

Global Existence and Uniform Boundedness in a fully parabolic Keller–Segel System with Non-monotonic Signal-dependent Motility

Yamin Xiao*, Jie Jiang†

June 27, 2022

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the global solvability of a fully parabolic system of Keller–Segel-type involving non-monotonic signal-dependent motility. First, we prove global existence of classical solutions to our problem with generic positive motility function under a certain smallness assumption at infinity, which however permits the motility function to be arbitrarily large within a finite region. Then uniform-in-time boundedness of classical solutions is established whenever the motility function has strictly positive lower and upper bounds in any dimension $N \geq 1$, or decays at a certain slow rate at infinity for $N \geq 2$. Our results remove the crucial non-increasing requirement on the motility function in some recent work [6, 8, 11] and hence apply for both chemo-attractive and chemo-repulsive effect, or their co-existence. The key ingredient of our proof lies in an important improvement of the comparison method developed in [6, 11, 12].

Keywords: Classical solutions, global existence, boundedness, Keller–Segel models, comparison.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider global existence of classical solutions to an initial-Neumann boundary value problem of the following Keller–Segel system :

$$u_t = \Delta(u\gamma(v)), \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\tau v_t - \Delta v + v = u, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\nabla(u\gamma(v)) \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.1c)$$

$$u(0) = u_0, v(0) = v_0, \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (1.1d)$$

*The Graduate School of China Academy of Engineering Physics, Beijing 100088, P.R. China, xiaoyamin20@gscaep.ac.cn.

†Innovation Academy for Precision Measurement Science and Technology, CAS, Wuhan 430071, HuBei Province, P.R. China, jiang@apm.ac.cn.

Here, u and v denote the density of cells and the signal concentration, respectively. $\tau > 0$ is a positive constant. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 1$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary. The above system features a signal-dependent motility function $\gamma(\cdot)$, which satisfies

$$\gamma \in C^3((0, \infty)), \quad \gamma > 0 \text{ in } (0, \infty). \quad (\text{A0})$$

This PDE system was originally proposed by Keller and Segel in their seminal work [4], which models the oriented movement of cells due to a local sensing mechanism for chemotaxis. The sign of γ' corresponds to different chemotaxis phenomenon: cells are attracted by signals when $\gamma' < 0$, and are repelled when $\gamma' > 0$.

Recently, an extended three-component chemotaxis system of (1.1a)-(1.1b) has been developed in [13], where a third variable n denoting the nutrient level is introduced. The full system reads

$$\partial_t u = \Delta(u\gamma(v)) + \theta u f(n), \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\tau \partial_t v = \Delta v - v + u, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.2b)$$

$$\partial_t n = \Delta n - \theta u f(n), \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty). \quad (1.2c)$$

In their work, γ is assumed to be a positive non-increasing function, which stands for a repressive effect of the signal on cellular motility. By numerical and experimental analyses, it is shown that the system can foster spatially periodic patterns in a growing bacteria population merely under this motility control. We note that setting $\theta = 0$ in (1.2) cancels the coupling and hence we recover system (1.1a)-(1.1b) for (u, v) .

The mathematical analysis for the above Keller-Segel system with signal-dependent motility has attracted a lot research interest in recently years. We refer the readers to [11] for a detailed review on this topic where the non-increasing monotonicity of γ is mostly assumed. In contrast, existence theories without the monotonicity requirement are largely missing in the literature. When γ has strictly positive bounds from the above and below, and moreover $|\gamma'|$ is bounded, Tao and Winkler [14] prove that there exists a unique globally bounded classical solution for $N = 2$, and global weak solution is constructed for $N \geq 3$. If the motility is permitted to approach zero at infinity, global existence of (very) weak solutions is established if γ either satisfies $\sup_{s>0} \gamma(s) < 1/\tau$ in [12], or exhibits an algebraic decay at infinity [2]. On the other hand, for the parabolic-elliptic version of (1.1) with $\tau = 0$, existence of classical solution is verified simply under the assumption (A0) and that $\sup_{s>0} \gamma(s) < \infty$ without the need of the non-increasing property. However, a corresponding theory for the fully parabolic case is still open. Thus, there arises a natural question that whether the monotonicity requirement is removable or replaceable to ensure the existence of global classical solutions for the fully parabolic system.

The first task of this work is to give an affirmative answer to the above question. More precisely, we establish the following existence result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $N \geq 1$. Suppose that γ satisfy assumptions (A0), and that the initial condition (u_0, v_0) satisfies*

$$(u_0, v_0) \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}) \times W^{1,\infty}(\Omega), \quad u_0 \geq 0, v_0 > 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega}, \quad u_0 \not\equiv 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Moreover, we assume

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(s) < 1/\tau. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Then problem (1.1) has a unique global non-negative classical solution $(u, v) \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Remark 1.1. Note the above result now permits sign-changing of γ' and thus applies for both chemo-attraction and chemo-repulsion. Moreover, since the smallness assumption (A1) is merely presumed at infinity, γ can be arbitrarily large within any finite interval.

Next, we are interested in the boundedness of the global solutions to problem (1.1). If γ has strictly positive lower and upper bounds, i.e.,

$$\text{there are generic constants } \gamma_*, \gamma^* > 0 \text{ such that } \gamma_* \leq \gamma(\cdot) \leq \gamma^* \text{ in } (0, \infty), \quad (\text{A2})$$

there are limited evidences indicating that the system fosters bounded solutions. In this direction, the first result is the one we mentioned before by Tao and Winkler in [14], proving that when $N = 2$, problem (1.1) permits a unique globally bounded classical solution provided that γ satisfies (A2), and $|\gamma'|$ is also bounded. The other result in higher dimension $N \geq 3$ is provided in [10, Remark 1.3] for the parabolic-elliptic simplification of system (1.1) ($\tau = 0$), establishing the uniform boundedness when γ is non-increasing and has a strictly positive lower bound.

The second main result of this paper considers the case when γ simply satisfies (A0) and (A2). We establish global existence of uniformly bounded classical solutions in any dimension.

Theorem 1.2. Let $N \geq 1$. Suppose that γ satisfy assumptions (A0) and (A2), and that the initial condition (u_0, v_0) satisfies (1.3). Then problem (1.1) has a unique global non-negative classical solution that is uniformly-in-time bounded, i.e.,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \{ \|u(t)\|_\infty + \|v(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \} < \infty. \quad (1.4)$$

Remark 1.2. Note that we do not need the boundedness assumption on $|\gamma'|$ as requested in [14].

Boundedness results are also available if γ is non-increasing and tending to zero at infinity, i.e.,

$$\gamma' \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(s) = 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Thus the motility function has no strictly positive lower bound and leads to a possible degenerate problem. Under the circumstances, the dynamic of classical solution is shown to be closely related to the decay rate of γ at infinity. Exponential decay rate is verified to be critical if $N = 2$ in a sense that the solution can become unbounded at time infinity when $\gamma(s) = e^{-s}$ with some large mass initial data [5, 6], whereas it is always uniformly bounded when γ decays slower than a negative exponential function, i.e., γ satisfies

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow +\infty} e^{\lambda s} \gamma(s) > 0 \quad (1.5)$$

for all $\chi > 0$ [7, 11]. If $N \geq 3$, the global classical solution is proved to be uniformly-in-time bounded in [9–11], provided that γ exhibits an algebraic decay at infinity. More precisely, the following algebraic growth assumption is requested on $1/\gamma$:

$$\text{there are } k \geq l \geq 0 \text{ such that } \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^k \gamma(s) > 0 \text{ and } \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^l \gamma(s) < \infty. \quad (\text{A4})$$

For the parabolic-elliptic version of system (1.1) ($\tau = 0$), it is shown in [10] that the global solution is bounded if we require further that

$$k < \frac{N}{N-2} \text{ and } k - l < \frac{2}{N-2}.$$

However, for the fully parabolic case $\tau > 0$, an additional technical assumption below is also needed in [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{there is } b_0 \in (0, 1] \text{ such that, for any } s \geq s_0 > 0, \\ & s\gamma(s) + (b_0 - 1) \int_1^s \gamma(\eta) d\eta \leq K_0(s_0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $K_0(s_0) > 0$ depends only on γ , b_0 , and s_0 .

One another aim of the present paper is to revisit the boundedness result in [7, 11] for $N \geq 2$. Thanks to an improvement of the comparison argument, we are now able to remove the above technical assumption (A5) and replace the non-increasing monotonicity on γ by (A1), provided that γ satisfies (1.5) for all $\chi > 0$ if $N = 2$, or (A4) with any $0 \leq l \leq k < \frac{N}{N-2}$ and $k - l < \frac{2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$.

Now we rephrase the boundedness result for problem (1.1) with possible decaying motility as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $N = 2$. Suppose that γ satisfies assumptions (A0) and (A1). Moreover, there is $\chi > 0$ such that (1.5) is satisfied. If the initial condition (u_0, v_0) satisfies (1.3) with*

$$\|u_0\|_1 < \frac{4\pi}{\chi}, \quad (1.6)$$

then the global classical solution (u, v) to (1.1) is uniformly-in-time bounded.

In particular, if (1.5) is satisfied for all $\chi > 0$, then the global classical solution to (1.1) is uniformly-in-time bounded for any given initial data satisfying (1.3).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $N \geq 3$. Suppose that γ satisfies assumptions (A0) and (A1). Moreover, assumption (A4) is fulfilled with some $k \geq l \geq 0$ satisfying*

$$k < \frac{N}{N-2} \text{ and } k - l < \frac{2}{N-2}.$$

Then, for any initial condition (u_0, v_0) satisfying (1.3), the global classical solution (u, v) to (1.1) is uniformly-in-time bounded in the sense that it satisfies (1.4).

Remark 1.3. *In Theorem 1.4, assumption (A1) is only needed in the case $l = 0$ and $0 < k < \frac{2}{N-2}$; see Sect. 5.2.*

The main idea of our proof relies on a refinement of the comparison argument of a systematic approach developed recently in [5, 6, 8–12] for systems (1.1) and (1.2). Since the approach is quite different from the conventional energy method, let us outline its procedure here. The key ingredient lies in an introduction of an auxiliary function $w(x, t)$, which satisfies an elliptic problem:

$$\begin{cases} w - \Delta w = u, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty), \\ \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

By taking an inverse operator $\mathcal{A} = (I - \Delta)^{-1}$ on both sides of (1.1a), one obtains the following key identity:

$$w_t + u\gamma(v) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)].$$

Substituting $u = w - \Delta w$ into the key identity, we transform the problem to a thorough study of the following quasilinear parabolic equation involving a non-local term:

$$w_t - \gamma(v)\Delta w + \gamma(v)w = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)]. \quad (1.7)$$

Its proof mainly consists of three steps as we sketch below.

- Step I: a three-step comparison argument is developed to derive the (time-dependent) upper bounds of w and v .
 - (a) Firstly, the above key identity allows us to derive a (time-dependent) upper bound of w via comparison principle of elliptic equations, see Lemma 2.2 below;
 - (b) Secondly, an application of comparison principle for heat equations yields to an upper control of v by w and thus gives a (time-dependent) upper bound of v ;
 - (c) Thirdly, we use comparison principle of elliptic as well as heat equations again to prove a reverse control. Hence we establish a two-sided control of v by w .
- Step II: thanks to the two-sided control and the monotonicity of γ , we can replace $\gamma(v)$ by $\gamma(Cw)$ in (1.7) with some generic positive constant C , and apply a Moser-Alikakos iteration to derive the time-independent upper bounds for w and v .
- Step III: we further establish the Hölder estimate for v , which enables us to regard $-\gamma(v(t))\Delta$ as a generator of an evolution operator and hence gives rise to high-order estimates for w in certain Sobolev spaces. Finally, we use semigroup theory and energy method to get the $W^{1,\infty}$ -boundedness of v , and L^∞ -boundedness of u , respectively.

We point out that the non-increasing property plays a crucial role in Step I-(b,c), and it is not needed in the last step once we have the (time-dependent or time-independent) upper bounds of w and v . Besides, the reverse control obtained in Step I-(c) is only needed when we try to establish the uniform boundedness of classical solution for the case $\tau > 0$ and $N \geq 3$.

The proof of our results Theorem 1.1–Theorem 1.4 for problem (1.1) with non-monotonic motility lies in an essential improvement and a careful revisit of the above mentioned steps. Firstly, we develop a variant version of the second comparison argument which replaces the non-increasing property by the smallness assumption (A1) at infinity; see Lemma 3.1 below.

Secondly, under the assumption of strictly lower and upper boundedness of γ , we can directly apply an iteration argument on (1.7) to derive the uniform boundedness of w without the monotonicity assumption on γ , which allows us to skip Step II. Lastly, we observe that under the assumptions (A1) and (A4) with some $k \geq l \geq 0$, monotonicity in Step I-(c) and Step II can also be dropped as well.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some preliminary results. In Section 3, we provide the key variant proof for the upper control of v by w , which replaces the monotonic non-increasing property by (A1) and enables us to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4, we use an iteration together with a comparison argument to derive the uniform upper bound for w directly and then prove Theorem 1.2 following Step III. In the last section, we discuss the boundedness when γ satisfies some decay condition at infinity.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some basic results for problem (1.1). First, we have the local well-posedness. We refer the readers to [11, Proposition 2.1] for a detailed proof.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that γ satisfies (A0) and (u_0, v_0) satisfies (1.3). Then there exists $T_{\max} \in (0, \infty]$ such that problem (1.1) has a unique non-negative classical solution $(u, v) \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max}); \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max}); \mathbb{R}^2)$. The solution (u, v) satisfies the mass conservation*

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} u_0(x) \, dx \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}). \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover, there is $v_* > 0$ depending only on Ω , v_0 , and $\|u_0\|_1$ such that

$$v(x, t) \geq v_*, \quad (x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max}). \quad (2.2)$$

Finally, if $T_{\max} < \infty$, then

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} \|u(t)\|_{\infty} = \infty.$$

The following result implies that under the assumptions (A0) and (A4), γ is controlled from the above and below by two algebraically decay functions.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that γ satisfies (A0) and (A4). Then for any $a > 0$, there are constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending on a and γ such that*

$$C_1 s^{-k} \leq \gamma(s) \leq C_2 s^{-l}, \quad s \in [a, \infty). \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. By the first condition of (A4), we infer there is $s_0 > a$ and $C'_1 > 0$ such that for $s \geq s_0$, there holds

$$s^{-k}/\gamma(s) \leq C'_1.$$

In view of the assumption (A0), we can find $C''_1 > 0$ such that for $s \in [a, s_0]$, $1/\gamma(s) \leq C''_1$ and hence

$$s^{-k}/\gamma(s) \leq C''_1 a^{-k} \quad \text{for } s \in [a, s_0].$$

Then it follows that for all $s \in [a, \infty)$,

$$s^{-k}/\gamma(s) \leq C'_1 + C''_1 a^{-k} := 1/C_1. \quad (2.4)$$

This proves the left-hand side of (2.3).

In the same manner, by the second condition of (A4), there is $s_1 > a$ and $C'_2 > 0$ such that for all $s \geq s_1$,

$$s^l \gamma(s) \leq C'_2$$

and for $s \in [a, s_1]$, we can find $C''_2 > 0$ by (A0) such that

$$s^l \gamma(s) \leq C''_2 s_1^l.$$

This concludes the proof by letting $C_2 = C'_2 + C''_2 s_1^l$. \square

Next, we define the operator \mathcal{A} on $L^2(\Omega)$ as

$$\text{dom}(\mathcal{A}) \triangleq \{z \in H^2(\Omega) : \nabla z \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \quad \mathcal{A}z \triangleq z - \Delta z, \quad z \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}).$$

We recall that \mathcal{A} generates an analytic semigroup on $L^p(\Omega)$ and is invertible on $L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then we introduce $w(t) \triangleq \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u(t)] \geq 0$, for $t \in [0, T_{\max})$, the non-negativity of w being a consequence of that of u and the comparison principle. Due to the time continuity of u ,

$$w_0 \triangleq w(0) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u_0] \quad (2.5)$$

and it follows the regularity assumption (1.3) that $w_0 \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ with any $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Last we recall the following key lemma. See [6, Lemma 5] for a detailed proof.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that γ satisfies (A0). Then the following key identity holds*

$$\partial_t w + u\gamma(v) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)] \quad (2.6)$$

in $\Omega \times (0, T_{\max})$. Moreover, if there is a constant $\gamma^* > 0$ such that $\gamma(v(x, t)) \leq \gamma^*$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max})$, then there holds

$$w_* \leq w(x, t) \leq w_0(x)e^{\gamma^* t}, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}) \quad (2.7)$$

with w_* being a positive constant depending only on Ω and $\|u_0\|_1$.

3 Global existence with non-monotonic motility

In this section, we aim to establish global existence of classical solutions to problem (1.1) under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. To begin with, we provide an upper control of v by w under the assumption (A1), which enables us to consider problem (1.1) without monotonicity assumption on γ in this work.

First, we notice that under the assumptions (A0) and (A1), there is a positive constant $\gamma^* > 0$ such that $\gamma(s) \leq \gamma^*$ for $s \in [v_*, \infty)$ with v_* being the constant given in (2.2). Then it results from Lemma 2.2 that

$$w_* \leq w(x, t) \leq w_0(x)e^{\gamma^* t} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}). \quad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there is a constant $C_\infty > 0$ depending only on Ω , γ , τ and the initial data such that for all $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})$,*

$$v(x, t) \leq \frac{2(w(x, t) + C_\infty)}{1 - \tau\gamma_\infty},$$

where $\gamma_\infty := \limsup_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(s) < 1/\tau$ by (A1).

Proof. Since $\limsup_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(s) = \gamma_\infty < 1/\tau$ and w, v are both non-negative, we may pick $C_\infty > 0$ sufficiently large such that

$$\gamma(\sigma v + w + C_\infty) < \frac{\gamma_\infty + 1/\tau}{2}, \quad \forall \sigma > 0 \quad (3.2)$$

as well as

$$v_0(x) \leq w_0(x) + C_\infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Denote $\mathcal{L}[z] = \tau z_t - \Delta z + z = \tau z_t + \mathcal{A}z$ and observe that $\mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)] \geq 0$ by comparison principle. We infer from (1.1b), the definition of w , the key identity (2.6) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[v] &= u = w - \Delta w = \mathcal{L}[w] - \tau w_t \\ &= \mathcal{L}[w] + \tau u \gamma(v) - \tau \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)] \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}[w] + \tau u \left(\gamma(v) - \gamma(\sigma v + w + C_\infty) \right) + \tau u \gamma(\sigma v + w + C_\infty) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}[w] + \tau u \left(\gamma(v) - \gamma(\sigma v + w + C_\infty) \right) + \frac{\tau\gamma_\infty + 1}{2} u, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which entails that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - \tau\gamma_\infty}{2} u &\leq \mathcal{L}[w] + \tau u \left(\gamma(v) - \gamma(\sigma v + w + C_\infty) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{L}[w] + \left(\tau u \int_0^1 \gamma'(\theta v + (1 - \theta)(\sigma v + w + C_\infty)) d\theta \right) ((1 - \sigma)v - w - C_\infty) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}[w + C_\infty] + \left(\tau u \int_0^1 \gamma'(\theta v + (1 - \theta)(\sigma v + w + C_\infty)) d\theta \right) ((1 - \sigma)v - w - C_\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Now, we let $1 - \sigma = \frac{1 - \tau\gamma_\infty}{2} \in (0, 1)$ and notice that $\frac{1 - \tau\gamma_\infty}{2} u = \mathcal{L}[\frac{1 - \tau\gamma_\infty}{2} v] = \mathcal{L}[(1 - \sigma)v]$. Then it follows from (3.5) that

$$\mathcal{L}[(1 - \sigma)v - w - C_\infty] \leq \left(\tau u \int_0^1 \gamma'(\theta v + (1 - \theta)(\sigma v + w + C_\infty)) d\theta \right) ((1 - \sigma)v - w - C_\infty). \quad (3.6)$$

Finally, we infer by comparison principles of linear parabolic equations together with the fact $(1 - \sigma)v_0 \leq v_0 \leq w_0 + C_\infty$ to get that for all $(x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})$,

$$(1 - \sigma)v(x, t) \leq w(x, t) + C_\infty.$$

This completes the proof. \square

As a result of (3.1) and Lemma 3.1, we obtain an upper control of v by w as well as a time-dependent upper bound of v .

Corollary 3.1. *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there is a constant $B > 0$ depending only on Ω , γ , τ and the initial data such that*

$$v(x, t) \leq Bw(x, t), \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}) \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$v(x, t) \leq \frac{2(w_0 e^{\gamma^* t} + C_\infty)}{1 - \tau \gamma_\infty}, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}). \quad (3.8)$$

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As illustrated in the introduction, the rest part consists of Step II and Step III. We note that with the upper and lower bounds of v , under the assumption of (A0), one can find two time-dependent constants $\gamma_*, \gamma^* > 0$ such that $\gamma(v(x, t)) \in [\gamma_*, \gamma^*]$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max})$. Thus, we may establish a local energy estimate for w as done in [11, Lemma 4.1] and thus finish Step II without an assumption of monotonicity for γ . Finally, we can finish the proof (Step III) in an exactly the same manner as in [11, Section 4.2]. \square

4 Uniform-in-time boundedness with non-vanishing motility

In this section, we study uniform-in-time boundedness of classical solution to problem (1.1) with non-vanishing motility. More precisely, we assume within this section that there are two positive constants γ_* and γ^* such that

$$0 < \gamma_* \leq \gamma(\cdot) \leq \gamma^* \quad \text{on } (0, +\infty). \quad (4.1)$$

If in particular γ is non-increasing on $(0, \infty)$, i.e., $\gamma'(\cdot) \leq 0$ on $(0, \infty)$, then one has $\gamma^* = \gamma(v_*)$.

First, we prove uniform-in-time L^p -estimates for w with any $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Lemma 4.1. *Under the assumption of (A0) and (4.1), for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ there holds*

$$\|w(\cdot, t)\|_p \leq C(p) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_{\max}), \quad (4.2)$$

where $C(p) > 0$ is a constant depending only on Ω , τ , γ , p and the initial data.

Proof. Thanks to the upper and lower bounds of γ , the non-negativity of u , the fact $w - \Delta w = u$, and the comparison principle of elliptic equations, we deduce from the key identity that

$$w_t - \gamma_* \Delta w + \gamma_* w = w_t + \gamma_* u \leq w_t + \gamma(v)u = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)] \leq \mathcal{A}^{-1}[\gamma^* u] = \gamma^* w. \quad (4.3)$$

A multiplication of (4.3) by pw^{p-1} with any $p \geq 2$ and an integration over Ω give rise to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^p dx + \frac{p-1}{4p} \gamma_* \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{p/2}|^2 dx + p\gamma_* \int_{\Omega} w^p dx \leq p\gamma^* \int_{\Omega} w^p dx. \quad (4.4)$$

Recall the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|z\| \leq C \|\nabla z\|^\alpha \|z\|_1^{1-\alpha} + C \|z\|_1 \quad (4.5)$$

with

$$\alpha = \frac{N}{N+2} \in (0, 1). \quad (4.6)$$

Letting $z = w^{p/2}$, it follows by the above inequality and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} p\gamma^* \int_{\Omega} w^p dx &\leq Cp\gamma^* \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{p/2}|^2 dx \right)^{\alpha} \left(\int_{\Omega} w^{p/2} \right)^{2(1-\alpha)} + Cp\gamma^* \left(\int_{\Omega} w^{p/2} dx \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma^*}{16} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{p/2}|^2 dx + C(N, p, \gamma_*, \gamma^*) \left(\int_{\Omega} w^{p/2} dx \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p \geq 2$, we notice that $\frac{p-1}{4p} \geq \frac{1}{8}$. Thus, we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^p dx + \frac{\gamma^*}{16} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{p/2}|^2 dx + p\gamma_* \int_{\Omega} w^p dx \leq C(N, p, \gamma_*, \gamma^*) \left(\int_{\Omega} w^{p/2} dx \right)^2. \quad (4.7)$$

Solving the above ODI with $p = p_k = 2^k$, ($k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) successively in view of the fact $\int_{\Omega} w dx = \int_{\Omega} u dx = \|u_0\|_1$ yields to the L^p -estimates for w with any $p \geq 2$ and the remainder case $1 \leq p < 2$ follows by the obvious embedding $L^2 \hookrightarrow L^p$ on bounded domains. This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the uniform-in-time bound of w .

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, there is a positive constant C depending only on Ω , τ , γ and the initial data such that*

$$\|w(\cdot, t)\|_{\infty} \leq C, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_{\max}). \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. The proof is based on a simple comparison argument. Let z be the solution of the following linear equation:

$$\begin{cases} z_t - \gamma_* \Delta z + \gamma_* z = \gamma^* w & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T_{\max}) \\ \nabla z \cdot \nu = 0 & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T_{\max}) \\ z(x, 0) = w_0(x) & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Then we have the following representation formula

$$z(t) = e^{\gamma_*(\Delta-1)t} w_0 + \gamma^* \int_0^t e^{\gamma_*(\Delta-1)(t-s)} w(s) ds.$$

It follows from above and Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z(\cdot, t)\|_{\infty} &\leq \|e^{\gamma_*(\Delta-1)t} w_0\|_{\infty} + \gamma^* \int_0^t \|e^{\gamma_*(\Delta-1)(t-s)} w(s)\|_{\infty} ds \\ &\leq C \|w_0\|_{\infty} + C\gamma^* \int_0^t e^{-\gamma_*(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{N}{2p}} \|w(s)\|_p ds \\ &\leq C(\|w_0\|_{\infty}, \gamma_*, p, N, \Omega) \end{aligned}$$

provided that $p > N/2$, since

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\gamma_* s} s^{-\frac{N}{2p}} ds < \infty.$$

Then by comparison principle of heat equations, we have $0 \leq w \leq z \leq C(\|w_0\|_{\infty}, \gamma_*, p, N, \Omega)$ in view of (4.3). This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Although we do not have the upper bound of v at the present stage, the strictly positive lower and upper bounds assumption (4.1) still allows us to carry out the proof in [11, Lemma 4.1] to establish the uniform-in-time local energy estimate for w , which yields to a uniform Hölder's estimate for w , i.e., there is $\beta > 0$ depending only on Ω , τ , γ and the initial data such that $w \in C^\beta(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$ for any $0 < T < T_{\max}$. Next, denote $r = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[v]$ and $r_0 = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[v_0]$. We infer from (1.1b) that

$$\begin{cases} \tau r_t - \Delta r + r = w, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T_{\max}) \\ \nabla r \cdot \nu = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T_{\max}) \\ r(0) = r_0 & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

so that Schauder's theory ensures that r belongs to $C^{2+\beta, 1+\beta}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$. As a result, we obtain that $v = r - \Delta r \in C^{\beta, 1+\beta}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$. Finally, we can proceed the rest part of proof in [10, Lemma 6.7 and Proposition 6.8] to derive the upper bound of u . This completes the proof. \square

5 Uniform-in-time boundedness with decaying motility

In this section, we consider problem (1.1) with a decaying motility function that may vanish at infinity. Under the circumstances, uniform boundedness of classical solution is related to the decay rate of γ at infinity.

5.1 The case $N = 2$

In this part, we first consider the two-dimensional case and we assume that γ satisfies (A0), (A1) and (1.5) with some $\chi > 0$. According to Theorem 1.1, classical solution exists globally. One also observes due to (A0) and (A1) that γ has an upper bound on $[v_*, \infty)$ denoted by γ^* . Then the proof for Theorem 1.3 can be carried out in the same manner as done in [7, Section 3.1]. We outline its proof below.

First, multiplying the key identity (2.6) by u and integrating over Ω , thanks to the growth control of $1/\gamma(v)$ given by (1.5), we may deduce the following time-independent duality estimate:

$$\sup_{t>0} \left(\|\nabla w\|^2 + \|w\|^2 + \int_t^{t+1} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \gamma(v) dx ds \right) \leq C(\chi), \quad (5.1)$$

where $C(\chi) > 0$ depends only on Ω, γ, τ and the initial data. Here, an application of the celebrated Brezis–Merle inequality plays a key role in the estimates for integrations involving $1/\gamma(v)$.

Second, by the 2D Sobolev embedding theorem and the regularity results for elliptic equations, we notice that $\|w\|_{\infty} \leq C\|w\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_p$ for any $p > 1$. Then we can derive from the third term in the above duality estimate that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \int_t^{t+1} \|w\|_{\infty} ds \leq C'(\chi). \quad (5.2)$$

Then we recall by the key identity again that

$$w_t \leq w_t + u\gamma(v) = \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u\gamma(v)] \leq \gamma^* w.$$

Solving the above ODI with the aid of (5.2) gives rise to uniform-in-time estimate $\sup_{t>0} \|w\|_\infty \leq C'''(\chi)$ and the upper bound of v follows due to Lemma 3.1.

Finally, we can perform the energy estimate in [6] to get the uniform L^∞ -norm of u and thus completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

5.2 The case $N \geq 3$

In this part, we assume that $N \geq 3$ and γ satisfies (A0), (A1) and (A4) with

$$k < \frac{N}{N-2} \quad \text{and} \quad k-l < \frac{2}{N-2}.$$

We show that under the above assumption, the technical condition (A5) and the non-increasing property of γ in [11, Theorem1.4] are both removable.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We divide the proof into three cases.

Case (i). We consider the case $k = l = 0$. According to Lemma 2.1, there are two time-independent positive constants γ_*, γ^* such that

$$0 < \gamma_* \leq \gamma(s) \leq \gamma^* \quad \text{for } s \in [v_*, \infty).$$

Thus, the existence and boundedness of classical solutions follows according to Theorem 1.2.

Case (ii). We consider the case $l = 0$ and $0 < k < \frac{2}{N-2}$. By Lemma 2.1 again, there are two generic positive constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending on Ω, γ and the initial data such that

$$C_1 s^{-k} \leq \gamma(s) \leq C_2 \quad \text{for } s \in [v_*, \infty).$$

Since γ also satisfies (A1), we infer by the upper control (3.7) that

$$C_1 B^{-k} w^{-k} \leq \gamma(v(x, t)) \leq C_2, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}),$$

which being substituted into the key identity (2.6) yields that

$$w_t - C_1 B^{-k} w^{-k} \Delta w + C_1 B^{-k} w^{1-k} = w_t + C_1 B^{-k} w^{-k} u \leq \mathcal{A}^{-1}[C_2 u] = C_2 w.$$

Then under the assumption $k < \frac{2}{N-2}$, we can perform a Moser-Alikakos iteration in the same way as done in [7, 10, 11] to establish the uniform-in-time upper bound for w , and the uniform-in-time upper bound of v follows by Lemma 3.1. Once we establish the uniform upper bounds for w and v , we can carry out the rest part of proof (Step III) as in [11] since monotonicity is not needed any more.

Case (iii). We consider the case $k \geq l > 0$. Thanks to Lemma 2.1 again, there holds

$$C_1 s^{-k} \leq \gamma(s) \leq C_2 s^{-l} \quad \text{for } s \in [v_*, \infty). \quad (5.3)$$

Since $l > 0$, (A1) is satisfied evidently. Then we obtain the upper control $v \leq Bw$ due to Corollary 3.1. However, we still need the following lemma establishing a reverse control.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that γ satisfies (A4) with some $k \geq l > 0$. Then there is a positive time-independent constant $A > 0$ such that*

$$Aw(x, t) \leq v(x, t), \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}]. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. We recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[v] &= u = w - \Delta w = \mathcal{L}[w] - \tau w_t \\ &= \mathcal{L}[w] + \tau u \gamma(v) - \tau \mathcal{A}^{-1}[u \gamma(v)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Since $\gamma(s) \leq C_2 s^{-l}$ for $s \geq v_*$ with some $l > 0$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} u \gamma(v) &\leq C_2 w v^{-l} \\ &= C_2 (\tau v_t - \Delta v + v) v^{-l} \\ &= C_2 \left(\tau \partial_t \Gamma(v) - \Delta \Gamma(v) + \Gamma(v) - l v^{-l-1} |\nabla v|^2 + v^{1-l} - \Gamma(v) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$\Gamma(s) \triangleq \int_1^s \eta^{-l} d\eta = \begin{cases} \frac{s^{1-l} - 1}{1-l}, & \text{if } l \neq 1, \\ \log s, & \text{if } l = 1. \end{cases}$$

Denote $s_+ = \max\{s, 0\}$. We observe that for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max})$,

$$v^{1-l} - \Gamma(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-lv^{1-l}}{1-l} & \text{if } l \neq 1, \\ 1 - \log v \leq (1 - \log v_*)_+ & \text{if } l = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$C' \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{lv_*^{1-l}}{l-1} & \text{if } l > 1, \\ \frac{1}{1-l} & \text{if } l < 1, \\ (1 - \log v_*)_+ & \text{if } l = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, in view of the fact $lv^{-l-1}|\nabla v|^2 \geq 0$, we deduce from (5.6) that

$$u \gamma(v) \leq C_2 \mathcal{L}[\Gamma(v) + C'] \quad (5.7)$$

and hence by comparison principle that

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}[u \gamma(v)] \leq C_2 \mathcal{A}^{-1}[\mathcal{L}[\Gamma(v) + C']] = C_2 \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(v) + C']].$$

It follows from (5.5), the non-negativity of $u \gamma(v)$ and the above that

$$\mathcal{L}[v] \geq \mathcal{L}[w] - C_2 \tau \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(v) + C']], \quad (5.8)$$

which according to comparison principle of heat equations, gives rise to

$$w \leq v + C_2 \tau \mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(v)] + C_0, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}) \quad (5.9)$$

with a generic positive constant $C_0 \geq C'$ ensuring that

$$w_0 \leq v_0 + C_2 \tau \mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(v_0)] + C_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Next, since $\Gamma(s)$ is monotone increasing, we infer by the fact $v \leq Bw$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max})$ that

$$\Gamma(v) \leq \Gamma(Bw) = \begin{cases} \frac{B^{1-l}w^{1-l}-1}{1-l} = B^{1-l}\Gamma(w) + \frac{B^{1-l}-1}{1-l} & \text{if } l \neq 1, \\ \log B + \log w & \text{if } l = 1. \end{cases}$$

We note that for $l > 1$, there holds $\Gamma(Bw) \leq \frac{1}{l-1}$. Then it follows from (5.9) and comparison principle of elliptic equations that when $l > 1$,

$$w \leq v + C_{2\tau}\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(Bw)] + C_0 \leq v + C'_0$$

with $C'_0 = \frac{C_{2\tau}}{l-1} + C_0$.

It remains to consider the case $0 < l \leq 1$. Recall that $w - \Delta w = u$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} uw^{-l} &= \Gamma(w) - \Delta\Gamma(w) - lw^{-l-1}|\nabla w|^2 + (w^{1-l} - \Gamma(w)) \\ &= \mathcal{A}[\Gamma(w)] - lw^{-l-1}|\nabla w|^2 + (w^{1-l} - \Gamma(w)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

When $l \in (0, 1)$, there holds that

$$w^{1-l} - \Gamma(w) = \frac{1 - lw^{1-l}}{1-l} = 1 - l\Gamma(w).$$

Therefore, we infer from the above identity, (5.10), the non-negativity of uw^{-l} and $lw^{-l-1}|\nabla w|^2$ that

$$l\Gamma(w) \leq \mathcal{A}[\Gamma(w)] + 1. \quad (5.11)$$

Hence, it follows by comparison principle of elliptic equations that

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(w)] \leq \frac{1}{l}(\Gamma(w) + 1) \quad (5.12)$$

and by (5.9) and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} w &\leq v + C_{2\tau}\mathcal{A}^{-1}\left[B^{1-l}\Gamma(w) + \frac{B^{1-l}-1}{1-l}\right] + C_0 \\ &\leq v + \frac{C_{2\tau}B^{1-l}}{l}\Gamma(w) + \frac{C_{2\tau}B^{1-l}}{l} + \frac{C_{2\tau}B^{1-l}}{1-l} + C_0 \\ &= v + \frac{C_{2\tau}B^{1-l}w^{1-l}}{l(1-l)} + C_0 \\ &\leq v + \frac{1}{2}w + C'_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have for $l \in (0, 1)$,

$$w \leq 2(v + C'_0).$$

Last, when $l = 1$, we recall that $\Gamma(w) = \log w$ and $w^{1-l} - \Gamma(w) = 1 - \Gamma(w) = 1 - \log w$. We further infer from (5.10) that

$$\Gamma(w) \leq \mathcal{A}[\Gamma(w)] + 1.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}\Gamma(w) \leq \Gamma(w) + 1$$

due to an application of the comparison principle. Finally, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
w &\leq v + C_2\tau\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\Gamma(Bw)] + C_0 \\
&\leq v + C_2\tau\mathcal{A}^{-1}[\log B + \Gamma(w)] + C_0 \\
&\leq v + C_2\tau\log B + C_2\tau\Gamma(w) + C_2\tau + C_0 \\
&= v + C_2\tau\log B + C_2\tau\log w + C_2\tau + C_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Since $\log w \leq w^\delta$ for any $\delta > 0$, we infer by Young's inequality again that

$$\frac{1}{2}w \leq v + C_0''.$$

In summary, we establish that

$$w \leq C(v + 1) = C(v + v/v_*) = C(1 + 1/v_*)v := \frac{1}{A}v.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Thanks to the above lemma, we now have the following two-sided control in the case $k \geq l > 0$ such that

$$Aw \leq v \leq Bw \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_{\max}).$$

Then it follows from (5.3) that

$$C_1B^{-k}w^{-k} \leq C_1v^{-k} \leq \gamma(v) \leq C_2v^{-l} \leq C_2A^{-l}w^{-l}, \tag{5.14}$$

and an application of the comparison principle to the key identity gives that

$$w_t - C_1B^{-k}w^{-k}\Delta w + C_1B^{-k}w^{1-k} \leq C_2A^{-l}[uw^{-l}]. \tag{5.15}$$

Using the same Moser-Alikakos iteration as in [10, 11], we can prove that $\sup_{t \in (0, T_{\max})} \|w\|_\infty \leq C$ with $C > 0$ independent of time provided that $k < \frac{N}{N-2}$ and $k - l < \frac{2}{N-2}$. Then the time-independent upper bound for v follows. With the uniform upper bound of v and w at hand, the rest part of proof for Theorem 1.4 is the same as in [11] and we omit the detail here. \square

Acknowledgments

J. Jiang is supported by the Training Programme of Interdisciplinary Cooperation of Innovation Academy for Precision Measurement Science and Technology, CAS (grant No. S21S3202) and he is grateful to Prof. Philippe Laurençot for helpful discussions and insightful comments which improve the proof. Both authors thank Prof. Boling Guo for his constant encouragement and helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] M. Burger, P. Laurençot and A. Trescases, Delayed blow-up for chemotaxis models with local sensing, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **103** (2021), 1596–1617.

- [2] L. Desvillettes, P. Laurençot, A. Trescases and M. Winkler, Weak solutions to triangular cross diffusion systems modeling chemotaxis with local sensing, preprint, arXiv:2202.10246.
- [3] X. Fu, L.H. Huang, C. Liu, J.D. Huang, T. Hwa and P. Lenz, Stripe formation in bacterial systems with density-suppressed motility, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **108** (2012), 198102.
- [4] E.F. Keller and L.A. Segel, Model for chemotaxis, *J. Theoret. Biol.*, **30** (1971): 225–234.
- [5] K. Fujie and J. Jiang, Global existence for a kinetic model of pattern formation with density-suppressed motilities, *J. Differential Equations*, **269** (2020), 5338–5778.
- [6] K. Fujie and J. Jiang, Comparison methods for a Keller–Segel model of pattern formations with signal-dependent motilities, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **60** (2021): 92.
- [7] K. Fujie and J. Jiang, Boundedness of classical solutions to a degenerate Keller–Segel type model with signal-dependent motilities, *Acta. Appl. Math.*, **176** (2021): 3.
- [8] K. Fujie and T. Senba, Global existence and infinite time blow-up of classical solutions to chemotaxis systems of local sensing in higher dimensions, *Nonlinear Anal. Theor. Meth. Appl.*, **222** (2022): 112987.
- [9] K. Fujie and T. Senba, Global boundedness of solutions to a parabolic-parabolic chemotaxis system with local sensing in higher dimensions, *Nonlinearity*, to appear.
- [10] J. Jiang and P. Laurençot, Global existence and uniform boundedness in a chemotaxis model with signal-dependent motility, *J. Differential Equations*, **299** (2021), 513–541.
- [11] J. Jiang, P. Laurençot and Y. Zhang, Global existence, uniform boundedness, and stabilization in a chemotaxis system with density-suppressed motility and nutrient consumption, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **47** (2022), 1024–1069.
- [12] H. Li and J. Jiang, Global existence of weak solutions to a signal-dependent Keller–Segel model for local sensing chemotaxis, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, **61** (2021): 103338.
- [13] C. Liu, X. Fu et al., Sequential establishment of stripe patterns in an expanding cell population, *Science*, **334** (2011): 238
- [14] Y.S. Tao and M. Winkler, Effects of signal-dependent motilities in a Keller–Segel-type reaction-diffusion system, *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, **27** (2017), 1645–1683.