

Global boundedness and decay property of a three-dimensional Keller–Segel–Stokes system modeling coral fertilization

Jing Li

College of Science, Minzu University of China, Beijing, 100081, P.R. China

Peter Y. H. Pang

Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore,

10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Republic of Singapore 119076

Yifu Wang*

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Beijing Institute of Technology,

Beijing, 100081, P.R. China

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the four-component Keller–Segel–Stokes system modelling the fertilization process of corals:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) - \rho m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ m_t + u \cdot \nabla m = \Delta m - \rho m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c + m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ u_t = \Delta u - \nabla P + (\rho + m) \nabla \phi, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T) \end{array} \right.$$

subject to the boundary conditions $\nabla c \cdot \nu = \nabla m \cdot \nu = (\nabla \rho - \rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) \cdot \nu = 0$ and $u = 0$, and suitably regular initial data $(\rho_0(x), m_0(x), c_0(x), u_0(x))$, where $T \in (0, \infty]$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. This system describes the spatio-temporal dynamics of the population densities of sperm ρ and egg m under a chemotactic

*Corresponding author. Email: wangyifu@bit.edu.cn

process facilitated by a chemical signal released by the egg with concentration c in a fluid-flow environment u modeled by the incompressible Stokes equation. In this model, the chemotactic sensitivity tensor $\mathcal{S} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)^2)^{3 \times 3}$ satisfies $|\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)| \leq C_S(1 + \rho)^{-\alpha}$ with some $C_S > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$. We will show that for $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{3}$, the solutions to the system are globally bounded and decay to a spatially homogeneous equilibrium exponentially as time goes to infinity. In addition, we will also show that, for any $\alpha \geq 0$, a similar result is valid when the initial data satisfy a certain smallness condition.

Keywords: Keller–Segel–Stokes; tensor–value sensitivity; global boundedness; decay property.

AMS Subject Classification: 35B65; 35B40; 35K57; 92C17; 35Q92.

1 Introduction

Chemotaxis, the directed movement caused by the concentration of certain chemicals, is ubiquitous in biology and ecology, and has a significant effect on pattern formation in numerous biological contexts [13, 22]. The first mathematically rigorous studies of chemotaxis were carried out by Patlak [24] and Keller–Segel [16]. The latter work involves the derivation of a system of PDEs, now known as the Keller–Segel system, which, despite its simple structure, was proved to have a lasting impact as a theoretical framework describing the collective behavior of populations under the influence of a chemotactic signal produced by the populations themselves [2, 12, 30, 31]. In contrast to this well-understood Keller–Segel system, there seem to be few theoretical results on nontrivial behavior in situations where the signal is not produced by the population, such as in oxygenotaxis processes of swimming aerobic bacteria [26], or where the signal production occurs by indirect processes, such as in glycolysis reaction and tumor invasion [7, 23, 5].

In this paper, we study a chemotaxis–fluid system modelling coral fertilization. Specifically, we are concerned with a Keller–Segel–Stokes system

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) - \rho m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\
m_t + u \cdot \nabla m = \Delta m - \rho m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\
c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c + m, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\
u_t = \Delta u - \nabla P + (\rho + m) \nabla \phi, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\
(\nabla \rho - \rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) \cdot \nu = \nabla m \cdot \nu = \nabla c \cdot \nu = 0, u = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial \Omega \times (0, T), \\
\rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), m(x, 0) = m_0(x), c(x, 0) = c_0(x), u(x, 0) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega,
\end{array} \right. \quad (1.1)$$

where $T \in (0, \infty]$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$, the chemotactic sensitivity tensor $\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) = (s_{ij}(x, \rho, c)) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)^2)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $\phi \in W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)$.

This PDE system describes the phenomenon of coral broadcast spawning [9, 10, 17, 18], where the sperm ρ chemotactically moves toward the higher concentration of the chemical c released by the egg m , while the egg m is merely affected by random diffusion, fluid transport and degradation upon contact with the sperm. Meanwhile, the fluid flow vector u , modeling the ambient ocean environment, satisfies a Stokes equation, where $P = P(x, t)$ represents the associated pressure, and the buoyancy effect of the sperm and egg on the velocity, mediated through a given gravitational potential ϕ , is taken into account. We note that the use of the Stokes equation instead of the Navier–Stokes equation is justified by the observation that the fluid flow is relatively slow compared with the movement of the sperm and egg. We further note that the sensitivity tensor $\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)$ may take values that are matrices possibly containing nontrivial off-diagonal entries, which reflects that the chemotactic migration may not necessarily be oriented along the gradient of the chemical signal, but may rather involve rotational flux components (see [36, 37] for the detailed model derivation).

A two-component variant of (1.1) has been used in the mathematical study of coral broadcast spawning. Indeed, in [17, 18], Kiselev and Ryzhik investigated the important effect of chemotaxis on the coral fertilization process via the Keller–Segel type system of the form

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \chi \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla c) - \mu \rho^q, \\
0 = \Delta c + \rho
\end{array} \right. \quad (1.2)$$

with a given regular solenoidal fluid flow vector u . This model implicitly assumes that the densities of sperm and egg gametes are identical, and that the Péclet number for the chemical

concentration c is small which allows us to ignore the effects of convection on c . The authors showed that, for the Cauchy problem in \mathbb{R}^2 , the total mass $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho(x, t) dx$ can become arbitrarily small with increasing χ in the case $q > 2$ of supercritical reaction, whereas in the critical case $q = 2$, a weaker but related effect within finite time intervals is observed. Recently, Ahn et al. [1] established the global well-posedness of regular solutions for the variant model of (1.2) with $c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c + \rho$ instead of $0 = \Delta c + \rho$. They also proved that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x, t) dx$ ($d = 2, 3$) asymptotically approaches a strictly positive constant $C(\chi)$ which tends to 0 as $\chi \rightarrow \infty$.

In [8], Espejo and Suzuki studied the three-component variant of (1.1)

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \chi \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) - \mu \rho^2, \\ c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c + \rho, \\ u_t + \kappa(u \cdot \nabla)u = \Delta u - \nabla P + \rho \nabla \phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

in the modeling of broadcast spawning when the interaction of chemotactic movement of the gametes and the surrounding fluid is not negligible. Here the coefficient $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ is related to the strength of nonlinear convection. In particular, when the fluid flow is slow, we can use the Stokes instead of the Navier–Stokes equation, i.e., assume $\kappa = 0$ (see [6, 21]). It should be mentioned that the chemotaxis–fluid model with $c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c\rho$ replacing the second equation in (1.3) has also been used to describe the behavior of bacteria of the species *Bacillus subtilis* suspended in sessile water drops [26]. From the viewpoint of mathematical analysis, this chemotaxis–fluid system compounds the known difficulties in the study of fluid dynamics with the typical intricacies in the study of chemotaxis systems. It has also been observed that when $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)$ is a tensor, the corresponding chemotaxis–fluid system loses some energy-like structure, which plays a key role in the analysis of the scalar-valued case. Despite these challenges, some comprehensive results on the global-boundedness and large time behavior of solutions are available in the literature (see [3, 19, 20, 25, 27, 29, 33, 34, 35] for example). It has been shown that when $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)$ is a tensor fulfilling

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)| \leq \frac{C_S}{(1 + \rho)^\alpha} \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0 \text{ and } C_S > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

the three-dimensional system (1.3) with $\mu = 0$, $\kappa = 0$ admits globally bounded weak solutions

for $\alpha > 1/2$ [27], which is slightly stronger than the corresponding subcritical assumption $\alpha > 1/3$ for the fluid-free system. As for $\alpha \geq 0$, when the suitably regular initial data (ρ_0, c_0, u_0) fulfill a smallness condition, (1.3) with $\mu = 0$, $\kappa = 1$ possesses a global classical solution which decays to $(\bar{\rho}_0, \bar{\rho}_0, 0)$ exponentially with $\bar{\rho}_0 = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \rho_0(x) dx$ [38].

Removing the presupposition that the densities of the sperm and egg coincide at each point, Espejo and Suzuki [9] looked at a simplified version of (1.1) in two dimensions, namely,

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \chi \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla c) - \rho m, \\ m_t + u \cdot \nabla m = \Delta m - \rho m, \\ 0 = \Delta c + k_0(m - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} m dx) \text{ with } \int_{\Omega} c dx = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

and showed that $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0(x) dx \geq \int_{\Omega} m_0(x) dx$ implies that $m(x, t)$ vanishes asymptotically, while $\int_{\Omega} \rho(x, t) dx \rightarrow \frac{1}{|\Omega|} (\int_{\Omega} \rho_0(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} m_0(x) dx)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, provided that χ is small enough and u is low. In two dimensions, Espejo and Winkler [10] have recently considered the Navier–Stokes version of (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + u \cdot \nabla \rho = \Delta \rho - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla c) - \rho m, \\ m_t + u \cdot \nabla m = \Delta m - \rho m, \\ c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - c + m, \\ u_t + \kappa(u \cdot \nabla) = \Delta u - \nabla P + (\rho + m) \nabla \phi, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

and established the global existence of classical solutions to the associated initial-boundary value problem, which tend towards a spatially homogeneous equilibrium in the large time limit.

Motivated by the above works, we shall consider the properties of solutions to the system (1.1) in the three-dimensional setting. In particular, we shall show that the corresponding solutions converge to a spatially homogeneous equilibrium exponentially as $t \rightarrow \infty$ as well.

Throughout the rest of the paper, we shall assume that

$$\begin{cases} \rho_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}), \rho_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho_0 \not\equiv 0, \\ m_0 \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}), m_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } m_0 \not\equiv 0, \\ c_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega), c_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } c_0 \not\equiv 0, \\ u_0 \in D(A^\beta) \text{ for all } \beta \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1), \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

where A denotes the realization of the Stokes operator in $L^2(\Omega)$. Under these assumptions, we shall first establish the existence of global bounded classical solutions to (1.1):

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that (1.4), (1.7) hold with $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$. Then the system (1.1) admits a global classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) , which is uniformly bounded in the sense that for any $\beta \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1)$, there exists $K > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, \infty)$*

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K. \quad (1.8)$$

Then, we establish the large time behavior of these solutions as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the solutions given by Theorem 1.1 satisfy*

$$\rho(\cdot, t) \rightarrow \rho_\infty, \quad m(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty, \quad c(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty, \quad u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, when $\int_\Omega \rho_0 \neq \int_\Omega m_0$, there exist $K > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K e^{-\delta t}, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K e^{-\delta t}, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K e^{-\delta t}, \quad (1.11)$$

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K e^{-\delta t}, \quad (1.12)$$

where $\rho_\infty = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left\{ \int_\Omega \rho_0 - \int_\Omega m_0 \right\}_+$, $m_\infty = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left\{ \int_\Omega m_0 - \int_\Omega \rho_0 \right\}_+$.

According to the result for the related fluid-free system, the subcritical restriction $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ seems to be necessary for the existence of global bounded solutions. However, for $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{3}$, inspired by [3, 38], we investigate the existence of global bounded classical solutions and their large time behavior under a smallness assumption imposed on the initial data, which can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that (1.4) hold with $\alpha = 0$ and $\int_\Omega \rho_0 \neq \int_\Omega m_0$. Further, let $N = 3$ and $p_0 \in (\frac{N}{2}, \infty)$, $q_0 \in (N, \infty)$ if $\int_\Omega \rho_0 > \int_\Omega m_0$; and $p_0 \in (\frac{2N}{3}, \infty)$, $q_0 \in (N, \infty)$ if $\int_\Omega \rho_0 < \int_\Omega m_0$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any initial data (ρ_0, m_0, c_0, u_0) fulfilling (1.7) as well as*

$$\|\rho_0 - \rho_\infty\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|m_0 - m_\infty\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

(1.1) possesses a global classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) . Moreover, for any $\alpha_1 \in (0, \min\{\lambda_1, m_\infty + \rho_\infty\})$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, \min\{\alpha_1, \lambda'_1, 1\})$, there exist constants K_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, such that for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad \|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t},$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}, \quad \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}.$$

Here λ'_1 is the first eigenvalue of A , and λ_1 is the first nonzero eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ on Ω under the Neumann boundary condition.

Remark 1.1. In Theorem 1.3, we have excluded the case $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 = \int_{\Omega} m_0$. Indeed, in this case, some results of Cao and Winkler [4] suggest that exponential decay of solutions may not hold.

Remark 1.2. It is observed that the similar result to Theorem 1.3 is also valid for the Navier–Stokes counterpart of (1.1) upon slight modification of the definition of T in (3.53) and (3.87).

As mentioned above, compared with the scalar sensitivity \mathcal{S} , the system (1.1) with rotational tensor loses a favorable quasi-energy structure. For example, we note that the integral

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho \ln \rho + a \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 + b \int_{\Omega} |u|^2$$

with appropriate positive constants a and b plays a favorable entropy-like functional in deriving the bounds of solution to (1.6). However, this will no longer be available in the present situation (see [10]). To overcome this difficulty, our approach underlying the derivation of Theorem 1.1 will be based on the estimate of the functional

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

In addition, the proof of the exponential decay results in Theorem 1.2 relies on careful analysis of the functional

$$G(t) := \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 + a \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m})^2 + b \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 + c \int_{\Omega} \rho m$$

with suitable parameters $a, b, c > 0$. Indeed, it can be seen that $G(t)$ satisfies the ODE: $G'(t) + \delta_1 G(t) \leq 0$ for some $\delta_1 > 0$, and thereby the convergence rate of solutions in $L^2(\Omega)$ is established. At the same time, in comparison with the chemotaxis–fluid system considered in [3, 38], due to

$$\|e^{t\Delta} \omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \left(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}\right) e^{-\lambda_1 t} \|\omega\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$$

for all $\omega \in L^q(\Omega)$ with $\int_{\Omega} \omega = 0$, $-\rho m$ in the first equation of (1.1) gives rise to some difficulty in mathematical analysis despite its dissipative feature. Accordingly it requires a non-trivial application of the mass conservation of $\rho(x, t) - m(x, t)$.

The plan of this paper is as follows: In Section 2, we give a local existence result and some useful estimates. In Section 3, in the case of \mathcal{S} vanishing on the boundary, we investigate the existence and large time behavior of global bounded classical solutions under the assumption

of either $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$ or smallness of the initial data. In the last section, on the basis of certain a priori estimates, we give the proofs of our main results.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we first recall a result on the local existence of classical solutions, which can be proved by a straightforward adaptation of well-known fixed point argument (see [29] for example).

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that (1.4), (1.7) and*

$$\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) = 0, \quad (x, \rho, c) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \quad (2.1)$$

hold. Then there exist $T_{max} \in (0, \infty]$ and a classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) of (1.1) on $(0, T_{max})$. Moreover, ρ, m, c are nonnegative in $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$, and if $T_{max} < \infty$, then for $\beta \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1)$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}} (\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) = \infty$. This solution is unique, up to addition of constants to P .

The following elementary properties of the solutions in Lemma 2.1 are immediate consequences of the integration of the first and second equations in (1.1), as well as an application of the maximum principle to the second and third equations.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that (1.4), (1.7) and (2.1) hold. Then for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, the solution of (1.1) from Lemma 2.1 satisfies*

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|m_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\int_0^t \|\rho(\cdot, s)m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} ds \leq \min\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \|m_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \|m_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \int_0^t \|\nabla m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds \leq \|m_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|m_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \max\{\|m_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\}. \quad (2.7)$$

3 Proof of Theorems for $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$

In this section, we shall consider the case in which besides (1.4), the sensitivity satisfies $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Under this hypothesis, the boundary condition for ρ in (1.1) actually reduces to the homogeneous Neumann condition $\nabla\rho \cdot \nu = 0$.

3.1 Global boundedness for $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that (1.4), (1.7), (2.1) hold with $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $K(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, the solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|\Delta c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + K(\varepsilon). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Multiplying the first equation of (1.1) by ρ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 = \int_{\Omega} \rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla \rho \nabla c - \int_{\Omega} \rho^2 m \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + \frac{C_S^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho)^{2\alpha}} |\nabla c|^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Now we estimate the term $\frac{C_S^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho)^{2\alpha}} |\nabla c|^2$ in the right hand side of (3.2). In fact, if $\alpha \geq \frac{3}{4}$,

$$\frac{C_S^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho)^{2\alpha}} |\nabla c|^2 \leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^4 + K(\varepsilon), \quad (3.3)$$

while for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$,

$$\frac{C_S^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^2}{(1+\rho)^{2\alpha}} |\nabla c|^2 \leq \frac{C_S^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho^{2-2\alpha} |\nabla c|^2 \leq \frac{C_S^4}{16\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \rho^{4-4\alpha} + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^4. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2 and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^4 \leq C_{GN} \left\{ \|\Delta c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^4 \right\} \leq C'_{GN} (\|\Delta c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\rho|^{4-4\alpha} = \|\rho\|_{L^{4-4\alpha}(\Omega)}^{4-4\alpha} \leq C_{GN} \left\{ \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{(4-4\alpha)\lambda_2} \|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{(4-4\alpha)(1-\lambda_2)} + \|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{4-4\alpha} \right\}$$

with $\lambda_2 = \frac{6(3-4\alpha)}{5(4-4\alpha)}$. Due to $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$, we have $(4-4\alpha)\lambda_2 < 2$ and thus

$$\frac{C_S^4}{16\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |\rho|^{4-4\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + K_1 \quad (3.6)$$

by the Young inequality. Combining (3.2)–(3.6), we readily have (3.1).

Lemma 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, there exists a positive constant $C = C(m_0, c_0)$ such that for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, the solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Delta c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K (\|\nabla u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1). \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Multiplying the c -equation of (1.1) by $-\Delta c$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\Delta c|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 \leq - \int_{\Omega} m \Delta c + \int_{\Omega} (u \cdot \nabla c) \Delta c \quad (3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_{\Omega} |m|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta c|^2 - \int_{\Omega} \nabla c \cdot (\nabla u \cdot \nabla c) \\
&\leq \|m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|\Delta c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|\nabla c\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.5) and taking $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2C'_{GN}}$ in the above inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\Delta c|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 \leq \|m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C'_{GN} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4},$$

which along with (2.5) readily ensures the validity of (3.7).

Lemma 3.3. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, the solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K \left(\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1 \right), \quad (3.9)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|Au(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K \left(\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1 \right) \quad (3.10)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$ for a positive constant K .

Proof. Testing the u -equation in (1.1) by u , using the Hölder inequality and Poincaré inequality, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 &= \int_{\Omega} (\rho + m) \nabla \phi \cdot u \\
&\leq \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\rho + m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + K_1 (\|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.5) yields (3.9). Applying the Helmholtz projection \mathcal{P} to the fourth equation in (1.1), testing the resulting identity by Au and using the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |Au|^2 &= - \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{P}[(\rho + m) \nabla \phi] \cdot Au \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |Au|^2 + K_2 \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^2 + \int_{\Omega} m^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.10), due to (2.5) and the fact that $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 = \int_{\Omega} |A^{\frac{1}{2}} u|^2$.

Lemma 3.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, one can find $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$, the solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}^2 \leq K.$$

Proof. By the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality

$$\|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{GN} \left(\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{5}} \|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{5}} + \|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right)$$

and (3.1), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $K(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|\Delta c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + K_1(\varepsilon). \quad (3.11)$$

Adding (3.9) and (3.10), and by the Poincaré inequality, one can find constants $K_i > 0$, $i = 2, 3, 4$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) + K_2 (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) &\leq K_3 (\|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + K_4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Recalling (3.7), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\|\nabla c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Delta c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K_5 (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 1). \quad (3.13)$$

Now combining the above inequalities and choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{K_2}{2K_3}$, one can see that there exists some constant $K_6 > 0$ such that

$$Y(t) := \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

satisfies $Y'(t) + \delta Y(t) \leq K_6$, where $\delta = \min\{1, \frac{K_2}{2}\}$. Hence by an ODE comparison argument, we obtain $Y(t) \leq K_7$ for some constant $K_7 > 0$ and thereby complete the proof.

With all of the above estimates at hand, we can now establish the global existence result in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. To establish the existence of globally bounded classical solution, by the extensibility criterion in Lemma 2.1, we only need to show that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K_1 \quad (3.14)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$ with some positive constant K_1 independent of T_{max} . To this end, by the estimate of Stokes operator (Corollary 3.4 of [32]), we first get

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_2 \|u\|_{W^{1,5}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 \quad (3.15)$$

with positive constant $K_3 > 0$ independent of T_{max} , due to $\|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K_4$ and $\|m\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4$ from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 2.2, respectively.

By Lemma 2.1 of [15], Lemma 3.4 and the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq K_5(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|m - u \cdot \nabla c\|_{L^4(\Omega)}) \\
&\leq K_5(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} (\|m\|_{L^4(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^{12}(\Omega)})) \\
&\leq K_5(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} (\|m\|_{L^4(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{5}{6}})) \\
&\leq K_6(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{5}{6}}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_7$. Along with (2.7) this implies $\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_8$. Furthermore, applying the variation-of-constants formula to the ρ -equation in (1.1) and by Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq \|e^{t\Delta} \rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S} \nabla c + \rho u)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{7}{8}}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\rho \mathcal{S} \nabla c + \rho u\|_{L^4(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + K_9 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{7}{8}}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^4(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + K_9 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{7}{8}}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + K_{10} \sup_{s \in (0, T_{max})} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

with $K_{10} = K_9 \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\infty (1 + s^{-\frac{7}{8}}) e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds$, where we have used $\nabla \cdot u = 0$. Taking supremum on the left side of the above inequality over $(0, T_{max})$, we obtain

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + K_{10} \sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and thereby $\sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_{11}$ by the Young inequality. Finally, by a straightforward argument, one can find $K_{12} > 0$ such that $\sup_{t \in (0, T_{max})} \|A^\beta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K_{12}$. The boundedness estimate (3.14) is now a direct consequence of the above inequalities and this completes the proof.

3.2 Large time behavior for $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$

This section is devoted to showing the large time behavior of global solutions to (1.1) obtained in the above subsection. In order to derive the convergence properties of solution with respect to the norm in $L^2(\Omega)$, we shall make use of the following lemma. In the sequel, we denote $\bar{f} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} f(x) dx$.

Lemma 3.5. (Lemma 4.6 of [10]) *Let $\lambda > 0$, $C > 0$, and suppose that $y \in C^1([0, \infty))$ and $h \in C^0([0, \infty))$ are nonnegative functions satisfying $y'(t) + \lambda y(t) \leq h(t)$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and all $t > 0$. Then if $\int_0^{\infty} h(s) ds \leq C$, we have $y(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

By means of the testing procedure and the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 &= 2 \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho}) (\Delta \rho - \nabla(\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)) \nabla c - u \cdot \nabla \rho - \rho m + \bar{\rho} \bar{m}) \quad (3.16) \\ &= -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} \rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c \cdot \nabla \rho - 2 \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho}) (\rho m - \bar{\rho} \bar{m}) \\ &\leq - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + K_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 - 2 \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho}) \rho m, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m})^2 &= 2 \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m}) (\Delta m - u \cdot \nabla m - \rho m + \bar{\rho} \bar{m}) \quad (3.17) \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} m (\Delta m - u \cdot \nabla m) - 2 \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m}) (\rho m - \bar{\rho} \bar{m}) \\ &\leq -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla m|^2 - 2 \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m}) \rho m, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 &= 2 \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c}) (\Delta c - u \cdot \nabla c - (c - \bar{c}) + (m - \bar{m})) \quad (3.18) \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} c (\Delta c - u \cdot \nabla c) - 2 \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c}) (m - \bar{m}) \\ &\leq -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 - \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 + \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m})^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 &= -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} (\rho + m) \nabla \phi \cdot u - 2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla P \cdot u \quad (3.19) \\ &= -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho} + m - \bar{m}) \nabla \phi \cdot u \\ &\leq -2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + K_2 \left(\int_{\Omega} |\rho - \bar{\rho} + m - \bar{m}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + K_3 \left(\int_{\Omega} |\rho - \bar{\rho}|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |m - \bar{m}|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and the boundedness of u , $\nabla \phi$ and \mathcal{S} are used.

Lemma 3.6. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1,*

$$\|(\rho - \bar{\rho})(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$\|(m - \bar{m})(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$\|(c - \bar{c})(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

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

Proof. From (3.16)–(3.19), it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 \leq - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \rho|^2 + K_1 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 + 2\bar{\rho} \int_{\Omega} \rho m, \quad (3.20)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m})^2 \leq - 2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla m|^2 + 2\bar{m} \int_{\Omega} \rho m, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 \leq - 2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c|^2 - \int_{\Omega} (c - \bar{c})^2 + \int_{\Omega} (m - \bar{m})^2, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \leq - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + K_3 \left(\int_{\Omega} |\rho - \bar{\rho}|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |m - \bar{m}|^2 \right). \quad (3.23)$$

Since $\int_{\Omega} |m - \bar{m}|^2 \leq C_p \|\nabla m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ and $\int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} \rho m \leq K_4$ by (2.3), an application of Lemma 3.5 to (3.21) yields

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - \bar{m}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.24)$$

Since

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} |(m - \bar{m})|^2 ds \leq C_p \int_0^\infty \|\nabla m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds \leq K_5, \quad (3.25)$$

the application of Lemma 3.5 to (3.22) also yields

$$\|c(\cdot, t) - \bar{c}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty \|\nabla c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} |m - \bar{m}|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |c_0 - \bar{c}_0|^2 \leq K_6. \quad (3.27)$$

Furthermore, by (3.27), $\int_{\Omega} |\rho - \bar{\rho}|^2 \leq C_p \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ and $\int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} \rho m \leq K_4$, Lemma 3.5 implies that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.28)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_p \int_0^\infty \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K_7. \quad (3.29)$$

Hence from (3.25), (3.29), $\int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \leq C_p \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ and Lemma 3.5, it follows that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.30)$$

as well as $\int_0^\infty \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq K_8$.

Now we turn the above convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$ into $L^\infty(\Omega)$ with the help of the higher regularity of the solutions. Indeed, similar to the proof of $\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K$ in Theorem 1.1 in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_{10}$ can be proved since $\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_9$ for all $t > 0$ in (3.14). Hence from (3.14), there exists a constant $K_{11} > 0$ such that $\|m(\cdot, t) - \bar{m}(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_{11}$, $\|c(\cdot, t) - \bar{c}(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_{11}$, $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,5}(\Omega)} \leq K_{11}$ for all $t > 1$. Therefore by (3.24), (3.26) and (3.30), the application of the interpolation inequality yields

$$\|m - \bar{m}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|m - \bar{m}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{5}} \|m - \bar{m}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{2}{5}} + \|m - \bar{m}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t) - \bar{c}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

In addition, similar to Lemma 4.4 in [10] or Lemma 5.2 in [3], there exist $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ and constant $K_{12} > 0$ such that $\|\rho\|_{C^{\vartheta, \frac{\vartheta}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [t, t+1])} \leq K_{12}$ for all $t > 1$, which along with (3.28) implies that $\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}(t)\|_{C_{loc}(\bar{\Omega})} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and then, by the finite covering theorem, $\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

By very similar argument as in Lemma 4.2 of [10], we have

Lemma 3.7. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1,*

$$\bar{\rho}(t) \rightarrow \rho_\infty, \quad \bar{m}(t) \rightarrow m_\infty, \quad \bar{c}(t) \rightarrow m_\infty \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

with $\rho_\infty = \{\bar{\rho}_0 - \bar{m}_0\}_+$ and $m_\infty = \{\bar{m}_0 - \bar{\rho}_0\}_+$.

Proof. From (2.3) and (2.5), we have

$$\int_{t-1}^t \|\rho m\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.31)$$

$$\int_{t-1}^t \|\nabla m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.32)$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{t-1}^t \|\rho m\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \int_{t-1}^t \int_{\Omega} \rho(m - \bar{m}) + \int_{t-1}^t \int_{\Omega} \rho \bar{m}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq - \int_{t-1}^t \|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|m - \bar{m}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\Omega| \int_{t-1}^t \bar{\rho} \cdot \bar{m} \\
&\geq -K \int_{t-1}^t \|\nabla m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\Omega| \int_{t-1}^t \bar{\rho} \cdot \bar{m} \\
&\geq -K \left(\int_{t-1}^t \|\nabla m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\Omega| \int_{t-1}^t \bar{\rho} \cdot \bar{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (3.31) and (3.32) into the above inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{t-1}^t \bar{\rho} \cdot \bar{m} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.33)$$

Now if $\bar{\rho}_0 - \bar{m}_0 \geq 0$, (2.4) warrants that $\bar{\rho} - \bar{m} \geq 0$, which along with (3.33) implies that

$$\int_{t-1}^t \bar{m}^2(s) ds \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.34)$$

Noticing that $\bar{m}(s) \geq \bar{m}(t)$ for all $t \geq s$, we have $0 \leq \bar{m}(t)^2 \leq \int_{t-1}^t \bar{m}^2(s) ds \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and thus $\bar{\rho} \rightarrow \rho_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ due to (2.4). By very similar argument, one can see that $\bar{\rho} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\bar{m} \rightarrow m_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the case of $\bar{\rho}_0 - \bar{m}_0 < 0$. Finally, it is observed that $c(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is also valid (see Lemma 4.7 of [10] for example) and thus $\bar{c}(t) \rightarrow m_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by the Hölder inequality.

Combining Lemma 3.6 with Lemma 3.7, we have

Lemma 3.8. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, we have*

$$\rho(\cdot, t) \rightarrow \rho_\infty, \quad m(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty, \quad c(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty, \quad u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now we proceed to estimate the decay rate of $\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, $\|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, $\|c(\cdot, t) - c_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, and $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ when $\int_\Omega \rho_0 \neq \int_\Omega m_0$. To this end, we first consider its decay rate in $L^2(\Omega)$ based on a differential inequality.

Lemma 3.9. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 and $\int_\Omega \rho_0 \neq \int_\Omega m_0$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants $K(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $t > t_\varepsilon$,*

$$|\bar{\rho}(t) - \rho_\infty| + |\bar{m}(t) - m_\infty| \leq K(\varepsilon) e^{-(\rho_\infty + m_\infty - \varepsilon)t}, \quad (3.35)$$

$$|\bar{c}(t) - m_\infty| \leq K(\varepsilon) e^{-\min\{1, (\rho_\infty + m_\infty - \varepsilon)\}t}. \quad (3.36)$$

Proof. For the case $\int_\Omega \rho_0 > \int_\Omega m_0$, we have $\rho_\infty > 0$ and $m_\infty = 0$. By Lemma 3.8, there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\rho(x, t) \geq \rho_\infty - \varepsilon$ for $t > t_\varepsilon$ and $x \in \Omega$, and thereby $\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega m = - \int_\Omega \rho m \leq -(\rho_\infty - \varepsilon) \int_\Omega m$ for $t > t_\varepsilon$, which implies that $\bar{m}(t) \leq \bar{m}_0 e^{-(\rho_\infty - \varepsilon)(t - t_\varepsilon)}$ for $t > t_\varepsilon$. Moreover, due

to $\bar{\rho} = \bar{m} + \rho_\infty$ by (2.4), we have $|\bar{\rho}(t) - \rho_\infty| = \bar{m}(t) \leq \bar{m}_0 e^{-(\rho_\infty - \varepsilon)(t - t_\varepsilon)}$ for $t > t_\varepsilon$. As for the case $\int_\Omega \rho_0 < \int_\Omega m_0$, similarly we can prove that $|\bar{m}(t) - m_\infty| = \bar{\rho} \leq \bar{\rho}_0 e^{-(m_\infty - \varepsilon)(t - t_\varepsilon)}$. for $t > t_\varepsilon$. Furthermore, by the third equation of (1.1), we have $\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega (c - m_\infty) = \int_\Omega (m - m_\infty) - \int_\Omega (c - m_\infty)$, and thereby $|\bar{c}(t) - m_\infty| \leq K(\varepsilon) e^{-\min\{1, \rho_\infty + m_\infty - \varepsilon\}t}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. By Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.8, we have

$$\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}(t) \rightarrow 0, \quad m(\cdot, t) - \bar{m}(t) \rightarrow 0, \quad \rho(\cdot, t) \rightarrow \rho_\infty, \quad m(\cdot, t) \rightarrow m_\infty \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\rho_\infty + m_\infty}{2})$, there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}(t)| < \varepsilon$, $|m(\cdot, t) - \bar{m}(t)| < \varepsilon$, $\rho(\cdot, t) + m(\cdot, t) \geq \rho_\infty + m_\infty - \varepsilon$ for all $t > t_\varepsilon$ and $x \in \Omega$. Hence from (3.16)–(3.19), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^2 \leq K_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla c|^2 + 2\varepsilon \int_\Omega \rho m, \quad (3.37)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega (m - \bar{m})^2 + 2 \int_\Omega |\nabla m|^2 \leq 2\varepsilon \int_\Omega \rho m, \quad (3.38)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega (c - \bar{c})^2 + 2 \int_\Omega |\nabla c|^2 + \int_\Omega (c - \bar{c})^2 \leq \int_\Omega (m - \bar{m})^2, \quad (3.39)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega |u|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \leq K_2 \left(\int_\Omega (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 + \int_\Omega (m - \bar{m})^2 \right) \quad (3.40)$$

for $t > t_\varepsilon$, as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \rho m &= \int_\Omega [\rho(\Delta m - u \cdot \nabla m - \rho m) + m(\Delta \rho - \nabla(\rho S(x, \rho, c)) \nabla c) - u \cdot \nabla \rho - \rho m] \\ &= -2 \int_\Omega \nabla \rho \nabla m - \int_\Omega (\rho u \cdot \nabla m + m u \cdot \nabla \rho) + \int_\Omega \rho S(x, \rho, c) \nabla c \cdot \nabla m - \int_\Omega \rho m^2 - \int_\Omega \rho^2 m \\ &\leq \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^2 + 2 \int_\Omega |\nabla m|^2 - \int_\Omega u \cdot \nabla(\rho m) + K_3 \int_\Omega |\nabla c|^2 - \int_\Omega \rho m(\rho + m) \\ &\leq \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^2 + 2 \int_\Omega |\nabla m|^2 + K_3 \int_\Omega |\nabla c|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\rho_\infty + m_\infty) \int_\Omega \rho m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

where $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and the boundedness of ρ are used.

On the other hand, by Poincaré's inequality, there exists $C_P > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho|^2 &\geq C_P \int_\Omega (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2, & \int_\Omega |\nabla m|^2 &\geq C_P \int_\Omega (m - \bar{m})^2, \\ \int_\Omega |\nabla c|^2 &\geq C_P \int_\Omega (c - \bar{c})^2, & \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 &\geq C_P \int_\Omega (u - \bar{u})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore combining the above inequalities, and taking $\varepsilon < \frac{C_P a(\rho_\infty + m_\infty)}{8(K_1 + C_P)}$ with $a = \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{K_1}{4C_P}, \frac{K_1}{K_3}\}$, the functional $G(t) := \int_\Omega (\rho - \bar{\rho})^2 + \frac{K_1}{C_P} \int_\Omega (m - \bar{m})^2 + K_1 \int_\Omega (c - \bar{c})^2 + a \int_\Omega \rho m$ satisfies the ordinary differential inequality $\frac{d}{dt}G(t) + \delta_1 G(t) \leq 0$ with $\delta_1 = \min\{\frac{C_P}{2}, 1, \frac{\rho_\infty + m_\infty}{4}\}$, which implies that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \bar{\rho}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t) - \bar{m}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t) - \bar{c}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta_1}{2}t}. \quad (3.42)$$

Moreover, by (3.42) and (3.40), $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\delta_2 t}$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$. At this position, combining (3.42) with Lemma 3.9, we can find $\delta_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\delta_3 t}. \quad (3.43)$$

Hence as in the proof of Lemma 3.6, we can obtain the decay estimates (1.9)–(1.12) by an application of the interpolation inequality, and thus the proof is complete.

3.3 Exponential decay under smallness condition

In this subsection, we give the proof of Theorem 1.3 under the assumption that $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. The proof is divided into two cases (Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2).

3.3.1 The case $\int_\Omega \rho_0 > \int_\Omega m_0$

In this subsection we consider the case $\int_\Omega \rho_0 > \int_\Omega m_0$, i.e., $\rho_\infty > 0$, $m_\infty = 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that (1.4) hold with $\alpha = 0$ and $\int_\Omega \rho_0 > \int_\Omega m_0$. Let $N = 3$, $p_0 \in (\frac{N}{2}, N)$, $q_0 \in (N, \frac{Np_0}{N-p_0})$. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any initial data (ρ_0, m_0, c_0, u_0) fulfilling (1.7) as well as*

$$\|\rho_0 - \rho_\infty\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|m_0\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

(1.1) admits a global classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) . In particular, for any $\alpha_1 \in (0, \min\{\lambda_1, \rho_\infty\})$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, \min\{\alpha_1, \lambda'_1, 1\})$, there exist constants K_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, such that for all $t \geq 1$

$$\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad (3.44)$$

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad (3.45)$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}, \quad (3.46)$$

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \quad (3.47)$$

Proposition 3.1 is the consequence of the following lemmas. In the proof of these lemmas, the constants $C_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, 10$, refer to those in Lemma 1.2 and Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma

2.3 of [3], Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 of [11], respectively. We first collect some easily verifiable observations in the following lemma:

Lemma 3.10. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 and $\sigma = \int_0^\infty \left(1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2p_0}}\right) e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds$, there exist $M_1 > 0, M_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$C_3 + 2C_2C_{10}e^{(1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})\sigma} \leq \frac{M_2}{4}, \quad M_1\varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.48)$$

$$12C_2C_{10}(C_6+4C_6C_9C_{10}\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(M_1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}}+4e^{(1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})\sigma}))\varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.49)$$

$$C_4C_{10}C_S M_2(e^{(1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})\sigma} + \rho_\infty|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}) \leq \frac{M_1}{8}, \quad (3.50)$$

$$3C_{10}C_4C_S(M_1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})M_2\varepsilon \leq \frac{M_1}{8}, \quad (3.51)$$

$$3C_{10}C_4C_6(M_1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})(1 + 2C_9C_{10}\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(M_1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}} + 4e^{(1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})\sigma}))\varepsilon \leq \frac{M_1}{4}. \quad (3.52)$$

Let

$$T \triangleq \sup \left\{ \tilde{T} \in (0, T_{max}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq M_1\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \\ \text{for all } \theta \in [q_0, \infty], t \in [0, \tilde{T}]; \\ \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_2\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \text{ for all } t \in [0, \tilde{T}]. \end{array} \right. \right\} \quad (3.53)$$

By (1.7) and Lemma 2.1, $T > 0$ is well-defined. We first show $T = T_{max}$. To this end, we will show that all of the estimates mentioned in (3.53) is valid with even smaller coefficients on the right hand side. The derivation of these estimates will mainly rely on $L^p - L^q$ estimates for the Neumann heat semigroup and the fact that the classical solutions on $(0, T_{max})$ can be represented as

$$(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) = e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0) - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)\nabla c) + u \cdot \nabla(\rho - m))(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.54)$$

$$m(\cdot, t) = e^{t\Delta}m_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\rho m - u \cdot \nabla m)(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.55)$$

$$c(\cdot, t) = e^{t(\Delta-1)}c_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - u \cdot \nabla c)(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.56)$$

$$u(\cdot, t) = e^{-tA}u_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\mathcal{P}((\rho + m)\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)ds \quad (3.57)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$ as per the variation-of-constants formula.

Lemma 3.11. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, for all $t \in (0, T)$ and $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$,*

$$\|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq M_3\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t}.$$

Proof. Since $e^{t\Delta}\rho_\infty = \rho_\infty$ and $\int_\Omega(\rho_0 - m_0 - \rho_\infty) = 0$, the definition of T and Lemma 1.3 of [28] show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} + \|e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0 - \rho_\infty)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ & \leq M_1\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t} + C_1(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})(\|\rho_0 - \rho_\infty\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} + \|m_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)})e^{-\lambda_1 t} \\ & \leq M_3\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$ and $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$, where $M_3 = M_1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}}$.

Lemma 3.12. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, for any $k > 1$,*

$$\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^k(\Omega)} \leq M_4\|m_0\|_{L^k(\Omega)}e^{-\rho_\infty t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T) \quad (3.58)$$

with $\sigma = \int_0^\infty (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2p_0}})e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds$ and $M_4 = e^{M_3\sigma\varepsilon}$.

Proof. Multiplying the m -equation in (1.1) by km^{k-1} and integrating the result over Ω , we get $\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega m^k \leq -k \int_\Omega \rho m^k$ on $(0, T)$. Since $-\rho \leq |\rho - m - \rho_\infty| - m - \rho_\infty \leq -\rho_\infty + |\rho - m - \rho_\infty|$, Lemma 3.11 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega m^k & \leq -k\rho_\infty \int_\Omega m^k + k \int_\Omega m^k |\rho - m - \rho_\infty| \\ & \leq -k\rho_\infty \int_\Omega m^k + k\|\rho - m - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_\Omega m^k \\ & \leq -k\rho_\infty \int_\Omega m^k + kM_3\varepsilon \left(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2p_0}}\right) e^{-\alpha_1 t} \int_\Omega m^k \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\int_\Omega m^k \leq \int_\Omega m_0^k \exp\{-k\rho_\infty t + kM_3\varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2p_0}})e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds\} \leq \|m_0\|_{L^k(\Omega)}^k e^{k(M_3\sigma\varepsilon - \rho_\infty t)}$.

The assertion (3.58) follows immediately.

Lemma 3.13. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, there exists $M_3 > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq M_5\varepsilon \left(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}}\right) e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

Proof. For any given $\alpha_2 < \lambda'_1$, we fix $\mu \in (\alpha_2, \lambda'_1)$. By (3.57), Lemma 2.3 of [3], Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 of [11], we obtain

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{N}-\frac{1}{q_0})} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho+m)\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{N}-\frac{1}{q_0})} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|\mathcal{P}((\rho+m-\overline{\rho+m})\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|(\rho+m-\overline{\rho+m})(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\overline{\rho+m}\nabla\Phi) = \overline{\rho+m}\mathcal{P}(\nabla\Phi) = 0$ is used. On the other hand, due to $\alpha_1 < \rho_\infty$, Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.12 show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\rho+m-\overline{\rho+m})(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\
&= \|(\rho-m-\overline{\rho-m})(\cdot, s) + 2(m-\overline{m})(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|(\rho-m-\rho_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + 2\|(m-\overline{m})(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq M'_5 \varepsilon (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

with $M'_5 = M_3 + 4e^{M_3\sigma\varepsilon}$. Combining (3.59) with (3.60) and applying Lemma 1.2 of [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M'_5 \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} e^{-\mu(t-s)} ds \\
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 C_{10} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M'_5 \varepsilon (1 + t^{\min\{0, 1-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})\}}) e^{-\alpha_2 t} \\
&\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \varepsilon + 2C_6 C_9 C_{10} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M'_5 \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_2 t} \\
&\leq M_5 \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-\alpha_2 t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_5 = C_6 + 2C_6 C_9 C_{10} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M'_5$ and $\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}) < 1$ is used.

Lemma 3.14. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, for all $t \in (0, T)$,*

$$\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_2}{2} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}.$$

Proof. By (3.56) and Lemma 1.3 of [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq \|e^{t(\Delta-1)} \nabla c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} (m - u \cdot \nabla c)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_3 (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)t} \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.61}$$

Now we estimate the last two integrals on the right hand side. From Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma 3.12 with $k = q_0$, Lemma 1.2 of [28] and the fact that $q_0 > N$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} m\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds &\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|m\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \quad (3.62) \\
&\leq C_2 M_4 \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} e^{-\rho_\infty s} ds \\
&\leq C_2 C_{10} M_4 (1 + t^{\min\{0, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}\}}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t} \\
&\leq 2C_2 C_{10} M_4 (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.3 of [3], Lemma 3.13 and the definition of T , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|u \cdot \nabla c\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \quad (3.63) \\
&\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|u\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_2 M_5 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}}) (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)s} ds \\
&\leq 3C_2 M_5 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} e^{-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)s} (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) (1 + s^{-1+\frac{N}{2q_0}}) ds \\
&\leq 3C_2 C_{10} M_2 M_5 \varepsilon^2 (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.61)–(3.63), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq (C_3 + 2C_2 C_{10} M_4 + 3C_2 C_{10} M_2 M_5 \varepsilon) (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t} \\
&\leq \frac{M_2}{2} (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t},
\end{aligned}$$

due to the choice of M_1, M_2 and ε satisfying (3.48), (3.49), and thereby complete the proof.

Lemma 3.15. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, for all $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$ and $t \in (0, T)$,*

$$\|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_1}{2} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}.$$

Proof. According to (3.54) and Lemma 1.3 of [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c) + u \cdot \nabla(\rho - m))(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c) \nabla c)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta} \nabla \cdot ((\rho - m - \rho_\infty)u)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_4 C_S \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\quad + C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|u(\rho - m - \rho_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&:= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we need to estimate I_1 and I_2 . Firstly, from Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.12, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} &\leq \|(\rho - m - \rho_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + \|\rho_\infty\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq M_3 \varepsilon (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} + M_6
\end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

with $M_6 = e^{(1+C_1+C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0}})\sigma} + \rho_\infty |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q_0}}$, which together with Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 1.2 of [28] implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq C_4 C_S M_6 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\quad + M_7 \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_4 C_S M_6 M_2 \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds \\
&\quad + 3M_7 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-2\alpha_1 s} e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} ds \\
&\leq C_{10} (C_4 C_S M_6 M_2 + 3M_7 M_2 \varepsilon) (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t} \\
&\leq \frac{M_1}{4} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

with $M_7 = C_4 C_S M_3$, where we have used (3.50) and (3.51) and $\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0} < \frac{1}{N}$. On the other hand, from Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.13, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|\rho - m - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq 3C_4 M_3 M_5 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0} - \frac{N}{2p_0}}) e^{-(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)s} ds \\
&\leq 3C_4 M_3 M_5 C_{10} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t^{\min\{0, \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{p_0})\}}) e^{-\min\{\lambda_1, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2\}t} \\
&\leq \frac{M_1}{4} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

where we have used (3.52) and $\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0} < \frac{1}{N}$. Hence combining the above inequalities leads to our conclusion immediately.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, part 1 (Proposition 3.1). First we claim that $T = T_{max}$. In fact, if $T < T_{max}$, then by Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 3.15, we have $\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_2}{2}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t}$ and

$$\|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_1}{2}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t}$$

for all $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$ and $t \in (0, T)$, which contradicts the definition of T in (3.53). Next, we show that $T_{max} = \infty$. In fact, if $T_{max} < \infty$, we only need to show that as $t \rightarrow T_{max}$,

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$$

according to the extensibility criterion in Lemma 2.1.

Let $t_0 := \min\{1, \frac{T_{max}}{3}\}$. Then from Lemma 3.12, there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that for $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$,

$$\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\rho_\infty t}. \quad (3.67)$$

Moreover, from Lemma 3.11 and the fact that

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

it follows that for all $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$ and some constant $K_2 > 0$,

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t}. \quad (3.68)$$

Furthermore, Lemma 3.14 implies that there exists $K'_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K'_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (t_0, T_{max}). \quad (3.69)$$

On the other hand, we can conclude that $\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C$ for $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$.

In fact, we first show that there exists a constant $M_9 > 0$ such that

$$\|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M_9 e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad (3.70)$$

for $t_0 < t < T_{max}$. By (3.57), we have

$$\|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|A^\beta e^{-tA} u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|A^\beta e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho + m - \rho_\infty)\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds.$$

According to Lemma 2.3 of [3], $\|A^\beta e^{-tA} u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_5 e^{-\mu t} \|A^\beta u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for all $t \in (0, T_{max})$. On the other hand, from Lemma 2.3 of [3] and Lemma 3.11, it follows that there exists $\hat{M} > 1$ such that

$$\int_0^t \|A^\beta e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho + m - \rho_\infty)\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_9 C_5 \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}} \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\beta} (\|(\rho - m - \rho_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + 2\|m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)}) ds \\
&\leq C_9 C_5 \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}} \hat{M} \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\beta} (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds \\
&\leq C_5 C_9 C_{10} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}} \hat{M} e^{-\alpha_2 t} (1 + t^{\min\{0, 1-\beta-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})\}}) \\
&\leq C_5 C_9 C_{10} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}} \hat{M} e^{-\alpha_2 t} (1 + t_0^{\min\{0, 1-\beta-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})\}})
\end{aligned}$$

for $t_0 < t < T_{max}$. Hence combining the above inequalities, we arrive at (3.70).

Since $D(A^\beta) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\beta \in (\frac{N}{4}, 1)$, we have

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for some } K_4 > 0 \text{ and } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.71)$$

Now we turn to show that there exists $K_3'' > 0$ such that

$$\|c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_3'' e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}). \quad (3.72)$$

Indeed, from (3.56), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq \|e^{t(\Delta-1)} c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} (m - u \cdot \nabla c)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq e^{-t} \|c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

An application of (3.58) with $k = \infty$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds &\leq \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} \|m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq \|m_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M_4 \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} e^{-\rho_\infty s} ds \\
&\leq M_4 C_{10} e^{-\alpha_2 t}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.74)$$

On the other hand, from (3.71) and (3.69), we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds &\leq \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq K_3' K_4 \int_0^t e^{-2\alpha_2 s} e^{-(t-s)} ds \\
&\leq K_3' K_4 C_{10} e^{-\alpha_2 t}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.75)$$

Hence, inserting (3.74), (3.75) into (3.73), we arrive at the conclusion (3.72). Therefore we have $T_{max} = \infty$, and the decay estimates in (3.44)–(3.47) follow from (3.67)–(3.72), respectively.

3.3.2 The case $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 < \int_{\Omega} m_0$

In this subsection we consider the case $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 < \int_{\Omega} m_0$, i.e., $m_{\infty} > 0$, $\rho_{\infty} = 0$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that (1.4) hold with $\alpha = 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 < \int_{\Omega} m_0$. Let $N = 3$, $p_0 \in (\frac{2N}{3}, N)$, $q_0 \in (N, \frac{Np_0}{2(N-p_0)})$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any initial data (ρ_0, m_0, c_0, u_0) fulfilling (1.7) as well as*

$$\|\rho_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|m_0 - m_{\infty}\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

(1.1) admits a global classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) . Furthermore, for any $\alpha_1 \in (0, \min\{\lambda_1, m_{\infty}\})$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, \min\{\alpha_1, \lambda'_1, 1\})$, there exist constants $K_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, such that

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - m_{\infty}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad (3.76)$$

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad (3.77)$$

$$\|c(\cdot, t) - m_{\infty}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}, \quad (3.78)$$

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \quad (3.79)$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 proceeds in a parallel fashion to that of Proposition 3.1. However, due to differences in the properties of ρ and m , there are significant differences in the details of their proofs. Thus, for the convenience of the reader, we will give the full proof of Proposition 3.2.

The following can be verified easily:

Lemma 3.16. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, it is possible to choose $M_1 > 0$, $M_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$C_3 \leq \frac{M_2}{6}, \quad C_2 C_{10} (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}} + M_1) \leq \frac{M_2}{6}, \quad (3.80)$$

$$18 C_2 C_6 C_{10} (1 + 2 C_9 C_{10} (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}} + 2 M_1)) \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \varepsilon \leq 1, \quad (3.81)$$

$$2 C_1 + (\min\{1, |\Omega|\})^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \leq \frac{M_1}{8}, \quad 24 C_4 C_5 C_{10} M_2 \varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.82)$$

$$24 C_4 C_{10} C_6 (1 + 2 C_9 C_{10} (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}} + 2 M_1)) \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.83)$$

$$24 C_4 C_{10} (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}} + M_1) \varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.84)$$

$$12 C_4 C_5 C_{10} M_1 M_2 \varepsilon < 1, \quad (3.85)$$

$$C_{10} C_6 C_4 (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}}) (1 + 2 C_9 C_{10} (1 + C_1 + C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}} + 2 M_1)) \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \varepsilon < \frac{1}{24}. \quad (3.86)$$

Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1, we define

$$T \triangleq \sup \left\{ \tilde{T} \in (0, T_{max}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \\ \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq M_1 \varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \forall \theta \in [q_0, \infty], \\ \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_2 \varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, \tilde{T}]. \end{array} \right. \right\} \quad (3.87)$$

By Lemma 2.1 and (1.7), $T > 0$ is well-defined. As in the previous subsection, we first show $T = T_{max}$, and then $T_{max} = \infty$. To this end, we will show that all of the estimates mentioned in (3.87) are valid with even smaller coefficients on the right hand side than appearing in (3.87). The derivation of these estimates will mainly rely on $L^p - L^q$ estimates for the Neumann heat semigroup and the corresponding semigroup for Stokes operator, and the fact that the classical solutions of (1.1) on $(0, T)$ can be represented as

$$(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) = e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)\nabla c) - u \cdot \nabla(m - \rho))(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.88)$$

$$\rho(\cdot, t) = e^{t\Delta}\rho_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)\nabla c) - u \cdot \nabla \rho + \rho m)(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.89)$$

$$c(\cdot, t) = e^{t(\Delta-1)}c_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - u \cdot \nabla c)(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (3.90)$$

$$u(\cdot, t) = e^{-tA}u_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\mathcal{P}((\rho + m)\nabla \Phi)(\cdot, s)ds. \quad (3.91)$$

Lemma 3.17. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, we have*

$$\|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq M_3 \varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$ and $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$.

Proof. Since $e^{t\Delta}(\bar{m}_0 - \bar{\rho}_0) = m_\infty$ and $\int_\Omega(m_0 - \rho_0 - m_\infty) = 0$, from the Definition of T and Lemma 1.3 of [28], we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} + \|e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0) - e^{t\Delta}m_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t} + C_1(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})(\|\rho_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} + \|m_0 - m_\infty\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)})e^{-\lambda_1 t} \\ & \leq (1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}})\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$ and $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$. This lemma is proved for $M_3 = 1 + C_1 + C_1|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}}$.

Lemma 3.18. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, we have*

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq M_4 \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T), \theta \in [q_0, \infty].$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.17 and the definition of T , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} &\leq \|(m - \rho - m_\infty)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} + \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ &\leq (M_3 + M_1) \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}. \end{aligned}$$

The Lemma is proved for $M_4 = M_3 + M_1$.

Lemma 3.19. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, there exists $M_5 > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq M_5 \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

Proof. For any given $\alpha_2 < \lambda'_1$, we can fix $\mu \in (\alpha_2, \lambda'_1)$. By (3.91), Lemma 2.3 of [3], and noticing that $\mathcal{P}(\nabla\Phi) = 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{q_0})} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho + m)\nabla\Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{q_0})} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|(\rho + m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} \|(\rho + m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.92}$$

By Lemma 3.18 and the definition of T , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\rho + m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} &= \|(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + \|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq (M_4 + M_1) \varepsilon (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.93}$$

Inserting (3.93) into (3.92), and noting $\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0}) < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 (M_4 + M_1) \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} e^{-\mu(t-s)} ds \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}} e^{-\mu t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + C_6 C_9 C_{10} (M_4 + M_1) \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \varepsilon (1 + t^{\min\{0, 1 - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})\}}) e^{-\alpha_2 t} \\ &\leq C_6 t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}} \varepsilon e^{-\mu t} + 2C_6 C_9 C_{10} (M_4 + M_1) \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_2 t} \\ &= M_5 \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-\alpha_2 t} \end{aligned}$$

with $M_5 = C_6 + 2C_6 C_9 C_{10} (M_4 + M_1) \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

Lemma 3.20. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, we have*

$$\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_2}{2}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

Proof. From (3.90) and Lemma 1.3 of [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq \|e^{t(\Delta-1)}\nabla c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - u \cdot \nabla c)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_3(1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)t}\|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.94)$$

In the second inequality, we have used $\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}m_\infty = 0$.

From Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma 3.18, Lemma 1.2 of [28], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 M_4 \varepsilon \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})})e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds \\ &\leq C_2 C_{10} M_4 \varepsilon (1 + t^{\min\{0, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2p_0}\}})e^{-\min\{\alpha_1, \lambda_1+1\}t} \\ &\leq C_2 C_{10} M_4 \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.95)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma 3.19 and the definition of T , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_2 M_5 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}})(1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)s} ds \\ &\leq 3C_2 M_5 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t e^{-(\lambda_1+1)(t-s)} e^{-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)s} (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2q_0}})(1 + s^{-1+\frac{N}{2q_0}}) ds \\ &\leq 3C_2 M_5 M_2 C_{10} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\min\{\lambda_1+1, \alpha_1+\alpha_2\}t} \\ &\leq 3C_2 M_5 M_2 C_{10} \varepsilon^2 (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}})e^{-\alpha_1 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.96)$$

Hence combining above inequalities with (3.80), (3.81), we arrive at the conclusion.

Lemma 3.21. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, we have*

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_1}{2} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T), \theta \in [q_0, \infty].$$

Proof. By the variation-of-constants formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\cdot, t) &= e^{t(\Delta - m_\infty)} \rho_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} (\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(\cdot, \rho, c) \nabla c) - u \cdot \nabla \rho)(\cdot, s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} \rho(m_\infty - m)(\cdot, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.3 of [28], the result in Section 2 of [14] and noticing $\alpha_1 < \min\{\lambda_1, m_\infty\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\ &\leq e^{-m_\infty t} (\|e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - \bar{\rho}_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)}) + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathcal{S}(\cdot, \rho, c) \nabla c)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} (u \cdot \nabla \rho)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} \rho(m_\infty - m)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_1 (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-(\lambda_1 + m_\infty)t} \|\rho_0 - \bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} + (\min\{1, |\Omega|\})^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} e^{-m_\infty t} \varepsilon \\ &\quad + C_4 C_S \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-(\lambda_1 + m_\infty)(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} \nabla \cdot (\rho u)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta - m_\infty)} \rho(m_\infty - m)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq (2C_1 + (\min\{1, |\Omega|\})^{-\frac{1}{p_0}}) (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t} \\ &\quad + C_4 C_S \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-(\lambda_1 + m_\infty)(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-(\lambda_1 + m_\infty)(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + C_1 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-m_\infty(t-s)} \|\rho\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|m - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &= (2C_1 + (\min\{1, |\Omega|\})^{-\frac{1}{p_0}}) (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_1 t} + I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of T , Lemma 3.20, Lemma 1.2 of [28] and (3.82), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq 3C_4 C_S M_1 M_2 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} e^{-2\alpha_1 s} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{q_0})}) ds \\ &\leq 3C_4 C_S C_{10} M_1 M_2 \varepsilon^2 (1 + t^{\min\{0, -\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})\}}) e^{-\min\{\lambda_1, 2\alpha_1\}t} \\ &\leq \frac{M_1}{8} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (3.84) and (3.85), we can also get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq 3C_4M_1M_5\varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}e^{-2\alpha_1s}(1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})})ds \\
&\leq 3C_4C_{10}M_5M_1\varepsilon^2(1 + t^{\min\{0, -\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})\}})e^{-\min\{\lambda_1, 2\alpha_1\}t} \\
&\leq \frac{M_1}{8}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1t}, \\
I_3 &\leq 3C_4M_1M_4\varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-m_\infty(t-s)}e^{-2\alpha_1s}(1 + s^{-\frac{N}{p_0}+\frac{N}{2q_0}})ds \\
&\leq 3C_4C_{10}M_1M_4\varepsilon^2(1 + t^{\min\{0, -\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})\}})e^{-\min\{m_\infty, 2\alpha_1\}t} \\
&\leq \frac{M_1}{8}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1t},
\end{aligned}$$

respectively, where the fact that $q_0 \in (N, \frac{Np_0}{2(N-p_0)})$ warrants $-\frac{N}{p_0} + \frac{N}{2q_0} > -1$ is used. Hence the combination of the above inequalities yields $\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_1}{2}\varepsilon(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1t}$.

Lemma 3.22. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, we have*

$$\|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1t} \text{ for } \theta \in [q_0, \infty], t \in (0, T).$$

Proof. From (3.88) and Lemma 1.3 of [28], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\nabla \cdot (\rho\mathcal{S}(\cdot, \rho, c)\nabla c) - u \cdot \nabla(m - \rho))(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta}\nabla \cdot (\rho\mathcal{S}(\cdot, \rho, c)\nabla c)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)\Delta}\nabla \cdot ((m - \rho - m_\infty)u)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_4C_S \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}\|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)}\|\nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\
&\quad + C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}\|u(m - \rho - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of T and (3.86), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq C_4C_S M_1M_2\varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}(1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})})e^{-2\alpha_1s} ds \\
&\leq 3C_4C_S C_{10}M_1M_2\varepsilon^2(1 + t^{\min\{0, -\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})\}})e^{-\min\{\lambda_1, 2\alpha_1\}t} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}(1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})})e^{-\alpha_1t}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 3.17, Lemma 3.19 and (3.87), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= C_4 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \|m - \rho - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq 2C_4 M_3 M_5 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2p_0}}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-\alpha_2 s} ds \\
&\leq 6C_4 M_3 M_5 \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) (1 + s^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0}-\frac{1}{p_0})}) e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} e^{-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)s} ds \\
&\leq 6C_{10} C_4 M_3 M_5 \varepsilon^2 e^{-\min\{\lambda_1, \alpha_1+\alpha_2\}t} (1 + t^{\min\{0, \frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{\theta}-\frac{1}{p_0})\}}) \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities, we arrive at $\|(\rho - m)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(\rho_0 - m_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}$, and thus complete the proof of this lemma.

By the above lemmas, we can claim that $T = T_{max}$. Indeed, if $T < T_{max}$, by Lemma 3.22, Lemma 3.21 and Lemma 3.20, we have $\|(m - \rho)(\cdot, t) - e^{t\Delta}(m_0 - \rho_0)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}$, $\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_1}{2} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{\theta})}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}$ as well as $\|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_2}{2} \varepsilon (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e^{-\alpha_1 t}$ for all $\theta \in [q_0, \infty]$ and $t \in (0, T)$, which contradict the definition of T in (3.87). Next, the further estimates of solutions are established to ensure $T_{max} = \infty$.

Lemma 3.23. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, there exists $M_6 > 0$ such that*

$$\|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon M_6 e^{-\alpha_2 t} \quad \text{for } t \in (t_0, T_{max}) \text{ with } t_0 = \min\left\{\frac{T_{max}}{6}, 1\right\}.$$

Proof. For any given $\alpha_2 < \lambda'_1$, we can fix $\mu \in (\alpha_2, \lambda'_1)$. From (3.91), it follows that

$$\|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|A^\beta e^{-tA} u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|A^\beta e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho + m - m_\infty) \nabla \Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds.$$

In the first integral, we apply Lemma 2.3 of [3], which gives

$$\|A^\beta e^{-tA} u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_5 |\Omega|^{\frac{N-2}{2N}} t^{-\beta} e^{-\alpha_2 t} \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq C_5 |\Omega|^{\frac{N-2}{2N}} t^{-\beta} e^{-\alpha_2 t} \varepsilon$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. Next by Lemma 2.3 of [3], Lemma 3.17 and Lemma 3.21, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \|A^\beta e^{-(t-s)A} \mathcal{P}((\rho + m - m_\infty) \nabla \Phi)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds \\
&\leq C_9 C_5 \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}} \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\beta} (\|m(\cdot, s) - \rho(\cdot, s) - m_\infty\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} + 2\|\rho(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)}) ds \\
&\leq M'_6 \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\beta} (1 + s^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{q_0})}) e^{-\alpha_1 s} ds \\
&\leq M'_6 \varepsilon C_{10} (1 + t^{-1}) e^{-\alpha_2 t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $M'_6 = (M_3 + M_1)C_9C_5\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}|\Omega|^{\frac{q_0-2}{2q_0}}$. Therefore there exists $M_6 > 0$ such that $\|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon M_6 e^{-\alpha_2 t}$ for $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$.

Lemma 3.24. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, there exists $M_7 > 0$ such that $\|c(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_7 e^{-\alpha_2 t}$ for all (t_0, T_{max}) with $t_0 = \min\{\frac{T_{max}}{6}, 1\}$.*

Proof. From (3.90) and Lemma 1.3 of [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(c - m_\infty)(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq C_1 e^{-t} \|c_0 - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.97)$$

By Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma 3.18, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds &\leq C_1 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(t-s)} \|(m - m_\infty)(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_1 C_{10} M_4 \varepsilon e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.98)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 1.3 of [28], Lemma 3.19 and Lemma 3.20, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds &\leq C_1 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(t-s)} \|u \cdot \nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq C_1 \int_0^t (1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{N}{2q_0}}) e^{-(t-s)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \|\nabla c(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\leq 6C_1 M_5 M_2 C_{10} \varepsilon^2 e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.99)$$

Therefore combining the above equalities, we arrive at the desired result.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 in the case $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, part 2 (Proposition 3.2). We now come to the final step to show that $T_{max} = \infty$. According to the extensibility criterion in Lemma 2.1, it remains to show that there exists $C > 0$ such that for $t_0 := \min\{\frac{T_{max}}{6}, 1\} < t < T_{max}$

$$\|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} + \|A^\beta u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < C.$$

From Lemma 3.18 and Lemma 3.21, there exists $K_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$\|m(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \|\rho(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \|\nabla c(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_1 t}$$

for $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$. Furthermore, Lemma 3.24 implies that $\|c(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K'_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}$ with some $K'_3 > 0$ for all $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$. Since $D(A^\beta) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\beta \in (\frac{N}{4}, 1)$, it follows from Lemma 3.23 that $\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}$ for some $K_4 > 0$ for all $t \in (t_0, T_{max})$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Before we move to the next section, we remark that the following result is also valid by suitably adjusting $\varepsilon > 0$ for the larger values of p_0 or q_0 .

Corollary 3.1. *Let $N = 3$ and $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \neq \int_{\Omega} m_0$. Further, let $p_0 \in (\frac{N}{2}, \infty)$, $q_0 \in (N, \infty)$ if $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 > \int_{\Omega} m_0$, and $p_0 \in (\frac{2N}{3}, \infty)$, $q_0 \in (N, \infty)$ if $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 < \int_{\Omega} m_0$. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any initial data (ρ_0, m_0, c_0, u_0) fulfilling (1.7) as well as*

$$\|\rho_0 - \rho_{\infty}\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|m_0 - m_{\infty}\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|u_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

(1.1) admits a global classical solution (ρ, m, c, u, P) . Moreover, for any $\alpha_1 \in (0, \min\{\lambda_1, m_{\infty} + \rho_{\infty}\})$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, \min\{\alpha_1, \lambda'_1, 1\})$, there exist constants K_i $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, such that for all $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|m(\cdot, t) - m_{\infty}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} &\leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, & \|\rho(\cdot, t) - \rho_{\infty}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} &\leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \\ \|c(\cdot, t) - m_{\infty}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} &\leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}, & \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} &\leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \end{aligned}$$

4 Proof of main results for general \mathcal{S}

In this section, we give the proof of our results for the general matrix-valued \mathcal{S} . This is accomplished by an approximation procedure. In order to make the previous results applicable, we introduce a family of smooth functions $\rho_{\eta} \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq \rho_{\eta}(x) \leq 1$ for $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \rho_{\eta}(x) = 1$ and let $\mathcal{S}_{\eta}(x, \rho, c) = \rho_{\eta}(x)\mathcal{S}(x, \rho, c)$. Using this definition, we regularize (1.1) as follows

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\rho_{\eta})_t + u_{\eta} \cdot \nabla \rho_{\eta} = \Delta \rho_{\eta} - \nabla \cdot (\rho_{\eta} \mathcal{S}_{\eta}(x, \rho_{\eta}, c_{\eta}) \nabla c_{\eta}) - \rho_{\eta} m_{\eta}, \\ (m_{\eta})_t + u_{\eta} \cdot \nabla m_{\eta} = \Delta m_{\eta} - \rho_{\eta} m_{\eta}, \\ (c_{\eta})_t + u_{\eta} \cdot \nabla c_{\eta} = \Delta c_{\eta} - c_{\eta} + m_{\eta}, \\ (u_{\eta})_t = \Delta u_{\eta} - \nabla P_{\eta} + (\rho_{\eta} + m_{\eta}) \nabla \phi, \quad \nabla \cdot u_{\eta} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \rho_{\eta}}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial m_{\eta}}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial c_{\eta}}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad u_{\eta} = 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (4.1)$$

with the initial data

$$\rho_{\eta}(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \quad m_{\eta}(x, 0) = m_0(x), \quad c(x, 0) = c_0(x), \quad \text{and } u_{\eta}(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (4.2)$$

It is observed that \mathcal{S}_{η} satisfies the additional condition $\mathcal{S} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore based on the discussion in Section 3, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3, the problem (4.1)-(4.2) admits a global classical solution $(\rho_{\eta}, m_{\eta}, c_{\eta}, u_{\eta}, P_{\eta})$ that satisfies

$$\|m_{\eta}(\cdot, t) - m_{\infty}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \quad \|\rho_{\eta}(\cdot, t) - \rho_{\infty}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t},$$

$$\|c_\eta(\cdot, t) - m_\infty\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t}, \quad \|u_\eta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_4 e^{-\alpha_2 t}.$$

for some constants K_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $t \geq 0$. Applying a standard procedure such as in Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.6 of [3], one can obtain a subsequence of $\{\eta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\eta_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\rho_{\eta_j} \rightarrow \rho$, $m_{\eta_j} \rightarrow m$, $c_{\eta_j} \rightarrow c$, $u_{\eta_j} \rightarrow u$ in $C_{loc}^{\vartheta, \frac{\vartheta}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty))$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, by the arguments as in Lemma 5.7, Lemma 5.8 of [3], one can also show that (ρ, m, c, u, P) is a classical solution of (1.1) with the decay properties asserted in Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. The proofs of Theorems 1.1–1.3 are thus complete.

5 Acknowledgments

The author Jing Li is grateful to Chinese University Hong Kong for its hospitality in January 2018, when this work was initiated. This work is partially supported by the NSFC grants 11571363 and 61620106002, and the NUS AcRF grant R-146-000-249-114.

References

- [1] J. Ahn, K. Kang, K. Kang, J. Kim, J. Lee, *Lower bound of mass in a chemotactic model with advection and absorbing reaction*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49(2)(2017), 723–755.
- [2] N. Bellomo, A. Belloquid, Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Toward a mathematical theory of Keller–Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci., 25(9)(2015), 1663–1763.
- [3] X. Cao, J. Lankeit, *Global classical small-data solutions for a 3D chemotaxis Navier–Stokes system involving matrix-valued sensitivities*, Calc. Var. PDE., 55(4)(2016), 55–107.
- [4] X. Cao, M. Winkler, *Sharp decay estimates in a bioconvection model with quadratic degradation in bounded domains*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, DOI: 10.2017/S0308210518000057 (2018).
- [5] M. A. J. Chaplain, G. Lolas, *Mathematical modelling of cancer cell invasion of tissue: the role of the urokinase plasminogen activation system*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci., 18(2005), 1685–1734.
- [6] M. Difrancesco, A. Lorz, P. A. Markowich, *Chemotaxis–fluid coupled model for swimming bacteria with nonlinear diffusion: global existence and asymptotic behavior*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A, 28(2010), 1437–1453.
- [7] R. Dillon, P. K. Maini, H. G. Othmer, *Pattern formation in generalised turing systems I. Steady-state patterns in systems with mixed boundary conditions*, J. Math. Biol., 32(1994), 345–393.
- [8] E. E. Espejo, T. Suzuki, *Reaction terms avoiding aggregation in slow fluids*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl., 21(2015), 110–126.

- [9] E. E. Espejo, T. Suzuki, *Reaction enhancement by chemotaxis*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl., 35(2017), 102–131.
- [10] E. E. Espejo, M. Winkler, *Global classical solvability and stabilization in a two-dimensional chemotaxis–Navier–Stokes system modeling coral fertilization*, Nonlinearity, 31(2018), 1227–1259.
- [11] D. Fujiwara, H. Morimoto, *An L^r -theorem of the Helmholtz decomposition of vector fields*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math., 24(3)(1977), 685–700.
- [12] M. A. Herrero, J. Velázquez, *A blow-up mechanism for a chemotaxis model*, Ann. Scuola Normale Super. Pisa, 24(1997), 633–683.
- [13] T. Hillen, K. Painter, *A user’s guide to PDE models for chemotaxis*, J. Math. Biol., 58(2009), 183–217.
- [14] D. Horstmann, M. Winkler, *Boundedness vs. blow-up in a chemotaxis system*, J. Diff. Eqns., 215(2005), 52–107.
- [15] 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.
- [16] E. F. Keller, L. A. Segel, *Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability*, J. Theoret. Biol., 26(1970), 399–415.
- [17] A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, *Biomixing by chemotaxis and efficiency of biological reactions: the critical reaction case*, J. Math. Phys., 53(2012), 115609, 9pp.
- [18] A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, *Biomixing by chemotaxis and enhancement of biological reactions*, Commun. PDE., 37(2012), 298–318.
- [19] D. Li, C. Mu, P. Zheng, K. Ke, *Boundedness in a three-dimensional Keller–Segel–Stokes system involving tensor-valued sensitivity with saturation*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 23(2018), doi: 10.3934/dcdsb.2018209.
- [20] J. Liu, Y. Wang, *Global weak solutions in a three-dimensional Keller–Segel–Navier–Stokes system involving a tensor-valued sensitivity with saturation*, J. Diff. Eqns., 262(10)(2017), 5271–5305.
- [21] A. Lorz, *Coupled chemotaxis fluid model*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci., 20(2010), 987–1004.
- [22] P. K. Maini, M. R. Myerscough, K. H. Winters, J. Murray, *Bifurcating spatially heterogeneous solutions in a chemotaxis model for biological pattern generation*, Bull. Math. Biol., 53(1991), 701–719.
- [23] K. J. Painter, P. K. Maini, H. G. Othmer, *Development and applications of a model for cellular response to multiple chemotactic cues*, J. Math. Biol., 41(2000), 285–314.
- [24] C. S. Patlak, *Random walk with persistence and external bias*, Bull. Math. Biol., 15(3)(1953), 311–338.

- [25] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Boundedness and decay enforced by quadratic degradation in a 3D chemotaxis–fluid system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 66(2015), 2555–2573.
- [26] I. Tuval, L. Cisneros, C. Dombrowski, C. W. Wolgemuth, J. O. Kessler, R. E. Goldstein, *Bacterial swimming and oxygen transport near contact lines*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 102(2005), 2277–2282.
- [27] Y. Wang, Z. Xiang, *Global existence and boundedness in a Keller–Segel–Stokes system involving a tensor-valued sensitivity with saturation: The 3D case*, J. Diff. Eqns., 261(2016), 4944–4973.
- [28] M. Winkler, *Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller–Segel model*, J. Diff. Eqns., 248(12)(2010), 2889–2905.
- [29] M. Winkler, *Global large-data solutions in a chemotaxis–(Navier–)Stokes system modeling cellular swimming in fluid drops*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns., 37(2012), 319–351.
- [30] M. Winkler, *Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic–parabolic Keller–Segel system*, J. Math. Pures Appl. 100(2013), 748–767.
- [31] M. Winkler, *How far can chemotactic cross–diffusion enforce exceeding carrying capacities?*, J. Nonlinear Sci., 24(2014), 809–855.
- [32] M. Winkler, *Boundedness and large time behavior in a three-dimensional chemotaxis–Stokes system with nonlinear diffusion and general sensitivity*, Calc. Var. Partial Diff. Eqns., 54(2015) 3789–3828.
- [33] M. Winkler, *How far do oxytaxis-driven forces influence regularity in the Navier–Stokes system ?*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., 369(2017), 3067–3125.
- [34] M. Winkler, *Global existence and stabilization in a degenerate chemotaxis–Stokes system with mildly strong diffusion enhancement*, J. Diff. Eqns., 264(2018), 6109–6151.
- [35] M. Winkler, *Does fluid interaction affect regularity in the three-dimensional Keller–Segel system with saturated sensitivity?*, preprint.
- [36] C. Xue, *Macroscopic equations for bacterial chemotaxis: integration of detailed biochemistry of cell signaling*, J. Math. Biol., 70(2015), 1–44.
- [37] C. Xue, H. G. Othmer, *Multiscale models of taxis-driven patterning in bacterial population*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 70(2009), 133–167.
- [38] H. Yu, W. Wang, S. Zheng, *Global classical solutions to the Keller–Segel–(Navier–)Stokes system with matrix valued sensitivity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 461(2)(2018), 1748–1770.