Stabilization for small mass in a quasilinear parabolic–elliptic–elliptic attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system with density-dependent sensitivity: repulsion-dominant case
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Abstract. This paper deals with the quasilinear attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system

\begin{align*}
  u_t &= \nabla \cdot ((u + 1)^{m-1}\nabla u - \chi u(u + 1)^{p-2}\nabla v + \xi u(u + 1)^{q-2}\nabla w), \\
  0 &= \Delta v + \alpha u - \beta v, \\
  0 &= \Delta w + \gamma u - \delta w
\end{align*}

in a bounded domain \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) (\(n \in \mathbb{N}\)) with smooth boundary \(\partial \Omega\), where \(m, p, q \in \mathbb{R}\), \(\chi, \xi, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta > 0\) are constants. In the case that \(m = 1\) and \(p = q = 2\), when \(\chi \alpha - \xi \gamma < 0\) and \(\beta = \delta\), Tao–Wang (Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.; 2013; 23; 1–36) proved that global bounded classical solutions toward the spatially constant equilibrium \((\bar{u}_0, \bar{v}_0, \bar{w}_0)\) via the reduction to the Keller–Segel system by using the transformation \(z := \chi v - \xi w\), where \(\bar{u}_0\) is the spatial average of the initial data \(u_0\). However, since the above system involves nonlinearities, the method is no longer valid. The purpose of this paper is to establish that global bounded classical solutions converge to the spatially constant equilibrium \((\bar{u}_0, \bar{v}_0, \bar{w}_0)\).
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1. Introduction

In this paper we study stabilization that solutions converge to a spatially constant equilibrium in the quasilinear attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \nabla \cdot ((u + 1)^{m-1}\nabla u - \chi u(u + 1)^{p-2}\nabla v + \xi u(u + 1)^{q-2}\nabla w), \\
    0 &= \Delta v + \alpha u - \beta v, \\
    0 &= \Delta w + \gamma u - \delta w,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(m, p, q \in \mathbb{R}, \chi, \xi, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta > 0\) are constants, and the functions \(u, v\) and \(w\) show the cell (or organism) density, the concentrations of the chemoattractant and chemorepellent, respectively. This system is a generalization of the chemotaxis models introduced by Keller–Segel [14], where \((u + 1)^{m-1}\), appearing in the diffusion term, means that the cell density increases and so does the diffusion rate. Also, the quasilinear sensitivities \(u(u + 1)^{p-2}\) and \(u(u + 1)^{q-2}\), which denote the density-dependent probabilities for cells to find space somewhere in their neighboring locations, were initially proposed by Painter–Hillen [26] via the approach of assuming the presence of a volume-filling effect and were studied by Tao–Winkler [30]. Here chemotaxis is the property of cells to move in a directional manner in response to concentration gradients of chemical substances. For instance, in bacteria such as E. coli, this property causes them to move toward the chemoattractant and away from the chemorepellent. One of the models describing such a chemotactic process is a fully parabolic attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system introduced by Painter–Hillen [26] to idealize the quorum effect in the chemotactic process and Luca et al. [20] to show the aggregation of microglia observed in Alzheimer’s disease.

The original Keller–Segel system proposed in [14] is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \nabla \cdot (\nabla u - \chi u\nabla v), \\
    v_t &= \Delta v - v + u.
\end{align*}
\]

After that, many versions have been derived from this system (see Hillen–Painter [9]) and have been extensively studied (see e.g., Bellomo et al. [2], Arumugam–Tyagi [1]). In particular, one of which is the following quasilinear version:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \nabla \cdot ((u + 1)^{m-1}\nabla u - \chi u(u + 1)^{p-2}\nabla v), \\
    v_t &= \Delta v - v + u.
\end{align*}
\]

This system, which was proposed in [26], has been well investigated. For example, finite-time blow-up was shown in [6, 7, 33, 34]; boundedness was proved in [11, 13, 17, 28, 30]. More precisely, Winkler [33] and Cieslak–Stinner [6, 7] established finite-time blow-up under the condition \(p > m + \frac{2}{n}\), where \(n\) denotes the spatial dimension. On the other hand, Tao–Winkler [30] derived boundedness in the above system on a convex domain when \(p < m + \frac{2}{n}\); after that, the convexity of the domain was removed by Ishida–Seki–Yokota [11]. Also, Ishida–Yokota [13] guaranteed existence of global bounded weak solutions in the above system on the whole space. Besides, in the critical case \(p = m + \frac{2}{n}\), blow-up and boundedness were classified by the condition for the initial data \(u_0, v_0\) (see e.g.,
As to stabilization in the above quasilinear system, in three or more space dimensions Winkler [32] proved that solutions converge to a constant steady state at an exponential rate as $t \to \infty$ under smallness conditions for $\|u_0\|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)}$ and $\|\nabla v_0\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)}$ for all $\sigma > \frac{2}{n}$ and all $\theta > n$, where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain; after the work, Cao [4] extended the result in the critical case that $\sigma = \frac{2}{n}$ and $\theta = n$ in two or more space dimensions. Also, in two or more space dimensions Cieślak–Winkler [8] showed that a global bounded classical solution exists and that the solution approaches the spatially constant equilibrium $(u_0^*, u_0^*)$, where $u_0^* := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega u_0$, in two or more space dimensions under the conditions that $p - m \in [0, \frac{2}{n})$ and that $\chi \|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{p-m} \leq C_s^{p-m}$, where $C_s^{p-m} > 0$ is a constant appearing in the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality. Some related works for the corresponding quasilinear chemotaxis system of parabolic–elliptic type, which shows that comparatively fast diffusion of the respective chemical substances, can be found in [24, 25, 31]. Also, Ishida [10] gave the $L^\infty$-decay property in the super-critical case with small initial data. Moreover, Mizukami [22, 23] built bridge between the parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system and the parabolic–elliptic version.

**A question in stabilization.** Let us start with a review of known results on stabilization in the attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \nabla \cdot (\nabla u - \chi u \nabla v + \xi u \nabla w), \\
    0 &= \Delta v + \alpha u - \beta v, \\
    0 &= \Delta w + \gamma u - \delta w.
\end{align*}
\]

In the literatures [18, 19, 29], it was established that global bounded classical solutions approach a spatially homogeneous steady state by the reduction to the Keller–Segel system via the transformation $z := \chi v - \xi w$. More precisely, Tao–Wang [29] obtained that the solution towards the spatially constant equilibrium $(\overline{u}_0, \overline{v}_0, \overline{w}_0)$ under the conditions that $\chi \alpha - \xi \gamma < 0$ and that $\beta = \delta$. Thereafter, Li et al. [18] and Lin et al. [19] derived asymptotic behavior by supposing some smallness condition for $u_0$ instead of the condition $\beta = \delta$ in the parabolic–elliptic–elliptic case ([18]) and the parabolic–parabolic–parabolic case ([19]). However, for the system in which the first equation of the above one is replaced by

\[
    u_t = \nabla \cdot ((u + 1)^{m-1} \nabla u - \chi u(u + 1)^{p-2} \nabla v + \xi u(u + 1)^{q-2} \nabla w),
\]

where $m, p, q \in \mathbb{R}$, due to the quasilinear structure of nonlinearities, it is no longer valid to use the transformation $z := \chi v - \xi w$. Meanwhile, global existence and boundedness of solutions have already been shown in the parabolic–elliptic–elliptic case under the condition that $p < q$, or $p = q$ and $\chi \alpha - \xi \gamma < 0$ ([5]). However, the following question remains:

**Does the global bounded classical solution converge to a spatially homogeneous steady state?**

The principal purpose of the present paper is to provide an answer to this question.
Main result. To achieve the aforementioned purpose, we concentrate on the quasilinear parabolic–elliptic–elliptic attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system

\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{du}{dt} &= \nabla \cdot \left( (u+1)^{m-1} \nabla u - \chi u(u+1)^{p-2} \nabla v + \xi u(u+1)^{q-2} \nabla w \right), \\
0 &= \Delta v + \alpha u - \beta v, \\
0 &= \Delta w + \gamma u - \delta w, \\
\nabla u \cdot \nu|_{\partial \Omega} &= \nabla v \cdot \nu|_{\partial \Omega} = \nabla w \cdot \nu|_{\partial \Omega} = 0, \\
u(\cdot,0) &= u_0
\end{aligned}
\]  

(1.1)

in a bounded domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) (\( n \in \mathbb{N} \)) with smooth boundary \( \partial \Omega \), where \( m, p, q \in \mathbb{R} \), \( \chi, \xi, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta > 0 \) are constants, \( \nu \) is the outward normal vector to \( \partial \Omega \),

\[u_0 \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}), \quad u_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad u_0 \neq 0.\]  

(1.2)

The main result of this paper reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Assume that \( p, q, \chi, \xi, \alpha, \gamma \) satisfy either

\[p < q\]  

(1.3)

or

\[p = q \quad \text{and} \quad \chi \alpha - \xi \gamma < 0,\]  

(1.4)

and that \( m, p \) fulfill

\[p - m \in [0, 1] \quad \text{when } n = 1, \quad p - m \in \left[0, \frac{2}{n}\right] \quad \text{when } n \geq 2.\]  

(1.5)

Suppose that \( u_0 \) satisfies (1.2) and

\[\chi \alpha \|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{p-m} \leq \frac{1}{2C_{(p-m)}},\]  

(1.6)

where \( C_{(p-m)} > 0 \) is a constant appearing in Lemma 2.1. Then the solution \((u, v, w)\) of the problem (1.1) fulfills

\[u(\cdot, t) \to \underline{u}_0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty\]  

(1.7)

and

\[v(\cdot, t) \to \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \underline{u}_0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty\]  

(1.8)

as well as

\[w(\cdot, t) \to \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \underline{u}_0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty,\]  

(1.9)

where \( \underline{u}_0 := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} u_0.\)
Remark 1.1. The conditions (1.3) and (1.4) in Theorem 1.1 are imposed only to guarantee boundedness. In other words, the same conclusion holds by assuming only the conditions (1.5) and (1.6) when boundedness is known.

Strategy and plan of the paper. The strategy for proving stabilization is to construct the energy inequality
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \Phi(u) + \varepsilon_0 \int_\Omega (u - u_0)^2 \leq 0 \tag{1.10}
\]
for some \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) and some nonnegative functional \( \Phi \). The key to the derivation of this inequality is to estimate the diffusion and attraction terms by \( \int_\Omega (u - u_0)^2 \). Specifically, we estimate the former by employing the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality. Also, as to the latter, we handle it by taking advantage of a favorable structure of the second equation in (1.1). Thereafter, using a smallness condition for \( u_0 \), we arrive to (1.10).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality which will be employed for a term derived from the diffusion one. In addition, we give some property of a uniformly continuous function. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of stabilization in the problem (1.1).

2. Preliminaries

In this section we collect two basic facts which will be used later. We first recall the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality which is proved based on the Sobolev embedding theorem and the Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality.

Lemma 2.1. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Assume that \( \theta \in (-1, 1] \) when \( n = 1 \) and that \( \theta \in (-1, \frac{2}{n}] \) when \( n \geq 2 \). Then there exists \( C_{(\theta)} > 0 \) such that
\[
\| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{(\theta)} \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+1}}(\Omega)} \tag{2.1}
\]
for all \( \varphi \in W^{1,\frac{2n}{n+1}}(\Omega) \), where \( \overline{\varphi} := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \varphi \).

Proof. We set \( \sigma := \frac{2}{n+1} > 0 \) for \( \theta > -1 \). By assumption, we have \( \sigma \in [1, \infty) \) when \( n = 1 \). Also, in the case \( n \geq 2 \) we observe from the condition \( \theta \leq \frac{2}{n} \) that \( \sigma^* \geq 2 \); note that \( \sigma^* \) is defined as \( \frac{1}{\sigma^*} = \frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{n} = \frac{\theta+1}{2} - \frac{1}{n} \left( \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \). Therefore we see from the Sobolev embedding theorem that there exists \( c_1 > 0 \) such that
\[
\| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1 \| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)} \\
\leq c_1 \left( \| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)} + \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)} \right)
\]
for all \( \varphi \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega) \). Moreover, we can employ the Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality
\[
\| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)} \leq c_2 \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)}
\]
for all \( \varphi \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega) \) with some \( c_2 > 0 \), because \( \sigma \in [1, \infty) \) is assured by the condition \( \theta \leq 1 \) in the case \( n = 1 \) and \( \theta \leq \frac{2}{n} \leq 1 \) in the case \( n \geq 2 \). Combining the above inequalities, we arrive to the conclusion. \( \square \)
We next give the following lemma which is called Barbalat’s lemma. For the proof, see [27, Lemma 4.2], for instance.

**Lemma 2.2.** Assume that \( f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is a uniformly continuous nonnegative function satisfying
\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} f(t) \, dt < \infty.
\]
Then
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} f(t) = 0.
\]

3. Stabilization

In this section we assume that \( p, q, \chi, \xi, \alpha, \gamma \) fulfill either (1.3) or (1.4), and that \( u_0 \) satisfies (1.2). Then we denote by \((u, v, w)\) the global classical solution of the problem (1.1) given in [5].

The goal of this section is to deduce stabilization in the problem (1.1). To this end, we will establish the key inequality (3.10), which, as will be shown in Lemma 3.5 below, leads to the energy inequality
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(u) + \varepsilon_0 \int_{\Omega} (u - \overline{u_0})^2 \leq 0,
\]
where a constant \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) and a functional \( \Phi \) will be given in later. In order to construct the key inequality, we define the functions
\[
V(x, t) := v(x, t) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \overline{u_0}, \quad x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \tag{3.1}
\]
and
\[
W(x, t) := w(x, t) - \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \overline{u_0}, \quad x \in \Omega, \ t > 0. \tag{3.2}
\]

We here note from the second and third equations in (1.1) that \( V \) and \( W \) satisfy
\[
0 = \Delta V + \alpha(u - \overline{u_0}) - \beta V, \tag{3.3}
\]
and
\[
0 = \Delta W + \gamma(u - \overline{u_0}) - \delta W. \tag{3.4}
\]

We first derive some identity to prove the key inequality.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( V \) be the function defined in (3.1). Then the following identity holds:
\[
0 = \int_{\Omega} \nabla u(\cdot, t) \cdot \nabla v(\cdot, t) - \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0})^2 + \beta \int_{\Omega} (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0})V(\cdot, t) \tag{3.5}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \).
Proof. Multiplying (3.3) by \( u - \overline{u}_0 \) and integrating it over \( \Omega \), we obtain
\[
0 = \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0) \Delta V + \alpha \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 - \beta \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)V. \tag{3.6}
\]
Also, integration by parts entails
\[
\int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0) \Delta V = - \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v,
\]
where we used the identity \( \nabla V = \nabla v \). This together with (3.6) yields (3.5).

We next establish the relation between \( \int_\Omega V^2 \) and \( \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 \), and the one between \( \int_\Omega W^2 \) and \( \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 \). They will play an important role to obtain (1.8) and (1.9).

**Lemma 3.2.** The functions \( V \) and \( W \) defined in (3.1) and (3.2) satisfy
\[
\int_\Omega V^2(\cdot, t) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} \int_\Omega (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u}_0)^2 \tag{3.7}
\]
and
\[
\int_\Omega W^2(\cdot, t) \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{\delta^2} \int_\Omega (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u}_0)^2 \tag{3.8}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \).

**Proof.** Multiplying (3.3) by \( V \) and integrating it over \( \Omega \), we see that
\[
0 = \int_\Omega V \Delta V + \alpha \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)V - \beta \int_\Omega V^2
= - \int_\Omega |\nabla V|^2 + \alpha \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)V - \beta \int_\Omega V^2,
\]
which implies
\[
\beta \int_\Omega V^2 \leq \alpha \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)V. \tag{3.9}
\]
Here the term on the right-hand side can be estimated by Young’s inequality as follows:
\[
\int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)V \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\beta} \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \int_\Omega V^2,
\]
which along with (3.9) ensures that
\[
\beta \int_\Omega V^2 \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta} \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_\Omega V^2,
\]
that is, (3.7) holds. Similarly, we can derive (3.8) via the relation (3.4). \( \square \)
In order to show stabilization in the problem (1.1) we introduce the function
\[ \Phi(s) := \int_1^s \int_1^\sigma \frac{1}{\eta(\eta + 1)^{p-2}} d\eta d\sigma, \quad s \geq 0, \]
where \( p \in \mathbb{R} \) is a constant appearing in the attraction term in (1.1). In the following lemma we establish the desired key inequality.

**Lemma 3.3.** The first component \( u \) of the solution to (1.1) satisfies that
\[ \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \Phi(u(\cdot, t)) + \int_\Omega \frac{(u(\cdot, t) + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u(\cdot, t)} |\nabla u(\cdot, t)|^2 \leq 2\chi\alpha \int_\Omega (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u}_0)^2 \quad (3.10) \]
for all \( t > 0 \).

**Proof.** The first equation in (1.1) and the identity \( \Phi''(u) = \frac{1}{u(u+1)^{p-2}} \) as well as straightforward calculations imply that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \Phi(u) \nonumber \n = \int_\Omega \Phi'(u) \nabla \cdot \left( (u + 1)^{m-1} \nabla u - \chi u(u + 1)^{p-2} \nabla v + \xi u(u + 1)^{q-2} \nabla w \right) \\
= -\int_\Omega \Phi''(u) \cdot (u + 1)^{m-1} |\nabla u|^2 \\
+ \chi \int_\Omega \Phi''(u) \cdot u(u + 1)^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - \xi \int_\Omega \Phi''(u) \cdot u(u + 1)^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \\
= -\int_\Omega \frac{(u + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u} |\nabla u|^2 + \chi \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - \xi \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \quad (3.11)
\]
for all \( t > 0 \). We now show that the third term on the right-hand side can be estimated by zero. Taking into account the third equation in (1.1), we observe that
\[ I := -\xi \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \nonumber \n = -\xi \int_\Omega \nabla \left( \int_0^u (s + 1)^{g-p} ds \right) \cdot \nabla w \\
= \frac{\xi}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p+1} \Delta w \\
= \frac{\xi}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p+1} (\delta w - \gamma u) \\
= \frac{\xi \delta}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p+1} w - \frac{\xi \gamma}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega u(u + 1)^{g-p+1} \\
= \frac{\xi \delta}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p+1} \left( w + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \right) - \frac{\xi \gamma}{q-p+1} \int_\Omega (u + 1)^{g-p+2}. \quad (3.12) \]
Again by the third equation in (1.1), we have
\[ 0 = \Delta \left( w + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \right) + \gamma (u + 1) - \delta \left( w + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \right), \]
which yields that
\[
\left\| w(\cdot, t) + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \right\|_{L^{q-p+2}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \| u(\cdot, t) + 1 \|_{L^{q-p+2}(\Omega)} \tag{3.13}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \). Therefore, applying the Hölder inequality with exponents \( \frac{q-p+1}{q-p+2} \) and \( \frac{1}{q-p+2} \) to (3.12) and using the estimate (3.13), we obtain
\[
I \leq \frac{\xi \delta}{q-p+1} \left( \int_{\Omega} (u + 1)^{q-p+2} \right)^{\frac{q-p+1}{q-p+2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left( w + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \right)^{q-p+2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-p+2}}
- \frac{\xi \gamma}{q-p+1} \int_{\Omega} (u + 1)^{q-p+2}
\leq \frac{\xi \delta}{q-p+1} \left( \int_{\Omega} (u + 1)^{q-p+2} \right)^{\frac{q-p+1}{q-p+2}} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \left( \int_{\Omega} (u + 1)^{q-p+2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-p+2}}
- \frac{\xi \gamma}{q-p+1} \int_{\Omega} (u + 1)^{q-p+2}
= 0,
\]
which along with (3.11) implies
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(u) + \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \tag{3.14}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \). Also, in view of (3.5) we see that
\[
\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \chi \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)^2 - \chi \beta \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)V. \tag{3.15}
\]
Inserting (3.15) into (3.14) entails that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(u) + \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \chi \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)^2 - \chi \beta \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)V \tag{3.16}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \). By means of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the estimate (3.7) we derive
\[
-\chi \beta \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)V \leq \chi \beta \left( \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} V^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq \chi \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)^2.
\]
This together with (3.16) proves (3.10).

We next estimate the term containing \( |\nabla u|^2 \) in (3.10) by \( \int_{\Omega} (u - u_0)^2 \) in view of Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( m, p \) satisfy (1.5). Then the first component \( u \) of the solution to (1.1) fulfills that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{(u(\cdot, t) + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u(\cdot, t)} |\nabla u(\cdot, t)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C_{(p-m)} \|u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)}} \int_{\Omega} (u(\cdot, t) - u_0)^2, \tag{3.17}
\]
for all \( t > 0 \), where \( C_{(p-m)} > 0 \) is a constant appearing in Lemma 2.1 with \( \theta = p - m \).
Proof. We first estimate
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{(u + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u} |\nabla u|^2 \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^{p-m}}. \tag{3.18}
\]
We next estimate the right-hand side of this inequality from below. Invoking Hölder’s inequality with exponents \(\frac{1}{p-m+1} \leq 1\) and \(\frac{p-m}{p-m+1} \leq 1\), because \(p - m \geq 0\), and noting from the first equation in (1.1) that the mass conservation \(\int_{\Omega} u(\cdot, t) = \int_{\Omega} u_0\) holds for all \(t > 0\), we infer
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^{p-m}} \geq \left( \int_{\Omega} u_0 \right)^{-(p-m)} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{2}{p-m+1}} \right)^{p-m+1},
\]
which means that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u^{p-m}} \geq \left( \int_{\Omega} u_0 \right)^{-(p-m)} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{2}{p-m+1}} \right)^{p-m+1} \tag{3.19}
\]
Here we can apply Lemma 2.1 with \(\theta = p - m\) to the term containing \(|\nabla u|^{\frac{2}{p-m+1}}\). Indeed, we see from (1.5) that \(p - m\) satisfies the assumption of Lemma 2.1. Thus, employing the inequality (2.1) with \(\theta = p - m\), we can find a constant \(C_{(p-m)} > 0\) such that
\[
\left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{2}{p-m+1}} \right)^{p-m+1} \geq \frac{1}{C_{(p-m)}} \int_{\Omega} (u - \overline{u_0})^2. \tag{3.20}
\]
Collecting (3.19) and (3.20) in (3.18), we establish (3.17).

We finally derive an energy inequality which implies boundedness of the integral of \(\|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\) with respect to \(t\) over \((0, \infty)\).

Lemma 3.5. Let \(m, p\) fulfill (1.5) and let \(C_{(p-m)} > 0\) be a constant as in Lemma 2.1 with \(\theta = p - m\). Then the first component \(u\) of the solution to (1.1) satisfies that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(u(\cdot, t)) + \frac{1}{C_{(p-m)}\|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}} - 2\chi \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0})^2 \leq 0 \tag{3.21}
\]
for all \(t > 0\). In particular, if \(u_0\) meets (1.6), then
\[
\int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} (u - \overline{u_0})^2 < \infty. \tag{3.22}
\]

Proof. Due to Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we have
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(u) + \frac{1}{C_{(p-m)}\|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}} \int_{\Omega} (u - \overline{u_0})^2 \leq 2\chi \alpha \int_{\Omega} (u - \overline{u_0})^2
\]
for all \( t > 0 \), which entails (3.21). Also, integrating the inequality (3.21) over \((0, t)\), we obtain
\[
\int_\Omega \Phi(u(\cdot, t)) + \left[ \frac{1}{C'(p-m)\|u_0\|^p_{L^1(\Omega)}} - 2\alpha \right] \int_0^t \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u_0})^2 \leq \int_\Omega \Phi(u_0)
\]
for all \( t > 0 \), which in conjunction with the positivity of \( \Phi \) enables us to see that
\[
\left[ \frac{1}{C'(p-m)\|u_0\|^p_{L^1(\Omega)}} - 2\alpha \right] \int_0^t \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u_0})^2 \leq \int_\Omega \Phi(u_0).
\]
In view of (1.6), taking the limit \( t \to \infty \), we derive (3.22).

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We first prove an \( L^\infty \)-convergence of \( u \). Since the first component \( u \) of the solution to (1.1) has the property \( \sup_{t>0} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty \), standard parabolic regularity theory ([15]) yields that there exist \( \sigma \in (0, 1) \) and \( c_1 > 0 \) such that
\[
\|u\|_{C^{2+\sigma, 1+\sigma}(\Omega \times [0, \infty))} \leq c_1,
\]
which implies that the nonnegative function \( t \mapsto \|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \) is uniformly continuous in \([0, \infty)\). Hence, taking into account (3.22), we infer from Lemma 2.2 that
\[
\|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \ t \to \infty.
\]
(3.24)

Also, by the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality we can find \( c_2 > 0 \) such that
\[
\|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_2 \|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}^{\frac{n}{n+2}} \|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.
\]
(3.25)

Noting from (3.23) that \( \|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq c_3 := c_1 + \overline{u_0} \), we obtain that (3.24) and (3.25) assert
\[
\|u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \ t \to \infty,
\]
which means that (1.7) holds. We next show \( L^\infty \)-convergences of \( v \) and \( w \). In view of Lemma 3.2, we have from (3.24) that
\[
\left\| v(\cdot, t) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \overline{u_0} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} \left\| u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \ t \to \infty
\]
and
\[
\left\| w(\cdot, t) - \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \overline{u_0} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{\delta^2} \left\| u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u_0} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \ t \to \infty.
\]
Therefore, by a similar argument as in the derivation of the \( L^\infty \)-convergence of \( u \), we can arrive to (1.8) and (1.9). \( \square \)
Remark 3.1. In Theorem 1.1 we can remove the upper bounds for \( p - m \) in (1.5) by modifying a condition for \( u_0 \). Indeed, without the upper bounds for \( p - m \), stabilization in (1.1) holds in the following form:

Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Assume that \( p, q, \chi, \xi, \alpha, \gamma \) satisfy either (1.3) or (1.4), and that \( m, p \) fulfill \( p - m \geq 0 \). Suppose that \( u_0 \) satisfies (1.2). Then one can find \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
\| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon
\]  

(3.26)

for all \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0) \), then the solution \( (u, v, w) \) of the problem (1.1) fulfills (1.7)–(1.9).

We briefly give the proof. By the proof of [5, Lemma 3.3], we see that there exists \( \sigma > n \) such that

\[
\| u(\cdot, t) \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)} \leq \max \{ C_\sigma(\| u_0 \|_{L^1(\Omega)}), \| u_0 \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)} \}
\]  

(3.27)

for all \( t > 0 \) with \( C_\sigma(\| u_0 \|_{L^1(\Omega)}) = c_1 \| u_0 \|_{L^1(\Omega)}(1 + \| u_0 \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2), \) where \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) are constants independent of \( u_0 \). Also, in view of the proof of [30, Lemma A.1] we have

\[
\| u(\cdot, t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_3 \sup_{t > 0} \| u(\cdot, t) \|_{L^\sigma(\Omega)}^2 + \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}
\]  

for all \( t > 0 \), where \( c_3, c_4 > 0 \) are constants independent of \( u_0 \). This along with (3.27) derives

\[
\| u(\cdot, t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_5 \max \left\{ \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^c (1 + \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^c)^{c_4}, \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right\} + \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} =: u_{\text{max}}
\]  

for all \( t > 0 \), where \( c_5 > 0 \) are constants independent of \( u_0 \). Thus we can find \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that if \( \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon \) for all \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0) \), then

\[
u_{\text{max}} \leq \left( \frac{1}{2\chi\alpha C_{PW}} \right)^{\frac{p-\gamma}{p-m}}, \quad \text{where } C_{PW} > 0 \text{ is a constant appearing in the Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality}
\]

\[
\| \varphi - \overline{\varphi} \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{PW} \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega).
\]

Employing this inequality and noting that \( p - m \geq 0 \), we obtain that

\[
\| u(\cdot, t) - \overline{u}_0 \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{PW}^2 \| \nabla u \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_{PW}^2 u_{\text{max}}^{p-m} \int_\Omega \frac{\| \nabla u \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}{u^{p-m}}
\]  

\[
\text{for all } t > 0, \text{ which in conjunction with (3.18) entails that}
\]

\[
\int_\Omega \frac{(u + 1)^{m-p+1}}{u} |\nabla u|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C_{PW}^2 u_{\text{max}}^{p-m}} \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2.
\]

This along with Lemma 3.3 implies that

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \Phi(u) + \left[ \frac{1}{C_{PW}^2 u_{\text{max}}^{p-m}} - 2\chi\alpha \right] \int_\Omega (u - \overline{u}_0)^2 \leq 0
\]

for all \( t > 0 \). Noting that if \( \| u_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon \) for all \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0) \), then \( u_{\text{max}} \leq \left( \frac{1}{2\chi\alpha C_{PW}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-m}} \), we can verify \( \frac{1}{C_{PW}^2 u_{\text{max}}^{p-m}} - 2\chi\alpha \geq 0 \) when (3.26) holds. Therefore we can derive the conclusion by an argument similar to that of the proof of Theorem 1.1.
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