

CRITICAL CURVE FOR A WEAKLY COUPLED SYSTEM OF SEMI-LINEAR σ -EVOLUTION EQUATIONS WITH DIFFERENT DAMPING TYPES

DINH VAN DUONG¹, TUAN ANH DAO^{1,*}, MICHAEL REISSIG²

¹ Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Hanoi University of Science and Technology
No.1 Dai Co Viet road, Hanoi, Vietnam

² Faculty for Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Bergakademie Freiberg
Prüferstr. 9, 09596, Freiberg, Germany

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we would like to consider the Cauchy problem for a weakly coupled system of semi-linear σ -evolution equations with different damping mechanisms for any $\sigma > 1$, “parabolic like damping” and “ σ -evolution like damping”. Motivated strongly by the well-known Nakao’s problem, the main goal of this work is to determine the critical curve between the power exponents p and q of nonlinear terms by not only establishing the global well-posedness property of small data solutions but also indicating blow-up in finite time solutions. We want to point out that the application of a modified test function associated with a judicious choice of test functions really plays an essential role to show a blow-up result for solutions and upper bound estimates for lifespan of solutions, where σ is assumed to be any fractional number. To end this paper, lower bound estimates for lifespan of solutions are also shown to verify their sharp results in some spatial dimensions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Global (in time) existence of small data solutions	6
2.1. Auxiliary estimates for solution to the linear equations	6
2.2. Philosophy of our approach	7
2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1	8
3. Blow-up results	11
3.1. Preliminaries	11
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2	12
4. Final conclusions and open problems	15
Acknowledgments	18
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us consider the following Cauchy problem for the weakly coupled system of semi-linear σ -evolution equations with mixing two different damping types:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} + (-\Delta)^\sigma u + (-\Delta)^\sigma u_t = |v|^p, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ v_{tt} + (-\Delta)^\sigma v + v_t = |u|^q, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = 0, \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v(0, x) = 0, \quad v_t(0, x) = v_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A01, 35B33, 35B44, 35L52.

Key words and phrases. Weakly coupled system, Parabolic like damping, σ -evolution like damping, Critical curve.

* *Corresponding author:* Tuan Anh Dao (anh.daotuan@hust.edu.vn).

where $\sigma > 1$ is assumed to be any fractional number. The parameters $p, q > 1$ stand for power exponents of the nonlinear terms. The operator $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ is defined by

$$((-\Delta)^\sigma \varphi)(x) := \mathfrak{F}_{\xi \rightarrow x}^{-1} (|\xi|^{2\sigma} \widehat{\varphi}(\xi))(x),$$

where $\widehat{\varphi}(\xi) := \mathfrak{F}_{x \rightarrow \xi}(\varphi(x))$ stands for the Fourier transform with respect to the space variable of a function $\varphi(x)$. Moreover, $(-\Delta)^\sigma u_t$ and v_t together appearing in (1) represent two damping terms, called visco-elastic (or strong damping) damping and frictional (or classical) damping, respectively.

During recent years, the following linear Cauchy problem for σ -evolution equations has gained a lot of attention from many mathematicians over the world (see, for example, [16, 18, 8, 7, 3, 10, 11]):

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} + (-\Delta)^\sigma u + \mu(-\Delta)^\delta u_t = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

with $\sigma \geq 1, \delta \in [0, \sigma]$ and $\mu > 0$. This equation can be seen as general models of a class of partial differential equations by means of choosing particular parameters σ and δ in (2). Among other things, one recognizes that the property of solutions to (2) change completely with respect to decay estimates when δ is taken from $[0, \sigma/2)$ to $(\sigma/2, \sigma]$. From this observation, the authors in the cited papers proposed a classification between “parabolic like models” with $\delta \in [0, \sigma/2)$ and “ σ -evolution like models” with $\delta \in (\sigma/2, \sigma]$, the so-called “hyperbolic like models” or “wave like models” in the special case $\sigma = 1$. Moreover, according to the asymptotic profile aspects of solutions to (2), the solution behavior, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, of “parabolic like models” is similar to that of the diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases} v_t + \nu(-\Delta)^{\sigma-\delta} v = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ v(0, x) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where the initial data $v_0 = v_0(u_0, u_1, \mu, \sigma, \delta, n)$ and a positive constant $\nu = \nu(\mu, \sigma, \delta, n)$ are appropriately chosen. Clearly, the above diffusion equation becomes to the heat equation when the situation $\sigma - \delta = 1$ occurs. Meanwhile, this phenomenon is no longer true for “ σ -evolution like models”, i.e. some kinds of wave structure and oscillations in time appear to describe the asymptotic profile of solutions to (2). More precisely, the solution behavior, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, of “ σ -evolution like models” is related to that of the free evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt} + \nu(-\Delta)^\sigma v = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ v(0, x) = v_0(x), \quad v_t(0, x) = v_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with suitable initial data and for some constant $\nu > 0$. From these above-mentioned views, we may claim that the specific case $\delta = \sigma/2$ is understood as a threshold to distinguish (2) into two different models corresponding to $\delta \in [0, \sigma/2)$ and $\delta \in (\sigma/2, \sigma]$.

Next, to present our motivation in terms of studying the Cauchy problem (1) let us recall some previous papers (see [20, 1, 2, 13, 17]), in there taking account of the following weakly coupled system for a semi-linear damped wave equation and a semi-linear wave equation in the whole space:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u + u_t = |v|^p, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ v_{tt} - \Delta v = |u|^q, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v(0, x) = v_0(x), \quad v_t(0, x) = v_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

This problem is well-known as a part of the so-called Nakao’s problem proposed by Professor Mitsuhiro Nakao (Emeritus of Kyushu University) to determine the *critical curve* between the exponents p and q of the power nonlinearities. Here, the critical curve expressed by $\Gamma(n, p, q) = 0$ in the $p - q$ plane is understood as the threshold condition of a pair of exponents (p, q) between

global (in time) existence of small data solutions (stability of the zero solutions) if $\Gamma(n, p, q) < 0$, and blow-up in finite time solutions even for small data if $\Gamma(n, p, q) > 0$. More precisely, the author in [20] used the test function method to find out

$$\Gamma(n, p, q) = \max \left\{ \frac{q/2 + 1}{pq - 1} - \frac{n - 1}{2}, \frac{q + 1}{pq - 1} - \frac{n}{2}, \frac{p + 1}{pq - 1} - \frac{n}{2} \right\},$$

which becomes sharp in one-dimensional case only, however, seems to be not optimal in higher dimensions $n \geq 2$. For this reason, a remarkable improvement was established in the paper [1] by effectively applying an iteration argument to partially fill this lack, i.e.

$$\Gamma(n, p, q) = \max \left\{ \frac{q/2 + 1}{pq - 1} - \frac{n - 1}{2}, \frac{p^{-1} + 2}{pq - 1} - \frac{n - 1}{2}, \frac{p + 1/2}{pq - 1} - \frac{n}{2} \right\}.$$

Then, a further contribution coming from [13] is to extend these mentioned results in [20, 1]. Quite recently, the authors in [17] considered a Nakao-type weakly coupled system with nonlinearities of derivative type instead of (3), namely, they concerned (3) with a semi-linear damped Klein–Gordon equation in place of a semi-linear damped equation on the left-hand side and a pair of nonlinearities $\{|v_t|^p, |u_t|^q\}$ on the right-hand sides. Their interest is to indicate a blow-up result in finite time under suitable sign assumptions for the Cauchy data when the exponents (p, q) belong to a suitable range. Among other things, one recognizes how the different structure of damped wave equations (parabolic like) and wave equations (hyperbolic like) affects on the critical curve for a weakly coupled system of their corresponding semi-linear equations.

Inspired strongly by the cited papers, in this work we would like to investigate the influence of two kind of different equations, “parabolic like models” and “ σ -evolution like models”, on their weakly coupled system (1) with the usual power nonlinearities. The main purpose of this paper is to verify the following critical curve for (1):

$$\max \left\{ \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}, \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} \right\} - \frac{n}{2\sigma} = 0$$

by providing both global (in time) existence of small data solutions (Theorem 1.1) and blow-up in finite time result (Theorem 1.2). We want to stress out that the appearance of damping terms in (1) gives some benefits in proving a result for global solution existence, which never appeared in the cited papers to explore (3). At this point, the crux of our approach is based on the technique of using loss of decay associated with new tools Harmonic Analysis. The advantage worthy of mentioning of allowing some loss of decay is to show how the restrictions to the admissible exponents p and q could be relaxed. Additionally, for the second contribution of this work we are interested in reporting sharp estimates for lifespan of solutions by demonstrating their lower bound and upper bound simultaneously when a blow-up situation of solutions occurs. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, so far it seems that there is no any paper devoted to studying the weakly coupled system of semi-linear σ -evolution equations with mixing two different structures of damping terms. This means that this work plays a pioneering role in this direction.

Notations

- We write $f \lesssim g$ when there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f \leq Cg$, and $f \approx g$ when $g \lesssim f \lesssim g$.
- The spaces H^a and \dot{H}^a , with $a \geq 0$, stand for Bessel and Riesz potential spaces based on L^2 spaces. Here $\langle D \rangle^a$ and $|D|^a$ denote the pseudo-differential operator with symbol $\langle \xi \rangle^a$ and the fractional Laplace operator with symbol $|\xi|^a$, respectively.
- For a given number $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by

$$[s] := \max \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \leq s\} \quad \text{and} \quad [s]^+ := \max\{s, 0\},$$

its integer part and its positive part, respectively.

- We put $\langle x \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |x|^2}$, the so-called Japanese bracket of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- Finally, we introduce the spaces $\mathcal{D} := (L^1 \cap L^2) \times (L^1 \cap L^2)$ with the norm

$$\|(f, g)\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \|f\|_{L^1} + \|f\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{L^1} + \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

Main results

Let's state the global (in time) existence of small data solutions and the blow-up result, which will be proved in this paper.

Theorem 1.1 (Global existence). *Let $1 < \sigma < n < 2\sigma$. We assume that the exponents p, q satisfy the following conditions:*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1}, \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2} \right\} < \frac{n}{2\sigma} \text{ and } p \geq 2. \quad (4)$$

Then, there exists a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any small data $(u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{D}$ fulfilling the assumption $\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} < \varepsilon_0$, we have a uniquely determined global (in time) small data energy solution

$$(u, v) \in (\mathcal{C}([0, \infty), H^\sigma \cap L^\infty \cap L^q) \cap C^1([0, \infty), L^2)) \times (\mathcal{C}([0, \infty), H^\sigma) \cap C^1([0, \infty), L^2))$$

to (1). Moreover, the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^q} &\lesssim (1+t)^{1-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{q})+[\varepsilon(p)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim (1+t)^{1-\frac{n}{\sigma}+[\varepsilon(p)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \| |D|^\sigma u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+[\varepsilon(p)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \|u_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+[\varepsilon(p)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \| |D|^\sigma v(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\frac{1}{2}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \|v_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon(p) := 1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon(q) := 1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1) + \varepsilon$ for any small positive number ε .

Remark 1.1. It is obvious to see that one of two quantities $[\varepsilon(p)]^+$ and $[\varepsilon(q)]^+$ appearing in Theorem 1.1 is non-negative. Comparing the achieved estimates for solutions to (1) with the corresponding ones to the linear equations (8) and (11) (see more Propositions 2.1 and 2.2), we can understand that these quantities represent some loss of decay.

Theorem 1.2 (Blow-up result). *Let $p, q > 1$. Assume that $u_1, v_1 \in L^1$ enjoy the conditions*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) dx > 0 \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) dx > 0. \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, we suppose the assumptions $n \leq \sigma$ or

$$\max \left\{ \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}, \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} \right\} \geq \frac{n}{2\sigma} \text{ if } n > \sigma. \quad (6)$$

Then, there is no global (in time) Sobolev solution $(u, v) \in \mathcal{C}([0, \infty), L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \times \mathcal{C}([0, \infty), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to (1).

Remark 1.2. From the conditions (4) and (6) in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, respectively, we claim that the critical curve for (1) in the $p - q$ plane is precisely described by

$$\max \left\{ \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}, \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} \right\} - \frac{n}{2\sigma} = 0.$$

Remark 1.3. For the purpose of observing more explicitly, let us illustrate some ranges describing results for both global existence from Theorem 1.1 and blow-up from Theorem 1.2 in the $p - q$ plane in the following figure:




FIGURE 1. Global existence and blow-up results in the $p - q$ plane when $\frac{4\sigma}{3} < n < 2\sigma$.




FIGURE 2. Global existence and blow-up results in the $p - q$ plane when $\sigma < n \leq \frac{4\sigma}{3}$.

Here $p_{\text{crit}} := 1 + \frac{2\sigma}{n}$, $q_{\text{crit}} := 1 + \frac{2\sigma}{n - \sigma}$, moreover, $p = p_0 := -1 + \frac{4\sigma}{n}$, $q = q_0 := \frac{n + 2\sigma}{2(n - \sigma)}$ are asymptotic lines corresponding to the curves

$$\frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2} = \frac{n}{2\sigma}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad q = \frac{2(n + \sigma)}{n(p + 1) - 4\sigma}$$

and

$$\frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} = \frac{n}{2\sigma}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad q = \frac{(p+1)(n+2\sigma)}{2p(n-\sigma)},$$

respectively. We note that

$$\frac{(p+1)(n+2\sigma)}{2p(n-\sigma)} \geq \frac{2(n+\sigma)}{n(p+1)-4\sigma} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad p \geq p_{\text{crit}} = 1 + \frac{2\sigma}{n}. \quad (7)$$

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we are going to recall the known results in previous studies on the Cauchy problems for the corresponding linear equations included in the system (1) to prove global (in time) existence of small data solutions to (1). Then, we will present the proof of the result for blow-up in finite time solutions in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 not only devotes to some estimates for lifespan of solutions but also leaves an open problem involving (1).

2. GLOBAL (IN TIME) EXISTENCE OF SMALL DATA SOLUTIONS

2.1. Auxiliary estimates for solution to the linear equations. In this section, we will recall the useful estimates in the previous papers. For this purpose, let us consider to the following first linear Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} + (-\Delta)^\sigma u_t + (-\Delta)^\sigma u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = 0, \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $\sigma \neq 1$. The solution of the problem (8) is given by

$$u^{\text{lin}}(t, x) := \mathfrak{F}_{\xi \rightarrow x}^{-1} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_1(t, \xi) \widehat{u}_1(\xi) \right), \quad (9)$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_1(t, \xi) = \mathfrak{F}_{x \rightarrow \xi}(\mathcal{K}_1(t, x)) = \frac{e^{\lambda_{11}(\xi)t} - e^{\lambda_{12}(\xi)t}}{\lambda_{11}(\xi) - \lambda_{12}(\xi)},$$

in which the characteristic roots are determined as follows:

$$\lambda_{11,12} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left(-|\xi|^{2\sigma} \pm |\xi|^\sigma \sqrt{|\xi|^{2\sigma} - 4} \right) & \text{if } |\xi|^\sigma \geq 2, \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(-|\xi|^{2\sigma} \pm i|\xi|^\sigma \sqrt{4 - |\xi|^{2\sigma}} \right) & \text{if } |\xi|^\sigma < 2. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.1 (see [5]). *Assuming that $m \in [1, 2]$ and $u_1 \in L^m \cap L^2$. The following energy estimate for solutions to (8) hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \| |D|^\sigma u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2})} \|u_1\|_{L^m \cap L^2}, \\ \|u_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2})} \|u_1\|_{L^m \cap L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, with $1 \leq \alpha_1 \leq m \leq \alpha_2 \leq \infty$ we define two quantities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a(m, \alpha_2) := n \left(\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right), \\ d(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &:= n \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right) + n\sigma \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{1}{\alpha_2} - \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that the conditions

$$a < 2\sigma, \quad d(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) < \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (10)$$

Then, we conclude that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{\alpha_2}} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2})+1} \|u_1\|_{L^{\alpha_1}} + e^{-ct} \|u_1\|_{L^m}.$$

Remark 2.1. To prove Theorem 1.1, we need to use some estimates by choosing the parameters $m = \alpha_1 = 1$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha \in \{q, \infty\}$ and $\sigma > 1$. It is clear to verify that from the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 the condition (10) is satisfied.

Next, we consider the following second linear Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt} + (-\Delta)^\sigma v + v_t = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0, \\ v(0, x) = 0, \quad v_t(0, x) = v_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma > 1$. The solution of the problem (11) is expressed by

$$v^{\text{lin}}(t, x) := \mathfrak{F}_{\xi \rightarrow x}^{-1} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_2(t, \xi) \widehat{v}_1(\xi) \right), \quad (12)$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_2(t, \xi) = \mathfrak{F}_{x \rightarrow \xi}(\mathcal{K}_2(t, x)) = \frac{e^{\lambda_{21}(\xi)t} - e^{\lambda_{22}(\xi)t}}{\lambda_{21}(\xi) - \lambda_{22}(\xi)},$$

in which the characteristic roots are determined as follows:

$$\lambda_{21,22} := \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - 4|\xi|^{4\sigma}} & \text{if } |\xi|^{2\sigma} < \frac{1}{2}, \\ -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{i}{2} \sqrt{4|\xi|^{4\sigma} - 1} & \text{if } |\xi|^{2\sigma} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.2 (see [9]). Let $\sigma \geq 1$. The Sobolev solutions to (11) satisfy the $(L^1 \cap L^2) - L^2$ estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|v_1\|_{L^1 \cap H^{-\sigma}}, \\ \||D|^\sigma v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}} \|v_1\|_{L^1 \cap L^2}, \\ \|v_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} - 1} \|v_1\|_{L^1 \cap L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and the $L^2 - L^2$ estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t) \|v_1\|_{L^2}, \\ \||D|^\sigma v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_1\|_{L^2}, \\ \|v_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|v_1\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for all space dimension $n \geq 1$.

2.2. Philosophy of our approach. Applying Duhamel's principle, the solution to (1) is written by in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} u(t, x) = u^{\text{lin}}(t, x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_1(t - \tau, x) *_x |v(\tau, x)|^p d\tau =: u^{\text{lin}}(t, x) + u^{\text{non}}(t, x), \\ v(t, x) = v^{\text{lin}}(t, x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_2(t - \tau, x) *_x |u(\tau, x)|^q d\tau =: v^{\text{lin}}(t, x) + v^{\text{non}}(t, x). \end{cases}$$

Here the terms $u^{\text{lin}}(t, x)$ and $v^{\text{lin}}(t, x)$ are defined in (9) and (12), respectively. We introduce the family $\{X(t)\}_{t>0}$ of the solution spaces

$$X(t) := \left(\mathcal{C}([0, t], H^\sigma \cap L^\infty \cap L^q) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, t], L^2) \right) \times \left(\mathcal{C}([0, t], H^\sigma) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, t], L^2) \right)$$

with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)} := \sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} & \left(f_1(\tau)^{-1} \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^q} + f_2(\tau)^{-1} \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\ & + f_3(\tau)^{-1} \| |D|^\sigma u(\tau, \cdot) \|_{L^2} + f_3(\tau)^{-1} \|u_t(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \\ & \left. + g_1(\tau)^{-1} \|v(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + g_2(\tau)^{-1} \| |D|^\sigma v(\tau, \cdot) \|_{L^2} + g_3(\tau)^{-1} \|v_t(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f_1(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{q})+1+[\varepsilon(p)]^+}, \quad f_2(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}+1+[\varepsilon(p)]^+}, \quad f_3(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+[\varepsilon(p)]^+},$$

and

$$g_1(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+}, \quad g_2(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\frac{1}{2}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+}, \quad g_3(\tau) = (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}+[\varepsilon(q)]^+}.$$

We define the following operator for all $t > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} : \quad X(t) & \longrightarrow X(t) \\ \mathcal{N}[u, v](t, x) & = (u^{\text{lin}}(t, x), v^{\text{lin}}(t, x)) + (u^{\text{non}}(t, x), v^{\text{non}}(t, x)). \end{aligned}$$

We shall indicate that the operator \mathcal{N} fulfills the following two inequalities:

$$\|\mathcal{N}[u, v]\|_{X(t)} \lesssim \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q, \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}[u, v] - \mathcal{N}[\bar{u}, \bar{v}]\|_{X(t)} & \lesssim \|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)} \left(\|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^{p-1} + \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)}^{p-1} \right. \\ & \left. + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^{q-1} + \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)}^{q-1} \right). \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

Then, we may conclude global (in time) existence results of small data solutions by applying Banach's fixed point theorem. To this, the following proposition from Harmonic Analysis comes into play in our proof.

Proposition 2.3 (Fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality). *Let $1 < q, q_1, q_2 < \infty$, $a > 0$ and $s \in [0, a)$. Then, it holds*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}_q^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{q_1}}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{\dot{H}_{q_2}^a}^\theta,$$

where

$$\theta = \theta_{s,a}(q, q_1, q_2) = \frac{\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{s}{n}}{\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{1}{q_2} + \frac{a}{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{s}{a} \leq \theta \leq 1.$$

2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let's divide our consideration into three cases as follows:

First, let us assume that $q \leq q_{\text{crit}}$ and $p > p_{\text{crit}}$. Thus, this implies that

$$\frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} = \max \left\{ \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}, \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} \right\},$$

combining with the relation (7), we choose $[\varepsilon(p)]^+ = 0$ and $[\varepsilon(q)]^+ = \varepsilon(q)$. From Proposition 2.1 and 2.2 we have the conclusion

$$\|(u^{\text{lin}}, v^{\text{lin}})\|_{X(t)} \lesssim \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

For this reason, to prove the estimate (13) we only need to prove the following estimate:

$$\|(u^{\text{non}}, v^{\text{non}})\|_{X(t)} \lesssim \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q. \quad (15)$$

In the first step we estimate the norm $\|u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in \{q, \infty\}$ in the way

$$\|u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\alpha} \lesssim \int_0^t (1 + t - \tau)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})+1} \| |v(\tau, \cdot)|^p \|_{L^1} d\tau.$$

Applying the fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality from Proposition 2.3 we can conclude with $\sigma < n < 2\sigma$ that

$$\|v(\tau, \cdot)|^p\|_{L^1} = \|v(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\varepsilon(q)} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p, \quad (16)$$

$$\|v(\tau, \cdot)|^p\|_{L^2} = \|v(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{2p}}^p \lesssim (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-\frac{1}{2})+p\varepsilon(q)} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p. \quad (17)$$

The condition (4) leads to

$$-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + p\varepsilon(q) < -1, \quad (18)$$

associated with relation $-\frac{n}{\sigma} + 1 > -1$, so we obtain

$$\int_0^t (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})+1} \|v(\tau, \cdot)|^p\|_{L^1} d\tau \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})+1} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p.$$

From this, one may achieve

$$\|u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\alpha} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})+1} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p \text{ for } \alpha \in \{q, \infty\}. \quad (19)$$

In the second step we control the norms $\| |D|^\sigma u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|u_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \| |D|^\sigma u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \int_0^{t/2} (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|v(\tau, \cdot)|^p\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{t/2}^t \|v(\tau, \cdot)|^p\|_{L^2} d\tau \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the estimates (16), (17) and the relation (18) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p \int_0^{t/2} (1+\tau)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\varepsilon(q)} d\tau \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p, \\ I_2 &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-\frac{1}{2})+1+p\varepsilon(q)} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have established the following estimate:

$$\| |D|^\sigma u^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|u_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^p. \quad (20)$$

Next, we will estimate the norms $\|v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$, $\| |D|^\sigma v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|v_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$. Using again the $(L^1 \cap L^2) - L^2$ estimates if $\tau \in [0, t/2]$ and the $L^2 - L^2$ estimates if $\tau \in [t/2, t]$ from Proposition 2.2 for $\| |D|^\sigma v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|v_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \int_0^t (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|u(\tau, \cdot)|^q\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} d\tau, \\ \| |D|^\sigma v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \int_0^{t/2} (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\frac{1}{2}} \|u(\tau, \cdot)|^q\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{t/2}^t (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u(\tau, \cdot)|^q\|_{L^2} d\tau, \\ \|v_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \int_0^{t/2} (1+t-\tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-1} \|u(\tau, \cdot)|^q\|_{L^1 \cap L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{t/2}^t \|u(\tau, \cdot)|^q\|_{L^2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of the norm in the solution space $X(t)$, we have the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}\| |u(\tau, \cdot)|^q \|_{L^1} &= \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^q}^q \lesssim (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q, \\ \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}^q &\lesssim (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{nq}{\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q.\end{aligned}$$

Using the fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality from Proposition 2.3 we obtain

$$\| |u(\tau, \cdot)|^q \|_{L^2} = \|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{2q}}^q \lesssim (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q - \frac{1}{2})} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q.$$

As a consequence, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_0^{t/2} (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)} d\tau \\ &\quad + (1 + t)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_{t/2}^t (1 + t - \tau)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}} d\tau \\ &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} + [\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q, \\ \| |D|^\sigma v^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_0^{t/2} (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)} d\tau \\ &\quad + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_{t/2}^t (1 + t - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q - \frac{1}{2})} d\tau \\ &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} + [\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q, \\ \|v_t^{\text{non}}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma} - 1} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_0^{t/2} (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)} d\tau \\ &\quad + \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q \int_{t/2}^t (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q - \frac{1}{2})} d\tau \\ &\lesssim (1 + t)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma} + [\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^q.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we link the previous estimates to (19) and (20) to get the estimate (15). By the same way, let us now sketch briefly the proof of the estimate (14). Taking two functions (u, v) and (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) in the solution space $X(t)$ one notices that

$$\mathcal{N}[u, v](t, x) - \mathcal{N}[\bar{u}, \bar{v}](t, x) = (u^{\text{non}}(t, x) - \bar{u}^{\text{non}}(t, x), v^{\text{non}}(t, x) - \bar{v}^{\text{non}}(t, x)).$$

Then, applying the Hölder's inequality and the fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg from Proposition 2.3 we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\| |u(\tau, \cdot)|^q - |\bar{u}(\tau, \cdot)|^q \|_{L^\gamma} &\lesssim \|(u - \bar{u})(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{q\gamma}} \left(\|u(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{q\gamma}}^{q-1} + \|\bar{u}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{q\gamma}}^{q-1} \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \tau)^{q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q - \frac{1}{\gamma})} \|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)} \left(\|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^{q-1} + \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)}^{q-1} \right), \\ \| |v(\tau, \cdot)|^p - |\bar{v}(\tau, \cdot)|^p \|_{L^\gamma} &\lesssim \|(v - \bar{v})(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{p\gamma}} \left(\|v(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{p\gamma}}^{p-1} + \|\bar{v}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{L^{p\gamma}}^{p-1} \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \tau)^{-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p - \frac{1}{\gamma}) + p[\varepsilon(q)]^+} \|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)} \left(\|(u, v)\|_{X(t)}^{p-1} + \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{X(t)}^{p-1} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = 1, 2$. Then, performing the similar proof steps to above, we gain the estimate (14). All in all, Theorem 1.1 has been proved.

Next, let us consider the case $q > q_{\text{crit}}$ and $p \leq p_{\text{crit}}$. This yields that

$$\max \left\{ \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1}, \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2} \right\} = \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}.$$

Observing from the condition (4) we choose $[\varepsilon(p)]^+ = \varepsilon(p)$, $[\varepsilon(q)]^+ = 0$. Combining this with the relation (7) gives

$$1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q - 1) + q[\varepsilon(p)]^+ < -1.$$

Then, following some steps as in the first case we can conclude Theorem 1.1 in this case.

Finally, let us consider the case $q > q_{\text{crit}}$ and $p > p_{\text{crit}}$. Noticing that from the condition (4) we choose $[\varepsilon(p)]^+ = [\varepsilon(q)]^+ = 0$ and repeat some steps as in the first case, we may finish the proof of Theorem 1.1 in this case. Summarizing, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

3. BLOW-UP RESULTS

3.1. Preliminaries. Before giving our proof, let us introduce the definition of a weak solution for (1) together some auxiliary ingredients as follows.

Definition 3.1. Let $p, q > 1, j = 1, 2$ and $T \in (0, \infty]$. We say that

$$(u, v) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T], L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

is a local (in time) weak solution to (1) if for any test functions $\Phi_j = \Phi_j(t, x) := \eta(t)\varphi_j(x)$ with $\eta \in C_0^\infty[0, T)$ and $\varphi_j \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying all their derivatives in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the following relations hold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x)|^p \Phi_2(t, x) dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) \Phi_2(0, x) dx \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x) (\partial_t^2 - \partial_t(-\Delta)^\sigma + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Phi_2(t, x) dx dt \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \Phi_1(t, x) dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \Phi_1(0, x) dx \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(t, x) (\partial_t^2 - \partial_t + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Phi_1(t, x) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

If $T = \infty$, then we say that (u, v) is a global (in time) weak solution to (1).

Lemma 3.1 (see [6]). Let $\gamma > 0$ and $s := \gamma - [\gamma]$. We denote \cdot . Then, the following estimates hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > n$:

$$|(-\Delta)^\gamma \langle x \rangle^{-r}| \lesssim \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle^{-r-2\gamma} & \text{if } \gamma \text{ is an integer,} \\ \langle x \rangle^{-n-2s} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.2 (see [12]). Let $s \in (0, 1)$. Assume that ψ is a smooth function satisfying $\partial_x^2 \psi \in L^\infty$. For any $R > 0$, let ψ_R be a function defined by

$$\psi_R(x) = \psi(R^{-1}x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then, $(-\Delta)^s(\psi_R)$ enjoys the following scaling property for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(-\Delta)^s(\psi_R)(x) = R^{-2s}((-\Delta)^s\psi)(R^{-1}x).$$

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** At first, we introduce the test function $\eta = \eta(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} 1. \quad & \eta \in C_0^\infty([0, \infty)) \text{ and } \eta(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text{decreasing} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < t < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \geq 1, \end{cases} \\ 2. \quad & \eta^{-\frac{\kappa'}{\kappa}}(t)(|\eta'(t)|^{\kappa'} + |\eta''(t)|^{\kappa'}) \leq C \quad \text{for any } t \in [1/2, 1], \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

with $\kappa = p$ or $\kappa = q$, where κ' is the conjugate of κ and C is a suitable positive constant. Let R be a large parameter in $[0, \infty)$. Next, we introduce the following radial space-dependent test function:

$$\varphi = \varphi(x) := \langle x \rangle^{-n-2\bar{\sigma}} = (1 + |x|^2)^{-n/2-\bar{\sigma}},$$

where $\bar{\sigma}$ is given by

$$\bar{\sigma} = \begin{cases} \text{an arbitrary constant } \epsilon \in (0, 1) & \text{if } \sigma \text{ is an integer number,} \\ \sigma - [\sigma] & \text{if } \sigma \text{ is a fractional number.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, it follows that $\bar{\sigma} \in (0, 1)$. For $j = 1, 2$, we denote the two test functions

$$\Psi_{j,R}(t, x) := \eta_R(t)\varphi_{j,R}(x),$$

where $\eta_R(t) := \eta(R^{-2\sigma}t)$ and $\varphi_{j,R}(x) := \varphi(R^{-j}K_j^{-j}x)$, moreover, we define the functionals

$$\begin{aligned} I_{j,R} &:= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x)|^p \Psi_{j,R}(t, x) dx dt = \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x)|^p \eta_R(t)\varphi_{j,R}(x) dx dt, \\ J_{j,R} &:= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \Psi_{j,R}(t, x) dx dt = \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \eta_R(t)\varphi_{j,R}(x) dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that $(u, v) = (u(t, x), v(t, x))$ is a global (in time) Sobolev solution belonging to the class

$$\mathcal{C}([0, \infty), L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)) \times \mathcal{C}([0, \infty), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

to (1). We use Definition 3.1 in place of $\Phi_j(t, x) = \Psi_{j,R}(t, x)$ with $j = 1, 2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,R} &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x)\varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x) (\partial_t^2 - \partial_t(-\Delta)^\sigma + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{2,R}(t, x) dx dt \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1,R} &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x)\varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(t, x) (\partial_t^2 - \partial_t + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{1,R}(t, x) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

After applying Hölder's inequality with $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$, then carrying out the change of variables $\tilde{t} := R^{-2\sigma}t$, $\tilde{x} := R^{-2}K_2^{-2}x$ combined with the property (21), we may proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)| |(\partial_t^2 - \partial_t(-\Delta)^\sigma + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{2,R}(t, x)| dx dt \\
& \lesssim \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \eta_R(t) \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \quad \times \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\partial_t^2 - \partial_t(-\Delta)^\sigma + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{2,R}(t, x)|^{q'} \Psi_{2,R}^{-\frac{q'}{q}}(t, x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\
& \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{q}} (2R^{-4\sigma} + R^{-6\sigma}) \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\
& \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{q}} R^{-4\sigma + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{q'}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} d\tilde{t} \right) = C J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{q}} R^{-4\sigma + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{q'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this and the relation (22), we have the conclusion

$$I_{2,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{q}} R^{-4\sigma + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{q'}}.$$

In the same way, using the change of variables $\tilde{t} := R^{-2\sigma}t$ and $\tilde{x} := R^{-1}K_1^{-1}x$ we also get the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x)| |(\partial_t^2 - \partial_t + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{1,R}(t, x)| dx dt \\
& \lesssim \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x)|^p \eta_R(t) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \quad \times \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |(\partial_t^2 - \partial_t + (-\Delta)^\sigma) \Psi_{1,R}(t, x)|^{p'} \Psi_{1,R}^{-\frac{p'}{p}}(t, x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
& \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} (R^{-4\sigma} + 2R^{-2\sigma}) \left(\int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
& \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} d\tilde{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} = C I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, combining this with the relation (23) one arrives at

$$J_{1,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}},$$

which leads to

$$J_{1,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{pq'}}.$$

Due to $u \in \mathcal{C}([0, \infty), L^q(\mathbb{R}^n))$, employing the Lebesgue dominant convergence theorem we obtain

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \varphi_{j,R}(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q dx < \infty \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

This means that with a sufficiently large positive constant R_0 we have the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, x)|^q dx, \end{aligned}$$

for all $R \in [R_0, \infty)$ and $t > 0$. Thus, it follows that $J_{1,R} \leq J_{2,R} \leq 2J_{1,R}$ for all $R \in [R_0, \infty)$. For this reason, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx &\lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{pq'}} \\ &\lesssim J_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{pq'}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$I_{1,R} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-4\sigma - \frac{2\sigma}{q} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{q'}},$$

i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \lesssim J_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{pq'}} - J_{1,R}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-4\sigma - \frac{2\sigma}{q} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{2n}{q'}} - I_{1,R}$$

for all $R \in [R_0, \infty)$. From this observation, the application of the inequality

$$Ay^\beta - y \lesssim A^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \text{ for any } A > 0, y \geq 0 \text{ and } 0 < \beta < 1,$$

gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx \lesssim R^{\frac{pq}{pq-1}(-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'})} K_1^{\frac{pq}{pq-1} \frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{q}{pq-1} \frac{2n}{q'}} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x) \varphi_{2,R}(x) dx \lesssim R^{\frac{pq}{pq-1}(-4\sigma - \frac{2\sigma}{q} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'})} K_1^{\frac{p}{pq-1} \frac{n}{p'}} K_2^{\frac{pq}{pq-1} \frac{2n}{q'}}. \quad (25)$$

Obviously, if the conditions (6) or $n \leq \sigma$ occurs, then it implies that $\Gamma_c(p, q) \geq 0$, where

$$\Gamma_c(p, q) := \frac{pq}{pq-1} \min \left\{ 2\sigma + \frac{4\sigma}{p} - \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} - \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}, 4\sigma + \frac{2\sigma}{q} - \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'} - \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'q} \right\}. \quad (*)$$

Let us now split our consideration into two cases as follows:

Case 1: If $\Gamma_c(p, q) > 0$, then we choose $K_1 = K_2 = 1$ and take $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (24) and (25) to conclude a contradiction to the condition (5).

Case 2: If $\Gamma_c(p, q) = 0$, then we consider the following subcases:

- **In the case** $p \leq p_{\text{crit}}$, i.e.

$$-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'} = 0,$$

taking $K_2 = 1$ one sees that $J_{1,R} \leq J_{2,R} \lesssim K_1^{\frac{pq}{pq-1} \frac{n}{p'}}$ for all $R \geq 1$. As a consequence, it holds:

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}(R) := \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(t, x) (\partial_t^2 \eta_R(t) - \partial_t \eta_R(t)) \varphi_{1,R}(x) dx dt = 0. \quad (26)$$

Indeed, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x) (\partial_t^2 \eta_R(t) - \partial_t \eta_R(t)) \varphi_{1,R}(x)| dx dt \\ & \lesssim R^{-2\sigma} \int_{R^{2\sigma}/2}^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x) |\eta_R^{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \varphi_{1,R}(x)| dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we notice that $\partial_t^j \eta_R(t) = 0$ with $t \in [0, R^{2\sigma}/2]$ for all $j \geq 1$. On the other hand, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(R) & := R^{-2\sigma} \int_0^{R^{2\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v(t, x) |\eta_R^{\frac{1}{p}}(t) \varphi_{1,R}(x)| dx dt \\ & \lesssim I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} \\ & \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} = J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} K_1^{\frac{n}{p'}} \leq C K_1^{\frac{pq}{pq-1} \frac{n}{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathcal{G}(R)$ is an increasing function, there exists the limit of $\mathcal{G}(R)$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, it follows immediately the relation (26). Moreover, they are true that

$$J_{1,R} \lesssim |\mathcal{H}(R)| + I_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{-2\sigma + \frac{n}{p'}} \quad \text{and} \quad I_{2,R} \lesssim J_{2,R}^{\frac{1}{q}} R^{-4\sigma + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'}},$$

that is,

$$J_{1,R} \lesssim |\mathcal{H}(R)| + J_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{p}} R^{-2\sigma - \frac{4\sigma}{p} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{pq'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'}} K_1^{-2\sigma + \frac{n}{p'}} = |\mathcal{H}(R)| + J_{1,R}^{\frac{1}{pq}} K_1^{-2\sigma + \frac{n}{p'}}.$$

From this, we derive

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} J_{1,R} \leq C K_1^{\frac{pq}{pq-1} (-2\sigma + \frac{n}{p'})}.$$

Because of $-2\sigma + \frac{n}{p'} < 0$, we take $K_1 \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain $u \equiv 0$. This is a contradiction to the condition (5).

- **In the case $p > p_{\text{crit}}$, i.e.**

$$-4\sigma - \frac{2\sigma}{q} + \frac{2n+2\sigma}{q'} + \frac{n+2\sigma}{p'q} = 0,$$

taking $K_1 = 1$ and then carrying out some same steps as in the first subcase, we also achieve a contradiction with the condition (5).

Summarizing, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is completed.

4. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

In this section, we will summarize how to get some estimates for lifespan of solutions in the subcritical case

$$\max \left\{ \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1}, \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2} \right\} > \frac{n}{2\sigma}. \quad (27)$$

Let us denote by T_ε the so-called lifespan of a local solution (u, v) , i.e the maximal existence time of local solutions. Moreover, we replace the initial data (u_1, v_1) by $(\varepsilon u_1, \varepsilon v_1)$, in which ε stands for a small, positive constant to describe the size of the initial data, and define the quantity $\Gamma_c(p, q)$ as in (*). Then, the lower bound estimates and the upper bound estimates of T_ε are given by the next statements.

Proposition 4.1 (Upper bound of lifespan). *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2 together with the condition (27) for the power exponents p and q , there exists a positive constant*

$\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ the lifespan of solutions to (1) fulfill the following upper bound estimates:

$$T_\varepsilon \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}}, \quad (28)$$

where C is a suitable positive constant.

Proof. Let R_1 is a large enough constant, the following relation holds:

$$\min \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x)\varphi_{2,R}(x)dx, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x)\varphi_{1,R}(x)dx \right\} > C_1 \text{ for all } R \geq R_1,$$

where

$$C_1 := \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_1(x)dx, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v_1(x)dx \right\}.$$

Combining this with the relations (24) and (25) we arrive at

$$C_1\varepsilon \leq C_2 R^{f_c(p,q)} = T_\varepsilon^{-\frac{\Gamma_c(p,q)}{2\sigma}}, \text{ that is, } T_\varepsilon \leq C_2 C_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}} = C\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}}.$$

Summarizing, the proof of Proposition 4.1 is completed. \square

Proposition 4.2 (Lower bound of lifespan). *Let $1 < \sigma < n < 2\sigma$ and $(u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{D}$. We assume that the power exponents $p, q \geq 2$ satisfy the condition (27). Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, the lower bound for the lifespan of solutions to (1) can be estimated as follows:*

$$T_\varepsilon \geq c\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}}, \quad (29)$$

where c is a suitable positive constant.

Proof. For $T > 0$, we introduce the following function spaces:

$$Y_1(T) := \mathcal{C}([0, T], H^\sigma \cap L^q \cap L^\infty), \quad Y_2(T) := \mathcal{C}([0, T], H^\sigma) \text{ and } Y_0(T) := Y_1(T) \times Y_2(T),$$

with the corresponding norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{Y_1(T)} &:= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\bar{f}_1(t)^{-1} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^q} + \bar{f}_2(t)^{-1} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \bar{f}_3(t)^{-1} \| |D|^\sigma u(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2}), \\ \|v\|_{Y_2(T)} &:= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\bar{g}_1(t)^{-1} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \bar{g}_2(t)^{-1} \| |D|^\sigma v(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|(u, v)\|_{Y_0(T)} := \|u\|_{Y_1(T)} + \|v\|_{Y_2(T)}.$$

In addition, with $k = 0, 1, 2$ we define operators $\mathcal{N}_k : Y_k(T) \rightarrow Y_k(T)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1[u] &:= u^{\text{lin}} + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_1(t - \tau, \cdot) *_x |v(\tau, x)|^p d\tau = u^{\text{lin}} + u^{\text{non}}, \\ \mathcal{N}_2[v] &:= v^{\text{lin}} + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_2(t - \tau, \cdot) *_x |u(\tau, x)|^q d\tau = v^{\text{lin}} + v^{\text{non}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_0[u, v] := (\mathcal{N}_1[u], \mathcal{N}_2[v]).$$

Let M be a suitable positive constant. With $k = 0, 1, 2$ we propose the following subspaces:

$$Y_k(T, M) := \{ \mathcal{G} \in Y_k(T) \text{ such that } \|\mathcal{G}\|_{Y_k(T)} \leq M \}.$$

Let us assume that $q < q_{\text{crit}}$ and $p \geq p_{\text{crit}}$, which imply

$$\frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} = \max \left\{ \frac{2q + 1}{pq + q - 2}, \frac{pq + p + 1}{2pq - p - 1} \right\}.$$

We choose the weights in the norms of the solution spaces as follows:

$$\bar{f}_1(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{q})+1}, \quad \bar{f}_2(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}+1}, \quad \bar{f}_3(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}}$$

and

$$\bar{g}_1(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}+\alpha}, \quad \bar{g}_2(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha_1},$$

where

$$\alpha := -\frac{q-1}{pq-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)\right) + \frac{p-1}{pq-1} \left(1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)\right).$$

Now we will construct a unique local (in time) solution small data $(u, v) \in Y_0(T, M\varepsilon)$ to (1). Indeed, applying the fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality from Proposition 2.3 with the conditions $\min\{p, q\} \geq 2$ and $\sigma < n < 2\sigma$, then carrying out some same step as the proof of Theorem 1.1, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}_2[v]\|_{Y_2(T)} &\leq C_1\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_1(1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha}\|u\|_{Y_1(T)}^q \\ &\leq C_1\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_1(1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha}M^q\varepsilon^q, \\ \|\mathcal{N}_1[u]\|_{Y_1(T)} &\leq C_2\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_2(1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha}\|v\|_{Y_2(T)}^p \\ &\leq C_2\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_2(1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha}M^p\varepsilon^p, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{N}_0[u, v] - \mathcal{N}_0[\bar{u}, \bar{v}]\|_{Y_0(T)} \\ &\leq C_3\|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{Y_0(T)} \\ &\quad \times \left((1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha} \left(\|v\|_{Y_2(T)}^{p-1} + \|\bar{v}\|_{Y_2(T)}^{p-1} \right) + (1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha} \left(\|u\|_{Y_1(T)}^{q-1} + \|\bar{u}\|_{Y_1(T)}^{q-1} \right) \right) \\ &\leq C_3\|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_{Y_0(T)} \left((1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha}M^{p-1}\varepsilon^{p-1} + (1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha}M^{q-1}\varepsilon^{q-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $(u, v), (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in Y_0(T, M\varepsilon)$. Here, we note that

$$1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + p \left(1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)\right) > 0,$$

$$1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1) - \alpha = \frac{q-1}{pq-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + p \left(1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)\right)\right) > 0, \quad (30)$$

$$1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + p\alpha = \frac{p-1}{pq-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1) + p \left(1 + q - \frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)\right)\right) > 0. \quad (31)$$

Therefore, as long as

$$\max\{C_1, C_2\}\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} < \frac{M\varepsilon}{6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\} \max \left\{ (1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha}M^p\varepsilon^p, (1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha}M^q\varepsilon^q, \right. \\ &\quad \left. (1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p(1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1))}M^{pq}\varepsilon^{pq} \right\} < \frac{M\varepsilon}{6}, \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

applying Banach's fixed point theorem we may construct a unique local solution $(u, v) \in Y_0(T, M\varepsilon)$. Consequently, it entails the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{Y_2(T)} &\leq C_1\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_1(1+T)^{1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1)-\alpha}M^q\varepsilon^q, \\ \|u\|_{Y_1(T)} &\leq C_2\varepsilon\|(u_1, v_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}} + C_2(1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p\alpha}\varepsilon^p \\ &\quad + C_2(1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p(1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1))}M^{pq}\varepsilon^{pq}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose

$$T^* := \sup \{t \in (0, T_\varepsilon) \text{ such that } \mathcal{H}(t) := \|(u, v)\|_{Y_0(t)} \leq M\varepsilon\}.$$

From the condition (32), we see that $\|(u, v)\|_{Y_0(T)} < M\varepsilon/2$. Due to the fact that $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is a continuous function for any $t \in (0, T_\varepsilon)$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_\varepsilon^-} \mathcal{H}(t) = +\infty,$$

we may claim that there exists a time $T^0 \in (T^*, T_\varepsilon)$ such that $\mathcal{H}(T^0) \leq M\varepsilon$. This contradicts to the definition of T^* . For this reason, combining the relations (30) and (31) one realizes

$$C_3(1+T)^{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p(1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1))} M^{pq} \varepsilon^{pq} \geq \frac{M\varepsilon}{6},$$

that is,

$$T_\varepsilon \geq T \geq c\varepsilon^{-\frac{pq-1}{1-\frac{n}{2\sigma}(p-1)+p(1+q-\frac{n}{\sigma}(q-1))}} = c\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}}.$$

Therefore, the proof Proposition 4.2 in this case is established.

Next, let us consider $q \geq q_{\text{crit}}$ and $p < p_{\text{crit}}$. In this case, we choose the weights in the norms of the solution spaces as follows:

$$\bar{f}_1(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}(1-\frac{1}{q})+1-\alpha}, \quad \bar{f}_2(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{\sigma}+1-\alpha},$$

$$\bar{f}_3(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\alpha}$$

and

$$\bar{g}_1(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}}, \quad \bar{g}_2(t) := (1+t)^{-\frac{n}{4\sigma}-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, following some steps as above we can conclude Proposition 4.2 in this case.

Finally, let us consider the case $p < p_{\text{crit}}$ and $q < q_{\text{crit}}$. Then, we choose the weights in the norms of the solution spaces either as the case $q < q_{\text{crit}}, p \geq p_{\text{crit}}$ if $\alpha > 0$ or as the case $q \geq q_{\text{crit}}, p < p_{\text{crit}}$ if $\alpha \leq 0$. Then, carrying out some steps as above we may arrive at Proposition 4.2 in this case.

Summarizing, the proof of Proposition 4.2 is completed. \square

Remark 4.1. Linking the achieved results (28) and (29) in Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 one recognizes that the sharp lifespan estimates for solutions to the Cauchy problem (1) in the subcritical case, i.e. the condition (27) occurs, are determined by the following relation:

$$T_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\sigma}{\Gamma_c(p,q)}}.$$

For this observation, it is really a challenging problem to verify the optimality of estimates for lifespan in the critical case, namely,

$$\max \left\{ \frac{pq+p+1}{2pq-p-1}, \frac{2q+1}{pq+q-2} \right\} = \frac{n}{2\sigma}.$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was partly supported by Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training under grant number B2023-BKA-06.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Chen, M. Reissig, Blow-up of solutions to Nakao's problem via an iteration argument, *J. Differential Equations*, **275** (2021), 733–756.
- [2] W. Chen, Blow-up and lifespan estimates for Nakao's type problem with nonlinearities of derivative type, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **45** (2022), 5988–6004.
- [3] M. D'Abbicco, M.R. Ebert, A new phenomenon in the critical exponent for structurally damped semi-linear evolution equations, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **149** (2017), 1–40.
- [4] M. D'Abbicco, M.R. Ebert, $L^p - L^q$ estimates for a parameter-dependent multiplier with oscillatory and diffusive components, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **504** (2021), 125393.
- [5] M. D'Abbicco, M.R. Ebert, The critical exponent for semilinear σ -evolution equations with a strong non-effective damping, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **215** (2022), 112637.
- [6] M. D'Abbicco, K. Fujiwara, A test function method for evolution equations with fractional powers of the Laplace operator, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **202** (2021), 112114.
- [7] P.T. Duong, M.M. Kainane, M. Reissig, Global existence for semi-linear structurally damped σ -evolution models, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **431** (2015), 569–596.
- [8] M. D'Abbicco, M. Reissig, Semilinear structural damped waves, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **37** (2014), 1570–1592.
- [9] P.T. Duong, M. Reissig, The external damping Cauchy problems with general powers of the Laplacian, *New Trends in Analysis and Interdisciplinary Applications, Trends in Mathematics*, (2017), 537–543.
- [10] T.A. Dao, M. Reissig, An application of L^1 estimates for oscillating integrals to parabolic like semi-linear structurally damped σ -evolution models, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **476** (2019), 426–463.
- [11] T.A. Dao, M. Reissig, L^1 estimates for oscillating integrals and their applications to semi-linear models with σ -evolution like structural damping, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. A*, **39** (2019), 5431–5463.
- [12] T.A. Dao, M. Reissig, Blow-up results for semi-linear structurally damped σ -evolution equations, In: M. Cicognani, D. Del Santo, A. Parmeggiani, M. Reissig (eds.), *Anomalies in Partial Differential Equations*, Springer INdAM Series, **43** (2021), 213–245.
- [13] K. Kita, R. Kusaba, A remark on the blowing up of solutions to Nakao's problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **513** (2022), 126199.
- [14] R. Ikehata, H. Takeda, Asymptotic profiles of solutions for structural damped wave equations, *J. Dyn. Differ. Equ.*, **31** (2019), 537–571.
- [15] A. Matsumura, On the asymptotic behavior of solutions of semi-linear wave equations, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, **12** (1976), 169–189.
- [16] A. Matsumura, Energy decay of solutions of dissipative wave equations, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, **53** (1977), 232–236.
- [17] A. Palmieri, H. Takamura, A blow-up result for a Nakao-type weakly coupled system with nonlinearities of derivative-type, *Math. Ann.*, **387** (2023), 111–132.
- [18] Y. Shibata, On the rate of decay of solutions to linear viscoelastic equation, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **23** (2000), 203–226.
- [19] G. Todorova, B. Yordanov, Critical exponent for a nonlinear wave equation with damping, *J. Differential Equations*, **174** (2001), 464–489.
- [20] Y. Wakasugi, A note on the blow-up of solutions to Nakao's problem, in: *New Trends in Analysis and Interdisciplinary Applications*, (2017), 545–551.
- [21] Q.S. Zhang, A blow-up result for a nonlinear wave equation with damping: the critical case, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, **333** (2001), 109–114.