

Global existence and boundedness of solution of a parabolic–parabolic–ODE chemotaxis–haptotaxis model with (generalized) logistic source

Ling Liu¹ * Jiashan Zheng^{a,b} †

¹ Department of Basic Science,

Jilin Jianzhu University, Changchun 130118, P.R.China

^a School of Information,

Renmin University of China, Beijing, 100872, P.R.China

^b School of Mathematics and Statistics Science,

Ludong University, Yantai 264025, P.R.China

Abstract

In this paper, we study the following chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with (generalized) logistic source

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) - \xi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + u(a - \mu u^{r-1} - w), \\ v_t = \Delta v - v + u, \\ w_t = -vw, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.1)$$

*E-mail address: liuling2004@sohu.com (L. Liu)

†Corresponding author. E-mail address: zhengjiashan2008@163.com (J. Zheng)

in a smooth bounded domain $\mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 1)$, with parameter $r > 1$. the parameters $a \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0, \chi > 0$. It is shown that when $r > 2$, or

$$\mu > \mu^* = \frac{(N-2)_+}{N}(\chi + C_\beta)C^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}, \quad \text{if } r = 2,$$

the considered problem possesses a global classical solution which is bounded, where $C^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}$ is a positive constant which is corresponding to the maximal sobolev regularity. Here C_β is a positive constant which depends on $\xi, \|u_0\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}, \|v_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$ and $\|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. This result improves or extends previous results of several authors.

Key words: Boundedness; Chemotaxis–haptotaxis; (Generalized) logistic source

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 92C17, 35K55, 35K59, 35K20

1 Introduction

Chemotaxis is the oriented cell movement along concentration gradients of a chemical signal produced by the cells themselves. In 1970s, a well-known chemotaxis model was proposed by Keller and Segel ([13]), which describes the aggregation processes of the cellular slime mold *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Since then, a number of variations of the Keller–Segel model have attracted the attention of many mathematicians, and the focused issue was the boundedness or blow-up of the solutions ([5, 7, 9, 10, 40, 20]). The striking feature of Keller–Segel models is the possibility of blow-up of solutions in a finite (or infinite) time (see, e.g., [1, 9, 18, 40]), which strongly depends on the space dimension. We also refer the reader to Winkler [39, 42, 41] (and the references therein) for some other works on the finite-time blow up of solutions of the variants of Keller–Segel models. Moreover, some recent studies have shown that the blow-up of solutions can be inhibited by the nonlinear diffusion (see Ishida et al. [11] Winkler et al. [1, 27, 36, 43]) and the (generalized) logistic damping (see Li and Xiang[14], Tello and Winkler [31], Wang et al. [33], Zheng et al. [51]).

In order to describe the cancer invasion mechanism, in 2005, Chaplain and Lolas ([3]) extended the classical Keller–Segel model where, in addition to random diffusion, cancer cells bias their movement towards a gradient of a diffusible matrix-degrading enzyme (MDE) secreted by themselves, as well as a gradient of a static tissue, referred to as extracellular matrix (ECM), by detecting matrix molecules such as vitronectin adhered therein. The latter type of directed migration of cancer cells is usually referred to as haptotaxis (see Chaplain and Lolas [4]). According to the model proposed in [3, 4, 8], in this paper, we consider the chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with (generalized) logistic source

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_t = \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) - \xi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) + u(1 - u^{r-1} - w), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ w_t = -vw, \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (1.1)$$

where $r > 1$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 1)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ denotes the

outward normal derivative on $\partial\Omega$, the three variables u, v and w represent the cancer cell density, the MDE concentration and the ECM density, respectively. The parameters χ, ξ and μ are positive which measure the chemotactic, haptotactic sensitivities and the proliferation rate of the cells, respectively. As is pointed out by [1] (see also Tao and Winkler [26], Winkler [39], Zheng [52]), in this modeling context the cancer cells are also usually assumed to follow a generalized logistic growth $u(1 - u^{r-1} - w)$ ($r > 1$), which denotes the proliferation rate of the cells and competing for space with healthy tissue. And the initial data (u_0, v_0, w_0) supposed to be satisfied the following conditions

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ with } u_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } u_0 \not\equiv 0, \\ v_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ with } v_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w_0 \in C^{2+\vartheta}(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ with } w_0 \geq 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega} \text{ and } \frac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

with some $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$.

In order to better understand model (1.1), let us mention the following quasilinear chemotaxis–haptotaxis system, which is a closely related variant of (1.1)

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (\phi(u)\nabla u) - \chi \nabla \cdot (u\nabla v) - \xi \nabla \cdot (u\nabla w) + \mu u(1 - u^{r-1} - w), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \tau v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ w_t = -vw, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), w(x, 0) = w_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $\mu \geq 0, \tau \in \{0, 1\}$, the function $\phi(u)$ fulfills

$$\phi \in C^2([0, \infty)) \quad (1.4)$$

and there exist constants $m \geq 1$ and C_ϕ such that

$$\phi(u) \geq C_\phi(u + 1)^{m-1} \text{ for all } u \geq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

When $w \equiv 0$, (1.3) is reduced to the chemotaxis-only system with (generalized) logistic source (see Xiang [44], Zheng et al. [47, 48, 50, 56, 54]). And global existence, boundedness

and asymptotic behavior of solution were studied in [15, 17, 32, 49]. Going beyond the above statements, we should mention the papers [40] and [42] (and references therein), which deal with the blow-up of solutions to parabolic-elliptic versions of (1.3) (with $w \equiv 0$). For example, when $D(u) \equiv 1$ and $N \geq 3$, it is demonstrated in [42] that a superlinear growth condition on logistic source may be insufficient to prevent finite time blow-ups for a parabolic-elliptic system of (1.3), which is the first rigorous detection of blow-up in a superlinearly dampened of Keller-Segel system in **three**-dimensional case. From a theoretical point of view, due to the fact that the chemotaxis and haptotaxis terms require different L^p -estimate techniques, the problem related to the chemotaxis–haptotaxis models of cancer invasion presents an important mathematical challenging. There are only few results on the mathematical analysis of this (quasilinear) chemotaxis–haptotaxis system (1.3) (Cao [2], Zheng et al. [16], Tao et al. [23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30], Wang et al. [16, 34, 35, 56]). Indeed, if MDEs diffuses much faster than cells (see [12, 29]), ($\tau = 0$ in the second equation of (1.3)), (1.3) is reduced to the parabolic–ODE–elliptic chemotaxis–haptotaxis system the (generalized) logistic source. To the best of our knowledge, there exist some boundedness and stabilization results on the simplified parabolic–elliptic–ODE chemotaxis–haptotaxis model [25, 29, 28]. When, $r = 2$ in the first equation of (1.3), the global boundedness of solutions to the chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with the standard logistic source has been proved for any $\mu > 0$ in two dimensions and for large μ (compared to the chemotactic sensitivity χ) in three dimensions (see Tao and Wang [25]). In [29], Tao and Winkler studied the global boundedness for model (1.3) under the condition $\mu > \frac{(N-2)^+}{N}\chi$, moreover, in additional explicit smallness on w_0 , they gave the exponential decay of w in the large time limit. While if $r > 1$ (the (generalized) logistic source), one can see [56].

As for parabolic–ODE–parabolic system (1.3), if $r = 2$, there has been some progress made in two or three dimensions (see Cao [2] Tao and Winkler [22, 24, 29]). In fact, when $\phi \equiv 1$, Cao ([2]) and Tao ([23]) proved that (1.3) admits a unique, smooth and bounded solution if $\mu > 0$ on $N = 2$ and μ is **large enough** on $N = 3$. Recently, assume that μ is **large enough** and $3 \leq N \leq 8$, the boundedness of the global solution of system (1.3) are obtained by Wang and Ke in [35]. However, they did not give the lower bound estimation

for the logistic source. Note that the global existence and boundedness of solutions to (1.3) is still open in three dimensions for **small** $\mu > 0$ and in higher dimensions.

The main object of the present paper is to address the boundedness to solutions of (1.1) without any restriction on the **space dimension**. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that the initial data (u_0, v_0, w_0) fulfills (1.2). For any $N \geq 1$, if one of the following cases holds:*

(i) $r > 2$;

(ii)

$$\mu > \mu^* = \frac{(N-2)_+}{N}(\chi + C_\beta)C_{\frac{N}{2}+1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}, \quad \text{if } r = 2, \quad (1.6)$$

then there exists a triple $(u, v, w) \in (C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)))^3$ which solves (1.1) in the classical sense, where $C_{\frac{N}{2}+1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}$ is a positive constant which is corresponding to the maximal sobolev regularity. Here C_β are positive constants which depends on ξ , $\|u_0\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}$, $\|v_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$ and $\|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Moreover, u , v and w are bounded in $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$.

Remark 1.1. (i) From Theorem 1.1, we derive that the global boundedness of the solution for the complete parabolic–parabolic and parabolic–elliptic models, which need a coefficient of the logistic source to keep the same (except a constant).

(ii) Obviously, if $r = 2$ and $\mu > \frac{(N-2)_+}{N}(\chi + C_\beta)C_{\frac{N}{2}+1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}$, thus, Theorem 1.1 extends the results of Theorem 1.1 of Cao ([2]), who proved the boundedness in the case $N = 3$, $r = 2$ and μ is **appropriately large**.

(iii) Obviously, if $r = 2$ and $\mu > \frac{(N-2)_+}{N}(\chi + C_\beta)C_{\frac{N}{2}+1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}$, hence Theorem 1.1 extends the results of Theorem 1.1 of Wang and Ke ([35]), who proved the boundedness of the solutions in the case $3 \leq N \leq 8$, $r = 2$ and μ is **appropriately large**.

(iv) Obviously, if $r > 2$, then, $2 < \frac{N+2}{2}$, therefore, Theorem 1.1 (partly) extends the results of Theorem 1.1 of Zheng ([52]), who showed the boundedness of the solutions in the cases $r > \frac{N+2}{2}$.

(v) If $w \equiv 0$, (the PDE system (1.1) is reduced to the chemotaxis-only system), it is not difficult to obtain that the solutions under the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are uniformly bounded when $r = 2$ and $\mu > \frac{(N-2)_+}{N}(\chi + C_\beta)C_{\frac{N}{2}+1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}+1}}$, which extends and coincides with the

results of Winkler (see Theorem 0.1 of [37]) and the result of Osaki et al. ([19]), respectively.

(vi) From Theorem 1.1, we derive that solutions of model (1.1) are global and bounded for any $r = 2, \mu > 0$ and $N \leq 2$, which coincides with the result of Tao ([23]).

(vii) With the help of precise estimation, the ideas of our paper can also be used to deal with the three-dimensional chemotaxis-fluid system with (generalized) logistic source.

If ϕ is a nonlinear function of u , then (1.3) becomes a quasilinear parabolic–ODE–parabolic chemotaxis–haptotaxis system. There are only few results on the mathematical analysis of this quasilinear parabolic–ODE–parabolic chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with the standard logistic source ($r = 2$ in the first equation of (1.3)). In fact, if $N = 2$, Zheng et al. ([57]) mainly studied the global boundedness for model (1.3) with ϕ satisfies (1.4)–(1.5) and $m > 1$. While, Tao and Winkler ([26]) proved that model (1.3) possesses at least one nonnegative **global** classical solution when ϕ satisfy (1.4)–(1.5) with $m > \max\{1, \bar{m}\}$ and

$$\bar{m} := \begin{cases} \frac{2N^2+4N-4}{N(N+4)} & \text{if } N \leq 8, \\ \frac{2N^2+3N+2-\sqrt{8N(N+1)}}{N(N+20)} & \text{if } N \geq 9. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Further, by using the boundedness of $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^l (1 \leq l < \frac{N}{N-1})$, assuming that $m > 2 - \frac{2}{N}$, Wang ([34]) obtained the boundedness of the global solutions to (1.3). Recently, with the help of the boundness of $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2$, Zheng ([53]) extends the results of [34] when $m > \frac{2N}{N+2}$. Very recently, it is asserted that if ϕ satisfies (1.4)–(1.5) and

$$m \begin{cases} > 2 - \frac{2}{N} & \text{if } 1 < r < \frac{N+2}{N}, \\ > 1 + \frac{(N+2-2r)^+}{N+2} & \text{if } \frac{N+2}{2} \geq r \geq \frac{N+2}{N}, \\ \geq 1 & \text{if } r > \frac{N+2}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

we ([52]) proved that the unique nonnegative classical solution of quasilinear parabolic–ODE–parabolic chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with generalized logistic source ($r > 1$ in the first equation of (1.3)) which is global in time and bounded, however, we have to leave open here the question of how far the above hypothesis (1.8) is sharp.

It is worth to remark the main idea underlying the proof of our results. The proof of theorem 1.1 is based on an iterative L^p estimation argument involving the maximal Sobolev

regularity and the Moser-type limit procedure. Indeed, with the help of

$$\min_{y>0} \left(y + \frac{1}{q_0 + 1} \left[\frac{q_0 + 1}{q_0} \right]^{-q_0} \left(\frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} \right)^{q_0+1} y^{-q_0} \chi^{q_0+1} C_{q_0+1} \right) = \frac{(q_0 - 1)}{q_0} C_{q_0+1}^{\frac{1}{q_0+1}} \chi$$

and $\min_{y>0} \left(y + \frac{1}{q_0+1} \left[\frac{q_0+1}{q_0} \right]^{-q_0} \left(\frac{q_0-1}{q_0} \right)^{q_0+1} y^{-q_0} C_{\beta}^{q_0+1} C_{q_0+1} \right) = \frac{(q_0-1)}{q_0} C_{q_0+1}^{\frac{1}{q_0+1}} C_{\beta}$ (see Lemma 3.3), we can obtain a subtle combination of entropy like estimates for

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{q_0} \quad \text{for some } q_0 > \frac{N}{2}. \quad (1.9)$$

Then we shall involve the variation-of-constants formula for variable v to gain

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^q \leq C \quad \text{for all } q \in \left[1, \frac{Nq_0}{(N - q_0)^+} \right), \quad (1.10)$$

and thereby establish the a priori estimates of the functional

$$\int_{\Omega} u^p \leq C \quad \text{for all } p > 1. \quad (1.11)$$

Finally, in light of the Moser iteration method (see e.g. Lemma A.1 of [27]) and the standard estimate for Neumann semigroup, we established the L^∞ bound of u (see the proof of Theorem 1.1).

2 Preliminaries and main results

Firstly, we recall some preliminary lemmas, which play essential roles in our subsequent analysis. To begin with, let us collect some basic solution properties which essentially have already been used in [10] (see also Winkler [38], Zhang and Li [45]).

Lemma 2.1. ([10]) *For $p \in (1, \infty)$, let $A := A_p$ denote the sectorial operator defined by*

$$A_p u := -\Delta u \quad \text{for all } u \in D(A_p) := \left\{ \varphi \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \mid \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega} = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The operator $A + 1$ possesses fractional powers $(A + 1)^\alpha$ ($\alpha \geq 0$), the domains of which have the embedding properties

$$D((A + 1)^\alpha) \hookrightarrow W^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad \text{if } \alpha > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.2)$$

If $m \in \{0, 1\}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (1, \infty)$ with $m - \frac{N}{p} < 2\alpha - \frac{N}{q}$, then we have

$$\|u\|_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\|(A+1)^\alpha u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } u \in D((A+1)^\alpha), \quad (2.3)$$

where C is a positive constant. The fact that the spectrum of A is a p -independent countable set of positive real numbers $0 = \mu_0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots$ entails the following consequences: For all $1 \leq p < q < \infty$ and $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ the general L^p - L^q estimate

$$\|(A+1)^\alpha e^{-tA} u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq ct^{-\alpha - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} e^{(1-\mu)t} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad (2.4)$$

for any $t > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$ with some $\mu > 0$.

Lemma 2.2. ([6, 11]) Let $s \geq 1$ and $q \geq 1$. Assume that $p > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1)$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{p}{N} = (1-a)\frac{q}{s} + a\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N}\right) \quad \text{and } p \leq a.$$

Then there exist $c_0, c'_0 > 0$ such that for all $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^{\frac{s}{q}}(\Omega)$,

$$\|u\|_{W^{p,2}(\Omega)} \leq c_0 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^a \|u\|_{L^{\frac{s}{q}}(\Omega)}^{1-a} + c'_0 \|u\|_{L^{\frac{s}{q}}(\Omega)}.$$

Lemma 2.3. ([2, 55]) Suppose $\gamma \in (1, +\infty)$. Consider the following evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} v_t - \Delta v = g, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & (x, t) \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

For each $v_0 \in W^{2,\gamma}(\Omega)$ such that $\frac{\partial v_0}{\partial \nu} = 0$ and any $g \in L^\gamma((0, T); L^\gamma(\Omega))$, there exists a unique solution $v \in W^{1,\gamma}((0, T); L^\gamma(\Omega)) \cap L^\gamma((0, T); W^{2,\gamma}(\Omega))$. Moreover, there exists a positive constant δ_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma dt + \int_0^T \|v_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma dt + \int_0^T \|\Delta v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma dt \\ & \leq \delta_0 \left(\int_0^T \|g(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma dt + \|v_0(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + \|\Delta v_0(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

On the other hand, consider the following evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} v_t - \Delta v + v = g, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & (x, t) \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Then there exists a positive constant $C_\gamma := C_{\gamma,|\Omega|}$ such that if $s_0 \in [0, T)$, $v(\cdot, s_0) \in W^{2,\gamma}(\Omega)$ ($\gamma > N$) with $\frac{\partial v(\cdot, s_0)}{\partial \nu} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{s_0}^T e^{\gamma s} (\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + \|\Delta v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma) ds \\ & \leq C_\gamma \left(\int_{s_0}^T e^{\gamma s} \|g(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma ds + e^{\gamma s} (\|v_0(\cdot, s_0)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma + \|\Delta v_0(\cdot, s_0)\|_{L^\gamma(\Omega)}^\gamma) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

The following lemma deals with local-in-time existence and uniqueness of a classical solution for the problem (1.1) (see [26, 16]).

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that the nonnegative functions u_0, v_0 , and w_0 satisfies (1.2) for some $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a maximal existence time $T_{max} \in (0, \infty]$ and a triple of nonnegative functions*

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

which solves (1.1) classically and satisfies $w \leq \|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ in $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$. Moreover, if $T_{max} < +\infty$, then

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \nearrow T_{max}. \quad (2.9)$$

Firstly, by Lemma 2.4, we can pick $s_0 \in (0, T_{max})$, $s_0 \leq 1$ and $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \beta \quad \|v(\tau)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|w(\tau)\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \beta \quad \text{for all } \tau \in [0, s_0]. \quad (2.10)$$

3 The proof of theorem 1.1

In this section, we are going to establish an iteration step to develop the main ingredient of our result. The iteration depends on a series of a priori estimates. Firstly, based on the ideas of Lemma 3.1 in [35] (see also Lemma 2.1 of [37]), we recall now a well-known property of systems of type (1.1) with a generalized logistic source exhibiting a decay with respect to u in the first equation.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumptions in theorem 1.1, we derive that there exists a positive constant C such that the solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x, t) + \int_{\Omega} v^2(x, t) + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v(x, t)|^2 \leq C \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, for each $T \in (0, T_{max})$, one can find a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε such that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla v|^2 + u^r + |\Delta v|^2] \leq C. \quad (3.2)$$

Now, applying almost exactly the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [34] (the minor necessary changes are left as an easy exercise to the reader), we conclude the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Let (u, v, w) be a solution to (1.1) on $(0, T_{max})$. Then for any $k > 1$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\beta} := C(\xi, \|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \beta)$ which depends on $\xi, \|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ and β such that*

$$-\xi \int_{\Omega} u^{k-1} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) \leq C_{\beta} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k (v+1) + k \int_{\Omega} u^{k-1} |\nabla u| \right). \quad (3.3)$$

where β is the same as (2.10).

Proof. Here and throughout the proof of Lemma 3.2, we shall denote by $M_i (i \in N)$ several positive constants independent of k . Firstly, observing that the third equation of (1.1) is an ODE, we derive that

$$w(x, t) = w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x, s) ds}, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.4)$$

Hence, by a basic calculation, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla w(x, t) &= \nabla w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x, s) ds} \\ &- w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x, s) ds} \int_0^t \nabla v(x, s) ds, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T_{max}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta w(x, t) \\ \geq &\Delta w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x, s) ds} - 2 \nabla w(x, s_0) \cdot \int_0^t \nabla v(x, s) ds e^{-\int_0^t v(x, s) ds} \\ &- w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, for any $k \geq 1$, integrating by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\xi \int_{\Omega} u^{k-1} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) \\
= & -\xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \Delta w \\
\leq & \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k (-\Delta w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} + 2 \nabla w(x, s_0) \cdot \int_0^t \nabla v(x, s) ds e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds}) \\
& + \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t \Delta v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
:= & J_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Now, using $v \geq 0$ and the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 \leq & -\xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \Delta w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} + \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
& + \xi \frac{2(k-1)}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \nabla w(x, s_0) \cdot \int_0^t \nabla v(x, s) ds e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \\
= & -\xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \Delta w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} + \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
& - \xi \frac{2(k-1)}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \nabla w(x, s_0) \cdot \nabla e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \\
\leq & \xi \beta \int_{\Omega} u^k + \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
& + 2\xi(k-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{k-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} + \frac{2(k-1)}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k \Delta w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \\
\leq & M_1 \int_{\Omega} u^k + \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
& + M_2 (k \int_{\Omega} u^{k-1} |\nabla u| + \int_{\Omega} u^k),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $M_1 = \xi \beta$ and $M_2 = \max\{2\xi \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla w(x, s_0)|, 2 \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\Delta w(x, s_0)|\}$. Next, due to the second equality of (1.1) and $u \geq 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t \Delta v(x, s) ds \\
= & \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} \int_0^t (v_s(x, s) + v(x, s) - u(x, s)) ds \\
\leq & \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \int_{\Omega} u^k w(x, s_0) e^{-\int_0^t v(x,s) ds} (v(x, t) - v_0(x) + \int_0^t v(x, s) ds) \\
\leq & \xi \frac{k-1}{k} \|w_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} u^k (v + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Here we have use the fact that $\frac{t}{e^t} \leq 1$ (for all $t \geq 0$). Collecting (3.8) with (3.9), we can get the result. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{\delta + 1} \left[\frac{\delta + 1}{\delta} \right]^{-\delta} \left(\frac{\delta - 1}{\delta} \right)^{\delta + 1}, \quad (3.10)$$

$H(y) = y + A_1 y^{-\delta} \chi^{\delta + 1} C_{\delta + 1}$ and $\tilde{H}(y) = y + A_1 y^{-\delta} C_{\beta}^{\delta + 1} C_{\delta + 1}$ for $y > 0$. For any fixed $\delta \geq 1, \chi, C_{\beta}, C_{\delta + 1} > 0$, Then

$$\min_{y > 0} H(y) = \frac{(\delta - 1)}{\delta} C_{\delta + 1}^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} \chi$$

and

$$\min_{y > 0} \tilde{H}(y) = \frac{(\delta - 1)}{\delta} C_{\delta + 1}^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} C_{\beta}. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. It is easy to verify that

$$H'(y) = 1 - A_1 \delta C_{\delta + 1} \left(\frac{\chi}{y} \right)^{\delta + 1}.$$

Let $H'(y) = 0$, we have

$$y = (A_1 C_{\delta + 1} \delta)^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} \chi.$$

On the other hand, by $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} H(y) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} H(y) = +\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y > 0} H(y) &= H[(A_1 C_{\delta + 1} \delta)^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} \chi] = (A_1 C_{\delta + 1})^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} (\delta^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} + \delta^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta + 1}}) \chi \\ &= \frac{(\delta - 1)}{\delta} C_{\delta + 1}^{\frac{1}{\delta + 1}} \chi. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Employing the same arguments as in the proof of (3.12), we conclude (3.11). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $r = 2$ and (u, v, w) be a solution to (1.1) on $(0, T_{max})$. If*

$$\mu > \frac{(N - 2)_+}{N} (\chi + C_{\beta}) C_{\frac{N}{2} + 1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2} + 1}}, \quad (3.13)$$

then for all $p > 1$, there exists a positive constant $C := C(p, |\Omega|, \mu, \chi, \xi, \beta)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} w^p(x, t) dx \leq C \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. Due to $\mu > \frac{(N - 2)_+}{N} (\chi + C_{\beta}) C_{\frac{N}{2} + 1}^{\frac{1}{\frac{N}{2} + 1}}$, one can choose $q_0 > \frac{N}{2}$ such that

$$\mu > \frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} (C_{\beta} + \chi) C_{q_0 + 1}^{\frac{1}{q_0 + 1}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Let $l = q_0$. Multiplying the first equation of (1.1) by u^{l-1} and integrating over Ω , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + (l-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &= -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{l-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} (au - \mu u^2) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + (l-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ & \leq -\frac{l+1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l dx - \chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx \\ & \quad - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{l-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{l+1}{l} u^l + u^{l-1} (au - \mu u^2) \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Hence, by Young inequality, it reads that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{l+1}{l} u^l + u^{l-1} (au - \mu u^2) \right) dx \\ & \leq \frac{l+1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l dx + a \int_{\Omega} u^l dx - \mu \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx \\ & \leq (\varepsilon_1 - \mu) \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx + C_1(\varepsilon_1, l), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{1}{4} \left(\mu - \frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} (C_{\beta} + \chi) C_{\frac{1}{q_0+1}} \right) > 0$$

and

$$C_1(\varepsilon_1, l) = \frac{1}{l+1} \left(\varepsilon_1 \frac{l+1}{l} \right)^{-l} \left(\frac{l+1}{l} + a \right)^{l+1} |\Omega|.$$

Next, integrating by parts to the first term on the right hand side of (3.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx \\ &= (l-1) \chi \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx \\ & \leq \frac{l-1}{l} \chi \int_{\Omega} u^l |\Delta v| dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Next, due to (3.3) and the Young inequality, we derive that there exist positive constant

$C_2 := (\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{l-1}C_\beta^2l^2 + C_\beta)$ and $C_3 := \frac{1}{l+1}(\varepsilon_3\frac{l+1}{l})^{-l}C_2^{l+1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{l-1} dx \\
\leq & C_\beta \left(\frac{l-1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l (v+1) + l \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} |\nabla u| \right) \\
\leq & \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{l-1} C_\beta^2 l^2 + \frac{l-1}{l} C_\beta \right) \int_{\Omega} u^l + C_\beta \frac{l-1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l v \\
\leq & \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C_2 \int_{\Omega} u^l + C_\beta \frac{l-1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l v \\
\leq & \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 + (\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3) \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} \\
& + \frac{1}{l+1} \left(\varepsilon_2 \frac{l+1}{l} \right)^{-l} C_\beta^{l+1} \left(\frac{l-1}{l} \right)^{l+1} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} + C_3,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where $\varepsilon_2 := \tilde{\lambda}_0$, $\varepsilon_3 = \frac{1}{4}(\mu - \frac{q_0-1}{q_0}(C_\beta + \chi)C_{\frac{q_0+1}{q_0}}) > 0$ and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_0 := (A_1 C_{l+1} l)^{\frac{1}{l+1}} C_\beta. \tag{3.21}$$

Here A_1 is given by (3.10).

Now, let

$$\lambda_0 := (A_1 C_{l+1} l)^{\frac{1}{l+1}} \chi. \tag{3.22}$$

While from (3.19) and the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx \\
\leq & \lambda_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx + \frac{1}{l+1} \left[\lambda_0 \frac{l+1}{l} \right]^{-l} \left(\frac{l-1}{l} \chi \right)^{l+1} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx \\
= & \lambda_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx + A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where A_1 is given by (3.10). Thus, inserting (3.18), (3.20) and (3.23) into (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 \leq & (\varepsilon_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_0 + \varepsilon_3 + \lambda_0 - \mu) \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx - \frac{l+1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l dx \\
& + A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx \\
& + A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_\beta^{l+1} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} + C_1 + C_3.
\end{aligned}$$

For any $t \in (s_0, T_{max})$, employing the variation-of-constants formula to the above inequality,

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{l} \|u(t)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l \\
\leq & \frac{1}{l} e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} \|u(s_0)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + (\varepsilon_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_0 + \varepsilon_3 + \lambda_0 - \mu) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx ds \\
& + A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx ds \\
& + (C_1 + C_3) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} ds + A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_{\beta}^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} dx ds \\
\leq & (\varepsilon_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_0 + \varepsilon_3 + \lambda_0 - \mu) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx ds \\
& + A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx ds \\
& + A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_{\beta}^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} dx ds + C_4,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$C_4 := C_4(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_3, l) = \frac{1}{l} \|u(s_0)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + (C_1 + C_3) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} ds.$$

Now, by (3.21), Lemma 2.3 and the second equation of (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx ds \\
= & A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} e^{-(l+1)t} \int_{s_0}^t e^{(l+1)s} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx ds \\
\leq & A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} e^{-(l+1)t} C_{l+1} \left(\int_{s_0}^t \int_{\Omega} e^{(l+1)s} u^{l+1} dx ds + e^{(l+1)s_0} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_{\beta}^{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} dx ds \\
= & A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_{\beta}^{l+1} e^{-(l+1)t} \int_{s_0}^t e^{(l+1)s} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} dx ds \\
\leq & A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_{\beta}^{l+1} e^{-(l+1)t} C_{l+1} \left(\int_{s_0}^t \int_{\Omega} e^{(l+1)s} u^{l+1} dx ds + e^{(l+1)s_0} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{max})$. By substituting (3.25)–(3.26) into (3.24), using (3.22) and Lemma 3.3,

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{l} \|u(t)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l \\
& \leq (\varepsilon_1 + \tilde{\lambda}_0 + A_1 \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_\beta^{l+1} C_{l+1} + \lambda_0 + A_1 \lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} C_{l+1} - \mu) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx ds \\
& \quad + A_1 (\lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} + \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_\beta^{l+1}) e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} C_{l+1} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} + C_4 \\
& = (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3 + \frac{(l-1)}{l} C_{l+1}^{\frac{1}{l+1}} C_\beta + \frac{(l-1)}{l} C_{l+1}^{\frac{1}{l+1}} \chi - \mu) \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx ds \\
& \quad + A_1 (\lambda_0^{-l} \chi^{l+1} + \tilde{\lambda}_0^{-l} C_\beta^{l+1}) e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} C_{l+1} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} + C_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Since $l = q_0$, therefore,

$$\frac{(l-1)}{l} C_{l+1}^{\frac{1}{l+1}} C_\beta + \frac{(l-1)}{l} C_{l+1}^{\frac{1}{l+1}} \chi - \mu = \frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} (C_\beta + \chi) C_{q_0+1}^{\frac{1}{q_0+1}} - \mu,$$

so that,

$$0 < \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3 = \frac{1}{2} (\mu - \frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} (C_\beta + \chi) C_{q_0+1}^{\frac{1}{q_0+1}}) < \mu - \frac{q_0 - 1}{q_0} (C_\beta + \chi) C_{q_0+1}^{\frac{1}{q_0+1}}. \tag{3.28}$$

Collecting (3.28) and (3.27), we derive that there exists a positive constant C_5 such that

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{q_0}(x, t) dx \leq C_5 \quad \text{for all } t \in (s_0, T_{max}). \tag{3.29}$$

Next, we fix $q < \frac{Nq_0}{(N-q_0)^+}$ and choose some $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ such that

$$q < \frac{1}{\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2}{N}(\alpha - \frac{1}{2})} \leq \frac{Nq_0}{(N - q_0)^+}. \tag{3.30}$$

Now, involving the variation-of-constants formula for v , we have

$$v(t) = e^{-t(A+1)} v(s_0) + \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(t-s)(A+1)} u(s) ds, \quad t \in (s_0, T_{max}). \tag{3.31}$$

Hence, it follows from (2.10) and (3.31) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(A+1)^\alpha v(t)\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_6 \int_{s_0}^t (t-s)^{-\alpha - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{q})} e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|u(s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds + C_6 s_0^{-\alpha - \frac{N}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{q})} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_6 \int_0^{s_0+\infty} \sigma^{-\alpha - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{q})} e^{-\mu\sigma} d\sigma + C_6 s_0^{-\alpha - \frac{N}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{q})} \beta.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Hence, due to (3.30) and (3.32), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v(t)|^q \leq C_7 \quad \text{for all } t \in (s_0, T_{max}) \tag{3.33}$$

and $q \in [1, \frac{Nq_0}{(N-q_0)^+})$. Finally, in view of (2.10) and (3.33), we can get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v(t)|^q \leq C_8 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}) \quad \text{and } q \in [1, \frac{Nq_0}{(N-q_0)^+}) \quad (3.34)$$

with some positive constant C_8 .

Multiplying both sides of the first equation in (1.1) by u^{p-1} , integrating over Ω and integrating by parts, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + (p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &= -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{p-1} dx - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{p-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} (au - \mu u^2) dx \\ &= \chi(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx + \xi(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} (au - \mu u^2) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

which together with the Young inequality and (3.3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + (p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{p-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{\chi^2(p-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 dx + C_9 \int_{\Omega} v^{p+1} - \frac{\mu}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} dx + C_{10} \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

for some positive constants C_9 and C_{10} . Now, in light of $q_0 > \frac{N}{2}$, due to (3.34) and the Sobolev imbedding theorem, we derive that there exists a positive constant C_{11} such that

$$C_9 \int_{\Omega} v^{p+1}(x, t) \leq C_{11} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}) \quad \text{and } p > 1. \quad (3.37)$$

Since, $q_0 > \frac{N}{2}$ yields $q_0 < \frac{Nq_0}{2(N-q_0)^+}$, in light of the Hölder inequality, (2.10) and (3.34), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi^2(p-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 & \leq \frac{\chi^2(p-1)}{2} \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{q_0}{q_0-1} p} \right)^{\frac{q_0-1}{q_0}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^{2q_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} \\ & \leq C_{12} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2 \frac{q_0}{q_0-1}(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where C_{10} is a positive constant. Since $q_0 > \frac{N}{2}$ and $p > q_0 - 1$, we have

$$\frac{q_0}{p} \leq \frac{q_0}{q_0-1} \leq \frac{N}{N-2},$$

which together with the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality (see e.g. [46]) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{12} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2 \frac{q_0}{q_0-1}(\Omega)}^2 & \leq C_{13} (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\mu_1} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{2q_0}{p}}(\Omega)}^{1-\mu_1} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{2q_0}{p}}(\Omega)})^2 \\ & \leq C_{14} (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{2\mu_1} + 1) \\ & = C_{14} (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{2N(p-q_0+1)}{Np+2q_0-Nq_0}} + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

with some positive constants C_{13}, C_{14} and

$$\mu_1 = \frac{\frac{Np}{2q_0} - \frac{Np}{2\frac{q_0}{q_0-1}p}}{1 - \frac{N}{2} + \frac{Np}{2q_0}} = p \frac{\frac{N}{2q_0} - \frac{N}{2\frac{q_0}{q_0-1}p}}{1 - \frac{N}{2} + \frac{Np}{2q_0}} \in (0, 1).$$

Now, in view of the Young inequality, we derive that

$$\frac{\chi^2(p-1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^p |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq \frac{p-1}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C_{15}. \quad (3.40)$$

Inserting (3.40) into (3.41), we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + \frac{p-1}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{\mu}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{p+1} dx \leq C_{16}. \quad (3.41)$$

Therefore, integrating the above inequality with respect to t yields

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_{17} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 1 \text{ and } t \in (0, T_{max}) \quad (3.42)$$

for some positive constant C_{17} . The proof Lemma 3.4 is complete. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let (u, v, w) be a solution to (1.1) on $(0, T_{max})$. Assume that $r > 2$. Then for all $p > 1$, there exists a positive constant $C := C(p, |\Omega|, r, \mu, \xi, \chi, \beta)$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} u^p(x, t) dx \leq C \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.43)$$

Proof. Firstly, multiplying the first equation of (1.1) by u^{l-1} and integrating over Ω , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + (l-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &= -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{l-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} (au - \mu u^r) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

In light of the Young inequality and $r > 2$, it reads that there exists a positive constant C_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{l+1}{l} u^l + u^{l-1} (au - \mu u^r) \right) dx \\ & \leq \frac{l+1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l dx + a \int_{\Omega} u^l dx - \mu \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx \\ & \leq -\frac{7\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx + C_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Next, integrating by parts to the first term on the right hand side of (3.44) and using the Young inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{l-1} dx \\
& \leq \frac{l-1}{l} \chi \int_{\Omega} u^l |\Delta v| dx \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx + C_2 \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{\frac{r+l-1}{r-1}} dx \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx + C_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

Next, due to (3.3) and the Young inequality, we derive that there exist positive constants C_4, C_5 and C_6 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{l-1} dx & \leq C_{\beta} \left(\frac{l-1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l (v+1) + l \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} |\nabla u| \right) \\
& \leq C_4 \left(\int_{\Omega} u^l (v+1) + l \int_{\Omega} u^{l-1} |\nabla u| \right) \\
& \leq \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C_5 \int_{\Omega} u^l + C_5 \int_{\Omega} u^l v \\
& \leq \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} + \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} + C_6.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Thus, inserting (3.45)–(3.23) into (3.44), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + \frac{l-1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{l-2} |\nabla u|^2 & \leq -\frac{5\mu}{8} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx - \frac{l+1}{l} \int_{\Omega} u^l dx \\
& \quad + \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx + \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} + C_7.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

For any $t \in (s_0, T_{max})$, applying the variation-of-constants formula to (3.48), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{l} \|u(t)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l \\
& \leq \frac{1}{l} e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} \|u(s_0)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l - \frac{5\mu}{8} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx ds \\
& \quad + \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^{l+1} dx ds + C_7 \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} ds + \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} v^{l+1} dx ds \\
& \leq -\frac{5\mu}{8} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx ds + \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} (|\Delta v|^{l+1} + v^{l+1}) dx ds + C_8,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

where

$$C_8 := \frac{1}{l} \|u(s_0)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l + C_7 \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} ds.$$

Now, by Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} (|\Delta v|^{l+1} + |v|^{l+1}) dx ds \\
&= e^{-(l+1)t} \int_{s_0}^t e^{(l+1)s} \int_{\Omega} (|\Delta v|^{l+1} + |v|^{l+1}) dx ds \\
&\leq e^{-(l+1)t} C_{l+1} \left(\int_{s_0}^t \int_{\Omega} e^{(l+1)s} u^{l+1} dx ds + e^{(l+1)s_0} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{max})$. By substituting (3.50) into (3.49) and using the Young inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{l} \|u(t)\|_{L^l(\Omega)}^l \\
&\leq -\frac{5\mu}{8} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx ds + C_{l+1} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+1} dx ds \\
&\quad + e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} C_{l+1} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} + C_8 \\
&\leq -\frac{\mu}{2} \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} u^{l+r-1} dx ds + C_9
\end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
C_9 = & e^{-(l+1)(t-s_0)} C_{l+1} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{W^{2,l+1}}^{l+1} \\
& + \frac{r-2}{r+l-1} \left(\frac{\mu}{8} \frac{r+l-1}{l+1} \right)^{-\frac{l+1}{r-2}} C_{l+1}^{\frac{r+l-1}{r-2}} \frac{\mu}{8} |\Omega| \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(l+1)(t-s)} ds + C_8.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, integrating (3.51) respect to t and using (2.10) yields

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^l(\Omega)} \leq C_{11} \quad \text{for all } l \geq 1 \quad \text{and } t \in (0, T_{max}) \tag{3.52}$$

for some positive constant C_{11} . The proof Lemma 3.4 is complete. \square

Our main result on global existence and boundedness thereby becomes a straightforward consequence of Lemmata 3.4–3.5 and Lemma 2.4. Indeed, collecting the above Lemmata, in the following, by invoking a Moser-type iteration (see Lemma A.1 in [27]) and the standard estimate for Neumann semigroup (or the standard parabolic regularity arguments), we will prove Theorem 1.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 Firstly, due to Lemmata 3.4–3.5, we derive that there exist positive constants $q_0 > N$ and C_1 such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \tag{3.53}$$

Next, employing the standard estimate for Neumann semigroup provides C_2 and $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_2 \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\alpha-\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|u(s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds + C_2 s_0^{-\alpha} \|v(s_0, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_2 \int_0^{s_0+\infty} \sigma^{-\alpha-\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu\sigma} d\sigma + C_2 s_0^{-\alpha} \beta \\
& \leq C_3 \text{ for all } t \in (0, T_{max}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

Multiplying both sides of the first equation in (1.1) by u^{p-1} , integrating over Ω and integrating by parts, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + (p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dx \\
& = -\chi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v) u^{p-1} dx - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{p-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} (au - \mu u^r) dx \\
& = \chi(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx - \xi \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) u^{p-1} dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} (au - \mu u^r) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

Due to (3.3) and (3.54) and the Young inequality, we derive that there exist positive constants C_4, C_5, C_6 and C_7 independent of p such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(p-1) \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx & \leq \chi(p-1) C_4 \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} |\nabla u| dx \\
& \leq \frac{p-1}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C_5 p \int_{\Omega} u^p
\end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
-\xi \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \nabla \cdot (u \nabla w) & \leq C_6 \left(\int_{\Omega} u^p (v+1) + p \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} |\nabla u| \right) \\
& \leq \frac{p-1}{4} \int_{\Omega} u^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + C_7 p \int_{\Omega} u^p.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.57}$$

Hence by (3.55)–(3.57), we conclude that there exist positive constants C_8 and C_9 independent of p such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + C_8 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} u^p \leq C_9 p^2 \int_{\Omega} u^p. \tag{3.58}$$

Here and throughout the proof of Theorem 1.1, we shall denote by $C_i (i \in \mathbb{N})$ several positive constants independent of p . Next, with the help of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality, we

derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_9 p^2 \int_{\Omega} u^p &= C_9 p^2 \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq C_9 p^2 (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{2\varsigma_1} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{2(1-\varsigma_1)} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2) \\
&= C_9 p^2 (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{4}{N+2}} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2) \\
&\leq C_9 p^2 (\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{2N}{N+2}} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{4}{N+2}} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2) \\
&\leq C_8 \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C_{10} p^{N+2} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2 + C_9 p^2 \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq C_8 \|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C_{11} p^{N+2} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

where

$$0 < \varsigma_1 = \frac{N - \frac{N}{2}}{1 - \frac{N}{2} + N} = \frac{N}{N+2} < 1,$$

C_{10} and C_{11} are positive constants independent of p . Therefore, inserting (3.59) into (3.58), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + \int_{\Omega} u^p &\leq C_{11} p^{2+N} \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq C_{11} p^{2+N} \left(\max\{1, \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2\} \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

Now, choosing $p_i = 2^i$ and letting $M_i = \max\{1, \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{p_i}{2}}\}$ for $T \in (0, T_{max})$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Then (3.60) implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^{p_i}(\Omega)}^{p_i} + \int_{\Omega} u^{p_i} \leq C_{11} p_i^{2+N} M_{i-1}^2(T), \tag{3.61}$$

which, together with the comparison argument entails that there exists a $\lambda > 1$ independent of i such that

$$M_i(T) \leq \max\{\lambda^i M_{i-1}^2(T), |\Omega| \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{p_i}\}. \tag{3.62}$$

Now, if $\lambda^i M_{i-1}^2(T) \leq |\Omega| \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{p_i}$ for infinitely many $i \geq 1$, we get

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_{12} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T) \tag{3.63}$$

with $C_{12} = \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Otherwise, if $\lambda^i M_{i-1}^2(T) > |\Omega| \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{p_i}$ for all sufficiently large i , then by (3.62), we derive that

$$M_i(T) \leq \lambda^i M_{i-1}^2(T) \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } i. \tag{3.64}$$

Hence, we may choose λ large enough such that

$$M_i(T) \leq \lambda^i M_{i-1}^2(T) \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1. \quad (3.65)$$

Therefore, in light of a straightforward induction (see e.g. Lemma 3.12 of [30]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_i(T) &\leq \lambda^i (\lambda^{i-1} M_{i-2}^2)^2 \\ &= \lambda^{i+2(i-1)} M_{i-2}^{2^2} \\ &\leq \lambda^{i+\sum_{j=2}^i (j-1)} M_0^{2^i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

Taking p_i -th roots on both sides of (3.66), with some basic calculation and by taking $T \nearrow T_{max}$, we can finally conclude that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_{13} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.67)$$

Now, with the above estimate in hand, using (3.5), we may establish

$$\|\nabla w(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_{14} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.68)$$

Finally, according to Lemma 2.4, this together with (3.54) and (3.67) entails that (u, v, w) is global in time, and that u is bounded in $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$. \square

Acknowledgement: This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11601215), Shandong Provincial Science Foundation for Outstanding Youth (No. ZR2018JL005), Shandong Provincial Natural Science Foundation, China (No. ZR2016AQ17) and the Doctor Start-up Funding of Ludong University (No. LA2016006).

References

- [1] N. Bellomo, A. Belloquid, Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Toward a mathematical theory of Keller–Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 25(9)(2015), 1663–1763.
- [2] X. Cao, *Boundedness in a three-dimensional chemotaxis–haptotaxis model*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 67(1)2015, 1–13.

- [3] M. A. J. Chaplain, G. Lolas, *Mathematical modelling of cancer invasion of tissue: The role of the urokinase plasminogen activation system*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 11(2005), 1685–1734.
- [4] M. A. J. Chaplain, G. Lolas, *Mathematical modelling of cancer invasion of tissue: dynamic heterogeneity*, Net. Hetero. Med., 1(2006), 399–439.
- [5] T. Cieřlak, C. Stinner, *Finite-time blowup and global-in-time unbounded solutions to a parabolic–parabolic quasilinear Keller–Segel system in higher dimensions*, J. Diff. Eqns., 252(2012), 5832–5851.
- [6] H. Hajaiej, L. Molinet, T. Ozawa, B. Wang, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for the fractional Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities and applications to Navier–Stokes and generalized boson equations*, in: Harmonic Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, in: RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu, vol. B26, Res. Inst. Math. Sci. (RIMS), Kyoto, 2011, pp. 159–175.
- [7] T. Hillen, K. J. Painter, *A use’s guide to PDE models for chemotaxis*, J. Math. Biol., 58(2009), 183–217.
- [8] T. Hillen, K. J. Painter, M. Winkler, *Convergence of a cancer invasion model to a logistic chemotaxis model*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 23(2013), 165–198.
- [9] D. Horstmann, *From 1970 until present: the Keller–Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences*, I. Jahresberichte der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, 105(2003), 103–165.
- [10] D. Horstmann, M. Winkler, *Boundedness vs. blow-up in a chemotaxis system*, J. Diff. Eqns, 215(2005), 52–107.
- [11] S. Ishida, K. Seki, T. Yokota, *Boundedness in quasilinear Keller–Segel systems of parabolic–parabolic type on non-convex bounded domains*, J. Diff. Eqns., 256(2014), 2993–3010.

- [12] W. Jäger, S. Luckhaus, *On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modelling chemotaxis*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., 329(1992), 819–824.
- [13] E. Keller, L. Segel, *Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability*, J. Theor. Biol., 26(1970), 399–415.
- [14] X. Li and Z. Xiang, *Boundedness in quasilinear Keller-Segel equations with nonlinear sensitivity and logistic source*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 35(2015), 3503–3531.
- [15] G. Liţcanu, C. Morales-Rodrigo, *Asymptotic behavior of global solutions to a model of cell invasion*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 20(2010), 1721–1758.
- [16] J. Liu, J. Zheng, Y. Wang, *Boundedness in a quasilinear chemotaxis-haptotaxis system with logistic source*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 67(2)2016, 1–33.
- [17] A. Marciniak-Czochra, M. Ptashnyk, *Boundedness of solutions of a haptotaxis model*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 20(2010), 449–476.
- [18] V. Nanjundiah, *Chemotaxis, signal relaying and aggregation morpholog*, J. Theor. Biol., 42(1973), 63–105.
- [19] K. Osaki, T. Tsujikawa, A. Yagi, M. Mimura, *Exponential attractor for a chemotaxis growth system of equations*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA., 51(2002), 119–144.
- [20] K. J. Painter, T. Hillen, *Volume-filling and quorum-sensing in models for chemosensitive movement*, Can. Appl. Math. Q., 10(2002), 501–543.
- [21] J. Simon, *Compact sets in the space $L^p(O, T; B)$* , Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, 146(1)(1986), 65–96.
- [22] Y. Tao, *Global existence of classical solutions to a combined chemotaxis-haptotaxis model with logistic source*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 354(2009), 60–69.
- [23] Y. Tao, *Boundedness in a two-dimensional chemotaxis-haptotaxis system*, Journal of Oceanography, 70(70)(2014), 165–174.

- [24] Y. Tao, M. Wang, *Global solution for a chemotactic–haptotactic model of cancer invasion*, *Nonlinearity*, 21(2008), 2221–2238.
- [25] Y. Tao, M. Wang, *A combined chemotaxis–haptotaxis system: The role of logistic source*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 41(2009), 1533–1558.
- [26] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *A chemotaxis–haptotaxis model: the roles of porous medium diffusion and logistic source*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(2011), 685–704.
- [27] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Boundedness in a quasilinear parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system with subcritical sensitivity*, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 252(2012), 692–715.
- [28] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Boundedness and stabilization in a multi-dimensional chemotaxis–haptotaxis model*, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 144(2014), 1067–1084.
- [29] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Dominance of chemotaxis in a chemotaxis–haptotaxis model*, *Nonlinearity*, 27(2014), 1225–1239.
- [30] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Energy-type estimates and global solvability in a two-dimensional chemotaxis–haptotaxis model with remodeling of non-diffusible attractant*, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 257(2014), 784–815.
- [31] J. I. Tello, M. Winkler, *A chemotaxis system with logistic source*, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.*, 32(2007), 849–877.
- [32] C. Walker, G. F. Webb, *Global existence of classical solutions for a haptotaxis model*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 38(2007), 1694–1713.
- [33] L. Wang, C. Mu, P. Zheng, *On a quasilinear parabolic–elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source*, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 256(2014), 1847–1872.
- [34] Y. Wang, *Boundedness in the higher-dimensional chemotaxis–haptotaxis model with nonlinear diffusion*, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 260(2)(2016), 1975–1989.
- [35] Y. Wang, Y. Ke, *Large time behavior of solution to a fully parabolic chemotaxis–haptotaxis model in higher dimensions*, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 260(9)(2016), 6960–6988.

- [36] M. Winkler, *Does a volume-filling effect always prevent chemotactic collapse*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., 33(2010), 12–24.
- [37] M. Winkler, *Boundedness in the higher-dimensional parabolic–parabolic chemotaxis system with logistic source*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns., 35(2010), 1516–1537.
- [38] M. Winkler, *Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller–Segel model*, J. Diff. Eqns., 248(2010), 2889–2905.
- [39] M. Winkler, *Blow-up in a higher-dimensional chemotaxis system despite logistic growth restriction*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 384(2011), 261–272.
- [40] M. Winkler, *Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 100(2013), 748–767.
- [41] M. Winkler, *A critical blow-up exponent in a chemotaxis system with nonlinear signal production*, Nonlinearity, 31(5)2018, 2031–2056.
- [42] M. Winkler, *Finite-time blow-up in low-dimensional Keller–Segel systems with logistic-type superlinear degradation*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., (2018) 69:40
- [43] M. Winkler, K. C. Djie, *Boundedness and finite-time collapse in a chemotaxis system with volume-filling effect*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA., 72(2010), 1044–1064.
- [44] T. Xiang, *Boundedness and global existence in the higher-dimensional parabolic–parabolic chemotaxis system with/without growth source*, J. Diff. Eqns., 258(2015), 4275–4323.
- [45] Q. Zhang, Y. Li, *Global boundedness of solutions to a two-species chemotaxis system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 66(1)(2015), 83–93.
- [46] J. Zheng, *Optimal controls of multi-dimensional modified Swift-Hohenberg equation*, International Journal of Control, 88(10)(2015), 2117–2125.
- [47] J. Zheng, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear parabolic–elliptic Keller–Segel system with logistic source*, J. Diff. Eqns., 259(1)(2015), 120–140.

- [48] J. Zheng, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system with logistic source*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 431(2)(2015), 867–888.
- [49] J. Zheng, *Boundedness and global asymptotic stability of constant equilibria in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with nonlinear a logistic source*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 450(2017), 104–1061.
- [50] J. Zheng, *A note on boundedness of solutions to a higher-dimensional quasi-linear chemotaxis system with logistic source*, Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik, (97)(4)(2017), 414–421.
- [51] J. Zheng, *Boundedness in a two-species quasi-linear chemotaxis system with two chemicals*, Topological methods in nonlinear analysis, (49)(2)(2017), 463–480.
- [52] J. Zheng, *Boundedness of solution of a higher-dimensional parabolic–ODE–parabolic chemotaxis–haptotaxis model with generalized logistic source*, Nonlinearity, 30(2017), 1987–2009.
- [53] J. Zheng, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear higher-dimensional chemotaxis–haptotaxis model with nonlinear diffusion*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, (37)(1)(2017), 627–643.
- [54] J. Zheng, *Global weak solutions in a three-dimensional Keller–Segel–Navier–Stokes system with nonlinear diffusion*, J. Diff. Eqns., 263(2017), 2606–2629.
- [55] J. Zheng, *A new result for global existence and boundedness of solutions to a parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system with logistic source*, arXiv:1712.00906, 2017.
- [56] J. Zheng, Y. Wang, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear chemotaxis–haptotaxis model*, Compu. Math. Appl., 71(2016), 1898–1909.
- [57] P. Zheng, C. Mu, X. Song, *On the boundedness and decay of solutions for a chemotaxis–haptotaxis system with nonlinear diffusion*, Disc. Cont. Dyna. Syst., 36(3)(2015), 1737–1757.