# A critical nonlinearity for blow-up in a higher-dimensional chemotaxis system with indirect signal production

Yiheng Zhao\*

School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, P.R. China

#### Abstract

The Neumann problem in balls  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \in \{3, 4\}$ , for the chemotaxis system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v), \\ 0 = \Delta v - \mu^{(w)}(t) + w, \\ w_t = \Delta w - w + f(u), \end{cases} \quad \mu^{(w)}(t) = \oint_{\Omega} w,$$

is considered. Under the assumption that  $f \in C^1([0,\infty))$  is such that  $f(\xi) \ge k\xi^{\sigma}$  for all  $\xi \ge 0$  and some k > 0 and  $\sigma > \frac{4}{n}$ , it is shown that finite-time blow-up occurs for some radially symmetric solutions.

Key words: chemotaxis; indirect signal production; critical blow-up exponent MSC 2020: 35B44 (primary); 35B33, 35K57, 35Q92, 92C17 (secondary)

\*zhaoyh2002@sjtu.edu.cn

# 1 Introduction

Chemotaxis systems including indirect signal production mechanisms on the one hand appear to provide more realistic descriptions of cross-diffusive migration than simple Keller-Segel systems in various application contexts ([13], [25], [12], [14]); in line with this, accordingly extended models have been in the focus of an increasing number of analytical investigations. Besides cases in which the respective attractant production is mediated by a non-diffusible quantity ([5], [9], [7], [15]), a considerable literature has been concerned with related situations in which the corresponding additional component responsible for signal production diffuses in space ([6], [4], [19], [23]).

Indeed, several studies on particular representatives of the general model class

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (D(u)\nabla u) - \nabla \cdot (S(u)\nabla v), \\ v_t = \Delta v - v + w, \\ w_t = \Delta w - w + f(u), \end{cases}$$
(1.1)

have revealed a significant strengthening of the tendency toward boundedness in comparison to twocomponent relatives accounting for direct signal production. In the most prototypical case when here  $D \equiv 1, S \equiv id$  and  $f \equiv id$ , for instance, blow-up phenomena can be ruled out not only in two- but even in three-dimensional boundary value problems ([6]); also in the presence of more general and suitably regular migration rates D and S, results on global solvability and boundedness addressing (1.1) require significantly weaker assupptions on the large-density asymptotics of S, relative to that of D, than those known to be critical for corresponding two-component quasilinear systems ([4], [3], [20]). For some further results concerned with variants of (1.1), we refer to [24] and [10].

Accordingly, detections of singularity formation in models of this and related types can yet only rarely be found in the analytical literature. When again  $S \equiv f \equiv id$ , for instance, in line with the above a necessary condition for blow-up to be possible at all is that the diffusion rate D(u) undergoes a suitably substantial decay at large population densities u, and a corresponding quantification has recently been achieved for a parabolic-elliptic simplification of (1.1) with  $f \equiv id$ , actually throughout large classes of fairly general power-type ingredients D and S ([16] and [17]). Beyond this, rigorous findings on the occurrence of unboundedness phenomena in chemotaxis models with indirect signal production seem to have concentrated on scenarios involving non-diffusible attractant producers ([9], [15], [5]). This may be viewed as confirming a substantially stronger dissipative character of (1.1) in comparison to the latter model class; correspondingly, the potential for a derivation of blow-up results on the basis of energy inequalities involving Lyapunov functionals unbounded from below, as known from the analysis of classical Keller-Segel systems ([3], [21]), seems limited due to the presence of lower bounds for energy functionals even in physically meaningful subcases of (1.1) for which they have been found ([6]).

**Main results.** The intention of this manuscript is to address this methodological problem, and to develop a technique which is capable of extending the yet small selection of chemotaxis systems involving diffusion-influenced indirect signal production mechanisms in which singularity formation

can be detected. This will be pursued in the framework of the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \nabla \cdot (u \nabla v), & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ 0 = \Delta v - \mu^{(w)}(t) + w, & \mu^{(w)}(t) = \oint_{\Omega} w, & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ w_t = \Delta w - w + f(u) & x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \ t > 0, \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad w(x,0) = w_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1.2)

which can be viewed as a straightforward parabolic-elliptic-parabolic simplification of (1.1), justifiable in cases when the signal concentration v diffuses suitably fast ([8]), in the special situation when  $D \equiv 1$ and  $S \equiv id$ , but when now the signal production rate f may depend nonlinearly on the population density u. For the corresponding version of (1.1) it is known that in any smoothly bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n \geq 2$ , the assumption that here

$$0 \le f \in C^1([0,\infty)) \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$f(\xi) \le K\xi^{\sigma} \qquad \text{for all } \xi > 1, \tag{1.4}$$

with some K > 0 and some

$$\sigma < \frac{4}{n}$$
 when  $n \ge 2$ ; or  $\sigma < 3$  when  $n = 1$  (1.5)

is sufficient to ensure that all suitably regular nonnegative initial data evolve into global bounded solutions ([2], [18]); in fact, by simple adaptation of the arguments therein this statement can readily be carried over to (1.2).

In order to supplement this by a result on the occurrence of blow-up under essentially optimal assumptions on the growth of f, we shall further develop an approach recently presented in [16], based on the observation that in settings of radially symmetric solutions in balls, the corresponding cumulated densities associated with u and w satisfy a parabolic system which is cooperative and hence admits a comparison principle (Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2). The design of suitable exploding subsolutions thereof, inspired by a corresponding construction in [16], indeed will enable us to reveal the presence of blow-up phenomena in three- and four-dimensional versions of (1.2) within ranges of ingredients f which, in view of the above implication on (1.4) and (1.5) on boundedness, apparently cannot be substantially extended. More precisely, our main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.1** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}, R > 0$  and  $\Omega = B_R \equiv B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and suppose that f satisfies (1.3) as well as

$$f(u) \ge ku^{\sigma} \qquad for \ all \ u \ge 0 \tag{1.6}$$

with some k > 0 and

$$\sigma > \frac{4}{n}.\tag{1.7}$$

Then one can find some initial data  $(u_0, v_0)$  fulfilling

$$u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ and } w_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ are radially symmetric and nonnegative}$$
(1.8)

and there exists  $T^* > 0$  such that the corresponding classical solution (u, v, w) of (1.2) blows up before time  $T^*$  in the following sense: There exists  $T_{max} \in (0, T^*)$  such that

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T_{max}} \sup \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} = \infty.$$
(1.9)

From Theorem 1.1 together with the boundedness results in [18] and [2] we infer that  $\sigma = \frac{4}{n}$  (n = 3, 4) is the critical exponent for blow-up to (1.2). In comparison with the corresponding two-component Keller-Segel systems with nonlinear signal production, we reminisce that  $\sigma = \frac{2}{n}$   $(n \ge 1)$  is the critical blow-up exponent for the latter systems: Namely, if f satisfies (1.3), (1.6) and  $\sigma > \frac{2}{n}$ , then the solutions blow up in finite time for suitably large initial-data ([22]); whereas the solutions exist globally and are bounded for any given smooth initial data whenever f fulfills (1.3), (1.4) and  $\sigma < \frac{2}{n}$  ([11]).

# 2 Local existence

We start from recalling a statement concerning the local existence and an extensibility criterion.

**Lemma 2.1** Let  $n \ge 1$  and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, and assume (1.3) and (1.8). Then there exist  $T_{max} \in (0, \infty]$  and a uniquely determined triple of functions

$$\begin{cases} u \in C^{0}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{max})), \\ v \in C^{2,0}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{max})) \quad and \\ w \in C^{0}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{max})) \end{cases}$$
(2.1)

with the properties that  $u \ge 0$  and  $w \ge 0$  in  $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$ , that  $\int_{\Omega} v(\cdot, t) = 0$  for all  $t \in (0, T_{max})$ , that (1.2) is satisfied in the classical sense in  $\Omega \times (0, T_{max})$ , and that

if 
$$T_{max} < \infty$$
, then  $\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{max}} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} = \infty.$  (2.2)

Moreover,

$$\int_{\Omega} u(\cdot, t) dx = \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}).$$
(2.3)

PROOF. The local existence as well as the extensibility criterion (2.2) can be achieved by adapting fixed-point approaches well-established in the context of chemotaxis systems (cf., e.g., [4] for some close relative). The mass identity (2.3) simply results from an integration of the first equation in (1.2).

# 3 Finite-time blow-up

## 3.1 A cooperative parabolic system for mass functions

Motivated by an idea that the construction of radial blow-up solutions in Kelle-Segel type systems can be achieved via analysis of associated cumulated densities ([8], [1] and [16]), we first transform the original system (1.2) into a parabolic system satisfied by cumulated densities in radially symmetric setting. Here we point out that in order to successfully deal with the nonlinear zero-order production term f(u), we will need the spatial-dimension restriction that  $n \leq 4$ . **Lemma 3.1** Let  $n \leq 4$  and R > 0, assume (1.3) and (1.6) as well as (1.7), and let  $M_{\star} > 0$  and  $M^{\star} > M_{\star}$ . Then, whenever (1.8) holds with

$$M_{\star} \leq \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx \leq M^{\star}, \qquad M_{\star} \leq \int_{\Omega} w_0 dx \leq M^{\star} \qquad and \qquad \|w_0\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M^{\star}}{|\Omega|}, \tag{3.1}$$

there exists  $T_0 = T_0^{(u_0,w_0)} > 0$  such that the corresponding solution (u,v,w) of (1.2) has the property that setting

$$U(s,t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1} u(\rho,t) d\rho, \qquad s \in [0,R^n], \ t \in [0,T_{max}), \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$W(s,t) := \int_0^{s^{\frac{1}{n}}} \rho^{n-1} w(\rho,t) d\rho, \qquad s \in [0,R^n], \ t \in [0,T_{max}), \tag{3.3}$$

we obtain functions U and W which belong to  $C^1([0, \mathbb{R}^n] \times [0, T_{max})) \cap C^{2,1}((0, \mathbb{R}^n) \times (0, T_{max}))$  and satisfy  $U_s \geq 0$  and  $W_s \geq 0$  as well as

$$U(0,t) = W(0,t) = 0, \quad U(R^n,t) \ge \frac{\mu_* R^n}{n} \quad and \quad W(R^n,t) \ge \frac{\mu_* R^n}{n} \quad for \ all \ t \in (0,T_{max}) \cap (0,T_0),$$
(3.4)

and for which we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[U,W](s,t) \ge 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in (0,R^n) \text{ and } t \in (0,T_{max}) \cap (0,T_0)$$
(3.5)

as well as

$$\mathcal{Q}[U,W](s,t) \ge 0 \qquad \text{for all } s \in (0,R^n) \text{ and } t \in (0,T_{max}) \cap (0,T_0), \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\mu_{\star} := \frac{M_{\star}}{2|\Omega|} \qquad and \qquad \mu^{\star} := \frac{2M^{\star}}{|\Omega|}. \tag{3.7}$$

Here and below, for T > 0 and functions  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  from  $C^1([0, \mathbb{R}^n] \times [0, T))$  which satisfy  $\varphi_s \ge 0$  on  $(0, \mathbb{R}^n) \times (0, T)$  and are such that  $\varphi(\cdot, t) \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}((0, \mathbb{R}^n))$  and  $\psi(\cdot, t) \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}((0, \mathbb{R}^n))$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ , we let

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\varphi,\psi](s,t) := \varphi_t - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \varphi_{ss} - n\varphi_s \cdot \left(\psi - \frac{\mu^{\star}s}{n}\right)$$
(3.8)

and

$$\mathcal{Q}[\varphi,\psi](s,t) := \psi_t - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \psi_{ss} + \psi - K s^{1-\sigma} \varphi^{\sigma}$$
(3.9)

for  $t \in (0,T)$  and a.e.  $s \in (0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $K := kn^{\sigma-1}$ .

**PROOF.** The mass identity (2.3) along with the first inequality in (3.1) entails that

$$\mu^{(u)}(t) \equiv \int_{\Omega} u(\cdot, t) dx = \int_{\Omega} u_0 dx \ge \frac{M_\star}{|\Omega|} \ge \frac{M_\star}{2|\Omega|} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}), \tag{3.10}$$

whence an integration of the third equation in (1.2) together with the nonnegativity of f(u) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu^{(w)}(t) + \mu^{(w)}(t) \ge 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max})$$

that implies

$$\mu^{(w)}(t) \ge e^{-t}\mu^{(w)}(0) \ge \frac{1}{2}\mu^{(w)}(0) \ge \frac{M_{\star}}{2|\Omega|} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}) \cap (0, \ln 2)$$
(3.11)

due to the second inequality in (3.1), where  $\mu^{(w)}(t) \equiv f_{\Omega} w(\cdot, t) dx$ . On the other hand, it follows from the continuity of the solution (u, v, w) that there exists  $T_0 = T_0^{(u_0, w_0)} \in (0, \ln 2]$  such that

$$||w(\cdot,t)||_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \le 2||w_0||_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}$$
 for all  $t \in (0, T_{max}) \cap (0, T_0)$ 

and thus thanks to the third inequality in (3.1),

$$\mu^{(w)}(t) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} w \le \|w(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \le 2\|w_0\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \le \frac{2M^{\star}}{|\Omega|} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{max}) \cap (0, T_0).$$
(3.12)

Since a direct computation based on (1.2) shows that (3.2) and (3.3) indeed define functions U and W which possess the claimed regularity and monotonicity properties, and which moreover satisfy

$$U(0,t) = W(0,t) = 0, \quad U(R^n,t) = \frac{\mu^{(u)}(t)R^n}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad W(R^n,t) = \frac{\mu^{(w)}(t)R^n}{n} \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T_{max})$$
(3.13)

as well as

$$U_t = n^2 s^{2 - \frac{2}{n}} U_{ss} + n U_s \cdot \left( W - \frac{\mu^{(w)}(t)s}{n} \right) \qquad \text{in } (0, R^n) \times (0, T_{max})$$
(3.14)

and

$$W_t = n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} W_{ss} - W + \frac{1}{n} \int_0^s f(nU_{\xi}(\xi, t)) d\xi \qquad \text{in } (0, R^n) \times (0, T_{max}).$$
(3.15)

From (3.13), (3.10) and (3.11) we obtain (3.4), while (3.5) is a consequence of (3.14) and (3.12) along with the nonnegativity of  $U_s$ . In order to verify (3.6), we first note that  $\sigma > 1$  due to (1.7) together with our assumption that  $n \leq 4$ , and thus we can use the Hölder inequality to obtain

$$U^{\sigma}(s,t) = \left(\int_0^s U_{\xi}(\xi,t)d\xi\right)^{\sigma} \le s^{\sigma-1}\int_0^s U_{\xi}^{\sigma}(\xi,t)d\xi$$

thanks to the nonnegativity of  $U_{\xi}$ , which along with (1.6) leads to

$$\frac{1}{n}\int_0^s f(nU_{\xi}(\xi,t))d\xi \ge kn^{\sigma-1}\int_0^s U_{\xi}^{\sigma}(\xi,t)d\xi \ge Ks^{1-\sigma}U^{\sigma}(s,t)$$

with  $K := kn^{\sigma-1}$ . Combining (3.15) with this we finally arrive at (3.6).

A cooperative feature of the parabolic system associated to (3.8) and (3.9) guarantees that a comparison principle holds, which is a corner stone of the construction of a blow-up sub-solution.

**Lemma 3.2** Let  $n \leq 4$  and R > 0, assume (1.7), and suppose that for some T > 0, the functions  $\underline{U}, \overline{U}, \underline{W}$  and  $\overline{W}$  belong to  $C^1([0, R^n] \times [0, T))$  and have the properties that

$$\{\underline{U}(\cdot,t), \overline{U}(\cdot,t), \underline{W}(\cdot,t), \overline{W}(\cdot,t)\} \subset W^{2,\infty}_{loc}((0,R^n)) \qquad for \ all \ t \in (0,T),$$

and that  $\underline{U}_s$  and  $\overline{U}_s$  are nonnegative on  $(0, \mathbb{R}^n) \times (0, T)$ . If with  $\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^*)}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}^{(\mu^*)}$  as in (3.8) and (3.9) we have

 $\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \quad and \quad \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\overline{U},\overline{W}](s,t) \ge 0 \quad for \ all \ t \in (0,T) \ and \ a.e. \ s \in (0,R^n) \quad (3.16)$ 

as well as

 $\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \quad and \quad \mathcal{Q}[\overline{U},\overline{W}](s,t) \ge 0 \quad for \ all \ t \in (0,T) \ and \ a.e. \ s \in (0,R^n), \tag{3.17}$ 

 $and \ if \ furthermore$ 

$$\underline{U}(0,t) \le \overline{U}(0,t), \quad \underline{U}(R^n,t) \le \overline{U}(R^n,t), \quad \underline{W}(0,t) \le \overline{W}(0,t) \quad and \quad \underline{W}(R^n,t) \le \overline{W}(R^n,t) \quad (3.18)$$

for all  $t \in [0,T)$  as well as

$$\underline{U}(s,0) \le \overline{U}(s,0) \quad and \quad \underline{W}(s,0) \le \overline{W}(s,0) \quad for \ all \ s \in [0, \mathbb{R}^n], \tag{3.19}$$

then

$$\underline{U}(s,t) \le \overline{U}(s,t) \qquad \text{for all } s \in [0, \mathbb{R}^n] \text{ and } t \in [0, T).$$
(3.20)

PROOF. Since for any given  $t_0 \in (0, T)$ , in view of the fact that  $\sigma > 1$  due to (1.7) and  $n \leq 4$ and according to our regularity assumption on  $\underline{U}$  and  $\overline{U}$ , the Lagrange intermediate value theorem guarantees the existence of some function  $A(s, t_0)$  and a constant  $c(t_0) > 0$  such that

$$\underline{U}^{\sigma}(s,t_0) - \overline{U}^{\sigma}(s,t_0) = A(s,t_0)(\underline{U}(s,t_0) - \overline{U}(s,t_0)) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, \mathbb{R}^n]$$

with  $|A(s,t_0)| \leq c(t_0)$ , the proof is then similar to [16, Lemma 3.2] and therefore we refrain us from repeating the details here.

#### 3.2 Construction of blow-up subsolutions

The blow-up subsolutions will involve two crucial parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . However, under the assumption that  $\sigma > \frac{4}{n}$ , the choice of these two parameters satisfying (3.22) below will require another spatial-dimension restriction that  $n \ge 3$ .

**Lemma 3.3** Let  $n \ge 3$ , and assume

$$\sigma > \frac{4}{n}.\tag{3.21}$$

Then there exist  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  and  $\beta \in (0,1)$  such that

$$1 + \frac{2}{n} - \sigma + \alpha \sigma < \beta < 1 - \frac{2}{n}.$$
(3.22)

**PROOF.** Since (3.21) ensures that

$$1+\frac{2}{n}-\sigma < 1-\frac{2}{n},$$

we can take  $\alpha = \alpha(\sigma) \in (0, 1)$  sufficiently small such that

$$1 + \frac{2}{n} - \sigma + \alpha \sigma < 1 - \frac{2}{n}$$

still holds. Due to  $n \ge 3$ , we have  $1 - \frac{2}{n} \ge \frac{1}{3} > 0$ , and thus we can fix some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  fulfilling (3.22).  $\Box$ 

Although the essential part of the blow-up subsolutions will take the same form as in [16], the choices of parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  and parameter function y(t) here are different from those in [16].

**Lemma 3.4** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0 and  $\mu_{\star} > 0$ , let  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  be provided by Lemma 3.3, and let

$$a \equiv a^{(\mu_{\star})} := \frac{\mu_{\star} R^n}{n e^{\frac{1}{e}} (R^n + 1)}.$$
(3.23)

Then for all T > 0 and any  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  with  $y(t) > \frac{1}{R^n}$  for all  $t \in (0,T)$ , setting

$$\widehat{U}(s,t) \equiv \widehat{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,y)} := \begin{cases} ay^{1-\alpha}(t)s, & t \in [0,T), \ s \in \left[0,\frac{1}{y(t)}\right], \\ \alpha^{-\alpha}a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha}, & t \in [0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n\right], \end{cases}$$
(3.24)

defines a function  $\widehat{U} \in C^1([0, \mathbb{R}^n] \times [0, T)) \cap C^0([0, T); W^{2,\infty}((0, \mathbb{R}^n))$  which satisfies

$$\widehat{U}(0,t) = 0 \quad and \quad \widehat{U}(\mathbb{R}^n,t) \le \frac{\mu_* \mathbb{R}^n}{n} \qquad for \ all \ t \in (0,T),$$
(3.25)

and for which we have  $\widehat{U}(\cdot,t) \in C^2([0,R^n] \setminus \{\frac{1}{y(t)}\}$  for all  $t \in (0,T)$ , with

$$\widehat{U}_{t}(s,t) = \begin{cases} (1-\alpha)ay^{-\alpha}(t)y'(t)s, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ \alpha^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^{2}(t)}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}\right), \end{cases}$$
(3.26)

and

$$\widehat{U}_{s}(s,t) = \begin{cases} ay^{1-\alpha}(t), & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ \alpha^{1-\alpha}a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}\right), \end{cases}$$
(3.27)

as well as

$$\widehat{U}_{ss}(s,t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ -\alpha^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-2}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n\right). \end{cases}$$
(3.28)

PROOF. The claimed regularity properties and the identities in (3.26)-(3.28) as well as the inequality in (3.25) can be directly verified on the basis of (3.24), (3.23) and the restriction  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .  $\Box$ Similarly, we also have: **Lemma 3.5** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0,  $\mu_{\star} > 0$ , and let  $\beta \in (0,1)$  be taken from Lemma 3.3. Then whenever T > 0 and  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  is such that  $y(t) > \frac{1}{R^n}$  for all  $t \in (0,T)$ , taking  $a = a^{(\mu_{\star})}$  from (3.23) and writing

$$\widehat{W}(s,t) \equiv \widehat{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,y)}(s,t) := \begin{cases} ay^{1-\beta}(t)s, & t \in [0,T), \ s \in \left[0,\frac{1}{y(t)}\right], \\ \beta^{-\beta}a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta}, & t \in [0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}\right], \end{cases}$$
(3.29)

we obtain an element  $\widehat{W}$  of  $C^1([0, \mathbb{R}^n] \times [0, T)) \cap C^0([0, T); W^{2,\infty}((0, \mathbb{R}^n))$  with the properties that

$$\widehat{W}(0,t) = 0 \quad and \quad \widehat{W}(\mathbb{R}^n,t) \le \frac{\mu_{\star}\mathbb{R}^n}{n} \qquad for \ all \ t \in (0,T),$$
(3.30)

that

$$\widehat{W}_{t}(s,t) = \begin{cases} (1-\beta)ay^{-\beta}(t)y'(t)s, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ \beta^{1-\beta}(1-\beta)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^{2}(t)}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}\right), \end{cases}$$
(3.31)

that

$$\widehat{W}_{s}(s,t) = \begin{cases} ay^{1-\beta}(t), & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ \beta^{1-\beta}a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-1}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}\right), \end{cases}$$
(3.32)

and that  $\widehat{W}(\cdot,t) \in C^2([0,R^n] \setminus \{\frac{1}{y(t)}\}$  for all  $t \in (0,T)$ , with

$$\widehat{W}_{ss}(s,t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \\ -\beta^{1-\beta}(1-\beta)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-2}, & t \in (0,T), \ s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n\right). \end{cases}$$
(3.33)

**PROOF.** The proof is the same as that of Lemma 3.4.

Now we can define the following family of functions that act as candidates for subsolutions.

**Definition 3.6** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0,  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\theta > 0$ , let  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  and  $\beta \in (0,1)$  be chosen by Lemma 3.3, and let  $a = a^{(\mu_{\star})}$  be as in (3.23). Given T > 0 and  $y \in C^{1}([0,T))$  such that  $y(t) > \frac{1}{R^{n}}$  for all  $t \in [0,T)$ , we then let

$$\underline{U}(s,t) \equiv \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}(s,t) := e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}(s,t), \qquad s \in [0,R^n], \ t \in [0,T),$$
(3.34)

and

$$\underline{W}(s,t) \equiv \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}(s,t) := e^{-\theta t} \widehat{W}(s,t), \qquad s \in [0,R^n], \ t \in [0,T),$$
(3.35)

where  $\widehat{U} = \widehat{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,y)}$  and  $\widehat{W} = \widehat{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,y)}$  are taken from (3.24) and (3.29).

From now on, we take  $\sigma > \frac{4}{n}$  with  $n \in \{3, 4\}$  and then fix  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  satisfying (3.22).

## 3.3 Subsolution properties: inner region

We begin with verifying that  $(\underline{U}, \underline{W})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^*)}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) \leq 0$  near s = 0.

**Lemma 3.7** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$  and R > 0, and assume (1.7). Then there exists  $\delta_{\star} \in (0,1)$  such that for any choice of  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\mu^{\star} > 0$  one can find  $y_{\star} = y_{\star}(\mu_{\star}, \mu^{\star}) > \frac{1}{R^n}$  and  $\gamma_{\star} = \gamma_{\star}(\mu_{\star}) > 0$  with the property that if T > 0 and  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  are such that

$$y(t) \ge y_{\star} \qquad for \ all \ t \in (0,T) \tag{3.36}$$

and

$$y'(t) \le \gamma_{\star} y^{1+\delta_{\star}}(t) \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.37}$$

then whenever  $\theta > 0$ , the functions  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}$  from (3.34) and (3.35) satisfy

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^*)}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}).$$
(3.38)

PROOF. We first fix

$$\delta_{\star} := 1 - \beta \in (0, 1). \tag{3.39}$$

Given  $\mu_{\star} > 0$ ,  $\mu^{\star} > 0$  and with  $a = a^{(\mu_{\star})}$  taken from (3.23), we then choose  $y_{\star} = y_{\star}(\mu_{\star}, \mu^{\star}) > \frac{1}{R^n}$  large enough such that

$$y_{\star} \ge 1$$
 and  $y_{\star} \ge \left(\frac{2e\mu^{\star}}{na}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}$  (3.40)

and

$$\gamma_{\star} = \gamma_{\star}(\mu_{\star}) := \frac{nae^{-1}}{2(1-\alpha)}.$$
 (3.41)

Since  $(e^{-\theta t}\widehat{U})_t = e^{-\theta t}\widehat{U}_t - \theta e^{-\theta t}\widehat{U}$  for  $t \in (0,T)$  and  $s \in (0,R^n)$ , it follows from (3.8) that

$$e^{\theta t} \cdot \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) = \widehat{U}_t - \theta \widehat{U} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss} - n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \left(\widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n}\right) \\ \leq \widehat{U}_t - n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \left(\widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n}\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T) \text{ and } s \in (0, \frac{1}{y(t)}),$$
(3.42)

because  $\widehat{U} \geq 0$  and because  $\widehat{U}_{ss} \equiv 0$  in the considered region according to (3.28). Here we note that due to (3.29), (3.40), (3.36) and our assumption  $\beta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n} &\geq \widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} es}{n} &= ay^{1-\beta}(t)s - \frac{\mu^{\star} es}{n} \\ &\geq ay^{1-\beta}(t)s - \frac{1}{2}ay^{1-\beta}s \geq ay^{1-\beta}(t)s - \frac{1}{2}ay^{1-\beta}(t)s = \frac{1}{2}ay^{1-\beta}(t)s \\ &\text{ for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}) \end{aligned}$$
(3.43)

and that by (3.27),

$$ne^{-\theta t}\widehat{U}_s = ne^{-\theta t} \cdot ay^{1-\alpha}(t) \ge nae^{-1}y^{1-\alpha}(t) \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}), \quad (3.44)$$

whence using (3.26), (3.43) and (3.44) we infer from (3.42) together with (3.41) and (3.39) that for all  $t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta})$  and  $s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)})$ ,

$$e^{\theta t} \cdot \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) \leq (1 - \alpha)ay^{-\alpha}(t)y'(t)s - nae^{-1}y^{1-\alpha}(t) \cdot \frac{a}{2}y^{1-\beta}(t)s$$
$$= (1 - \alpha)ay^{-\alpha}(t)s \cdot \left\{y'(t) - \frac{nae^{-1}}{2(1 - \alpha)}y^{2-\beta}(t)\right\}$$
$$= (1 - \alpha)ay^{-\alpha}(t)s \cdot \left\{y'(t) - \gamma_{\star}y^{1+\delta_{\star}}(t)\right\}$$
$$\leq 0$$

due to (3.37), and this shows (3.38).

We next show that  $\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0$  near s = 0.

**Lemma 3.8** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$  and R > 0, let  $\mu_* > 0$  and  $\mu^* > 0$ , assume (1.7), and suppose that with T > 0, the function  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  satisfies

$$y(t) > \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{R^n}\right\}$$
 and  $0 \le y'(t) \le Ly^{1+\frac{2}{n}}(t)$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$  (3.45)

where  $L := K(e^{-1}a)^{\sigma-1}$  with K defined in (3.9) and a given by (3.23). Then whenever

$$\theta \ge 1,\tag{3.46}$$

for  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}$  as in (3.34) and (3.35) we have

$$\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}). \tag{3.47}$$

PROOF. Since  $\sigma > \frac{4}{n}$  by (1.7) and since  $n \in \{3, 4\}$ , we can apply Lemma 3.3 to see that the left-side inequality in (3.22) entails

$$\beta + (1 - \alpha)\sigma > 1 + \frac{2}{n}.$$
 (3.48)

For arbitrary  $\theta \ge 1$ , we recall (3.9), Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.4 to see that by the facts that  $\widehat{W}_{ss} = 0$  and that  $\widehat{W} \ge 0$  in the region  $(0, \frac{1}{y(t)})$ ,

$$\begin{split} e^{\theta t} \cdot \mathcal{Q}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) &= \widehat{W}_t - \theta \widehat{W} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{W}_{ss} + \widehat{W} - e^{\theta t} \cdot K s^{1-\sigma} e^{-(\theta t)\sigma} \widehat{U}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq \widehat{W}_t - K s^{1-\sigma} e^{-(\theta t)(\sigma-1)} \widehat{U}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq (1-\beta) a y^{-\beta}(t) y'(t) s - K s^{1-\sigma} e^{-(\sigma-1)} \cdot a^{\sigma} y^{(1-\alpha)\sigma}(t) s^{\sigma} \\ &\leq a y^{-\beta}(t) s \cdot \left\{ y'(t) - L y^{\beta+(1-\alpha)\sigma}(t) \right\} \\ &\leq a y^{-\beta}(t) s \cdot \left\{ y'(t) - L y^{1+\frac{2}{n}}(t) \right\} \\ &\leq 0 \quad \text{ for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,\frac{1}{y(t)}) \end{split}$$

due to  $\sigma > 1$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , (3.45) and (3.48), and this leads to (3.47).

## 3.4 Subsolution properties: intermediate annulus

For our choice of  $\beta$ , we also have that  $\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^*)}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0$  in an intermediate region.

**Lemma 3.9** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$  and R > 0, assume (1.7), take any  $\delta_{\star\star} \in (0, 1 - \beta)$ , and let  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\mu^{\star} > 0$  be given. Then it is possible to fix  $s_{\star} \in (0,1]$  with the property that given any T > 0 and  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  fulfilling

$$y(t) > \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{R^n}\right\}$$
 and  $0 \le y'(t) \le y^{1+\delta_{\star\star}}(t)$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ , (3.49)

for any  $\theta > 0$ , with  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}$  taken from (3.34) and (3.35) we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)},R^n) \cap (0,s_{\star}).$$
(3.50)

**PROOF.** By (1.7) and Lemma 3.3 we first see that

$$1 - \frac{2}{n} - \beta > 0 \tag{3.51}$$

due to  $n \in \{3, 4\}$ . We then can choose  $s_{\star} \in (0, 1]$  sufficiently small such that

$$s_{\star} \le \left(\frac{na}{2e\mu^{\star}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}} \tag{3.52}$$

and

$$\frac{2n(1-\alpha)e}{a\alpha} \cdot s_{\star}^{1-\frac{2}{n}-\beta} \le \frac{1}{2}$$
(3.53)

as well as

$$\frac{2(1-\alpha)e}{na} \cdot s_{\star}^{1-\beta-\delta_{\star\star}} \le \frac{1}{2}.$$
(3.54)

due to (3.51) and the fact that  $1 - \beta - \delta_{\star\star} > 0$  by our choice of  $\delta_{\star\star}$ . Now we recall the identity

$$e^{\theta t} \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) = \widehat{U}_t - \theta \widehat{U} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss} - n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \left(\widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n}\right),$$
$$t \in (0,T), s \in \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n\right). \tag{3.55}$$

Here we note that

$$s - \frac{1 - \beta}{y(t)} \ge s - (1 - \beta)s = \beta s$$
 for all  $t \in (0, T)$  and  $s > \frac{1}{y(t)}$ , (3.56)

and thus according to this and (3.29) together with (3.52) we see that for all  $t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta})$  and  $s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap (0, s_*)$ .

$$\widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n} \ge \beta^{-\beta} a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n} \ge as^{\beta} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e}{n} \cdot s$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} \cdot \left\{ 1 - \frac{2e\mu^{\star}}{na} \cdot s^{1-\beta} \right\}$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} \cdot \left\{ 1 - \frac{2e\mu^{\star}}{na} \cdot s^{1-\beta} \right\}$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta} \cdot \left\{ 1 - \frac{2e\mu^{\star}}{na} \cdot \frac{na}{2e\mu^{\star}} \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} as^{\beta}.$$
(3.57)

Thus, due to the nonnegativity of  $\hat{U}$  and  $\hat{U}_s$ , the identity in (3.55) can be turned into the inequality

$$e^{\theta t} \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq \widehat{U}_t - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss} - n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \frac{a}{2} s^{\beta}$$
  
for all  $t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta})$  and  $s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap (0, s_{\star}).$  (3.58)

Here by (3.27) and (3.28) and in view of the inequality

$$s - \frac{1 - \alpha}{y(t)} \ge s - (1 - \alpha)s = \alpha s \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T) \text{ and } s > \frac{1}{y(t)}, \tag{3.59}$$

we have

$$\frac{-n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss}}{n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \frac{a}{2} s^{\beta}} = -\frac{2n e^{\theta t}}{a} \cdot s^{2-\frac{2}{n}-\beta} \widehat{U}_s^{-1} \widehat{U}_{ss}$$

$$= \frac{2n e^{\theta t}}{a} \cdot s^{2-\frac{2}{n}-\beta} \cdot \left\{ \alpha^{1-\alpha} a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1} \right\}^{-1} \times \alpha^{1-\alpha} (1-\alpha) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-2}$$

$$= \frac{2n(1-\alpha) e^{\theta t}}{a} \cdot s^{2-\frac{2}{n}-\beta} \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{-1}$$

$$\leq \frac{2n(1-\alpha) e}{a\alpha} \cdot s^{1-\frac{2}{n}-\beta}$$

$$\leq \frac{2n(1-\alpha) e}{a\alpha} \cdot s_\star^{1-\frac{2}{n}-\beta}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap (0,s_\star) \quad (3.60)$$

due to (3.53), which implies the inequality

$$-n^{2}s^{2-\frac{2}{n}}\widehat{U}_{ss} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot ne^{-\theta t}\widehat{U}_{s} \cdot \frac{a}{2}s^{\beta} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}) \cap (0,s_{\star}).$$
(3.61)

We next use (3.26) and (3.27) along with (3.59) and (3.49) to compute

$$\frac{\widehat{U}_{t}}{ne^{-\theta t}\widehat{U}_{s} \cdot \frac{a}{2}s^{\beta}} = \frac{2e^{\theta t}}{na} \cdot s^{-\beta}\widehat{U}_{s}^{-1}\widehat{U}_{t}$$

$$= \frac{2e^{\theta t}}{na} \cdot s^{-\beta} \cdot \left\{\alpha^{1-\alpha}a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1}\right\}^{-1} \times \alpha^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^{2}(t)}$$

$$= \frac{2(1-\alpha)e^{\theta t}}{na} \cdot s^{-\beta} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^{2}(t)}$$

$$\leq \frac{2(1-\alpha)e}{na} \cdot s^{-\beta} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}\right)^{1-\delta_{\star\star}}$$

$$\leq \frac{2(1-\alpha)e}{na} \cdot s^{1-\beta-\delta_{\star\star}}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^{n}) \cap (0, s_{\star})$$
(3.62)

thanks to (3.54), which leads to

$$\widehat{U}_t \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \frac{a}{2} s^\beta \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap (0,s_\star).$$

Inserting this and (3.61) into (3.58) establishes (3.50).

Similarly, relying on our choice of the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we can find suitable parameter function y(t) and parameter  $\theta$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0$  in an appropriate intermediate annulus.

**Lemma 3.10** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$  and R > 0, assume (1.7), and let  $\mu_* > 0$  and  $\mu^* > 0$  be given. Then one can find  $s_{**} \in (0,1]$  with the property that if T > 0 and  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  are such that

$$y(t) > \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{R^n}\right\}$$
 and  $0 \le y'(t) \le y^{1+\frac{2}{n}}(t)$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ , (3.63)

and if

$$\theta \ge 1, \tag{3.64}$$

then the functions  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}$  defined in (3.34) and (3.35) satisfy

$$\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)},R^n) \cap (0,s_{\star\star}).$$
(3.65)

PROOF. Since  $\beta - \frac{2}{n} - 1 + \sigma - \alpha \sigma > 0$  asserted by Lemma 3.3, we can choose  $s_{\star\star} \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$a(1+n^{2}\beta^{-1}) \cdot s_{\star\star}^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}-1+\sigma-\alpha\sigma} \le Ka^{\sigma}e^{-(\sigma-1)}$$
(3.66)

with a as in (3.23). Due to the nonnegativity of  $\widehat{W}$  and thanks to  $\sigma > 1$ , we can utilize (3.9), (3.64), (3.31), (3.33) and (3.24) together with (3.56), (3.59) and (3.63) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\theta t} \cdot \mathcal{Q}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) &= \widehat{W}_t - \theta \widehat{W} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{W}_{ss} + \widehat{W} - e^{\theta t} \cdot K s^{1-\sigma} e^{-(\theta t)\sigma} \widehat{U}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq \widehat{W}_t - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{W}_{ss} - K e^{-\theta t(\sigma-1)} \cdot s^{1-\sigma} \widehat{U}^{\sigma} \\ &= \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^2(t)} \\ &+ n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \cdot \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-2} \\ &- K e^{-\theta t(\sigma-1)} \cdot s^{1-\sigma} \cdot \left\{\alpha^{-\alpha} a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha}\right\}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta-1} \cdot y^{-1+\frac{2}{n}} (t) \\ &+ n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \cdot \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta-2} \\ &- K e^{-(\sigma-1)} \cdot s^{1-\sigma} \cdot \left\{\alpha^{-\alpha} a \cdot (\alpha s)^{\alpha}\right\}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq a (1+n^2\beta^{-1}) \cdot s^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}} - K a^{\sigma} e^{-(\sigma-1)} \cdot s^{1-\sigma+\alpha\sigma} \\ &= s^{1-\sigma+\alpha\sigma} \cdot \left\{a (1+n^2\beta^{-1}) \cdot s^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}-1+\sigma-\alpha\sigma} - K a^{\sigma} e^{-(\sigma-1)}\right\} \\ &= s^{1-\sigma+\alpha\sigma} \cdot \left\{a (1+n^2\beta^{-1}) \cdot s^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}-1+\sigma-\alpha\sigma} - K a^{\sigma} e^{-(\sigma-1)}\right\} \\ &\leq 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0, \frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap (0, s_{\star\star}), \end{aligned}$$

due to our choice of  $s_{\star\star}$  in (3.66), and this yields (3.65).

## 3.5 Subsolution properties: outer region

Depending on the properties of the function  $\widehat{U}$  in an outer region, we can find some large parameter  $\theta$  and parameter function y(t) such that  $\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^*)}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0$  holds in the outer region.

**Lemma 3.11** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0,  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\mu^{\star} > 0$ , assume (1.7), and let  $s_0 \in (0,1]$  be arbitrarily given. Then there exists  $\theta_{\star} = \theta_{\star}^{(s_0)} > 0$  such that whenever  $\theta \ge \theta_{\star}$  and T > 0 as well as  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  are such that

$$y(t) > \frac{1}{R^n}$$
 and  $0 \le y'(t) \le y^2(t)$  for all  $t \in (0,T)$ , (3.68)

the functions  $\underline{U}$  and  $\underline{W}$  defined in (3.34) and (3.35) satisfy

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)},R^n) \cap [s_0,R^n).$$
(3.69)

PROOF. For any given  $s_0 \in (0,1]$ , we first choose  $\theta_{\star} = \theta_{\star}^{(s_0)} > 0$  sufficiently large such that

$$\theta_{\star} > \frac{1 + \mu^{\star} R^{n}}{s_{0}^{1+\alpha}} + \frac{n^{2} R^{2n-2}}{\alpha s_{0}^{2+\alpha}}.$$
(3.70)

Since

$$s - \frac{1 - \alpha}{y(t)} \ge s - (1 - \alpha)s = \alpha s \ge \alpha s_0 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap [s_0, R^n)$$

and since  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  and  $s_0 \leq 1$ , we then obtain that according to (3.24), (3.26), (3.27) and (3.28) along with (3.68),

$$\widehat{U} = \alpha^{-\alpha} a \cdot \left( s - \frac{1 - \alpha}{y(t)} \right)^{\alpha} \ge \alpha^{-\alpha} a \cdot (\alpha s_0)^{\alpha} = a s_0^{\alpha}$$

and

$$\widehat{U}_t = \alpha^{1-\alpha} (1-\alpha) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^2(t)}$$

$$\leq \alpha^{1-\alpha} (1-\alpha) a \cdot (\alpha s_0)^{\alpha-1} = (1-\alpha) a s_0^{\alpha-1} \leq \frac{a}{s_0}$$

as well as

$$\widehat{U}_s = \alpha^{1-\alpha} a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-1} \le \alpha^{1-\alpha} a \cdot (\alpha s_0)^{\alpha-1} = a s_0^{\alpha-1} \le \frac{a}{s_0}$$

and

$$-\widehat{U}_{ss} = \alpha^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\alpha}{y(t)}\right)^{\alpha-2} \le \alpha^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)a \cdot (\alpha s_0)^{\alpha-2} = \frac{(1-\alpha)as_0^{\alpha-2}}{\alpha} \le \frac{a}{\alpha s_0^2}$$

for all  $t \in (0,T)$  and  $s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap [s_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Relying on the above estimates and utilizing the nonnegativity of  $\widehat{U}_s$  and  $\widehat{W}$ , we see that whenever  $\theta > \theta_{\star}$ ,

$$\begin{split} e^{\theta t} \mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) &= \widehat{U}_t - \theta \widehat{U} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss} - n e^{-\theta t} \widehat{U}_s \cdot \left(\widehat{W} - \frac{\mu^{\star} e^{\theta t} s}{n}\right) \\ &\leq \widehat{U}_t - \theta \widehat{U} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{U}_{ss} + \mu^{\star} s \cdot \widehat{U}_s \\ &\leq \frac{a}{s_0} - \theta a s_0^{\alpha} + n^2 (R^n)^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \cdot \frac{a}{\alpha s_0^2} + \mu^{\star} R^n \cdot \frac{a}{s_0} \\ &= a s_0^{\alpha} \cdot \left\{ \frac{1 + \mu^{\star} R^n}{s_0^{1+\alpha}} + \frac{n^2 R^{2n-2}}{\alpha s_0^{2+\alpha}} - \theta \right\} \\ &\leq a s_0^{\alpha} \cdot \left\{ \frac{1 + \mu^{\star} R^n}{s_0^{1+\alpha}} + \frac{n^2 R^{2n-2}}{\alpha s_0^{2+\alpha}} - \theta_{\star} \right\} \\ &\leq 0 \quad \text{ for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap [s_0, R^n) \end{split}$$

thanks to (3.70). This yields (3.69).

Similarly, using several explicit estimates of the function  $\widehat{W}$  in an outer region, we can chose sufficiently large parameter  $\theta$  and parameter function y(t) such that  $\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0$  is satisfied in the outer region.

**Lemma 3.12** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0,  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\mu^{\star} > 0$ , and assume (1.7). Then for any given  $s_0 \in (0,1]$  there exists  $\theta_{\star\star} = \theta_{\star\star}^{(s_0)} > 0$  such that if  $\theta \ge \theta_{\star\star}$ , T > 0 and  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  are such that

$$y(t) > \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{R^n}\right\}$$
 and  $0 \le y'(t) \le y^{1+\frac{2}{n}}(t)$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ , (3.71)

with  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_\star, \alpha, \theta, y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_\star, \beta, \theta, y)}$  taken from (3.34) and (3.35), there holds

$$\mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \le 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)},R^n) \cap [s_0,R^n). \tag{3.72}$$

PROOF. Given any  $s_0 \in (0, 1]$ , we take  $\theta_{\star\star} = \theta_{\star\star}^{(s_0)} > 0$  large enough such that

$$\theta_{\star\star} \ge 2$$
 and  $\theta_{\star\star} \ge 2(1-\beta)(1+n^2\beta^{-1})s_0^{-\frac{m}{2}}$ . (3.73)

Again since

$$s - \frac{1 - \beta}{y(t)} \ge \beta s$$
 and  $s - \frac{1 - \alpha}{y(t)} \ge \alpha s$   $t \in (0, T)$  and  $s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n)$ ,

in view of Lemma 3.5 together with the nonnegativity of  $\widehat{U}$  and (3.71), we obtain that if  $\theta \geq \theta_{\star\star}$ ,

$$\begin{split} e^{\theta t} \cdot \mathcal{Q}[\underline{U}, \underline{W}](s, t) &= \widehat{W}_t - \theta \widehat{W} - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{W}_{ss} + \widehat{W} - e^{\theta t} \cdot K s^{1-\sigma} e^{-(\theta t)\sigma} \widehat{U}^{\sigma} \\ &\leq \widehat{W}_t - n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \widehat{W}_{ss} - \frac{\theta}{2} \widehat{W} \\ &= \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-1} \cdot \frac{y'(t)}{y^2(t)} \\ &\quad + n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \cdot \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta-2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\theta}{2} \beta^{-\beta} a \cdot \left(s - \frac{1-\beta}{y(t)}\right)^{\beta} \\ &\leq \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{y(t)}\right)^{1-\frac{2}{n}} \\ &\quad + n^2 s^{2-\frac{2}{n}} \cdot \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta-2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\theta}{2} \beta^{-\beta} a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta} \\ &\leq \beta^{1-\beta} (1-\beta) a \cdot (\beta s)^{\beta-1} \cdot s^{1-\frac{2}{n}} + n^2 \beta^{-1} (1-\beta) a \cdot s^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}} - \theta \cdot \frac{a}{2} s^{\beta} \\ &= (1-\beta) (1+n^2 \beta^{-1}) a \cdot s^{\beta-\frac{2}{n}} - \theta \cdot \frac{a}{2} s^{\beta} \\ &= \frac{a}{2} s^{\beta} \cdot \left\{ 2(1-\beta) (1+n^2 \beta^{-1}) a \cdot s^{-\frac{2}{n}} - \theta \right\} \\ &\leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \text{ and } s \in (\frac{1}{y(t)}, R^n) \cap [s_0, R^n), \end{split}$$

$$(3.74)$$

because  $0 < \beta < 1$  and because (3.73). The completes the proof.

# 3.6 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We now make sure that under the assumption on  $\sigma$  from Theorem 1.1 we can chose the parameters  $\alpha, \beta, \theta$  and the parameter function y(t) such that all hypotheses in Lemmata 3.7-3.12 are simultaneously satisfied, and thus the pair  $(\underline{U}, \underline{W})$  will indeed forms a subsolution.

**Lemma 3.13** Let  $n \in \{3,4\}$ , R > 0,  $\mu_{\star} > 0$  and  $\mu^{\star} > 0$ , and assume (1.7). Then for any  $T_{\star} > 0$ , one can find  $\theta > 0, T \in (0, T_{\star})$  and a positive function  $y \in C^{1}([0, T))$  such that

$$y(t) \to +\infty$$
 as  $t \nearrow T$ , (3.75)

and that with the functions  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}^{(\mu_{\star},\alpha,\theta,y)}$  and  $\underline{W} = \underline{W}^{(\mu_{\star},\beta,\theta,y)}$  taken from (3.34) and (3.35) satisfy

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0 \quad and \quad \mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0 \quad for \ all \ t \in (0,T) \ and \ s \in (0,R^n) \setminus \{\frac{1}{y(t)}\}.$$
(3.76)

PROOF. With  $\delta_{\star} > 0$  and  $\delta_{\star\star} > 0$  provided by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.9, we take

$$\delta := \min\left\{\delta_{\star}, \, \delta_{\star\star}, \, \frac{2}{n}\right\}. \tag{3.77}$$

We then let  $s_{\star} = s_{\star}^{(\delta_{\star\star})}$  and  $s_{\star\star}$  be chosen in Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.10, and apply Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.12 to

$$s_0 := \min\left\{s_\star, s_{\star\star}\right\} \tag{3.78}$$

to obtain  $\theta_{\star} = \theta_{\star}^{(s_0)}$  and  $\theta_{\star\star} = \theta_{\star\star}^{(s_0)}$  with the properties therein. Setting

$$\theta := \max\left\{\theta_{\star}, \theta_{\star\star}, 2\right\} \tag{3.79}$$

and taking  $\gamma_{\star}$ ,  $y_{\star}$  and L from lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8, we then let

$$\gamma := \min\left\{\gamma_{\star}, L, 1\right\} \tag{3.80}$$

and select  $y_0 > 0$  large enough such that

$$y_0 > \max\left\{1\frac{1}{R^n}\right\}$$
 and  $y_0 \ge y_\star,$  (3.81)

and that

$$T := \frac{1}{\gamma \delta y_0^{\delta}} \quad \text{satisfies} \quad T < \min\left\{\frac{1}{\theta}, T_\star\right\}.$$
(3.82)

Our choice of T guarantees that the problem

$$\begin{cases} y'(t) = \gamma y^{1+\delta}(t), & t \in (0,T), \\ y(0) = y_0, \end{cases}$$
(3.83)

has a solution  $y \in C^1([0,T))$  which satisfies (3.75) as well as  $y \ge y_0$ , so that (3.81), (3.80) and (3.77) ensure that all the requirements on y made in Lemmata 3.7-3.12 are fulfilled. Moreover, (3.79) makes sure that also the corresponding assumptions on  $\theta$  in these lemmata are met, we may conclude from the above-said statements and from (3.79) that for  $(\underline{U}, \underline{W}) = (\underline{U}^{(\mu_\star, \alpha, \theta, y)}, \underline{W}^{(\mu_\star, \beta, \theta, y)})$  defined in (3.34) and (3.35) we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\mu^{\star})}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}[\underline{U},\underline{W}](s,t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) \text{ and } s \in (0,R^n) \setminus \{\frac{1}{y(t)}\}.$$

Since from (3.82) we also have that  $(0,T) \cap (0,\frac{1}{\theta}) = (0,T)$  and that  $T < T_{\star}$ , this completes the proof.

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

PROOF of Theorem 1.1. On the basis of Lemma 3.13, one readily verifies that  $(\underline{U}, \underline{W})$  defined through (3.34) and (3.35) indeed forms a sub-solution of the parabolic system (3.5)-(3.6) and (3.4), and thus in view of (3.34) and (3.27) we have that  $u(0,t) = nU_s(0,t) \ge n\underline{U}_s(0,t) = e^{-\theta t} \cdot ay^{1-\alpha}(t)$ , where the latter blows up at T due to (3.75) and  $\alpha < 1$ . The readers may refer [16] for a detailed proof.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171316).

# References

- BILER, P.: Local and global solvability of some parabolic systems modelling chemotaxis. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. 8, 715-743 (1998)
- [2] CAO, X.: Superlinear transmission in an indirect signal production chemotaxis system. Appl. Math. Lett. 158, Paper No. 109235 (2024)
- [3] CIEŚLAK, T., STINNER, C.: Finite-time blowup and global-in-time unbounded solutions to a parabolic-parabolic quasilinear Keller-Segel system in higher dimensions. J. Differential Equations 252, 5832-5851 (2012)
- [4] DING, M., WANG, W.: Global boundedness in a quasilinear fully parabolic chemotaxis system with indirect signal production. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. B 24, 4665-4684 (2019)
- [5] FUEST, M., LANKEIT, J., TANAKA, Y.: Critical mass phenomena in higher dimensional quasilinear Keller-Segel systems with indirect signal production. Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 46, 14362-14378 (2023)
- [6] FUJIE, K., SENBA, T.: Application of an Adams type inequality to a two-chemical substances chemotaxis system. J. Differential Equations 263, 88-148 (2017)
- [7] HU, B., TAO, Y.: To the exclusion of blow-up in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-growth model with indirect attractant production. Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 26, 2111-2128 (2016)
- [8] JÄGER, W., LUCKHAUS, S.: On explosions of solutions to a system of partial differential equations modelling chemotaxis. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 329, 819-824 (1992)
- [9] LAURENÇOT, PH., STINNER, C.: Mass threshold for infinite-time blowup in a chemotaxis model with split population. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 53, 3385-3419 (2021)
- [10] LI, M., XIANG, Z.: Convergence analysis from the indirect signal production to the direct one.
   J. Differential Equations 367, 834-889 (2023)
- [11] LIU, D., TAO, Y.: Boundedness in a chemotaxis system with nonlinear signal production. Appl. Math. J. Chinese Univ. Ser. B 31, 379-388 (2016)
- [12] MACFARLANE, F.R., LORENZI, T., PAINTER, K.J.: The impact of phenotypic heterogeneity on chemotactic self-organisation. Bull. Math. Biol. 84, Paper No. 143 (2022)
- [13] SHI, Q., SHI, J., WANG, H.: Spatial movement with distributed memory. J. Math. Biol. 82, 33 (2021)
- [14] STROHM, S., TYSON, R.C., POWELL, J.A.: Pattern formation in a model for mountain pine beetle dispersal: linking model predictions to data. Bull. Math. Biol. 75, 1778-1797 (2013)
- [15] TAO, Y., WINKLER, M.: Critical mass for infinite-time aggregation in a chemotaxis model with indirect signal production. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 19, 3641-3678 (2017)

- [16] TAO, Y., WINKLER, M.: A switch in dimension dependence of critical blow-up exponents in a Keller-Segel system involving indirect signal production. arXiv:2411.06475 (2024)
- [17] TAO, Y., WINKLER, M.: A critical blow-up exponent in a low-dimensional chemotaxis system with indirect signal production. Preprint
- [18] TAO, Y., ZHANG, H.: Nonlinear transmission exponent for boundedness of solutions to a chemotaxis system with indirect signal production. Appl. Math. Lett. 149, Paper No. 108928 (2024)
- [19] WANG, W.: A quasilinear fully parabolic chemotaxis system with indirect signal production and logistic source. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 477 488-522 (2019)
- [20] WINKLER, M.: Does a volume-filling effect always prevent chemotactic collapse? Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 33, 12-24 (2010)
- [21] WINKLER, M.: Finite-time blow-up in the higher-dimensional parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system. J. Math. Pures Appl. 100, 748-767 (2013), arXiv:1112.4156v1
- [22] WINKLER, M.: A critical blow-up exponent in a chemotaxis system with nonlinear signal production. Nonlinearity 31, 2031-2056 (2018)
- [23] WU, S.: Boundedness in a quasilinear chemotaxis model with logistic growth and indirect signal production. Acta Appl. Math. 176, Paper No. 9, 14 pp (2021)
- [24] ZHENG, P., XIANG, Y., XING, J.: On a two-species chemotaxis system with indirect signal production and general competition terms. Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 32, 1385-1430 (2022)
- [25] ZUO, W., SHI, J.: Existence and stability of steady-state solutions of reaction-diffusion equations with nonlocal delay effect. Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 72, 43 (2021)