative chemotaxis occurs if the movement is in the opposite direction. The chemical substances that lead to positive chemotaxis are called chemoattractants and those leading to negative chemotaxis are called chemorepellents. Mathematical models for chemotaxis date to the pioneering works of Keller and Segel in the 1970s [18, 19]. The reader is referred to [4, 14, 15, 31] and the references therein for some detailed introduction into the mathematics and applications of chemotaxis models. For the recent developments on chemotaxis models, we refer to the survey paper [3].

The current paper is devoted to the study of the spatial spreading dynamics of the following parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis model with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N :

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ v_t = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where χ , a , b , λ and μ are positive constants. In (1.1), $u(x, t)$ and $v(x, t)$ denote the population densities of some biological species and chemical substance at location x and time t , respectively; the term Δu describes the movement of the biological species following random walk; the term $\chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v)$ characterizes the influence of chemical substance, and the logistic term $u(a - bu)$ governs the local dynamics of the biological species. The second equation indicates that the chemical substance diffuses via random walk with a finite diffusion rate and is produced over time by the biological species. Both mathematically and biologically, it is important to investigate how chemotaxis affects the dynamics of (1.1).

Numerous research works have been carried out on the dynamics of the following counterpart of (1.1) on a bounded domain with Neumann boundary condition,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \Omega, \\ v_t = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded smooth domain (see [8, 13, 16, 21, 22, 24, 42, 43, 44, 45], etc.). For example, when $a \equiv b \equiv 0$ in (1.2), and Ω is a ball in \mathbb{R}^N with $N \geq 3$, it is proved that for any $M > 0$ there exists positive initial data $(u_0, v_0) \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \times W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\int_{\Omega} u_0 = M$ such that the corresponding solution blows up in finite time (see [43]). It is shown in [44] that, when Ω is a convex bounded domain with smooth boundary and $\frac{b}{\chi}$ is sufficiently large, for any choice of suitably regular nonnegative initial data (u_0, v_0) such that $u_0 \not\equiv 0$, (1.2) possesses a uniquely determined global classical solution and that the constant solution $(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b})$ is asymptotically stable in the sense that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\|u(\cdot, t; u_0, v_0) - \frac{a}{b}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t; u_0, v_0) - \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}] = 0.$$

The particular requirement on the convexity of the bounded domain Ω was later removed in [16] and [45]. Hence finite-time blow-up phenomena in (1.2) can be suppressed to some extent by the logistic source.

There are also numerous research papers on the dynamics of (1.1) in the case that $a \equiv b \equiv 0$ and many interesting dynamical scenarios are observed (see [6, 7, 10, 25, 28, 29, 30] etc.). For example, it is observed that finite-time blow-up may occur when $N \geq 2$ (see [6]) and it is shown

that bounded solutions decay to zero as time goes to infinity and behaves like the heat kernel with the self-similarity (see [28, 29]).

Very recently, the authors of current paper [38] studied the dynamics of (1.1) with $a, b > 0$ and observed that finite-time blow-up phenomena in (1.1) can also be suppressed to some extent by the logistic source. To be more precise, it is proved in [38] that if $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$, (1.1) has a unique bounded global classical solution for every nonnegative, bounded, and uniformly continuous function $u_0(x)$, and every nonnegative, bounded, uniformly continuous, and differentiable function $v_0(x)$. Moreover, any globally defined bounded positive classical solution with strictly positive initial function u_0 is bounded below by a positive constant independent of (u_0, v_0) when time is large.

The objective of the current paper is to investigate the spreading speeds of globally defined classical solutions of (1.1) with compactly supported or front-like initial functions. Roughly speaking, it is about how fast the biological species spreads into the region without biological species initially as time evolves.

Observe that, in the absence of chemotaxis (i.e. $\chi = 0$), (1.1) reduces to the following reaction-diffusion equation

$$u_t = \Delta u + u(a - bu), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1.3)$$

Due to the pioneering works of Fisher [11] and Kolmogorov, Petrowsky, Piskunov [20] on traveling wave solutions and take-over properties of (1.3), (1.3) is also referred to as the Fisher-KPP equation. The following results are well known about the spatial spreading dynamics of (1.3). Equation (1.3) has traveling wave solutions $u(t, x) = \phi(x \cdot \xi - ct)$ ($\xi \in S^{N-1}$) connecting $\frac{a}{b}$ and 0 ($\phi(-\infty) = \frac{a}{b}, \phi(\infty) = 0$) of all speeds $c \geq 2\sqrt{a}$ and has no such traveling wave solutions of slower speeds. For any given bounded $u_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\liminf_{x \cdot \xi \rightarrow -\infty} u_0(x) > 0$ and $u_0(x) = 0$ for $x \cdot \xi \gg 1$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \cdot \xi \geq ct} u(x, t) = 0 \quad \forall c > 2\sqrt{a}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \cdot \xi \leq ct} |u(x, t) - \frac{a}{b}| = 0 \quad \forall c < 2\sqrt{a}.$$

Since their pioneering works, a considerable amount of research has been carried out toward the front propagation dynamics of reaction-diffusion equations of the form,

$$u_t = \Delta u + uf(x, t, u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.4)$$

where $f(x, t, u) < 0$ for $u \gg 1$, $\partial_u f(x, t, u) < 0$ for $u \geq 0$ (see [2, 5, 23, 39, 41], etc.). In literature, the number $c_0^* := 2\sqrt{a}$ is called the *spreading speed* for (1.3) which was first introduced by Aronson and Weinberger [1].

It is interesting to investigate the influence of chemotaxis on the spreading dynamics of (1.1). The authors of [35], [36] studied the existence of traveling wave solutions of (1.1). Among others, it is proved that if $b > 2\chi\mu$ and $1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\lambda}{a})_+$, then for every $c \geq 2\sqrt{a}$, (1.1) has a traveling wave solution $(u, v)(t, x) = (U^c(x \cdot \xi - ct), V^c(x \cdot \xi - ct))$ ($\forall \xi \in S^{N-1}$) connecting the two constant steady states $(0, 0)$ and $(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b})$, and there is no such solution with speed c less than $2\sqrt{a}$, which shows that (1.1) has a minimal wave speed $c_0^* = 2\sqrt{a}$, which is independent of the chemotaxis.

In this paper, we will prove that, if $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$, then $c_0^* = 2\sqrt{a}$ is also the spatial spreading speed of (1.1), which shows that the chemotaxis neither speeds up nor slows down the spatial spreading

in the Fisher-KPP equation (1.3). To state our results precisely, we introduce some notations. Let

$$X_1 = C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid u(x) \text{ is uniformly continuous in } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and } \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)| < \infty\}$$

equipped with the norm $\|u\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|$, and

$$X_2 = C_{\text{unif}}^{b,1} := \{u \in C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid \partial_{x_i} u \in C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}^N), i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$$

equipped with the norm $\|u\|_{C_{\text{unif}}^{b,1}} = \|u\|_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^N \|\partial_{x_i} u\|_\infty$. Let

$$X_1^+ = \{u \in X_1 \mid u \geq 0\}, \quad X_2^+ = \{v \in X_2 \mid v \geq 0\}.$$

For any given $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, we denote by $(u(x, t; u_0, v_0), v(x, t; u_0, v_0))$ the classical solution of (1.1) satisfying $u(x, 0; u_0, v_0) = u_0(x)$ and $v(x, 0; u_0, v_0) = v_0(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Note that, by the comparison principle for parabolic equations, for every $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, it always holds that $u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq 0$ and $v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq 0$ whenever $(u(x, t; u_0, v_0), v(x, t; u_0, v_0))$ is defined. In this work we shall only focus on nonnegative classical solutions of (1.1) since both functions $u(x, t)$ and $v(x, t)$ represent density functions.

The following proposition states the existence and uniqueness of global classical solutions of (1.1) with non-negative initial function. It has been proved in [38, Theorem 1.2].

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose that $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$. Then for every $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, (1.1) has a unique bounded global classical solution $(u(x, t; u_0, v_0), v(x, t; u_0, v_0))$.*

For given $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let $|x| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_N^2}$. Let

$$S^{N-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x| = 1\}.$$

For $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, define $x \cdot y = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i y_i$.

Let

$$C_{cp}^+ = \{u \in X_1^+ \mid \text{supp}(u) \text{ is non-empty and compact}\},$$

and

$$C_{cp}^{+,1} = \{v \in X_2^+ \mid \text{supp}(v) \text{ is non-empty and compact}\}.$$

For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, we define

$$C_{fl}^+(\xi) = \{u \in X_1^+ \mid \liminf_{x \cdot \xi \rightarrow -\infty} u(x) > 0, u(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } x \cdot \xi \gg 1\},$$

$$C_{fl}^{+,1}(\xi) = \{v \in X_2^+ \mid \liminf_{x \cdot \xi \rightarrow -\infty} v(x) > 0, v(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } x \cdot \xi \gg 1\},$$

$$C^+(\xi) = \{u \in X_1^+ \mid \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| < r} u(x) > 0 \text{ for some } r > 0, u(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } |x \cdot \xi| \gg 1\},$$

and

$$C^{+,1}(\xi) = \{v \in X_2^+ \mid \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| < r} v(x) > 0 \text{ for some } r > 0, v(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } |x \cdot \xi| \gg 1\}.$$

The main results of this paper are then stated in the following theorems.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that $b > \frac{N\mu_X}{4}$. For any $(u_0, v_0) \in C_{cp}^+ \times C_{cp}^{+,1}$, the following hold.

(1) For any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0,$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

(2) For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0.$$

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that $b > \frac{N\mu_X}{4}$. For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$ and $(u_0, v_0) \in C_{fl}^+(\xi) \times C_{fl}^{+,1}(\xi)$, the following hold.

(1) For any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

(2) For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \cdot \xi \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \cdot \xi \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0.$$

Theorem 1.4. Suppose that $b > \frac{N\mu_X}{4}$. For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$ and $(u_0, v_0) \in C^+(\xi) \times C^{+,1}(\xi)$, the following hold.

(1) For any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

(2) For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x \cdot \xi| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x \cdot \xi| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0.$$

We conclude the introduction with the following remarks.

Remark 1.5. (1) As it is recalled in the above, in the absence of chemotaxis (i.e. $\chi = 0$), $2\sqrt{a}$ is the spreading speed of (1.3). Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 provide some new approach to prove that $2\sqrt{a}$ is the spreading speed of the Fisher-KPP equation (1.3). The new approach can also be applied to the study of the spreading speeds of (1.4) with general time and space dependence.

(2) Assume $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$. Theorem 1.2 (1), Theorem 1.3 (1) and Theorem 1.4 (1) show that the chemotaxis does not slow down the spreading speed in the Fisher-KPP equation (1.3). Theorem 1.2 (2), Theorem 1.3 (2) and Theorem 1.4 (2) show that the chemotaxis does not speed up the spreading speed in the Fisher-KPP equation (1.3). Biologically, the condition $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$ means that the logistic damping is large relative to the product of the chemotaxis sensitivity and the production rate of the chemical substance.

(3) Consider the following parabolic-elliptic counterpart of (1.2),

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \Omega, \\ 0 = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

The dynamics of (1.5) has been studied in many research papers and very rich dynamical scenarios have been observed. For example, when $a \equiv b \equiv 0$, finite-time blow-up may occur in (1.5) if either $N = 2$ and the total initial population mass is large enough, or $N \geq 3$ (see [12, 17, 26, 27], etc.). When a and b are positive constants, if either $N \leq 2$ or $b > \frac{N-2}{N}\chi$, then for any nonnegative initial data $u_0 \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, (1.5) possesses a unique bounded global classical solution $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ with $u(x, 0; u_0) = u_0(x)$, and hence the finite-time blow-up phenomena in (1.5) is suppressed to some extent. Moreover, if $b > 2\chi$, then $(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b})$ is the unique positive steady-state solution of (1.5), and for any nonnegative initial distribution $u_0 \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ ($u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$),

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\|u(\cdot, t; u_0) - \frac{a}{b}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t; u_0) - \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}] = 0$$

(hence the chemotaxis does not affect the limiting distribution). But if $b < 2\chi$, there may be more than one positive steady-state solutions of (1.5) (see [40]).

(4) Consider the following parabolic-elliptic counterpart of (1.1),

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ 0 = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

The authors of [32, 33, 34, 37] studied the spatial spreading dynamics of (1.6). Among others, it is proved that, if $b > \chi\mu$ and $b \geq (1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{\lambda})_+}{(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{\lambda})})\chi\mu$, $c_0^* := 2\sqrt{a}$ is the spreading speed of the solutions of (1.6) with nonnegative continuous initial function u_0 with nonempty compact support, that is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq ct} u(x, t; u_0) = 0 \quad \forall c > c_0^*$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq ct} u(x, t; u_0) > 0 \quad \forall 0 < c < c_0^*,$$

where $(u(x, t; u_0), v(x, t; u_0))$ is the unique global classical solution of (1.6) with $u(x, 0; u_0) = u_0(x)$. It is also proved that, if $b > 2\chi\mu$ and $\lambda \geq a$ hold, then $2\sqrt{a}$ is the minimal speed of the traveling wave solutions of (1.6) connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b})$, that is, for any $c \geq 2\sqrt{a}$, (1.6) has a traveling wave solution connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\mu a}{\lambda b})$ with speed c , and (1.6) has no such traveling wave solutions with speed less than $2\sqrt{a}$. In particular, if $\lambda \geq a$ and $b > \chi\mu$, or $\lambda < a$ and $b \geq (1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{\lambda})}{(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{\lambda})})\chi\mu$, then the chemotaxis neither speeds up nor slows down the spatial spreading in the Fisher-KPP equation (1.3).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we study the lower bounds of spreading speeds of (1.1) and prove Theorem 1.2 (1), Theorem 1.3 (1) and Theorem 1.4 (1). In section 3, we explore the upper bounds of spreading speeds of (1.1) and prove Theorem 1.2 (2), Theorem 1.3 (2) and Theorem 1.4 (2).

2 Lower bounds of spreading speeds

In this section, we investigate lower bounds of spreading speeds of global classical solutions of (1.1) with different initial functions. We first prove some preliminary lemmas in subsection 2.1. Then we prove Theorem 1.2 (1), Theorem 1.3 (1), and Theorem 1.4 (1) in subsections 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, respectively. Throughout this section, we assume that $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$.

2.1 Preliminary lemmas

In this subsection, we present some lemmas to be used in the proofs of Theorem 1.2 (1), Theorem 1.3 (1), and Theorem 1.4 (1).

For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\tilde{u}(x, t) = u(x + ct\xi, t)$ and $\tilde{v}(x, t) = v(x + ct\xi, t)$. Then (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_t = \Delta \tilde{u} + c\xi \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} - \chi \nabla \cdot (\tilde{u} \nabla \tilde{v}) + \tilde{u}(a - b\tilde{u}) & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \tilde{v}_t = \Delta \tilde{v} + c\xi \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} - \lambda \tilde{v} + \mu \tilde{u}, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

In the following, $(\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0), \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0))$ denotes the classical solution of (2.1) with $\tilde{u}(x, 0; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = u_0 \in X_1^+$ and $\tilde{v}(x, 0; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = v_0 \in X_2^+$.

For any given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, fix $0 < \bar{a} < a$ such that

$$4\bar{a} - c^2 \geq \epsilon\sqrt{a} \quad \forall -2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon. \quad (2.2)$$

Let

$$l = \frac{2\pi\sqrt{N}}{(\epsilon\sqrt{a})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\lambda(c, \bar{a}) = \frac{4\bar{a} - c^2 - \frac{N\pi^2}{l^2}}{4}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then $\lambda(c, \bar{a}) \geq \frac{3\epsilon\sqrt{a}}{16} > 0$ for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$. Let

$$D_l = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x_i| < l \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}.$$

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $r > 0$, we define

$$B_r(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |y - x| < r\}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *For any given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, let \bar{a} and l be as in (2.2) and (2.3). Then for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$ and $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, $\lambda(c, \bar{a})$ which is defined as in (2.4) is the principal eigenvalue of*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi + c\xi \cdot \nabla\phi + \bar{a}\phi = \lambda\phi, & x \in D_l \\ \phi(x) = 0, & x \in \partial D_l, \end{cases}$$

and $\phi(x; \xi, c, \bar{a}) = e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\xi \cdot x} \prod_{i=1}^N \cos \frac{\pi}{2l} x_i$ is a corresponding positive eigenfunction.

Proof. It follows from direct calculations. \square

Lemma 2.2. *There are $M > 0$, $M_1 > 0$, and $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, there is $T_0(u_0, v_0) > 1$ such that for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \|\tilde{u}(\cdot, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)\|_\infty \leq M & \forall t \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) \\ \|\tilde{v}(\cdot, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)\|_\infty \leq M & \forall t \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) \\ \|\nabla\tilde{v}(\cdot, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)\|_\infty \leq M & \forall t \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) \\ \|\Delta\tilde{v}(\cdot, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)\|_\infty \leq M & \forall t \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{t, s \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) + 1, t \neq s} \frac{\|\nabla\tilde{v}(\cdot, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) - \nabla\tilde{v}(\cdot, s; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)\|_\infty}{|t - s|^\theta} \leq MM_1.$$

Proof. It follows from [38, Lemma 4.1]. \square

In the following, $M > 0$ is as in Lemma 2.2, and for given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, $l > 0$ is as in (2.3). For given $\eta > 0$, let $T = T(\eta) \geq 1$ be such that

$$e^{-\lambda T} M \leq \eta, \tag{2.5}$$

and $L = L(\eta) \geq l$ be such that $B_L(0) \supset D_l$ and

$$\max\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{a}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} e^{-|z|^2} dz, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{a}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} |z| e^{-|z|^2} dz \right\} \leq \eta. \tag{2.6}$$

Lemma 2.3. *For any given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, let \bar{a} and l be as in (2.2) and (2.3). Let $0 < \tilde{a} < a - \bar{a}$ be fixed. There is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \eta \leq \epsilon_0$, any $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any t_1, t_2 satisfying $T_0(u_0, v_0) \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq \infty$, and any ball $B_{2L(\eta)}$ with radius $2L(\eta)$ in \mathbb{R}^N , if*

$$\sup_{x \in B_{2L(\eta)}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \leq \eta \quad \forall t_1 \leq t < t_2,$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in B_{L(\eta)}} \max\{\tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0), |\partial_{x_i} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)|\} \leq \tilde{M}\eta \quad \forall t_1 + T(\eta) \leq t < t_2 \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\chi \sup_{x \in B_L(\eta)} \sum_{i,j=1}^N |\partial_{x_i x_j} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)| \leq \tilde{a} \quad \forall t_1 + T(\eta) + 1 \leq t < t_2, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\tilde{M} = \max \left\{ 1 + \frac{\mu M}{\lambda \pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}, 1 + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) M + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the lemma for the ball centered at the origin with radius $2L(\eta)$. If not, we can make appropriate translation of $(\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0), \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0))$ for the space variable x to achieve this. We first prove that (2.7) holds for any $\eta > 0$. Fix $t_1 \geq T_0(u_0, v_0)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)}}{(4\pi(t-t_1))^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x+c(t-t_1)\xi-y|^2}{4(t-t_1)}} \tilde{v}(y, t_1; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dy \\ &+ \mu \int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{e^{-\lambda(t-s)}}{(4\pi(t-s))^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x+c(t-s)\xi-y|^2}{4(t-s)}} \tilde{u}(y, s; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dy ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)} e^{-|z|^2} \tilde{v}(x + c(t-t_1)\xi + 2\sqrt{t-t_1}z, t_1; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dz \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} e^{-|z|^2} \tilde{u}(x + c(t-s)\xi + 2\sqrt{t-s}z, s; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dz ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x_i} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(y_i - x_i - c(t-t_1)\xi) e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)}}{2(t-t_1)(4\pi(t-t_1))^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x+c(t-t_1)\xi-y|^2}{4(t-t_1)}} \tilde{v}(y, t_1; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dy \\ &+ \mu \int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(y_i - x_i - c(t-s)\xi) e^{-\lambda(t-s)}}{2(t-s)(4\pi(t-s))^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x+c(t-s)\xi-y|^2}{4(t-s)}} \tilde{u}(y, s; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dy ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} (t-t_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda(t-t_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z e^{-z^2} \tilde{v}(x + c(t-t_1)\xi + 2\sqrt{t-t_1}z, t_1; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dz \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} z e^{-z^2} \tilde{u}(x + c(t-s)\xi + 2\sqrt{t-s}z, s; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) dz ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $x \in B_L(0)$ and $t_1 + T \leq t \leq \min\{t_1 + 2T, t_2\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) &\leq e^{-\lambda T} M + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \left[\int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} e^{-|z|^2} dz ds \right] M \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \left[\int_{t_1}^t \int_{B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} e^{-|z|^2} dz ds \right] \sup_{t_1 \leq t < t_2, |z| \leq 2L} \tilde{u}(z, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.5) and (2.6), if $\sup_{x \in B_{2L}(0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \leq \eta$ for any $t_1 \leq t < t_2$, then

$$\tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu M}{\lambda \pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right) \eta \quad \forall t_1 + T \leq t \leq \min\{t_1 + 2T, t_2\}, \quad |x| \leq L. \quad (2.9)$$

For $t_1 + T \leq t \leq \min\{t_1 + 2T, t_2\}$, and $x \in B_L(0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{x_i} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda T} M + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \left[\int_{t_1}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{a}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} |z| e^{-|z|^2} dz ds \right] M \\ & + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \left[\int_{t_1}^t \int_{B_{\frac{L-4T\sqrt{a}}{2\sqrt{2T}}}(0)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} |z| e^{-|z|^2} dz ds \right] \sup_{t_1 \leq t < t_2, |z| \leq 2L} \tilde{u}(z, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.5) and (2.6), if $\sup_{x \in B_{2L}(0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \leq \eta$ for any $t_1 \leq t < t_2$, then

$$|\partial_{x_i} \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) M + \frac{\mu}{\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \eta \quad (2.10)$$

for $t_1 + T \leq t \leq \min\{t_1 + 2T, t_2\}$ and $x \in B_L(0)$.

In the above arguments, replace t_1 by $t_1 + T$. We have (2.9) and (2.10) for $t_1 + 2T \leq t \leq \min\{t_1 + 3T, t_2\}$. Repeating this process, we have (2.9) and (2.10) for $t_1 + T \leq t < t_2$. It then follows that (2.7) holds for any $\eta > 0$.

Next, we prove that there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that (2.8) holds for $0 < \eta \leq \epsilon_0$. Assume this is not true. Then there are $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $(u_n, v_n) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, $\xi_n \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c_n \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, $T_0(u_n, v_n) \leq t_{1n} < t_{1n} + T(\eta_n) + 1 \leq t_n < t_{2n}$ such that

$$\sup_{|x| \leq 2L(\eta_n)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi_n, c_n, u_n, v_n) \leq \eta_n, \quad \forall t_{1n} \leq t < t_{2n}$$

and

$$\chi \sup_{|x| \leq L(\eta_n)} \sum_{i,j=1}^N |\partial_{x_i x_j} \tilde{v}(x, t_n; \xi_n, c_n, u_n, v_n)| > \tilde{a}.$$

Let

$$(\tilde{u}_n(x, t), \tilde{v}_n(x, t)) = (\tilde{u}(x, t + t_n; \xi_n, c_n, u_n, v_n), \tilde{v}(x, t + t_n; \xi_n, c_n, u_n, v_n)).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$(\tilde{u}_n(x, t), \tilde{v}_n(x, t)) \rightarrow (u^*(x, t), v^*(x, t))$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly on $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [-1, \infty)$, $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi^*$, $c_n \rightarrow c^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\xi^* \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c^* \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$. Note that $v^*(x, t)$ satisfies

$$v_t^* = \Delta v^* + c^* \xi^* \cdot \nabla v^* - \lambda v^* + \mu u^*, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t \geq -1$$

and

$$\chi \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N |\partial_{x_i x_j} v^*(x, 0)| \geq \tilde{a}.$$

By (2.7), we have

$$u^*(x, t) = 0, v^*(x, t) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, -1 \leq t \leq 0.$$

Then by the comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$v^*(x, t) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t \geq -1,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence (2.8) holds. \square

Lemma 2.4. *For any given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, let \bar{a} and l be as in (2.2) and (2.3). Let $\lambda_0 = \min_{-2\sqrt{a}+\epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a}-\epsilon} \lambda(c, \bar{a}) > 0$, where $\lambda(c, \bar{a})$ is as in Lemma 2.1. Let $\tilde{T}_0 \geq 1$ be such that $e^{\lambda_0 \tilde{T}_0} \geq 4$. Let ϵ_0 be as in Lemma 2.3. For any $0 < \eta \leq \epsilon_0$, there is $0 < \delta_\eta \leq \epsilon_0$ such that for any $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $t_0 \geq T_0(u_0, v_0) + 2$, and any ball $B_{2L} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with radius $2L$, if*

$$\sup_{x \in B_{2L}} \tilde{u}(x, t_0; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \eta,$$

then

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \delta_\eta \quad \forall t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + T + \tilde{T}_0,$$

where $L = L(\eta)$ and $T = T(\eta)$.

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that the conclusion fails. Then there exist $0 < \eta_0 \leq \epsilon_0$, $(u_{0n}, v_{0n}) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, $\xi_n \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c_n \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, $t_{0n} \geq T_0(u_{0n}, v_{0n}) + 2$, a sequence of ball $B_{2L(\eta_0)}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with radius $2L(\eta_0)$, $x_n, x_n^* \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x_n \in B_{2L(\eta_0)}^n$, $x_n^* \in B_{2L(\eta_0)}^n$, $t_n \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t_{0n} \leq t_n \leq t_{0n} + T(\eta_0) + \tilde{T}_0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(x_n, t_{0n}; \xi_n, c_n, u_{0n}, v_{0n}) \geq \eta_0 \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(x_n^*, t_n; \xi_n, c_n, u_{0n}, v_{0n}) = 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Let $\tilde{u}_n(x, t) = \tilde{u}(x + x_n, t + t_{0n} - 1; \xi_n, c_n, u_{0n}, v_{0n})$, $\tilde{v}_n(x, t) = \tilde{v}(x + x_n, t + t_{0n} - 1; \xi_n, c_n, u_{0n}, v_{0n})$, and $T = T(\eta_0) + \tilde{T}_0$, $L = L(\eta_0)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$x_n^* - x_n \rightarrow x^*, \quad t_n - t_{0n} + 1 \rightarrow t^* \geq 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$(\tilde{u}_n(x, t), \tilde{v}_n(x, t)) \rightarrow (u^*(x, t), v^*(x, t))$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi^*$ and $c_n \rightarrow c^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\xi^* \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c^* \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$. Then (u^*, v^*) is a solution of (2.1) with ξ being replaced by ξ^* and c being replaced by c^* for $t \geq 0$.

By (2.11), $u^*(0, 1) \geq \eta_0$, it follows from comparison principle for parabolic equations that $u^*(x, t) > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t > 0$. But by (2.12), $u^*(x^*, t^*) = 0$. This is a contraction. \square

Lemma 2.5. For any given $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, let \bar{a} and l be as in (2.2) and (2.3). There is $0 < \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \leq \epsilon_0$ such that for any $0 < \eta \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0$, there is $\tilde{\delta}_\eta > 0$ such that for any $(u_0, v_0) \in X_1^+ \times X_2^+$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any t_1, t_2 satisfying that $T_0(u_0, v_0) + 2 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq \infty$, and any ball $B_{2L} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with radius $2L$, if

$$\sup_{x \in B_{2L}} \tilde{u}(x, t_1; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = \eta, \quad \sup_{x \in B_{2L}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \leq \eta, \quad \forall t_1 < t < t_2,$$

then

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \tilde{\delta}_\eta \quad \forall t_1 \leq t < t_2,$$

where $L = L(\eta)$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the lemma for the ball $B_{2L}(0)$ centered at the origin with the radius $2L$. If the ball with the radius $2L$ is not centered at the origin, we can make an appropriate translation of $(\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0), \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0))$ for the space variable x to shift the ball into the ball centered at the origin.

First, consider

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + c\xi \cdot \nabla u + q(x, t) \cdot \nabla u + \bar{a}u, & x \in D_l, t > 0 \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial D_l, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \bar{\phi}(x; \xi, c, \bar{a}), & x \in D_l, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

where $\bar{\phi}(x; \xi, c, \bar{a}) = \frac{\phi(x; \xi, c, \bar{a})}{\|\phi\|_\infty}$ and $\phi(x; \xi, c, \bar{a})$ is as in Lemma 2.1. Let $\bar{u}(x, t; \xi, c, q)$ be the solution of (2.13). Let $\tilde{T}_0 \geq 1$ be as in lemma 2.4. We claim that there is $\tilde{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ such that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, any function $q(x, t)$ which is C^1 in x and Hölder continuous in t with exponent $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|q(\cdot, t)\|_{C(\bar{D}_l)} \leq \chi \sqrt{N} \tilde{M} \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \quad (2.14)$$

(\tilde{M} is as in Lemma 2.3), and

$$\sup_{t, s \geq 0, t \neq s} \frac{\|q(\cdot, t) - q(\cdot, s)\|_{C(\bar{D}_l)}}{|t - s|^\theta} \leq \chi M M_1 \quad (2.15)$$

(M and M_1 are as in Lemma 2.2), there holds

$$\bar{u}(x, \tilde{T}_0; \xi, c, q) \geq 2\bar{\phi}(x; \xi, c, \bar{a}) \quad \forall x \in D_l. \quad (2.16)$$

In fact, assume this is not true. Then there are $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $x_n \in D_l$, $\xi_n \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c_n \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, and $q_n(x, t)$ satisfying (2.15) and

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|q_n(\cdot, t)\|_{C(\bar{D}_l)} \leq \chi \sqrt{N} \tilde{M} \epsilon_n$$

such that

$$\bar{u}(x_n, \tilde{T}_0; \xi_n, c_n, q_n) < 2\bar{\phi}(x_n; \xi_n, c_n, \bar{a}) \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (2.17)$$

Let $u_n(x, t) = \bar{u}(x, t; \xi_n, c_n, q_n)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$u_n(x, t) \rightarrow u^*(x, t), \quad \partial_{x_j} u_n(x, t) \rightarrow \partial_{x_j} u^*(x, t) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

locally uniformly in $(x, t) \in \bar{D}_l \times [0, \infty)$, $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi^*$ and $c_n \rightarrow c^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\xi^* \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c^* \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$. Note that $u^*(x, t) = \bar{u}(x, t; \xi^*, c^*, 0) = e^{\lambda(c^*, \bar{a})t} \bar{\phi}(x; \xi^*, c^*, \bar{a})$. Hence

$$u^*(x, \tilde{T}_0) \geq e^{\lambda_0 \tilde{T}_0} \bar{\phi}(x; \xi^*, c^*, \bar{a}) \geq 4\bar{\phi}(x; \xi^*, c^*, \bar{a}), \quad \forall x \in D_l.$$

This together with the Hopf's Lemma implies that

$$u_n(x, \tilde{T}_0) \geq 2\bar{\phi}(x; \xi_n, c_n, \bar{a}) \quad \forall x \in D_l, \quad n \gg 1,$$

which contradicts to (2.17). Hence the claim holds true.

Next, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$a - \bar{a} - b\tilde{\epsilon}_0 \geq \bar{a}.$$

Let $T = T(\eta)$. By Lemma 2.3, for any given $0 < \eta \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0$, $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, $t_1 + T + 1 \leq t < t_2 \leq \infty$, and $x \in B_L(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_t &= \Delta \tilde{u} + c\xi \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} - \chi \nabla \tilde{v} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}(a - \chi \Delta \tilde{v} - b\tilde{u}) \\ &\geq \Delta \tilde{u} + c\xi \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} + q(x, t) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} + \bar{a}\tilde{u}, \end{aligned}$$

where $q(x, t) = -\chi \nabla \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0)$. By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, $q(\cdot, \cdot + t_1 + T + 1)$ satisfies (2.14) and (2.15). Let $n_0 \geq 0$ be such that

$$t_1 + T + 1 + n_0 \tilde{T}_0 < t_2 \quad \text{and} \quad t_1 + T + 1 + (n_0 + 1) \tilde{T}_0 \geq t_2.$$

By Lemma 2.4,

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L}(0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \delta_\eta \quad \forall t_1 \leq t \leq t_1 + T + 1.$$

This together with the comparison principle for parabolic equations and (2.16) implies that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(x, t_1 + T + 1 + k\tilde{T}_0; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) &\geq 2^{k-1} \delta_\eta \tilde{u}(x, \tilde{T}_0; \xi, c, q(\cdot, \cdot + t_1 + T + 1 + (k-1)\tilde{T}_0)) \\ &\geq 2^k \delta_\eta \bar{\phi}(x; \xi, c, \bar{a}) \quad \forall x \in D_l \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n_0$, where δ_η is as in Lemma 2.4. By Lemma 2.4 again, we then have for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$,

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L}(0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \tilde{\delta}_\eta := \min\{\delta_\eta, \delta_{\delta_\eta}\} \quad \forall t_1 \leq t < t_2.$$

□

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2 (1)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.2 (1). Throughout this subsection, let $(u_0, v_0) \in C_{cp}^+ \times C_{cp}^{+,1}$ be fixed.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (1). We first prove that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0. \quad (2.18)$$

For any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$, let \bar{a} and l be as in (2.2) and (2.3). Let $T_0 = T_0(u_0, v_0)$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_0$ be as in Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5, respectively. Let $T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$ be such that (2.5) holds. For any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, let

$$\tilde{\delta} := \tilde{\delta}(\xi, c) = \inf_{x \in \tilde{D}_l} \tilde{u}(x, T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3; \xi, c, u_0, v_0).$$

By the assumption $u_0(x) \geq 0$ and $u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$, $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. Let

$$k_0 = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid 2^k \tilde{\delta} \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{00} = T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3 + k_0 \tilde{T}_0,$$

where $\tilde{T}_0 \geq 1$ is as in lemma 2.4. We claim that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$,

$$\inf_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}. \quad (2.19)$$

To prove the claim, for any given $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, let

$$I = \{t > T_0 + 2 \mid \sup_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) < \tilde{\epsilon}_0\}.$$

Note that I is an open set. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\inf_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0} \quad \forall t \notin I \text{ for } t > T_0 + 2. \quad (2.20)$$

Hence, if $I = \emptyset$, then

$$\inf_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0} \quad \forall t \geq T_0 + 2. \quad (2.21)$$

If $I \neq \emptyset$, then $I = \cup(a_i, b_i)$. If $a_i \neq T_0 + 2$, then

$$\sup_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, a_i; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) < \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \quad \forall t \in (a_i, b_i).$$

By Lemma 2.5,

$$\inf_{|x| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0} \quad \forall t \in (a_i, b_i) \text{ for } a_i \neq T_0 + 2. \quad (2.22)$$

If $a_i = T_0 + 2$, by the arguments in Lemma 2.5, there holds

$$\tilde{u}(x, T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3 + k\tilde{T}_0; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq 2^k \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0} \quad \forall x \in D_l$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k_0$. This implies that $b_i \leq T_{00}$. This together with (2.20), (2.21), and (2.22) implies (2.19).

By (2.19) and $\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = u(x + ct\xi, t; u_0, v_0)$, we have for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any $\xi \in S^{N-1}$,

$$\inf_{|x-ct\xi| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

Thus for any $t \geq T_{00}$, any $|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t$, there exist $c = \frac{|x|}{t}$ and $\xi = \frac{x}{|x|}$ such that $|x - ct\xi| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$, it then holds that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\},$$

which implies that

$$\inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\}.$$

(2.18) is thus proved.

Finally, we prove that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Suppose by contraction that the result does not hold. Then there are constant $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$ and a sequence $\{(x_n, t_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $|x_n| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t_n$, and

$$v(x_n, t_n; u_0, v_0) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.24)$$

For every $n \geq 1$, let us define

$$u_n(x, t) = u(x + x_n, t + t_n; u_0, v_0), \quad \text{and} \quad v_n(x, t) = v(x + x_n, t + t_n; u_0, v_0)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t \geq -t_n$. By a prior estimates for parabolic equations, without loss of generality, we may assume that $(u_n(x, t), v_n(x, t)) \rightarrow (u^*(x, t), v^*(x, t))$ locally uniformly in $C^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, $(u^*(t, x), v^*(t, x))$ is an entire solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) + u(a - bu), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ v_t = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

Choose $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} < \epsilon$. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x + x_n| &\leq |x| + |x_n| \leq |x| + (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t_n \\ &= (2\sqrt{a} - \tilde{\epsilon})(t_n + t) - (\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon})(t_n - \frac{|x| - (2\sqrt{a} - \tilde{\epsilon})t}{\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon}}) \\ &\leq (2\sqrt{a} - \tilde{\epsilon})(t_n + t) \end{aligned}$$

whenever $t_n \geq \frac{|x| + (2\sqrt{a} - \tilde{\epsilon})t}{\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon}}$. By (2.18),

$$u^*(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(x + x_n, t + t_n; u_0, v_0) \geq \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|y| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \tilde{\epsilon})s} u(y, s; u_0, v_0) > 0$$

for every $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$. It follows from comparison principle for parabolic equations that $v^*(x, t) > 0$ for every $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $v^*(0, 0) > 0$, which contradicts to (2.24). \square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3 (1)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.3 (1). Throughout this subsection, let $\xi \in S^{N-1}$ and $(u_0, v_0) \in C_{fl}^+(\xi) \times C_{fl}^{+,1}(\xi)$ be fixed.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 (1). We first prove that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Let $\tilde{u}(x, t) = u(x + (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t\xi, t)$ and $\tilde{v}(x, t) = v(x + (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t\xi, t)$. Then $(\tilde{u}(x, t), \tilde{v}(x, t))$ solves (2.1) with c being replaced by $2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$. $(\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0), \tilde{v}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0))$ denotes the classical solution of (2.1) with c being replaced by $2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$ and $(\tilde{u}(x, 0; \xi, u_0, v_0), \tilde{v}(x, 0; \xi, u_0, v_0)) = (u_0, v_0)$. Let $T_0 = T_0(u_0, v_0)$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_0$ be as in Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5, respectively. Let $T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$ be such that (2.5) holds. Let

$$\tilde{\delta} = \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3; \xi, u_0, v_0).$$

Since $\liminf_{x \cdot \xi \rightarrow -\infty} u_0(x) > 0$, $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. Let

$$k_0 = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid 2^k \tilde{\delta} \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{00} = T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3 + k_0 \tilde{T}_0.$$

where $\tilde{T}_0 \geq 1$ is as in Lemma 2.4. By the similar arguments used in the proof of (2.19), we can prove that for any ball $B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \subset \{x \mid x \cdot \xi < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$ with radius $2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$, it holds that

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

For any $x \in \{x \mid x \cdot \xi < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$, there exists a ball $B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \subset \{x \mid x \cdot \xi < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$ such that $x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}$, we then obtain that

$$\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0) \geq \inf_{x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00},$$

which implies that

$$\inf_{x \cdot \xi < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} > 0 \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}. \quad (2.26)$$

By (2.26) and $\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, u_0, v_0) = u(x + (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t\xi, t; u_0, v_0)$, we have

$$\inf_{x \cdot \xi < (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t + 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\}.$$

(2.25) is thus proved.

Finally, it can be proved by the similar arguments used in proving (2.23) that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \cdot \xi \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

□

2.4 Proof of Theorem 1.4 (1)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.4 (1). Throughout this subsection, let $\xi \in S^{N-1}$ and $(u_0, v_0) \in C^+(\xi) \times C^{+,1}(\xi)$ be fixed.

Proof of Theorem 1.4 (1). We first prove that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0. \quad (2.27)$$

Let $T_0 = T_0(u_0, v_0)$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_0$ be as in Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5, respectively. Let $T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$ be such that (2.5) holds. For any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, let

$$\tilde{\delta} := \tilde{\delta}(\xi, c) = \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3; \xi, c, u_0, v_0).$$

Since there exists $r > 0$ such that $\inf_{|x \cdot \xi| < r} u_0(x) > 0$, $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. Let

$$k_0 = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid 2^k \tilde{\delta} \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{00} = T_0 + T(\tilde{\epsilon}_0) + 3 + k_0 \tilde{T}_0.$$

where $\tilde{T}_0 \geq 1$ is as in lemma 2.4. By the similar arguments used in the proof of (2.19), we can prove that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$, any ball $B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \subset \{x \mid |x \cdot \xi| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$ with radius $2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)$, it holds that

$$\inf_{x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

For any $x \in \{x \mid |x \cdot \xi| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$, there exists a ball $B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \subset \{x \mid |x \cdot \xi| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$ such that $x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}$, we then obtain that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$,

$$\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \inf_{x \in B_{2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)}} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00},$$

which implies that for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$,

$$\inf_{|x \cdot \xi| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} \tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} > 0 \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}. \quad (2.28)$$

By (2.28) and $\tilde{u}(x, t; \xi, c, u_0, v_0) = u(x + ct\xi, t; u_0, v_0)$, we have for any $-2\sqrt{a} + \epsilon \leq c \leq 2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon$,

$$\inf_{|x \cdot \xi - ct| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

For any $t \geq T_{00}$, any $x \in \{x \mid |x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t\}$, there exists $c = \frac{x \cdot \xi}{t}$ such that $x \in \{x \mid |x \cdot \xi - ct| < 2L(\tilde{\epsilon}_0)\}$, it then holds that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\},$$

which implies that

$$\inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\} \quad \forall t \geq T_{00}.$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \geq \min\{\delta_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}, \tilde{\delta}_{\tilde{\epsilon}_0}\}.$$

(2.27) is thus proved.

Finally, it can be proved by the similar arguments used in proving (2.23) that for any $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{a}$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x \cdot \xi| \leq (2\sqrt{a} - \epsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) > 0.$$

□

3 Upper bounds of spreading speeds

This section is devoted to the study of upper bounds of the spreading speeds of global classical solutions of (1.1) with different initial functions and prove Theorem 1.2 (2), Theorem 1.3 (2) and Theorem 1.4 (2). Throughout this section, we assume that $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$.

First, we present a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $w = u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu}|\nabla v|^2$. Then*

$$w_t \leq \Delta w + aw.$$

Proof. Similar arguments to those used in the proof of [38, Theorem 1.2] yield that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2 \right] \leq \Delta \left[u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2 \right] - \frac{\chi\lambda}{\mu} |\nabla v|^2 - \left(b - \frac{N\mu\chi}{4} \right) u^2 + au.$$

Since $b > \frac{N\mu\chi}{4}$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2 \right] \leq \Delta \left[u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2 \right] + a \left[u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2 \right] \quad (3.1)$$

The lemma then follows from (3.1). \square

We now prove Theorem 1.2 (2)

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (2). First of all, for any given $(u_0, v_0) \in C_{cp}^+ \times C_{cp}^{+,1}$ and $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$, let $M > 0$ be such that

$$u_0(x) + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v_0(x)|^2 \leq \min\{M e^{-kx \cdot \xi}, \xi \in S^{N-1}\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let

$$c = \frac{k^2 + a}{k},$$

and

$$U(x, t, \xi) = M e^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}.$$

Write $u = u(x, t; u_0, v_0)$, $v = v(x, t; u_0, v_0)$. Let $w = u + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v|^2$. By Lemma 3.1,

$$w_t \leq \Delta w + aw.$$

It follows from comparison principle for parabolic equations that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq U(x, t, \xi) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0, \quad \xi \in S^{N-1}. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $\xi = \frac{x}{|x|}$, then

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq M e^{-k(|x| - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$ such that $2\sqrt{a} + \varepsilon > c$, it then holds that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \varepsilon)t} u(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Next, we prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \geq (2\sqrt{a} + \varepsilon)t} v(x, t; u_0, v_0) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $d \geq \frac{\mu M}{a + \lambda}$ be such that

$$v_0(x) \leq \min\{de^{-kx \cdot \xi}, \xi \in S^{N-1}\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By the second equation of (1.1) and (3.2),

$$v_t = \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu u \leq \Delta v - \lambda v + \mu M e^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}.$$

Direct computation yields that $de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}$ satisfies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}) \geq \Delta(de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}) - \lambda(de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}) + \mu M e^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)}.$$

It follows from comparison principle for parabolic equations again that

$$v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0, \quad \xi \in S^{N-1}.$$

Similar arguments as in deriving (3.3) yield that (3.4) holds. \square

Next, we prove Theorem 1.3 (2).

Proof of Theorem 1.3 (2). For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, $(u_0, v_0) \in C^+(\xi) \times C_{fl}^{+,1}(\xi)$ and $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$, let

$$c = \frac{k^2 + a}{k},$$

and $M > 0$ be such that

$$u_0(x) + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v_0(x)|^2 \leq M e^{-kx \cdot \xi} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let $d \geq \frac{\mu M}{a + \lambda}$ be such that

$$v_0(x) \leq de^{-kx \cdot \xi} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By similar arguments as those in Theorem 1.2 (2), we can prove that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq M e^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0$$

and

$$v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$ such that $2\sqrt{a} + \varepsilon > c$, Theorem 1.3 (2) thus follows. \square

At the end of this section, we prove Theorem 1.4 (2).

Proof of Theorem 1.4 (2). For any given $\xi \in S^{N-1}$, $(u_0, v_0) \in C^+(\xi) \times C^{+,1}(\xi)$ and $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$, let

$$c = \frac{k^2 + a}{k},$$

and $M > 0$ be such that

$$u_0(x) + \frac{\chi}{2\mu} |\nabla v_0(x)|^2 \leq \min\{Me^{-kx \cdot \xi}, Me^{kx \cdot \xi}\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let $d \geq \frac{\mu M}{a + \lambda}$ be such that

$$v_0(x) \leq \min\{de^{-kx \cdot \xi}, de^{kx \cdot \xi}\} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By the similar arguments as those in Theorem 1.2 (2), we can prove that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq Me^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0,$$

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq Me^{k(x \cdot \xi + ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0,$$

$$v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq de^{-k(x \cdot \xi - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0,$$

and

$$v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq de^{k(x \cdot \xi + ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0.$$

It then follows that

$$u(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq Me^{-k(|x \cdot \xi| - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0,$$

and

$$v(x, t; u_0, v_0) \leq de^{-k(|x \cdot \xi| - ct)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < k < \sqrt{a}$ such that $2\sqrt{a} + \varepsilon > c$, Theorem 1.4 (2) thus follows. \square

References

- [1] D. G. Aronson, H.F. Weinberger, Nonlinear diffusion in population genetics, combustion, and nerve pulse propagation, *J.A. Goldstein (Ed.), Partial Differential Equations and Related Topics Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 446, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1975)*, pp. 5-49.
- [2] D. G. Aronson and H. F. Weinberger, Multidimensional nonlinear diffusions arising in population genetics, *Adv. Math.*, **30** (1978), pp. 33-76.
- [3] G. Arumugam and J. Tyagi, Keller–Segel chemotaxis models: a review, *Acta Appl Math.*, **171** (2021), Paper No. 6, 82 pp.
- [4] N. Bellomo, A. Bellouquid, Y. Tao, and M. Winkler, Toward a mathematical theory of Keller–Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, **25** (2015), 1663-1763.

- [5] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel and G. Nadin, Asymptotic spreading in heterogeneous diffusive excitable media, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **255** (2008), 2146-2189.
- [6] S. Childress, J. K. Percus, Nonlinear aspects of chemotaxis, *Math. Biosci.*, **56**(1981) 217-237.
- [7] L. Corrias, M. Escobedo, and J. Matos, Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behavior of the solutions to the fully parabolic Keller–Segel system in the plane, *J. Differential Equations*, **257** (2014), 1840-1878.
- [8] Dirk Horstmann, Michael Winkler, Boundedness vs. blow-up in a chemotaxis system, *J. Differential Equations*, **215** (2005) 52-107.
- [9] M. Eisenbach, Chemotaxis. Imperial College Press, London (2004).
- [10] L.C. Ferreira and J.C. Precioso, Existence and asymptotic behavior for the parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system with singular data, *Nonlinearity*, **24** (2011), pp. 1433-1449.
- [11] R. Fisher, The wave of advance of advantageous genes, *Ann. of Eugenics*, **7** (1937), 355-369.
- [12] M.A. Herrero, E. Medina and J.J.L. Velázquez, Singularity patterns in a chemotaxis model, *Math. Ann.*, **306** (1996), pp. 583-623.
- [13] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez, A blow-up mechanism for a chemotaxis model, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci.*, IV. Ser. 24 (1997), 633-683.
- [14] T. Hillen and K.J. Painter, A User’s Guide to PDE Models for Chemotaxis, *J. Math. Biol.* **58** (2009) (1), 183-217.
- [15] D. Horstmann, From 1970 until present: the Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences, *Jahresber. Dtsch. Math.-Ver.*, **105** (2003), 103-165.
- [16] T. B. Issa and W. Shen, Pointwise persistence in full chemotaxis models with logistic source on bounded heterogeneous environments, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **490**, (2020) 124204.
- [17] W. Jäger and S. Luckhaus, On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modeling chemotaxis, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **329** (1992), 819-824.
- [18] E.F. Keller and L.A. Segel, Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability, *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **26** (1970), 399-415.
- [19] E.F. Keller and L.A. Segel, A Model for chemotaxis, *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **30** (1971), 225-234.
- [20] A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrowsky, and N. Piscunov, A study of the equation of diffusion with increase in the quantity of matter, and its application to a biological problem, *Bjul. Moskovskogo Gos. Univ.*, **1** (1937), 1-26.
- [21] K. Kuto, K. Osaki, T. Sakurai, and T. Tsujikawa, Spatial pattern formation in a chemotaxis-diffusion-growth model, *Physica D*, **241** (2012), 1629-1639.
- [22] J. Lankeit, Eventual smoothness and asymptotics in a three-dimensional chemotaxis system with logistic source, *J. Differential Eq.*, **258** (2015), 1158-1191.

- [23] X. Liang and X.-Q. Zhao, Spreading speeds and traveling waves for abstract monostable evolution systems, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **259** (2010), 857-903.
- [24] K. Lin and C. L. Mu, Global dynamics in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with logistic source, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **36** (2016), 5025-5046.
- [25] N. Mizoguchi, Global existence for the Cauchy problem of the parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system on the plane, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **48** (2013), pp. 491-505.
- [26] T. Nagai, Blow-up of radially symmetric solutions of a chemotaxis system, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, **5** (1995), pp. 581-601.
- [27] T. Nagai, Blowup of nonradial solutions to parabolic-elliptic systems modeling chemotaxis in two-dimensional domains, *J. Inequal. Appl.*, **6** (2001), pp. 37-55.
- [28] T. Nagai, R. Syukuinn and M. Umesako, Decay properties and asymptotic profiles of bounded solutions to a parabolic system of chemotaxis in \mathbb{R}^N . *Funkcialaj Ekvacioj*, **46** (2003), 383-407.
- [29] T. Nagai and T. Yamada, Large time behavior of bounded solutions to a parabolic system of chemotaxis in the whole space, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **336** (2007), 704-726.
- [30] Y Naito, T Suzuki and K Yoshida, Self-Similar solutions to a Parabolic System Modeling Chemotaxis, *J. of Differential Equations*, **184** (2020), 386–421.
- [31] K.J. Painter, Mathematical models for chemotaxis and their applications in self-organisation phenomena, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **481** (2019), 162-182.
- [32] R. B. Salako and Wenxian Shen, Global existence and asymptotic behavior of classical solutions to a parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N , *J. Differential Equations*, **262** (2017) 5635-5690.
- [33] R. B. Salako and Wenxian Shen, Spreading Speeds and Traveling waves of a parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N , *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series A*, **37** (2017), pp. 6189-6225.
- [34] R. B. Salako and Wenxian Shen, Parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis model with space–time-dependent logistic sources on \mathbb{R}^N . I. Persistence and asymptotic spreading, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, Vol. 28, No. 11, (2018), pp. 2237-2273.
- [35] R. B. Salako and Wenxian Shen, Existence of Traveling wave solution of parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis systems, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications* Volume **42**, (2018), 93-119.
- [36] R. B. Salako and Wenxian Shen, Traveling wave solutions for fully parabolic Keller-Segel chemotaxis systems with a logistic source, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* **2020**, Paper No. 53, 18 pp.
- [37] R. B. Salako, W. Shen, and S. Xue, Can chemotaxis speed up or slow down the spatial spreading in parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel systems with logistic source?, *J. Math. Biol.*, **79** (2019), 1455–1490

- [38] W. Shen, and S. Xue, Persistence and convergence in parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis system with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N , preprint.
- [39] W. Shen, Variational principle for spatial spreading speeds and generalized propagating speeds in time almost and space periodic KPP models, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **362** (2010), 5125-5168.
- [40] J. I. Tello and M. Winkler, A Chemotaxis System with Logistic Source, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, **32** (2007), 849-877.
- [41] H. F. Weinberger, On spreading speeds and traveling waves for growth and migration models in a periodic habitat, *J. Math. Biol.*, **45** (2002), 511-548.
- [42] M. Winkler, Boundedness in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis system with logistic source, *Comm. Part. Differential Eq.*, **35** (2010), 1516-1537.
- [43] M. Winkler, Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **100** (2013), 748-767.
- [44] M. Winkler, Global asymptotic stability of constant equilibria in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with strong logistic dampening, *J. Differential Eq.*, **257** (2014), 1056-1077.
- [45] J. Zheng, Y. Y. Li, G. Bao, and X. Zou, A new result for global existence and boundedness of solutions to a parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system with logistic source, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **462** (2018), 1-25.