

The asymptotic behavior of solutions to a doubly degenerate chemotaxis-consumption system in two-dimensional setting

DUAN WU*

Institut für Mathematik, Universität Paderborn, 33098 Paderborn, Germany

Abstract

The present work proceeds to consider the convergence of the solutions to the following doubly degenerate chemotaxis-consumption system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (u^{m-1}v\nabla v) - \nabla \cdot (f(u)v\nabla v) + \ell uv, \\ v_t = \Delta v - uv, \end{cases}$$

under no-flux boundary conditions in a smoothly bounded convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, where the nonnegative function $f \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is asked to satisfy $f(s) \leq C_f s^\alpha$ with $\alpha, C_f > 0$ for all $s \geq 1$.

The global existence of weak solutions or classical solutions to the above system has been established in both one- and two-dimensional bounded convex domains in previous works. However, the results concerning the large time behavior are still constrained to one dimension due to the lack of a Harnack-type inequality in the two-dimensional case. In this note, we complement this result by using the Moser iteration technique and building a new Harnack-type inequality.

Keywords: degenerate diffusion; chemotaxis; asymptotic stability

AMS (2020) Subject Classification: 35K65, 92C17, 35B40

1 Introduction

Investigating the long-term behavior of bounded solutions to a parabolic system can serve as one of the criteria for assessing whether or not the system is capable of precisely describing the emergence and evolution of structures in some specific biological situations. For instance, the concordance between the nontrivial stabilization characteristics shown in [17] and the experimental observations reported in [3, 11, 12] rigorously indicates that, nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems involving cross-degeneracy proposed in [6] are more suitable for modeling the bacterial patterning of *Bacillus subtilis* grown on thin agar plates than the general linear non-degenerate systems.

*E-mail: duan_wu@126.com

The main purpose of our work is to consider the asymptotic behavior of the chemotaxis-consumption system

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

that arises in mathematical biology as a model for describing the evolutionary processes of the species *Bacillus subtilis* living in poor nutrient environments ([8]). At the level of mathematical analysis for this model, there is some literature concentrating on the fundamental global solvability for different choices of $S(u, v)$, $D(u, v)$ and $f(u, v)$. When considering the nutrient-induced proliferation case (i.e., $f(u, v) = uv$), Winkler demonstrated that the one-dimensional version of (1.1) admits global weak solutions in the context of $S(u, v) = uv$, $D(u, v) = u^2v$ in [15], which was subsequently followed by [10] removing an integrability condition to obtain similar results; alternatively, global solvability in a two-dimensional setting can also be achieved by assuming smallness assumption on initial data, as shown in [16]. Also under the circumstances $D(u, v) = f(u, v) = uv$, the existence of global weak solutions holds in the taxis-free case (i.e., $S(u, v) = 0$) in any dimension ([17]); if chemotactic migration is taken into account of the form $S(u, v) = u^\alpha v$, Li in [9] proved that (1.1) possesses global weak solutions in two-dimensional domains with $1 < \alpha < \frac{3}{2}$ and in three-dimensional domains with $\frac{7}{6} < \alpha < \frac{13}{9}$, which was extended by [18] and [19]. In the presence of logistic source terms $f(u, v) = \rho u - \mu u^\kappa$, the global solvability was shown in [13] for the case when $\kappa > \frac{n+2}{2}$.

At the stage of research on asymptotic features, the available results from mathematically rigorous studies appear to be restricted to the one-dimensional version of (1.1) with $D(u, v) = f(u, v) = uv$ and $S(u, v) = u^2v$ ([15]), the striking peculiarity of which consists in the presence of an uncountable family of spatially heterogeneous steady states significantly unlike the common case. In the two-dimensional setting, only numerical simulations have been performed in [8], which coincides with the observations gained experimentally in [2] and [4]. To the best of our knowledge, however, describing the role of steady states in the dynamics of (1.1) by means of mathematical analysis in higher dimensions is still lacking. The present work aims to address this gap.

More precisely, we continue our investigations related to the solutions of the initial-boundary value system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (u^{m-1}v\nabla u) - \nabla \cdot (f(u)v\nabla v) + \ell uv, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v - uv, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ (u^{m-1}v\nabla u - f(u)v\nabla v) \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

in a smoothly bounded convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, with $1 \leq m < 4$, $\ell \geq 0$, where the nonnegative function $f \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is assumed to satisfy

$$f(u) \leq C_f u(u+1)^{\alpha-1} \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0 \quad (1.3)$$

or

$$f(u) \leq C_f u^\alpha \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0 \quad (1.4)$$

with $C_f > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. In addition, the initial data are throughout supposed to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ is nonnegative with } u_0 \not\equiv 0 & \text{and} \\ v_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ is positive in } \overline{\Omega}. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

In such frameworks, the global existence of weak solutions for $1 \leq m < 3$ and classical solutions for $3 \leq m < 4$ has been studied in [19]. This paper will firstly illustrate that the solutions obtained previously actually exhibit higher regularities by employing a Moser iteration argument. These results are beneficial for establishing a certain Harnack-type inequality in the next step, which is crucial for describing the asymptotic behavior.

The following statement is with respect to the definition of weak solutions used in this paper.

Definition 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $m \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 0$. Suppose that f satisfies (1.3) or (1.4) with $C_f > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, and that $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $v_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ are nonnegative. Then we call that a pair (u, v) of nonnegative functions*

$$\begin{cases} u \in L^1_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) & \text{and} \\ v \in L^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap L^1_{loc}([0, \infty); W^{1,1}(\Omega)) \end{cases}$$

satisfying

$$u^m \nabla v \in L^1_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad u^m v \in L^1_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$$

is a global weak solution of (1.2) if

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u \varphi_t - \int_\Omega u_0 \varphi(\cdot, 0) &= \frac{1}{m} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u^m \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi + \frac{1}{m} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u^m v \Delta \varphi \\ &+ \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega f(u) v \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi + \ell \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega uv \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$ fulfilling $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \times (0, \infty)$, as well as

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega v \varphi_t + \int_\Omega v_0 \varphi(\cdot, 0) = \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega uv \varphi \quad (1.7)$$

for each $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$.

Now we can state our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded convex domain with smooth boundary, and let $\ell \geq 0$. Suppose that the initial data u_0 and v_0 satisfy (1.5). Then if one of the following cases holds:*

- (i) $1 \leq m < 2$, f fulfills (1.3) with $m - 1 < \alpha < m$;
- (ii) $2 \leq m < 3$, f fulfills (1.4) with $m - 1 < \alpha < \frac{m}{2} + 1$,

there exist functions

$$\begin{cases} u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) & \text{and} \\ v \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)) \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

such that (u, v) forms a global weak solution of (1.2) in the sense of Definition 1.1. Moreover, if (iii) $3 \leq m < 4$, f fulfills (1.4) with $m - 1 < \alpha < \frac{m}{2} + 1$ and $u_0 > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, there exist functions

$$\begin{cases} u \in \cap_{q \geq 1} C^0([0, \infty); W^{1,q}(\Omega)) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)) & \text{and} \\ v \in \cap_{q \geq 1} C^0([0, \infty); W^{1,q}(\Omega)) \cap C^{2,1}(\bar{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)) \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

such that (u, v) forms a global classical solution of (1.2).

Furthermore, $u \geq 0$ and $v > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)$, and

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} < \infty \quad \text{for a.e. } t > 0. \quad (1.10)$$

Remark 1.1. Compared to the results of Theorem 1.2 in [19], we improve the L^p regularity of u to L^∞ , which essentially provides the possibility for the following result on asymptotic stability.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied, and let (u, v) be as accordingly given by Theorem 1.1. Then there exists $u_\infty \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow u_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad v(\cdot, t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.11)$$

Here the limit function satisfies $u_\infty = w(\cdot, 1)$ with $w \in C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, 1])$ being a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} w_\tau = \nabla \cdot (a(x, \tau)w^{m-1}\nabla w) - \nabla \cdot (b(x, \tau)f(w)) + \ell a(x, \tau)w, & x \in \Omega, \tau \in (0, 1), \\ \nabla w \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \tau \in (0, 1), \\ w(x, 0) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^1 \int_\Omega w \varphi_t - \int_\Omega w_0 \varphi(\cdot, 0) &= \frac{1}{m} \int_0^1 \int_\Omega w^m \nabla a(x, \tau) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \frac{1}{m} \int_0^1 \int_\Omega a(x, \tau) w^m \Delta \varphi \\ &+ \int_0^1 \int_\Omega b(x, \tau) f(w) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \ell \int_0^1 \int_\Omega a(x, \tau) w \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, 1])$ fulfilling $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \times (0, 1)$, where

$$a(x, \tau) := L \cdot \frac{v(x, t)}{\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} \quad \text{and} \quad b(x, \tau) := L \cdot \frac{v(x, t) \nabla v(x, t)}{\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}, \quad (x, \tau) \in \Omega \times (0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad t = \phi^{-1}(\tau)$$

with

$$L := \int_0^\infty \|v(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(t) := \frac{1}{L} \cdot \int_0^t \|v(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds, \quad t \geq 0$$

are such that there exists $C > 0$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq a(x, \tau) \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad |b(x, \tau)| \leq C \quad \text{for all } (x, \tau) \in \Omega \times (0, 1). \quad (1.13)$$

Remark 1.2. Although we only state the asymptotic behavior in the large time limit for spatially two-dimensional version of (1.2), the approach developed in this paper appears to be available to (1.2) and its variants in higher dimensions.

2 Some preliminaries

Similar to the approximating procedure used in [19], we consider the regularized variant of (1.2) given by

$$\begin{cases} u_{\varepsilon t} = \nabla \cdot (u_{\varepsilon}^{m-1} v_{\varepsilon} \nabla u_{\varepsilon}) - \nabla \cdot (f(u_{\varepsilon}) v_{\varepsilon} \nabla v_{\varepsilon}) + \ell u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon}, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_{\varepsilon t} = \Delta v_{\varepsilon} - u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon}, & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u_{\varepsilon}}{\partial \nu} = \frac{\partial v_{\varepsilon}}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u_{\varepsilon}(x, 0) = u_{0\varepsilon}(x), \quad v_{\varepsilon}(x, 0) = v_{0\varepsilon}(x) := v_0(x), & x \in \Omega \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

with $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, where $u_{0\varepsilon}(x)$ depending on m is defined by

$$u_{0\varepsilon}(x) := \begin{cases} u_0(x) + \varepsilon, & 1 \leq m < 3, \\ u_0(x), & 3 \leq m < 4. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

The following lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 5.2, and Lemma 5.6 in [19].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Then for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists at least one pair $(u_{\varepsilon}, v_{\varepsilon})$ of functions*

$$\begin{cases} u_{\varepsilon} \in \cap_{q \geq 1} C^0([0, \infty); W^{1,q}(\Omega)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)) \\ v_{\varepsilon} \in \cap_{q \geq 1} C^0([0, \infty); W^{1,q}(\Omega)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)) \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

such that $u_{\varepsilon}, v_{\varepsilon} > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)$, and there exist $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, 1)$ fulfilling $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and a pair (u, v) of nonnegative functions

$$\begin{cases} u \in L^{\infty}((0, \infty); L^2(\Omega)) & \text{and} \\ v \in L^{\infty}((0, \infty); W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)) \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

such that (u, v) forms a global weak solution of (1.2) in the sense of Definition 1.1, and that

$$u_{\varepsilon_j} \rightarrow u \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\varepsilon_j} \rightarrow v \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \times (0, \infty) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.5)$$

From now on, without further explicit mention, it is assumed that u_0 and v_0 always fulfill (1.5). Now we further introduce some elementary boundedness properties of the approximate system.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $(u_{\varepsilon}, v_{\varepsilon})$ is given by Lemma 2.1. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } t > t_0 \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} u_{0\varepsilon} \leq \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t) \leq \int_{\Omega} u_{0\varepsilon} + \ell \int_{\Omega} v_{0\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \quad (2.7)$$

as well as

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \leq \int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t_0) \quad \text{for all } t_0 \geq 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^6}{v_\varepsilon^5} \leq C \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^p(\cdot, t) \leq C \quad (2.10)$$

as well as

$$\|\nabla v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. The properties in (2.6)-(2.8) can be obtained from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 5.2 in [19]. As an implication of Lemmata 4.5-4.7 in [19], we can claim that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2}{v_\varepsilon} |D^2 \ln v_\varepsilon|^2 \leq c_1 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which in conjunction with [19, Lemma 2.2] implies (2.9). Finally, (2.10) and (2.11) are direct results of Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 5.1, respectively, in [19]. \blacksquare

3 Uniform L^∞ boundedness of u and the proof of Theorem 1.1

We start by presenting an inequality from [18, Lemma 6.2], which plays a critical role in the following context.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $p_* > 2$. Then there exist $\kappa = \kappa(p_*) > 0$ and $K = K(p_*) > 0$ such that for any choice of $p \geq p_*$ and $\eta \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\int_\Omega \varphi^{p+1} \psi \leq \eta \int_\Omega \varphi^{p-1} \psi |\nabla \varphi|^2 + \eta \cdot \left\{ \int_\Omega \varphi^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{2(p+1)}{p}} \cdot \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla \psi|^6}{\psi^5} + K \eta^{-\kappa} p^{2\kappa} \cdot \left\{ \int_\Omega \varphi^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^2 \cdot \int_\Omega \varphi \psi \quad (3.1)$$

is valid for arbitrary positive functions $\varphi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\psi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$.

We are now able to establish the L^∞ bound for u_ε by using the Moser iterative technique.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Let $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ be as yielded by Lemma 2.1. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$$

Proof. Take $p_0 = 4$, and recursively define

$$p_k := 2p_{k-1} + 2 - m, \quad k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then it is obvious that $(p_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ increases and

$$c_1 \cdot 2^k \leq p_k \leq c_2 \cdot 2^k \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (3.3)$$

with $c_1 := p_0 - (2 - m)_-$ and $c_2 := p_0 + (2 - m)_+$. Setting

$$M_{k,\varepsilon}(T) := 1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k}(\cdot, t), \quad T \in (0, \infty), \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad (3.4)$$

then we see that each $M_{k,\varepsilon}(T)$ is finite and we can use (2.10) to see the existence of $c_3 > 0$ independent of T satisfying

$$M_{0,\varepsilon} \leq c_3 \quad \text{for all} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (3.5)$$

Now we try to estimate $M_{k,\varepsilon}(T)$ for $T \in (0, \infty)$, $k \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. By (2.11), we have

$$\|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq c_4 \quad \text{for all} \quad t > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

with $c_4 > 0$. And recalling (1.3) and (1.4), we can claim that there exists $c_5 > 0$ such that

$$f^2(u_{\varepsilon}) \leq c_5 C_f^2 (u_{\varepsilon}^{2\alpha} + u_{\varepsilon}^2) \quad \text{for all} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Thus, after testing the first equation in (2.1) by $p_k u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-1}$ and integrating by parts, the Young inequality along with the boundary conditions entails that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} &= p_k \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-1} \nabla \cdot (u_{\varepsilon}^{m-1} v_{\varepsilon} \nabla u_{\varepsilon}) - p_k \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-1} \nabla \cdot (f(u_{\varepsilon}) v_{\varepsilon} \nabla v_{\varepsilon}) + p_k \ell \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &= -p_k(p_k - 1) \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-3} v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + p_k(p_k - 1) \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-2} f(u_{\varepsilon}) v_{\varepsilon} \nabla u_{\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla v_{\varepsilon} + p_k \ell \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq -\frac{p_k(p_k - 1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-3} v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + \frac{p_k(p_k - 1)}{2} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-m-1} f^2(u_{\varepsilon}) v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^2 + p_k \ell \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq -\frac{p_k^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-3} v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 p_k^2 \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k-m+1} v_{\varepsilon} + \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+2\alpha-m-1} v_{\varepsilon} \right\} + p_k \ell \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq -\frac{p_k^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-3} v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + (2c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 + \ell) p_k^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-1} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + (2c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 + \ell) p_k^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all} \quad t > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where we also use the facts that $1 < p_k + 2\alpha - m - 1 < p_k + m - 1$ and $1 < p_k - m + 1 \leq p_k \leq p_k + m - 1$ guaranteed by our restrictions $1 \leq m < 4$ and $m - 1 < \alpha < m$.

Due to $p_k \geq 4$ for all $k \geq 1$, we have $p_k + m - 1 > 4$, and thus Lemma 3.1 with taking $p_* := 3$ infers the existence of $\kappa > 0$ and $K > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &(2c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 + \ell) p_k^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-1} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{p_k^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k+m-3} v_{\varepsilon} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon}|^2 + \frac{p_k^2}{4} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{p_k+m-2}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{2(p_k+m-1)}{p_k+m-2}} \cdot \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5} \\ &\quad + 4^{\kappa} (2c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 + \ell)^{\kappa+1} K p_k^2 (p_k + m - 2)^{2\kappa} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{p_k+m-2}{2}} \right\}^2 \cdot \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for all $t > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Combining (3.6) and (3.7), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} \leq \frac{p_k^2}{4} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{p_k+m-2}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{2(p_k+m-1)}{p_k+m-2}} \cdot \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5}$$

$$+ c_7 p_k^2 (p_k + m - 2)^{2\kappa} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{p_k+m-2}{2}} \right\}^2 \cdot \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} + c_6 p_k^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \quad (3.8)$$

for all $t > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ with $c_6 := 2c_4^2 c_5 C_f^2 + \ell$ and $c_7 := 4^{\kappa} c_6^{\kappa+1} K$. From (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$c_1 \cdot 2^k \leq p_k + m - 2 = 2p_{k-1} \leq c_2 \cdot 2^k \quad \text{for all } k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\},$$

which together with (3.3), (3.4) and (3.8) implies that for all $t \in (0, T)$, $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} &\leq \frac{(2^k c_2)^2}{4} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_{k-1}} \right\}^{2+\frac{2}{p_k+m-2}} \cdot \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5} \\ &\quad + c_7 (2^k c_2)^{2\kappa+2} \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_{k-1}} \right\}^2 \cdot \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} + c_6 (2^k c_2)^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{c_2^2}{4} (2^k)^2 M_{k-1, \varepsilon}^{2+\frac{2}{c_1} \cdot 2^{-k}}(T) \cdot \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5} + c_7 c_2^{2\kappa+2} (2^k)^{2\kappa+2} M_{k-1, \varepsilon}^2(T) \cdot \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + c_6 c_2^2 (2^k)^2 \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq c_8 (2^k)^{2\kappa+2} M_{k-1, \varepsilon}^{2+\frac{2}{c_1} \cdot 2^{-k}}(T) \cdot \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5} + \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \right\} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

with $c_8 := \frac{c_2^2}{4} + c_7 c_2^{2\kappa+2} + c_6 c_2^2$. Integrating this in time, we see that for all $t \in (0, T)$, $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon}^{p_k} \leq c_8 c_9 (2^k)^{2\kappa+2} M_{k-1, \varepsilon}^{2+\frac{2}{c_1} \cdot 2^{-k}}(T) + \int_{\Omega} (u_0 + 1)^{p_k}, \quad (3.9)$$

where

$$c_9 := \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}|^6}{v_{\varepsilon}^5} + \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon} v_{\varepsilon} \right\} < \infty$$

warranted by (2.8) and (2.9). If we write

$$a := 1 + (|\Omega| + 1) \|u_0 + 1\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}^{c_2} \quad \text{and} \quad b := (c_8 c_9 + 1) \cdot 2^{2\kappa+2},$$

then it is easy to verify that

$$\|u_0 + 1\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}^{p_k} \cdot |\Omega| + 1 \leq 1 + (|\Omega| + 1)^{2^k} \|u_0 + 1\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}^{c_2 \cdot 2^k} \leq a^{2^k}$$

and

$$c_8 c_9 (2^k)^{2\kappa+2} \leq (c_8 c_9 + 1)^k (2^{2\kappa+2})^k = b^k.$$

That is, we can further conclude from (3.9) and (3.4) that

$$M_{k, \varepsilon}(T) \leq c_8 c_9 (2^k)^{2\kappa+2} M_{k-1, \varepsilon}^{2+\frac{2}{c_1} \cdot 2^{-k}}(T) + \|u_0 + 1\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}^{p_k} \cdot |\Omega| + 1$$

$$\leq b^k M_{k-1,\varepsilon}^{2+\frac{2}{c_1}\cdot 2^{-k}}(T) + a^{2^k}. \quad (3.10)$$

Since $k \geq 1$ is arbitrary here, together with (3.3) and (3.5), we may use [18, Lemma 6.3] to claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{c_1} &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u_\varepsilon^{p_k}(\cdot, t) \right\}^{\frac{c_1}{p_k}} \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_{k,\varepsilon}^{\frac{c_1}{p_k}}(T) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_{k,\varepsilon}^{\frac{1}{2^k}}(T) \\ &\leq (2\sqrt{2}b^3 a^{1+\frac{1}{c_1}} c_3)^{e^{\frac{1}{c_1}}} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T), T \in (0, \infty) \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

This clearly proves the lemma. ■

We finally show that u_ε and v_ε enjoy higher regularities.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Let $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ be as yielded by Lemma 2.1. Then for any $T_1 > 0$, there exist $\theta_1 = \theta_1(T_1) \in (0, 1)$ and $C_1(T_1) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\theta_1, \frac{\theta_1}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_1])} \leq C_1(T_1) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{C^{\theta_1, \frac{\theta_1}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_1])} \leq C_1(T_1) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (3.13)$$

In addition, for each $\tau > 0$ and any $T_2 > \tau$, there exist $\theta_2 = \theta_2(\tau, T_2) \in (0, 1)$ and $C_2(\tau, T_2) > 0$ such that

$$\|v_\varepsilon\|_{C^{2+\theta_2, 1+\frac{\theta_2}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [\tau, T_2])} \leq C_2(\tau, T_2) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.2, we see the existence of positive constant c_1 such that

$$u_\varepsilon(x, t) \leq c_1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which yields from the second equation in (2.1) that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$v_{\varepsilon t} \geq \Delta v_\varepsilon - c_1 v_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty).$$

Then by the comparison principle we get that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$v_\varepsilon(x, t) \geq c_2 e^{-c_1 t} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \quad (3.15)$$

with $c_2 = \inf_{\Omega} v_0 > 0$ due to the strict positivity of v_0 asserted by (1.5).

Now we rewrite the first equation in (2.1) in the following form

$$u_{\varepsilon t} = \nabla \cdot A_\varepsilon(x, t, u_\varepsilon, \nabla u_\varepsilon) + B_\varepsilon(x, t, u_\varepsilon), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon(x, t, u_\varepsilon, \nabla u_\varepsilon) &:= v_\varepsilon(x, t)u_\varepsilon^{m-1}(x, t)\nabla u_\varepsilon(x, t) - f(u_\varepsilon(x, t))v_\varepsilon(x, t)\nabla v_\varepsilon(x, t) \quad \text{and} \\ B_\varepsilon(x, t) &= \ell u_\varepsilon(x, t)v_\varepsilon(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (1.3) and (1.4), when $1 \leq m < 2$, the assumption $m - 1 < \alpha < m$ leads

$$\frac{f^2(u_\varepsilon)}{u_\varepsilon^{m-1}} \leq C_f^2 u_\varepsilon^{3-m} (u_\varepsilon + 1)^{2\alpha-2} \leq C_f^2 (u_\varepsilon + 1)^{2\alpha-m+1} \leq C_f^2 (c_1 + 1)^3 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

and when $2 \leq m < 4$, the assumption $m - 1 < \alpha < \frac{m}{2} + 1$ results

$$\frac{f^2(u_\varepsilon)}{u_\varepsilon^{m-1}} \leq C_f^2 u_\varepsilon^{2\alpha-m+1} \leq C_f^2 u_\varepsilon^3 \leq C_f^2 c_1^3 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Thus, the Young inequality combined with (3.15), (2.6) and (2.11) yields that for each $T > 0$, there exists $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon(x, t, u_\varepsilon, \nabla u_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon &= v_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{m-1} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 - f(u_\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} v_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{m-1} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 - \frac{f^2(u_\varepsilon)}{u_\varepsilon^{m-1}} v_\varepsilon |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{c_2}{2} \cdot e^{-c_1 T} u_\varepsilon^{m-1} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 - c_3 \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T). \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} |A_\varepsilon(x, t, u_\varepsilon, \nabla u_\varepsilon)| &\leq c_3 u_\varepsilon^{m-1} |\nabla u_\varepsilon| + c_3 u_\varepsilon^{\frac{m-1}{2}}, \quad \text{and} \\ |B_\varepsilon(x, t)| &\leq \ell c_1 c_3 \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T). \end{aligned}$$

We may invoke the Hölder estimates in [14] to obtain (3.12). The property in (3.13) can be achieved by proceeding with a similar but simpler argument on the second equation in (1.2). Furthermore, the parabolic Schauder theory in [7] is applicable to get (3.14). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let (u, v) and $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in Lemma 2.1. Using the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem together with (3.12)-(3.14), as $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C_{loc}^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)), \quad (3.17)$$

which in conjunction with Lemma 3.2 reveals that

$$\begin{cases} u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, \infty)) & \text{and} \\ v \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, \infty)). \end{cases}$$

This together with (2.3) and (2.4) completes the proof. \blacksquare

4 Harnack-type inequality and the proof of Theorem 1.2

Based on the L^∞ boundedness of the first component, we can proceed to derive a Harnack-type inequality for the second component v , which is of essential importance to the subsequent outcome regarding asymptotic stability.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Let $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ be as yielded by Lemma 2.1. Then there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$v_\varepsilon(x, t) \geq \lambda \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. According to Lemma 3.2, there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, \infty))} \leq c_1 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which together with the second equation in (2.1) makes [5, Lemma 2.5] become applicable so as to deduce with $\lambda_* > 0$ we have

$$v_\varepsilon(x, t) \geq \lambda_* \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, t > 1 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

When $0 < t \leq 1$, (3.15) provides positive constants c_2 and c_3 such that

$$v_\varepsilon(x, t) \geq c_2 e^{-c_3 t} \geq c_2 e^{-c_3} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

whereas (2.6) entails that

$$\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which yields that

$$v_\varepsilon(x, t) \geq \frac{c_2 e^{-c_3}}{\|v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, 0 < t \leq 1 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

We thereby obtain (4.1) by taking $\lambda = \min \left\{ \lambda_*, \frac{c_2 e^{-c_3}}{\|v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} \right\}$. ■

With the above elliptic Harnack-type inequality at hand, we can immediately derive the following result, which is similar to that in [10, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Let $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ be as yielded by Lemma 2.1, and λ be taken from Lemma 4.1. Then we have*

$$\int_0^\infty \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} dt \leq \frac{\int_\Omega v_0}{\lambda \int_\Omega u_0} \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Making use of (2.6)-(2.8) and (4.1), for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega v_0 &\geq \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon \geq \lambda \int_0^\infty \left\{ \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon \right\} \cdot \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\geq \lambda \cdot \left\{ \int_\Omega u_0 \right\} \cdot \int_0^\infty \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

We observe that the integrability of $\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ allows for a transformation on time scale, and the Harnack-type in Lemma 4.1 will facilitate the transformed version belonging to a non-degenerate diffusion parabolic problem of porous medium type. To this end, we arrive at the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *With $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ and $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ taken from Lemma 2.1. Let*

$$L_\varepsilon := \int_0^\infty \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} dt, \quad \varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}},$$

$$\tau := \phi_\varepsilon(t) := \frac{1}{L_\varepsilon} \int_0^t \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds, \quad t \geq 0$$

and

$$w_\varepsilon(x, \tau) := u_\varepsilon(x, \phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(\tau)), \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, \tau \in [0, 1].$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} w_{\varepsilon\tau} = \nabla \cdot (a_\varepsilon(x, \tau) w_\varepsilon^{m-1} \nabla w_\varepsilon) - \nabla \cdot (b_\varepsilon(x, \tau) f(w_\varepsilon)) + \ell a_\varepsilon(x, \tau) w_\varepsilon, & x \in \Omega, \tau \in (0, 1), \\ \nabla w_\varepsilon \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \tau \in (0, 1), \\ w_\varepsilon(x, 0) = u_0(x) + \varepsilon, & x \in \Omega \end{cases}$$

with

$$a_\varepsilon(x, \tau) := L_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{v_\varepsilon(x, t)}{\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} \quad \text{and} \quad b_\varepsilon(x, \tau) := L_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{v_\varepsilon(x, t) \nabla v_\varepsilon(x, t)}{\|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}.$$

Additionally, there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c} \leq a_\varepsilon(x, \tau) \leq c \quad \text{and} \quad |b_\varepsilon(x, \tau)| \leq c \quad \text{for all } (x, \tau) \in \Omega \times (0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$L_\varepsilon \rightarrow L := \int_0^\infty \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} dt \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Let λ be taken from Lemma 4.1, then (3.15) shows the existence of c_1 and c_2 fulfilling

$$a_\varepsilon(x, \tau) > \lambda L_\varepsilon = \lambda \int_0^\infty \|v_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} dt \geq \lambda c_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-c_2 t} dt = \frac{\lambda c_1}{c_2}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. The upper bounds for $a_\varepsilon(x, \tau)$ and $|b_\varepsilon(x, \tau)|$ in (4.3) can be resulted from Lemma 4.2 and (2.11).

It follows from (3.17), Fatou's lemma and Lemma 4.2 that,

$$\int_0^\infty \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} dt \leq |\Omega| \int_0^\infty \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} dt \leq \frac{|\Omega| \int_\Omega v_0}{\lambda \int_\Omega u_0}. \quad (4.5)$$

From (3.17), we know that $\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is uniformly continuous with respect to $t > 0$. Therefore, an application of [1, Lemma 3.1] together with (4.5) shows that for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\eta\lambda \int_{\Omega} u_0}{6},$$

which in conjunction with (3.17) concludes that there exists $\varepsilon_* \in (0, 1)$ satisfying

$$\|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\eta\lambda \int_{\Omega} u_0}{3}, \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ with } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_*,$$

whence similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t_0)}{\lambda \int_{\Omega} u_0} \leq \frac{\eta}{3}. \quad (4.6)$$

Now we apply (3.17) and Fatou's lemma once more to see that

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt \leq \frac{\eta}{3} \quad (4.7)$$

and moreover, we can pick $\varepsilon_{**} \in (0, 1)$ fulfilling

$$\|v(\cdot, t) - v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\eta}{3t_0} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, t_0) \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ with } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{**}. \quad (4.8)$$

Thus, combining (4.6)-(4.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{\varepsilon} - L| &= \left| \int_0^{\infty} \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt - \int_0^{\infty} \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^{t_0} \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t) - v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt + \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|v_{\varepsilon}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt + \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} dt \\ &\leq \eta \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ with } \varepsilon < \min\{\varepsilon_*, \varepsilon_{**}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This thereby proves (4.4). ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in Lemma 2.1. Then according to (3.17) and (4.4), we have

$$\phi_{\varepsilon}(t) \rightarrow \phi(t) \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, from (3.16) and (3.17) we have

$$w_{\varepsilon}(x, \tau) \rightarrow u(x, \phi^{-1}(\tau)), \quad a_{\varepsilon}(x, \tau) \rightarrow a(x, \tau) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\varepsilon}(x, \tau) \rightarrow b(x, \tau) \quad (4.9)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \Omega \times (0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$.

On the other hand, thanks to (4.3), we may rely on the Hölder regularity in quasilinear degenerate parabolic equations ([14]) to claim that there exist $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\|w_{\varepsilon}\|_{C^{\theta, \frac{\theta}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1])} \leq C \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$$

in quite a similar manner stated in Lemma 3.3. Then by the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we obtain that

$$w_\varepsilon(x, \tau) \rightarrow w(x, \tau) \quad \text{in } C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1]) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon = \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$$

for some $w \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1])$. Then we can conclude that

$$w(x, \tau) = u(x, \phi^{-1}(\tau)) \quad \text{for all } (x, \tau) \in \Omega \times (0, 1),$$

which along with the continuity of $w(\cdot, 1)$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ indicates that

$$u(\cdot, t) \rightarrow u_\infty := w(\cdot, 1) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (2.6) and (3.17), we have

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t_0 \geq 0 \quad \text{and } t > t_0,$$

which together with (4.5) deduces that

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

Consequently, (1.11) is proved. Finally, (1.12) is a consequence of (1.6), and (1.13) can be derived from (4.9) and (4.3). ■

Acknowledgements. This work is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (No. 462888149).

References

- [1] Bai, X., Winkler, M.: *Equilibration in a fully parabolic two-species chemotaxis system with competitive kinetics*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 65 (2016): 553-583.
- [2] Ben-Jacob, E., Cohen, I., Levine, H.: *Cooperative self-organization of microorganisms*. Adv. Phys. 49 (2000): 395-554.
- [3] Fujikawa, H.: *Periodic growth of Bacillus subtilis colonies on agar plates*. Physica A 189 (1992): 15-21.
- [4] Golding, I., Kozlovsky, Y., Cohen, I., Ben-Jacob, E.: *Studies of bacterial branching growth using reaction-diffusion models for colonial development*. Physica A 260 (1998): 510-554.
- [5] Húska, J.: *Harnack inequality and exponential separation for oblique derivative problems on Lipschitz domains*. J. Differential Equations 226 (2006): 541-557.
- [6] Kawasaki, K., Mochizuki, A., Matsushita, M., Umeda, T., Shigesada, N.: *Modeling spatio-temporal patterns generated by Bacillus subtilis*. J. Theor. Biol. 188 (1997): 177-185.
- [7] Ladyženskaja, O.A., Solonnikov, V.A., Ural'ceva, N.N.: *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1968.
- [8] Leyva, J.F., Málaga, C., Plaza, R.G.: *The effects of nutrient chemotaxis on bacterial aggregation patterns with non-linear degenerate cross diffusion*. Physica A 392 (2013): 5644-5662.

- [9] Li G.: *Large-data global existence in a higher-dimensional doubly degenerate nutrient system*. J. Differential Equations 329 (2022): 318-347.
- [10] Li, G., Winkler, M.: *Nonnegative solutions to a doubly degenerate nutrient taxis system*. Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 21 (2022): 687-704.
- [11] Matsushita, M., Fujikawa, H.: *Diffusion-limited growth in bacterial colony formation*. Physica A 168 (1990): 498-506.
- [12] Ohgiwari, M., Matsushita, M., Matsuyama, T.: *Morphological changes in growth phenomena of bacterial colony patterns*. J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 61 (1992): 816-822.
- [13] Pan, X.: *Superlinear degradation in a doubly degenerate nutrient taxis system*. Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. 77 (2024): 104040.
- [14] Porzio, M.M., Vespi, V.: *Holder estimates for local solutions of some doubly nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations*. J. Differential Equations 103 (1993): 146-178.
- [15] Winkler, M.: *Does spatial homogeneity ultimately prevail in nutrient taxis systems? A paradigm for structure support by rapid diffusion decay in an autonomous parabolic flow*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 374 (2021): 219-268.
- [16] Winkler, M.: *Small-signal solutions of a two-dimensional doubly degenerate taxis system modeling bacterial motion in nutrient-poor environments*. Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. 63 (2022): 103407.
- [17] Winkler, M.: *Stabilization of arbitrary structures in a doubly degenerate reaction-diffusion system modeling bacterial motion on a nutrient-poor agar*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 61 (2022): 108.
- [18] Winkler, M.: *L^∞ bounds in a two-dimensional doubly degenerate nutrient taxis system with general cross-diffusive flux*. J. Differential Equations 400 (2024): 423-456.
- [19] Wu, D.: *Refined existence theorems for doubly degenerate chemotaxis-consumption systems with large initial data*. NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. Accepted. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2409.02741>.