

Can chemotactic effects lead to blow-up or not in two-species chemotaxis-competition models?

Masaaki Mizukami*

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, Kyoto University of Education
1, Fujinomori, Fukakusa, Fushimi-ku, Kyoto 612-8522, Japan

Yuya Tanaka†

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

Tomomi Yokota‡

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

August 9, 2022

Abstract. This paper deals with the two-species chemotaxis-competition models

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1 - 1} - a_1 v^{\lambda_1 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v - \chi_2 \nabla \cdot (v \nabla w) + \mu_2 v (1 - a_2 u^{\lambda_2 - 1} - v^{\kappa_2 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ 0 = d_3 \Delta w + \alpha u + \beta v - h(u, v, w), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, and $h = \gamma w$ or $h = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u + \beta v) dx$. In the case that $\kappa_1 = \lambda_1 = \kappa_2 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and $h = \gamma w$, it is known that smallness conditions for the chemotactic effects lead to boundedness of solutions in e.g. [21]. However, the case that the chemotactic effects are large seems not to have been studied yet; therefore it remains to consider the question whether the solution is bounded also in the case that the chemotactic effects are large. The purpose of this paper is to give a negative answer to this question.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35K51; Secondary: 35B44, 92C17

Key words and phrases: Chemotaxis, Lotka–Volterra, boundedness, finite-time blow-up.

*Corresponding author

†Partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22J11193.

‡Partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21K03278.

E-mail: masaaki.mizukami.math@gmail.com, yuya.tns.6308@gmail.com, yokota@rs.tus.ac.jp

1. Introduction

Background. A Lotka–Volterra competition model represents a simplified scenario of the coexistence of two competing species. Moreover, if the species have random spatial motion, the model reads

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u + \mu_1 u(1 - u - a_1 v), \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v + \mu_2 v(1 - a_2 u - v) \end{cases}$$

(see e.g. [22]), where $d_1, d_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, a_1, a_2 > 0$ are constants and u, v idealize the population densities of the two species. In a mathematical view, the diffusion and competition terms lead to boundedness and stabilization of solutions. Indeed, there is a rich literature on large time behavior of solutions to the above model (see e.g. [5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19]). In addition to the random spatial motion, if the model includes concentration phenomena of the two species, how do solutions behave? In order to consider this question, we next focus on a two-species chemotaxis-competition model proposed by Tello and Winkler [24], that is,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \mu_1 u(1 - u - a_1 v), \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v - \chi_2 \nabla \cdot (v \nabla w) + \mu_2 v(1 - a_2 u - v), \\ \tau w_t = d_3 \Delta w + \alpha u + \beta v - \gamma w, \end{cases}$$

where $\chi_1, \chi_2, d_3, \alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ and $\tau \in \{0, 1\}$ are constants and w shows the concentration of the signal substance. This model describes a situation in which multi species move toward higher concentrations of the signal substance, and moreover compete with each other. Here the structural feature of this model is that it involves not only the diffusion and competition terms but also the chemotaxis terms. In particular, the diffusion and competition terms indicate stabilization of the species, whereas the chemotaxis terms represent concentration of the species. Therefore it is one of the fundamental themes whether the solutions remain bounded or not.

Now let us collect known results in the above models. We shall recall the parabolic–parabolic–elliptic case ($\tau = 0$). In this case, boundedness and stabilization were obtained under smallness conditions for χ_1 and χ_2 in the cases that $a_1, a_2 \in (0, 1)$ ([4, 24]) and that $a_1 > 1 > a_2$ ([23]); moreover, these conditions in [4, 23, 24] were improved in some cases in [21]; particularly, the conditions for boundedness in [21] were given by $0 < \chi_1 < \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha}, \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2}$ and $0 < \chi_2 < \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta}, \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2}$. Similarly, in the fully parabolic case ($\tau = 1$), results on global existence and asymptotic stability were obtained under smallness conditions for χ_1 and χ_2 in [1, 17, 20].

The challenge of proving blow-up. The above studies indicate that smallness of chemotactic effects entails boundedness and stabilization of solutions to chemotaxis-competition models. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no result in the case that chemotactic effects are large. Therefore the following question arises:

Does the solution remain bounded in the case that the chemotactic effects are large?

The purpose of this work is to give a *negative* answer to this question.

Review of chemotaxis systems. In order to consider the above question, it is useful to give an overview of known results for the parabolic–elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \lambda u - \mu u^\kappa, \\ 0 = \Delta w - w + u, \end{cases}$$

where $\chi, \lambda, \mu > 0$ and $\kappa > 1$. As to this model, results on boundedness and blow-up were obtained in [3, 11, 25, 27, 29]. Indeed, Tello and Winkler [25] proved boundedness of solutions in the cases that $\kappa = 2$ and $\chi < \frac{n}{(n-2)_+} \mu$ and that $\kappa > 2$ and $\chi > 0$, whereas Winkler [29] derived finite-time blow-up under some smallness condition for $\kappa > 1$; in a simplified parabolic–elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source, smallness conditions for κ leading to finite-time blow-up were established in higher-dimensional cases by Winkler [27] and in three- and four-dimensional cases by Black et al. [3]; moreover, Fuest [11] succeeded in improving the conditions for κ in [3, 27] and showing finite-time blow-up under largeness conditions for χ in the case $\kappa = 2$ in higher-dimensional cases. In summary, in the one-species model, boundedness and blow-up are determined by the sizes of χ and κ .

Main results. From the review of the one-species chemotaxis systems with logistic source, it is expected that a behavior of solutions depends on chemotactic effects and competitive effects also in the two-species model. In this context, we consider two-species chemotaxis models with generalized competition terms, which read

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1 - 1} - a_1 v^{\lambda_1 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v - \chi_2 \nabla \cdot (v \nabla w) + \mu_2 v (1 - a_2 u^{\lambda_2 - 1} - v^{\kappa_2 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ 0 = d_3 \Delta w + \alpha u + \beta v - h(u, v, w), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla u \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$; ν is the outward normal vector to $\partial\Omega$; $d_1, d_2, d_3, \chi_1, \chi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, a_1, a_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$ and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 1$;

$$h(u, v, w) := \begin{cases} \gamma w & (\gamma > 0) \quad (\text{Keller–Segel type (cf. [14, 15])}), \\ \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u + \beta v) dx & (\text{Jäger–Luckhaus type (cf. [12])}); \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

the initial data u_0, v_0 are assumed to be nonnegative functions; in particular, in the case that h is of Jäger–Luckhaus type, we consider the model (1.1) with

$$\int_{\Omega} w dx = 0, \quad t > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

From the preceding consideration, we aim to show boundedness and blow-up of solutions to (1.1). Here we briefly state our main results as follows:

- **Prevention of blow-up, i.e., boundedness (Theorem 3.1):** If $n \geq 2$ and

$$0 < \chi_1 < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \kappa_1 > 2, \lambda_1 > 2, \\ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2, \lambda_1 > 2, \\ \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 > 2, \lambda_1 = 2, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha}, \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2, \lambda_1 = 2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$0 < \chi_2 < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \kappa_2 > 2, \lambda_2 > 2, \\ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \lambda_2 > 2, \\ \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 > 2, \lambda_2 = 2, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta}, \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \lambda_2 = 2, \end{cases}$$

then for all nonnegative initial data, (1.1) has a bounded solution.

- **Finite-time blow-up in the case $h = \gamma w$ (Theorem 4.1):** If

$$\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} < \begin{cases} \frac{7}{6} & \text{if } n \in \{3, 4\}, \\ 1 + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} & \text{if } n \geq 5, \end{cases}$$

then for some nonnegative initial data, (1.1) has a blow-up solution.

- **Finite-time blow-up in the case $h = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u + \beta v) dx$ (Theorem 5.1):** If $n \geq 5$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and

$$\chi_1 > \begin{cases} \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_1 < 2, \\ \max \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha}, \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2 > \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha}$$

or $n \geq 5$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and

$$\chi_1 > \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2 > \begin{cases} \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_2 < 2, \\ \max \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta}, \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \end{cases}$$

then for some nonnegative initial data, (1.1) has a blow-up solution.

Main ideas and plan of the paper. We first collect some preliminary facts on local existence of solutions to (1.1) and estimates for masses of u and v in Section 2. In Section 3 we show boundedness of solutions to (1.1), the proof of which is based on [21]. The key point is to establish an L^p -estimate for u and an L^q -estimate for v by constructing the differential inequalities

$$\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx \leq C_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p dx - C_2 \int_{\Omega} u^{p+\kappa_1-1} dx + C_3$$

and

$$\frac{1}{q} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} v^q dx \leq C_4 \int_{\Omega} v^q dx - C_5 \int_{\Omega} v^{q+\kappa_2-1} dx + C_6.$$

In Section 4 we prove finite-time blow-up in the case that h is of Keller–Segel type. Referring to [29], we will introduce the functions

$$\phi_U(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s)U(s, t) ds \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_V(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s)V(s, t) ds$$

with $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (0, 1)$, where

$$U(s, t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1}u(\rho, t) d\rho \quad \text{and} \quad V(s, t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1}v(\rho, t) d\rho.$$

In this case the goal is to obtain a superlinear differential inequality for $\phi_U + \phi_V$, and toward this goal, we need to control the integrals

$$\int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s^{\lambda_1 - 1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds$$

and

$$\int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s V_s(\sigma, t) U_s^{\lambda_2 - 1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds$$

which come from the competition terms. To this end, we derive pointwise upper estimates for u and v (see Lemma 4.2) by an argument similar to that in [29, Lemma 3.3]. Finally, in Section 5 we show finite-time blow-up in the case that h is of Jäger–Luckhaus type. In this case, by the structure of the third equation in (1.1), it is sufficient to establish a superlinear differential inequality for ϕ_U or ϕ_V with the parameter $b > 1$. The key to obtaining the inequality for ϕ_U or ϕ_V is to derive concavity of U and V (see Lemma 5.2). Here, this property will be shown by using a comparison principle, which is a different method in [28, Lemma 2.2].

2. Preliminaries

We first recall the known result about local existence of solutions to (1.1), which is proved by a standard fixed point argument as in [6, 23].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $d_1, d_2, d_3, \chi_1, \chi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, a_1, a_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$, $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 1$ and let h satisfy (1.2). Assume that*

$$u_0, v_0 \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ are nonnegative.} \tag{2.1}$$

Then there exist $T_{\max} \in (0, \infty]$ and a unique triplet (u, v, w) of functions

$$u, v, w \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})),$$

which solves (1.1) classically, and fulfills (1.3) in the case that h is of Jäger–Luckhaus type. Moreover, $u, v \geq 0$ in $\Omega \times (0, T_{\max})$ and

$$\text{if } T_{\max} < \infty, \quad \text{then} \quad \lim_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) = \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

Furthermore, if u_0, v_0 are radially symmetric, then so are u, v, w for any $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

We next show that the masses of u and v can be controlled by μ_1, u_0 and μ_2, v_0 , respectively.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $u_0, v_0 \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ are nonnegative. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t) dx \leq e^{\mu_1 t} \int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} v(x, t) dx \leq e^{\mu_2 t} \int_{\Omega} v_0(x) dx$$

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

Proof. By integrating the first and second equations in (1.1), and using that $\mu_1 > 0$ and $\mu_2 > 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u dx \leq \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u dx \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} v dx \leq \mu_2 \int_{\Omega} v dx$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. These inequalities imply the conclusion of this lemma. \square

3. Boundedness

In this section let us denote by (u, v, w) the local classical solution of (1.1) on $[0, T_{\max})$ given in Lemma 2.1. We shall prove the following theorem which asserts global existence and boundedness in (1.1).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, and let $d_1, d_2, d_3, \chi_1, \chi_2, a_1, a_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$. Assume that μ_1 and μ_2 fulfill*

$$0 < \chi_1 < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \kappa_1 > 2, \lambda_1 > 2, \\ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2, \lambda_1 > 2, \\ \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 > 2, \lambda_1 = 2, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha}, \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2, \lambda_1 = 2 \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$0 < \chi_2 < \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \kappa_2 > 2, \lambda_2 > 2, \\ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \lambda_2 > 2, \\ \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 > 2, \lambda_2 = 2, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta}, \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-2} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \lambda_2 = 2 \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and that (2.1) is satisfied. Then the corresponding solution (u, v, w) of (1.1) is global and bounded in the sense that $T_{\max} = \infty$ and

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

for all $t \geq 0$ with some $C > 0$.

Remark 3.1. In the case that $\kappa_1 = \lambda_1 = \kappa_2 = \lambda_2 = 2$, the conditions (3.1) and (3.2) are the same as in [21, (6)]. Thus this theorem is a generalization of [21, Theorem 1.1].

For the proof of Theorem 3.1 we derive an L^p -estimate for u with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and an L^q -estimate for v with some $q > \frac{n}{2}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that (2.1) holds.*

(i) *If μ_1 satisfies (3.1), then for some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \quad (3.3)$$

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

(ii) *If μ_2 satisfies (3.2), then for some $q > \frac{n}{2}$ there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \quad (3.4)$$

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

Proof. We let $p > \frac{n}{2}$ be fixed later. Multiplying the first equation in (1.1) by u^{p-1} and integrating it over Ω , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx &= d_1 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \Delta u dx - \chi_1 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) dx \\ &\quad + \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p (1 - u^{\kappa_1-1} - a_1 v^{\lambda_1-1}) dx \\ &= -\frac{4(p-1)}{p^2} d_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx - \frac{p-1}{p} \chi_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p \Delta w dx \\ &\quad + \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p dx - \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^{p+\kappa_1-1} dx - a_1 \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p v^{\lambda_1-1} dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. From the third equation in (1.1) and the nonnegativity of h , it follows that

$$-\frac{p-1}{p} \chi_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p \Delta w dx \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha \chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} dx + \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta \chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^p v dx$$

and so, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx &\leq -\frac{4(p-1)}{p^2} d_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha \chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} dx + \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta \chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^p v dx \\ &\quad + \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p dx - \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^{p+\kappa_1-1} dx - a_1 \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p v^{\lambda_1-1} dx \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. We first prove (3.3) in the case that $\kappa_1 = 2$ and $\lambda_1 = 2$. In this case, the above inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p dx &\leq \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p dx - \left(\mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha \chi_1}{d_3} \right) \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} dx \\ &\quad - \left(a_1 \mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta \chi_1}{d_3} \right) \int_{\Omega} u^p v dx. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.1) we can choose $p > \frac{n}{2}$ fulfilling

$$\mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} > 0 \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$a_1\mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Then, noting that $-(a_1\mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3}) \int_{\Omega} u^p v \, dx \leq 0$, by using Hölder's inequality we derive that

$$\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx \leq \mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx - c_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx \right)^{p+1}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, where $c_1 := (\mu_1 - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha\chi_1}{d_3}) |\Omega|^{-1} > 0$. Hence (3.3) results from this. Next, we consider the case that $\kappa_1 > 2$ and $\lambda_1 > 2$. For all $p > \frac{n}{2}$ it follows from Young's inequality that

$$\frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} \, dx \leq \frac{\mu_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+\kappa_1-1} \, dx + c_2 \quad (3.8)$$

with some $c_2 > 0$, and

$$\frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} \int_{\Omega} u^p v \, dx \leq a_1\mu_1 \int_{\Omega} u^p v^{\lambda_1-1} \, dx + c_3 \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx \quad (3.9)$$

with some $c_3 > 0$. Combining these inequalities with (3.5), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx \leq c_4 \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dx - \frac{\mu_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+\kappa_1-1} \, dx + c_2$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, where $c_4 := \mu_1 + c_3$, and this leads to (3.3). Similarly, taking p satisfying (3.6) and using (3.8) in the case that $\kappa_1 = 2$ and $\lambda_1 > 2$, and picking p fulfilling (3.7) and applying (3.9) in the case that $\kappa_1 > 2$ and $\lambda_1 = 2$, we can confirm that (3.3) holds. Moreover, we can show that (3.4) holds for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ with some $q > \frac{n}{2}$ by an argument similar to that in the proof of (3.3) under the condition (3.2). \square

With these estimates for u and v at hand, we can show Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since the proof is similar to that in [21, Lemma 2.4], let us briefly state the proof. By making use of Lemma 3.2, we can establish an L^p -estimate for u for some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and an L^q -estimate for v for some $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Thus, for all $r \in (\frac{n}{2}, \min\{p, q\}] \cap (0, n)$ there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq c_1$ for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Hence, applying elliptic regularity theory (see e.g. [9, Theorem 19.1]) to the third equation in (1.1) and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we can take $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla w(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\frac{nr}{n-r}}(\Omega)} \leq c_2$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, and moreover, we invoke the standard semigroup technique (see e.g. [2, Proof of Lemma 3.2]) to find $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_3$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, which in conjunction with (2.2) implies the end of the proof. \square

4. Finite-time blow-up in a model of Keller–Segel type

In this section we consider the system (1.1) in the case that h is of Keller–Segel type as follows:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1 - 1} - a_1 v^{\lambda_1 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v - \chi_2 \nabla \cdot (v \nabla w) + \mu_2 v (1 - a_2 u^{\lambda_2 - 1} - v^{\kappa_2 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ 0 = d_3 \Delta w + \alpha u + \beta v - \gamma w, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla u \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Omega = B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$) is a ball with some $R > 0$, and u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1) and

$$u_0, v_0 \text{ are radially symmetric.} \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, let (u, v, w) be the local classical solution of (4.1) on $[0, T_{\max})$ given in Lemma 2.1. We now state the following theorem which guarantees finite-time blow-up.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Omega = B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$) and let $d_1, d_2, d_3, \chi_1, \chi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, a_1, a_2 > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ as well as $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 1$. Assume that $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_1$ and λ_2 satisfy that*

$$\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} < \begin{cases} \frac{7}{6} & \text{if } n \in \{3, 4\}, \\ 1 + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} & \text{if } n \geq 5. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Then, for all $L > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ and $\widetilde{M}_0 \in (0, M_0)$ there exists $r_\star \in (0, R)$ with the following property: If u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2) and

$$\int_{\Omega} (u_0(x) + v_0(x)) dx = M_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_{r_\star}(0)} (u_0(x) + v_0(x)) dx \geq \widetilde{M}_0 \quad (4.4)$$

as well as

$$u_0(x) + v_0(x) \leq L|x|^{-n(n-1)} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \quad (4.5)$$

then the corresponding solution (u, v, w) of (4.1) blows up in finite time in the sense that $T_{\max} < \infty$ and

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) = \infty. \quad (4.6)$$

Remark 4.1. If $v = 0$ in (4.1), then λ_1, κ_2 and λ_2 can be taken smaller than κ_1 , and thus (4.3) is rewritten as

$$\kappa_1 < \begin{cases} \frac{7}{6} & \text{if } n \in \{3, 4\}, \\ 1 + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} & \text{if } n \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

This is the same condition as in [29, (1.4)], which means that the result in [29, Theorem 1.1] is generalized to that in the two-species model.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is based on [29]. In what follows, we regard $u(x, t)$, $v(x, t)$ and $w(x, t)$ as functions of $r := |x|$ and t . Also, we introduce the mass accumulation functions U, V and W as

$$U(s, t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1} u(\rho, t) d\rho,$$

$$V(s, t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1} v(\rho, t) d\rho$$

and

$$W(s, t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1} w(\rho, t) d\rho$$

for $s \in [0, R^n]$ and $t \in [0, T_{\max})$. Moreover, we define the functions ϕ_U, ϕ_V, ψ_U and ψ_V as

$$\phi_U(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) U(s, t) ds,$$

$$\phi_V(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) V(s, t) ds$$

and

$$\psi_U(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) U(s, t) U_s(s, t) ds,$$

$$\psi_V(t) := \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) V(s, t) V_s(s, t) ds$$

for $t \in [0, T_{\max})$ with suitably chosen $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (0, 1)$. Here, we note that $\phi_U, \phi_V \in C^0([0, T_{\max})) \cap C^1((0, T_{\max}))$.

To prove Theorem 4.1, we will establish an ordinary differential inequality for $\phi_U + \phi_V$. As a preparation of the proof, we show pointwise upper estimates for u and v .

Lemma 4.2. *For all $L > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that if u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2) and $\int_{\Omega} (u_0(x) + v_0(x)) dx = M_0$ as well as (4.5), then*

$$u(r, t) \leq C_1 r^{-n(n-1)-\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad v(r, t) \leq C_2 r^{-n(n-1)-\varepsilon} \quad (4.7)$$

for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$.

Proof. We put $\tilde{u}(x, t) := e^{-\mu_1 t} u(x, t)$. Then we see from (4.1) that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_t \leq d_1 \Delta \tilde{u} - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (\tilde{u} \nabla w), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nu = \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ \tilde{u}(x, 0) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Also, we have $\int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0) dx \leq M_0$. Next we verify that

$$\int_{\Omega} |x|^{(n-1)\theta} |\nabla w(x, t)|^\theta dx \leq c_1 \quad (4.9)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$ with some $\theta > n$ and $c_1 > 0$. Since the third equation in (4.1) yields $\int_{\Omega}(\alpha u + \beta v) dx = \gamma \int_{\Omega} w dx$, we can observe from the third equation in (4.1) that

$$|r^{n-1}w_r| = \left| -\frac{1}{d_3} \int_0^r \rho^{n-1}(\alpha u + \beta v - \gamma w) d\rho \right| \leq \frac{2}{d_3} \int_0^R \rho^{n-1}(\alpha u + \beta v) d\rho.$$

Estimating the right-hand side by Lemma 2.2 and the condition $\int_{\Omega}(u_0 + v_0) dx = M_0$, we see that for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$,

$$|r^{n-1}w_r| \leq \frac{2(\alpha e^{\mu_1} + \beta e^{\mu_2})M_0}{d_3\omega_n} =: c_2, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\omega_n := n|B_1(0)|$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let us choose $\theta > n$ so large such that

$$n(n-1) + \varepsilon > \frac{n(n-1)\theta}{\theta - n}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then, due to (4.10) we can derive (4.9) with $c_1 = c_2^\theta|\Omega|$. Thanks to (4.5), (4.8), (4.9) and (4.11), we can apply [10, Theorem 1.1] to find $c_3 > 0$ such that $\tilde{u}(x, t) \leq c_3|x|^{-n(n-1)-\varepsilon}$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$, which means the first claim in (4.7). Similarly, the second claim in (4.7) can be obtained. \square

We next derive differential inequalities for ϕ_U and ϕ_V . The following lemma is based on [29, Lemmas 4.1, 4.3 and 4.5].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and let $b \in (1 - \frac{2}{n}, \min\{1, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\})$ satisfy*

$$(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} - 1) < \frac{b}{2}. \quad (4.12)$$

Then, for all $L > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $C_3 > 0$ and $C_4 > 0$ such that if u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2) and $\int_{\Omega}(u_0(x) + v_0(x)) dx = M_0$ as well as (4.5), then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) &\geq -C_1 s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2} - \frac{2}{n}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha\chi_1 n}{d_3} \psi_U(t) - (b+1) \frac{\gamma\chi_1 n}{d_3} s_0 \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b-1} U(s, t) W(s, t) ds \\ &\quad - C_2 s_0^{-(n-1)(\kappa_1-1) + \frac{3-b}{2} - \varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ &\quad - a_1 \mu_1 n^{\lambda_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_V(t) &\geq -C_3 s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2} - \frac{2}{n}} \sqrt{\psi_V(t)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta\chi_2 n}{d_3} \psi_V(t) - (b+1) \frac{\gamma\chi_2 n}{d_3} s_0 \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b-1} V(s, t) W(s, t) ds \\ &\quad - C_4 s_0^{-(n-1)(\kappa_2-1) + \frac{3-b}{2} - \varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_V(t)} \\ &\quad - a_2 \mu_2 n^{\lambda_2-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s V_s(\sigma, t) U_s^{\lambda_2-1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$.

Proof. We first derive a differential inequality for ϕ_U from the first and third equations in (4.1). The first equation in (4.1) is rewritten as

$$u_t = d_1 r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} u_r)_r - \chi_1 r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} u w_r)_r + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1-1} - a_1 v^{\lambda_1-1}) \quad (4.15)$$

for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Also, we multiply the third equation in (4.1) by r^{n-1} and integrate it over $[0, s^{\frac{1}{n}}]$ to obtain

$$s^{1-\frac{1}{n}} w_r(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t) = -\frac{\alpha}{d_3} U(s, t) - \frac{\beta}{d_3} V(s, t) + \frac{\gamma}{d_3} W(s, t). \quad (4.16)$$

Thus, noticing that $U_s(s, t) = \frac{1}{n} u(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$, $V_s(s, t) = \frac{1}{n} v(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$, $W_s(s, t) = \frac{1}{n} w(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$ and $U_{ss}(s, t) = \frac{1}{n^2} s^{\frac{1}{n}-1} u_r(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$, we can verify from (4.15) and (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= d_1 n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} U_{ss} + \frac{\alpha \chi_1 n}{d_3} U U_s + \frac{\beta \chi_1 n}{d_3} U_s V - \frac{\gamma \chi_1 n}{d_3} U_s W \\ &\quad + \mu_1 U - \mu_1 n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma - a_1 \mu_1 n^{\lambda_1-1} \int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. In light of this identity we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) &\geq d_1 n^2 \int_0^{s_0} s^{2-\frac{2}{n}-b} (s_0 - s) U_{ss} ds \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha \chi_1 n}{d_3} \psi_U(t) - \frac{\gamma \chi_1 n}{d_3} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) U_s W ds \\ &\quad - \mu_1 n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &\quad - a_1 \mu_1 n^{\lambda_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. We next show estimates for I_1, I_3 and I_4 . By arguments similar to those in [29, estimate (4.4) and Lemma 4.3], it follows that

$$I_1 \geq -c_1 s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}-\frac{2}{n}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \quad (4.18)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ with some $c_1 > 0$. As to I_4 , by Fubini's theorem we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= -\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} \left(\int_\sigma^{s_0} s^{-b} (s_0 - s) ds \right) U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \\ &\geq -\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} \left(\int_\sigma^{s_0} s^{-b} ds \right) (s_0 - \sigma) U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \\ &\geq -\frac{\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1-1}}{1-b} s_0^{1-b} \int_0^{s_0} (s_0 - s) U_s^{\kappa_1}(s, t) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

so that by virtue of (4.12) we apply [29, Lemma 4.5] to find $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$I_4 \geq -c_2 s_0^{-(n-1)(\kappa_1-1)+\frac{3-b}{2}-\varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \quad (4.20)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. With regard to I_3 , as in [29, estimate (4.5)], by integration by parts we can make sure that

$$I_3 \geq -(b+1) \frac{\gamma\chi_1 n}{d_3} s_0 \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b-1} U W \, ds \quad (4.21)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. By (4.17), (4.18), (4.20) and (4.21) we arrive at (4.13). The inequality (4.14) is derived by a similar argument. \square

We next present an estimate for the integrals involving W in (4.13) and (4.14). Since the following lemma has been obtained in [26, Lemma 4.4], we provide only the statement of the lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (0, \min\{1, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\})$. For all $L > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that if u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2) and $\int_{\Omega}(u_0(x) + v_0(x)) \, dx = M_0$ as well as (4.5), then*

$$\begin{aligned} & - (b+1) \frac{\gamma\chi_1 n}{d_3} s_0 \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b-1} U(s, t) W(s, t) \, ds - (b+1) \frac{\gamma\chi_2 n}{d_3} s_0 \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b-1} V(s, t) W(s, t) \, ds \\ & \geq -C s_0^{1-b+\frac{2}{n}} - C s_0^{\frac{2}{n}} (\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$.

We estimate the last terms in (4.13) and (4.14).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and let $b \in (0, 1)$ satisfy*

$$(n-1)(\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} - 1) < \frac{b}{2}.$$

Then, for all $L > 0$, $M_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that if u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2) and $\int_{\Omega}(u_0(x) + v_0(x)) \, dx = M_0$ as well as (4.5), then

$$\begin{aligned} & - a_1 \mu_1 n^{\lambda_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(\sigma, t) \, d\sigma \right) \, ds \\ & \geq -C_1 s_0^{-(n-1)(\lambda_1-1) + \frac{3-b}{2} - \varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & - a_2 \mu_2 n^{\lambda_2-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s V_s(\sigma, t) U_s^{\lambda_2-1}(\sigma, t) \, d\sigma \right) \, ds \\ & \geq -C_2 s_0^{-(n-1)(\lambda_2-1) + \frac{3-b}{2} - \varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_V(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$.

Proof. It is sufficient to show (4.22), because we can confirm (4.23) by a similar argument. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let us fix $\eta > 0$ fulfilling

$$\frac{\eta}{n}(\lambda_1 - 1) \leq \min\{\varepsilon, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad (n-1)(\lambda_1 - 1) + \frac{\eta}{n}(\lambda_1 - 1) < \frac{b}{2}.$$

By an argument similar to that in (4.19), we infer from Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} & -a_1\mu_1n^{\lambda_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0-s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma,t)V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(\sigma,t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ & \geq -\frac{a_1\mu_1n^{\lambda_1-1}}{1-b} s_0^{1-b} \int_0^{s_0} (s_0-s)U_sV_s^{\lambda_1-1} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Moreover, from Lemma 4.2 there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$V_s^{\lambda_1-1}(s,t) = \left(\frac{1}{n}v(s^{\frac{1}{n}},t) \right)^{\lambda_1-1} \leq c_1s^{-(n-1)(\lambda_1-1)-\frac{\eta}{n}(\lambda_1-1)}$$

for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$, and thus we derive that

$$s_0^{1-b} \int_0^{s_0} (s_0-s)U_sV_s^{\lambda_1-1} ds \leq c_1s_0^{1-b} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-(n-1)(\lambda_1-1)-\frac{\eta}{n}(\lambda_1-1)}(s_0-s)U_s ds$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. Combining this inequality with (4.24) and using an argument similar to that in the proof of [29, Lemma 4.5], we can verify that (4.22) holds. \square

We can now pass to the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let us show that there are $b \in (1 - \frac{2}{n}, \min\{1, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\})$, $s_1 \in (0, R^n)$, $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $s_0 \in (0, s_1)$,

$$\phi'_U(t) + \phi'_V(t) \geq c_1s_0^{-(3-b)}(\phi_U(t) + \phi_V(t))^2 - c_2s_0^{1-b+\frac{2}{n}} \quad (4.25)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. By virtue of (4.3), in the case $n = 3$ we can make sure that $(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} - 1) < \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2-\frac{4}{n}}{2}$, whereas in the case $n \geq 4$ we have $(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} - 1) < \frac{1}{2}$. Thus we take $b \in (1 - \frac{2}{n}, \min\{1, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\})$ such that

$$(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} - 1) < \frac{b}{2}. \quad (4.26)$$

Also, let us pick $\varepsilon > 0$ fulfilling

$$2\varepsilon \leq 1 - \frac{2}{n}. \quad (4.27)$$

Then we can apply Lemmas 4.3–4.5 to find $c_3 > 0$ and $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) + \phi'_V(t) & \geq -c_3s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}-\frac{2}{n}}(\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} + \sqrt{\psi_V(t)}) \\ & \quad + c_4(\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) \\ & \quad - c_3s_0^{1-b+\frac{2}{n}} - c_3s_0^{\frac{2}{n}}(\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) \\ & \quad - c_3s_0^{-(n-1)(\kappa_1-1)+\frac{3-b}{2}-\varepsilon}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} - c_3s_0^{-(n-1)(\kappa_2-1)+\frac{3-b}{2}-\varepsilon}\sqrt{\psi_V(t)} \\ & \quad - c_3s_0^{-(n-1)(\lambda_1-1)+\frac{3-b}{2}-\varepsilon}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} - c_3s_0^{-(n-1)(\lambda_2-1)+\frac{3-b}{2}-\varepsilon}\sqrt{\psi_V(t)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. Moreover, Young's inequality yields that there exists $c_5 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) + \phi'_V(t) &\geq \frac{3}{4}c_4(\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) - c_3s_0^{\frac{2}{n}}(\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) \\ &\quad - c_5s_0^{1-b+\frac{2}{n}} \left(s_0^{\frac{2-\frac{6}{n}}{n}} + 1 + s_0^{2-\frac{2}{n}-2(n-1)(\kappa_1-1)-2\varepsilon} + s_0^{2-\frac{2}{n}-2(n-1)(\kappa_2-1)-2\varepsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s_0^{2-\frac{2}{n}-2(n-1)(\lambda_1-1)-2\varepsilon} + s_0^{2-\frac{2}{n}-2(n-1)(\lambda_2-1)-2\varepsilon} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. Here, we choose $s_1 \in (0, R^n)$ such that $c_3s_1^{\frac{2}{n}} \leq \frac{c_4}{4}$, and then we see that $c_3s_0^{\frac{2}{n}} \leq \frac{c_4}{4}$ for all $s_0 \in (0, s_1)$. Also, since it follows from (4.26), (4.27) and the condition $b < 2 - \frac{4}{n}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &2 - \frac{2}{n} - 2(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} - 1) - 2\varepsilon \\ &\geq 1 - 2(n-1)(\max\{\kappa_1, \lambda_1, \kappa_2, \lambda_2\} - 1) \\ &> 1 - b > 0, \end{aligned}$$

we infer from the relation $s_0 < R^n$ that

$$\phi'_U(t) + \phi'_V(t) \geq \frac{c_4}{2}(\psi_U(t) + \psi_V(t)) - c_6s_0^{1-b+\frac{2}{n}} \quad (4.28)$$

for all $s_0 \in (0, s_1)$ and $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} c_6 := &c_5(R^{2n-6} + 1 + R^{2n-2-2n(n-1)(\kappa_1-1)-2n\varepsilon} + R^{2n-2-2n(n-1)(\kappa_2-1)-2n\varepsilon} \\ &+ R^{2n-2-2n(n-1)(\lambda_1-1)-2n\varepsilon} + R^{2n-2-2n(n-1)(\lambda_2-1)-2n\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Since [29, Lemma 4.4] provides $c_7 > 0$ such that

$$\psi_U(t) \geq c_7s_0^{-(3-b)}\phi_U^2(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_V(t) \geq c_7s_0^{-(3-b)}\phi_V^2(t)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, these inequalities together with (4.28) lead to (4.25).

Now let us prove (4.6). We take $s_0 \in (0, s_1)$ so small such that

$$\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}s_0^{\frac{1}{n}}} + \frac{2}{c_1}s_0 \leq \frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n},$$

and then the relation

$$\frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n}s_0^{2-b} \geq \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}s_0^{2-b+\frac{1}{n}}} + \frac{2}{c_1}s_0^{3-b}$$

holds. Let us put $r_* := (\frac{s_0}{4})^{\frac{1}{n}} \in (0, R)$. Moreover, we suppose that the initial data u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1), (4.2), (4.4) and (4.5). Then we can make sure that $\phi_U(0) + \phi_V(0) \geq \frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n}s_0^{2-b}$ by [29, estimate (5.5)]. Thus, as in the proof of [11, Lemma 4.6] (with $d_1(s_0) = c_1s_0^{-(3-b)}$, $d_2(s_0) = c_2s_0^{1-b-\frac{2}{n}}$ and $\phi(s_0) = \frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n}s_0^{2-b}$), we can establish that $T_{\max} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and hence (4.6) results from (2.2). \square

5. Finite-time blow-up in a model of Jäger–Luckhaus type

In this section we deal with the system (1.1) with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ in the case that h is of Jäger–Luckhaus type. Namely, we consider the system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u - \chi_1 \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1 - 1} - a_1 v), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v - \chi_2 \nabla \cdot (v \nabla w) + \mu_2 v (1 - a_2 u - v^{\kappa_2 - 1}), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ 0 = d_3 \Delta w + \alpha u + \beta v - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u + \beta v) dx, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla u \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$\int_{\Omega} w dx = 0, \quad t > 0,$$

where $\Omega = B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 5$) is a ball with some $R > 0$, and u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1) and

$$u_0, v_0 \text{ are radially symmetric and nonincreasing with respect to } |x|. \quad (5.2)$$

Let (u, v, w) be the local classical solution of (5.1) on $[0, T_{\max})$ given in Lemma 2.1. Moreover, we put

$$\overline{M}(t) := \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} (\alpha u + \beta v) dx.$$

The main theorem in this section reads as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Omega = B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 5$) and let $d_1, d_2, d_3, \chi_1, \chi_2, a_1, a_2, \alpha, \beta > 0$ and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in (1, 2]$. Assume that μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy that*

$$\chi_1 > \begin{cases} \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_1 < 2, \\ \max \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_1}{\alpha}, \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2 > \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha}. \quad (5.3)$$

Then, for all $M_0 > 0$ and $\widetilde{M}_0 \in (0, M_0)$ there exists $r_{\star} \in (0, R)$ with the following property: If u_0, v_0 satisfy (2.1) and (5.2) as well as

$$\int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx = M_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_{r_{\star}}(0)} u_0(x) dx \geq \widetilde{M}_0, \quad (5.4)$$

then the corresponding solution (u, v, w) of (5.1) blows up in finite time in the sense that $T_{\max} < \infty$ and

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) = \infty.$$

Remark 5.1. If $v = 0$, $d_1 = d_3 = 1$, $\chi_1 = 1$, $\kappa_1 = 2$ and $\alpha = 1$ in (5.1), then the condition (5.3) is the same as in [11, (1.4b)]. Thus this theorem is a generalization of [11, Theorem 1.1] in the higher-dimensional case.

Remark 5.2. If μ_1 and μ_2 fulfill that

$$\chi_1 > \frac{a_1 d_3 \mu_1}{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2 > \begin{cases} \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_2 < 2, \\ \max \left\{ \frac{d_3 \mu_2}{\beta}, \frac{a_2 d_3 \mu_2}{\alpha} \right\} \cdot \frac{n}{n-4} & \text{if } \kappa_2 = 2, \end{cases}$$

then, by replacing u_0 with v_0 in (5.4), a similar result can be derived.

Now, let us define the functions U, V and W as in Section 4. Furthermore, we introduce the functions ϕ_U, ϕ_V, ψ_U and ψ_V defined in Section 4 with $b \in (1, 2)$.

Remark 5.3. As to the functions ϕ_U and ϕ_V , even though we have taken $b \in (1, 2)$ unlike e.g. [3, 28, 29] and Section 4, we see that these functions are well-defined and that ϕ_U and ϕ_V belong to $C^0([0, T_{\max})) \cap C^1((0, T_{\max}))$, since we can confirm from the following lemma that $s^{-b}(s_0 - s)U(s, t) \leq C s^{1-b}(s_0 - s)$ for all $t \in [0, T_{\max})$ with some $C > 0$ and that for any $t_0 \in (0, T_{\max})$ and $t_1 \in (t_0, T_{\max})$, $|\frac{d}{dt} s^{-b}(s_0 - s)U(s, t)| \leq \tilde{C} s^{1-b}(s_0 - s)$ for all $t \in (t_0, t_1)$ with some $\tilde{C} > 0$ (for details see the proof of [11, Lemma 4.1]).

We first show concavity of U and V , which is obtained by the comparison principle.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that (2.1) and (5.2) hold. If μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy that*

$$0 < \mu_1 < \frac{\beta \chi_1}{a_1 d_3} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \mu_2 < \frac{\alpha \chi_2}{a_2 d_3}, \quad (5.5)$$

then

$$U_{ss}(s, t) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad V_{ss}(s, t) \leq 0 \quad (5.6)$$

and moreover,

$$U_s(s, t) \leq \frac{U(s, t)}{s} \leq U_s(0, t) \quad \text{and} \quad V_s(s, t) \leq \frac{V(s, t)}{s} \leq V_s(0, t) \quad (5.7)$$

for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in [0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. Since (5.7) is proved by using the mean value theorem and (5.6), we need only to show (5.6). To see this, we establish that $u_r \leq 0$ and $v_r \leq 0$ for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ because we have $U_{ss}(s, t) = \frac{1}{n^2} s^{\frac{1}{n}-1} u_r(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$ and $V_{ss}(s, t) = \frac{1}{n^2} s^{\frac{1}{n}-1} v_r(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t)$ for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. By an approximation argument as in Step 2 in the proof of [28, Lemma 2.2], we can assume without loss of generality that $u_0, v_0 \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\nabla u_0 \cdot \nu = \nabla v_0 \cdot \nu = 0$. Then this assumption guarantees that

$$u_r, v_r \in C^0([0, R] \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}((0, R) \times (0, T_{\max})).$$

From the third equation in (5.1) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_1 r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} u w_r)_r &= \chi_1 u_r w_r + \chi_1 u \cdot r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} w_r)_r \\ &= \chi_1 u_r w_r + \chi_1 u \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha}{d_3} u - \frac{\beta}{d_3} v + \frac{1}{d_3} \overline{M}(t) \right) \\ &= \chi_1 u_r w_r - \frac{\alpha \chi_1}{d_3} u^2 - \frac{\beta \chi_1}{d_3} u v + \frac{\chi_1}{d_3} \overline{M}(t) u, \end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{rt} &= (d_1 r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} u_r)_r - \chi_1 r^{1-n} (r^{n-1} u w_r)_r + \mu_1 u (1 - u^{\kappa_1 - 1} - a_1 v))_r \\
&= d_1 u_{rrr} + d_1 \frac{n-1}{r} u_{rr} - d_1 \frac{n-1}{r^2} u_r \\
&\quad - \chi_1 u_{rr} w_r - \chi_1 u_r w_{rr} + \frac{2\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} u u_r + \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} u_r v + \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} u v_r - \frac{\chi_1 \overline{M}(t)}{d_3} u_r \\
&\quad + \mu_1 u_r - \mu_1 \kappa_1 u^{\kappa_1 - 1} u_r - a_1 \mu_1 u_r v - a_1 \mu_1 u v_r
\end{aligned}$$

for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Moreover, this identity is rewritten as

$$u_{rt} = d_1 u_{rrr} + A_1(r, t) u_{rr} + B_1(r, t) u_r + C_1(r, t) v_r, \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1(r, t) &:= d_1 \frac{n-1}{r} - \chi_1 w_r(r, t), \\
B_1(r, t) &:= -d_1 \frac{n-1}{r^2} - \chi_1 w_{rr}(r, t) + \frac{2\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} u(r, t) + \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} v(r, t) - \frac{\chi_1 \overline{M}(t)}{d_3} \\
&\quad + \mu_1 - \mu_1 \kappa_1 u^{\kappa_1 - 1}(r, t) - a_1 \mu_1 v(r, t)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$C_1(r, t) := \frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} u(r, t) - a_1 \mu_1 u(r, t)$$

for $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Now let us fix $T \in (0, T_{\max})$ and denote by $(u_r)_+$ and $(v_r)_+$ the positive part functions of u_r and v_r , respectively. Then we have

$$(u_r)_+(0, t) = (u_r)_+(R, t) = 0, \quad (5.9)$$

because the regularity and radial symmetry of u imply that $(u_r)_+(0, t) = 0$ and the Neumann boundary condition in (5.1) gives $(u_r)_+(R, t) = 0$. In view of (5.8) we can verify from integration by parts and (5.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr \\
&= \int_0^R r (u_r)_+ [d_1 u_{rrr} + A_1(r, t) u_{rr} + B_1(r, t) u_r + C_1(r, t) v_r] dr \\
&= -d_1 \int_0^R \left(\frac{1}{2} [(u_r)_+]_r + r ([(u_r)_+]_r)^2 \right) dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R r A_1(r, t) [(u_r)_+]_r dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^R r B_1(r, t) (u_r)_+^2 dr + \int_0^R r C_1(r, t) (u_r)_+ v_r dr \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R r A_1(r, t) [(u_r)_+]_r dr + \int_0^R r B_1(r, t) (u_r)_+^2 dr + \int_0^R r C_1(r, t) (u_r)_+ v_r dr \\
&=: J_1 + J_2 + J_3
\end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. Recalling the definition of A_1 , we obtain from (5.9) and integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \frac{d_1(n-1)}{2} \int_0^R [(u_r)_+]^2_r dr - \chi_1 \int_0^R r w_r [(u_r)_+]^2_r dr \\
&= \frac{d_1(n-1)}{2} [(u_r)_+^2(R, t) - (u_r)_+^2(0, t)] \\
&\quad - \chi_1 R w_r(R, t) \cdot (u_r)_+^2(R, t) + \chi_1 \int_0^R w_r (u_r)_+^2 dr + \chi_1 \int_0^R r w_{rr} (u_r)_+^2 dr \\
&\leq \chi_1 \int_0^R w_r (u_r)_+^2 dr + \chi_1 \|w_{rr}\|_{L^\infty((0, R) \times (0, T))} \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the third equation in (5.1) yields

$$w_r = -\frac{1}{d_3} r^{1-n} \int_0^r \rho^{n-1} (\alpha u + \beta v) d\rho + \frac{1}{d_3 n} \overline{M}(t) r \leq \frac{1}{d_3 n} \overline{M}(t) r, \quad (5.11)$$

which together with Lemma 2.2 means that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\leq \frac{\chi_1}{d_3 n} \overline{M}(t) \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr + \chi_1 \|w_{rr}\|_{L^\infty((0, R) \times (0, T))} \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr \\
&\leq c_1 \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr
\end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, where

$$c_1 := \frac{\chi_1}{d_3 n |\Omega|} \left(\alpha e^{\mu_1 T} \int_\Omega u_0 dx + \beta e^{\mu_2 T} \int_\Omega v_0 dx \right) + \chi_1 \|w_{rr}\|_{L^\infty((0, R) \times (0, T))}.$$

We next estimate J_2 . Noticing from the third equation in (5.1) and (5.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}
-w_{rr} &= \frac{n-1}{r} w_r + \frac{\alpha}{d_3} u + \frac{\beta}{d_3} v - \frac{1}{d_3} \overline{M}(t) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{d_3 n} \overline{M}(t) + \frac{\alpha}{d_3} u + \frac{\beta}{d_3} v \\
&\leq \frac{\alpha}{d_3} u + \frac{\beta}{d_3} v
\end{aligned}$$

and using the nonpositivity of $-d_1 \frac{n-1}{r^2}$, $-\frac{\chi_1}{d_3} \overline{M}(t)$, $-\mu_1 \kappa_1 u^{\kappa_1-1}$ and $-a_1 \mu_1 v$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1(r, t) &\leq \frac{3\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} u + \frac{2\beta\chi_1}{d_3} v + \mu_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3\alpha\chi_1}{d_3} \|u\|_{L^\infty((0, R) \times (0, T))} + \frac{2\beta\chi_1}{d_3} \|v\|_{L^\infty((0, R) \times (0, T))} + \mu_1 =: c_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$J_2 \leq c_2 \int_0^R r (u_r)_+^2 dr \quad (5.13)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. With regard to J_3 , the first condition in (5.5) ensures that $\frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} - a_1\mu_1 > 0$, and thereby we have

$$C_1(r, t) \leq \left(\frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} - a_1\mu_1 \right) \|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R) \times (0,T))}.$$

Thanks to this inequality, J_3 is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &\leq \left(\frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} - a_1\mu_1 \right) \|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R) \times (0,T))} \int_0^R r(u_r)_+(v_r)_+ dr \\ &\leq c_3 \int_0^R r(u_r)_+^2 dr + c_3 \int_0^R r(v_r)_+^2 dr \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, where $c_3 := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\beta\chi_1}{d_3} - a_1\mu_1 \right) \|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R) \times (0,T))}$. Therefore a combination of (5.12)–(5.14) with (5.10) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^R r(u_r)_+^2 dr \leq c_4 \int_0^R r(u_r)_+^2 dr + c_3 \int_0^R r(v_r)_+^2 dr$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, where $c_4 := c_1 + c_2 + c_3$. Similarly, under the second condition in (5.5), we can observe from the second equation in (5.1) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^R r(v_r)_+^2 dr \leq c_5 \int_0^R r(u_r)_+^2 dr + c_6 \int_0^R r(v_r)_+^2 dr$$

with some $c_5 = c_5(T) > 0$ and $c_6 = c_6(T) > 0$, and thus find $c_7 = c_7(T) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^R r((u_r)_+^2 + (v_r)_+^2) dr \leq c_7 \int_0^R r((u_r)_+^2 + (v_r)_+^2) dr$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. Since $u_{0r} \leq 0$ and $v_{0r} \leq 0$ for all $r \in [0, R]$ by (5.2), the above inequality provides that $u_r \leq 0$ and $v_r \leq 0$ for all $r \in (0, R)$ and $t \in (0, T)$. Letting $T \nearrow T_{\max}$, we arrive at the conclusion. \square

We next establish a differential inequality for ϕ_U . In order to derive it, we will use estimates as in [11, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4].

Lemma 5.3. *Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (1, 2 - \frac{4}{n})$. Assume that μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy (5.5). Then there exist $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) &\geq -C_1 s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2} - \frac{2}{n}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha\chi_1 n}{d_3} \psi_U(t) + \frac{\beta\chi_1 n}{d_3} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) U_s(s, t) V(s, t) ds \\ &\quad - C_2 s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ &\quad - \mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &\quad - a_1 \mu_1 n \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t) V_s(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$.

Proof. Since we can verify from the third equation in (5.1) that

$$s^{1-\frac{1}{n}}w_r(s^{\frac{1}{n}}, t) = -\frac{\alpha}{d_3}U(s, t) - \frac{\beta}{d_3}V(s, t) + \frac{1}{d_3n}\overline{M}(t)s$$

for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, we obtain from (4.15) and this identity that

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= d_1n^2s^{2-\frac{2}{n}}U_{ss} + \frac{\alpha\chi_1n}{d_3}UU_s + \frac{\beta\chi_1n}{d_3}U_sV - \frac{\chi_1}{d_3}\overline{M}(t)sU_s \\ &\quad + \mu_1U - \mu_1n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma - a_1\mu_1n \int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t)V_s(\sigma, t) d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. In view of this identity we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) &\geq d_1n^2 \int_0^{s_0} s^{2-\frac{2}{n}-b}(s_0-s)U_{ss} ds \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha\chi_1n}{d_3}\psi_U(t) + \frac{\beta\chi_1n}{d_3} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0-s)U_sV ds \\ &\quad - \frac{\chi_1}{d_3}\overline{M}(t) \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-b}(s_0-s)U_s ds \\ &\quad - \mu_1n^{\kappa_1-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0-s) \left(\int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &\quad - a_1\mu_1n \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0-s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t)V_s(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &=: \tilde{I}_1 + \tilde{I}_2 + \tilde{I}_3 + \tilde{I}_4 + \tilde{I}_5 + \tilde{I}_6 \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Let us next show estimates for \tilde{I}_1 and \tilde{I}_4 . With regard to \tilde{I}_1 , owing to (5.5) we can employ (5.7), and so by an argument similar to that in the proof of [11, Lemma 4.3] we provide $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{I}_1 \geq -c_1s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}-\frac{2}{n}}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \tag{5.17}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. As to \tilde{I}_4 , arguing as in [29, Lemma 4.3], we can take $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\psi_U(t) \geq c_2s_0^{-(3-b)}\phi_U^2(t) \tag{5.18}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, so that we rely on (5.7) and this inequality to see that

$$\tilde{I}_4 \geq -\frac{\chi_1}{d_3}\overline{M}(t)\phi_U(t) \geq -\frac{\chi_1}{\sqrt{c_2}d_3}s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}}\overline{M}(t)\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \tag{5.19}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Moreover, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$,

$$\overline{M}(t) \leq \alpha e^{\mu_1} \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx + \beta e^{\mu_2} \int_{\Omega} v_0 dx,$$

which in conjunction with (5.19) yields

$$\tilde{I}_4 \geq -c_3s_0^{\frac{3-b}{2}}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \tag{5.20}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$, where $c_3 := \frac{\chi_1}{\sqrt{c_2}d_3}(\alpha e^{\mu_1} \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx + \beta e^{\mu_2} \int_{\Omega} v_0 dx)$. Accordingly, a combination of (5.16), (5.17) and (5.20) entails (5.15). \square

Next, we estimate the fifth term on the right-hand side of (5.15). The following lemma generalizes [11, (i) in Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 5.4. *Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (1, 2)$. Assume that μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy (5.5). Then*

$$-\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \geq \begin{cases} -C s_0^{(3-b)\frac{2-\kappa_1}{2}} \psi_U^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}}(t) & \text{if } \kappa_1 \in (1, 2), \\ -\frac{\mu_1 n}{b-1} \psi_U(t) & \text{if } \kappa_1 = 2 \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ with some $C > 0$.

Proof. In the case $\kappa_1 = 2$ this lemma can be obtained by the same argument as in the proof of [11, (i) in Lemma 4.2]. Therefore we consider the case $\kappa_1 \in (1, 2)$. Noting that $b > 1$, by Fubini's theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ &= -\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1} \int_0^{s_0} \left(\int_\sigma^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) ds \right) U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \\ &\geq -\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1} \int_0^{s_0} \left(\int_\sigma^{s_0} s^{-b} ds \right) (s_0 - \sigma) U_s^{\kappa_1}(\sigma, t) d\sigma \\ &\geq -\frac{\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1}}{b-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-b}(s_0 - s) U_s^{\kappa_1}(s, t) ds \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Since we can apply Lemma 5.2 by the condition (5.5), we know that $U_s(s, t) \leq s^{-1}U(s, t)$ for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, and hence it follows that

$$-\frac{\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1}}{b-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-b}(s_0 - s) U_s^{\kappa_1} ds \geq -\frac{\mu_1 n^{\kappa_1 - 1}}{b-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-\frac{\kappa_1}{2}-b}(s_0 - s) (UU_s)^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}} ds. \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover, by using Hölder's inequality we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-\frac{\kappa_1}{2}-b}(s_0 - s) (UU_s)^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}} ds \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{s_0} s^{1-b}(s_0 - s) ds \right)^{1-\frac{\kappa_1}{2}} \left(\int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) UU_s ds \right)^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}} \\ &= c_1 s_0^{(3-b)\frac{2-\kappa_1}{2}} \psi_U^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, where $c_1 := \left(\frac{1}{(2-b)(3-b)} \right)^{(3-b)\frac{2-\kappa_1}{2}}$. A combination of (5.21)–(5.23) leads to the conclusion of this lemma. \square

As a final preparation for the proof of Theorem 5.1, we show that the sixth term on the right-hand side of (5.15) is estimated by the third term.

Lemma 5.5. Let $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ and $b \in (1, 2)$. Assume that μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy (5.5). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & -a_1\mu_1n \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t)V_s(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ & \geq -\frac{a_1\mu_1n}{b-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s)U_s(s, t)V(s, t) ds \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

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

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 5.4, Fubini's theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} & -a_1\mu_1n \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b}(s_0 - s) \left(\int_0^s U_s(\sigma, t)V_s(\sigma, t) d\sigma \right) ds \\ & \geq -\frac{a_1\mu_1n}{b-1} \int_0^{s_0} s^{1-b}(s_0 - s)U_s(s, t)V_s(s, t) ds \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Also, from Lemma 5.2 we obtain that $V_s(s, t) \leq s^{-1}V(s, t)$ for all $s \in (0, R^n)$ and $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, which together with the above inequality implies (5.24). \square

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We first find $b \in (1, 2 - \frac{4}{n})$ that there exist $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$,

$$\phi'_U(t) \geq c_1s_0^{-(3-b)}\phi_U^2(t) - c_2s_0^{3-b-\frac{4}{n}} \quad (5.25)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. To see this, we first consider the case $\kappa_1 \in (1, 2)$. In this case, the condition for χ_1 in (5.3) implies

$$2 - \frac{4}{n} > 1 + \frac{a_1d_3\mu_1}{\beta\chi_1}. \quad (5.26)$$

Thus we can choose $b_1 \in (1 + \frac{a_1d_3\mu_1}{\beta\chi_1}, 2 - \frac{4}{n})$. Then, applying Lemmas 5.3–5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) & \geq -c_3s_0^{\frac{3-b_1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha\chi_1n}{d_3}\psi_U(t) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\beta\chi_1n}{d_3} - \frac{a_1\mu_1n}{b_1-1} \right) \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b_1}(s_0 - s)U_sV ds \\ & \quad - c_3s_0^{\frac{3-b_1}{2}}\sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ & \quad - c_3s_0^{(3-b_1)\frac{2-\kappa_1}{2}}\psi_U^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$ with some $c_3 > 0$. Noting from the condition $b_1 > 1 + \frac{a_1d_3\mu_1}{\beta\chi_1}$ that

$$\left(\frac{\beta\chi_1n}{d_3} - \frac{a_1\mu_1n}{b_1-1} \right) \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b_1}(s_0 - s)U_sV ds \geq 0 \quad (5.28)$$

and using Young's inequality to the first, fourth and fifth terms on the right-hand side of (5.27), we obtain $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\phi'_U(t) \geq \frac{\alpha\chi_1 n}{2d_3} \psi_U(t) - c_4 s_0^{3-b_1-\frac{4}{n}} \left(1 + 2s_0^{\frac{4}{n}}\right)$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. Hence, from (5.18) and the fact that $s_0 < R^n$ it follows that

$$\phi'_U(t) \geq c_5 s_0^{-(3-b_1)} \phi_U^2(t) - c_4 (1 + 2R^4) s_0^{3-b_1-\frac{4}{n}}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$ with some $c_5 > 0$, which means that (5.25) holds with $c_1 = c_5$ and $c_2 = c_4(1 + 2R^4)$. Next, we consider the case $\kappa_1 = 2$. In light of the condition for χ_1 in (5.3) we can make sure that (5.26) and the relation $2 - \frac{4}{n} > 1 + \frac{d_3\mu_1}{\alpha\chi_1}$ hold, and thereby take $b_2 \in \left(1 + \max\left\{\frac{a_1}{\beta}, \frac{1}{\alpha}\right\} \cdot \frac{d_3\mu_1}{\chi_1}, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\right)$. By means of Lemmas 5.3–5.5, there exists $c_6 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_U(t) &\geq -c_6 s_0^{\frac{3-b_2}{2}-\frac{2}{n}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha\chi_1 n}{d_3} - \frac{\mu_1 n}{b_2 - 1}\right) \psi_U(t) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\beta\chi_1 n}{d_3} - \frac{a_1\mu_1 n}{b_2 - 1}\right) \int_0^{s_0} s^{-b_2}(s_0 - s) U_s V ds \\ &\quad - c_6 s_0^{\frac{3-b_2}{2}} \sqrt{\psi_U(t)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$. By the condition $b_2 > 1 + \max\left\{\frac{a_1}{\beta}, \frac{1}{\alpha}\right\} \cdot \frac{d_3\mu_1}{\chi_1}$, the identity (5.28) with b_1 replaced with b_2 holds. Furthermore we deduce that

$$\frac{\alpha\chi_1 n}{d_3} - \frac{\mu_1 n}{b_2 - 1} > 0.$$

Therefore, as in the case $\kappa_1 \in (1, 2)$, Young's inequality and (5.18) as well as the fact that $s_0 < R^n$ provide that

$$\phi'_U(t) \geq c_7 s_0^{-(3-b_2)} \phi_U^2(t) - c_8 s_0^{3-b_2-\frac{4}{n}}$$

for all $t \in (0, \min\{1, T_{\max}\})$ with some $c_7 > 0$ and $c_8 > 0$.

We next show that T_{\max} is finite. Now we pick $b \in \left(1, 2 - \frac{4}{n}\right)$ such that (5.25) holds. Let us fix $s_0 \in (0, R^n)$ so small satisfying

$$\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}} s_0^{1-\frac{2}{n}} + \frac{2}{c_1} s_0 \leq \frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n},$$

and hence

$$\frac{\widetilde{M}_0}{2^{3-b}\omega_n} s_0^{2-b} \geq \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}} s_0^{3-b-\frac{2}{n}} + \frac{2}{c_1} s_0^{3-b}.$$

Then, putting $r_\star := \left(\frac{s_0}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \in (0, R)$ and taking the initial data u_0 with (2.1), (5.2) and (5.4), we obtain that $T_{\max} < \infty$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, which means the end of the proof. \square

References

- [1] X. Bai and M. Winkler. Equilibration in a fully parabolic two-species chemotaxis system with competitive kinetics. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 65:553–583, 2016.
- [2] 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.*, 25:1663–1763, 2015.
- [3] T. Black, M. Fuest, and J. Lankeit. Relaxed parameter conditions for chemotactic collapse in logistic-type parabolic–elliptic Keller–Segel systems. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 72:96, 2021.
- [4] T. Black, J. Lankeit, and M. Mizukami. On the weakly competitive case in a two-species chemotaxis model. *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 81:860–876, 2016.
- [5] P. N. Brown. Decay to uniform states in ecological interactions. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 38:22–37, 1980.
- [6] T. Cieřlak and M. Winkler. Finite-time blow-up in a quasilinear system of chemotaxis. *Nonlinearity*, 21:1057–1076, 2008.
- [7] E. D. Conway and J. A. Smoller. A comparison technique for systems of reaction-diffusion equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 2:679–697, 1977.
- [8] P. de Mottoni and F. Rothe. Convergence to homogeneous equilibrium state for generalized Volterra–Lotka systems with diffusion. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 37:648–663, 1979.
- [9] A. Friedman. *Partial differential equations*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York-Montreal, Que.-London, 1969.
- [10] M. Fuest. Blow-up profiles in quasilinear fully parabolic Keller–Segel systems. *Nonlinearity*, 33:2306–2334, 2020.
- [11] M. Fuest. Approaching optimality in blow-up results for Keller–Segel systems with logistic-type dampening. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 28:16, 2021.
- [12] W. Jäger and S. Luckhaus. On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modelling chemotaxis. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 329:819–824, 1992.
- [13] Y. Kan-on and E. Yanagida. Existence of non-constant stable equilibria in competition diffusion equations. *Hiroshima Math. J.*, 23:193–221, 1993.
- [14] E. F. Keller and L. A. Segel. Traveling bands of chemotactic bacteria: A theoretical analysis. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 30:235–248, 1971.
- [15] E.F. Keller and L.A. Segel. Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 26:399–415, 1970.

- [16] K. Kishimoto and H. F. Weinberger. The spatial homogeneity of stable equilibria of some reaction-diffusion systems on convex domains. *J. Differential Equations*, 58:15–21, 1985.
- [17] K. Lin, C. Mu, and L. Wang. Boundedness in a two-species chemotaxis system. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 38:5085–5096, 2015.
- [18] Y. Lou and W.-M. Ni. Diffusion, self-diffusion and cross-diffusion. *J. Differential Equations*, 131:79–131, 1996.
- [19] H. Matano and M. Mimura. Pattern formation in competition-diffusion systems in nonconvex domains. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 19:1049–1079, 1983.
- [20] M. Mizukami. Boundedness and asymptotic stability in a two-species chemotaxis-competition model with signal-dependent sensitivity. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 22:2301–2319, 2017.
- [21] M. Mizukami. Boundedness and stabilization in a two-species chemotaxis-competition system of parabolic–parabolic–elliptic type. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 41:234–249, 2018.
- [22] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical biology. II Spatial models and biomedical applications*, volume 18 of *Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2003.
- [23] C. Stinner, J. I. Tello, and M. Winkler. Competitive exclusion in a two-species chemotaxis model. *J. Math. Biol.*, 68:1607–1626, 2014.
- [24] J. I. Tello and M. Winkler. Stabilization in a two-species chemotaxis system with a logistic source. *Nonlinearity*, 25:1413–1425, 2012.
- [25] J.I. Tello and M. Winkler. A chemotaxis system with logistic source. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32:849–877, 2007.
- [26] X. Tu and S. Qiu. Finite-time blow-up and global boundedness for chemotaxis system with strong logistic dampening. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 486:123876, 25, 2020.
- [27] M. Winkler. Blow-up in a higher-dimensional chemotaxis system despite logistic growth restriction. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 384:261–272, 2011.
- [28] M. Winkler. A critical blow-up exponent in a chemotaxis system with nonlinear signal production. *Nonlinearity*, 31:2031–2056, 2018.
- [29] M. Winkler. Finite-time blow-up in low-dimensional Keller–Segel systems with logistic-type superlinear degradation. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 69:Art. 69, 40, 2018.