

# Formulation of Chimera Gradient Flows for Chemotaxis Systems with Indirect Signal Production and Degenerate Diffusion

Yoshifumi MIMURA\*

Department of Mathematics, College of Humanities & Sciences, Nihon University  
3-25-40 Sakurajosui Setagaya-ku Tokyo 156-8550, Japan

## Abstract

A parabolic system of three unknown functions, not expressible as gradient flows, is treated as three coupled gradient flows. For each unknown function, the minimizing movement scheme is used to construct a time-discrete approximate solution. Unlike standard minimizing movement scheme for gradient flows, the relative compactness of the time-discrete approximate solution with respect to the time step is not inherently guaranteed. However, the existence of a Lyapunov functional ensures this relative compactness, leading to the existence of time-global solutions.

KEYWORDS: Keller-Segel; Wasserstein distance; Minimizing movement scheme; Global existence; degenerate diffusion

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35K65, 35K40, 47J30, 35Q92, 35B33.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the following system.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \Delta u^m - \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t > 0, \\ \varepsilon_1 \partial_t v = \kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t > 0, \\ \varepsilon_2 \partial_t w = \kappa_2 \Delta w - \gamma_2 w + u, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 \geq 0, \varepsilon_1 v(x, 0) = \varepsilon_1 v_0 \geq 0, \varepsilon_2 w(x, 0) = \varepsilon_2 w_0 \geq 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\varepsilon_i, \kappa_i > 0$  and  $\gamma_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . In this paper, we consider the case where

$$m \geq 2 - \frac{4}{d}, \quad d \geq 5.$$

Assuming the integrability of  $\nabla u^m$  and  $u \nabla v$ , it follows from the first equation of system (1.1) that the conservation law of the mass

$$M := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_0(x) dx$$

---

\*mimura.yoshifumi@nihon-u.ac.jp

is satisfied.

The objectives of this paper are threefold:

1. to provide sufficient conditions for the existence of global-in-time weak solutions to problem (1.1),
2. to demonstrate an application of the minimizing movement approach to a system of evolution equations that is not a gradient flow,
3. to propose a method that allows for handling Lyapunov functionals without concern for the smoothness of the solution.

Let us briefly explain the system (1.1). In conditions where

$$\kappa_1 \neq 0, \varepsilon_2 = \kappa_2 = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \kappa_2 \neq 0, \varepsilon_1 = \kappa_1 = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

as specified in equation (1.1), the system is well-known as the Keller-Segel system. The existence of a critical mass threshold  $M_c$  has been predicted and studied: if  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} < M_c$ , solutions exist globally in time, whereas for any  $M > M_c$ , there exists a solution with  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} = M$  that blows up in finite time. The Keller-Segel system, under the conditions of (1.2), is further classified into fully parabolic and parabolic-elliptic types depending on whether

$$\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \neq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = 0,$$

respectively. Research concerning the aforementioned threshold  $M_c$  has been reported for both cases. See for instance, [5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 26, 27, 29] for time global existence, [6, 17, 18, 21, 24, 30, 31] for the existence of blow-up solutions, [8, 10, 12, 34] for the threshold. Additionally, for a review of the Keller-Segel system up to recent years, see [4] and the references therein. Furthermore, the method of constructing time-global solutions by viewing the Keller-Segel system as a gradient flow can be considered a precursor to the approaches in this paper. For the parabolic-elliptic case with  $m = 1$  and  $d = 2$ , it is formulated as a gradient flow in [7], and for the fully parabolic case with  $m = 1$  and  $d = 2$  in [9], and for the fully parabolic case with  $m > 1$  in [11, 26, 27, 28]. Additionally, while not specific to the so-called minimal models, see [23] for an application of the gradient flow approach to the multi-species Keller-Segel system.

To view the Keller-Segel system as a gradient flow, the concept of Wasserstein distance is required. The Wasserstein distance is a notion of distance applicable to probability measures, and was utilized by Jordan-Kinderlehrer-Otto [22] in constructing solutions to the Fokker-Planck equation. This method is referred to as the JKO-Scheme or the Minimizing Movement Scheme (MMS). The MMS is often used in a more general context than the original work of Jordan-Kinderlehrer-Otto, and it involves discussions in abstract metric spaces as seen in [2]. Both the JKO-Scheme and the MMS involve discretizing the time interval, variationally constructing discrete solutions at each time step, and then obtaining the existence of solutions in the limit as the time discretization approaches zero. Due to their variational nature, by focusing on the minimal point, solutions to partial differential

equations can be derived via the Euler-Lagrange equations, and by focusing on the minimum values, the existence of curves of maximal slope, which do not require the concept of derivatives, can be established as alternatives to solutions of partial differential equations. In any case, the resulting partial differential equations are of the form known as gradient flows.

However, the concept of a gradient flow is inherently unstable. For instance, even a slight perturbation to the first or second equation of the Keller-Segel system could disrupt its structure as a gradient flow. In mathematical modeling, inaccuracies and subsequent model revisions are unavoidable issues, and the MMS, being specialized for gradient flows, has inherent limitations in terms of versatility. A notable example is the problem (1.1) where coefficients are not set to zero; unlike the Keller-Segel system, (1.1) under these conditions no longer fits within the framework of gradient flows. Hence, this paper proposes a slight modification to MMS to variationally construct solutions to problem (1.1). This minor modification uniquely does not require the knowledge of Lyapunov functionals or their lower bounds during the construction phase of approximate solutions. Moreover, it not only addresses equations that are non-gradient in flow, but also significantly diverges from the MMS, which constructs solutions under the assumption that the Lyapunov functional is already known.

The existence of a threshold similar to that in the Keller-Segel system has been confirmed for problem (1.1), specifically reported when  $m = 1$  and  $d = 4$ . Fujie-Senba [13] have proved that in a bounded domain, under spherical symmetry with the boundary conditions

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

or the boundary conditions

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} - u \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = v = w = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0$$

without spherical symmetry, if  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} < (8\pi)^2$ , the solution remains global in time. Furthermore, Fujie-Senba [14] have proved the existence of solutions that blow up in finite time when  $M$  exceeds  $(8\pi)^2$  and is not a natural number multiple of  $(8\pi)^2$ , satisfying  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} = M$ . Additionally, Hosono-Ogawa [20] deal with problems that are reduced to (1.1) through variable transformations, demonstrating that global-in-time solutions exist under the conditions  $m = 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0$  and  $d = 4$  when  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} < (8\pi)^2$ . Also, Hosono-Laurençot [19] showed that when  $m = 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 1$  and  $d = 4$ , time-global solutions exist if  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} < (8\pi)^2$ .

Fujie-Senba [13], Hosono-Ogawa [20] and Hosono-Laurençot [19] derive the Lyapunov functional or the modified Lyapunov functional through direct calculation from the existence of classical local solutions. Roughly speaking, the existence of time-global solutions requires the boundedness from below of the functional, for which Fujie-Senba and Hosono et al. apply Adams-type inequality and Brezis-Merle inequality, respectively. Contrary to their analysis, our problem includes a degenerate diffusion term in the first equation, which precludes the expectation of classical solutions. Consequently, deriving and utilizing the Lyapunov functional is challenging. Therefore, instead of direct differentiation, we

derived the Lyapunov functional from its variational properties and obtained the existence of time-global solutions and the energy inequality as demonstrated below.

Before describing the main theorem of this paper, let us first clarify the concept of weak solutions that will be addressed herein.

**Definition 1.1** (time-global weak solutions). *A triple  $(u, v, w)$  of non-negative functions is defined as a **time-global weak solution** of (1.1) if it satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) *For any  $T > 0$ , the functions meet these regularity conditions:*

- $u \in L^\infty(0, T; (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $v \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $w \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $\|u(t)\|_{L^1} = \|u_0\|_{L^1}$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,
- $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 u \, dx < \infty$ .

(ii) *For any  $T > 0$ , the functions demonstrate additional regularity:*

- $u \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $u^m \in L^1(0, T; W^{1, \frac{d}{d-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $v \in L^2(0, T; W^{3,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,
- $w \in L^2(0, T; W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ .

(iii) *As  $t$  approaches 0 from above, the following initial conditions are met:*

- $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_2(u(t), u_0) = 0$ ,
- $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \|v(t) - v_0\|_{H^1} = 0$ ,
- $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \|w(t) - w_0\|_{L^2} = 0$ ,

where  $\mathcal{W}_2$  denotes the Wasserstein distance defined in Section 2.

(iv) *The triplet  $(u, v, w)$  satisfies the following system of equations*

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u \partial_t \varphi - \langle \nabla u^m - u \nabla v, \nabla \varphi \rangle] \, dx dt = 0, & \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty)), \\ \varepsilon_1 \partial_t v = \kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w, & \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty), \\ \varepsilon_2 \partial_t w = \kappa_2 \Delta w - \gamma_2 w + u, & \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we establish the proof of the existence of time-global weak solutions by constructing approximate solutions using variational methods and obtaining the solution as a limit of these approximations. To address the technical issues related to the convergence of the approximate solutions, we make the following assumptions:

$$\left( 1 < m < 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{4m + 2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)} \geq 2 \right) \quad \text{or} \quad m \geq 2. \quad (1.3)$$

When  $m > 2 - \frac{4}{d}$ , the existence of time-global weak solutions can be established without any restrictions on  $\|u_0\|_{L^1}$ . This is due to the fact that under this condition, the Lyapunov functional is always bounded from below.

**Theorem 1.2** (global existence in sub-critical exponent). *Assume that  $\kappa_1\kappa_2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 \neq 0$  and  $m > 2 - \frac{4}{d}$  along with condition (1.3). Then, for any non-negative functions  $u_0$  satisfying  $u_0 \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $|x|^2 u_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $v_0 \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $w_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a time-global weak solution to (1.1).*

When  $m = 2 - \frac{4}{d}$ , a mass threshold appears, and the existence of time-global weak solutions is conditional upon  $\|u_0\|_{L^1} < M_*$ . Furthermore, since condition (1.3) is satisfied for  $d \geq 6$ , we can summarize without explicit mention of (1.3) as follows:

**Theorem 1.3** (global existence in critical exponent). *Assume that  $\kappa_1\kappa_2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 \neq 0$  and  $m = 2 - \frac{4}{d}$ , and  $d \geq 6$ . Then, for any non-negative functions  $u_0$  satisfying  $u_0 \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $|x|^2 u_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $v_0 \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $w_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a time-global weak solution to problem (1.1), provided that*

$$\|u_0\|_{L^1} < M_*,$$

where  $M_*$  is defined by

$$M_* := \left( \frac{2d}{d-4} \frac{\kappa_1\kappa_2}{C_*^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{4}} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$C_*^2 := \sup_{(u,v) \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(-\Delta)^{-2} u \, dx}{\|u\|_{L^1}^{\frac{4-(2-m)d}{d(m-1)}} \|u\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m(d-4)}{d(m-1)}}}. \quad (1.5)$$

In particular, since  $M_*$  is the threshold for the lower boundedness of the Lyapunov functional, it can be expected to serve as the threshold for the existence of finite-time blow-up solutions in (1.1).

**Theorem 1.4** (energy inequality). *Assume that  $\kappa_1\kappa_2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 \neq 0$ . Define the functional  $\mathcal{L}$  as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(u, v, w) := & \frac{1}{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^m \, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv \, dx \\ & + \frac{\kappa_1\kappa_2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta v|^2 \, dx + \frac{\gamma_1\kappa_2 + \gamma_2\kappa_1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v^2 \, dx \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w|^2 \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Then, the following inequality holds for the solutions obtained by Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(u_0, v_0, w_0) - \mathcal{L}(u(T), v(T), w(T)) \\ & \geq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla u^m - u \nabla v|^2}{u} dxdt + \frac{\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \{\kappa_1 \Delta v(t) - \gamma_1 v(t) + w(t)\}|^2 dxdt \\ & \quad + \frac{\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta v(t) - \gamma_1 v(t) + w(t)|^2 dxdt \end{aligned}$$

for every  $T \in [0, \infty)$ .

It is anticipated that the existence of time-global weak solutions can also be proven for cases where  $d = 4, 5$  and  $m = 2 - \frac{4}{d}$ . However, although we have succeeded in constructing approximate solutions and demonstrating the boundedness from below of  $\mathcal{L}$  under the restricted condition for  $M$ , we were unable to verify what appears to be the condition  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$ , which seems necessary for the convergence of these approximate solutions. To establish the versatility of the methods used in this paper, it is desirable to clarify this issue in future research.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 introduces the Wasserstein distance and constructs approximate solutions for problem (1.1). Section 3 derives the Lyapunov functional  $\mathcal{L}$  for (1.1), and Section 4 examines its boundedness from below. Notably, if  $m > 2 - \frac{4}{d}$  or  $m = 2 - \frac{4}{d}$  and  $M < M_*$ ,  $\mathcal{L}$  is bounded below. Under this condition, Section 5 derives uniform estimates for the approximate solutions that are independent of the time discretization step. The uniform boundedness obtained in Section 5 leads to the compactness of the approximate solutions, as shown in Section 6. This compactness implies the convergence of the approximate solutions to the solution of problem (1.1), as demonstrated in Section 7. Section 8 proves the energy inequality.

## 2 Time-discretized approximate solutions

In this section, we partition the time interval  $[0, \infty)$  and construct variational approximations to the solutions of (1.1) at each partition point. Before defining the approximate solutions, we revisit the concept of the (quadratic) Wasserstein distance, denoted as  $\mathcal{W}_2$ . Consider the space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) & := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 d\mu(x) < +\infty \right\}, \\ M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) & := \left\{ \mu : \frac{\mu}{M} \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), M > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.1** (Wasserstein distance). For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the **Wasserstein distance**  $\mathcal{W}_2$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{p \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \left( \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 dp(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where  $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$  represents the set of measures  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  that satisfy

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} b(x) dp(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x) d\mu(x), \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} b(y) dp(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(y) d\nu(y),$$

for any continuous and bounded function  $b \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . For  $\mu, \nu \in M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)$  is additionally defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) := \sqrt{M} \mathcal{W}_2\left(\frac{\mu}{M}, \frac{\nu}{M}\right).$$

It is well-established that a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , if absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{L}^d$  and denoted by  $\mu = u\mathcal{L}^d$  with density  $u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , allows for the existence of a unique optimal transport  $p_*$  and an optimal transport map  $\mathbf{t}_\mu^\nu$ , characterized by

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) := \left( \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 dp_*(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - \mathbf{t}_\mu^\nu(x)|^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Moreover,  $\mathbf{t}_\mu^\nu$  coincides almost everywhere with the gradient of a convex function (refer to [2, §6.2.3], [3, Theorem 2.3], [35, Theorem 2.12] for instance). For more detailed information on Wasserstein distances, consider consulting sources such as Chapter 7 of [2], Chapter 6 of [36], and Chapter 5 of [33]. In this paper, we specifically address cases where both  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  possess densities  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , respectively, simplifying the notation for the Wasserstein distance to  $\mathcal{W}_2(\rho_1, \rho_2)$  instead of  $\mathcal{W}_2(\rho_1\mathcal{L}^d, \rho_2\mathcal{L}^d)$  and  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  instead of  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $p \in \Gamma_o(\rho_1, \rho_2)$  denote that  $p$  is the optimal transport between  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ .

We define three functionals  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(u, v) &:= \frac{1}{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^m dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx, \\ \mathcal{F}(v, w) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 |\nabla v|^2 + \gamma_1 v^2) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} vw dx, \\ \mathcal{G}(w, u) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 |\nabla w|^2 + \gamma_2 w^2) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uw dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the system (1.1) can formally be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = -\nabla_u \mathcal{E}(u, v), \\ \varepsilon_1 \partial_t v = -\nabla_v \mathcal{F}(v, w), \\ \varepsilon_2 \partial_t w = -\nabla_w \mathcal{G}(w, u), \end{cases}$$

where  $\nabla_u$  represents the gradient of the functional  $u \mapsto \mathcal{E}(u, v)$  in the Wasserstein space. Namely, when  $\mathcal{E}(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(u) dx$ , we have  $-\nabla_u \mathcal{E}(u) = \nabla \cdot (u \nabla f'(u))$ . Similarly,  $\nabla_v$  and  $\nabla_w$  represent the gradients of the functionals  $v \mapsto \mathcal{F}(v, w)$  and  $w \mapsto \mathcal{G}(w, u)$  in  $L^2$ -space, respectively. Let us refer to this system of equations as the **Chimera Gradient Flow**. As will be discussed later, it is possible to construct a ‘‘formal’’ approximate solution for the Chimera Gradient Flow using techniques similar to the minimizing movement scheme.

While convergence of the approximate solution is not generally guaranteed by theory, in the current problem (1.1), the existence of a Lyapunov functional can be asserted, which allows for a discussion on the convergence of the approximate solutions.

Now, we divide the time interval  $[0, \infty)$  into sub-intervals with length  $\tau > 0$ . Let  $(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) := (\rho_\tau * u_0, v_0, w_0)$  be an approximated initial data, where  $\rho_\tau$  is a family of mollifiers satisfying

$$\rho_\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \rho \left( \frac{x}{\sqrt{\tau^{1/d}}} \right), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x) dx = 1, \quad \rho \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \rho \geq 0.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_0, u_\tau^0) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  by [2, Lemma 7.1.10] and that  $\mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(u_0, v_0, w_0)$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the functional defined in Theorem 1.4. Therefore, there exists a  $\tau_* > 0$  such that for  $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) \leq \mathcal{L}(u_0, v_0, w_0) + 1 \quad (2.1)$$

Hereafter, assume  $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$  and it will be understood without stating each time that (2.1) holds. For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , we recursively define  $(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k)$  by

$$\begin{cases} w_\tau^k \in \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \mathcal{G}(w, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}, \\ v_\tau^k \in \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \mathcal{F}(v, w_\tau^k) + \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2\tau} \|v - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right\}, \\ u_\tau^k \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u, u_\tau^{k-1}) \right\}, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\operatorname{argmin}_X \{\dots\}$  denotes the set of minimizers of the functional  $\{\dots\}$  over  $X$ . Note that  $k$  represents a parameter, not an exponent.

**Proposition 2.2.** *For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the triple  $(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k)$  is defined, where  $u_\tau^k \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $(u_\tau^k)^m \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $v_\tau^k \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $w_\tau^k \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k \geq 0$ . Furthermore, they satisfy the following Euler-Lagrange equations:*

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) + \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = 0, \\ \varepsilon_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1}) \zeta dx = \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k) \zeta dx, \\ \varepsilon_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}) \eta dx = \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 \Delta w_\tau^k - \gamma_2 w_\tau^k + u_\tau^{k-1}) \eta dx, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , for all  $\zeta, \eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , where  $p_k \in \Gamma_o(u_\tau^{k-1}, u_\tau^k)$  is the optimal transport plan between  $u_\tau^{k-1}$  and  $u_\tau^k$ , which satisfies

$$\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k/M, u_\tau^{k-1}/M) = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 dp_k(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The remainder of this section provides a proof of Proposition 2.3 by dividing it into several lemmas.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assuming  $u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}, w_\tau^{k-1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the pair  $(v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k)$  is uniquely well-determined as defined in (2.2), with both components being non-negative. Additionally, the second and third equations of (2.3) are satisfied, and  $v_\tau^k$  and  $w_\tau^k$  respectively qualify as elements of  $W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof for  $v_\tau^k$  can be similarly established; therefore, for  $w_\tau^k$ , the proof is provided divided into four parts: existence, uniqueness, non-negativity, and the Euler-Lagrange equations.

**(i) existence of  $w_\tau^k$**

The negative term in  $\mathcal{G}$  is estimated using the Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequalities, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w u_\tau^{k-1} dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (w - w_\tau^{k-1}) u_\tau^{k-1} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_\tau^{k-1} u_\tau^{k-1} dx \\ &\leq \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2} \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_\tau^{k-1} u_\tau^{k-1} dx \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{4\tau} \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_2} \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_\tau^{k-1} u_\tau^{k-1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

From Young's inequality:

$$\|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_{L^2}^2 - \|w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(w, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2 \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{2\tau} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 |\nabla w|^2 + \gamma_2 w^2) dx + \frac{\varepsilon_2 \|w\|_{L^2}^2}{8\tau} \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon_2}{4\tau} \|w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_2} \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_\tau^{k-1} u_\tau^{k-1} dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Hence, the minimizing sequence  $\{w_n\}$  for the left-hand side is bounded in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and we may assume it weakly converges to some  $w_* \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . At this point, we have

$$\mathcal{G}(w_*, u_\tau^{k-1}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(w_n, u_\tau^{k-1}), \quad \|w_* - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2$$

which confirms that  $w_*$  is a minimizer of the left-hand side in (2.4). Therefore, we can define  $w_\tau^k := w_*$ .

**(ii) uniqueness**

The uniqueness of discrete solution follows from the strict convexity of  $w \mapsto \mathcal{G}(w, u_\tau^{k-1})$  and  $w \mapsto \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2$ .

**(iii) non-negativity**

The non-negativity of  $u_\tau^{k-1}$  is clear because  $u_\tau^{k-1}$  belongs to  $M\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)$  for  $k \geq 2$  and  $u_0 \geq 0$ . Consequently, it holds that

$$\mathcal{G}(w_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \geq \mathcal{G}(|w_\tau^k|, u_\tau^{k-1}). \quad (2.5)$$

We prove  $v_\tau^k \geq 0$  by induction in  $k$ . For  $k = 0$ , we have  $w_\tau^0 = w_0 \geq 0$  by the assumption. By the triangle inequality,  $||w_\tau^k| - |w_\tau^{k-1}|| \leq |w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}|$ . Therefore, if  $w_\tau^{k-1} \geq 0$ , then we have

$$||w_\tau^k| - w_\tau^{k-1}||_{L^2} \leq \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Combining (2.5) and (2.6), we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}(w_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \|v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \mathcal{G}(|w_\tau^k|, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \||v_\tau^k| - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since  $w_\tau^k$  is a unique minimizer of the functional

$$w \mapsto \mathcal{G}(w, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \|w - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we have  $|w_\tau^k| = w_\tau^k$ .

#### (iv) Euler-Lagrange equation

For any  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left( \mathcal{G}(w_\tau^k + \varepsilon\eta) + \frac{\varepsilon_2 \|w_\tau^k + \varepsilon\eta - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{2\tau} \right) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0,$$

thus confirming that the third equation of (2.3) holds. From elliptic regularity, we have  $w_\tau^k \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Assume that  $u_\tau^{k-1} \in M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $v_\tau^k \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then,  $u_\tau^k$ , defined in (2.2), is uniquely well-determined and non-negative.*

*Proof.* The proof is provided in two parts: existence and uniqueness.

#### (i) existence of $u_\tau^k$

Since  $\frac{2(d-2)}{d} \leq m \leq 2$ , the conjugate exponent  $m'$  satisfies

$$2 \leq m' \leq \frac{2(d-2)}{d-4}.$$

Furthermore, given  $v_\tau^k \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  embeds into  $L^{m'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the Hölder and Young's inequalities yield

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_\tau^k dx \leq \|u\|_{L^m} \|v_\tau^k\|_{L^{m'}} \leq \frac{1}{m} \|u\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{1}{m'} \|v_\tau^k\|_{L^{m'}}^{m'}.$$

From this, it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u, u_\tau^{k-1}) \geq \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \|u\|_{L^m}^m - \frac{1}{m'} \|v_\tau^k\|_{L^{m'}}^{m'} + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u, u_\tau^{k-1}),$$

and the minimizing sequence  $\{u_n\} \subset M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$  in the left-hand side forms a bounded sequence in  $L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover, for any  $K > 0$ , the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{u_n > K\}} u_n dx &= \int_{\{u_n > K\}} (u_n)^{\frac{m}{2}} (u_n)^{1-\frac{m}{2}} dx \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\{u_n > K\}} u_n^m dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\{u_n > K\}} u_n^{1-(m-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{K^{m-1}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_n^m dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_n dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{\sqrt{M}}{K^{m-1}} \|u_n\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

hence, the sequence  $\{u_n\}$  is equi-integrable. The boundedness of  $\|u_n\|_{L^m}$  and the Dunford-Pettis theorem imply that a subsequence of  $\{u_n\}$ , still denoted by  $\{u_n\}$ , weakly converges to some  $u_* \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Particularly, from  $\|u_n\|_{L^1} = M$ , it follows  $\|u_*\|_{L^1} = M$ . At this point,

$$\mathcal{E}(u_*, v_\tau^k) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(u_n, v_\tau^k)$$

and from [2, Lemma 7.1.4]

$$\mathcal{W}(u_*, u_\tau^{k-1}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(u_n, u_\tau^{k-1}).$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 u_*(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \mathcal{W}(u_*, \delta_0) \leq \mathcal{W}(u_*, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \mathcal{W}(u_\tau^{k-1}, \delta_0) \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}(u_n, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 u_\tau^{k-1}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

hence,  $u_* \in M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Thus,

$$\mathcal{E}(u_*, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}(u_*, u_\tau^{k-1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathcal{E}(u_n, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}(u_n, u_\tau^{k-1}) \right).$$

Therefore,  $u_\tau^k := u_*$  can be defined.

## (ii) uniqueness

It is clear that  $u \mapsto \mathcal{E}(u, v_\tau^k)$  is strictly convex, so we demonstrate that  $u \mapsto \mathcal{W}_2^2(u, u_\tau^{k-1})$  is weakly convex following [32, Proposition A.1]. Let  $p_1 \in \Gamma_o(u_1, u_3)$  and  $p_2 \in \Gamma_o(u_2, u_3)$ . In this case, it is straightforward to verify that  $p_s := (1-s)p_1 + sp_2 \in \Gamma((1-s)u_1 + su_2, u_3)$ . Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2^2((1-s)u_1 + su_2, u_3) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x-y|^2 dp_s \\ &= (1-s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x-y|^2 dp_1 + s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x-y|^2 dp_2 \\ &= (1-s) \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_1, u_3) + s \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_2, u_3) \end{aligned}$$

The convexity demonstrated here implies the uniqueness of  $u_\tau^k$ .  $\square$

To derive the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $u_\tau^k$ , it is important to recall the concept of the push-forward and its properties.

**Definition 2.5** (push-forward [2, §5.2]). *Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Consider a  $\mu$ -measurable map  $\mathbf{t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . If for every  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the equality*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) d\nu(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{t}(x)) d\mu(x)$$

*holds, then  $\nu$  is termed the **push-forward** of  $\mu$  through  $\mathbf{t}$ , denoted by  $\nu = \mathbf{t}_\# \mu$ . Specifically, if  $\mu = \rho_1 \mathcal{L}^d$  and  $\nu = \rho_2 \mathcal{L}^d$  with  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , the same notation remains consistent provided that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) \rho_2(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{t}(x)) \rho_1(x) dx$$

*for every  $f \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

If  $\nu = \mathbf{t}_\# \mu$  with  $d\mu = u d\mathcal{L}^d$  and  $d\nu = v d\mathcal{L}^d$ , then one can deduce from change of variables that

$$v(\mathbf{t}(x)) |\det(D\mathbf{t}(x))| = u(x) \tag{2.7}$$

holds for almost every  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . If  $v_n$  converges to  $v$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then for  $\delta > 0$  small enough and for every  $t \in [0, \delta]$ ,  $v_n(\mathbf{id} + t\boldsymbol{\xi})$  converges to  $v(\mathbf{id} + t\boldsymbol{\xi})$  in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . In addition, it holds that*

$$\|v_n(\mathbf{id} + t\boldsymbol{\xi}) - v(\mathbf{id} + t\boldsymbol{\xi})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_\delta \|v_n - v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \text{ for all } t \in [0, \delta],$$

*where  $C_\delta$  is a positive constant depending on  $\delta$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{r}_t(x) := x + t\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)$ . Note that for  $\delta$  small enough,  $\mathbf{r}_t$  is a  $C^1$  diffeomorphism and  $\det D\mathbf{r}_t > 0$  in  $t \in [0, \delta]$  since  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . By the change of variables  $y = \mathbf{r}_t(x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v_n(\mathbf{r}_t(x)) - v(\mathbf{r}_t(x))|^p dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v_n(y) - v(y)|^p \det(D\mathbf{r}_t^{-1}(y)) dy \\ &\leq \sup_{(y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,\delta]} \left( \det(D\mathbf{r}_t^{-1}(y)) \right) \|v_n - v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^p. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

With these preparations in place, the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $u_\tau^k$  are derived.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let the pair  $(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k)$  be a solution of (2.2). Then, the first equation in (2.3) holds.*

*Proof.* The proof is provided in four steps.

**Step 1 : Gâteaux derivative of the internal energy**

Define  $U_s := (\mathbf{id} + s\boldsymbol{\xi})_{\#} u_{\tau}^k$ . Then, from the relation (2.7), we have

$$U_s(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)) |\det(\mathbf{id} + sD\boldsymbol{\xi}(x))| = u_{\tau}^k(x).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_s^m - (u_{\tau}^k)^m dx &= \frac{1}{s} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_s^{m-1} (\mathbf{id} + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)) u_{\tau}^k(x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_{\tau}^k)^m dx \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\det(\mathbf{id} + sD\boldsymbol{\xi}(x))|^{1-m} - 1}{s} (u_{\tau}^k)^m dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(|\det(\mathbf{id} + sD\boldsymbol{\xi}(x))|^{1-m} - 1)/s$  uniformly converges to  $(1-m) \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi}$  because of the uniform boundedness of  $D\boldsymbol{\xi}$ , we obtain

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{U_s^m - (u_{\tau}^k)^m}{s} dx = (1-m) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_{\tau}^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} dx.$$

**Step 2 : Gâteaux derivative of the potential energy**

Let  $\{v_n\} \subset C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be a sequence converging to  $v$  in  $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Define

$$I_n(s) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_s v_n dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_n(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)) u(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad I(s) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_s v dx.$$

Then,  $I_n(s)$  converges uniformly to  $I(s)$  in a small interval  $[0, \delta]$ , and  $I_n(s)$  is differentiable with

$$I_n'(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_n(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)), \boldsymbol{\xi}(x) \rangle u(x) dx.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)) - \nabla v_n(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)), \boldsymbol{\xi}(x) \rangle u(x) dx \right| \\ & \leq \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^{\infty}} \|u\|_{L^m} \left( \int_{\operatorname{spt} \boldsymbol{\xi}} |\nabla v(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x)) - \nabla v_n(x + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(x))|^{m'} dx \right)^{1/m'}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6, the right-hand side converges uniformly to 0 in  $[0, \delta]$ . Hence,  $I(s)$  is differentiable at  $s = 0$ , and we have

$$I'(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v(x), \boldsymbol{\xi}(x) \rangle u(x) dx.$$

**Step 3 : the right Gâteaux derivative of the Wasserstein distance**

Let  $p_k \in \Gamma_o(u_{\tau}^{k-1}/M, u_{\tau}^k/M)$ . Define  $p_s \in \Gamma(U_s/M, u_{\tau}^k/M)$  by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f(x, y) dp_s(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f(x, y + s\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)) dp_k(x, y)$$

for any  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then by definition of the Wasserstein distance,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(U_s, u_\tau^k) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 M dp_s(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y - s \boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 M dp_k(x, y).$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_s, u_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (|x - y - s \boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 - |x - y|^2) M dp_k(x, y) \\ &\leq -2s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle x - y, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) + s^2 M \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by  $s > 0$  and passing to the limit as  $s \downarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\limsup_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(U_s, u_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{s} \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y).$$

#### Step 4 : Euler-Lagrange equations

Given the minimality of  $u_\tau^k$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}(U_s, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_s, u_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \geq 0$$

Dividing both sides by  $s > 0$  and taking the limit as  $s \downarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k dx \geq 0$$

By considering  $-\boldsymbol{\xi}$  instead of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k dx = 0.$$

Below, we demonstrate that  $\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k dx \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |y - x|^2 M dp_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 M dp_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 u_\tau^k dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

so, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} dx \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k dx \right| + \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_\tau^k |\nabla v_\tau^k| dx + \sqrt{M} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the Hahn-Banach theorem and the Riesz-Markov representation theorem, there exists an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued measure  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^k = (\mu_1^k, \mu_2^k, \dots, \mu_d^k)$  such that

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} \, dx = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_j \, d\mu_j^k,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_d)$ . Building on this result, we revisit the aforementioned inequality:

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_j \, d\mu_j^k, -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k \, dx \right| \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 u_\tau^k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and apply the Riesz representation theorem to find:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_j \, d\mu_j^k, -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle R_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k \, dx, \\ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |R_\tau^k|^2 u_\tau^k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau}, \end{cases}$$

confirming the existence of an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function  $R_\tau^k$ . Summarizing the above, we can express the equation as:

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k)^m \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} \, dx = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \xi_j \, d\mu_j^k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle u_\tau^k R_k + u^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \, dx.$$

From the fact that  $u_\tau^k R_k + u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , it follows that  $\nabla u_\tau^k \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^k = \nabla u_\tau^k \mathcal{L}^d$ . Consequently, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \, dx = 0.$$

□

The following lemma is an estimation formula associated with the minimizing movement scheme and can be proven in an abstract setting. In this paper, it can be directly derived from the Euler-Lagrange equations (2.3).

**Lemma 2.8** (slope estimate [2, Lemma 3.1.3]). *Let the pair  $(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k)$  be a solution of (2.2). Then, the following estimate holds.*

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla (u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau}. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.* From the first equation in (2.3) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \boldsymbol{\xi}(y) \rangle M dp_k \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 M dp_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 M dp_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}(y)|^2 u_\tau^k(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the Riesz representation theorem, there exists a function  $R_\tau^k$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; u_\tau^k \mathcal{L}^d)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle R_\tau^k, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle u_\tau^k dx, \\ \|R_\tau^k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; u_\tau^k \mathcal{L}^d)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau}. \end{cases}$$

This confirms that the specified inequality is valid.  $\square$

By setting  $u_\tau^0 := \rho_\tau * u_0$ , we can ensure that  $u_\tau^0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  even if  $u_0 \notin L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . This regularity is then transferred to  $w_\tau^1 \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $v_\tau^1 \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  through the second and third equations of (2.3) and elliptic estimates. To maintain this chain of regularity, we hope to obtain  $u_\tau^1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  from (2.3) and  $v_\tau^1 \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The following lemma demonstrates that this expectation is indeed realized.

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $u_\tau^k$  be a solution of the minimizing problem (2.2). Then  $u_\tau^k \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* Initially, we establish that  $u_\tau^k \in L^{\frac{md}{d-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the slope estimate (2.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k| dx &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_\tau^k dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{M} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Euler-Lagrange equations (2.3) and elliptic estimates, we conclude that  $u_\tau^{k-1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  implies  $w_\tau^k \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , which in turn ensures  $v_\tau^k \in W^{4,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . So, it follows from the Sobolev inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k| dx &\leq \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}} \|\nabla v_\tau^k\|_{\frac{2d}{d-4}} \\ &\leq C_{3,2} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}} \|v_\tau^k\|_{W^{3,2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $m \geq 2 - 4/d > 2d/(d+4)$  we have

$$\|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^1} \leq \sqrt{M} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + \|u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^1} < \infty.$$

Consequently, by the Sobolev inequality we obtain

$$\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{md}{d-1}}}^m = \|(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq C_{1,1} \|(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{W^{1,1}} < \infty.$$

Therefore, we have  $u_\tau^k \in L^{\frac{md}{d-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Note that since  $d > 4$ ,

$$\frac{md}{d-1} \geq \frac{2(d-2)}{d} \cdot \frac{d}{d-1} = \frac{2(d-2)}{d-1} > \frac{2d}{d+2}$$

holds.

Next, let us suppose that  $u_\tau^k \in (L^1 \cap L^q)(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $2d/(d+2) < q < 2$ . Let  $p = qd/2(d-q)$ . Then we have  $1 < p < q$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Hölder's inequality, for any  $\xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \xi \rangle dx &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^2 u_\tau^k dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\xi\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

By duality and the slope estimate (2.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}} &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Since  $2p/(p+1) = 2qd/\{2d+q(d-2)\} < d/(d-1)$ , the Sobolev inequality with  $C_{1, \frac{2qd}{2d+q(d-2)}}$  and the inequality (2.9) and Hölder's inequality lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{2qd}{2d+q(d-4)}}} &\leq C_{1, \frac{2qd}{2d+q(d-2)}} \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{2qd}{2d+q(d-2)}}} \\ &\leq C_{1, \frac{2qd}{2d+q(d-2)}} \left( \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^q} \|\nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $u_\tau^k \in L^{\frac{2mqd}{2d+q(d-4)}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  since  $u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Consequently, we see that

$$\frac{2d}{d+2} < q < 2 \text{ and } u_\tau^k \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \implies u_\tau^k \in L^{\frac{2mqd}{2d+d(d-4)}}$$

Now, let us define

$$\begin{cases} q_1 := \frac{md}{d-1} > \frac{2d}{d+2}, \\ q_{j+1} := \frac{2mq_j d}{2d+q_j(d-4)}. \end{cases}$$

Since if  $q_j < 2$  and  $q_j < 2(m-1)d/(d-4)$  we have  $u_\tau^k \in L^{q_{j+1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $q_{j+1} > q_j$ , we see that  $u_\tau^k \in L^{\min\{2, \frac{2(m-1)d}{d-4}\}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . When  $m \geq 2 - 4/d$  we have  $2(m-1)d/(d-4) \geq 2$ . Therefore,  $u_\tau^k \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .  $\square$

In this paper, we initially derived the Euler-Lagrange equations for each unknown function and subsequently obtained the regularity of the discrete solutions. Conversely, as seen in [25, 11, 9, 23], there is also an approach where the regularity of the discrete solutions is discussed before deriving the Euler-Lagrange equations. Knowing the sufficient regularity of discrete solutions in advance can facilitate the derivation of the Euler-Lagrange equations. Therefore, it is advisable to select the method according to the problem at hand.

### 3 Lyapunov functional for discrete solutions

In this section, we derive the Lyapunov functional for problem (1.1) using the variational properties of discrete solutions and the Euler-Lagrange equations. For convenience, we introduce the following two operators for the discrete solution  $z_\tau^k \in \{v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k\}$ .

$$\partial_t z_\tau^k := \frac{z_\tau^k - z_\tau^{k-1}}{\tau}, \quad \bar{\partial}_t z_\tau^k := \frac{z_\tau^k + z_\tau^{k-1}}{\tau}. \quad (3.1)$$

From the definitions, it is clear that these operators are linear, and the following relations hold:

$$\begin{cases} z_\tau^k = \frac{\tau}{2}(\partial_t + \bar{\partial}_t)z_\tau^k, & z_\tau^{k-1} = \frac{\tau}{2}(\bar{\partial}_t - \partial_t)z_\tau^k, \\ \langle \partial_t z_\tau^k, \bar{\partial}_t z_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} = \frac{\|z_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 - \|z_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{\tau^2}, \\ \nabla \partial_t z_\tau^k = \partial_t \nabla z_\tau^k, & \nabla \bar{\partial}_t z_\tau^k = \bar{\partial}_t \nabla z_\tau^k, & \Delta \partial_t z_\tau^k = \partial_t \Delta z_\tau^k, & \Delta \bar{\partial}_t z_\tau^k = \bar{\partial}_t \Delta z_\tau^k. \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k)$  be a solution in (2.2) and  $\mathcal{L}$  be the functional defined in 1.6. Then, for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^N \mathcal{D}_\tau^k \leq \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^N, v_\tau^N, w_\tau^N),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\tau^k &:= \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \tau^2}{2} \|\partial_t^2 v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \tau^2}{2} \|\partial_t \Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \left[ \frac{2(\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1)}{\tau} + (\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1) \right] \|\partial_t \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau^2}{2} \left[ \frac{2(\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1)}{\tau} + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \right] \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By definition of  $u_\tau^k$ , the following inequality holds:

$$\mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \leq \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^{k-1}, u_\tau^{k-1}).$$

Considering that  $u_\tau^{k-1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) &\leq \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^k) - \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) \\ &= \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) - \langle u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1} \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) - \tau \langle u_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Let us rewrite the last term on the right-hand side using the Euler-Lagrange equations (2.3). The second and third equations in (2.3) can be expressed using the operator (3.1) as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} w_\tau^k &= (\varepsilon_1 \partial_t - \kappa_1 \Delta + \gamma_1) v_\tau^k, \\ u_\tau^{k-1} &= (\varepsilon_2 \partial_t - \kappa_2 \Delta + \gamma_2) w_\tau^k \\ &= (\varepsilon_2 \partial_t - \kappa_2 \Delta + \gamma_2) (\varepsilon_1 \partial_t - \kappa_1 \Delta + \gamma_1) v_\tau^k \\ &= \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \partial_t^2 v_\tau^k - \{ \varepsilon_1 (\kappa_2 \Delta - \gamma_2) + \varepsilon_2 (\kappa_1 \Delta - \gamma_1) \} \partial_t v_\tau^k \\ &\quad + (\kappa_1 \Delta - \gamma_1) (\kappa_2 \Delta - \gamma_2) v_\tau^k. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (3.3)$$

Define  $v_\tau^{-1}$  as follows:

$$v_\tau^{-1} := v_\tau^0 - \tau \left( \frac{\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^0 - \gamma_1 v_\tau^0 + w_\tau^0}{\varepsilon_1} \right)$$

This definition allows us to assume that (3.3) holds for  $k \geq 1$ . Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_\tau^{k-1}, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} &= \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \langle \partial_t^2 v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} - \langle (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \Delta - \gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 - \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1 \rangle \partial_t v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \langle (\kappa_1 \Delta - \gamma_1) (\kappa_2 \Delta - \gamma_2) v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \langle \partial_t^2 v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{\tau}{2} \langle \partial_t^2 v_\tau^k, (\partial_t + \bar{\partial}_t) \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} = \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{\tau}{2} \|\partial_t^2 v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{\|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\partial_t v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{2\tau}, \\ I_2 &:= -\langle (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \Delta - \gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 - \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1 \rangle \partial_t v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= -(\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \langle \Delta \partial_t v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1) \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \|\nabla \partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1) \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2, \\ I_3 &:= \langle (\kappa_1 \Delta - \gamma_1) (\kappa_2 \Delta - \gamma_2) v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} = \langle (\kappa_1 \Delta - \gamma_1) v_\tau^k, (\kappa_2 \Delta - \gamma_2) \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \frac{\tau}{2} \langle (\partial_t + \bar{\partial}_t) \Delta v_\tau^k, \partial_t \Delta v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{\tau (\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1)}{2} \langle (\partial_t + \bar{\partial}_t) \nabla v_\tau^k, \partial_t \nabla v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tau}{2} \langle (\partial_t + \bar{\partial}_t) v_\tau^k, \partial_t v_\tau^k \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \frac{\tau}{2} \|\partial_t \Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \frac{\|\Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\Delta v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{2\tau} \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau (\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1)}{2} \|\partial_t \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{(\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1)}{2\tau} \{ \|\nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 - \|\nabla v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \} \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tau}{2} \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}{2\tau} \{ \|v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, it can be observed that the right-hand side of (3.2) can be divided into two parts: the norm values of the terms parameterized by  $k$ , and the differences in the norm values of the terms parameterized by  $k$  and  $k - 1$ . The former is denoted as  $\mathcal{D}_\tau^k$ , and the latter is denoted as  $\mathcal{L}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}, w_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k)$ . Then, we can see that the following inequality holds.

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \mathcal{D}_\tau^k \leq \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}, w_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k).$$

By summing both sides from  $k = 1$  to  $N$ , we obtain the desired inequality.  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* As demonstrated in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the derivation of  $\mathcal{L}$  does not utilize the properties of the first term of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Consequently, if  $\mathcal{E}$  takes the form

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \mathcal{E}_0(u) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv \, dx,$$

a similar derivation is possible. Notably, it is not necessary for  $u$  to be a gradient flow in the Wasserstein space. Therefore, by replacing  $\mathcal{E}_0$  or considering the gradient  $\nabla_u$  as a gradient in a space other than the Wasserstein space, it is possible to consider a chimera gradient flow endowed with  $\mathcal{L}$  as a Lyapunov functional different from (1.1).

## 4 Lower bounds of $\mathcal{L}$

In this section, we examine the lower boundedness of  $\mathcal{L}$  on

$$X_M := \{(u, v, w) \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid u, v, w \geq 0, \|u\|_{L^1} = M\}, \quad (4.1)$$

and investigate its coercivity, expressed by the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(u, v, w) &\geq \alpha \|u\|_{L^m}^m + \beta \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1}{2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}{2} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \|\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w\|_{L^2}^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

for some positive constants  $\alpha, \beta$ , and for all elements  $(u, v, w) \in X_M$ . By carefully estimating the lower bound of the negative term in  $\mathcal{L}$ , we derive the following propositions.

**Proposition 4.1** (lower bounds of  $\mathcal{L}$  in subcritical case). *Assume  $m > 2 - \frac{4}{d}$  and  $M > 0$ . Then, the functional  $\mathcal{L}$  is bounded from below on  $X_M$  and satisfies (4.2).*

**Proposition 4.2** (lower bounds of  $\mathcal{L}$  in critical case). *Assume  $m = 2 - \frac{4}{d}$  and  $M > 0$ . Then, the functional  $\mathcal{L}$  is bounded from below on  $X_M$  if and only if  $M \leq M_*$ , where  $M_*$  is defined in (1.4). In particular, when  $M < M_*$ , (4.2) holds.*

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* When  $u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $v \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the negative term of  $\mathcal{L}$  can be estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv \, dx &\leq \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-4}}} \quad (\text{H\"older's inequality}) \\
&\leq \|u\|_{L^1}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L^m}^\theta \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-4}}} \quad (\text{The interpolation inequality}) \\
&\leq C_1 \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}} \|\nabla v\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \quad (\text{The Sobolev inequality}) \\
&\leq C_1 C_2 \|u\|_{L^1}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L^m}^\theta \|D^2 v\|_{L^2} \quad (\text{The Sobolev embedding theorem}) \\
&\leq C_1 C_2 C_3 \|u\|_{L^1}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L^m}^\theta \|\Delta v\|_{L^2} \quad (\text{Corollary 9.10 in [16]}) \\
&\leq \frac{(C_1 C_2 C_3)^2}{2\kappa_1 \kappa_2} \|u\|_{L^1}^{2(1-\theta)} \|u\|_{L^m}^{2\theta} + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (\text{Young's inequality})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{m(d-4)}{2d(m-1)}, \quad 1-\theta = \frac{4m - (2-m)d}{2d(m-1)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Consequently, the functional  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(u, v, w) \geq \frac{1}{m-1} \|u\|_{L^m}^m - \frac{(C_1 C_2 C_3)^2}{2\kappa_1 \kappa_2} \|u\|_{L^1}^{2(1-\theta)} \|u\|_{L^m}^{2\theta}.$$

From this, it follows that when  $m > 2\theta$ , i.e.,

$$m > 2 - \frac{4}{d},$$

$\mathcal{L}$  is bounded below regardless of the value of  $\|u\|_{L^1}$  and (4.2) holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* The proof is divided into three parts.

**(i) lower bounds and coercivity**

To obtain a better, lossless estimate in (4.3), we define

$$\tilde{C}_* := \sup_{(u,v) \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv \, dx}{\|u\|_{L^1}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{L^m}^\theta \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}}, \tag{4.5}$$

where  $\dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is the closure of compactly supported smooth functions in the seminorm  $\|\Delta \cdot\|_{L^2}$  and  $\theta$  is given by (4.4). From the definition of  $\tilde{C}_*$  and Young's inequality, for any  $\delta$  such that  $0 \leq \delta < \kappa_1 \kappa_2$ , the following inequality holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv \, dx \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_*^2}{2(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 - \delta)} M^{\frac{4}{d}} \|u\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 - \delta}{2} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^m dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta v|^2 dx \\
& \geq \left( \frac{1}{m-1} - \frac{\tilde{C}_*^2}{2(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 - \delta)} M^{\frac{4}{d}} \right) \|u\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& = \frac{\tilde{C}_*^2}{2(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 - \delta)} \left( \frac{2d}{d-4} \frac{(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 - \delta)}{\tilde{C}_*^2} - M^{\frac{4}{d}} \right) \|u\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\delta = 0$  shows that the right-hand side is lower bounded when  $M \leq \left( \frac{2d}{d-4} \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{\tilde{C}_*^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{4}}$ , and as shown in the next,  $\tilde{C}_*^2 = C_*^2$ , defined in (1.5), holds, indicating that this implies  $M \leq M_*$ . When  $M < M_*$ , since the coefficient of  $\|u\|_{L^m}^m$  can be made positive by appropriately choosing  $\delta$ , (4.2) holds.

(ii)  $\tilde{C}_*^2 = C_*^2$

By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{C}_*^2 &= \sup_{(u,v) \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx \right)^2}{\|u\|_{L^1}^{2(1-\theta)} \|u\|_{L^m}^{2\theta} \|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2} \\
&= \sup_{u \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{1}{\|u\|_{L^1}^{2(1-\theta)} \|u\|_{L^m}^{2\theta}} \left( \inf_{v \in \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx \right)^2} \right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$A_u(v) := \frac{\|\Delta v\|_{L^2}^2}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx \right)^2},$$

which is bounded below, and let  $\{v_n\}$  be a minimizing sequence for  $A_u$ . Since  $\{v_n / \|\Delta v_n\|_{L^2}\}$  is also a minimizing sequence,  $\{v_n / \|\Delta v_n\|_{L^2}\}$  forms a bounded sequence in  $\dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d-4}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Thus, we can extract a subsequence  $\{v_{n(j)}\}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta v_{n(j)} &\rightharpoonup \Delta v_* \text{ weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \\
v_{n(j)} &\rightharpoonup v_* \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{2d}{d-4}}(\mathbb{R}^d).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $u \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^{\frac{2d}{d+4}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the dual space of  $L^{\frac{2d}{d-4}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_{n(j)} dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_* dx \quad (j \rightarrow \infty).$$

Moreover,

$$\|\Delta v_*\| \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta v_{n(j)}\|_{L^2}$$

implies that

$$A_u(v_*) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} A_u(v_{n(j)})$$

confirming the existence of a minimizer  $v_*$ . For any  $\varphi \in \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the following holds

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left[ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(v_* + \varepsilon\varphi) dx \right)^2 A_u(v_* + \varepsilon\varphi) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \|\Delta v_* + \varepsilon\Delta\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}$$

yielding

$$A_u(v_*) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_* dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta v_* \Delta\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi (-\Delta)^2 v_* dx,$$

that is,

$$\left( A_u(v_*) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_* dx \right) u = (-\Delta)^2 v_*. \quad (4.6)$$

Continuing from the earlier equations, by solving for  $v_*$  using  $(-\Delta)^{-2}$  and then multiplying both sides by  $u$  and integrating, we derive that

$$\frac{1}{A_u(v_*)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(-\Delta)^{-2}u dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{K}(x-z)\mathcal{K}(z-y)u(x)u(y) dx dy dz$$

where,  $\mathcal{K}$  is the fundamental solution of  $-\Delta$ , given by

$$\mathcal{K}(x) = \frac{1}{(d-2)\omega_d|x|^{d-2}},$$

and  $\omega_d := 2\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2)$  is the surface area of the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Therefore  $\tilde{C}_*^2 = C_*^2$ .

### (iii) unboundedness of $\mathcal{L}$ from below

From the analysis provided, we obtain an expression for  $C_*$  given by

$$C_* = \sup_{u \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv_* dx}{\|u\|_{L^1}^{\frac{2}{d}} \|u\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m}{2}} \|\Delta v_*\|_{L^2}},$$

where  $v_*$  is defined as specified in equation (4.6). Therefore, for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a pair  $(U_*, V_*) \in (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_* V_* dx &> (C_* - \delta) M^{\frac{2}{d}} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m}{2}} \|\Delta V_*\|_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{\sqrt{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}} (C_* - \delta) M^{\frac{2}{d}} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \|\Delta V_*\|_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2\kappa_1 \kappa_2} (C_* - \delta)^2 M^{\frac{4}{d}} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2\alpha} \|\Delta V_*\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(U_*, V_*)$  satisfies

$$\frac{\|\Delta V_*\|_{L^2}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_* V_* dx} U_* = (-\Delta)^2 V_*. \quad (4.7)$$

and we set

$$\alpha := \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \|\Delta V_*\|_{L^2}}{C_* M^{\frac{2}{d}} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m}{2}}}$$

to utilize the equality condition of Young's inequality. So, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_* \left( \frac{V_*}{\alpha} \right) dx > \frac{(C_* - \delta)^2 M^{\frac{4}{d}}}{2\kappa_1 \kappa_2} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^m + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2} \left\| \Delta \left( \frac{V_*}{\alpha} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Define the functional  $\mathcal{L}_0$  by

$$\mathcal{L}_0(u, v, w) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u^m}{m-1} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uv dx + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta v|^2 dx + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta v + w|^2 dx.$$

Then, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}_0(U_*, \alpha^{-1} V_*, -\kappa_1 \alpha^{-1} \Delta V_*) < \left( \frac{d}{d-4} - \frac{(C_* - \delta)^2 M^{\frac{4}{d}}}{2\kappa_1 \kappa_2} \right) \|U_*\|_{L^m}^m.$$

When  $M > M_*$ , we can choose  $\delta$  such that the right-hand side becomes negative. Particularly, since we may assume  $U_*, V_* \geq 0$ , it follows from the relation (4.7) that  $-\kappa_1 \alpha^{-1} \Delta V_* \geq 0$ . Now, define

$$(U_\lambda(x), V_\lambda(x), W_\lambda(x)) := (\lambda^d U_*(\lambda x), \lambda^{d-4} \alpha^{-1} V_*(\lambda x), -\lambda^{d-2} \kappa_1 \alpha^{-1} \Delta V_*(\lambda x)).$$

Then, we can check the following.

$$\begin{cases} \|U_\lambda\|_{L^1} = \|U_*\|_{L^1}, \\ \|U_\lambda\|_{L^m}^m = \lambda^{d-4} \|U_*\|_{L^m}^m, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \|V_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 = \lambda^{d-8} \|\alpha^{-1} V_*\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \|\nabla V_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 = \lambda^{d-6} \|\alpha^{-1} \nabla V_*\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \|\Delta V_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 = \lambda^{d-4} \|\alpha^{-1} \Delta V_*\|_{L^2}^2, \end{cases} \quad \|W_\lambda\|_{L^2}^2 = \lambda^{d-4} \|\kappa_1 \alpha^{-1} \Delta V_*\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_0(U_\lambda(x), V_\lambda(x), W_\lambda(x)) = \lambda^{d-4} \mathcal{L}_0(U_*, \alpha^{-1} V_*, -\kappa_1 \alpha^{-1} \Delta V_*) \rightarrow -\infty \quad (\lambda \rightarrow \infty),$$

from which

$$\mathcal{L}(U_\lambda(x), V_\lambda(x), W_\lambda(x)) \rightarrow -\infty \quad (\lambda \rightarrow \infty).$$

follows. □

## 5 Uniform bounds

In this section, we introduce the piecewise constant interpolation of discrete solutions and derive uniform estimates for them. These uniform estimates play a crucial role in leading to the weak compactness of the discrete solutions.

**Definition 5.1** (piecewise constant interpolation of discrete solutions). *We define the piecewise constant interpolation of discrete solutions by*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_\tau(t) := u_\tau^k, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \\ \bar{v}_\tau(t) := v_\tau^k, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \\ \bar{w}_\tau(t) := w_\tau^k, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau]. \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \underline{u}_\tau(t) := u_\tau^{k-1}, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \\ \underline{v}_\tau(t) := v_\tau^{k-1}, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \\ \underline{w}_\tau(t) := w_\tau^{k-1}, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau]. \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 5.2** (uniform bounds). *Assume (1.3) and*

$$m > 2 - \frac{4}{d} \text{ or } \left( m = 2 - \frac{4}{d} \text{ and } M < M_* \right). \quad (5.1)$$

*Then, for any  $T > 0$  and for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{t \in [0, T] \\ \tau \in (0, \tau_*)}} \left\{ \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^m}^m, \|\bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{W^{2,2}}^2, \|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{H^1}^2, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \bar{u}_\tau(t) dx \right\} < \infty, \\ & \sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \left( \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}_\tau^m(t)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{p_*} + \|\bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{W^{3,2}}^2 + \|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 \right) dt < \infty, \\ & \sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau}, \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\|v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2}{\tau}, \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{\tau} \right\} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p_* := \begin{cases} \frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}, & \text{if } m < 2, \\ 2, & \text{if } m \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

*Remark 5.1.* When  $d \geq 5$ ,  $p_* > 1$ , and further, when  $d \geq 7$ ,  $p_* \geq 2$ .

In the following, we will prove Proposition 5.2 by dividing it into several lemmas.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Assume (5.1). then, for any  $T > 0$  and for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\tau N \leq T$  the following inequality holds.*

$$\frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \sum_{k=1}^N \|v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq T \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0).$$

*Proof.* According to Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, and based on (4.2), we establish that

$$\frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} \|\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \varepsilon_1 \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k).$$

Furthermore, employing (2.3) and Proposition 3.1, we deduce that

$$\frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} \|\varepsilon_1 \partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} \|\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \varepsilon_1 \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k) \leq \varepsilon_1 L(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0).$$

Thus, by multiplying both sides by  $\tau$  and summing over  $k$  from 1 to  $N$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\varepsilon_1^2 \varepsilon_2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \tau \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \varepsilon_1 \sum_{k=1}^N \tau L(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) \leq \varepsilon_1 T \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0).$$

□

The following lemma follows immediately from Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 5.3.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Assume (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  and for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\tau N \leq T$  the following inequality holds.*

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \left( \sum_{k=1}^N \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^N d_{H^1}^2(v_\tau^k, v_\tau^{k-1}) \right) \leq (T+1) \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0),$$

where

$$d_{H^1}^2(v_\tau^k, v_\tau^{k-1}) := (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \|\nabla(v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1})\|_{L^2}^2 + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2) \|v_\tau^k - v_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Lemma 5.4 ensures the uniform boundedness of the second moment of  $\bar{u}_\tau$  and  $H^1$ -norm of  $\bar{v}_\tau(t)$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Assume (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  and for any  $t \in [0, T]$  the following inequality holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \bar{u}_\tau(t) dx + (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \|\nabla \bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2) \|\bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq 4T(T+1) \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) \\ & \quad + 2 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \bar{u}_0(t) dx + (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \|\nabla v_0\|_{L^2}^2 + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2) \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $z_\tau^k := (u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k)$ ,  $z_* := (\delta_0, 0)$ , and define  $d_{WH^1} := \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_2^2 + d_{H^1}^2}$ . Using the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any  $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{WH^1}^2(z_\tau^\ell, z_*) & \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} d_{WH^1}(z_\tau^k, z_\tau^{k-1}) + d_{WH^1}(z_\tau^0, z_*) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{d_{WH^1}^2(z_\tau^k, z_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + d_{WH^1}(z_\tau^0, z_*) \right)^2 \\ & \leq 4T \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{d_{WH^1}^2(z_\tau^k, z_\tau^{k-1})}{2\tau} + 2d_{WH^1}^2(z_\tau^0, z_*). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the claim substantiated by Lemma 5.4. □

The following lemma follows immediately from (4.2) and Lemma 5.5.

**Lemma 5.6.** *Assume (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  there exists a constant  $C_T$  such that for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^m}^m + \|\Delta \bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & + \frac{\kappa_2(\gamma_1 + \varepsilon_1) + \kappa_1(\varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2)}{2} \|\nabla \bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2 + \varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2}{2} \|\bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 < C_T. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it is evident that the first inequality of Proposition 5.2 holds, except for the estimate of  $\|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{H^1}$ . To demonstrate the remaining inequalities, we begin with the proof of the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt < \infty.$$

**Corollary 5.8.** *Assume that  $m = 2 - 4/d$  and  $M < M_*$ . If  $d \geq 6$ , then, for any  $T > 0$  it holds that*

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt < \infty.$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.7.* It is clear from Lemma 5.5 when  $m \geq 2$ , so consider  $1 < m < 2$ . Letting  $p = \frac{d}{d-2}$  in (2.9), we obtain

$$\|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}. \quad (5.3)$$

First, we show that the left-hand side can be lower bounded by a constant multiple of  $\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m}{d(2-m)}}$ . By the Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{md}{d-2}}}^m = \|(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} \leq C_1 \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}.$$

Since  $md/(d-2) \geq 2$ , by the interpolation inequality, we obtain

$$\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^m}^{\frac{4-(2-m)d}{4}} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{md}{d-2}}}^{\frac{(2-m)d}{4}} \leq C_2 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{md}{d-2}}}^{\frac{(2-m)d}{4}},$$

where  $C_2$  is a constant determined by Lemma 5.6. Consequently, we obtain

$$C_3 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m}{d(2-m)}} \leq \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}.$$

Next, consider estimating the norm appearing on the right-hand side of equation (5.3) from above using  $\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}$ . By the interpolation inequality and Lemma 5.6, there exists a constant  $C_4$  such that

$$\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}} \leq \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^m}^{\frac{m(d-4)}{d(2-m)}} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \leq C_4 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev inequality with the Sobolev constant  $C_{2,2}$  we have

$$\|u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \leq C_{2,2} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \|\Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \leq C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}, \quad (5.4)$$

where we have used Lemma 5.6 to determine the positive constant  $C_5$ . Hence we have

$$C_3 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m}{d(2-m)}} \leq \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq C_4 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)}} + C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}, \quad (5.5)$$

Since

$$m \geq 2 - \frac{4}{d} \geq \frac{2d}{d+4} \iff \frac{4m}{d(2-m)} > 1, \quad \frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)} < 1 \iff m < \frac{d}{2}, \quad (5.6)$$

we obtain

$$C_3 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m}{d(2-m)} - \frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)}} \leq C_4 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{1 - \frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)}}.$$

After squaring both sides and rearranging the exponents, we have

$$C_3^2 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \leq 2C_4^2 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau^2} + 2C_5^2 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}}.$$

For  $p = \frac{2m+(m-1)d}{d-2m}$  and its conjugate exponent  $p' = \frac{2m+(m-1)}{m(d+4)-2d}$ , by Young's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2C_5^2 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}} &= 2C_5^2 \left(\frac{C_3^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{C_3^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p'} (2C_5^2)^{p'} \left(\frac{C_3^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{p'}{p}} + \frac{C_3^2}{2} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}} \\ &= C_6 + \frac{C_3^2}{2} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\frac{C_3^2}{2} \tau \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \leq 2C_4^2 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + C_6 \tau. \quad (5.7)$$

$$\lceil T/\tau \rceil - 1 < \frac{T}{\tau} \leq \lceil T/\tau \rceil$$

Using the ceiling function  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  and summing over  $k = 1$  to  $\lceil T/\tau \rceil$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_3^2}{2} \int_0^T \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} dt &\leq \frac{C_3^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \\ &< 2C_4^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + C_6(T + \tau_*). \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is bounded independently of  $\tau$  as per Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.9.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  the following inequality holds.*

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \|\nabla \bar{u}_\tau^m(t)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{p_*} dt < \infty,$$

where  $p_*$  is specified in (5.2)

*Proof.* The proof is divided into two cases:  $1 < m < 2$  and  $m \geq 2$ .

**(i) the case  $1 < m < 2$**

Let  $p = \frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}$ . According to (5.6), we have  $p < 2$ . From (5.5), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} &\leq C_4 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m-2(m-1)d}{2d(2-m)}} + C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \\ &= C_4 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p}{2}} + C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{2-p}} + (C_4^{\frac{2}{p}} + C_5) \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Raising both sides to the power of  $2-p = \frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)} > 1$ , we get

$$\|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{2-p} \leq 2^{1-p} \left[ \left( \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \right)^2 + (C_4^{\frac{2}{p}} + C_5)^{2-p} \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{2-p} \right].$$

By considering  $\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)} \geq 2-p$  and Young's inequality  $\|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{2-p} \leq \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} + 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|\nabla(\bar{u}_\tau(t))^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}} dt &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{\frac{2(d-2m)}{d(2-m)}} \\ &\leq 2^{1-p} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + 2^{1-p} (C_4^{\frac{2}{p}} + C_5)^{2-p} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \\ &\quad + 2^{1-p} (C_4^{\frac{2}{p}} + C_5)^{2-p} (T + \tau_*). \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemmas 5.4 and 5.7, the right-hand side is bounded independently of  $\tau$ .

**(ii) the case  $m \geq 2$**

The interpolation inequality yields that

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|u\|_{L^1}^{\frac{m(d-2)-d}{2d(m-1)}} \|u\|_{L^m}^{\frac{2m}{2d(m-1)}} \leq C_7.$$

Combining this with (5.3) and (5.4), we obtain

$$\|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq C_7 \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} + C_5 \|u_\tau^k\|_{L^2}. \quad (5.8)$$

Squaring both sides and multiplying by  $\tau$ , and then summing from  $k = 1$  to  $\lceil T/\tau \rceil$  yields the result of the corollary.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\frac{\varepsilon_2 \kappa_2}{2} \|\nabla w_\tau^\ell\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2 \gamma_2}{2} \|w_\tau^\ell\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^2}{4\tau} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C.$$

*Proof.* By the definitions of  $w_\tau^k$  and applying Hölder's and Young's inequalities, we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(w_\tau^k) - \mathcal{G}(w_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\tau} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \int u_\tau^{k-1} (w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}) dx \leq \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_2} \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{4\tau} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing from  $k = 1$  to  $\ell$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(w_\tau^\ell) + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{4\tau} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \mathcal{G}(w_\tau^0) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tau \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}(w_0) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2} \sum_{k=1}^N \tau \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}(w_0) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2} \left( \tau \|u_\tau^0\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|\bar{u}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$ , the term  $\tau \|u_\tau^0\|_{L^2}^2$  on the right-hand side can be estimated using Young's convolution inequality as follows:

$$\tau \|u_\tau^0\|_{L^2}^2 = \tau \|\rho_\tau * u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \tau \|\rho_\tau\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_0\|_{L^1}^2 = \sqrt{\tau} \|u_0\|_{L^1}^2 \leq \sqrt{\tau_*} \|u_0\|_{L^1}^2. \quad (5.9)$$

Thus, it is bounded. The subsequent term is also bounded by Lemma 5.7.  $\square$

From Lemmas 5.4 and 5.10, it can be seen that the third inequality in Proposition 5.2 holds. Furthermore, as demonstrated by the following lemma, even when  $\gamma_2 = 0$ , Lemma 5.10 asserts the uniform boundedness of  $\|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  there exists a positive constant  $C_T$  such that for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\varepsilon_2 \|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 < C_T$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfies  $\tau\ell \leq T$ . Then, the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_2 \|w_\tau^\ell\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \varepsilon_2 \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2} + \|w_0\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2 \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{\|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{\tau} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon_2 \|w_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon_2 T \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{\|w_\tau^k - w_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{\tau} \right) + 2\varepsilon_2 \|w_0\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is uniformly bounded by Lemma 5.10.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.12.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, for any  $T > 0$  it holds that*

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \|\bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 dt < \infty.$$

*Proof.* From the Euler-Lagrange equation (2.3), we derive

$$\kappa_2 \Delta w_\tau^k = \varepsilon_2 \partial_t w_\tau^k - \gamma_2 w_\tau^k + u_\tau^{k-1}.$$

Applying elliptic estimates yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\kappa_2 w_\tau^k\|_{W^{2,2}}^2 &= C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\varepsilon_2 \partial_t w_\tau^k - \gamma_2 w_\tau^k + u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq 3C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\varepsilon_2 \partial_t w_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + 3C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\gamma_2 w_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + 3C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . The right-hand side is uniformly bounded by Lemmas 5.7 and 5.10, and (5.9).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.13.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \tau_*)} \int_0^T \|v(t)\|_{W^{3,2}}^2 dt \leq C$$

*Proof.* From the Euler-Lagrange equations (2.3), we derive

$$\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^k = \varepsilon_1 \partial_t v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k.$$

Since the right-hand side belongs to  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , elliptic estimates give

$$\|\kappa_1 v_\tau^k\|_{W^{3,2}} \leq C \|\varepsilon_1 \partial_t v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k\|_{H^1}$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . Consequently, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\kappa_1 v_\tau^k\|_{W^{3,2}}^2 \leq 3C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\varepsilon_1 \partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{H^1}^2 + 3C \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\gamma_1 v_\tau^k\|_{H^1}^2 + 3 \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|w_\tau^k\|_{H^1}^2.$$

The right-hand side is uniformly bounded by Lemmas 5.4 and 5.12  $\square$

Consequently, all parts of Proposition 5.2 have been proven.

## 6 Convergence

In this section, we demonstrate that there exists a sequence of time steps for which piecewise constant interpolation of discrete solutions converges to the solution of problem (1.1).

**Proposition 6.1.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Then, there exist a sequence  $\{\tau_n\}$  with  $\tau_n \rightarrow 0$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) and a triple  $(u, v, w)$  of functions such that for any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t), \underline{u}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) & \text{weakly in } (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t), \underline{v}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup v(t) & \text{weakly in } W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \bar{w}_{\tau_n}(t), \underline{w}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup w(t) & \text{weakly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* The proposition's proof is already presented under abstract assumptions in [2, Proposition 3.3.1]. For clarity and relevance, we provide a tailored proof for this paper. Define  $\bar{z}_\tau(t) := (\bar{u}_\tau(t), \bar{v}_\tau(t), \bar{w}_\tau(t))$  and the distance  $d$  as follows

$$d(z_1, z_2) := \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_1, u_2) + \|v_2 - v_1\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w_2 - w_1\|_{L^2}^2}$$

for  $z_1 := (u_1, v_1, w_1), z_2 := (u_2, v_2, w_2) \in M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Firstly, we establish that

$$d(\bar{z}_\tau(t), \bar{z}_\tau(s)) \leq C\sqrt{|t-s| + \tau} \quad (6.2)$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $s < t$ . By the triangle inequality, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the third inequality in Proposition 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\bar{z}_\tau(t), \bar{z}_\tau(s)) &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil s/\tau \rceil+1}^{\lceil t/\tau \rceil} d(z_\tau^k, z_\tau^{k-1}) \leq \sqrt{t-s+\tau} \left( \sum_{k=\lceil s/\tau \rceil+1}^{\lceil t/\tau \rceil} \frac{d^2(z_\tau^k, z_\tau^{k-1})}{\tau} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\sqrt{t-s+\tau}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lceil t/\tau \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer not less than  $T/\tau$ .

Next, we use the diagonal argument to show that for any  $t \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , (6.1) holds. First, we take an arbitrary  $t_1 \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ . From the first inequality in Proposition 5.2, there exist a sequence  $\{\tau_n\} = \{\tau_n^1\}$  and  $(u(t_1), v(t_1), w(t_1))$  that satisfy (6.1) for  $t = t_1$ . Similarly, there exist a subsequence  $\{\tau_n^2\}$  of  $\{\tau_n^1\}$  and functions  $(u(t_1), v(t_1), w(t_1))$  that satisfy (6.1)

for  $t = t_1, t_2$ . By repeating this argument, we can ensure that for any  $t \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , there exist a sequence  $\{\tau_n\}$  with  $\tau_n := \tau_n^n$  and functions  $(u, v, w)$  that satisfy (6.1).

Using inequality (6.2), weak convergence (6.1), the weak lower semicontinuity of the norm in Hilbert spaces, and the weak lower semicontinuity of the Wasserstein distance [2, Lemma 7.1.4], for  $z(t) := (u(t), v(t), z(t))$  and  $t, s \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , we have

$$d(z(t), z(s)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{\tau_n}(t), z_{\tau_n}(s)) \leq C\sqrt{|t-s|}.$$

Since  $M\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is complete with respect to the distance  $d$ , the function  $z(t) := (u(t), v(t), w(t))$ , which is defined on  $(0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , can be continuously extended to a function on  $(0, \infty)$ .

To establish (6.1) for  $t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ , we use the density of rational points and continuity of  $z(t)$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $t_* \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$  such that if  $|t - t_*| < \delta$ , then  $d(z(t), z(t_*)) < \varepsilon$ . From the first inequality in Proposition 5.2, since  $\{z_{\tau_n}(t)\}$  is a bounded sequence in  $(L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{\tau'_n\}$  of  $\{\tau_n\}$  for which convergence similar to (6.1) can be asserted. Let the weak limit be  $\tilde{z}(t) = (\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{w}(t))$ . Then, by the weak lower continuity of  $d$  and (6.2), we have

$$d(\tilde{z}(t), z(t_*)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{\tau'_n}(t), z_{\tau'_n}(t_*)) \leq C\sqrt{|t-t_*|} < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Thus,

$$d(\tilde{z}(t), z(t)) \leq d(\tilde{z}(t), z(t_*)) + d(z(t_*), z(t)) < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, it follows that  $\tilde{z}(t) = z(t)$ . This holds for any weakly convergent subsequence  $\{\tilde{z}_{\tau'_n}(t)\}$ , implying that result holds without taking subsequences. Hence, (6.1) is also valid  $t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ .  $\square$

Let us consider any  $T > 0$  and define the following.

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}(t) := \|\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m(t)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} + \|\bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t)\|_{W^{3,2}} + \|\bar{w}_{\tau_n}(t)\|_{W^{2,2}}, \\ q_* := \min\{2, p_*\} > 1, \text{ where } p_* \text{ is specified in (5.2)}, \\ S_{\tau_n}(K) := \{t \in (0, T] \mid \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q_*}(t) > K\}. \end{cases}$$

Then, according to the second inequality in Proposition 5.2,  $\|\mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}\|_{L^{q_*}(0, T)}$  is uniformly bounded. Consequently, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}^1(S_{\tau_n}(K)) \leq \int_{S_{\tau_n}(K)} \frac{\mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q_*}(t)}{K} dt \leq \frac{1}{K} \int_0^T \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q_*}(t) dt \rightarrow 0 \quad (K \rightarrow \infty).$$

**Lemma 6.2** (pointwise-convergence). *Let  $(\bar{u}_{\tau_n}, \bar{v}_{\tau_n})$  and  $(u, v)$  be that in Proposition 6.1. Assume that  $\sup_n \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}(t_0) < \infty$ . Then,*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m(t_0) - \bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m(t_0) - u(t_0) \nabla v(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0) + \bar{w}_{\tau_n}(t_0)) \eta dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta v(t_0) - \gamma_1 v(t_0) + w(t_0)) \eta dx, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 \Delta \bar{w}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - \gamma_2 \bar{w}_{\tau_n}(t_0) + \underline{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0)) \eta dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta w(t_0) - \gamma_1 w(t_0) + u(t_0)) \eta dx, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n} + \bar{w}_{\tau_n})(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w)(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \underline{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) \eta dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(t_0) \eta dx \end{array} \right.$$

holds for all  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and for all  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

*Proof.* By assumption  $\sup_n \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}(t_0) < \infty$ ,  $\{u_{\tau_n}^m(t_0)\}$  forms a bounded sequence in  $W^{1, \frac{d}{d-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Considering the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, there exists a subsequence  $\{\tau'_n\} \subset \{\tau_n\}$  such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_{\tau'_n}^m(t_0) \rightarrow u_* \text{ in strongly } L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \nabla u_{\tau'_n}^m(t_0) \rightharpoonup \nabla u_* \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{array} \right. \quad (6.3)$$

Moreover, for any bounded subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists another subsequence  $\{\tau''_n\} \subset \{\tau'_n\}$  such that  $u_{\tau''_n}(x, t_0) \rightarrow u_*^{\frac{1}{m}}(x, t_0)$  a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ . Combining this with (6.3), we achieve convergence  $u_{\tau''_n}(t_0) \rightarrow u_*^{\frac{1}{m}}(t_0)$  in  $L^m(\Omega)$  ([1, Proposition 1.33]). Furthermore, since  $u_{\tau''_n}(t_0) \rightharpoonup u(t_0)$  weakly in  $L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , it follows that  $u_* = u^m(t_0)$ . As this holds for any chosen subsequence, the results are valid without extracting a particular subsequence. Therefore, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx.$$

Given that  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0)\|_{L^2}^2 < \infty$  and  $\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) \rightharpoonup u(t_0)$  weakly in  $L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , it follows that  $\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) \rightharpoonup u(t_0)$  weakly in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  as well. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle u(t_0) \nabla v(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) (\nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - \nabla v(t_0)), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle (\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - u(t_0)) \nabla v(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx \right| \\ &\leq \|\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0)\|_{L^2} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\text{spt } \boldsymbol{\xi}} |\nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - \nabla v(t_0)|^2 dx + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0) - u(t_0)) \langle \nabla v(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{spt } \boldsymbol{\xi}$  denotes the support of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ . The first factor of the first term on the right-hand side is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n$ , and the third factor converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by

Proposition 6.1 and Rellich's theorem. The second term on the right-hand side converges to 0 since  $\bar{u}_{\tau_n}(t_0)$  weakly converges to  $\dashv u(t_0)$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Thus, the first assertion holds. From Proposition 6.1 and its corollary, the second and third assertions follow directly. The fourth assertion can be proven similarly to the first assertion.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.3** ( $L^1$ -convergence). *Assuming conditions (1.3) and (5.1), and referring to the triplet  $(\bar{u}_{\tau_n}, \bar{v}_{\tau_n}, \bar{w}_{\tau_n})$  as well as  $(u, v, w)$  from Lemma 6.1, the following convergence results hold for any test functions  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$  and for any  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty))$ , and for any  $T > 0$ ,*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m - \bar{u}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m - u \nabla v, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx dt, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n} + \bar{w}_{\tau_n}) \eta dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w) \eta dx dt, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 \Delta \bar{w}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_2 \bar{w}_{\tau_n} + \underline{u}_{\tau_n}) \eta dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa_2 \Delta w - \gamma_2 w + u) \eta dx dt, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n} + \bar{w}_{\tau_n}), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx dt, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \underline{u}_{\tau_n} \eta dx = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u \eta dx. \end{array} \right.$$

*Proof.* Initially, we establish that the integrand of the time integral on the right-hand side of the first equation in the proposition is an element of  $L^{q^*}(0, T)$ . Applying Fatou's Lemma, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q^*}(t) dt \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q^*}(t) dt \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q^*}(t) dt < \infty.$$

Thus, there exists an  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -negligible subset such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q^*}(t) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T] \setminus \mathcal{N}. \quad (6.4)$$

For every  $t_0 \in [0, T] \setminus \mathcal{N}$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{\tau_n^0\} \subset \{\tau_n\}$  such that

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n^0}^{q^*}(t_0) < \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n^0}^{q^*}(t_0) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n^0}^{q^*}(t_0). \quad (6.5)$$

By Lemma 6.2, we can deduce that for  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}^m(t_0) - \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0) \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m(t_0) - u(t_0) \nabla v(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx$$

holds. Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality, the triangle inequality and the inequality (5.4), the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}^m(t_0) - \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0) \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0), \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dx &\leq \|\nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}^m(t_0) - \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0) \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0)\|_{L^{\frac{d-1}{d}}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^d} \\ &\leq (\|\nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}^m(t_0)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} + C_5 \|\bar{u}_{\tau_n^0}(t_0)\|_{L^2}) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^d} \\ &\leq C \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n^0}^{q^*}(t_0) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^d} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . Thus, by duality and (6.5), we deduce that

$$\|\nabla u^m(t_0) - u(t_0)\nabla v(t_0)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} C\mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}(t_0).$$

Since this estimate holds for every  $t_0 \in [0, T] \setminus \mathcal{N}$ , we can conclude that

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla u^m(t) - u(t)\nabla v(t)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{q_*} dt \leq C \int_0^T \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q_*}(t) dt \leq C \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \mathcal{B}_{\tau_n}^{q_*}(t) dt < \infty.$$

For arbitrary  $\xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ , let us define

$$\rho_n(t) := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m - \bar{u}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}, \xi \rangle dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m - u \nabla v, \xi \rangle dx \right|$$

and note that  $\rho_n \in L^{q_*}(0, T)$  with  $\sup_n \|\rho_n\|_{L^{q_*}} < \infty$ . According to Lemma 6.2, it holds that  $\rho_n(t)\mathbb{1}_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}}(t) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality

$$\int_E \rho_n(t)\mathbb{1}_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}}(t) dt \leq (\mathcal{L}^1(E))^{\frac{q_*-1}{q_*}} \|\rho_n\|_{L^{q_*}} \leq (\mathcal{L}^1(E))^{\frac{q_*-1}{q_*}} \sup_n \|\rho_n\|_{L^{q_*}},$$

thereby showing that  $\rho_n\mathbb{1}_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}}$  is uniform integrable. By the Vitali convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}} \rho_n(t) dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \rho_n(t)\mathbb{1}_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}}(t) dt = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_{\tau_n}} \rho_n(t) dt &\leq \|\rho_n\|_{L^{q_*}} (\mathcal{L}^1(S_{\tau_n}))^{\frac{q_*-1}{q_*}} \\ &\leq (\mathcal{L}^1(S_{\tau_n}))^{\frac{q_*-1}{q_*}} \sup_n \|\rho_n\|_{L^{q_*}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (K \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^T \rho_n(t) dt = \int_{[0, T] \setminus S_{\tau_n}(K)} \rho_n(t) dt + \int_{S_{\tau_n}(K)} \rho_n(t) dt$$

where the first term on the right-hand side converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $K$ , and the second term on the right-hand side can be made arbitrarily small by choosing  $K$  sufficiently large, independently of  $n$ . Thus, the left-hand side approaches 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , establishing the first assertion of the proposition. Similarly, the second, third and fourth assertions can also be demonstrated.  $\square$

## 7 Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

From the Taylor expansion, we obtain

$$|\langle y - x, \nabla \varphi(y) \rangle - (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x))| \leq \frac{\|D^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2} |x - y|^2.$$

Integrating both sides over  $p_k \in \Gamma_o(u_\tau^{k-1}, u_\tau^k)$ , we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \nabla \varphi(y) \rangle M dp_k(x, y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}) \varphi dx \right| \leq \frac{\|D^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}).$$

Thus, for any function  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty))$ , defining

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_\tau^k := \varphi(\cdot, k\tau), & \begin{cases} \bar{\varphi}_\tau(t) := \varphi_\tau^k, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \\ \underline{\dot{\varphi}}_\tau(t) := \dot{\varphi}_\tau^{k-1}, & t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau], \end{cases} \end{cases} \quad \xi = \nabla \varphi_\tau^k,$$

we establish from the first equation in (2.3) that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}) \varphi_\tau^k dx + \tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla (u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \nabla \varphi_\tau^k \rangle dx \right| \leq \frac{\|D_x^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}).$$

Considering the identity

$$(u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}) \varphi_\tau^k = u_\tau^k \varphi_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1} \varphi_\tau^{k-1} - u_\tau^{k-1} (\varphi_\tau^k - \varphi_\tau^{k-1})$$

and the inequality

$$|(\varphi_\tau^k - \varphi_\tau^{k-1}) - \tau \dot{\varphi}_\tau^{k-1}| \leq \frac{\|\partial_t^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \tau^2,$$

summing from  $k = 1$  to  $k = \lceil T/\tau \rceil$ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \varphi_\tau^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} - u_\tau^0 \varphi_\tau^0) dx - \int_0^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil \tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\underline{u}_\tau \underline{\dot{\varphi}}_\tau - \langle \nabla \bar{u}_\tau^m - \bar{u}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau, \nabla \bar{\varphi}_\tau \rangle) dx dt \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\|D_x^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \lceil T/\tau \rceil \tau^2 \frac{M \|\partial_t^2 \varphi\|_{L^\infty}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

Considering  $\{\tau_n\}$  as  $\tau$  from Lemma 6.1, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the right-hand side converges to 0 due to Proposition 5.2. Given that  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times (0, \infty)$ , the first term inside the absolute value on the left-hand side is 0 for sufficiently large  $T$ , independent of  $n$ . As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\underline{\dot{\varphi}}_{\tau_n}$  and  $\nabla \bar{\varphi}_{\tau_n}$  converge uniformly to  $\partial_t \varphi$  and  $\nabla \varphi$  respectively. Therefore, considering Proposition 6.3, the second term inside that absolute value on the left-hand side converges to

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u \partial_t \varphi - \langle \nabla u^m - u \nabla v, \nabla \varphi \rangle] dx dt,$$

which equals to 0. This holds for any sufficiently large  $T > 0$ , and by letting  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that  $(u, v)$  satisfies the first equation of Definition 1.1-(iv). From the second and the third equations in (2.3), by similarly summing over  $k$  and considering the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it becomes evident that the limit functions  $(u, v, w)$  constitute a weak solution as defined in Definition 1.1.

## 8 Proof of Theorem 1.4

**Definition 8.1** (De Giorgi variational interpolation [2, Definition 3.3.1]). *The De Giorgi variational interpolation  $\tilde{U}_\tau$  of  $\{u_\tau^k\}$  is defined by*

$$\tilde{U}_\tau(t) := U_\sigma^k \text{ for } t = (k-1)\tau + \sigma.$$

where  $U_\sigma^k$  is defined by

$$U_\sigma^k \in \underset{u \in M \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^m(\mathbb{R}^d)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\sigma} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u, u_\tau^{k-1}) \right\}$$

for  $\sigma \in (0, \tau]$  and for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

$\bar{u}_\tau$  and  $\tilde{U}_\tau$  take the same values  $u_\tau^k$  at  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and differ in their interpolation for  $t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau)$ , but they belong to the same function space and have the same limit.

**Lemma 8.2** (slope estimate). *Let  $U_\sigma^k$  be a solution in (8.1). Then,*

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{U_\sigma^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\sigma} \quad (8.1)$$

holds.

*Proof.* Similarly to the derivation of the first equation in Proposition 2.3, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle y - x, \xi(y) \rangle M dP_k(x, y) + \sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k, \xi \rangle dx = 0.$$

Here,  $P_k \in \Gamma_o(u_\tau^{k-1}, U_\sigma^k)$ . From this, by the same method as the derivation of Lemma 2.8, we obtain

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{U_\sigma^k} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\mathcal{W}_2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{\sigma}.$$

□

**Lemma 8.3.** *Let  $\bar{u}_\tau$  and  $\tilde{U}_\tau$  be the piecewise constant interpolation defined in Definition 5.1 and the De Giorgi variational interpolation defined in 8.1, respectively. Then, for any  $T > 0$  the following inequality holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}_\tau^m - \bar{u}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\bar{u}_\tau} dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_\tau^m - \tilde{U}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\tilde{U}_\tau} dx dt \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \{ \kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_\tau(t) - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_\tau(t) + \bar{w}_\tau(t) \}|^2 dx dt \\ & + \frac{\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_\tau(t) - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_\tau(t) + \bar{w}_\tau(t)|^2 dx dt \\ & \leq \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^{[T/\tau]}, v_\tau^{[T/\tau]}, w_\tau^{[T/\tau]}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By applying the derivative of Moreaux-Yosida approximation [2, Theorem 3.1.4] to the third minimizing problem in (2.2), it holds for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\tau} + \int_0^\tau \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\sigma^2} d\sigma &= \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^k) - \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) \\ &= \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^{k-1}, w_\tau^{k-1}) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k) - \mathcal{D}_\tau^k, \end{aligned}$$

Summing over  $k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\tau} + \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \int_0^\tau \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\sigma^2} d\sigma + \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \mathcal{D}_\tau^k \\ = \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil}, v_\tau^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil}, w_\tau^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil}). \end{aligned}$$

The three terms on the left-hand side are bounded below as follows, according to the inequalities (2.8) and (8.1), and the representation of  $\mathcal{D}_\tau^k$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\tau} &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \frac{\tau}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(u_\tau^k)^m - u_\tau^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{u_\tau^k} dx \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}_\tau^m - \bar{u}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\bar{u}_\tau} dx dt. \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \int_0^\tau \frac{\mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1})}{2\sigma^2} d\sigma &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{U_\sigma^k} dx d\sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \int_{(k-1)\tau}^{k\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_\tau^m - \tilde{U}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\tilde{U}_\tau} dx dt \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_\tau^m - \tilde{U}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\tilde{U}_\tau} dx dt, \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \mathcal{D}_\tau^k &\geq (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\partial_t \nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1) \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\tau \rceil} \tau \|\partial_t v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\geq (\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1) \int_0^T \|\nabla \partial_t \bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt + (\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1) \int_0^T \|\partial_t \bar{v}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_1 \kappa_2 + \varepsilon_2 \kappa_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \|\nabla \{\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_\tau(t) - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_\tau(t) + \bar{w}_\tau(t)\}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_1 \varepsilon_2 + \gamma_2 \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_1^2} \int_0^T \|\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_\tau(t) - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_\tau(t) + \bar{w}_\tau(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

By organizing the above, we obtain the inequality stated in the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.4.** *Assume (1.3) and (5.1). Let  $\{\tau_n\}$  and  $u$  be that in Lemma 6.1. Then, the following holds:*

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \text{ weakly in } (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ for any } t > 0, \\ \sup_n \left( \int_0^T \|\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|\nabla \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}^m(t)\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{p^*} dt \right) < \infty, \text{ for any } T > 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The proof is divided into two parts.

**(i) convergence**

From the definition of  $U_\sigma^k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\sigma} \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \\
& \leq \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\sigma} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \\
& = \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \\
& \leq \mathcal{E}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\tau} \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})
\end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain  $\mathcal{W}_2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \leq \mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1})$ . Consequently, for  $t = (k-1)\tau + \sigma$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, \tau]$ , using the triangle inequality, the above inequality, Young's inequality, and Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_2^2(\tilde{U}_\tau(t), \bar{u}_\tau(t)) &= \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^k) \\
&\leq (\mathcal{W}_2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) + \mathcal{W}_2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}))^2 \\
&\leq 4\mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \leq 8\tau \left( \frac{1}{2\tau} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathcal{W}_2^2(u_\tau^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) \right) \\
&\leq 8\tau [\mathcal{L}(u_\tau^0, v_\tau^0, w_\tau^0) - \mathcal{L}(u_\tau^N, v_\tau^N, w_\tau^N)] \rightarrow 0 \quad (\tau \rightarrow 0).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

Again, from the definition of  $U_\sigma^k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{1}{2\sigma} \mathcal{W}_2^2(U_\sigma^k, u_\tau^{k-1}) &\leq \mathcal{E}(u_\tau^{k-1}, v_\tau^k) = \frac{1}{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^{k-1})^m dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_\tau^{k-1} v_\tau^k dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_\tau^{k-1})^m dx + C_* M^{1-\theta} \|u_\tau^{k-1}\|_{L^m}^\theta \|\Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^m},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_*$  is defined by (4.5). By Proposition 5.2, the right-hand side is bounded independently of  $\tau$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $k$ , so  $\mathcal{E}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k)$  is also bounded.

From (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k, w_\tau^k) &= \mathcal{E}(U_\sigma^k, v_\tau^k) + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{2} \|\Delta v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma_1 \kappa_2 + \gamma_2 \kappa_1}{2} \|\nabla v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}{2} \|v_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \|\kappa_1 \Delta v_\tau^k - \gamma_1 v_\tau^k + w_\tau^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\geq C_1 \|U_\sigma^k\|_{L^m}^m
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C_1$ . Therefore, considering (4.2), we see that  $\|U_\sigma^k\|_{L^m}$  is bounded independently of  $\tau$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $k$ . Hence,

$$\sup_{\substack{t \in [0, T] \\ \tau \in (0, \tau_*)}} \|\tilde{U}_\tau(t)\|_{L^m} < \infty.$$

Now, if  $\{\tau_n\}$  is the sequence from Proposition 6.1, then for any fixed  $t_0 \in [0, T]$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{\tau'_n\} \subset \{\tau_n\}$  and  $\tilde{U}(t_0)$  such that

$$\tilde{U}_{\tau'_n}(t_0) \rightharpoonup \tilde{U}(t_0) \quad \text{weakly in } (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By inequality (8.2) and the weak lower semicontinuity of the Wasserstein distance [2, Lemma 7.1.4], we have

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\tilde{U}(t_0), u(t_0)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}_2(\tilde{U}_{\tau'_n}(t_0), u_{\tau'_n}(t_0)) = 0.$$

Thus,  $\tilde{U}(t_0) = u(t_0)$ . This holds for any subsequence of  $\{\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}(t_0)\}$ , so the result holds without extracting subsequences. Therefore, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}(t) \rightharpoonup u(t) \quad \text{weakly in } (L^1 \cap L^m)(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

## (ii) uniform boundedness

Let  $1 < m < 2$ . Following the same argument as in the derivation of inequalities (2.9) and (5.7), we obtain

$$\frac{C_3^2}{2} \|U_\sigma^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} \leq 2C_4^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{U_\sigma^k} dx + C_6.$$

By integrating both sides with respect to  $\sigma$  over  $(0, \tau]$  and summing from  $k = 1$  to  $[T/\tau]$ , we obtain

$$\frac{C_3^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{[T/\tau]} \int_0^\tau \|U_\sigma^k\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} d\sigma \leq 2C_4^2 \sum_{k=1}^{[T/\tau]} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(U_\sigma^k)^m - U_\sigma^k \nabla v_\tau^k|^2}{U_\sigma^k} dx d\sigma + C_6(T + \tau_*).$$

This implies

$$\frac{C_3^2}{2} \int_0^T \|\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{4m+2(m-1)d}{d(2-m)}} dt \leq 2C_4^2 \int_0^{T+\tau_*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}^m - \tilde{U}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}|^2}{\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}} dx dt + C_6(T + \tau_*).$$

The right-hand side is bounded independently of  $n$  by Lemma 8.3. Due to (1.3), the exponent of the power of the integrand on the left-hand side is at least 2. Consequently, the result of lemma follows in a similar manner to Corollary 5.9.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.5.** *Let  $(\bar{u}_{\tau_n}, \bar{v}_{\tau_n}, \bar{w}_{\tau_n})$  and  $(u, v, w)$  be that in Lemma 6.1. Then, for any  $T > 0$  it holds that*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla u^m - u \nabla v|^2}{u} dx dt \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \bar{u}_{\tau_n}^m - \bar{u}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}|^2}{\bar{u}_{\tau_n}} dx dt, \\ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla u^m - u \nabla v|^2}{u} dx dt \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_\tau^m - \tilde{U}_\tau \nabla \bar{v}_\tau|^2}{\tilde{U}_\tau} dx dt, \\ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w|^2 dx dt \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n} + \bar{w}_{\tau_n}|^2 dx dt, \\ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla(\kappa_1 \Delta v - \gamma_1 v + w)|^2 dx dt \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla(\kappa_1 \Delta \bar{v}_{\tau_n} - \gamma_1 \bar{v}_{\tau_n} + \bar{w}_{\tau_n})|^2 dx dt. \end{array} \right.$$

*Proof.* Since they can all be proven in a similar manner, we will only demonstrate the second inequality. From Lemma 8.4, we know that the first equation of Proposition 6.3 holds even when  $\{u_{\tau_n}\}$  is replaced by  $\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla u^m - u \nabla v, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dxdt &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}^m - \tilde{U}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle dxdt \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}^m - \tilde{U}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}|^2}{\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}} dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \tilde{U}_{\tau_n} dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla \tilde{U}_{\tau_n}^m - \tilde{U}_{\tau_n} \nabla \bar{v}_{\tau_n}|^2}{\tilde{U}_{\tau_n}} dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 u dxdt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By duality, the second inequality of the lemma holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Substituting  $\tau_n$  from Lemma 6.1 into  $\tau$  in Lemma 8.3 and taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we see from Lemma 8.5 that the desired inequality holds.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford university press, 2000.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [3] Luigi Ambrosio and Giuseppe Savaré. Gradient flows of probability measures. In *Handbook of differential equations: evolutionary equations*, volume 3, pages 1–136. Elsevier, 2007.
- [4] Gurusamy Arumugam and Jagmohan Tyagi. Keller-segel chemotaxis models: A review. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 171:1–82, 2021.
- [5] Piotr Biler. Local and global solvability of some parabolic systems modelling chemotaxis. *Advances in Mathematical Sciences and Applications*, 8:715–743, 1998.
- [6] Piotr Biler and Jacek Zienkiewicz. Blowing up radial solutions in the minimal keller–segel model of chemotaxis. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 19(1):71–90, 2019.
- [7] Adrien Blanchet, Vincent Calvez, and José A Carrillo. Convergence of the mass-transport steepest descent scheme for the subcritical patlak–keller–segel model. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 46(2):691–721, 2008.
- [8] Adrien Blanchet, José A Carrillo, and Philippe Laurençot. Critical mass for a patlak–keller–segel model with degenerate diffusion in higher dimensions. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 35(2):133–168, 2009.

- [9] Adrien Blanchet, José Antonio Carrillo, David Kinderlehrer, Michał Kowalczyk, Philippe Laurençot, and Stefano Lisini. A hybrid variational principle for the keller–segel system in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 49(6):1553–1576, 2015.
- [10] Adrien Blanchet, Jean Dolbeault, and Benoît Perthame. Two-dimensional keller-segel model: Optimal critical mass and qualitative properties of the solutions. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations (EJDE)[electronic only]*, 2006:Paper–No, 2006.
- [11] Adrien Blanchet and Philippe Laurençot. The parabolic-parabolic keller-segel system with critical diffusion as a gradient flow in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \geq 3$ . *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 38(4):658–686, 2013.
- [12] Vincent Calvez and Lucilla Corrias. The parabolic-parabolic keller-segel model in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 6(2):417–447, 2008.
- [13] Kentarou Fujie and Takasi Senba. Application of an adams type inequality to a two-chemical substances chemotaxis system. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 263(1):88–148, 2017.
- [14] Kentarou Fujie and Takasi Senba. Blowup of solutions to a two-chemical substances chemotaxis system in the critical dimension. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 266(2-3):942–976, 2019.
- [15] Herbert Gajewski, Klaus Zacharias, and Konrad Gröger. Global behaviour of a reaction-diffusion system modelling chemotaxis. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 195(1):77–114, 1998.
- [16] David Gilbarg and Neil Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer, 1977.
- [17] Takahiro Hashira, Sachiko Ishida, and Tomomi Yokota. Finite-time blow-up for quasi-linear degenerate keller–segel systems of parabolic–parabolic type. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 264(10):6459–6485, 2018.
- [18] Miguel A Herrero and Juan JL Velázquez. Chemotactic collapse for the keller-segel model. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 35:177–194, 1996.
- [19] Tatsuya Hosono and Philippe Laurençot. Global existence and boundedness of solutions to a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with indirect signal production in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01724*, 2024.
- [20] Tatsuya Hosono and Takayoshi Ogawa. Global existence of solutions to the 4d attraction–repulsion chemotaxis system and applications of brezis–merle inequality. *Nonlinearity*, 36(11):5860, 2023.
- [21] Kazuhiro Ishige, Philippe Laurençot, and Noriko Mizoguchi. Blow-up behavior of solutions to a degenerate parabolic–parabolic keller–segel system. *Mathematische Annalen*, 367:461–499, 2017.

- [22] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the fokker–planck equation. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [23] Debabrata Karmakar and Gershon Wolansky. On patlak-keller-segel system for several populations: a gradient flow approach. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(12):7483–7520, 2019.
- [24] Philippe Laurençot and Noriko Mizoguchi. Finite time blowup for the parabolic–parabolic keller–segel system with critical diffusion. *Annales de l’IHP Analyse non linéaire*, 34(1):197–220, 2017.
- [25] Daniel Matthes, Robert J McCann, and Giuseppe Savaré. A family of nonlinear fourth order equations of gradient flow type. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 34(11):1352–1397, 2009.
- [26] Yoshifumi Mimura. Critical mass of degenerate keller-segel system with no-flux and neumann boundary conditions. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 37(3):1603–1630, 2016.
- [27] Yoshifumi Mimura. The variational formulation of the fully parabolic keller–segel system with degenerate diffusion. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 263(2):1477–1521, 2017.
- [28] Yoshifumi Mimura. Global existence of solutions to parabolic-parabolic keller-segel system in between two critical exponents. *Advances in Mathematical Sciences and Applications*, 33(1):77–96, 2024.
- [29] Toshitaka Nagai, Takasi Senba, and Kiyoshi Yoshida. Application of the trudingermoser inequal. ty to a parabolic system of chemotaxis. *Funkc. Ekvacioj*, 40:411–433, 1997.
- [30] Takayoshi Ogawa, Takeshi Suguro, and Hiroshi Wakui. Finite time blow up and concentration phenomena for a solution to drift-diffusion equations in higher dimensions. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 62(2):47, 2023.
- [31] Takayoshi Ogawa and Hiroshi Wakui. Finite time blow up and non-uniform bound for solutions to a degenerate drift-diffusion equation with the mass critical exponent under non-weight condition. *Manuscr. Math.*, 159:475–509, 2019.
- [32] Felix Otto. *Double degenerate diffusion equations as steepest descent*. Citeseer, 1996.
- [33] Filippo Santambrogio. Optimal transport for applied mathematicians. *Birkäuser, NY*, 55(58-63):94, 2015.
- [34] Takashi Suzuki and Ryo Takahashi. Degenerate parabolic equation with critical exponent derived from the kinetic theory. II. Blowup threshold. *Differential Integral Equations*, 22(11-12):1153–1172, 2009.

- [35] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [36] Cédric Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.