




we show that if $\theta > 0$, the solution (u, v, w) will converge to $(0, 0, w)$ in L^∞ with some $w > 0$ as time tends to infinity, while if $\theta = 0$, the solution (u, v, w) will asymptotically converge to $(u, u, 0)$ in L^∞ with $u = \frac{1}{\alpha} (u_0 - L^1 + \alpha w_0 - L^1)$ if $D > 0$ is suitably large.

© 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

MSC: 35A01; 35B40; 35B44; 35K57; 35Q92; 92C17

Keywords: Density-dependent Motility; Global existence; Asymptotic stability

1. Introduction and main results

The reaction-diffusion models can generate a wide variety of exquisite spatio-temporal patterns arising in embryogenesis and development due to the diffusion-driven (Turing) instability [16,21]. In addition, colonies of bacteria and eukaryotes can also generate rich and complex patterns driven by chemotaxis, which typically result from coordinated cell movement, growth and differentiation that often involve the detection and processing of extracellular signals [5,6]. Many of these models invoke nonlinear diffusion which is enhanced by the local environment condition because of population pressure (cf. [20]), volume exclusion (cf. [8,22]) or avoidance of danger (cf. [21]) and so on. By employing a synthetic biology approach, the authors of [17] introduced the so-called “self-trapping” mechanism into programmed bacterial *Eshcherichia coli* cells which excrete signalling molecules acyl-homoserine lactone (AHL) such that at low AHL level, the bacteria undergo run-and-tumble random motion and are motile, while at high AHL levels, the bacteria tumble incessantly and become immotile due to the vanishing macroscopic motility. As a result, *Eshcherichia coli* cells formed the outward expanding stripe (wave) patterns in the petri dish. To gain a quantitative understanding of the patterning process in the experiment, the following three-component reaction-diffusion system has been proposed in [17]:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \gamma(v)u + \frac{\alpha w^2 u}{w^2 + \lambda}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t = D \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ w_t = \Delta w - \frac{w^2 u}{w^2 + \lambda}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $u(x, t)$, $v(x, t)$, $w(x, t)$ denote the bacterial cell density, concentration of acyl-homoserine lactone (AHL) and nutrient density, respectively; $\alpha, \lambda, D > 0$ are constants and Ω is bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$). The first equation of (1.1) describes the random motion of bacterial cells with an AHL-dependent motility coefficient $\gamma(v)$, and a cell growth due to the nutrient intake. The second equation of (1.1) describes the diffusion, production and turnover of AHL, while the third equation provides the dynamics of diffusion and consumption for the nutrient. The prominent feature of the system (1.1) is that the cell diffusion rate depends on a motility function $\gamma(v)$ satisfying $\gamma'(v) < 0$, which takes into account the repressive effect of AHL concentration on the cell motility (cf. [17]).

Though the system (1.1) may numerically reproduce some key features of experimental observations as illustrated in [17], the mathematical analysis remains open. Later an alternative simplified two-component so-called “density-suppressed motility” model was proposed in [9]:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_t = \end{array} \right.$$

$$\begin{cases} u_t = -(\gamma(v)u) + \alpha u F(w) - \theta u, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t = D \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ w_t = -\Delta w - u F(w), & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ (u, v, w)(x, 0) = (u_0, v_0, w_0)(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $\theta \geq 0$ accounts for the natural death rate. We assume that the motility function $\gamma(v)$ satisfies the assumption (H1) as used in [30] and the intake rate function $F(w)$ satisfies the following conditions

(H2) $F(w) \in C^1([0, \infty))$, $F(0) = 0$, $F(w) > 0$ in $(0, \infty)$ and $F'(w) > 0$ on $[0, \infty)$.

The conditions in (H2) can be satisfied by a wide class of functions such as

$$F(w) =$$

(1) If $\theta > 0$, then it holds that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|w(\cdot, t) - w\|_{L^\infty}) = 0,$$

where $w > 0$ is a constant determined by $w = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} w_0$ and $\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} u F(w)$.

(2) If $\theta = 0$, there exists a constant $D_0 > 0$ such that if $D > D_0$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|u(\cdot, t) - u\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t) - u\|_{L^\infty} + \|w(\cdot, t) - u\|_{L^\infty}) = 0,$$

where $u = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} (\int_{\Omega} u_0 + \alpha \int_{\Omega} w_0)$.

Remark 1.1. The results of Theorem 1.2 hold for any $\alpha \geq 0$. In the case $\theta = 0$ and $\alpha = 0$, the system (1.3) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \gamma(v)u, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t = D \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ (u, v)(x, 0) = (u_0, v_0)(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

The global existence of classical solutions of (1.5) in two dimensions has been established in [30], whereas the large time behavior of solution is left open. The result of Theorem 1.2(2) solves this open question for large $D > 0$.

Sketch the proof. With the special structure of the first equation of (1.3), we shall use some ideas in [12,30] to show the boundedness of solutions. More precisely, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a self-adjoint realization of $\gamma(v)\Delta$ (see more details in [24]) defined on $D(\mathcal{A}) := \{\varphi \in W^{2,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} \varphi = 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega\}$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the self-adjoint realization of $\Delta + \delta$ under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions in $L^2(\Omega)$ for some $\delta > 0$. We can use the first and third equations of (1.3) to obtain

$$(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})_t + \mathcal{A}(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w - \overline{\gamma(v)u} - \alpha \bar{w}) = 0, \text{ if } \theta = 0,$$

and

$$(u + \alpha w)_t + \mathcal{B}(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w) = (\delta \gamma(v) - \theta)u + \delta \alpha w, \text{ if } \theta > 0,$$

which enable us to find a constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of D and α such that $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \leq c_1(1+\alpha)^2$ for some appropriately small $\tau \in (0, 1]$. Using the smoothing properties of the second equation of (1.3) we can obtain the boundedness of $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2$ and $\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} |v|^2$. Then we use the direct L^2 estimate of u as developed in [12] to find two positive constants c_2, c_3 independent of D and α such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2} \leq c_2(1+\alpha)e^{c_3(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}),$$

see Lemma 3.3 for details. Then using the routine bootstrap argument and Moser-iteration method, we derive that $u(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \leq M$ with M satisfying (1.4).

To study the asymptotic behavior, we divide our proofs into two cases: $\theta > 0$ and $\theta = 0$. When $\theta > 0$, we can obtain from the first equation of (1.3) that $\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u < \infty$, which combined with the relative compactness of $(u(\cdot, t))_{t>1}$ in $C(\bar{\Omega})$ (see Lemma 4.1) gives $u(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ and hence $v(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ from the second equation of (1.3). Then using the semigroup estimates and the decay property of u , from the third equation we can show that $w(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for some $w > 0$, where $w > 0$ is proved by showing

$$\int_\Omega \ln w(x, t) \leq c_4, \text{ for all } t \geq 1$$

for some constant $c_4 > 0$, see Lemma 4.3 for details.

When $\theta = 0$, from the third equation of (1.3) we have

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u F(w) + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 < \infty,$$

which, combined with $u_0 \in L^1$ and $u(\cdot, t) \in L^1$, entails us that

$$w(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, using the relations between M and D in (1.4), we can construct a L^2 energy functional of (u, v) which along with suitable regularity of (u, v) finally leads to the convergence of (u, v) as claimed. $\square$

2. Local existence and Preliminaries

The existence and uniqueness of local solutions of (1.3) can be readily proved by the Amann's theorem [3,4] (cf. also [32, Lemma 2.6]) or the fixed point theorem along with the parabolic regularity theory [12,29]. We omit the details of the proof for brevity.

Lemma 2.1 (Local existence). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and the assumptions (H1) and (H2) hold. Assume $(u_0, v_0, w_0) \in [W^{1,\infty}(\bar{\Omega})]^3$ with $u_0, v_0, w_0 \geq 0$. Then there exists $T_{\max} \in (0, \infty]$ such that the problem (1.3) has a unique classical solution $(u, v, w) \in [C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max}))]^3$ satisfying $u, v, w > 0$ for all $t > 0$. Moreover,*

$$\text{if } T_{\max} < \infty, \text{ then } u(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \nearrow T_{\max}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *The solution (u, v, w) of (1.3) satisfies*

$$u(\cdot, t)_{L^1} + \alpha w(\cdot, t)_{L^1} + \theta \int_0^t u(\cdot, s)_{L^1} = u_0_{L^1} + \alpha w_0_{L^1}, \quad t \in (0, T_{\max}), \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$w(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty \text{ is decreasing in } t. \quad (2.2)$$

Moreover, for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T_{\max})$, it follows that

$$F(w(x, t)) \leq C_F = F(w_0) \in L^\infty. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. We first multiply the third equation of (1.3) by α and add the resulting equation to the first equation of (1.3). Then integrating the result over $\Omega \times (0, t)$, we have (2.1) directly. The application of the maximum principle to the third equation of (1.3) gives (2.2). Furthermore, since $F'(w) > 0$ for all $w > 0$, one has (2.3) by using (2.2). $\square$

Next, we list some well-known estimates for the Neumann heat semigroup for later use.

Lemma 2.3 ([33]). *Let $(e^t)_t \geq 0$ be the Neumann heat semigroup in Ω , and let $\lambda_1 > 0$ denote the first nonzero eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ in Ω under Neumann boundary conditions. Then for all $t > 0$, there exist some constants k_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) depending only on Ω such that*

(i) *If $1 \leq q \leq p < \infty$, then*

$$e^t \|z\|_{L^p} \leq k_1 \left(1 + t^{-\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}\right) e^{-\lambda_1 t} \|z\|_{L^q} \quad (2.4)$$

for all $z \in L^q(\Omega)$ satisfying $\int_\Omega z = 0$.

(ii) *If $1 \leq q \leq p < \infty$, then*

$$\|\nabla e^t z\|_{L^p} \leq k_2 \left(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}\right) e^{-\lambda_1 t} \|z\|_{L^q} \quad (2.5)$$

for all $z \in L^q(\Omega)$.

(iii) *If $2 \leq q \leq p < \infty$, then*

$$\|\nabla e^t z\|_{L^p} \leq k_3 \left(1 + t^{-\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}\right) e^{-\lambda_1 t} \|\nabla z\|_{L^q} \quad (2.6)$$

for all $z \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The following lemma will be used to show the boundedness of solution, one can see [18, Lemma 3.3] or [26, Lemma 3.4] for details.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $T > 0$, $\tau \in (0, T)$, $a > 0$ and $b > 0$. Suppose that $y : [0, T) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is absolutely continuous and fulfils*

$$y'(t) + ay(t) \leq h(t), \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T),$$

with some nonnegative function $h \in L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, T))$ satisfying

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} h(s) ds \leq b, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T - \tau).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A} \left(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w - \overline{\gamma(v)u} - \alpha \bar{w} \right) \mathcal{A}^{-1}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w}) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w}) \left(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w - \overline{\gamma(v)u} - \alpha \bar{w} \right) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)(u - \bar{u})^2 - \alpha^2 \int_{\Omega} (w - \bar{w})^2 - \alpha \int_{\Omega} (1 + \gamma(v))(u - \bar{u})(w - \bar{w}) \\
&\quad - \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)(u - \bar{u}) - \alpha \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)(w - \bar{w}),
\end{aligned}$$

which together with the facts $0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma(v) \leq \gamma_2$ and the nonnegativity of u, w , gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 + \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + \alpha^2 \int_{\Omega} (w - \bar{w})^2 \\
&= -\alpha \int_{\Omega} (1 + \gamma(v))(u - \bar{u})(w - \bar{w}) - \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)(u - \bar{u}) - \alpha \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)(w - \bar{w}) \\
&\quad - \alpha \bar{w} \int_{\Omega} (1 + \gamma(v))u + \alpha \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} (1 + \gamma(v))w + (\bar{u}^2 + \alpha \bar{u} \bar{w}) \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v) \\
&\quad \frac{2\alpha + 3\alpha\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1} \|w - \bar{w}\|_{L^1} + \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

in which we have used the fact $\int_{\Omega} (\varphi - \bar{\varphi})^2 = \int_{\Omega} \varphi^2 - \bar{\varphi}^2$ for all $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)$. We know from Lemma 2.2 that $\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1} \leq \|u_0 - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1} + \alpha \|w_0 - \bar{w}_0\|_{L^1} \leq (\|u_0 - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty} + \alpha \|w_0 - \bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty})$ and $\|w - \bar{w}\|_{L^1} \leq \|w_0 - \bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}$. Therefore, (3.5) shows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 + 2\gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + 2\alpha^2 \int_{\Omega} (w - \bar{w})^2 \\
&\leq c_1(1 + \alpha)^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $c_1 = 4(1 + 2\gamma_2) (\|u_0 - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|w_0 - \bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty})^2$. Because of $\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w}) = 0$, we can apply the Poincaré inequality with a positive constant c_2 and the fact $\|w - \bar{w}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|w_0 - \bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 \\
 & \quad c_2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 \\
 & = c_2 \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 \\
 & \quad 2c_2 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + 2c_2 \alpha^2 \int_{\Omega} (w - \bar{w})^2 \\
 & \quad 2c_2 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + 2c_2 \alpha^2 \|\bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Substituting (3.7) into (3.6), and letting $X(t) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2$, one yields

$$X'(t) + \frac{\gamma_1}{2c_2} X(t) + \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 = c_3(1 + \alpha)^2, \tag{3.8}$$

where $c_3 = c_1 + \gamma_1 \|\bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}^2$. Then applying the Grönwall's inequality to (3.8), we first obtain

$$X(t) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w - \bar{u} - \alpha \bar{w})^2 = c_4(1 + \alpha)^2, \tag{3.9}$$

where $c_4 = \frac{2c_2c_3}{\gamma_1} + 2c_2 \|\bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}^2$. Then integrating (3.8) over $(t, t + \tau)$ with $\tau := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2}T_{\max} \right\}$ and using (3.9), one has

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 = \frac{c_3\tau + c_4}{\gamma_1} (1 + \alpha)^2 = \frac{c_3 + c_4}{\gamma_1} (1 + \alpha)^2. \tag{3.10}$$

By the fact $\int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 = \int_{\Omega} u^2 - \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2$, it follows from (3.10) that

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 = \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 = \frac{c_3 + c_4}{\gamma_1} (1 + \alpha)^2 + \bar{u}^2 \tau,$$

which yields (3.1) by using the fact $\bar{u} = \|\bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty} + \alpha \|\bar{w}_0\|_{L^\infty}$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi \big|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\Omega} \psi \mathcal{B}^{-1} \psi - c_5 \big| \psi \big|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in L^2(\Omega), \quad (3.12)$$

one can see the details in [18]. From the system (1.3), we have

$$(u + \alpha w)_t = \gamma(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w) - \theta u,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$(u + \alpha w)_t + \mathcal{B}(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w) = \delta(\gamma(v)u + \alpha w) - \theta u = (\delta\gamma(v) - \theta)u + \delta\alpha w. \quad (3.13)$$

With the fact $0 < \delta < \frac{\theta}{\gamma_2}$ and the boundedness of w , we derive

$$(\delta\gamma(v) - \theta)u + \delta\alpha w \leq (\delta\gamma_2 - \theta)u + \delta\alpha \|w\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_6\alpha, \quad (3.14)$$

where $c_6 = \frac{\theta \|w\|_{L^\infty}}{\gamma_2}$. Hence, multiplying (3.13) by $\mathcal{B}^{-1}(u + \alpha w) \geq 0$, and using (3.14), one has

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w) \big|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\Omega} (\gamma(v)u + \alpha w)(u + \alpha w) \leq c_6\alpha \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-1}(u + \alpha w),$$

and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w) \big|_{L^2}^2 + 2c_7 \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w)^2 \leq 2c_6\alpha \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-1}(u + \alpha w), \quad (3.15)$$

with $c_7 := \min\{\gamma_1, 1\}$. Using (3.11) and (3.12), we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{c_7}{2c_5} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w) \big|_{L^2}^2 + 2c_6\alpha \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-1}(u + \alpha w) \\ & \leq \frac{c_7}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w)^2 + 2c_5c_6\alpha \big| \mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w) \big|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq c_7 \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w)^2 + \frac{2c_5^2c_6^2}{c_7} \alpha^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Substituting (3.16) into (3.15), and defining $Y(t) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u + \alpha w) \big|_{L^2}^2$, one has

$$Y'(t) + \frac{c_7}{2c_5} Y(t) + c_7 \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w)^2 \leq \frac{2c_5^2c_6^2}{c_7} \alpha^2,$$

which combined with the Grönwall's inequality gives

$$Y(t) \leq c_5 \left((u_0)_{L^\infty} + (w_0)_{L^\infty} \right)^2 + \frac{4c_5^2 c_6^2}{c_7^2} (1 + \alpha)^2 := c_8(1 + \alpha)^2$$

and thus

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \leq \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u + \alpha w)^2 \leq \frac{Y(t)}{c_7} + \frac{2c_5^2 c_6^2}{c_7^2} \tau \alpha^2 \leq c_9(1 + \alpha)^2,$$

where $c_9 = \frac{c_8}{c_7} + \frac{2c_5^2 c_6^2}{c_7^2} \tau$, which gives (3.1). Then we complete the proof of this lemma. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there exist two positive constants K_2, K_3 independent of D, α and t such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 \leq K_2(1 + \alpha)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}), \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 \leq K_3(1 + \alpha)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right)^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \tilde{T}_{\max}). \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. We multiply the second equation of (1.3) by $|v|$ and integrate the result with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 &= -D \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 - \int_{\Omega} u |v| + \int_{\Omega} v |v| \\ &\leq \frac{D}{2} \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 + \frac{1}{2D} \int_{\Omega} u^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 \leq \max \left\{ |\nabla v_0|^2_{L^2} + \frac{K_1(1+\alpha)^2}{D}, \frac{K_1(1+\alpha)^2}{2D\tau} + \frac{2K_1(1+\alpha)^2}{D} \right\} \\ |\nabla v_0|^2_{L^2} + \frac{2K_1(1+\alpha)^2}{D} + \frac{K_1(1+\alpha)^2}{2D\tau} \\ \left(|\nabla v_0|^2_{L^2} + 2K_1 + \frac{K_1}{2\tau} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right) (1+\alpha)^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}),$$

which yields (3.17) with $K_2 = |\nabla v_0|^2_{L^2} + 2K_1 + \frac{K_1}{2\tau}$. On the other hand, integrating (3.19) over $(t, t + \tau)$ for $t \in (0, \tilde{T}_{\max})$ and using (3.17), we can derive that

$$D \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{1}{D} \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\Omega} u^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 \\ \frac{K_1}{D} (1+\alpha)^2 + K_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right) (1+\alpha)^2,$$

which implies (3.18) with $K_3 = K_1 + K_2$. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there exist two positive constants K_4 and K_5 , which are independent of D and α , such that*

$$u(\cdot, t) \leq_{L^2} K_4(1+\alpha)e^{K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}). \quad (3.21)$$

Proof. Multiplying the first equation of (1.3) by u and integrating the result with assumptions (H1) and (2.3) gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 = \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla (\gamma(v)u) + \alpha \int_{\Omega} F(w)u^2 - \theta \int_{\Omega} u^2 \\ \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v) |\nabla u|^2 - \int_{\Omega} \gamma'(v)u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^2 \\ \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \eta \int_{\Omega} u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^2 \\ \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^2,$$

which yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 + \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \frac{\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 + 2\alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^2. \quad (3.22)$$

Moreover, applying Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Young inequality to the first term on the right hand side of (3.22), we obtain a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|u\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \left(\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \gamma_1 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \left(2 + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{2\gamma_1^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{2\gamma_1^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Substituting (3.23) into (3.22), and using (3.17), we conclude

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c_2(1+\alpha)^4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2 (1 + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2) \|u\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (3.24)$$

where $c_2 = \frac{c_1 \eta^2}{\gamma_1} \left(2K_2 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{c_1 \eta^2 K_2 (1+K_2)}{2\gamma_1^2} \right) + 2C_F$. On the other hand, using the facts (3.1) and (3.18), then for any $t \in (0, T_{max})$, we can find a $t_0 > 0$ satisfying $t_0 \in (0, \tilde{T}_{max})$ and $t_0 \in ((t - \tau)^+, t)$ such that

$$u(\cdot, t_0) \leq c_3(1+\alpha)^2, \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 \leq K_3(1+\alpha)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2, \quad (3.26)$$

with $c_3 = \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{K_1}{\tau}$. Then we integrate (3.24) over (t_0, t) , and use the facts (3.25), (3.26) and $t - t_0 + \tau \leq t_0 + 1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 & \leq \|u(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 e^{c_2(1+\alpha)^4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2 \int_{t_0}^t (1 + \|\nabla v(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2}^2) ds} \\ & \leq \|u(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 e^{c_2(1+\alpha)^4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2 \int_{t_0}^t ds + c_2(1+\alpha)^4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.21) with $K_4 = c_3$ and $K_5 = c_2(1 + K_3)$. Then we finish the proof of this lemma. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1.1 hold. Let (u, v, w) be the solution of the system (1.3). Then it holds that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^4} \leq K_6(1 + \alpha)^3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2 e^{3K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}), \quad (3.27)$$

where $K_6 > 0$ is a constant independent of α , D and t .

Proof. With the fact that $0 \leq F(w) \leq C_F$ from (2.3) and the assumptions (H1), we multiply the first equation of (1.3) with u^3 and integrate the result to have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^4 &= 3 \int_{\Omega} u^2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla (\gamma(v)u) + \alpha \int_{\Omega} F(w)u^4 - \theta \int_{\Omega} u^4 \\ &\quad - 3 \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)u^2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u^2 - 3 \int_{\Omega} \gamma'(v)u^3 \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^4 \\ &\quad - 3\gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} u^2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u^2 + 3\eta \int_{\Omega} u^3 \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^4 \\ &\quad - \frac{3\gamma_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \nabla u \cdot \nabla u^2 + \frac{3\eta^2}{2\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^4 \nabla v \cdot \nabla v^2 + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^4, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^4 + \frac{3\gamma_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u^2 \cdot \nabla u^2 \leq \frac{6\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^4 \nabla v \cdot \nabla v^2 + 4\alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^4. \quad (3.28)$$

Using Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Young's inequality, along with the facts (3.33) and $\|u^2\|_{L^1} = \|u\|_{L^2}^2$, we can find a constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of α and D , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{6\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} u^4 \nabla v \cdot \nabla v^2 &\leq \frac{6\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^8 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{6\eta^2}{\gamma_1} \|u^2\|_{L^4}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{6\eta^2 c_1}{\gamma_1} \left(\|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u^2\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u^2\|_{L^1}^2 \right) \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{6\eta^2 c_1}{\gamma_1} \|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 + \frac{6\eta^2 c_1}{\gamma_1} \|u\|_{L^2}^4 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\gamma_1 \|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^2 + c_2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^4 (\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^6 + 1), \quad (3.29)$$

where

$$c_2 := \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{3}{4\gamma_1} \right)^3 \left(\frac{6\eta^2 c_1}{\gamma_1} \right)^4 + \frac{6\eta^2 c_1}{\gamma_1}.$$

Furthermore, using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Young's inequality again, we can find a constant $c_3 > 0$ independent of D and α , such that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + 4\alpha C_F) \int_{\Omega} u^4 &= (1 + 4\alpha C_F) \|u^2\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq c_3(1 + 4\alpha C_F) \left(\|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u^2\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u^2\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \right) \\ &\leq c_3(1 + 4\alpha C_F) \left(\|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u\|_{L^1} + \|u\|_{L^1}^4 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \|\nabla u^2\|_{L^2}^2 + c_4(1 + \alpha)^8, \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

where $c_4 = \left(\frac{c_3^4}{4} (4C_F + 1)^4 \left(\frac{3}{2\gamma_1} \right)^3 + c_3(4C_F + 1) \right) (\|u_0\|_{L^1} + \|w_0\|_{L^1})^4$. Substituting (3.29) and (3.30) into (3.28), one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^4 + \int_{\Omega} u^4 \leq c_2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^4 (\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}^6 + 1) + c_4(1 + \alpha)^8 \quad (3.31)$$

By the scaling $\tilde{t} = Dt$, and applying the variation-of-constants formula to the second equation of (1.3), one has

$$v(\cdot, \tilde{t}) = e^{(\cdot - \frac{1}{D})\tilde{t}} v_0 + \frac{1}{D} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} e^{(\cdot - \frac{1}{D})(\tilde{t} - s)} u(\cdot, s) ds. \quad (3.32)$$

Then using the semigroup estimates (2.5) and (2.6), we derive from (3.32)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla v(\cdot, \tilde{t})\|_{L^4} &\leq \|\nabla e^{(\cdot - \frac{1}{D})\tilde{t}} v_0\|_{L^4} + \frac{1}{D} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \|\nabla e^{(\cdot - \frac{1}{D})(\tilde{t} - s)} u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^4} ds \\ &\leq k_1 e^{-\lambda_1 \tilde{t}} \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^4} + \frac{k_2}{D} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \left(1 + (\tilde{t} - s)^{\frac{3}{4}} \right) e^{-\lambda_1(\tilde{t} - s)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\leq k_1 \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^4} + \frac{k_2 K_4}{D \lambda_1} \left(1 + (1/4) \lambda_1^{\frac{3}{4}} \right) (1 + \alpha) e^{K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\nabla v(\cdot, t)_{L^4} \leq c_5(1 + \alpha) \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right) e^{K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}, \quad (3.33)$$

with $c_5 = k_1 \nabla v_0_{L^4} + \frac{k_2 K_4}{\lambda_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_1^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$. Then substituting (3.33) into (3.31), one can find a constant $c_6 := c_2 K_4^4 c_5^2 (c_5^6 + 1) + c_4$ to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^4 + \int_{\Omega} u^4 \leq c_6(1 + \alpha)^{12} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^8 e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}.$$

This along with the Grönwall's inequality yields a constant $c_7 = c_6 + u_0^4_{L^4}$ independent of D and α so that

$$\begin{aligned} u(\cdot, t)_{L^4} &\leq u_0^4_{L^4} + c_6(1 + \alpha)^{12} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^8 e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4} \\ &\leq c_7(1 + \alpha)^{12} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^8 e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.27). $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let the conditions in Lemma 3.4 hold. Suppose (u, v, w) is a solution of (1.3). Then it follows that*

$$u(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \leq K_7(1 + \alpha)^{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^{12} e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}), \quad (3.34)$$

where the constant $K_7 > 0$ is independent of D and α .

Proof. Using (2.5), (3.27) and the estimate $\nabla e^{(\frac{1}{D})\tilde{t}} v_0_{L^\infty} \leq c_1 v_0_{W^{1,\infty}}$ for all $\tilde{t} > 0$ (see [10]), from (3.32) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla v(\cdot, \tilde{t})_{L^\infty} &\leq \nabla e^{(\frac{1}{D})\tilde{t}} v_0_{L^\infty} + \frac{1}{D} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \nabla e^{(\frac{1}{D})(\tilde{t}-s)} u(\cdot, s)_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\leq c_1 v_0_{W^{1,\infty}} + \frac{k_2}{D} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \left(1 + (\tilde{t}-s)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right) e^{-\lambda_1(\tilde{t}-s)} u(\cdot, s)_{L^4} ds \\ &\leq c_1 v_0_{W^{1,\infty}} + \frac{k_2 K_6}{D \lambda_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_1^{\frac{3}{4}}\right) (1 + \alpha)^3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^2 e^{3K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4} \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\nabla v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_2(1+\alpha)^3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^3 e^{3K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}, \quad (3.35)$$

where $c_2 := c_1 \|v_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \frac{k_2 K_6}{\lambda_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_1^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$. With (2.3) and (3.35), we multiply the first equation of (1.3) by $u^{p-1}(p-2)$ and integrate the result to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p &= (p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla(\gamma(v)u) + \alpha \int_{\Omega} F(w)u^p - \theta \int_{\Omega} u^p \\ &\quad - (p-1) \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v)u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 - (p-1) \int_{\Omega} \gamma'(v)u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^p \\ &\quad - \gamma_1(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \eta(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \alpha C_F \int_{\Omega} u^p \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_1(p-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{2\gamma_1}(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha C_F(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p \\ &\quad - \frac{\gamma_1(p-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \mathcal{K}_D(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p, \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_D$ is independent of p and defined by

$$\mathcal{K}_D := \left(\frac{\eta^2 c_2^2}{2\gamma_1} + C_F \right) (1+\alpha)^6 \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^6 e^{6K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}.$$

Then using the identity $\int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} \nabla u = \frac{4}{p^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{p}{2}}$, from (3.36) one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p + p(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p = \frac{2\gamma_1(p-1)}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{p}{2}} + (\mathcal{K}_D + 1)p(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p. \quad (3.37)$$

Using the interpolation inequality and Young's inequality with ε , then for all $f \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, one has

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla f\|_{L^2}^2 + c_3(1+\varepsilon^{-1}) \|f\|_{L^1}^2 \quad (3.38)$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where $c_3 > 0$ only depends on Ω . Then letting $f = u^{\frac{p}{2}}$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{2\gamma_1}{p^2(\mathcal{K}_D+1)}$ in (3.38), we can derive that

$$(\mathcal{K}_D + 1)p(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p - \frac{2\gamma_1(p-1)}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_D p(p-1)(1+p^2) \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^2, \quad (3.39)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_D &= \frac{c_3(1+2\gamma_1)}{2\gamma_1}(\mathcal{K}_D+1)^2 \\ &= \frac{c_3(1+2\gamma_1)}{2\gamma_1} \left(\frac{\eta^2 c_2^2}{2\gamma_1} + C_F + 1 \right)^2 (1+\alpha)^{12} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right)^{12} e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.39) into (3.37) and using the fact $1+p^2 \leq (1+p)^2$, one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^p + p(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^p \leq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_D p(p-1)(1+p)^2 \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^2,$$

which gives

$$\int_{\Omega} u^p(x, t) \leq \int_{\Omega} u_0^p(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_D(1+p)^2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{\max}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{p}{2}}(x, t) \right)^2. \quad (3.40)$$

Then using the Moser iteration [2] (see also the similar argument as in [27,28]), from (3.40) one has

$$u(\cdot, t) \leq_{L^\infty} 2^6 \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_D(1+\frac{1}{D})(1+\alpha)(u_0 \leq_{L^\infty} + w_0 \leq_{L^\infty}),$$

which gives (3.34). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For any fixed $D > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, from Lemma 3.5, we can find a constant $C > 0$ independent of t such that

$$u(\cdot, t) \leq_{L^\infty} C(1+\alpha)^{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D} \right)^{12} e^{12K_5(1+\alpha)^6(1+\frac{1}{D})^4},$$

which combined with the local existence results in Lemma 2.1 proves Theorem 1.1. $\square$

4. Asymptotic behavior (Proof of Theorem 1.2)

In this section, we will derive the asymptotic behavior of solutions as shown in Theorem 1.2. Before embarking on these details, we first use the standard parabolic property to improve the regularity of u , v and w as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (u, v, w) be the nonnegative global classical solution of (1.3) obtained in Theorem 1.1. Then there exist $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$u(\cdot, t) \leq_{C^{\sigma, \frac{\sigma}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [t, t+1])} C \quad \text{for all } t > 1 \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$v(\cdot, t) \in C^{2+\sigma, 1+\frac{\sigma}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [t, t+1]) + W^{2+\sigma, 1+\frac{\sigma}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [t, t+1]) \subset C \quad \text{for all } t > 1. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Let $A(x, t, u, \nabla u) = \gamma(v)\nabla u + \gamma'(v)u\nabla v$ and $B(x, t, u) = \alpha F(w)u - \theta u$. Then we can rewrite the first equation of (1.3) as follows

$$u_t = \nabla \cdot A(x, t, u, \nabla u) + B(x, t, u).$$

Noting that Theorem 1.1 gives two positive constants c_1 and c_2 satisfying $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_1$ and $\|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|w\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq c_2$, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, t, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u &= (\gamma(v)\nabla u + u\gamma'(v)\nabla v) \cdot \nabla u \\ &= \gamma(v) |\nabla u|^2 + \gamma'(v)u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \\ &= \frac{\gamma(v)}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\gamma'(v))^2}{2\gamma(v)} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 \\ &= \frac{\gamma_2}{2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{c_1^2 c_2^2 \eta^2}{2\gamma_1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, t, u, \nabla u) &= \gamma(v)\nabla u + \gamma'(v)u\nabla v \\ &= \gamma(v) |\nabla u| + \gamma'(v) \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} \\ &= \gamma_2 |\nabla u| + c_1 c_2 \eta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, since (2.3) guarantees $F(w) \leq C_F$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, t, u) &= \alpha F(w)u - \theta u \\ &= \alpha F(w) \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \theta \|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &= c_1(\alpha C_F + \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

With (4.3)–(4.5) in hand, we obtain (4.1) by applying [23, Theorem 1.3]. Furthermore, the standard parabolic regularity combined with (4.1) infers (4.2) directly. $\square$

4.1. Case of $\theta > 0$

In this subsection, we are devoted to studying the large time behavior of solutions for the case $\theta > 0$. Notice that $\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u < \infty$ and the relative compactness of $(u(\cdot, t))_{t>1}$ in $C(\bar{\Omega})$ (see Lemma 4.1) indicate some decay information for u and hence the decay properties of v from the second equation of (1.3). Precisely, we have the following results.

Lemma 4.2. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.2 hold, and suppose $\theta > 0$ and (u, v, w) is the solution of the system (1.3). Then it follows that*

$$u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$v(\cdot, t) \xrightarrow{L^\infty} 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. First, we claim that

$$u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.8)$$

Indeed, defining $A(t) := \int_\Omega u > 0$, we have $\int_0^\infty A(t) = \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u < \infty$ from (2.1). Furthermore, from the first equation of (1.3) and the fact $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ (see Lemma 2.2), we can derive that

$$\int_0^\infty A'(t) = \int_0^\infty \left| \int_\Omega (\alpha F(w) - \theta)u \right| \leq c_1 \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u < \infty,$$

which together with the fact $\int_0^\infty A(t) = \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u < \infty$ gives $A(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This verifies the claim (4.8).

With (4.8) in hand, we shall show (4.6) holds. In fact, if (4.6) is false, we can find a constant $c_2 > 0$ and a time sequence $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (1, \infty)$ satisfying $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$u(\cdot, t_k) \xrightarrow{L^\infty} c_2 \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.9)$$

On the other hand, using (4.1) in Lemma 4.1 and the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we know that $(u(\cdot, t))_{t > 1}$ is relatively compact in $C(\bar{\Omega})$. Hence, we can extract a subsequence, still denoted by $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (1, \infty)$, such that

$$u(\cdot, t_k) \rightarrow u_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which combined with (4.8) implies $u_\infty = 0$. This however contradicts (4.9) and hence (4.6) is proved.

Next, we show (4.7) holds. To this end, we consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} v_t + v = D \Delta v + u, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega, t > 0, \\ v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Let $v(t)$ be solutions of the ODE problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t(t) + v(t) = u(\cdot, t) \xrightarrow{L^\infty}, & t > 0, \\ v(0) = v_0 \xrightarrow{L^\infty}. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

By the comparison principle, we know that $v(t)$ is a super-solution of (4.10) satisfying $v(x, t) \geq v(t)$ for all $x \in \Omega, t > 0$. Similarly, we can prove that $v(x, t) \leq v(t)$ for all $x \in \Omega, t > 0$. Hence, one has

$$v(x, t) = v(t) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega, t > 0. \quad (4.12)$$

On the other hand, from (4.11) and using the fact $u(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$v(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which combined with (4.12) gives

$$v(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} = v(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This yields (4.7) and completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. Suppose the conditions in Lemma 4.2 hold. Let (u, v, w) be the solution of the system (1.3). Then we have the following result

$$w(\cdot, t) - w_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.13)$$

where $w_{L^\infty} > 0$ is a constant determined by $w_{L^\infty} = \frac{1}{\beta} w_0_{L^1} - \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega uF(w)$.

Proof. Let $\bar{w}(t) = \frac{1}{\beta} \int_\Omega w = \frac{1}{\beta} w_{L^1}$, then the third equation of (1.3) can be rewritten as

$$(w - \bar{w})_t = \beta (w - \bar{w}) - uF(w) + \overline{uF(w)}. \quad (4.14)$$

Then applying the variation-of-constants formula to (4.14), we get

$$w(\cdot, t) - \bar{w}(t) = e^{\frac{t}{2}\beta} (w(\cdot, t/2) - \bar{w}(t/2)) - \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t e^{(t-s)\beta} (uF(w) - \overline{uF(w)}) ds,$$

which, together with the fact $w(\cdot, t)_{L^\infty} \leq c_1$ and (2.4), gives

$$\begin{aligned} & w(\cdot, t) - \bar{w}(t)_{L^\infty} \\ & \leq e^{\frac{t}{2}\beta} (w(\cdot, t/2) - \bar{w}(t/2))_{L^\infty} + \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t e^{(t-s)\beta} (uF(w) - \overline{uF(w)})_{L^\infty} ds \\ & \leq k_1 e^{\frac{\lambda_1 t}{2}} w(\cdot, t/2) - \bar{w}(t/2)_{L^\infty} + k_1 C_F \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t e^{(t-s)\lambda_1} u(\cdot, s)_{L^\infty} ds \\ & \leq 2k_1 c_1 e^{\frac{\lambda_1 t}{2}} + \frac{k_1 C_F}{\lambda_1} \sup_{\frac{t}{2} \leq s \leq t} u(\cdot, s)_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Then using the decay property of u in (4.6), from (4.15) one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(\cdot, t) - \bar{w}(t)_{L^\infty} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Next we define a number w by

$$w = \frac{1}{\|\cdot\|_{L^1}} \|w_0\|_{L^1} - \frac{1}{\|\cdot\|_{L^1}} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega uF(w). \quad (4.17)$$

Then integrating the third equation of (1.3) over $\Omega \times (0, t)$, we see that

$$\bar{w}(t) = w + \frac{1}{\|\cdot\|_{L^1}} \int_t^\infty \int_\Omega uF(w),$$

which implies

$$\bar{w}(t) - w \leq \frac{C_F}{\|\cdot\|_{L^1}} \int_t^\infty \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^1} ds \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.18)$$

Then combining (4.16) and (4.18), one has

$$\|w(\cdot, t) - w\|_{L^\infty} = \|w(\cdot, t) - \bar{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\bar{w}(t) - w\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which yields (4.13).

Next, we shall show $w > 0$. Noting $F(w) \in C^1([0, \infty))$ and $F(0) = 0$ and using the boundedness of u and w , we can find $\xi \in (0, w)$ and $\mathcal{K} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{uF(w)}{w} = \frac{F(w) - F(0)}{w} = u = F'(\xi)u \leq F'(\xi) \|u\|_{L^\infty} := \mathcal{K}.$$

Let $\tilde{w}(x, t)$ be the solution of the following system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{w}_t - \Delta \tilde{w} = \mathcal{K}\tilde{w}, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ \tilde{w}(x, 0) = w_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{w}(x, t)$ is a sub-solution of $w(x, t)$ by the comparison principle, and hence

$$w(x, t) \geq \tilde{w}(x, t). \quad (4.19)$$

On the other hand, using [11, Lemma 3.1], we can find a constant $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 1$

$$\tilde{w}(x, t) = e^{-\mathcal{K}t} e^{\eta_0 t} w_0 - e^{-\mathcal{K}t} \eta_0 \int_0^t \int_\Omega w_0,$$

which combined with (4.19) gives

$$w(x, t) = e^{-\kappa t} \int_0^1 w_0, \text{ for all } t \geq 1. \quad (4.20)$$

Multiplying the third equation of (1.3) by $\frac{1}{w}$, and integrating by parts with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln w(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\nabla w|^2}{w^2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(w)}{w} u - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(w)}{w} u,$$

which thus gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln w(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln w(x, 1) - \int_1^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(w)}{w} u. \quad (4.21)$$

Then using (4.20) and the fact $\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} u = c_7$, from (4.21) we can find a constant $c_8 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln w(x, t) \geq -c_8, \text{ for all } t \geq 1,$$

which combined with the fact (4.13) implies $w > 0$. $\square$

In summary, we have the asymptotic behavior of solutions for the system (1.3) with $\theta > 0$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let the conditions of Theorem 1.2 hold and $\theta > 0$, the solution of system (1.3) satisfies*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|w(\cdot, t) - w\|_{L^\infty}) = 0,$$

where $w > 0$ defined by (4.17).

4.2. Case of $\theta = 0$

In this subsection, we shall study the large time behavior of the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$. We first show the decay of w based on some ideas in [34].

Lemma 4.5. *Assume the conditions in Theorem 1.2 hold. Let (u, v, w) be the solution of the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$. Then we have*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} u F(w) < \infty \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} u F(w) = \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} u(F(w) - \bar{F}(w)) + \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} u \bar{F}(w) = I_1(j) + I_2(j). \quad (4.28)$$

Using the Hölder inequality, Poincaré inequality and the boundedness of $u(\cdot, t)_{L^2}$ in (3.21), one has

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1(j)| & \left(\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} (F(w) - \bar{F}(w))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & c_1 \left(\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} (F(w) - \bar{F}(w))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & c_1 \left(c_2 \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla F(w)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & c_3 \left(\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

where we have used (4.23) to derive the convergence. Then combining (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29), one has $I_2(j) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, using (2.1) and the fact $w(\cdot, t)_{L^1} = w_0_{L^1}$, we have

$$u_0_{L^1} + \alpha w_0_{L^1} = u_{L^1} + \alpha w_{L^1} = u_{L^1} + \alpha w_0_{L^1},$$

which implies

$$u_0_{L^1} - u_{L^1} = u_0_{L^1} + \alpha w_0_{L^1}. \quad (4.30)$$

Hence, using (4.30) and the fact $I_2(j) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, one has

$$\bar{u}_0 \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} F(w) = u_0_{L^1} \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} \bar{F}(w) - I_2(j) = \int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} u \bar{F}(w) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies

$$\int_j^{j+1} \int_{\Omega} F(w) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.31)$$

Next, we will show that (4.31) implies (4.26). In fact, if we define $w_j(x, s) := w(x, j + s)$, $(x, s) \in \square \quad (0, 1), j \in \mathbb{N}$, then (4.31) implies

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\square} F(w_j(x, s)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence we can extract a subsequence $(j_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $j_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $F(w_{j_k}) \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in $\square \quad (0, 1)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Because the function F is positive on $(0, \infty)$ and $F(0) = 0$, which requires that $w_{j_k} \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in $\square \quad (0, 1)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, since $w(\cdot, t) \leq c_4$ for all $t > 0$, then the sequence $(w_{j_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\square \quad (0, 1))$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Choosing $t_k := j_k$, one has (4.26). Then the proof of this lemma is completed. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. Suppose the conditions in Lemma 4.5 hold. Then, for any (x, w) in the solution of the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$. Then it holds that

$$w(\cdot, t) \leq c_4 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. We rewrite the first equation of the system (1.3) as

$$(u - u_t)_t = \gamma(v)u + \alpha F(w). \quad (4.36)$$

Then multiplying (4.36) by $u - u_t$, and integrating it by parts, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_t)^2 + \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v) |\nabla u|^2 \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \gamma'(v) u |\nabla u|^2 + \alpha \int_{\Omega} u F(w) (u - u_t) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma(v) |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\gamma'(v)^2}{\gamma(v)} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha \int_{\Omega} u^2 F(w), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with the facts $u - u_t \in L^\infty(\Omega; M)$ and $\gamma(v) \geq \gamma_1$, gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_t)^2 + \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\gamma'(v)^2}{\gamma(v)} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha M^2 \int_{\Omega} F(w),$$

and hence (4.35) follows. $\square$

Lemma 4.9. *The solution (u, v, w) of the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$ satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (v - u)^2 + 2D \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 + \int_{\Omega} (v - u)^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} (u - u_t)^2. \quad (4.37)$$

Proof. Multiplying the second equation of the system (1.3) by $v - u$, and integrating by parts, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (v - u)^2 &= \int_{\Omega} (v - u) [D \Delta v + (u - u_t)(v - u)] \\ &= -D \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 - \int_{\Omega} (v - u)^2 + \int_{\Omega} (v - u)(u - u_t) \\ & \quad - D \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (v - u)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (u - u_t)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.37). $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Let (u, v, w) be the solution of the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$. Then there exists a positive constant D_1 such that if $D \geq D_1$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|u(\cdot, t) - u\|_{L^\infty} + \|v(\cdot, t) - u\|_{L^\infty}) = 0. \quad (4.38)$$

Proof. Applying the Poincaré inequality, we find a constant $C_p > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 \leq C_p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2. \quad (4.39)$$

Then using the definition of u , we know from (2.1) that $u = \bar{u} + \alpha \bar{w}$. Then it follows from (4.39) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + 2\alpha^2 \int_{\Omega} \bar{w}^2 \\ &\leq 2C_p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2}{|\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} w \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\frac{\gamma_1}{2C_p} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 \leq \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2 \gamma_1}{C_p |\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} w \right)^2. \quad (4.40)$$

Applying (4.40) into (4.35), and using the facts $u(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma(v)$ and $\gamma'(v) \leq \eta$, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + \frac{\gamma_1}{2C_p} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\gamma'(v)}{\gamma(v)} u^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha M^2 \int_{\Omega} F(w) + \frac{\alpha^2 \gamma_1}{C_p |\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} w \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\eta^2 M^2}{\gamma_1} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha M^2 \int_{\Omega} F(w) + \frac{\alpha^2 \gamma_1}{C_p |\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} w \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

On the other hand, we multiply (4.37) by $\frac{\gamma_1}{4C_p}$, and use (4.41) to have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + \frac{\gamma_1}{4C_p} \int_{\Omega} (v - \bar{u})^2 \right) + \frac{\gamma_1}{4C_p} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 + \frac{\gamma_1}{4C_p} \int_{\Omega} (v - \bar{u})^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\eta^2 M^2}{\gamma_1} - \frac{D\gamma_1}{2C_p} \right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 + \alpha M^2 \int_{\Omega} F(w) + \frac{\alpha^2 \gamma_1}{C_p |\Omega|} \left(\int_{\Omega} w \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Using the definition of M in (1.4), one can find two constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of D such that

$$M := C_1(1 + \alpha)^{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{D}\right)^{12} e^{C_2(1 + \frac{1}{D})^4(1 + \alpha)^6}.$$

Let D be the positive constant uniquely determined by the following identity

$$D = \frac{2\eta^2 C_p C_1^2}{}$$

5. Simulations and discussions

5.1. Linear instability analysis

The results of Theorem 1.2 imply that the system (1.3) has no pattern formation if $\theta > 0$ or $\theta = 0$ and D is large. In this section, we will study the possible pattern arising from the system (1.3) with $\theta = 0$ and small D . To this end, we note that (1.3) with $\theta = 0$ has three constant equilibria $(0, 0, 0)$, $(0, 0,$

where $W_k(x)$ denotes the eigenfunction of the following eigenvalue problem:

$$\square W_k(x) + k^2 W_k(x) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial W_k(x)}{\partial \nu} = 0,$$

and the constants c_k are determined by the Fourier expansion of the initial conditions in terms of $W_k(x)$ and ρ is the temporal eigenvalue. After some calculations, we know ρ is the eigenvalue of the following matrix

$$M_k = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(u_c)k^2 & u_c \gamma'(u_c)k^2 & \alpha u_c F'(0) \\ 1 & Dk^2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & k^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ u_c F'(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously, $\rho(k^2) = -k^2 u_c F'(0)$ is an eigenvalue, which is negative for all $k \neq 0$. Hence to get the possible pattern formation, we only need to consider the other two eigenvalues of the matrix M_k , which satisfy

$$\rho^2 + a_1(k^2)\rho + a_0(k^2) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_1(k^2) = 1 + (D + \gamma(u_c))k^2 > 0, \\ a_0(k^2) = D\gamma(u_c)k^4 + (\gamma(u_c) + u_c \gamma'(u_c))k^2. \end{cases}$$

One can check that if $\gamma(u_c) + u_c \gamma'(u_c) \geq 0$ which is the case for $u_c = 0$, then $a_0(k^2) > 0$ for all $k \neq 0$, which implies the real part of the eigenvalues $\rho(k^2)$ are negative, and hence the steady state $(0, 0, 0)$ is linearly stable and no patterns will bifurcate from $(0, 0, 0)$. Next we consider the equilibrium $(u^*, u^*, 0)$. If $\gamma(u^*) + u^* \gamma'(u^*) < 0$, the real part of the eigenvalues $\rho(k^2)$ can be positive and hence the pattern formation may occur provided that the admissible wavenumber k satisfies

$$0 < k^2 < \frac{\gamma(u^*) + u^* \gamma'(u^*)}{D\gamma(u^*)} =: \bar{k}. \quad (5.3)$$

Note the allowable wave numbers k are discrete in a bounded domain, for instance if $\square = (0, l)$ then $k = \frac{n\pi}{l}$.

5.2. Simulations and questions

In section 5.1, we identify the instability parameter regimes for the possible pattern formation. But this linear instability result is not sufficient to conclude that there are non-constant stationary (pattern) solutions. Now we want to numerically test in one dimension whether non-constant stationary patterns exist for $\gamma(v)$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma 5.1. For definiteness in the simulation, we assume $\Omega = (0, l)$ and consider

$$\gamma(v) = \gamma_1 + \gamma_0 e^{-\lambda v}, \quad F(w) = \frac{w^2}{1 + w^2}$$

where γ_0, γ_1 and λ are positive constants. Then the condition $\gamma(u) + u\gamma'(u) = \gamma_1 + \gamma_0 e^{-\lambda u}(1 - \lambda u) < 0$ in Lemma 5.1 amounts to

$$u > \frac{1}{\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0} e^{\lambda u} < \lambda u - 1. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $k = \frac{\pi}{l}$, then the condition (5.3) becomes

$$D < \frac{\gamma(u) + u\gamma'(u)}{\gamma(u)} \frac{l^2}{(n\pi)^2} = \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_0 e^{-\lambda u}(1 - \lambda u)}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_0 e^{-\lambda u}} \frac{l^2}{(n\pi)^2}. \quad (5.5)$$

Therefore if we choose appropriate values of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \lambda, u$ and l so that the conditions (5.4)–(5.5) hold for some positive integer n , the pattern formation is expected from the results of Lemma 5.1. Note that $u = \bar{u}_0 + \alpha \bar{w}_0$. Hence for numerical simulations, we choose the initial value (u_0, v_0, w_0) as a small random perturbation of the equilibrium $(u, v, 0)$, and fix $\lambda = \alpha = 1$. The system (1.3) is numerically solved by the MATLAB PDEPE solver. We choose $l = 20, (u, v, 0) = (4, 4, 0), \gamma_0 = 10, \gamma_1 = 0.1$ and show the numerical simulations for $D = 0.1$ and $D = 0.01$ in Fig. 1 where we do observe the aggregated stationary patterns. This indicates for suitably small $D > 0$, the system (1.3) with appropriate motility function $\gamma(v)$ admits the pattern formation, which complements the analytical results of Theorem 1.2. However the rigorous proof the existence of pattern (stationary) solutions leaves open in this paper and we shall investigate this question in the future. Note that the assumption (H1) rules out the possible degeneracy of motility function $\gamma(v)$, which plays a key role in proving the results of this paper. Therefore another interesting open question is the global dynamics of (1.3) without assuming that $\gamma(v)$ has a positive lower bound such as $\gamma(v) = (1 + v)^{-\lambda}$ or $\gamma(v) = e^{-\lambda v}$ with $\lambda > 0$. Such motility function $\gamma(v)$ without positive lower bound has been used to study the global boundedness/asymptotics of solutions and stationary solutions for the two-component density-suppressed motility model (1.2) in [12,19], where the quadratic decay $-\mu u^2$ plays an essential role. However the three-component system (1.3) does not have such nice decay term and hence novel ideas are anticipated to solve the above-mentioned open question.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful to the referee for several helpful comments improving our results. The research of H.Y. Jin was supported by the NSF of China (No. 11871226), Guangdong Basic and

$$D = 0.$$

- [4] H. Amann, Nonhomogeneous Linear and Quasilinear Elliptic and Parabolic Boundary Value Problems. Function Spaces, Differential Operators and Nonlinear Analysis, Teubner-Texte zur Math., Stuttgart-Leipzig, vol. 133, 1993, pp. 9–126.
- [5] E.O. Budrene, H.C. Berg, Complex patterns formed by motile cells of *Escherichia coli*, *Nature* 349 (1991) 630–633.
- [6] E.O. Budrene, H.C. Berg, Dynamics of formation of symmetrical patterns by chemotactic bacteria, *Nature* 376 (1995) 49–53.
- [7] L. Desvillettes, Y.J. Kim, A. Trescases, C. Yoon, A logarithmic chemotaxis model featuring global existence and aggregation, *Nonlinear Anal., Real World Appl.* 50 (2019) 562–582.
- [8] L. Dyson, R.E. Baker, The importance of volume exclusion in modelling cellular migration, *J. Math. Biol.* 71 (3) (2015) 691–711.
- [9] X. Fu, L.H. Tang, C. Liu, J.D. Huang, T. Hwa, P. Lenz, Stripe formation in bacterial system with density-suppressed motility, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108 (2012) 198102.
- [10] K. Fujie, A. Ito, M. Winkler, T. Yokota, Stabilization in a chemotaxis model for tumor invasion, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 36 (2016) 151–169.
- [11] T. Hillen, K. Painter, M. Winkler, Convergence of a cancer invasion model to a logistic chemotaxis model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 23 (2013) 165–198.
- [12] H.Y. Jin, Y.J. Kim, Z.A. Wang, Boundedness, stabilization, and pattern formation driven by density-suppressed motility, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 78 (3) (2018) 1632–1657.
- [13] H.Y. Jin, Z.A. Wang, Global stability of prey-taxis systems, *J. Differ. Equ.* 262 (3) (2017) 1257–1290.
- [14] H.Y. Jin, Z.A. Wang, Global dynamics and spatio-temporal patterns of predator-prey systems with density-dependent motion, *Eur. J. Appl. Math.* (2020), in press.
- [15] H.Y. Jin, Z.A. Wang, Critical mass on the Keller-Segel system with signal-dependent motility, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* (2020), in press, <https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/15124>.
- [16] S. Kondo, T. Miura, Reaction-diffusion model as a framework for understanding biological pattern formation, *Science* 329 (5999) (2010) 1616–1620.
- [17] C. Liu, et al., Sequential establishment of stripe patterns in an expanding cell population, *Science* 334 (2011) 238–241.
- [18] Y. Lou, M. Winkler, Global existence and uniform boundedness of smooth solutions to a cross-diffusion system with equal diffusion rates, *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.* 40 (10) (2015) 1905–1941.
- [19] M. Ma, R. Peng, Z. Wang, Stationary and non-stationary patterns of the density-suppressed motility model, *Phys. D* 402 (2020) 132259.
- [20] V. Méndez, D. Campos, I. Pagonabarraga, S. Fedotov, Density-dependent dispersal and population aggregation patterns, *J. Theor. Biol.* 309 (2012) 113–120.
- [21] J.D. Murray, *Mathematical Biology*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [22] K.J. Painter, T. Hillen, Volume-filling and quorum-sensing in models for chemosensitive movement, *Can. Appl. Math. Q.* 10 (4) (2002) 501–543.
- [23] M.M. Porzio, V. Vespi, Hölder estimates for local solutions of some doubly nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations, *J. Differ. Equ.* 103 (1) (1993) 146–178.
- [24] M. Schechter, Self-adjoint realizations in another Hilbert space, *Am. J. Math.* 106 (1) (1984) 43–65.
- [25] J. Smith-Roberge, D. Iron, T. Kolokolnikov, Pattern formation in bacterial colonies with density-dependent diffusion, *Eur. J. Appl. Math.* 30 (2019) 196–218.
- [26] C. Stinner, C. Surulescu, M. Winkler, Global weak solutions in a PDE-ODE system modeling multiscale cancer cell invasion, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 46 (2014) 1969–2007.
- [27] Y. Tao, Boundedness in a chemotaxis model with oxygen consumption by bacteria, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 381 (2011) 521–529.
- [28] Y.S. Tao, Z.A. Wang, Competing effects of attraction vs. repulsion in chemotaxis, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 23 (2013) 1–36.
- [29] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, Large time behavior in a multidimensional chemotaxis-haptotaxis model with slow signal diffusion, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 47 (6) (2015) 4229–4250.
- [30] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, Effects of signal-dependent motilities in a Keller-Segel-type reaction-diffusion system, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 27 (19) (2017) 1645–1683.
- [31] J. Wang, M. Wang, Boundedness in the higher-dimensional Keller-Segel model with signal-dependent motility and logistic growth, *J. Math. Phys.* 60 (2019) 011507.
- [32] Z.A. Wang, T. Hillen, Classical solutions and pattern formation for a volume filling chemotaxis model, *Chaos* 17 (2007) 037108.
- [33] M. Winkler, Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller-Segel model, *J. Differ. Equ.* 248 (2010) 2889–2905.

- [34] M. Winkler, Stabilization in a two-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier-Stokes system, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 211 (2014) 455–487.
- [35] S. Wu, J. Shi, B. Wu, Global existence of solutions and uniform persistence of a diffusive predator-prey model with