

BOUNDED WEAK SOLUTIONS FOR KELLER-SEGEL EQUATIONS WITH GENERALIZED DIFFUSION AND LOGISTIC SOURCE VIA AN UNBALANCED OPTIMAL TRANSPORT SPLITTING SCHEME

KYUNGKEUN KANG, HWA KIL KIM, GEUNTAEK SEO

ABSTRACT. We consider a parabolic-elliptic type of Keller-Segel equations with generalized diffusion and logistic source under homogeneous Neumann-Neumann boundary conditions. We construct bounded weak solutions globally in time in an unbalanced optimal transport framework, provided that the magnitude of the chemotactic sensitivity can be restricted depending on parameters. In the case of subquadratic degradation of the logistic source, we quantify the chemotactic sensitivity, in particular, in terms of the power of degradation and the pointwise bound of the initial density.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Keller-Segel models & gradient flows approach. In this paper, we study the following Keller-Segel equations with generalized diffusion and logistic source:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U'(\rho) - \chi \rho \nabla c) - \rho F'(\rho) \\ -\Delta c + \Lambda c = \rho \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

The equation (1.1) is set in $\Omega \times (0, T)$, $T > 0$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d . Here, ρ and c denote the density of bacteria and the concentration of a chemoattractant substance, respectively. The constant $\chi > 0$ represents the sensitivity of the bacteria to the chemoattractant, and $\Lambda > 0$ denotes the degradation rate of the chemoattractant. The homogenous Neumann-Neumann boundary conditions are imposed, and the initial datum $\rho_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ is given, i.e.,

$$\rho \nabla U'(\rho) \cdot \nu = \nabla c \cdot \nu = 0, \quad \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \quad (1.2)$$

We assume that $U : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $F : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (1.1) are convex functions which will be specified later. It is taken into account that the logistic term $-\rho F'(\rho)$ slows the rate of proliferation when the density of organisms is large.

We note that the typical cases of U and F' are

$$U(\rho) = \rho \log \rho, \quad F'(\rho) = \beta \rho^{r-1} - \alpha, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta > 0$, and $r > 1$. In such a case, the Keller-Segel system (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho = \Delta \rho - \chi \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla c) + \alpha \rho - \beta \rho^r \\ -\Delta c + \Lambda c = \rho \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

which have been extensively studied (see e.g. [27, 32, 29, 33, 24, 6, 31]). In recent decades, one of the central issues for these equations (including equations without logistic source terms) has been whether the solutions of (1.4) are globally bounded or blow up in a finite time. Some notable results are summarized below:

Key words and phrases. Wasserstein-Fisher-Rao metric, Hellinger-Kantorovich distance, Unbalanced optimal transport, JKO scheme, Keller-Segel equation, Logistic source.

• It was proved in [27] that in the case $r > 2$, a unique classical solution globally exists. On the other hand, when $r = 2$, it was also shown in [27] that if $\beta > \frac{\chi(d-2)}{d}$ (the limiting case $\beta = \frac{\chi(d-2)}{d}$ was resolved in [16]), then the same conclusion holds as in the case $r > 2$ (see also [29, 33]).

• Winkler [30] showed that if $2 - \frac{1}{d} < r < 2$, very weak solutions exist globally in time when the logistic source is in principle of the form $\alpha - \beta\rho^r$. Furthermore, it was also proved that a global bounded very weak solution exists if $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\gamma}$ is sufficiently small for $\gamma > \max(1, d/2)$.

• It was shown in [32] that for $\chi = \Lambda = 1$, $d \geq 3$, and $\Omega = B_1(0)$, there exists $\kappa = \kappa(d) < 2$ such that if $r \in (1, \kappa)$, then blow-up may occur in a finite time.

The main objective of this paper is to construct globally in time existence of bounded weak solutions of (1.1)-(1.2) by employing the gradient flow structures, and to quantify χ in terms of given parameters and the size of $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$ (see Theorem 1.5).

To introduce gradient flow structures, we define energy functionals associated with gradient flows, starting with the assumptions on U and F .

Assumption 1.1. The function U satisfies

- (H1) $U \in C^2(0, \infty) \cap C[0, \infty)$.
- (H2) $U'' > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$.
- (H3) $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} sU'(s)$ exists.

The function F satisfies

- (A1) $F \in C^1[0, \infty) \cap C^2(0, \infty)$, and $F'' > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$.
- (A2) There exist $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta > 0$, and $r > 1$ such that $F'(s) \geq \beta s^{r-1} - \alpha$.
- (A3) $F'(Mu)u \in L^1(\Omega)$ for any $M > 0$ and for any $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega F(u) < \infty$.

Remark 1.2. It is worth noting that the superlinear growth of U is not necessary at infinity, since all functions in the admissible set are uniformly bounded in JKO scheme (see (3.1)).

We denote by $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ the set of nonnegative Radon measures. Suppose that U and F fulfill Assumption 1.1. Given $\rho \ll \mathcal{L}^d|_\Omega$, let $c = c[\rho]$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta c + \Lambda c = \rho & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial c}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

We denote

$$\mathcal{K}_U := \left\{ \rho \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \rho \ll \mathcal{L}^d|_\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega U(\rho) dx < \infty \right\} \quad (1.6)$$

and define the energy functional \mathcal{E}_1 on $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_\Omega U(\rho(x)) dx - \frac{\chi}{2} \int_\Omega \Lambda |c(x)|^2 + |\nabla c(x)|^2 dx & \text{if } \rho \in \mathcal{K}_U \text{ and } c \in H^1(\Omega) \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

With the set \mathcal{K}_F , similarly defined in (1.6), we define

$$\mathcal{E}_2(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_\Omega F(\rho(x)) dx & \text{if } \rho \in \mathcal{K}_F, \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Remark 1.3. In addition to (1.3), let us comment on the typical types of U and F . For example, if we set $U(s) = \frac{1}{m-1}s^m$, $m > 0$, $m \neq 1$, then the term $\nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U'(\rho))$ in (1.1) becomes the porous media diffusion, i.e., $\Delta \rho^m$. Furthermore, with a suitable U , $\nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U'(\rho))$ can

represent a linear diffusion (e.g. $U(s) = s \log s$). From (A2), we note that the logistic source term $-\rho F'(\rho)$ does not exceed $\alpha\rho - \beta\rho^r$ (if $F(s) := \beta s^r/r - \alpha s$, then $-\rho F'(\rho)$ coincides with the logistic term in (1.4), i.e., $\alpha\rho - \beta\rho^r$).

Let us mention our approaches. We analyze the solution of (1.1) by splitting the equation and by finding two gradient flow structures in the equation. For convenience, we write W_2 and FR as the 2-Wasserstein metric and Fisher-Rao metric, respectively (the precise definition of these metrics will be specified in Section 2). In short, our strategy is to regard (1.1) formally as

$$\partial_t \rho = -\text{grad}_{W_2} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho) - \text{grad}_{\text{FR}} \mathcal{E}_2(\rho).$$

where \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are defined in (1.7) and (1.8) respectively. The main point is to use alternately gradient flow structures of \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 to construct a sequence of approximated solutions in $(\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega), \text{WFR})$, where WFR denotes the *Wasserstein-Fisher-Rao* metric (also called *Hellinger-Kantorovich* distance, see Definition 2.5). This will lead to the global existence of bounded weak solutions under the suitable restriction on χ (see (1.11)).

To be more precise, firstly, W_2 gradient flows of \mathcal{E}_1 , i.e., $\partial_t \rho = -\text{grad}_{W_2} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho)$, read (see e.g. [3])

$$\partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U'(\rho)) - \chi \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla c[\rho]). \quad (1.9)$$

On the other hand, similarly, FR gradient flows of \mathcal{E}_2 , i.e., $\partial_t \rho = -\text{grad}_{\text{FR}} \mathcal{E}_2(\rho)$ read (see e.g. [13, 12])

$$\partial_t \rho = -\rho F'(\rho). \quad (1.10)$$

The results of Carrillo and Santambrogio [7] give L^∞ estimates for densities locally in time by using the JKO scheme (see [15]) to exploit the gradient flow structure of (1.9). In addition, Gallouët, Laborde, and Monsaingeon [12] obtained the existence of weak solutions for the types of reaction-drift-diffusion equations

$$\partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla (F'_1(\rho) + V_1)) - \rho (F'_2(\rho) + V_2)$$

with some specific F_1 and F_2 and with $V_1 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $V_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, by means of splitting JKO schemes for the Wasserstein metric and for the Fisher-Rao metric (compare to [13]).

Motivated by the approach in [12], we construct minimizers of Wasserstein/Fisher-Rao JKO schemes by splitting (1.1) into two parts given in (1.9) and (1.10).

The main difference compared to [12] is that the reaction term in (1.1), $\nabla \cdot (\chi \rho \nabla c)$, is of nonlinear structure, which causes major obstacles and makes our problem more difficult.

In our case, since our main interest is to establish global existence of bounded weak solutions, it seems necessary to obtain uniform control for L^∞ norms of minimizers obtained by each splitting scheme, which is, however, not necessary in [12] because of the linear structure of an advection term, $\nabla(\rho V_1)$, and $V_1 \in W^{1,\infty}$. Therefore, the novelty of our paper lies in the construction of weak solutions with uniform bounds via the Wasserstein-Fisher-Rao metric under the size restriction of χ .

To be more precise, we use the result of [7] to obtain the L^∞ estimate of the minimizers given by the Wasserstein JKO scheme corresponding to (1.9), and then control L^∞ norm of the minimizers caused by the Fisher-Rao JKO step relevant to (1.10). We note that L^∞ norm of minimizers obtained from the Wasserstein JKO scheme in [7] generally explodes in a finite time. With the aid of the damping effect of the logistic source, the size of the mass and the L^∞ norm of minimizers can be uniformly controlled by going through the Fisher-Rao JKO scheme, provided that χ is less than a threshold depending on other parameters. As a consequence of the uniform boundedness, we obtain the existence of bounded weak solutions of (1.1).

1.2. **Main results.** Throughout this paper, we write

$$\chi_* := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } r > 2, \\ \beta & \text{if } r = 2, \\ \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1}(\beta\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{r-1} - \alpha) & \text{if } 1 < r < 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} > \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta(2-r)}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}, \\ \alpha^{\frac{2-r}{1-r}}\beta^{\frac{1}{r-1}}(2-r)^{\frac{2-r}{r-1}}(r-1) & \text{if } 1 < r < 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta(2-r)}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}. \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

Next, we introduce the notion of weak solutions of (1.1).

Definition 1.4. Let $\rho_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$. A pair (ρ, c) is called a weak solution of (1.1) if for all $T > 0$

- (i) ρ , $\rho \nabla U'(\rho)$, $\rho \nabla c[\rho]$, and $\rho F'(\rho)$ belong to $L^1(\Omega \times (0, T))$.
- (ii) for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\rho \partial_t \varphi - \rho \nabla U'(\rho) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \chi \rho \nabla c[\rho] \cdot \nabla \varphi - \rho F'(\rho) \varphi \right) dx dt = - \int_\Omega \varphi(x, 0) \rho_0 dx. \quad (1.12)$$

- (iii) c solves (1.5) in the sense of distributions.

We are now ready to state our main theorem:

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that Ω is a strictly convex bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d with smooth boundary and assume that U and F are functions satisfying Assumption 1.1. Let $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. If $0 < \chi < \chi_*$, there exists a weak solution of (1.1), namely ρ . In particular, for all $T > 0$, the curve $\rho : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous with respect to WFR-metric, and ρ satisfies*

$$\rho \nabla U'(\rho) \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T)) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T])} \leq C, \quad (1.13)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of T .

Remark 1.6. We make some comments on the existence of blow-up/bounded solutions in [30, 32], which are most relevant to our results. The only case $\chi = 1$ was treated in [32], but it is not difficult to see that the result can be also extended to arbitrary positive χ . In such a case, the main result in [32] can be restated as follows: When $\Omega = B_R(0)$, $r \in (1, \frac{7}{6})$, and $d = 3, 4$ (or $r \in (1, \frac{1}{2(d-1)})$ with $d \geq 5$), there exist $C > 0$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that if $\chi \int_{B_{R_0}(0)} \rho_0 \geq C$, then a finite-time blow-up occurs, where $\int_{B_{R_0}(0)} \rho_0$ denotes the mean value of ρ_0 in $B_{R_0}(0)$. Thus, for a given ρ_0 , our results in Theorem 1.5 are about global existence in case χ is bounded by the number in (1.11), while the blow-up result in [32] was derived for large χ . As mentioned earlier, global bounded solutions were constructed in [30] by assuming a type of logistic source, $\alpha - \beta \rho^r$, which is given differently from ours, $\alpha \rho - \beta \rho^r$. It seems that the values of χ_* in the third and fourth cases of (1.11) are essentially the same as the condition in [30, Lemma 2.1]. In particular, in the case $\alpha = 0$, two conditions are identical. However, the critical value of χ remains open, so that blow-up or global existence is separated by this value.

Remark 1.7. When $1 < r < 2$, our result reads that if $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, r}^{(2)}$, then the bounded weak solution globally exists as long as $\chi < C_{\alpha, \beta, r}^{(1)}$, independent of the size of $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}$, where

$$C_{\alpha, \beta, r}^{(1)} := \alpha^{\frac{2-r}{1-r}} \beta^{\frac{1}{r-1}} (2-r)^{\frac{2-r}{r-1}} (r-1), \quad C_{\alpha, \beta, r}^{(2)} := \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta(2-r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}.$$

On the other hand, in the case that $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} > C_{\alpha, \beta, r}^{(2)}$ and it is sufficiently large, χ is to be less than $\frac{\beta}{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{2-r}}$ for the global existence.

Remark 1.8. For variations of the elliptic equation (1.5), the proof of Theorem 1.5 applies almost as well. For example, if we replace (1.5) with

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta c = \rho & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ c|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

we obtain the same result as Theorem 1.5. To this end, all we have to do is to replace \mathcal{E}_1 with $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ defined as $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1(\rho) = \int_{\Omega} U(\rho(x)) dx - \frac{\chi}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c(x)|^2 dx$ where c depends on ρ through $-\Delta c = \rho$ with $c = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Remark 1.9. With the same assumptions on Ω, ρ_0 , and χ as in Theorem 1.5, we note that the solution of (1.4) becomes a classical solution in $[\delta, \infty) \times \Omega$ for any $\delta > 0$. In addition, if we further assume $\rho_0 \in (C^\infty \cap L^\infty)(\Omega)$, then we have a unique classical solution in $[0, \infty) \times \bar{\Omega}$.

From now on, without loss of generality, we will assume $\Lambda \equiv 1$ since it does not affect our main result. We also suppose that Ω is a strictly convex bounded domain.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is prepared for the preliminaries. In Section 3, we study two JKO schemes, namely Wasserstein and Fisher-Rao JKO schemes. In Section 4, we construct approximate weak solutions. Section 5 is devoted to providing the proof of Theorem 1.5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we deal with three metrics between positive measures and recall some properties on them.

We start with an introduction to *Wasserstein metric* (see e.g. [1, 25, 28] for details):

Definition 2.1. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ with equal masses. 2-Wasserstein distance between μ and ν is defined by

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) := \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \quad (2.1)$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the subset of $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega \times \Omega)$ with μ as the first marginal and ν as the second marginal.

We recall several facts on W_2 : If μ is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathcal{L}^d (but not necessary), then the equality in (2.1) is attained for some $\gamma = (id, T)_\# \mu$. In this case, $W_2^2(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\Omega} |T(x) - x|^2 d\mu(x)$, and we say that T is an optimal transport map. Next, we introduce Kantorovich's duality, that is,

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) = \max_{(\varphi, \psi)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi(x) d\mu(x) + \int_{\Omega} \psi(y) d\nu(y) \right) \quad (2.2)$$

where the maximum is taken over all pairs $(\varphi, \psi) \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \times C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying $\varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq |x - y|^2$. Indeed, the maximum in (2.2) is attained by a pair of (φ, φ^c) , where $\varphi^c(y) := \inf_{x \in \Omega} (|x - y|^2 - \varphi(x))$. In this case, φ is called a *Kantorovich potential* from μ to ν , and $\mathcal{K}(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the set of all Kantorovich potentials from μ to ν . It is important to note that both φ and φ^c are Lipschitz. Since φ is Lipschitz, it is differentiable a.e. Finally, we pay attention to the relationship between an optimal transport map T from μ to ν and its Kantorovich potential φ . In fact, the equality $T(x) = x - \nabla\varphi(x)$ holds a.e.

Theorem 2.2 (Benamou-Brenier formula). *Let $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ with $|\rho_0| = |\rho_1|$. Then*

$$W_2^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) = \min_{(\rho, v) \in \mathcal{A}_{W_2}[\rho_0, \rho_1]} \int_0^1 \int_{\Omega} |v_t|^2 d\rho_t dt,$$

where the admissible set $\mathcal{A}_{W_2}[\rho_0, \rho_1]$ consists of curves $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto (\rho_t, v_t) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, d\rho_t)^d$ such that $t \mapsto \rho_t$ is narrowly continuous with endpoints ρ_0, ρ_1 and solving the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho_t v_t) = 0$$

in the sense of distributions, that is, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, 1) \times \overline{\Omega})$

$$\int_0^1 \int_\Omega \partial_t \varphi d\rho_t dt + \int_0^1 \int_\Omega \nabla_x \varphi \cdot v_t d\rho_t dt = 0.$$

The *Fisher-Rao distance* between ρ_0 and ρ_1 , denoted by $\text{FR}(\rho_0, \rho_1)$, is defined as follows:

Definition 2.3. Let $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$.

$$\text{FR}^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) := \min_{(\rho, r) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{FR}}[\rho_0, \rho_1]} \int_0^1 \int_\Omega |r_t|^2 d\rho_t dt,$$

where the admissible set $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FR}}[\rho_0, \rho_1]$ consists of curves $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto (\rho_t, r_t) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, d\rho_t)$ such that $t \mapsto \rho_t$ is narrowly continuous with endpoints ρ_0, ρ_1 and solving

$$\partial_t \rho_t = \rho_t r_t$$

in the sense of distributions, that is, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, 1) \times \overline{\Omega})$

$$\int_0^1 \int_\Omega \partial_t \varphi d\rho_t dt + \int_0^1 \int_\Omega \varphi r_t d\rho_t dt = 0.$$

Remark 2.4. If $\rho_0, \rho_1 \ll \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, the following formula is given [13]:

$$\text{FR}^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) = 4 \int_\Omega \left| \sqrt{\frac{d\rho_0}{d\lambda}} - \sqrt{\frac{d\rho_1}{d\lambda}} \right|^2 d\lambda, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\frac{d\rho_i}{d\lambda}$, $i = 0, 1$, denote Radon-Nikodym derivatives.

The *Wasserstein-Fisher-Rao distance* between ρ_0 and ρ_1 , denoted by $\text{WFR}(\rho_0, \rho_1)$, is defined as follows:

Definition 2.5. Let $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$.

$$\text{WFR}^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) := \min_{(\rho, v, r) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{WFR}}[\rho_0, \rho_1]} \int_0^1 \int_\Omega |v_t|^2 + |r_t|^2 d\rho_t dt,$$

where the admissible set $\mathcal{A}_{W_2}[\rho_0, \rho_1]$ consists of curves $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto (\rho_t, v_t, r_t) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, d\rho_t)^d \times L^2(\Omega, d\rho_t)$ such that $t \mapsto \rho_t$ is narrowly continuous with endpoints ρ_0, ρ_1 and solving the continuity equation with source

$$\partial_t \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho_t v_t) = \rho_t r_t$$

in the sense of distributions, that is, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0, 1) \times \overline{\Omega})$

$$\int_0^1 \int_\Omega \partial_t \varphi d\rho_t dt + \int_0^1 \int_\Omega (\nabla_x \varphi \cdot v_t + \varphi r_t) d\rho_t dt = 0.$$

Remark 2.6. We leave some comments on the WFR metric: It was shown in [18] that

- $(\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega), \text{WFR})$ is a complete metric space.
- WFR metrizes the narrow convergences of measures.
- WFR distance is lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak* convergence of measures.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, we use the notation $|\mu|$ to denote $\mu(\Omega)$. Using the three definitions above, it is not difficult to check that for any $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$,

$$\text{WFR}(\rho_0, \rho_1) \leq W_2(\rho_0, \rho_1) \quad \text{whenever } |\rho_0| = |\rho_1|,$$

and

$$\text{WFR}(\rho_0, \rho_1) \leq \text{FR}(\rho_0, \rho_1). \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore, using the elementary inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$, we see that for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ with $|\rho_0| = |\sigma|$,

$$\text{WFR}^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) \leq 2(W_2^2(\rho_0, \sigma) + \text{FR}^2(\sigma, \rho_1)). \quad (2.5)$$

We refer the reader to [8, 9, 13, 18, 20, 21] for a comprehensive description of the above metrics.

Finally, let us briefly recall some classical results for (1.5) and (1.14). Let c be a solution of (1.5) or (1.14). It is well known that

$$\|c\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq K\|\rho\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

for some $K > 0$ (see e.g. [19, Section 3 in Chapter 9] for Neumann boundary case and [14, Chapter 9] for Dirichlet boundary case). For fixed d , if $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and p is large enough, by Sobolev inequality, there exist $\gamma, K_1, K_2, K_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|c\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq K_1\|c\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq K_2\|\rho\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_3\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (2.6)$$

Thanks to the estimate (2.6), it is possible to check Remark 1.8 immediately. For the rest part of this paper, we proceed with (1.5).

Finally, we recall an extension of the Aubin-Lions lemma proved in [23].

Proposition 2.7. *On a Banach space X , let be given*

- (a) *a normal coercive integrand $\mathcal{F} : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, i.e., \mathcal{F} is lower semicontinuous, and its sublevels are relatively compact in X ;*
- (b) *a pseudo-distance $g : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, i.e., g is lower semicontinuous, and $g(\rho, \eta) = 0$ for any $\rho, \eta \in X$ with $\mathcal{F}(\rho) < \infty$, $\mathcal{F}(\eta) < \infty$ implies $\rho = \eta$.*

Let further \mathcal{U} be a set of measurable functions $u : (0, T) \rightarrow X$ with a fixed $T > 0$. Under the hypotheses that

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \int_0^T \mathcal{F}(u(t)) dt < \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \int_0^{T-h} g(u(t+h), u(t)) dt = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

\mathcal{U} contains an infinite sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges in measure (with respect to $t \in (0, T)$) to a limit $u^ : (0, T) \rightarrow X$.*

Remark 2.8. At the conclusion of the above proposition, the convergence in measure means that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \{t \in (0, T) : \|u_n(t) - u^*(t)\|_X \geq \varepsilon\} \right| = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

3. SPLITTING JKO SCHEME

Motivated by [7, 12, 13], we analyze (1.1) by exploiting two gradient flow structures (1.9) and (1.10). To be more precise, we alternately use the Wasserstein JKO scheme / Fisher-Rao JKO scheme.

3.1. Wasserstein JKO step. We recall the results introduced in [7, Theorem 1 and Subsection 2.1] in our setting, which is presented with the following minimization problem: For fixed $\tau > 0$, and for $g \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$,

$$\rho \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_1(\mu) + \frac{W_2^2(g, \mu)}{\tau} \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega) : \mu \leq \frac{1}{\tau\chi}, |\mu| = |g|\}$.

Thanks to [7, Theorem 1 and Subsection 2.1], the following proposition holds. Although the proof is essentially the same, we provide its proof in the Appendix for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that U satisfies Assumption 1.1. The following statements hold.*

- (i) *There exists at least one minimizer of the scheme in (3.1).*
- (ii) *Let $\overline{M} := \frac{1}{\tau\chi}$. If $\inf_{t>0} tU''(t) > 0$ and ρ is a minimizer of (3.1), there exist a continuous function p with $p \geq 0$ and a constant l such that ρ satisfies*

$$U'(\rho) - \chi c[\rho] + \frac{\varphi}{\tau} + p = l, \quad (\overline{M} - \rho)p = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where $c[\rho]$ is a solution in (1.5), and φ is a Kantorovich potential from ρ to g , i.e., $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}(\rho, g)$. In particular, $U'(\rho)$, $c[\rho]$, and φ are Lipschitz on $\overline{\Omega}$. Moreover, $\inf_{\Omega} \rho > 0$ and ρ is Lipschitz on $\overline{\Omega}$.

- (iii) *If Ω is strictly convex, $\inf_{t>0} tU''(t) > 0$ and $\log g \in C^{0,a}(\overline{\Omega})$, then for every $\lambda > 1$ there exists a constant $c_0 = c_0(\lambda, \chi, d)$ such that, if $\tau \|g\|_{L^\infty} \leq c_0$ then any minimizer of (3.1), say ρ , satisfies*

$$\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{\|g\|_{L^\infty}}{1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|g\|_{L^\infty}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 3.2. Proposition 3.1 is only used in construction steps for approximate solutions by JKO scheme, and therefore $\inf_{t>0} tU''(t) > 0$ is not needed in Theorem 1.5.

3.2. Fisher-Rao JKO step. Given $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, we consider

$$\hat{\rho} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_2(\mu) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \mu)}{2\tau} \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

The second minimization problem (3.4) was considered in [12] (although the authors only treated $F(\rho) = \frac{\rho^m}{m-1}$, $m > 1$). In this paper, we proceed with F under the assumptions (A1)-(A3). In the absence of a precise reference, we prove the existence of a minimizer in the Fisher-Rao step.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that (A1)-(A2) hold. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{E}_2(\rho) < \infty$. Then, for any $\tau > 0$ there exists a minimizer of the following functional:*

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \mapsto \mathcal{E}_2(\mu) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \mu)}{2\tau}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. We note that F is bounded below. Considering the minimizing sequence of the functional (3.5), there exists a sequence (ρ_n) such that

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \left(\mathcal{E}_2(\mu) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \mu)}{2\tau} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_2(\rho_n) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \rho_n)}{2\tau},$$

and $\mathcal{E}_2(\rho_n) + \text{FR}^2(\rho, \rho_n)/(2\tau)$ is uniformly bounded in n . Using that \mathcal{E}_2 is bounded below,

$$|\mathcal{E}_2(\rho_n)| \leq C \quad (3.6)$$

for some $C > 0$. Due to (A1)-(A2), we easily get

$$\mathcal{E}_2(\rho_n) = \int_{\Omega} F(\rho_n) \geq F(0)|\Omega| + \int_{\Omega} \frac{\beta}{r} \rho_n^r - \alpha \rho_n.$$

Applying Young's inequality and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\sup_n \|\rho_n\|_{L^r} < \infty,$$

where we used (3.6). Hence, by weak compactness, up to a subsequence, we have

$$\rho_n \rightharpoonup \hat{\rho} \quad \text{in } L^r(\Omega), \quad (3.7)$$

On the other hand, we note that \mathcal{E}_2 is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence in L^r ($r > 1$), that is,

$$\liminf \mathcal{E}_2(\mu_n) \geq \mathcal{E}_2(\mu) \quad (3.8)$$

whenever $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ in $L^r(\Omega)$. In fact, this follows from the fact that the functional \mathcal{E}_2 is weak* lower semicontinuous (see e.g. [4, Theorem 3.4.1]).

We also investigate some weak* lower semicontinuity of FR^2 . It is known that

$$\liminf \text{FR}^2(\mu_n, \nu_n) \geq \text{FR}^2(\mu, \nu) \quad (3.9)$$

whenever $\mu_n \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ and $\nu_n \xrightarrow{*} \nu$ (see e.g. [4, Lemma 3.1.6 and Theorem 3.4.1])

Therefore, we conclude

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \left(\mathcal{E}_2(\mu) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \mu)}{2\tau} \right) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{E}_2(\rho_n) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \rho_n)}{2\tau} \right) \geq \mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho, \hat{\rho})}{2\tau},$$

where we used (3.7) and the lower semicontinuity in (3.8) and (3.9). Thus, $\hat{\rho}$ is a minimizer of (3.5). \square

We recall an Euler-Lagrange equation for (3.4), introduced in [13, Subsection 4.2]. In the absence of a precise reference with sufficient conditions, we prove the following lemma for clarity, following the arguments in [13, Subsection 4.2].

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{E}_2(\rho) < \infty$. Suppose that F satisfies the assumptions (A1)-(A3). If $\hat{\rho}$ is a minimizer obtained from (3.4) for the given datum ρ , then*

$$\int_{\Omega} (\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} - \sqrt{\rho}) \sqrt{\hat{\rho}} \psi = -\frac{\tau}{2} \int_{\Omega} F'(\hat{\rho}) \hat{\rho} \psi \quad \forall \psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}). \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\rho}$ be a minimizer of the problem (3.4). Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, define $\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon = \hat{\rho} e^{\varepsilon \psi}$. Due to the minimality of $\hat{\rho}$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\hat{\rho}, \rho)}{2\tau} \leq \mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon, \rho)}{2\tau}.$$

The assumption (A1) implies that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left| \frac{F(\hat{\rho}e^{\varepsilon\psi}) - F(\hat{\rho})}{\varepsilon} \right| \leq \hat{\rho}|\psi|(|F'(0)| + |F'(\hat{\rho}e^{|\psi|})|).$$

Since $|\psi(x)| \leq B$ for some $B > 0$, by the assumption (A3) and the dominated convergence theorem, we see that $(\mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}))/\varepsilon \rightarrow \int_\Omega F'(\hat{\rho})\hat{\rho}\psi$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Using (2.3) with $\lambda = \mathcal{L}^d|_\Omega$, we see that $(\text{FR}^2(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon, \rho) - \text{FR}^2(\hat{\rho}, \rho))/\varepsilon \rightarrow 4 \int_\Omega \sqrt{\hat{\rho}}(\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} - \sqrt{\rho})\psi$. Replacing ψ with $-\psi$ gives (3.10). \square

For the rest of this paper, we define

$$\eta_M := \left(\frac{\alpha + M}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}. \quad (3.11)$$

We often use the notation η instead of η_M if there is no confusion. Moreover, for notational simplicity, we often use $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$.

The following lemma tells us how much the L^∞ norm decreases when passing through the Fisher-Rao step.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold. Let $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ and let $\hat{\rho}$ be a minimizer obtained by (3.4) with the given datum ρ . If $M > 0$ and if $\alpha\tau < 1$, then we have*

$$\|\hat{\rho}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}}{1+\tau M} & \text{if } \|\hat{\rho}\|_{L^\infty} > \eta, \\ \eta & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

with $\eta = \eta_M$ specified in (3.11).

Proof. To prove (3.12), we can assume

$$\|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty > \eta = \left(\frac{\alpha + M}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \quad \text{or} \quad \|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty^{r-1} > \frac{\alpha + M}{\beta}. \quad (3.13)$$

The Euler-Lagrange equation (3.10) implies

$$\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} - \sqrt{\rho} = -\frac{\tau}{2}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}F'(\hat{\rho}) \quad \hat{\rho}\text{-a.e.} \quad (3.14)$$

Clearly,

$$\rho = \hat{\rho} + \tau\hat{\rho}F'(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{\tau^2}{4}\hat{\rho}(F'(\hat{\rho}))^2 \quad \hat{\rho}\text{-a.e.}, \quad (3.15)$$

which yields for a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$\rho \geq \hat{\rho} + \tau\hat{\rho}F'(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{\tau^2}{4}\hat{\rho}(F'(\hat{\rho}))^2 \geq \hat{\rho} + \tau\hat{\rho}(\beta\hat{\rho}^{r-1} - \alpha) \geq (1 - \alpha\tau)\hat{\rho} \geq 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho\|_\infty &\geq \|\hat{\rho} + \tau\hat{\rho}(\beta\hat{\rho}^{r-1} - \alpha)\|_\infty = \|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty + \tau\|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty(\beta\|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty^{r-1} - \alpha) \\ &\geq \|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty + \tau M\|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty = (1 + \tau M)\|\hat{\rho}\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.16) and (3.13). Thus, we obtain (3.12). \square

The following lemma shows that the minimizer of the Fisher-Rao step preserves the support, the Lipschitz condition, and the strict positivity of the minimizer of the Wasserstein step.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that Assumption 1.1 holds. Given $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, let ρ be a minimizer obtained by (3.1) with the initial datum ρ_0 . Similarly, let $\hat{\rho}$ be a minimizer given by (3.4) with the given datum ρ . Then*

(i) For $\tau \in (0, \frac{2}{\alpha})$,

$$\text{supp}(\rho) = \text{supp}(\hat{\rho}).$$

(ii) If $\tau \in (0, \frac{2}{\alpha})$ and if $\inf_{t>0} tU''(t) > 0$, then

$$\text{supp}(\rho) = \text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) = \Omega.$$

Moreover, if $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2\alpha})$, then $\hat{\rho}$ is Lipschitz and $\inf_\Omega \hat{\rho} > 0$.

Proof. (i) Since $F' \geq -\alpha$, by using (3.14), we have

$$\sqrt{\rho} = \sqrt{\hat{\rho}} \left(1 + \frac{\tau}{2} F'(\hat{\rho})\right) \geq \sqrt{\hat{\rho}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\tau}{2}\right) \quad \hat{\rho}\text{-a.e.},$$

which implies $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) \subset \text{supp}(\rho)$. To prove that $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) = \text{supp}(\rho)$ by contradiction, we assume $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) \subsetneq \text{supp}(\rho)$, and hence we can find $z \in \Omega$ so that

$$z \in \text{supp}(\rho) \setminus \text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then there exists $r^* > 0$ such that $\rho(B_r(z)) > 0$ and $\hat{\rho}(B_r(z)) = 0$ for all $0 < r < r^*$. If we define $\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon := \hat{\rho} + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{B_r(z)}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$, then by the minimality of $\hat{\rho}$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \text{FR}^2(\rho, \hat{\rho}) \leq \mathcal{E}_2(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \text{FR}^2(\rho, \hat{\rho}^\varepsilon). \quad (3.17)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} (\text{FR}^2(\rho, \hat{\rho}^\varepsilon) - \text{FR}^2(\rho, \hat{\rho})) &= \int_{B_r(z)} |\sqrt{\rho} - \sqrt{\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon}|^2 - |\sqrt{\rho} - \sqrt{\hat{\rho}}|^2 \\ &= \int_{B_r(z)} |\sqrt{\rho} - \sqrt{\varepsilon}|^2 - |\sqrt{\rho}|^2 = \int_{B_r(z)} -2\sqrt{\varepsilon\rho} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.17), we obtain

$$0 \leq \int_{B_r(z)} F(\hat{\rho}^\varepsilon) - F(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{2}{\tau} \int_{B_r(z)} \left(-2\sqrt{\varepsilon\rho} + \varepsilon\right).$$

Dividing by $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we get a contradiction because $F'(0+)$ exists and $\int_{B_r(z)} \sqrt{\rho} > 0$. Thus, we obtain the desired result.

(ii) Following the proof of [25, Lemma 8.6], we can see that $\text{supp}(\rho) = \Omega$. The assumption $\inf_{t>0} tU''(t) > 0$ is necessary here to require $U'(0+) = -\infty$. Due to (i), we conclude that $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) = \Omega$.

To prove the second statement, from (ii) of Proposition 3.1, we recall that ρ is Lipschitz and $\text{ess inf}_\Omega \rho > 0$. Using Lemma 3.4 and the fact that $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) = \Omega$, we obtain

$$\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} - \sqrt{\rho} = -\frac{\tau}{2} \sqrt{\hat{\rho}} F'(\hat{\rho}) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (3.18)$$

Similar to (3.15), we get

$$\rho = J_\tau(\hat{\rho}), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad (3.19)$$

where $J_\tau(s) := s + \tau s F'(s) + \frac{\tau^2}{4} s (F'(s))^2$, $s \geq 0$. Using (A1) and (A2), we see that $J'_\tau(s) \geq 1 - \alpha\tau + \tau s F''(s) (1 - \frac{\alpha\tau}{2})$. Hence, if $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2\alpha}$, then $\inf_{s>0} J'_\tau \geq 1/2$. In this case, since J_τ is strictly increasing, we can assume $\hat{\rho}$ is continuous (by redefining $\hat{\rho} := J_\tau^{-1}(\rho)$). Therefore, we have

$$\|\hat{\rho}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq \frac{1}{\inf_{s>0} J'_\tau} \|\rho\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 2 \|\rho\|_{\text{Lip}}.$$

It thus remains to show $\inf_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} > 0$. Since $\text{supp}(\hat{\rho}) = \Omega$ and $\hat{\rho}$ is Lipschitz, from (3.19), we have

$$\rho = \hat{\rho} + \tau \hat{\rho} F'(\hat{\rho}) + \frac{\tau^2}{4} \hat{\rho} (F'(\hat{\rho}))^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \quad (3.20)$$

If $\inf_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} = 0$, then there exists $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\hat{\rho}(x_0) = 0$ due to the regularity of $\hat{\rho}$. Then, (3.20) implies a contradiction to the fact that $\text{ess inf}_{\Omega} \rho > 0$ (if $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, choose a sequence (x_k) converging to x_0), and thus we obtain the desired result. \square

Remark 3.7. Let $\rho, \hat{\rho}$ be the minimizers in (ii) of Lemma 3.6. Then it is possible to obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (\hat{\rho} - \rho) \phi = -\frac{\tau}{2} \int_{\Omega} F'(\hat{\rho}) \sqrt{\hat{\rho}} (\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} + \sqrt{\rho}) \phi \quad \forall \phi \in C^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega}), \quad (3.21)$$

which is a variant of Lemma 3.4. Indeed, since ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ are Lipschitz, multiplying (3.18) by $\sqrt{\hat{\rho}} + \sqrt{\rho}$ and taking $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega})$ as test functions, we get (3.21).

4. APPROXIMATE WEAK SOLUTIONS: CONSTRUCTION AND L^{∞} -ESTIMATES

In this section, we construct an approximate weak solution via splitting JKO scheme. More precisely, we alternately repeat the Wasserstein and Fisher-Rao JKO steps;

$$\rho_0 \xrightarrow{W_2^2} \rho_{1/2}^{\tau} \xrightarrow{\text{FR}^2} \rho_1^{\tau} \xrightarrow{W_2^2} \rho_{3/2}^{\tau} \xrightarrow{\text{FR}^2} \rho_2^{\tau} \xrightarrow{W_2^2} \dots \xrightarrow{\text{FR}^2} \rho_n^{\tau} \xrightarrow{W_2^2} \rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} \xrightarrow{\text{FR}^2} \rho_{n+1}^{\tau} \xrightarrow{W_2^2} \dots$$

i.e., we iteratively define

$$\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}_n} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_1(\mu) + \frac{W_2^2(\rho_n^{\tau}, \mu)}{\tau} \right\}, \quad \rho_{n+1}^{\tau} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_2(\mu) + \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}, \mu)}{2\tau} \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_n = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega) : \mu \leq \frac{1}{\tau\chi}, |\mu| = |\rho_n^{\tau}|\}$.

Then, for each $n \geq 0$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(0) &:= \rho_0, & \rho^{\tau}(0) &:= \rho_0, \\ \tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(t) &:= \rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}, & \rho^{\tau}(t) &:= \rho_{n+1}^{\tau}, \quad \text{whenever } t \in (n\tau, (n+1)\tau]. \end{aligned}$$

It will be shown that the curves $\tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(t), \rho^{\tau}(t)$ approximate weak solutions of (1.1). To this end, we start by analyzing the minimizers in (4.1).

The following lemma shows that the splitting schemes are well-defined. To repeat the scheme (3.1) and (3.4) alternately and infinitely, we need the following L^1 -estimate of ρ_n^{τ} because of the density constraint of (3.1).

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that Assumption 1.1 holds. Let $\rho_0 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Then, there exists $\xi > 0$ (depending on $\alpha, \beta, r, |\Omega|, \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$) such that if $0 < \tau < \frac{|\Omega|}{\xi\chi}$, then the minimizers $\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}$ and ρ_{n+1}^{τ} in (4.1) exist for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and*

$$\|\rho_n^{\tau}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \xi.$$

Proof. If $0 < \tau < \frac{|\Omega|}{\chi\|\rho_0\|_{L^1}}$, from (i) in Proposition 3.1, we admit a minimizer of (3.1) for the initial datum ρ_0 , say $\rho_{1/2}$. Here, we need the condition on τ because of the constraints in (3.1). Also, by Lemma 3.3, we have ρ_1 , which is a minimizer of (3.4) for the initial datum $\rho_{1/2}$. Due to (3.15), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 = \int_{\Omega} \rho_{1/2} \geq \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 + \int_{\Omega} \tau \rho_1 F'(\rho_1) \geq \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 + \tau \left(\beta \int_{\Omega} \rho_1^r - \alpha \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \right).$$

Using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \geq \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 + \tau \left(\beta k_0^{-r} \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \right)^r - \alpha \int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \right) \quad (4.2)$$

with $k_0 = |\Omega|^{1/r'}$, where r' is the Hölder conjugate of r . For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, applying Young's inequality, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \leq \varepsilon \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho_1 \right)^r + C_{\varepsilon}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $C_{\varepsilon} := (r\varepsilon)^{\frac{-1}{r-1}}/r'$. Combining (4.2) and (4.3), we obtain

$$\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \|\rho_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \tau A_{\varepsilon} \|\rho_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \tau B_{\varepsilon},$$

where $A_{\varepsilon} = \beta k_0^{-r} \varepsilon^{-1} - \alpha$ and $B_{\varepsilon} = \beta k_0^{-r} \varepsilon^{-1} C_{\varepsilon}$. Then,

$$\|\rho_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \tau B_{\varepsilon}}{1 + \tau A_{\varepsilon}} = \left(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \frac{B_{\varepsilon}}{A_{\varepsilon}} \right) \frac{1}{1 + A_{\varepsilon} \tau} + \frac{B_{\varepsilon}}{A_{\varepsilon}}. \quad (4.4)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small so that A_{ε} is positive, and we set

$$\xi := \max \left(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \frac{B_{\varepsilon}}{A_{\varepsilon}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\tau} := \frac{|\Omega|}{\xi \chi}.$$

Since $A_{\varepsilon} > 0$, from (4.4), we know that if $0 < \tau < \bar{\tau}$ ($\leq \frac{|\Omega|}{\chi \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}}$) then

$$\|\rho_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \xi. \quad (4.5)$$

Using Lemma 3.5, we know $\rho_1 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Moreover, a simple perturbation argument shows $\|\rho_1\|_{L^1}$ cannot be zero (suppose $\rho_1 = 0$ a.e., and define $\rho_1^{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon$ on Ω , and use the minimality of ρ_1). So we can repeat the above argument to obtain (4.4) for ρ_2 . More precisely, using again (i) in Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we see that for $0 < \tau < \frac{|\Omega|}{\chi} \min(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1}^{-1}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^1}^{-1})$, $\rho_{3/2}$ and ρ_2 exist, and

$$\|\rho_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\|\rho_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \tau B_{\varepsilon}}{1 + \tau A_{\varepsilon}}.$$

Solving this recurrence relation, we get

$$\|\rho_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \left(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \frac{B_{\varepsilon}}{A_{\varepsilon}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + A_{\varepsilon} \tau} \right)^2 + \frac{B_{\varepsilon}}{A_{\varepsilon}}.$$

Similar to (4.5), if $0 < \tau < \bar{\tau}$ ($\leq \frac{|\Omega|}{\chi} \min(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1}^{-1}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^1}^{-1})$), then

$$\|\rho_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \xi.$$

Moreover, we know that $\rho_2 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ by Lemma 3.5. We obtain the desired result by induction. \square

We turn to our attention to getting L^{∞} -estimates of the minimizers $\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}$ and ρ_{n+1}^{τ} . To this end, the following lemma plays a key role.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\rho_0 \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and let $M > 0$. Suppose that $0 < \chi < \chi_*$, where χ_* is the number stated in (1.11), and let $\lambda > 1$ with $\lambda \chi < \chi_*$. Define two functions of τ , namely*

$$\theta_1(\tau) := (1 + \tau M) (\|\rho_0\|_{L^{\infty}}^{-1} - \lambda \chi \tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_2(\tau) := (1 + \tau M) (\eta_M^{-1} - \lambda \chi \tau)$$

which are defined on $[0, \infty)$. Then, we can find M , namely M_ , so that $\theta'_i(0) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$. As a consequence, there exists $\tau_* > 0$ such that $\theta_i(t) \geq \theta_i(0)$, $i = 1, 2$, whenever $t \in (0, \tau_*)$.*

Remark 4.3. In the proof of Lemma 4.2, the value χ_* in (1.11) is exactly determined. In fact,

$$\chi_* = \sup_{M>0} \left(\min(M\eta_M^{-1}, M\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1}) \right).$$

Proof. We want to find $M > 0$ so that

$$\theta'_1(0) = M\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1} - \lambda\chi > 0 \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\theta'_2(0) = M\eta_M^{-1} - \lambda\chi > 0. \quad (4.7)$$

It is straightforward to choose M fulfilling that (4.6) holds by choosing M large enough. Note that (4.7) is equivalent to

$$\frac{M\beta^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}{(\alpha + M)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}} := f(M) > \lambda\chi.$$

To find M satisfying (4.7), we consider three cases of the range of r :

(Case $r > 2$) Notice that $f(M) \rightarrow \infty$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ because $r > 2$. Hence, it is always possible to find M_* satisfying (4.6) and (4.7).

(Case $r = 2$) Let us first consider the case $\alpha > 0$. By our assumption on this case, we have

$$\lambda\chi < \beta = \chi_*.$$

Since $f(M) \uparrow \beta$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$, there is large M such that $\lambda\chi < f(M)$, and hence we can find M_* satisfying (4.6) and (4.7). The case $\alpha = 0$ follows directly, because $f(M) \equiv \beta$.

(Case $1 < r < 2$) Unlike the above two cases, since $f(M) \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$, we avoid growing M . Recalling the definition of χ_* , in the case that

$$\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{-1} < \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta(2-r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}}, \quad (4.8)$$

we know

$$\lambda\chi < \chi_* = \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1} (\beta\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{r-1} - \alpha). \quad (4.9)$$

If we set $M_* := \beta\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{r-1} - \alpha$, then $M_*\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1} = M_*\eta_{M_*}^{-1} = \chi_*$, and therefore (4.6) and (4.7) hold due to (4.9); Such a choice of M_* is optimal in the sense that the range of χ is maximized. Indeed, from (4.6) and (4.7), χ_* is determined as follows:

$$\chi_* = \max_{M>0} \left(\min(f(M), g(M)) \right), \quad (4.10)$$

where $g(M) := M\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1}$. Notice that (4.8) is equivalent to

$$g'(0) < \frac{f(M_f)}{M_f},$$

where $M_f := \frac{\alpha(r-1)}{2-r}$ is a unique maximizer of f . Since $M_* = \beta\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{r-1} - \alpha$ is a unique positive solution of the equation $f = g$ and it is a maximizer of the function $\min(f, g)$, the chosen M_* maximizes the range of χ .

Let us consider the other case

$$\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{-1} \geq \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-r}} \beta^{\frac{1}{r-1}} (2-r)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}, \quad (4.11)$$

By our assumption,

$$\lambda\chi < \chi_* = \alpha^{\frac{2-r}{1-r}} \beta^{\frac{1}{r-1}} (2-r)^{\frac{2-r}{r-1}} (r-1). \quad (4.12)$$

If we set $M_* := M_f = \frac{\alpha(r-1)}{2-r}$, (4.6) and (4.7) are satisfied due to (4.12); To be more specific, (4.11) is equivalent to $g'(0) \geq f(M_f)/M_f$. In this case, the maximizer of the function $\min(f, g)$ is always consistent with the maximizer of f . Taking into account (4.10) again, we conclude that such a choice of M_* maximizes the range of χ .

Thus, we found M_* fulfilling (4.6) and (4.7) in all three cases. Therefore, there is $\tau_1^* > 0$ such that $\theta_1(\tau) \geq \theta_1(0) = \|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1}$ whenever $\tau \in (0, \tau_1^*)$. Similarly, there exists $\tau_2^* > 0$ such that if $\tau \in (0, \tau_2^*)$ then $\theta_2(\tau) \geq \theta_2(0) = \eta^{-1}$. We denote $\tau_* = \min(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$. This completes the proof. \square

Let us introduce the following hypothesis:

$$\mathbf{(H)} \quad \inf_{s>0} sU''(s) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < c_* \leq \rho_0 \in C^{0,a}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

These conditions satisfy the assumptions on U and g (regarded as ρ_0) in (iii) of Proposition 3.1. Under the hypothesis $\mathbf{(H)}$, we prove the following proposition, which ensures that the minimizers $\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ and ρ_{n+1}^τ are uniformly bounded. Note that we temporarily need such a technical assumption $\mathbf{(H)}$, but it will be removed later (see *Step 3* in the proof of Theorem 1.5).

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that Assumption 1.1 and $\mathbf{(H)}$ hold, and assume the same hypotheses as in Lemma 4.2. Let λ, M_*, η_{M_*} , and τ_* be the numbers in Lemma 4.2, and let ξ be the number given in Lemma 4.1. Also, c_0 denotes the number given in (iii) of Proposition 3.1, corresponding to $g = \rho_0$. We write $\eta = \eta_{M_*}$. Suppose that $\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ and ρ_{n+1}^τ are minimizers in (4.1). If $0 < \tau < \widehat{\tau} := \min(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, c_0\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^{-1}, \tau_*, \eta^{-1}c_0, \frac{|\Omega|}{\chi\xi})$, then*

$$\|\rho_k^\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq \max(\eta, \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}. \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover, under the additional assumption $\tau < \widetilde{\tau} := \min\left((2\lambda\chi\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty})^{-1}, (2\lambda\chi\eta)^{-1}\right)$, we have

$$\|\rho_{k+1/2}^\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2 \max(\eta, \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}) := C_1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}. \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, $\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ and ρ_{n+1}^τ exist for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Recall the functions θ_i , $i = 1, 2$, in Lemma 4.2.

Due to the assumption $\mathbf{(H)}$, the hypotheses of (iii) in Proposition 3.1 are satisfied. Then we have

$$\|\rho_{1/2}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\rho_0\|_\infty}{1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|\rho_0\|_\infty}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, we get

$$\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\|\rho_{1/2}\|_\infty}{1 + \tau M} & \text{if } \|\rho_1\|_\infty > \eta, \\ \eta & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

If $\|\rho_1\|_\infty > \eta$, we have

$$\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\rho_0\|_\infty}{(1 + \tau M)(1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|\rho_0\|_\infty)} = \frac{1}{\theta_1(\tau)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta_1(0)} = \|\rho_0\|_\infty \quad (4.15)$$

(if $\|\rho_0\|_\infty \leq \eta$ at first, it is contrary, and we need to consider the other cases). Consequently, we obtain $\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \max(\eta, \|\rho_0\|_\infty)$.

We inductively show the following estimate of $\|\rho_k^\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\|\rho_{k+1}^\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq \begin{cases} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} & \text{if } \|\rho_k^\tau\|_{L^\infty} > \eta \text{ and } \|\rho_{k+1}^\tau\|_{L^\infty} > \eta, \\ \eta & \text{if } \|\rho_k^\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq \eta \text{ or } \|\rho_{k+1}^\tau\|_{L^\infty} \leq \eta, \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

First, we show that (4.16) holds for $k = 1$, that is,

$$\|\rho_2\|_\infty \leq \begin{cases} \|\rho_0\|_\infty & \text{if } \|\rho_1\|_\infty > \eta \text{ and } \|\rho_2\|_\infty > \eta, \\ \eta & \text{if } \|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \eta \text{ or } \|\rho_2\|_\infty \leq \eta. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

To show the first case, we assume that $\|\rho_1\|_\infty > \eta$ and $\|\rho_2\|_\infty > \eta$. Since $\|\rho_1\|_\infty > \eta$, from (4.15), we know $\tau\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \tau\|\rho_0\|_\infty < c_0$. Hence, thanks to Lemma 3.6, we can apply (iii) of Proposition 3.1 again, that is,

$$\|\rho_{3/2}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\rho_1\|_\infty}{1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|\rho_1\|_\infty},$$

where $\rho_{3/2}$ is any minimizer determined by (3.1). Since $\|\rho_2\|_\infty > \eta$, using Lemma 3.5 again, we obtain

$$\|\rho_2\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\rho_1\|_\infty}{(1 + \tau M)(1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|\rho_1\|_\infty)},$$

and hence

$$\|\rho_2\|_\infty^{-1} \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_1\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) = \theta_1(\tau) \geq \theta_1(0) = \|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1}.$$

Thus, the first inequality in (4.17) holds.

Let us prove the second inequality in (4.17), that is, we show that if $\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \eta$, then $\|\rho_2\|_\infty \leq \eta$. We assume $\|\rho_2\|_\infty > \eta$ to derive a contradiction. Note that $\tau\|\rho_1\|_\infty \leq \tau\eta < c_0$. Then, similar to the proof above, we have

$$\|\rho_2\|_\infty^{-1} \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_1\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) \geq (1 + \tau M)(\eta^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) = \theta_2(\tau) \geq \theta_2(0) = \eta^{-1},$$

where the assumption $\|\rho_2\|_\infty > \eta$ is used to apply Lemma 3.5. Thus, it gives a contradiction, and hence we proved (4.17).

Now suppose that (4.16) holds when $k = n$. Then it should be shown that

$$\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty \leq \begin{cases} \|\rho_0\|_\infty & \text{if } \|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty > \eta \text{ and } \|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty > \eta, \\ \eta & \text{if } \|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \eta \text{ or } \|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty \leq \eta. \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

Let $0 < \tau < \hat{\tau}$. Assume that $\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty > \eta$ and $\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty > \eta$. Since $\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty > \eta$ and (4.16) holds for $k = n$, we must have $\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \|\rho_0\|_\infty$ (if not, we have $\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \eta$). Then $\tau\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \tau\|\rho_0\|_\infty < c_0$. Due to Lemma 3.6, ρ_{n+1}^τ is Lipschitz and $\inf_\Omega \rho_{n+1}^\tau > 0$. Therefore, (iii) in Proposition 3.1 can be used again, and we get the estimate about $\|\rho_{n+3/2}\|_\infty$:

$$\|\rho_{n+3/2}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty}{1 - \lambda\tau\chi\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty},$$

Since $\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty > \eta$, using Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty^{-1} \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) = \theta_1(\tau) \geq \theta_1(0) = \|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1}.$$

Thus, the first inequality in (4.18) holds.

To prove the second inequality in (4.18), let us assume $\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \eta$. In order to get a contradiction, suppose $\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty > \eta$. Clearly, $\tau\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \tau\eta < c_0$. Proceeding similarly to the proof of the first inequality, we have

$$\|\rho_{n+2}\|_\infty^{-1} \geq (1 + \tau M)(\|\rho_{n+1}\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) \geq (1 + \tau M)(\eta^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi) = \theta_2(\tau) \geq \theta_2(0) = \eta^{-1},$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore, (4.16) holds when $k = n + 1$, which implies that (4.16) is true for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As a result, (4.13) is proved.

It remains to check (4.14), which is a direct consequence of (3.3) and (4.13). Indeed, since $\tau < \hat{\tau}$ and (4.13) holds, we have $\tau\|\rho_n\|_\infty \leq c_0$. Using (iii) in Proposition 3.1 and (4.13), we obtain

$$\|\rho_{n+1/2}\|_\infty^{-1} \geq \|\rho_n\|_\infty^{-1} - \lambda\tau\chi \geq \min(\eta^{-1}, \|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1}) - \lambda\tau\chi \geq \frac{1}{2} \min(\eta^{-1}, \|\rho_0\|_\infty^{-1}),$$

which shows (4.14) and thus we complete the proof. \square

In the following lemma, we investigate the difference of the L^∞ norm, the energy gap, and the WFR distance for the successive minimizers.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that the assumptions in Proposition 4.4 hold. We denote $C_1 := 2 \max(\eta_{M^*}, \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})$ as in (4.14). There exists $\tau_{**} > 0$ such that if $\tau < \tau_{**}$, then*

(i) for all $t > 0$

$$\|\tilde{\rho}^\tau(t) - \rho^\tau(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau C_2 \quad (4.19)$$

where $C_2 := C_1 \sup_{z \in [0, C_1]} |F'(z)|$.

(ii) for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) - \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \leq (C_3 + C_4)\tau, \quad (4.20)$$

where

$$C_3 := (2\alpha C_1 U'(2C_1) - 3 \sup_{z \in [0, C_1]} |F'(z)| \inf_{s \in [0, C_1]} s U'(s)) |\Omega|,$$

$$C_4 := 2\chi K_3^2 C_1 C_2 |\Omega|,$$

where K_3 is the number in (2.6).

(iii) for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$

$$\mathcal{E}_2(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - \mathcal{E}_2(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) \leq C_5 \tau, \quad (4.21)$$

where $C_5 := (4 \sup_{z \in [0, C_1]} |F'(z)| C_1 U'(2C_1) + \alpha^2 C_1) |\Omega|$.

(iv) Let $0 < T < \infty$. For all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$

$$\text{WFR}^2(\tilde{\rho}^\tau(s), \tilde{\rho}^\tau(t)) \leq C_6(t - s + \tau), \quad \text{WFR}^2(\rho^\tau(s), \rho^\tau(t)) \leq C_6(t - s + \tau), \quad (4.22)$$

where $C_6 := 2(2TC_5 + (C_3 + C_4)T + \sup_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho) - \inf_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho))$.

Remark 4.6. In (4.19)-(4.22), the constants on the right hand side are given to clarify the dependence of the constants. This is important for the proof of the main theorem.

Proof. (i) Fix $t \in (n\tau, (n+1)\tau]$. Using (ii) of Lemma 3.6 and (3.14), we obtain

$$\sqrt{\rho_{n+1}^\tau} - \sqrt{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau} = -\frac{\tau}{2} \sqrt{\rho_{n+1}^\tau} F'(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e.} \quad (4.23)$$

By Proposition 4.4 and the continuity of F' , $F'(\rho_{n+1}^\tau)$ is uniformly bounded in n . Multiplying (4.23) by $\sqrt{\rho_{n+1}^\tau} + \sqrt{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau}$, we deduce that

$$\|\rho_{n+1}^\tau - \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau C_1 \sup_{z \in [0, C_1]} |F'(z)|. \quad (4.24)$$

(ii) Let us first show that

$$\int U(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) - \int U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \leq C_3\tau = (2\alpha C_1 U'(2C_1) - 3k_0 \inf_{s>0} sU'(s))|\Omega|\tau. \quad (4.25)$$

To prove this, we note from (4.23) that

$$\sqrt{\rho_{n+1}^\tau} - \sqrt{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau} \geq -\frac{k_0}{2}\tau\sqrt{\rho_{n+1}^\tau} \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e.}$$

where

$$k_0 := \sup_{z \in [0, C_1]} |F'(z)|.$$

This implies that there exists $\tau_{**} > 0$ such that if $\tau < \tau_{**}$ then

$$\rho_{n+1}^\tau \geq (1 - 2k_0\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e.} \quad (4.26)$$

On the other hand, using (4.23) again, similar to (3.19), we have

$$\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau - \rho_{n+1}^\tau \geq \tau\rho_{n+1}^\tau F'(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) \geq -\alpha\tau\rho_{n+1}^\tau \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e.} \quad (4.27)$$

Since we assumed **(H)**, U is increasing on (r, ∞) and is decreasing on $[0, r)$ (of course, r can be 0, in which case the proof is easier). From (4.27), there exist $\tau_{**} > 0$ (not relabeld) such that for all n , $\rho_{n+1}^\tau \leq (1 + 2\alpha\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ whenever $\tau < \tau_{**}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{\rho_{n+1}^\tau \geq r\}} U(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \geq r\}} U((1 + 2\alpha\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \geq r\}} U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) + 2\alpha\tau\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \sup_{z \in [0, 2\alpha]} U'((1 + z\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \geq r\}} U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) + 2\alpha\tau C_1 U'(2C_1), \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

where we used Proposition 4.4 and the fact that U' is continuous. To estimate $\int_{\{\rho_{n+1}^\tau < r\}} U(\rho_{n+1}^\tau)$, we note that $\inf_{s>0} sU'(s) \leq 0$ due to the definition of r (if $r = 0$, the following estimate is not needed). Using (4.26) and assuming $6k_0\tau < 1$, still denoted by $\tau < \tau_{**}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{\rho_{n+1}^\tau < r\}} U(\rho_{n+1}^\tau) &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau < r\}} U((1 - 2k_0\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau < r\}} U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - 2k_0\tau\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau U'((1 - 2k_0\tau)\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau < r\}} U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - \frac{2k_0\tau}{1 - 2k_0\tau} \inf_{s \in [0, C_1]} sU'(s) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau < r\}} U(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - 3k_0\tau \inf_{s \in [0, C_1]} sU'(s). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain (4.25).

It remains to show that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c[\rho_{n+1}^\tau]|^2 + (c[\rho_{n+1}^\tau])^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau]|^2 + (c[\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau])^2 dx \right| \leq 4K_3^2 C_1 C_2 |\Omega|\tau. \quad (4.29)$$

Let us denote $\bar{\rho}_n := \rho_{n+1}^\tau - \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ and $\bar{c}_n := c[\rho_{n+1}^\tau] - c[\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau]$. Clearly, by the linearity, $(\bar{\rho}_n, \bar{c}_n)$ solves (1.5). Sobolev embeddings theorems and (2.6) imply that for large p ,

$$\|\bar{c}_n\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq K_2 \|\bar{\rho}_n\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_3 \|\bar{\rho}_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K_3 C_2 \tau,$$

where we have used (4.24). Thus, we get

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (c[\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}])^2 - (c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}])^2 \right| \leq \int_{\Omega} |\bar{c}_n| (c[\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}] + c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}]) \leq 2K_3^2 C_1 C_2 |\Omega| \tau$$

Estimating similarly $\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla c[\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}]|^2 - |\nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}]|^2)$, we obtain (4.29).

(iii) Similar to (4.28), we can observe that

$$\int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} \geq r'\}} F(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}) \leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} \geq r'\}} F(\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}) + 4k_0 \tau C_1 F'(2C_1). \quad (4.30)$$

Using that $\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} \geq (1 - \alpha)\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}$ and $F' \geq -\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} < r'\}} F(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau}) &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} < r'\}} F((1 - \alpha)\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} < r'\}} F(\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}) - \alpha \rho_{n+1}^{\tau} F'((1 - \alpha)\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau} < r'\}} F(\rho_{n+1}^{\tau}) + \alpha^2 C_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

The desired result is obtained by combining (4.30) and (4.31).

(iv) Let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$. Obviously, $s \in (N_1\tau, (N_1 + 1)\tau]$ and $t \in (N_2\tau, (N_2 + 1)\tau]$ for some $N_1, N_2 \leq \lfloor \frac{T}{\tau} \rfloor$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WFR}(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(s), \tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(t)) &= \text{WFR}(\rho_{N_1+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{N_2+1/2}^{\tau}) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=N_1}^{N_2-1} \text{WFR}(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau}) \leq \left(\sum_{k=N_1}^{N_2-1} \tau \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k=N_1}^{N_2-1} \frac{\text{WFR}^2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau})}{\tau} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

From (2.5), (3.1), and (3.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WFR}^2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau}) &\leq 2 \left(\text{FR}^2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+1}^{\tau}) + W_2^2(\rho_{k+1}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau}) \right), \\ \frac{W_2^2(\rho_{k+1}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau})}{\tau} &\leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{k+1}^{\tau}) - \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau}), \\ \frac{\text{FR}^2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+1}^{\tau})}{2\tau} &\leq \mathcal{E}_2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}) - \mathcal{E}_2(\rho_{k+1}^{\tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

Therefore, thanks to (4.20), (4.21), and Proposition 4.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=N_1}^{N_2-1} \frac{\text{WFR}^2(\rho_{k+1/2}^{\tau}, \rho_{k+3/2}^{\tau})}{\tau} \\ &\leq 2(2TC_5 + (C_3 + C_4)T + \sup_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho) - \inf_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho)) = C_6. \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

Combining (4.32) and (4.34), we get the first inequality in (4.22). The second one follows in a similar way. \square

Now, we obtain an approximate weak formulation of (1.1) by using the curves $\tilde{\rho}^{\tau}(t), \rho^{\tau}(t)$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $T > 0$. Suppose that the assumptions in Proposition 4.4 hold and that $\tau < \tau_{**}$ as stated in Lemma 4.5. Let $\Psi(\rho) := \rho U'(\rho) - U(\rho)$. For all $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (\rho^\tau(t_2) - \rho^\tau(t_1))\phi + \mathcal{R}(\tau) &= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\sqrt{\rho^\tau}(\sqrt{\rho^\tau} + \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^\tau})}{2} F'(\rho^\tau)\phi \\ &\quad - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Psi(\tilde{\rho}^\tau) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \chi\tilde{\rho}^\tau \nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^\tau] \cdot \nabla\phi \quad \forall 0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T, \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

where the remainder term $\mathcal{R}(\tau)$ tends to 0 as $\tau \downarrow 0$.

Proof. First, we recall the Euler-Lagrange equation (3.2). Using Proposition 4.4, $\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ is always smaller than $\bar{M} := \frac{1}{\chi^\tau}$ whenever τ is small enough, which means $p \equiv 0$ in (3.2). Hence, we get

$$U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - \chi c[\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau] + \frac{\varphi}{\tau} = l \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{\Omega}. \quad (4.36)$$

Since all functions in (4.36) are Lipschitz,

$$\nabla(U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau)) - \chi \nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau] + \frac{id - T_n}{\tau} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad (4.37)$$

where T_n is an optimal transport map from $\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$ to ρ_n^τ . Since $\rho_n^\tau = T_n \# \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau$, for all $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \phi \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau - \int \phi \rho_n^\tau = \int \phi \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau - \int \phi \circ T_n \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \\ &= - \int (\phi(T_n(x)) - \phi(x)) \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau = -\tau \int \nabla\phi(x) \cdot \frac{T_n(x) - x}{\tau} \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau + \sup |D^2\phi| W_2^2(\rho_n^\tau, \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &= -\tau \int \nabla\phi(x) \cdot (\nabla U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) - \chi \nabla c) \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau + \sup |D^2\phi| W_2^2(\rho_n^\tau, \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) \\ &= -\tau \int \nabla\phi(x) \cdot \nabla\Psi(\rho_{n+1/2}^\tau) + \tau \int \chi \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau \nabla c \cdot \nabla\phi + \sup |D^2\phi| W_2^2(\rho_n^\tau, \rho_{n+1/2}^\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

where in the last equality we have used that $\rho \nabla U'(\rho) = \nabla(\rho U'(\rho) - U(\rho)) = \nabla\Psi(\rho)$.

Finally, we fix $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$. We will only show that (4.35) holds for the case $t_1 > 0$, since the proof for the case $t_1 = 0$ can be treated in a similar way. Let $t_1 > 0$, and then obviously we have $t_1 \in ((n-1)\tau, n\tau]$ and $t_2 \in ((m-1)\tau, m\tau]$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \phi(\rho^\tau(t_2) - \rho^\tau(t_1)) &= \int_{\Omega} \phi(\rho_m^\tau - \rho_n^\tau) \\ &= \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega} \phi(\rho_{k+1}^\tau - \rho_k^\tau) = \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \int_{\Omega} \phi(\rho_{k+1}^\tau - \rho_{k+1/2}^\tau) + \phi(\rho_{k+1/2}^\tau - \rho_k^\tau), \end{aligned}$$

by using Proposition 4.4, (3.21), and (4.38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \phi \rho^\tau(t_2) - \int_{\Omega} \phi \rho^\tau(t_1) &= - \int_{n\tau}^{m\tau} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\sqrt{\rho^\tau}(\sqrt{\rho^\tau} + \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^\tau})}{2} F'(\rho^\tau)\phi \\ &\quad - \int_{n\tau}^{m\tau} \int_{\Omega} \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\Psi(\tilde{\rho}^\tau) + \int_{n\tau}^{m\tau} \int_{\Omega} \chi\tilde{\rho}^\tau \nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^\tau] \cdot \nabla\phi + E(\tau) \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

where $E(\tau) := \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \sup |D^2\phi| W_2^2(\rho_k^\tau, \rho_{k+1/2}^\tau)$. Clearly $E(\tau)$ is nonnegative, and using (4.20) and (4.33) (as in (4.34)) we have

$$E(\tau) \leq \tau \|D^2\phi\|_{L^\infty} [(C_3 + C_4)T + \sup_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho) - \inf_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1(\rho)]$$

with the constants C_1, C_3 , and C_4 given in Lemma 4.5.

Let $\mathcal{R}(\tau)$ be the subtraction of the right hand side in (4.39) from the right hand side in (4.35). Thanks to Proposition 4.4, since $\sqrt{\rho^\tau}(\sqrt{\rho^\tau} + \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^\tau})F'(\rho^\tau)$, $\tilde{\rho}^\tau U'(\tilde{\rho}^\tau) - U(\tilde{\rho}^\tau)$, and $\tilde{\rho}^\tau \nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^\tau]$ belong to $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$, we see that $\mathcal{R}(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

We prove Theorem 1.5 sequentially. More precisely, we will first prove the theorem with the additional assumption **(H)**. Finally, we will show that the assumption **(H)** can be removed, and finally Theorem 1.5 is proved.

Proof of Theorem 1.5: Fix $T > 0$. Let τ be small enough to satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 4.7. Let (τ_k) be a vanishing sequence that satisfies such a smallness. It is important to note that we are assuming **(H)** in *Step 1* and *Step 2*.

Step 1. $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuity w.r.t. WFR metric : In order to prove this step, we follow the main lines of [13, Corollary 4.1] (in our case, thanks to Proposition 4.4, we do not need to estimate the masses by the WFR distance as before; moreover, our limit measure belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$). Clearly, by Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\|\rho^{\tau_k}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_1, \quad \|\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.1)$$

Using (5.1), we know that $\rho^{\tau_k}(t)$, $\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)$ belong to the set $\{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}^+(\bar{\Omega}) : |\sigma| \leq |\Omega|C_1\}$, which is relatively compact in $\mathcal{M}^+(\bar{\Omega})$. Since (4.22) holds, thanks to a refined version of the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem [1, Proposition 3.3.1], we admit a subsequence (τ_k) (not relabeled) such that for all $t \in [0, T]$

$$\rho^{\tau_k}(t) \xrightarrow{*} \nu(t) \quad \text{in } C_c(\bar{\Omega})^* = C(\bar{\Omega})^* \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which means

$$\int_{\bar{\Omega}} \rho^{\tau_k}(t) \phi dx \rightarrow \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \phi d\nu(t) \quad \forall \phi \in C(\bar{\Omega}).$$

Thanks to (5.1), we conclude that there exists a curve $\rho : [0, T] \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nu(t) = \rho(t) \mathcal{L}^d|_{\bar{\Omega}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Repeating this process to $\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}$, up to a subsequence, we have

$$\int_{\bar{\Omega}} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) \phi dx \rightarrow \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \rho^*(t) \phi dx \quad \forall \phi \in C(\bar{\Omega}),$$

for a curve $\rho^* : [0, T] \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, from (2.4) and (iii) of Lemma 4.5, we note $\text{WFR}(\rho^{\tau_k}(t), \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)) \leq \sqrt{2C_5} \tau_k$. As mentioned in Remark 2.6, since WFR is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak* convergence, we obtain $\text{WFR}(\rho(t), \rho^*(t)) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{WFR}(\rho^{\tau_k}(t), \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)) \leq 0$, which gives $\rho = \rho^*$. Therefore, for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $\phi \in C(\bar{\Omega})$,

$$\int_{\bar{\Omega}} \rho^{\tau_k}(t) \phi dx, \quad \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) \phi dx \rightarrow \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \rho(t) \phi dx. \quad (5.2)$$

Recalling (4.22) and using again the lower semicontinuity of WFR, we get

$$\text{WFR}(\rho(t), \rho(s)) \leq C_6 |t - s|^{1/2} \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.3)$$

This means that $\rho \in C^{1/2}([0, T]; \mathcal{M}_{\text{WFR}}^+(\Omega))$.

Step 2. Existence of a weak solution & (1.13) : We wish to pass to the limit in (4.35) as $\tau \downarrow 0$. The limit on the left hand side follows directly from (5.2), i.e.,

$$\int_{\Omega} (\rho^{\tau_k}(t_2) - \rho^{\tau_k}(t_1))\phi \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} (\rho(t_2) - \rho(t_1))\phi \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}). \quad (5.4)$$

From (4.37), we know that

$$\nabla(U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k})) - \chi \nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}] = \frac{T_n - id}{\tau_k} \quad a.e. \quad (5.5)$$

where T_n is an optimal transport map from $\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}$ to $\rho_n^{\tau_k}$. Combining (5.5) with the following inequality

$$\frac{W_2^2(\rho_n^{\tau_k}, \rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k})}{\tau_k} \leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_n^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}),$$

we obtain

$$\tau_k \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k})) - \chi \nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}]|^2 \rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k} dx \leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_n^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}). \quad (5.6)$$

Using (4.20) and (5.6), we have

$$\tau_k \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(U'(\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k})) - \chi \nabla c[\rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k}]|^2 \rho_{n+1/2}^{\tau_k} dx \leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_n^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{n+1}^{\tau_k}) + (C_3 + C_4)\tau_k. \quad (5.7)$$

Adding up (5.7) from $n = 0$ to $n = N_k$ (with $N_k := \lfloor \frac{T}{\tau_k} \rfloor$), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|\nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)) - \chi \nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)]\|_{L^2(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)dx)}^2 dt &\leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_0) - \inf_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1 + (C_3 + C_4)(N_k + 1)\tau_k \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_0) - \inf_{\rho \leq C_1} \mathcal{E}_1 + (C_3 + C_4)(T + 1) := C_7 \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where we used Proposition 4.4 to get the uniform boundedness of \mathcal{E}_1 .

Applying Young's inequality to (5.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} |\nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 &\leq C_7 + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} |\nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\chi^2}{\varepsilon} - \chi^2\right) \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}]|^2 \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

On the other hand, using (5.1) and (2.6), similar to (4.29), we get

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}]|^2 \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} \leq K_3^2 C_1^3 |\Omega \times (0, T)| := C_8. \quad (5.10)$$

Combining (5.9) and (5.10) and choosing $\varepsilon = 1/2$, we see that

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} |\nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 \leq 2(C_7 + \chi^2 C_8), \quad (5.11)$$

which gives

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla \Psi(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 = \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} \nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 \leq 2C_1(C_7 + \chi^2 C_8) := C_9. \quad (5.12)$$

Now, in order to prove the following claim, we use a variant of the Aubin-Lions lemma [23] introduced in Proposition 2.7.

Claim: There exists a subsequence (τ_k) (not relabeled) such that for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ and for all $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) \rightarrow \rho^{**}(t) \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega), \quad (5.13)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} \rightarrow \rho^{**} \quad \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega \times (0, T)). \quad (5.14)$$

Proof of Claim: Let $X := L^p(\Omega)$ with $p > 1$. We write $L_{C_1}^\infty(\Omega) := \{\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) : \rho \leq C_1 \text{ a.e.}\}$. Then we set

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\rho)|^2 & \text{if } \nabla \Psi(\rho) \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ and } \rho \in L_{C_1}^\infty(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

where $\Psi(\rho) := \rho U'(\rho) - U(\rho)$, and define the pseudo distance g on $L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega)$ as follows:

$$g(u, \tilde{u}) := \begin{cases} \text{WFR}(u, \tilde{u}) & \text{if } u, \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We first show that sublevels of \mathcal{F} are relatively compact in X . Given $L > 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\leq L} := \{\rho \in L^p(\Omega) : \mathcal{F} \leq L\}$. If (ρ_n) is any sequence in $\mathcal{F}_{\leq L}$, then,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\rho_n)|^2 \leq L,$$

which implies by Rellich's theorem, up to a subsequence, $\Psi(\rho_n) \rightarrow \mu$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ strongly. Therefore, up to a subsequence,

$$\rho_n \rightarrow \Psi^{-1}(\mu) \quad \text{a.e.}$$

where we have used that $\Psi'(s) > 0$ for all $s > 0$. Since $\rho_n \leq C_1$, we see that

$$\rho_n \rightarrow \Psi^{-1}(\mu) \quad \text{in } L^p(\Omega),$$

which gives us the desired result.

We now show that \mathcal{F} is lower semicontinuous with respect to $L^p(\Omega)$ convergence, that is,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\rho_n) \geq \mathcal{F}(\rho) \quad (5.16)$$

whenever $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. Suppose that $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. To show (5.16), without loss of generality, we can assume that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\rho_n) < \infty$, and hence there exists a subsequence (n') such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\rho_n) = \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\rho_{n'}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{n'} \mathcal{F}(\rho_{n'}) < \infty.$$

Due to the strong convergence of (ρ_n) in $L^p(\Omega)$, by passing to a subsequence, $\rho_{n'} \rightarrow \rho$ a.e. Using weak compactness in $L^2(\Omega)$, up to a subsequence, we obtain

$$\nabla \Psi(\rho_{n'}) \rightharpoonup \nabla \Psi(\rho) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),$$

where we used that $\rho_{n'} \rightarrow \rho$ a.e.

From the elementary inequality $|x|^2 - |y|^2 \geq 2(x - y) \cdot y$ yields

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_{n'}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho) \geq 2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla \Psi(\rho) \cdot (\nabla \Psi(\rho_{n'}) - \nabla \Psi(\rho)). \quad (5.17)$$

Letting $n' \rightarrow \infty$, we get (5.16).

Thus, the assumption (a) of Proposition 2.7 is satisfied. By the definition of \mathcal{F} and g , the assumption (b) is also clearly fulfilled. Set $\mathcal{U} := \{\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}\}$, where (τ_k) is the sequence in (5.11). Then (2.7) holds due to (5.12). In addition, (2.8) follows from (4.22). \square

We go back to the proof. Due to (5.2), one can check that

$$\rho^{**} = \rho. \quad (5.18)$$

Combining (5.14) and (5.18), $\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}$ converges to ρ in $L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))$, and hence ρ^{τ_k} also converges to ρ in $L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))$ by (4.19). Thus, up to a subsequence,

$$\rho^{\tau_k}, \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k} \text{ converge pointwise to } \rho \text{ for almost every } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T). \quad (5.19)$$

Using (5.12), weak compactness, and (5.19) we have for all $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla U'(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)) \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) \, dx dt &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \Psi(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)) \, dx dt \\ &\rightarrow \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \Psi(\rho(t)) \, dx dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla U'(\rho(t)) \rho(t) \, dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

On the other hand, (5.13), (5.18), and (2.6) imply that for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\|c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)] - c[\rho(t)]\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)} \leq K_1 \|c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)] - c[\rho(t)]\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq K_2 \|\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) - \rho(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$, $\nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)]$ converges to $\nabla c[\rho(t)]$ in the sup-norm, which shows that $c[\rho(t)]$ satisfies the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition, that is,

$$\nabla c[\rho(t)] \cdot \nu = 0 \quad (5.21)$$

and

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t) \nabla c[\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)] \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dt \rightarrow \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t) \nabla c[\rho(t)] \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dt \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \quad (5.22)$$

by using the dominated convergence theorem.

As we have already shown (5.4), (5.20), and (5.22), it remains to show the convergence about the first term in the right hand side of (4.35). From (5.1), (5.19), and dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\sqrt{\rho^{\tau_k}(t)}(\sqrt{\rho^{\tau_k}(t)} + \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k}(t)})}{2} F'(\rho^{\tau_k}(t)) \phi \rightarrow \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t) F'(\rho(t)) \phi \, dx dt.$$

Hence, for all $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and for all $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} (\rho(t_2) - \rho(t_1)) \phi \, dx \\ &= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t) \left(\nabla U'(\rho(t)) - \chi \nabla c[\rho(t)] \right) \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx dt - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \rho(t) F'(\rho(t)) \phi \, dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

It is well known that (5.23) is equivalent to (1.12).

Lastly, we prove (1.13). Applying Fatou's lemma to (5.12), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\rho)|^2 \leq \int_0^T \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\tilde{\rho}^{\tau_k})|^2 \leq C_9, \quad (5.24)$$

where we used (5.13), (5.18), and a lower semicontinuity of the functional $\rho \mapsto \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \Psi(\rho)|^2$ (see (5.17)). Moreover, thanks to (5.1), and (5.19), we get

$$\sup_{\Omega \times [0, T]} \rho(x, t) \leq C_1. \quad (5.25)$$

Step 3. Removing the hypothesis (H) : We show that the assumption (H) can be dropped. Given $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and a convex function U satisfying Assumption 1.1, we approximate ρ_0 and U with $(\rho_0^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ and $(U_\delta)_{\delta > 0}$ respectively. Let

$$\rho_0^\varepsilon := (\tilde{\rho}_0 * \eta_\varepsilon + \varepsilon) \mathbf{1}_{\bar{\Omega}}, \quad U_\delta(s) = U(s) + \delta s \log s,$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_0 := \rho_0$ in Ω and it vanishes in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$, and η_ε denotes a standard (positive) mollifier. Thus, (ρ_0^ε) and (U_δ) satisfy **(H)**. Moreover, we note that

$$\|\rho_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.26)$$

Therefore, we obtain a curve $\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)$ which fulfills Theorem 1.5 as shown in *Step 1* and *Step 2*. Hence, by (5.3), (5.23), (5.25), (5.24) $\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ satisfies

$$\text{WFR}(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t), \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(s)) \leq C_6^{\varepsilon,\delta} |t - s|^{1/2}, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t_2) - \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t_1)) \phi \, dx + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \nabla \Psi_\delta(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)) \cdot \nabla \phi - \chi \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) \nabla c[\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)] \cdot \nabla \phi \\ &= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) F'(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)) \phi \, dx dt \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \forall 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T, \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

$$\text{ess sup}_{\Omega \times [0, T]} \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x, t) \leq C_1^\varepsilon, \quad (5.29)$$

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla \Psi_\delta(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta})|^2 = \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta} \nabla U'_\delta(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta})|^2 \leq C_9^{\varepsilon,\delta}, \quad (5.30)$$

where we have used the notations $C_1^\varepsilon, C_6^{\varepsilon,\delta}, C_9^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ that depend on ρ_0^ε and U_δ to distinguish from C_1, C_6, C_9 . Due to (5.26), we see that $C_1^\varepsilon \rightarrow C_1, C_6^{\varepsilon,\delta} \rightarrow C_6,$ and $C_9^{\varepsilon,\delta} \rightarrow C_9$ as $\varepsilon, \delta \downarrow 0$. Let ε, δ be small enough to satisfy $C_1^\varepsilon \leq C_1 + 1$ and $C_9^{\varepsilon,\delta} \leq C_9 + 1$.

With an abuse of notation, we do not use sequence notations for ε, δ like ε_k, δ_j .

All we need to do is to repeat the proofs of *Step 1* and *Step 2* for $\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. The main differences are described below.

Firstly, since $\sup_{\Omega \times (0, T)} \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta} \leq C_1 + 1$, following the proof of (5.3) and using (5.27), we obtain a curve $\varrho(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\text{WFR}(\varrho(t), \varrho(s)) \leq C_6 |t - s|^{1/2}.$$

Secondly, we apply Aubin-Lions lemma again. More precisely, we note that $\nabla \Psi_\delta(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}) = \nabla \Psi(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}) + \delta \nabla \rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $\Psi' \geq 0$. Then, from (5.30), we have

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla \Psi(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta})|^2 \leq \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla \Psi_\delta(\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta})|^2 \leq C_9 + 1, \quad (5.31)$$

In particular, thanks to this inequality, we keep the definition of (5.15), not replacing $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \int_{\Omega} |\Psi_\delta(\rho)|^2$. Then, similar to (5.13) and (5.19), by setting $\mathcal{U} := \{\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)\}$ and by passing to a subsequence, we obtain:

$$\|\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) - \varrho(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad (5.32)$$

$$\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta} \rightarrow \varrho \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T). \quad (5.33)$$

Since $\nabla c[\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t)] \cdot \nu = 0$ from (5.21) and since (5.32) holds, we derive similarly $\nabla c[\varrho(t)] \cdot \nu = 0$ for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$. Moreover, thanks to (5.33), it is possible to pass to the limit in (5.28), i.e., $\rho_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and Ψ_δ in (5.28) can be replaced by ϱ and Ψ respectively by following the proof of (5.23). Thus, we have a weak solution.

Thirdly, using (5.29) and (5.33), we get

$$\text{ess sup}_{\Omega \times [0, T]} \varrho(x, t) \leq C_1.$$

Finally, due to (5.31) and (5.33), we can repeat the proof of (5.24), and therefore

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\nabla \Psi(\varrho)|^2 = \int_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\varrho \nabla U'(\varrho)|^2 \leq C_9 + 1.$$

This completes the proof.

6. APPENDIX

6.1. Proofs of Proposition 3.1. (i) Let $(\rho_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence of the scheme (3.1), and let $(c[\rho_n])_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of the solutions in (1.5) corresponding to ρ_n . Since $\rho_n \leq \overline{M}$, for any $p > 1$ there exists $\rho \in L^p(\Omega)$ such that up to a subsequence $\rho_n \rightharpoonup \rho$ weakly in $L^p(\Omega)$. Also, the functional $\rho \mapsto \int_{\Omega} U(\rho) dx$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to such a weak convergence, since ρ_n is uniformly bounded by \overline{M} (see e.g. [25, Proposition 7.7]). On the other hand, we know from (2.6) that $\|c[\rho_n]\|_{W^{2,p}}$ is uniformly bounded in n . Using weak compactness in $W^{2,p}$ and the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, up to a subsequence, we see that $\sup_{\Omega} (|c[\rho_n] - c[\rho]| + |\nabla c[\rho_n] - \nabla c[\rho]|) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\int_{\Omega} \Lambda |c[\rho_n]|^2 + |\nabla c[\rho_n]|^2 \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \Lambda |c[\rho]|^2 + |\nabla c[\rho]|^2$. Since Ω is bounded and ρ_n narrowly converges to ρ , we have $W_2^2(g, \rho_n) \rightarrow W_2^2(g, \rho)$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{E}_1(\mu) + \frac{W_2^2(g, \mu)}{\tau} \right) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{E}_1(\rho_n) + \frac{W_2^2(g, \rho_n)}{\tau} \right) \geq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho) + \frac{W_2^2(g, \rho)}{\tau},$$

which means that ρ is a minimizer.

(ii) Now we investigate an Euler-Lagrange equation for the minimization problem (3.1):

Let ρ be a minimizer obtained from (3.1). Let $\tilde{\rho}$ be a nonnegative measure so that $\tilde{\rho} \leq \overline{M} := \frac{1}{\tau_X}$ and $|\tilde{\rho}| = |\rho|$, and define $\rho_{\varepsilon} := (1 - \varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\tilde{\rho}$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$. From the minimality of ρ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) + \frac{W_2^2(\rho, g)}{\tau} \leq \mathcal{E}_1(\rho_{\varepsilon}) + \frac{W_2^2(\rho_{\varepsilon}, g)}{\tau}. \quad (6.1)$$

Recall that $\rho \leq \overline{M}$ and the function $sU'(s)$ is bounded from below on $(0, \infty)$ due to the assumptions on U . Following the arguments in [25, Lemma 8.6], we see that $U'(\rho) \in L^1(\Omega)$. In addition, we note that $|(\tilde{\rho} - \rho)U'((1 - \varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\tilde{\rho})| \leq 2\overline{M}(|U'(\rho)| + |U'(\overline{M})|) \in L^1(\Omega)$. Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and using the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\frac{\int U(\rho_{\varepsilon}) - \int U(\rho)}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \int U'(\rho)(\tilde{\rho} - \rho). \quad (6.2)$$

Moreover, from (1.5), we obtain

$$\frac{\int (\Lambda |c[\rho_{\varepsilon}]|^2 + |\nabla c[\rho_{\varepsilon}]|^2) - \int (\Lambda |c[\rho]|^2 + |\nabla c[\rho]|^2)}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \int 2c[\rho](\tilde{\rho} - \rho), \quad (6.3)$$

where we used the fact that $c[\rho_{\varepsilon}] = c[\rho] + \varepsilon c[\tilde{\rho} - \rho]$ and $\int_{\Omega} c[\tilde{\rho}]\rho = \int_{\Omega} c[\rho]\tilde{\rho}$.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}(\rho, g)$ and $\varphi_{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{K}(\rho_{\varepsilon}, g)$. We also note that

$$W_2^2(\rho_{\varepsilon}, g) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\varepsilon} d\rho_{\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\varepsilon}^c dg, \quad W_2^2(\rho, g) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\rho + \int_{\Omega} \varphi^c dg \geq \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\varepsilon} d\rho + \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\varepsilon}^c dg.$$

Following the arguments in [5, Lemma 3.4], we see that φ_{ε} converges uniformly, up to a subsequence, to φ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see also [17, Proposition 2.4]). Therefore, we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{W_2^2(\rho_{\varepsilon}, g) - W_2^2(\rho, g)}{\varepsilon} \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\varepsilon} d(\tilde{\rho} - \rho) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi d(\tilde{\rho} - \rho). \quad (6.4)$$

Combining (6.1)-(6.4), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} U'(\rho)\rho - \chi \int_{\Omega} c[\rho]\rho + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \varphi\rho \leq \int_{\Omega} U'(\rho)\tilde{\rho} - \chi \int_{\Omega} c[\rho]\tilde{\rho} + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \varphi\tilde{\rho}.$$

Let $h := U'(\rho) - \chi c[\rho] + \frac{\varphi}{\tau}$. Since $\int h\rho \leq \int h\tilde{\rho}$ for all admissible $\tilde{\rho}$, there exists $l \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \rho = \overline{M} & \text{a.e. in } \{h < l\}, \\ \rho \leq \overline{M} & \text{a.e. in } \{h = l\}, \\ \rho = 0 & \text{a.e. in } \{h > l\}. \end{cases}$$

More precisely, we can write

$$l := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{\overline{M} \mathcal{L}^d(\{h < a\}) \leq |\rho|\}.$$

Similar to [25, Lemma 8.6], we see that $\text{supp}(\rho) = \Omega$. Hence, $h \leq l$ a.e. So we have

$$U'(\rho) = \begin{cases} U'(\overline{M}) & \text{a.e. in } \{h < l\}, \\ l + \chi c - \varphi/\tau & \text{a.e. in } \{h = l\}. \end{cases}$$

Recalling that U' is increasing and distinguishing two cases $\rho = \overline{M}$ and $\rho < \overline{M}$, we are able to redefine (up to a negligible set)

$$U'(\rho) := \min(U'(\overline{M}), l + \chi c - \frac{\varphi}{\tau}) \quad \text{on } \Omega. \quad (6.5)$$

We know that the Kantorovich potential φ is Lipschitz on $\overline{\Omega}$. Moreover, c is also Lipschitz because $c \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ for large q . Since $U'(\overline{M})$ and $l + \chi c - \frac{\varphi}{\tau}$ are Lipschitz on $\overline{\Omega}$, $U'(\rho)$ is also Lipschitz by (6.5). If we define $p := (l - h)^+$ with $U'(\rho)$ redefined, then p is continuous and for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$,

$$U'(\rho) - \chi c[\rho] + \frac{\varphi}{\tau} + p = l, \quad p \geq 0, \quad p(\overline{M} - \rho) = 0. \quad (6.6)$$

Since $U'(0+) = -\infty$, (6.6) implies

$$\text{ess inf}_{\Omega} \rho > 0,$$

and hence ρ is also Lipschitz.

(iii) From the assumptions and (ii), we have $g, \rho \in C^{0,a}(\overline{\Omega})$, and g and ρ are strictly positive and bounded. Then Caffarelli's regularity theory gives $\varphi \in C^{2,a}(\overline{\Omega})$ (see also [28, Theorem 4.14]). Let $w := \varphi - \tau\chi c$ and $x_0 \in \arg \min_{\overline{\Omega}} w$. Using (6.6), we know that ρ has its maximum at x_0 , and hence $\rho(x_0) = \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}$. We now consider two cases, $x_0 \in \text{int}(\Omega)$ and $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$.

First, let x_0 belong to the interior of Ω . Since w has its minimum at x_0 , we have $\Delta w(x_0) \geq 0$, and hence $\Delta\varphi(x_0) \geq \tau\chi(c(x_0) - \rho(x_0)) \geq -\tau\chi\rho(x_0)$. Due to the connection between the map T and the Monge-Ampère equation, we have $\rho(x_0) = g(T(x_0))\det(I_d - D^2\varphi(x_0))$. Since $I_d - D^2\varphi$ is positive definite, thanks to arithmetic-geometric inequality, $\det(I_d - D^2\varphi(x_0)) \leq (1 - \frac{\Delta\varphi}{d})^d \leq (1 + \frac{\tau\chi\rho(x_0)}{d})^d$. Consequently, we obtain

$$X \leq Y(1 + X)^d, \quad \text{or} \quad Y \geq \frac{X}{(1 + X)^d},$$

where $X := \frac{\tau\chi\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}}{d}$ and $Y := \frac{\tau\chi\|g\|_{L^\infty}}{d}$.

Let $G : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the map defined as $G(x) = \frac{x}{(1+x)^d}$, and observe that G has attained its maximum at $x = \frac{1}{d-1}$ (when $d \geq 2$). Note that for given $\lambda > 1$, there exists a small $\delta(\lambda) \in (0, \frac{1}{2(d-1)})$ such that if $x \in [0, \delta(\lambda)]$, then $G(x) \geq \frac{x}{1+\lambda dx}$. We also note that $\rho \leq \overline{M} := \frac{1}{\chi^\tau}$ implies $X \leq \frac{1}{d} < \frac{1}{d-1}$. Then, if Y is small enough, the level set $\{G \leq Y\}$ should be located in a small neighborhood of the origin. Therefore, we conclude that given $\lambda > 1$, if $Y < G(\delta(\lambda))$, i.e., $\tau \|g\|_{L^\infty} < c_0 = c_0(\lambda, \chi, d) := \frac{d\delta(\lambda)}{\chi(1+\delta(\lambda))^d}$, then

$$Y \geq \frac{X}{(1+X)^d} \geq \frac{X}{1+\lambda dX},$$

because $X \leq \delta(\lambda)$. Thus, we have $\frac{1}{X} + \lambda d \geq \frac{1}{Y}$, which gives (3.3).

Second, we need to check the case $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Since w attains its minimum at x_0 , we deduce $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x_0) \leq 0$. So we have $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}(x_0) \leq 0$ because of $\frac{\partial c}{\partial \nu}(x_0) = 0$. Hence, $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}(x_0) = (x_0 - T(x_0)) \cdot n \leq 0$, where T is the optimal transport map from ρ to g . On the other hand, since we assumed Ω is strictly convex, we obtain $(T(x_0) - x_0) \cdot n < 0$ unless $T(x_0) = x_0$. Consequently, if $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, then we have a contradiction except for the case $T(x_0) = x_0$. Finally, we have to consider the case where $T(x_0) = x_0$. If so, we get $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x_0) = 0$. Due to the minimality of x_0 for w , we know that $\Delta w(x_0) \geq 0$. Then we can obtain (3.3) by following the same proof for the case $x_0 \in \text{int}(\Omega)$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

K. Kang was supported by NRF RS-2024-00336346 and RS-2024-00406821. H. Kim was supported by NRF-2021R1F1A1048231. G. Seo was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (RS-2023-00219980 and RS-2023-00212227).

REFERENCES

- [1] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, G. SAVARÉ, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Second edition. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zurich. Birkhauser Verlag, Basel (2008)
- [2] A. BLANCHET, V. CALVEZ, J. A. CARRILLO, *Convergence of the mass-transport steepest descent scheme for the subcritical Patlak-Keller-Segel model*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 46 (2), 691–721 (2008)
- [3] A. BLANCHET, *A gradient flow approach to the Keller-Segel systems*, RIMS Kokyuroku's lecture note 1837, pp.52-73 (2013)
- [4] G. BUTTAZZO, *Semicontinuity, relaxation and integral representation in the calculus of variations*, Longman Scientific and Technical, New York (1989)
- [5] G. BUTTAZZO, F. SANTAMBROGIO, *A model for the optimal planning of an urban area*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 37 (2), 514–530 (2005)
- [6] X. CAO, S. ZHENG, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with logistic source*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 37 (15) 2326–2330 (2014)
- [7] J.A. CARRILLO, F. SANTAMBROGIO, *L^∞ estimates for the JKO scheme in parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel systems*, Quart. Appl. Math. 76 (3), 515–530 (2018)
- [8] L. CHIZAT, G. PEYRÉ, B. SCHMITZER, F.-X. VIALARD, *Unbalanced optimal transport: Dynamic and Kantorovich formulations*, J. Funct. Anal. 274 (11), 3090–3123 (2018)
- [9] L. CHIZAT, G. PEYRÉ, B. SCHMITZER, F.-X. VIALARD, *An Interpolating Distance Between Optimal Transport and Fisher–Rao Metrics*, Found Comput Math 18, 1–44 (2018)
- [10] M. DI FRANCESCO, D. MATTHES, *Curves of steepest descent are entropy solutions for a class of degenerate convection-diffusion equations*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 50 (1-2), 199–230 (2014)
- [11] K. FUJIE, M. WINKLER, T. YOKOTA, *Blow-up prevention by logistic sources in a parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with singular sensitivity*, Nonlinear Anal. 109, 56–71 (2014)
- [12] T.O. GALLOUËT, M. LABORDE, L. MONSAINGEON, *An unbalanced optimal transport splitting scheme for general advection-reaction-diffusion problems*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 25 (8) (2019)

- [13] T.O. GALLOUËT, L. MONSAINGEON, *A JKO splitting scheme for Kantorovich-Fisher-Rao gradient flows*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 49 (2), 1100–1130 (2017)
- [14] D. GILBARG, N.S. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, second edition, Reprint of the 1998 edition Classics Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2001)
- [15] R. JORDAN, D. KINDERLEHRER, F. OTTO, *The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 29 (1), 1–17 (1998)
- [16] K. KANG, A. STEVENS, *Blowup and global solutions in a chemotaxis-growth system*, Nonlinear Anal. 135, 57–72 (2016)
- [17] I.C. KIM, A. MELLET, Y. WU, *A density-constrained model for chemotaxis*, Nonlinearity 36 (2) 1082–1119 (2023)
- [18] S. KONDRATYEV, L. MONSAINGEON, D. VOROTNIKOV, *A new optimal transport distance on the space of finite Radon measures*, Adv. Differential Equations 21 (11-12) 1117–1164 (2016)
- [19] N.V. KRYLOV, *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces*, Grad. Stud. Math. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2008)
- [20] M. LIERO, A. MIELKE, G. SAVARÉ, *Optimal Transport in Competition with Reaction: The Hellinger-Kantorovich Distance and Geodesic Curves*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 48 (4), 2869–2911 (2016)
- [21] M. LIERO, A. MIELKE, G. SAVARÉ, *Optimal Entropy-Transport problems and a new Hellinger-Kantorovich distance between positive measures*, Invent. math. 211, 969–1117 (2018)
- [22] F. OTTO, *The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 26 (1-2), 101–174 (2001)
- [23] R. ROSSI, G. SAVARÉ, *Tightness, integral equicontinuity and compactness for evolution problems in Banach spaces*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. 2 (5), 395–431 (2003)
- [24] R. B. SALAKO, W. SHEN, *Global existence and asymptotic behavior of classical solutions to a parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source on \mathbb{R}^N* , J. Differential Equations 262 (11) 5635–5690 (2017)
- [25] F. SANTAMBROGIO, *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications 87, Birkhäuser (2015)
- [26] F. SANTAMBROGIO, *Euclidean, metric, and Wasserstein gradient flows: an overview*, Bull. Math. Sci. 7 (1), 87–154 (2017)
- [27] J. I. TELLO, M. WINKLER, *A chemotaxis system with logistic source*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 32 (4-6), 849–877 (2007)
- [28] C. VILLANI, *Topics in optimal transportation*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 58. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2003)
- [29] L. WANG, C. MU, P. ZHENG, *On a quasilinear parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis system with logistic source*, J. Differential Equations 256 (5), 1847–1872 (2014)
- [30] M. WINKLER, *Chemotaxis with logistic source: very weak global solutions and their boundedness properties*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 348 (2), 708–729 (2008)
- [31] M. WINKLER, *How far can chemotactic cross-diffusion enforce exceeding carrying capacities?*, J. Nonlinear Sci. 24 (5) 809–855 (2014)
- [32] M. WINKLER, *Finite-time blow-up in low-dimensional Keller-Segel systems with logistic-type superlinear degradation*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 69 (2), 40 pp. (2018)
- [33] J. ZHENG, *Boundedness of solutions to a quasilinear parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel system with logistic source*, J. Differential Equations 259 (1), 120–140 (2015)

KYUNGKEUN KANG: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 YONSEI UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 03722, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Email address: kkang@yonsei.ac.kr

HWA KIL KIM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION
 HANNAM UNIVERSITY, DAEJEON 34430, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Email address: hwakil@hnu.kr

GEUNTAEK SEO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 POSTECH, POHANG 37673, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Email address: gtseo@postech.ac.kr