

GLOBAL SOLUTIONS FOR A CHEMOTAXIS-NAVIER-STOKES MODEL WITH POTENTIAL CONSUMPTION

DANIEL BARBOSA ¹, FRANCISCO GUILLÉN-GONZÁLEZ ², AND GABRIELA PLANAS ¹

ABSTRACT. The present work deals with a Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system with potential consumption, under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions for both the cell density and the chemical signal, and of Dirichlet type for the velocity field, over a bounded three-dimensional domain. The cases where there is no fluid flow, or the consumption has a linear rate have been previously dealt with. This work then handles the so far open question of whether global solutions exist for this system. The solution is obtained through a time discretization approach and a regularization of the system, using suitable truncations. Minimal conditions on the boundary of the domain are required.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work, we investigate the dynamics of a chemotaxis-fluid system, a mathematical model with an intricate interplay between cellular behavior and fluid dynamics. The system, described within a bounded three-dimensional domain, encompasses three coupled nonlinear partial differential equations governing the evolution of cell density, chemical concentration, and a fluid velocity field.

Originating from biological scenarios such as bacterial motility in response to chemical gradients, chemotaxis modelling was first introduced by Keller and Segel [17]. Chemotaxis is seen in many organic functions, even playing an important role in inflammatory diseases, wound healing, cancer metastasis or disease progressions, [21, 22, 23]. In recent years, numerous studies have focused on chemotaxis-related models. For comprehensive reviews of this literature, see, for instance, [3, 1, 4, 19].

In cases where a chemical signal attracts cells that they also consume, a useful energy law emerges due to the interplay between the chemotactic and consumption terms. This effect has been explored in previous studies, allowing the estimation of chemotactic terms. Global large data solutions have been found for three-dimensional domains in [24], and, with the addition of a logistic term on the cell density the results were extended to higher dimensional cases in [18]. Some closely related considerations also lead to several other works such as [2, 6, 5, 20].

Recently, in [11], a model where cells are attracted by a chemical substance that they consume, with a potential consumption rate, was introduced as

$$\begin{cases} n_t = \Delta n - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla c), \\ c_t = \Delta c - n^s c, \end{cases}$$

where $n = n(t, x) \geq 0$ is the cell density and $c = c(t, x) \geq 0$ the chemical concentration being $x \in \Omega$, a bounded domain, and $t > 0$. The term $\nabla \cdot (n \nabla c)$ corresponds to the chemotactic attraction and n^s is the consumption rate of c , with $s \geq 1$. In [11] global weak solutions, uniformly bounded in time, are found for a three-dimensional domain with minimal regularity.

In the presence of fluid flow, a buoyancy effect known as bioconvection occurs when bacterial populations exhibit collective behavior in an incompressible fluid, as discussed in [15]. This effect

¹ DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, ESTATÍSTICA E COMPUTAÇÃO CIENTÍFICA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS

² DEPARTAMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS AND NUMERICAL ANALYSIS, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA

combined with chemotactic behavior may occur, this is the case, for example, in [9], where aerobic bacteria in water droplets search for oxygen. This buoyancy effect, couples cell density with a fluid velocity field, where additionally convective terms appear. This macro-scale chemotaxis fluid model has been extensively studied in various works such as [8, 12].

In the present work, we focus on this attraction-consumption chemotaxis model, in the presence of fluid flow by integrating the Navier-Stokes (NS) equations for an incompressible flow, for the velocity field $u = u(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and pressure $P = P(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}$. This is achieved by introducing convective terms for both n and c equations and incorporating a source term into the NS equations accounting the gravitational effect of the heavier bacteria on the flow. Moreover, homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions for both the cell density n and the chemical concentration c are considered, jointly with Dirichlet boundary conditions for the velocity field u . Then the system remains as

$$\begin{cases} n_t + u \cdot \nabla n = \Delta n - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla c), \\ c_t + u \cdot \nabla c = \Delta c - n^s c, \\ u_t + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \Delta u + n \nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ \partial_\eta n|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta c|_\Gamma = u|_\Gamma = 0, \quad n(0) = n^0, \quad c(0) = c^0, \quad u(0) = u^0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here, η represents the outward normal vector to the boundary Γ of the domain Ω . The gravitational potential, Φ , is assumed to be a given $W^{1,\infty}$ function. Finally, n^0, c^0, u^0 are the initial data.

The case where $s = 1$ has been treated firstly in convex domains obtaining global classical solutions in a two-dimensional setting [25]; these results were extended to non-convex domains in [16]. Global weak solutions have been also proved in a three-dimensional setting in [26].

The main objective of this work is to extend the existing results for consumption rate n^s , with $s > 1$, proving the existence of global weak solutions to system (1). The key point is to make use of the energy structure of the Keller-Segel equations as presented in [14] combined with the approach of the coupling chemotaxis-fluid as in [25]. More specifically, the main contributions of this paper are the following:

- (i) Proving the existence of global weak solutions for the chemotaxis-Navier-Stokes model with potential consumption $n^s c$ for $s > 1$.
- (ii) Proposing a new regularization to fit the chemotaxis system with potential consumption, through a new truncation operator for the consumption term, truncating also the source term from the Navier-Stokes system.
- (iii) Getting the convergence of a time discrete scheme towards weak solutions of system (1).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 presents the key ideas and results. We introduce the new truncation operator and the corresponding regularized system of (1). The definition of weak solutions is provided, along with the existence result for global weak solutions of (1). Additionally, we discuss the regularizing effect of increasing the potential rate s up until $s = 2$ and remark that asymptotic in time estimates are obtained only for $s \geq 2$. Section 2 focuses on preliminary results that are either referenced or proved. Keys are Lemma 2.6 which deals with the source term $n \nabla \Phi$ of the fluid system and Lemma 2.7 which clarifies the relationship between the direct upper truncation T^m and the newly defined one G^m . Section 3 treats the existence of the time discrete regularized problem which is obtained by a fixed point argument. Section 4 presents some a priori estimates and an adequate energy inequality. This is done separately for $s \in (1, 2)$ and $s \geq 2$ due to the presence of a singular energy term depending on n when $s < 2$. Section 5 shows the passage to the limit of the time discrete regularized system towards a weak solution of (1) and additional estimates up to infinity time are proved for the case $s \geq 2$.

1.1. Main results. Here and henceforth Ω is assumed to be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^3 with boundary Γ sufficiently regular as specified below. For simplicity, we will omit the domain in the notation of functional spaces. That is, we will denote, for instance, $L^2(\Omega)$ simply as L^2 from now on.

We start by introducing some usual spaces in fluid problems. Let

$$\mathcal{V} := \{v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^3, \nabla \cdot v = 0\}.$$

Denoting by $\overline{\mathcal{V}}^X$ the closure of \mathcal{V} in the X -norm, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} H &:= \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{L^2} = \{v \in L^2, \nabla \cdot v = 0, \gamma_\eta(v) = 0\}, \\ V &:= \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{H_0^1} = \{v \in H_0^1, \nabla \cdot v = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where γ_η is the normal trace on Γ , which in this case is well defined [7]. Both identifications hold true for bounded Lipschitz domains. Moreover, one has the Gelfand Triple $V \subset H \subset V'$, with compact and dense embeddings. We also define $W_{0,\sigma}^{1,p} := \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{W_0^{1,p}}$.

The idea is to work with sufficient domain regularity such that the boundary terms on the energy inequality are dealt with. This leads to the following definitions. First, we consider the Poisson-Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta z + z = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and introduce the following

Definition 1.1. Let $z \in H^1$ be a weak solution of (2) with $f \in (H^1)'$. It will be said that the Poisson-Neumann problem (2) has H^2 -regularity if for any $f \in L^2$ then $z \in H^2$ and there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|z\|_{H^2} \leq C \|-\Delta z + z\|_{L^2}.$$

We also introduce the additional density hypothesis:

Hypothesis (H). Assume that, for every $z \in H^2$ such that $\partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = 0$, there is a sequence $\{\rho_n\} \subset C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\partial_\eta \rho_n|_\Gamma = 0$ and $\rho_n \rightarrow z$ in H^2 .

The conditions outlined in Definition 1.1, and Hypothesis (H), can be viewed as conditions on the regularity of the domain Ω . Note that, as shown in [11], it suffices require Γ to be at least $C^{2,1}$ to both hold.

We now introduce what is meant by a weak solution to problem (1).

Definition 1.2 (Weak solution). A triplet (n, c, u) is a weak solution in $(0, \infty) \times \Omega$ of (1) if the following regularity hold

- for $s \in (1, 2)$:

$$\begin{cases} n \in L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; L^s) \cap L_{loc}^{5s/3}(0, \infty; L^{5s/3}), \\ \nabla n \in L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; L^s) \cap L_{loc}^{5s/(3+s)}(0, \infty; L^{5s/(3+s)}), \\ n \nabla c \in L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; L^s), \\ \begin{cases} c \in L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; H^1) \cap L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; H^2), \\ \nabla c \in L_{loc}^4(0, \infty; L^4), \end{cases} \\ u \in L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; V); \end{cases}$$

- for $s \geq 2$:

$$\begin{cases} n \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^s) \cap L_{loc}^{5s/3}(0, \infty; L^{5s/3}), \\ \nabla n \in L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; L^2), \\ n \nabla c \in L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; L^2), \\ \begin{cases} c \in L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; H^1) \cap L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; H^2), \\ \nabla c \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2) \cap L_{loc}^4(0, \infty; L^4), \\ u \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; V), \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

and (n, c, u) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_t, \phi \rangle - \langle u n, \nabla \phi \rangle + \langle \nabla n, \nabla \phi \rangle &= \langle n \nabla c, \nabla \phi \rangle, \quad \forall \phi \in W^{1, \infty}, \quad a.e. \ t \in (0, \infty), \\ c_t + u \cdot \nabla c - \Delta c &= -n^s c, \quad a.e. \ (0, \infty) \times \Omega, \\ \langle u_t, \varphi \rangle + \langle u \otimes u, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \langle \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle &= \langle n \nabla \Phi, \varphi \rangle, \quad \forall \varphi \in V, \quad a.e. \ t \in (0, \infty), \end{aligned}$$

and the initial conditions $(n, c, u)|_{t=0} = (n^0, c^0, u^0)$. Hereafter, $(u \otimes u)_{ij} = u_i u_j$.

Remark 1. Observe the change of regularity from finite time to infinite time in cases $s \in (1, 2)$ and $s \geq 2$ respectively. Concretely, for $s \geq 2$ we have the global in-time regularity $n \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^s)$, $\nabla c \in L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2)$ and $u \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H)$, which are only “loc” for $s \in (1, 2)$.

Remark 2. With the above regularities it also holds that $n_t \in L_{loc}^{10/9}(0, \infty; (W^{1, \infty})')$ for $s < 2$, $n_t \in L_{loc}^2(0, \infty; (W^{1, \infty})')$ for $s \geq 2$, $c_t \in L_{loc}^{5/3}(0, \infty; L^{5/3})$ and $u_t \in L_{loc}^{4/3}(0, \infty; V')$. In particular, the initial conditions $(n, c, u)|_{t=0} = (n^0, c^0, u^0)$ have sense.

Having defined what we mean by a weak solution we may now state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain such that the H^2 -regularity on the Poisson-Neumann Problem and hypothesis **(H)** are satisfied. Let $n^0 \in L^s$ ($s > 1$) and $c^0 \in H^1 \cap L^\infty$ with $n^0 \geq 0, c^0 \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω , and $u^0 \in H$. Then there exists (n, c, u) a weak solution in $(0, \infty) \times \Omega$ of problem (1), in the sense of Definition 1.2, with $n, c \geq 0$ a.e. in $(0, \infty) \times \Omega$, and such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} n = \int_{\Omega} n^0 \quad a.e. \ t \in (0, \infty), \\ 0 \leq c(t, x) \leq \|c^0\|_{L^\infty} \quad a.e. \ (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \Omega. \end{cases}$$

1.2. Time discretization and regularization in the proof of Theorem 1.1. A weak solution will be obtained as a limit of solutions for a time-discrete regularized problem. We now state how this time approximation and regularization will be made.

A convenient way to rewrite the equations is by setting an adequate change of variables, changing the chemical variable c by $z = \sqrt{c + \alpha^2}$ for some $\alpha > 0$, which simplifies the test functions involved for obtaining an energy law of system (1).

A time discretization approach is applied in [14], which deals with the corresponding chemotaxis model, but without the interaction with a fluid flow. A regularization to this system is made with upper and lower truncations in order to have bounded terms and prevent division by zero, respectively. For that reason, we define the lower truncation for z as

$$T_\alpha(z) = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } z \leq \alpha, \\ z & \text{if } z \geq \alpha, \end{cases}$$

and the lower-upper truncation for n ,

$$T_0^m(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \leq 0, \\ n & \text{if } n \in [0, m], \\ m & \text{if } n \geq m, \end{cases} \quad T^m(n) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } n \leq m, \\ m & \text{if } n \geq m. \end{cases}$$

In this work, a new regularization is proposed. Compared with [14], this regularization fits better concerning the test functions employed in the n equation. We define the new lower-upper truncation operators

$$G_0^m(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{s}n^s & \text{if } n \in [0, m], \\ \frac{m}{s-1}n^{s-1} - \frac{m^s}{s(s-1)} & \text{if } n \geq m, \end{cases}$$

$$G^m(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{s}n^s & \text{if } n \leq m, \\ \frac{m}{s-1}n^{s-1} - \frac{m^s}{s(s-1)} & \text{if } n \geq m, \end{cases}$$

where $G_0^m(n)$ is defined such that $G_0^m \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$(G_0^m)'(n) = T_0^m(n)n^{s-2}. \quad (3)$$

At this point, we consider the regularized Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system as follows

$$\begin{cases} n_t + u \cdot \nabla n = \Delta n - \nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n)2T_\alpha(z)\nabla z), \\ z_t - \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{T_\alpha(z)} + u \cdot \nabla z = \Delta z - \frac{s}{2}G_0^m(n) \left(z - \frac{\alpha^2}{T_\alpha(z)} \right), \\ u_t + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \Delta u + T_0^m(n)\nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ \partial_\eta n|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = u|_\Gamma = 0, \quad n(0) = n^0, \quad z(0) = z^0, \quad u(0) = u^0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $z^0 = \sqrt{c^0 + \alpha^2}$.

As for the time discretization, we will divide the interval $[0, \infty)$ into subintervals denoted by $I_i = [t_{i-1}, t_i)$, with $t_0 = 0$ and $t_i = t_{i-1} + k$, where $k > 0$ is the time step. We use the notation

$$\delta_t n^i = \frac{n^i - n^{i-1}}{k}, \quad \forall i \geq 1,$$

for the discrete time derivative of a sequence n^i . Then, we define the following Backward Euler scheme of (4) with semi-implicit convection fluid system: given $(n^{i-1}, z^{i-1}, u^{i-1})$, to find (n^i, z^i, u^i) solving

$$\begin{cases} \delta_t n^i + u^i \cdot \nabla n^i = \Delta n^i - \nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n^i)2T_\alpha(z^i)\nabla z^i), \\ \delta_t z^i + u^i \cdot \nabla z^i = \Delta z^i - \frac{s}{2}G_0^m(n^i) \left(z^i - \frac{\alpha^2}{T_\alpha(z^i)} \right) + \frac{|\nabla z^i|^2}{T_\alpha(z^i)}, \\ \delta_t u^i + u^{i-1} \cdot \nabla u^i + \nabla P^i = \Delta u^i + T_0^m(n^i)\nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u^i = 0, \\ \partial_\eta n^i|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta z^i|_\Gamma = u^i|_\Gamma = 0. \end{cases} \quad (I_k^m)$$

Since $z^0 = \sqrt{c^0 + \alpha^2}$, as long as $c^0 \geq 0$ in Ω , there follows $z \geq \alpha$ and if, in addition, n^0 is also nonnegative we then can drop the lower truncations in (I_k^m) . Hence, to return to the original system (1), we will check what happens to the solution of (I_k^m) as $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$.

We need to ensure that the initial data for the regularized problem is slightly more regular than (n^0, z^0, u^0) . While a little more regularity is sufficient for existence, it is essential to have increased

regularity when estimating continuous functions in time from the discrete ones, as discussed in section 5.3. Therefore, we consider

$$\begin{cases} n_\delta^0 \in W^{1,5s/(s+3)} \text{ if } s \leq 2, & n_\delta^0 \in H^1 \cap L^s \text{ if } s \geq 2, \\ n_\delta^0 \rightarrow n^0 \text{ in } L^s \text{ and } \|n_\delta^0\|_{L^s} \leq C \|n^0\|_{L^s}, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{cases} c_\delta^0 \in H^2, \\ c_\delta^0 \rightarrow c^0 \text{ in } H^1 \cap L^\infty \text{ and } \|c_\delta^0\|_{H^1 \cap L^\infty} \leq C \|c^0\|_{H^1 \cap L^\infty}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_\delta^0 \in V, \\ u_\delta^0 \rightarrow u^0 \text{ in } H \text{ and } \|u_\delta^0\|_{L^2} \leq C \|u^0\|_{L^2}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

From now on we omit δ from the notation and note that all estimates below will be δ -independent.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

This section presents several technical results that will be essential tools throughout the paper.

Lemmas 2.1 through 2.3, previously established and proven in [11, 14], are restated here for completeness. The following Lemma is used to obtain an energy inequality without a boundary term otherwise present.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that the Poisson-Neumann problem (2) has H^2 regularity and assume hypothesis **(H)**. Let $z \in H^2$ be such that $\partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = 0$ and $z \geq \alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Then there exist positive constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$, independent of α , such that*

$$\int_\Omega |\Delta z|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z dx \geq C_1 \left(\int_\Omega |D^2 z|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} dx \right) - C_2 \int_\Omega |\nabla z|^2 dx.$$

As for the time discretization, when dealing with time discrete derivatives the following holds.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $z^n, z^{n-1} \in L^\infty$, and let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 function. Then*

$$\int_\Omega \delta_t z^n(x) f'(z^n(x)) dx = \delta_t \int_\Omega f(z^n(x)) dx + \frac{1}{2k} \int_\Omega f''(b^n(x)) (z^n(x) - z^{n-1}(x))^2 dx,$$

where $b^n(x)$ is an intermediate point between $z^n(x)$ and $z^{n-1}(x)$.

To establish the convergence of the powers of a function, we will utilize the following result.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, and let $\{w_n\}$ be a sequence of nonnegative functions such that $w_n \rightarrow w$ in $L^p(0, T; L^p)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for every $r \in (1, p)$, $w_n^r \rightarrow w^r$ in $L^{p/r}(0, T; L^{p/r})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

We also make use of the classical version of Aubin-Lions theorem for compactness [7].

Lemma 2.4. *Let X, B and Y be three Banach spaces with $X \subset B \subset Y$. Suppose that X is compactly embedded in B and B is continuously embedded in Y . For $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$, let*

$$W = \{u \in L^p(0, T; X) \mid \partial_t u \in L^q(0, T; Y)\}.$$

- (1) *If $p < \infty$ then the embedding of W into $L^p(0, T; B)$ is compact.*
- (2) *If $p = \infty$ and $q > 1$ then the embedding of W into $C([0, T]; B)$ is compact.*

We present a discrete version of uniform in time Gronwall's estimates.

Lemma 2.5. *Consider a sequence of inequalities*

$$\delta_t a^n + \lambda a^n \leq C, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and $\{a^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, the following estimate holds

$$a^n \leq (1 + \lambda k)^{-n} a^0 + \frac{C}{\lambda} (1 - (1 + \lambda k)^{-n}), \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

In particular,

$$a^n \leq a^0 + \frac{C}{\lambda}, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Proof. We adapt a proof given in [10]. Let $\tilde{a}^n := (1 + \lambda k)^n a^n$. Then, from the recursive inequality

$$\delta_t \tilde{a}^n \leq (1 + \lambda k)^{n-1} C, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

Now, summing over n leads to

$$\tilde{a}^n \leq \tilde{a}^0 + C k \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 + \lambda k)^j = a^0 + \frac{C}{\lambda} ((1 + \lambda k)^n - 1),$$

and finally

$$a^n \leq (1 + \lambda k)^{-n} a^0 + \frac{C}{\lambda} (1 - (1 + \lambda k)^{-n}).$$

□

The following lemma will be used to deal with the source term on the fluid velocity equation.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, with $d \leq 3$. Let also f, g be functions defined on Ω such that $\int_{\Omega} |f| = K$, $|f|^{s/2} \in H^1$ ($s > 1$) and $g \in H_0^1$. Then for any $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} |f| |g| \leq \epsilon_1 \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon_2 \left\| \nabla |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C,$$

where C depends on ϵ_1, ϵ_2 and $\int_{\Omega} |f|$.

Proof. By using the embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^6$, the equivalence between $\|g\|_{H^1}$ and $\|\nabla g\|_{L^2}$ for any $g \in H_0^1$ and Young's inequality,

$$\int_{\Omega} |f| |g| \leq \|f\|_{L^{6/5}} \|g\|_{L^6} \leq C \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^{12/(5s)}}^{2/s} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^{12/(5s)}}^{4/s} + \epsilon_1 \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since $2/s < 12/5s < 6$, by interpolating

$$\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^{12/(5s)}}^{4/s} \leq \left(\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^6}^a \right)^{4/s} \left(\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^{2/s}}^{(1-a)} \right)^{4/s} = \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^6}^{4a/s} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f| \right)^{2(1-a)}$$

where $a = s/2(3s - 1)$. Then, $4a/s = 2/(3s - 1) < 1$ for any $s > 1$, so applying Young's inequality and again the embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^6$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |f| |g| &\leq \epsilon \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^6}^2 + C(K) + \epsilon_1 \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \epsilon \left\| \nabla |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C(K) + \epsilon_1 \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By using Poincaré's inequality we have

$$\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left\| \nabla |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^1}^2. \quad (9)$$

The remaining term $\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^1}^2$ is dealt separately in the cases $s \leq 2$ and $s > 2$. Indeed, if $s \leq 2$, then

$$\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^1}^2 = \left(\int_{\Omega} |f|^{s/2} \right)^2 \leq \|f\|_{L^1}^s |\Omega|^{(2-s)} \leq C(K).$$

If $s > 2$, by interpolation and Young inequalities,

$$\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^1}^2 = \|f\|_{L^{s/2}}^s \leq \|f\|_{L^s}^{sa} \|f\|_{L^1}^{s(1-a)} \leq \epsilon \|f\|_{L^s}^s + C(K) = \epsilon \left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C(K).$$

Therefore, in both cases, from (9), we arrive at

$$\left\| |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left\| \nabla |f|^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C(K),$$

hence using (8) the proof is finished. \square

We also make use of a comparison inequality between the truncation operators.

Lemma 2.7. *Let T^m and G^m be the truncations defined previously. Then for every $s > 1$ and $1 \leq q \leq s$, it holds that*

$$n^{s-q} T^m(n)^q \leq s G^m(n), \quad \forall n > 0.$$

Proof. If $n \leq m$, the equality becomes $n^s = s G^m(n)$. Let $n > m$ and define the auxiliary function,

$$f(n) := \frac{1}{s} n^{s-q} T^m(n)^q - G^m(n) = \frac{1}{s} n^{s-q} m^q - \frac{m}{s-1} n^{s-1} + \frac{m^s}{s(s-1)}.$$

It suffices to prove that $f(n) \leq 0$ for all $n > m$. Note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow m^+} f(n) = \frac{1}{s} m^s - \frac{m^s}{s-1} + \frac{m^s}{s(s-1)} = 0.$$

Moreover, for $n > m$

$$\begin{aligned} f'(n) &= \frac{s-q}{s} n^{s-q-1} m^q - m n^{s-2} = \frac{s-q}{s} n^{s-q-1} m^q - n^{s-q-1} n^{q-1} m \\ &\leq \frac{s-q}{s} n^{s-q-1} m^q - n^{s-q-1} m^q = n^{s-q-1} m^q \left(\frac{s-q}{s} - 1 \right) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

because as $q \geq 1$ it holds $(s-q)/s \leq 1$. In summary $f(n)$ is a non-increasing negative function for all $n > m$. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS FOR THE TIME DISCRETE SYSTEM I_k^m

With the preliminary results established and the discretization defined, we can now state an existence result for the approximate system. The initial step requires slightly higher regularity due to the bootstrapping argument involved.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Ω be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $(u^{i-1}, n^{i-1}, z^{i-1}) \in (L^5 \cap H) \times (L^2 \cap L^s) \times L^\infty$, with $n^{i-1} \geq 0$, $z^{i-1} \geq \alpha$ where $z^{i-1} = \sqrt{c^{i-1} + \alpha^2}$. Then for α small enough, there exists $(u^i, P^i, n^i, z^i) \in (H^2 \cap V) \times H^1 \times H^2 \times H^2$ that solves the time discrete scheme (I_k^m) .*

Proof. The existence of solutions to (I_k^m) is proven by a fixed point argument. Given $(\bar{n}, \bar{z}, \bar{u}) \in (W^{1,4})^2 \times V$, we consider the (decoupled) auxiliary problem, to define (n, z, u, P) solving

$$\begin{cases} \frac{u}{k} + (u^{i-1} \cdot \nabla)u - \Delta u + \nabla P = T_0^m(\bar{n})\nabla\Phi + \frac{u^{i-1}}{k}, & \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ \frac{z}{k} - \Delta z + \frac{s}{2}G_0^m(\bar{n})z = \alpha^2 \frac{s}{2} \frac{G_0^m(\bar{n})}{T_\alpha(\bar{z})} + \frac{|\nabla\bar{z}|^2}{T_\alpha(\bar{z})} + \frac{z^{i-1}}{k} - \bar{u} \cdot \nabla\bar{z}, \\ \frac{n}{k} + \bar{u} \cdot \nabla n - \Delta n = -2 \nabla \cdot (T_0^m(\bar{n})T_\alpha(\bar{z})\nabla z) + \frac{n^{i-1}}{k}, \\ \partial_\eta n|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = u|_\Gamma = 0. \end{cases}$$

We first ensure, through Lax-Milgram theorem, the existence of u and z , and then the existence of n (depending on z), in such a way that a compact map

$$S : (\bar{n}, \bar{z}, \bar{u}) \rightarrow (n, z, u),$$

is defined from $(W^{1,4})^2 \times V$ to itself. Finally by Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem [13] we will obtain the desired solution of the discrete scheme (I_k^m) . We start with the well definition of S .

The existence and uniqueness of the pair (u, P) follow a standard argument, by first applying Lax-Milgram theorem to get only $u \in V$, and after via De Rham's Lemma and the regularity of the Stokes problem, in a bootstrapping argument, getting that there exists a unique $(u, P) \in H^2 \times (H^1 \cap L_0^2)$, where $L_0^2 = \{f \in L^2 : \int f = 0\}$.

The existence and uniqueness of $z \in H^1$ follows from Lax-Milgram theorem, obtaining that in fact $z \in H^2$ via regularity of the Poisson-Neumann problem (2). From that, looking at n equation and applying Lax-Milgram theorem, we again obtain through a bootstrapping argument, necessary due to the presence of the convective term $\bar{u} \cdot \nabla n$, that there exists a unique $n \in H^2$.

The bounds obtained throughout the bootstrapping argument are sufficient to conclude that S is a well-defined compact mapping, defined by the composition of a sequentially continuous map from $(W^{1,4})^2 \times V$ into $(H^2)^2 \times (H^2 \cap V)$ and the compact embedding from $(H^2)^2 \times (H^2 \cap V)$ into $(W^{1,4})^2 \times V$.

3.1. The fixed point argument. To apply the fixed point theorem, we now need λ -independent estimates for all possible triplets (n, z, u) in $(W^{1,4})^2 \times V$ satisfying $(n, z, u) = \lambda S(n, z, u)$ for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

The case $\lambda = 0$ is trivially satisfied because $(n, z, u) \equiv (0, 0, 0)$. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, therefore if $(n, z, u) = \lambda S(n, z, u)$, then (n, z, u) satisfies the equations

$$\frac{u}{k} + u^{i-1} \cdot \nabla u - \Delta u + \nabla P = \lambda T_0^m(n)\nabla\Phi + \lambda \frac{u^{i-1}}{k}, \quad (1_\lambda)$$

$$\frac{n}{k} + u \cdot \nabla n - \Delta n = -\nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n)2T_\alpha(z)\nabla z) + \lambda \frac{n^{i-1}}{k}, \quad (2_\lambda)$$

$$\frac{z}{k\lambda} + u \cdot \nabla z - \Delta \frac{z}{\lambda} + \frac{s}{2\lambda}G_0^m(n)z = \alpha^2 \frac{sG_0^m(n)}{2T_\alpha(z)} + \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{T_\alpha(z)} + \frac{z^{i-1}}{k}. \quad (3_\lambda)$$

Firstly, as $u \in V$, we can test (1_λ) by u , obtaining that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \int |u|^2 + \int |\nabla u|^2 &= \lambda \int T_0^m(n)\nabla\Phi \cdot u + \int \lambda \frac{u^{i-1}}{k} \cdot u \\ &\leq \delta \int |u|^2 + C_\delta \left(\frac{1}{k^2} \|u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + m^2 \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By taking $\delta < 1/k$ there follows that u is bounded in V (independently of λ).

We now deal separately with n and z . The proof is analogous to that presented in Theorem 3.1 of [14], and here we only point out the main differences.

The first step is to show that n is a nonnegative function. For that, n equation (2_λ) is tested by the negative part of n , defined as $n_- := \min\{0, n\}$. Noting that for the convective term

$$\int (u \cdot \nabla n) n_- = \frac{1}{2} \int u \cdot \nabla (n_-^2) = 0,$$

then it can be shown that $n_- = 0$ a.e. in Ω , and therefore $n \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω .

The second step shows pointwise bounds, not only on z but also on z/λ . For it, we use the structure of the z equation.

Lemma 3.1. (*z/λ pointwise bounds*) *It holds*

$$\alpha \leq \frac{z}{\lambda} \leq \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Proof. The calculations are similar to the ones presented in [14, Theorem 3.1]. The only difference is given by the convective term. However, rewriting (3_λ) in terms of $\tilde{z} := z/\lambda - \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}$ and testing by \tilde{z}_+ where $\tilde{z}_+ := \max\{0, \tilde{z}\}$, the convective term becomes

$$\lambda \int (u \cdot \nabla z) \tilde{z}_+ = \lambda \int (u \cdot \nabla \tilde{z}) \tilde{z}_+ = -\frac{\lambda}{2} \int u \cdot \nabla (\tilde{z}_+^2) = 0.$$

Similarly, when dealing with the lower bound, the equation is rewritten in terms of $\tilde{z} := z/\lambda - \alpha$ and testing by \tilde{z}_- the convective term also vanishes. \square

With pointwise estimates for z/λ we also gain a pointwise estimate for z in L^∞ (independent of λ).

To estimate z in H^2 we use the energy structure of the z equation. We first multiply (3_λ) by $\lambda T_\alpha(z)/z$, recalling that $z > 0$, and arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{k} - T_\alpha(z) \frac{\Delta z}{z} - \lambda \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \\ &= -\frac{s}{2} G_0^m(n) T_\alpha(z) + \lambda \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} G_0^m(n) \frac{1}{z} + \lambda u \cdot \nabla z \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z} + \lambda \frac{z^{i-1} T_\alpha(z)}{k} \frac{1}{z}. \end{aligned}$$

By testing by $-\Delta z$, and integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{k} \int T_\alpha(z) \Delta z + \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z + \int T_\alpha(z) \frac{|\Delta z|^2}{z} \\ &= -\frac{s}{2} \int T_\alpha(z) \nabla G_0^m(n) \cdot \nabla z - \frac{s}{2} \int G_0^m(n) (T_\alpha(z))' |\nabla z|^2 - \lambda \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G_0^m(n)}{z^2} |\nabla z|^2 \\ &+ \lambda \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z} \nabla G_0^m(n) \cdot \nabla z - \lambda \int u \cdot \nabla z \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z} \Delta z - \lambda \int \frac{z^{i-1} T_\alpha(z)}{k} \frac{1}{z} \Delta z. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For the LHS of (10), using the fact that for $T_\alpha(z)/z \geq 1$ and integrating by parts

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{k} \int T_\alpha(z) \Delta z + \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z + \int T_\alpha(z) \frac{|\Delta z|^2}{z} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \int T_\alpha'(z) |\nabla z|^2 + \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z + \int T_\alpha(z) \frac{|\Delta z|^2}{z} \\ &\geq \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z + \lambda \int |\Delta z|^2 + (1 - \lambda) \int |\Delta z|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{k} \int T_\alpha(z) \Delta z + \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \Delta z + \int T_\alpha(z) \frac{|\Delta z|^2}{z} \\ &\geq C_3 \int |\Delta z|^2 - C_2 \lambda \int |\nabla z|^2 + C_1 \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we deal with the RHS of (10). Note that using the already obtained pointwise estimates gives us

$$\lambda \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z} = \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z/\lambda} \leq \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{\alpha} \leq \frac{\|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}}{\alpha}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, by first applying Hölder and using (11) yields

$$\lambda \int u \cdot \nabla z \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z} \Delta z \leq C \|u\|_{H^1} \|\nabla z\|_{L^4} \|\Delta z\|_{L^2}.$$

Now by applying Young's inequality twice, and multiplying and dividing the gradient term by z^2/λ^2 , we have

$$\|u\|_{H^1} \|\nabla z\|_{L^4} \|\Delta z\|_{L^2} \leq C(\epsilon, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H^1}^4 + \lambda^2 \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \epsilon \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} + \epsilon \|\Delta z\|_{L^2}^2,$$

hence

$$\lambda \int u \cdot \nabla z \frac{T_\alpha(z)}{z} \Delta z \leq C(\epsilon, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}, \|u\|_{H^1}) + \lambda \epsilon \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} + \epsilon \|\Delta z\|_{L^2}^2.$$

It also holds true that

$$\lambda \int \frac{z^{i-1} T_\alpha(z)}{k z} \Delta z \leq C(\epsilon, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}, k) + \epsilon \|\Delta z\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Moreover, using (3) one has $\nabla G_0^m(n) = T_0^m(n) n^{s-2} \nabla n = (2/s) T_0^m(n) n^{s/2-1} \nabla(n^{s/2})$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda s \alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z} \nabla G_0^m(n) \cdot \nabla z &= \lambda \alpha^2 \int \frac{n^{s/2-1}}{z} T^m(n) \nabla z \cdot \nabla n^{s/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda \alpha^3}{2} \int \frac{n^{s-2}}{z^2} (T^m(n))^2 |\nabla z|^2 + \frac{\lambda \alpha}{2} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By using now Lemma 2.7,

$$\frac{\lambda s \alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z} \nabla G_0^m(n) \cdot \nabla z \leq \frac{\lambda s \alpha^3}{2} \int \frac{G_0^m(n)}{z^2} |\nabla z|^2 + \frac{\lambda \alpha}{2} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2. \quad (12)$$

Then by setting $\alpha < 1$ the first term will be absorbed in (10). We also note that $\nabla n^{s/2}$ might be singular for $s < 2$. For an adaptation of this argument on the case $s < 2$ the use of a translation on n is necessary. This is done more accurately in Lemma 4.2 below.

Altogether, we arrive at the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &C_3 \int |\Delta z|^2 - C_2 \lambda \int |\nabla z|^2 + (C_1 - \epsilon) \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} + \frac{s}{2} \int G_0^m(n) (T_\alpha(z))' |\nabla z|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda \alpha}{2} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2 - \frac{s}{2} \int \nabla G_0^m(n) \cdot T_\alpha(z) \nabla z + C(\epsilon, \|u\|_{H^1}, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, we multiply (2 λ) by n^{s-1} and use (3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{n^s}{k} + \frac{4(s-1)}{s^2} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2 &= (s-1) \int T_0^m(n) n^{s-2} 2T_\alpha(z) \nabla z \cdot \nabla n + \frac{\lambda}{k} \int n^{i-1} n^{s-1} \\ &\leq (s-1) \int 2T_\alpha(z) \nabla z \cdot \nabla G_0^m(n) + C(k, \|n^{i-1}\|_{L^s}) + \frac{1}{2k} \int n^s, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\frac{s}{8(s-1)} \int \frac{n^s}{k} + \frac{1}{2s} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2 \leq \frac{s}{2} \int T_\alpha(z) \nabla z \cdot \nabla G_0^m(n) + C(k, \|n^{i-1}\|_{L^s}). \quad (14)$$

Summing up (13) and (14), and taking ϵ small enough, we get

$$\frac{s}{8(s-1)} \int \frac{n^s}{k} + \frac{1}{s} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2 + C_3 \int |\Delta z|^2 + C_4 \lambda \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} + \frac{s}{2} \int G_0^m(n) (T_\alpha(z))' |\nabla z|^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \int |\nabla n^{s/2}|^2 + C_2 \lambda \int |\nabla z|^2 + C.$$

Thus if we set $\alpha < 2/s$, we may absorb the first term of the RHS. As for the second one just note that

$$C_2 \lambda \int |\nabla z|^2 \leq \lambda \epsilon \int \frac{|\nabla z|^4}{z^2} + C(\epsilon, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}).$$

Therefore Δz is bounded in L^2 independently of λ , hence z is bounded in H^2 independently of λ through the Poisson-Neumann regularity (*Definition 1.1*).

Now to check that n is bounded in H^2 independently of λ , we start by testing (2_λ) by n , getting that n is bounded independently of λ in H^1 . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \|n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int T_0^m(n) \nabla(z^2) \cdot \nabla n + \frac{\lambda}{k} \int n^{i-1} n \\ &\leq \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{k} \|n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + C(\epsilon, m, k, \|z\|_{H^1}, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}, \|n^{i-1}\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $z \in H^2$ we can use the identity

$$\nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n) T_\alpha(z) \nabla z) = \nabla n \cdot \nabla z (T_0^m)'(n) T_\alpha(z) + T_0^m(n) (T_\alpha(z))' |\nabla z|^2 + T_0^m(n) T_\alpha(z) \Delta z.$$

Then $\nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n) T_\alpha(z) \nabla z)$ is bounded in L^2 and we may then test (2_λ) by $-\Delta n$. We observe that by interpolation

$$\begin{aligned} \int u \cdot \nabla n \Delta n &= - \int (\nabla u \nabla n) \cdot \nabla n \leq \int |\nabla n|^2 |\nabla u| \\ &\leq C(\epsilon, \|u\|_{H^1}, \|n\|_{H^1}) + \epsilon \|\Delta n\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \int |\nabla n|^2 + \int |\Delta n|^2 &= -2 \int \nabla \cdot (T_0^m(n) T_\alpha(z) \nabla z) \Delta n - \frac{\lambda}{k} \int n^{i-1} \Delta n + \int u \cdot \nabla n \Delta n \\ &\leq C_1(\epsilon, m, k, \|z\|_{H^2}, \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty}, \|n^{i-1}\|_{L^2}, \|u\|_{H^1}) + 3\epsilon \int |\Delta n|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking ϵ small enough it follows that n is bounded in H^2 (and in particular in $W^{1,4}$) independently of λ .

In summary, the fixed-point gives a triplet $(u^i, n^i, z^i) \in V \times (W^{1,4})^2$, with an associated pressure $P^i \in H^1$, solution of the discrete scheme (I_k^m) . \square

4. FIRST UNIFORM (m, k) -ESTIMATES

From now on the lower truncations of time discrete scheme (I_k^m) may be dropped, as we have ensured the lower bounds of both $n \geq 0$ and $z \geq \alpha$, that is we make the following changes

$$T_\alpha(z^i) = z^i, \quad T_0^m(n^i) = T^m(n^i) \quad \text{and} \quad G_0^m(n^i) = G^m(n^i).$$

Indeed, for each z^i , Lemma 3.1 readily implies that

$$\alpha \leq z^i \leq \|z^{i-1}\|_{L^\infty},$$

as this is the estimate obtained for $\lambda = 1$, namely the fixed point. This guarantees the lower bound for z and also provides a pointwise upper bound.

The next step is to obtain some (m, k) -independent estimates. The first result is obtained directly through testing the equations of discrete scheme (I_k^m) , and reads as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (n^i, z^i, u^i) be any solution of (I_k^m) . Then the following estimates hold*

- i) $\int n^i dx = \int n^0 dx$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$;
- ii) $\|z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^i \|z^j - z^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|z^0\|_{L^2}^2$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$;

iii) $k \sum_{j=1}^i \|\nabla z^j\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} \|c^0 + \alpha^2\|_{L^2}^2$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. All items will follow exactly from Lemma 3.2 in [14]. The first item is obtained by integrating n^i equation, in which the convective term vanishes. The second and third items are obtained by testing z^i equation, by z^i and $k(z^i)^3$ respectively, and, in both cases, the convective term also vanishes. In the latter case, there is also a strong reliance on the fact that z^i is bounded below by α . □

We now make use of the structure of the equations, and the cancellation effects between chemotactic attraction and consumption terms, which is formally achieved by testing n equation by n^{s-1} , z equation by $-\Delta z$ and balancing out the results. On the other hand, we use Lemma 2.6 to bound the source term of the u system.

Due to the choice of test function for n , there is a term of the form $\nabla n^{s/2}$, which may be singular in the case $s < 2$. For this reason, the energy inequality is obtained separately for $s \in (1, 2)$ and $s \geq 2$.

Lemma 4.2. (*Energy inequality for $s \in (1, 2)$*). *Let (n^i, z^i, u^i) be a solution of (I_k^m) with $s \in (1, 2)$. Then, if α is small enough, there exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta_t}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2(s-1)} \|n^i\|_{L^s}^s + \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ & + C_2 \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{4} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \leq C_4. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start by testing z^i equation by $-\Delta z^i$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{z^{i-1} - z^i}{k} \Delta z^i - \int u^i \cdot \nabla z^i \Delta z^i + \|\Delta z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^2}{z^i} \Delta z^i \\ & = \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) z^i \Delta z^i - \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{z^i} \Delta z^i \\ & = -\frac{s}{2} \int z^i \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i - \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 - \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \\ & + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i. \end{aligned}$$

Then, making use of Lemma 2.1 to rewrite the diffusive terms, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_t \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) \\ & + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \\ & \leq -\frac{s}{4} \int \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla (z^i)^2 + \int u^i \cdot \nabla z^i \Delta z^i + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i + C_2 \int |\nabla z^i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^i \cdot \nabla z^i \Delta z^i & = - \int (\nabla u^i \cdot \nabla z^i) \cdot \nabla z^i \leq \int |\nabla z^i|^2 |\nabla u^i| \\ & \leq \epsilon \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} + C_3 \int |\nabla u^i|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$C_2 \int |\nabla z^i|^2 = C_2 \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^2}{z^i} z^i \leq \epsilon \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} + C_2 (\|z^0\|_{L^\infty}).$$

Therefore, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_t \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_4 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \\ & + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \leq C_3 \int |\nabla u^i|^2 - \frac{s}{4} \int \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla (z^i)^2 \\ & + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i + C_2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Due to the presence of the term $\int |\nabla u^i|^2$ in the RHS of (15), we look at the usual u^i energy equation, testing the u^i system by u^i (accounting that $\int (u^{i-1} \cdot \nabla) u^i \cdot u^i = 0$),

$$\frac{\delta_t}{2} \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 = \int T^m(n^i) u^i \cdot \nabla \Phi. \quad (16)$$

Finally, we can then add up $K(16)$ and (15), with $K > C_3$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_t \frac{1}{2} \left[\|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ & + C_5 \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_4 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \\ & \leq -\frac{s}{4} \int \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla (z^i)^2 + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i + C_2 + KC_6 \int n^i |u^i|. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now, when testing n^i equation by $(n^i)^{s-1}$ the Laplacian term becomes $\nabla(n^i)^{s/2}$ which is singular for $s < 2$, and for that reason we translate the test function by $1/j$ and then pass the limit as $j \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus, testing n^i equation by $(n^i + 1/j)^{s-1}/(s-1)$, and using Lemma 2.2 there follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \delta_t \int (n^i + 1/j)^s + \frac{4}{s^2} \|\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \int (b^i + 1/j)^{s-2} (n^i - n^{i-1})^2 \\ & = \int T^m(n^i) (n^i + 1/j)^{s-2} \nabla (z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla n^i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(b^i + 1/j)^{s-2} \geq 0$, we drop this term and arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \delta_t \int (n^i + 1/j)^s + \frac{4}{s^2} \|\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \int T^m(n^i) (n^i + 1/j)^{s-2} \nabla (z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla n^i. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

So adding $s/4$ times (18) to (17) and using (3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta_t}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2(s-1)} \|(n^i + 1/j)\|_{L^s}^s + \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{s} \|\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_5 \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_4 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \\ & + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \leq \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i + C_2 + KC_6 \int n^i |u^i| \\ & - \frac{s}{4} \int T^m(n^i) \nabla (z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla n^i \left((n^i)^{s-2} - (n^i + 1/j)^{s-2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the RHS we note that

$$\int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i = \int \frac{(n^i)^{s-2}}{z^i} T^m(n^i) \nabla z^i \cdot \nabla n^i,$$

and

$$\nabla n^i = \nabla(n^i + 1/j) = \nabla((n^i + 1/j)^{s/2})^{2/s} = \frac{2}{s}(n^i + 1/j)^{1-s/2} \nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i &= \frac{2\alpha^2}{s} \int \frac{(n^i)^{s-2}}{z^i} T^m(n^i) (n^i + 1/j)^{1-s/2} \nabla z^i \cdot \nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2} \\ &\leq C(\epsilon)\alpha^2 \int (n^i)^{2s-4} (T^m(n^i))^2 (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s} |\nabla z^i|^2 + \epsilon \int |\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}|^2 \\ &\leq C(\epsilon)\alpha^2 s \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 (n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s} + \epsilon \int |\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.7 in the last line. First, choose ϵ small enough to absorb the second term and then set an α accordingly, depending on ϵ . We also note that even with the presence of a term of the type $(n^i)^{s-2}$ the whole term is still not singular as close to zero G^m is of the order of $(n^i)^s$ making it well defined. Overall, for α small enough we get

$$\frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i \leq \frac{s}{4} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 (n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s} + \frac{1}{4s} \int |\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}|^2.$$

For the source term of the u system, applying Lemma 2.6 with $f = n^i + 1/j$ and $g = u^i$ and choosing adequate ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 we have that

$$KC_6 \int_{\Omega} n^i |u^i| \leq KC_6 \int_{\Omega} (n^i + 1/j) |u^i| \leq \frac{C_5}{2} \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4s} \|\nabla(n^i + 1/j)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_7.$$

Dropping the gradient term of n^i , avoiding any division by zero, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\delta_t}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2(s-1)} \|n^i + 1/j\|_{L^s}^s + \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ &+ \frac{C_5}{2} \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_4 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \left(1 - \frac{(n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s}}{2} \right) \\ &\leq C_8 - \frac{s}{4} \int T^m(n^i) \nabla(z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla n^i \left((n^i)^{s-2} - (n^i + 1/j)^{s-2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can pass to the limit as $j \rightarrow \infty$, via the Dominated Convergence Theorem, to finish the proof, remarking only that

$$\begin{aligned} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 (n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s} &\leq \frac{1}{s} \int |\nabla z^i|^2 (n^i)^s (n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{s} \int |\nabla z^i|^2 (n^i + 1)^s, \end{aligned}$$

which is a L^1 function, and so

$$\frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \left(1 - \frac{(n^i)^{s-2} (n^i + 1/j)^{2-s}}{2} \right) \rightarrow \frac{s}{4} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2.$$

The remaining terms can be treated similarly. \square

Lemma 4.3. (Energy inequality for $s \geq 2$). Let (n^i, z^i, u^i) be a solution of (I_k^m) for $s \geq 2$. Then, if α is small enough, there exist constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\delta_t \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2(s-1)} \|n^i\|_{L^s}^s + \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\|\nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \|u^i - u^{i-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2s} \left\| \nabla (n^i)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_2 \left\| \nabla u^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3 \left(\left\| D^2 z^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) \\
& + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \leq C_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Up until (17) there is no distinction whether $s \in (1, 2)$ or $s \geq 2$. Now as there is no singularity, testing n^i equation by $(n^i)^{s-1}/(s-1)$ and using Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\frac{1}{s(s-1)} \delta_t \int (n^i)^s + \frac{4}{s^2} \left\| \nabla (n^i)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \int \nabla (z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla G^m(n^i). \quad (19)$$

Adding $s/4$ times (19) to (17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta_t \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{s-1} \left\| n^i \right\|_{L^s}^s + \left\| \nabla z^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + K \left\| u^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2k} \left[\left\| \nabla z^i - \nabla z^{i-1} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + K \left\| u^i - u^{i-1} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\
& + \frac{1}{s} \left\| \nabla (n^i)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_5 \left\| \nabla u^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_4 \left(\left\| D^2 z^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2 \\
& + \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 \leq \frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i + C_2 + KC_6 \int n^i |u^i|.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same calculations for the first term of the RHS as in (12)

$$\frac{s\alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{1}{z^i} \nabla G^m(n^i) \cdot \nabla z^i \leq \frac{s\alpha^3}{2} \int \frac{G^m(n^i)}{(z^i)^2} |\nabla z^i|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int |\nabla (n^i)^{s/2}|^2.$$

For the source term of u^i system, applying Lemma 2.6 with $f = n^i$ and $g = u^i$ and choosing adequate ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 , we get

$$KC_6 \int_{\Omega} n^i |u^i| \leq \frac{C_5}{2} \left\| \nabla u^i \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4s} \left\| \nabla (n^i)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + C_7,$$

hence by taking α small enough we obtain the result. \square

Note that, for each regularized initial data $(n_{\delta}^0, z_{\delta}^0, u_{\delta}^0)$ given in (5), (6) and (7), the estimates obtained from the energy inequality only depend on $\|n_{\delta}^0\|_{L^s}^s + \|\nabla z_{\delta}^0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_{\delta}^0\|_{L^2}^2$ which is bounded independently of δ .

5. LAST (m, k) -ESTIMATES AND PASSAGE TO THE LIMIT AS $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$

With the estimates provided in Lemmas 4.1-4.3 at hand, we are now prepared to prove our main result, Theorem 1.1.

We start by building a continuous in-time system using the functions u^i, P^i, z^i , and n^i , defined in the time step i at the time interval $I_i = [t_{i-1}, t_i)$. We define the piecewise constant function n_m^k and the locally linear and globally continuous function \tilde{n}_m^k by

$$n_m^k(t, x) = n^i(x) \quad \text{if } t \in I_i.$$

and

$$\tilde{n}_m^k(t, x) = n^i(x) + \frac{(t - t_i)}{k} \left(n^i(x) - n^{i-1}(x) \right) \quad \text{if } t \in I_i.$$

Analogously, we define the functions $z_m^k, \tilde{z}_m^k, u_m^k, \tilde{u}_m^k$ and P_m^k . We also define

$$\hat{u}_m^k(t, x) = u^{i-1}(x) \quad \text{if } t \in I_i.$$

In particular, one has $\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k = \delta_t n^i$ for $t \in I_i$. Then, the discrete scheme (I_m^k) can now be rewritten as the fully coupled and nonlinear time scheme

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k + u_m^k \cdot \nabla n_m^k - \Delta n_m^k = \nabla \cdot \left(T^m(n_m^k) \nabla (z_m^k)^2 \right), \\ \partial_t \tilde{z}_m^k + u_m^k \cdot \nabla z_m^k - \Delta z_m^k = \frac{s}{2} G^m(n_m^k) \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{z_m^k} - z_m^k \right) + \frac{|\nabla z_m^k|^2}{z_m^k}, \\ \partial_t \tilde{u}_m^k + (\hat{u}_m^k \cdot \nabla) u_m^k - \Delta u_m^k + \nabla P_m^k = T^m(n_m^k) \nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u_m^k = 0, \\ \partial_\eta \tilde{n}_m^k|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta \tilde{z}_m^k|_\Gamma = \tilde{u}_m^k|_\Gamma = 0, \quad \tilde{n}(0) = n^0, \quad \tilde{z}(0) = z^0, \quad \tilde{u}(0) = u^0. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

As a direct consequence of those definitions, from Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1 it also holds that $\int n_m^k = \int n^0$ and $\|z_m^k\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|z^0\|_{L^\infty}$. This will ensure the additional properties of Theorem 1.1.

5.1. Energy estimates. We sum up the energy inequalities obtained in Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, from $j = 1$ to i , for any i , and multiply it by k to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4(s-1)} \int (n^i)^s + \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla z^i|^2 + \frac{C_1}{2} \int |u^i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^i \left[\|\nabla z^j - \nabla z^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_1 \|u^j - u^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ & + k \sum_{j=1}^i \left(C_2 \|\nabla u^j\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3 \left(\|D^2 z^j\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^j|^4}{(z^j)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{4} \int G^m(n^j) |\nabla z^j|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4(s-1)} \int (n^0)^s + \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla z^0|^2 + \frac{C_1}{2} \int |u^0|^2 + C_4 t_i. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

As $n^0 \in L^s$, $z^0 \in H^1$ and $u^0 \in H$, then we may conclude that the RHS is bounded at finite time, therefore for any fixed $T > 0$, the following bounds hold

$$\nabla z_m^k \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^4(0, T; L^4), \quad (22)$$

$$u_m^k \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \quad (23)$$

$$n_m^k \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^s), \quad (24)$$

and

$$\nabla u_m^k, G^m(n_m^k)^{1/2} \nabla z_m^k \text{ and } D^2 z_m^k \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^2). \quad (25)$$

Then, (22), (25), Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1 imply that

$$z_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; H^1 \cap L^\infty) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2). \quad (26)$$

From (23) and (25),

$$u_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V) \cap L^{10/3}(0, T; L^{10/3}). \quad (27)$$

Lemma 4.1 and the energy estimate (21) also imply that

$$\sum_{j=1}^i \|z^j - z^{j-1}\|_{H^1}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^i \|u^j - u^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C T, \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

Hence we may infer, through standard calculations, that there exists a positive constant C independent of m and k such that

$$\|z_m^k - \tilde{z}_m^k\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1)}^2 + \|u_m^k - \tilde{u}_m^k\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}^2 + \|\hat{u}_m^k - \tilde{u}_m^k\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}^2 \leq C T k. \quad (28)$$

5.2. Additional estimates for $s < 2$. We next obtain an estimate for the difference $n_m^k - \tilde{n}_m^k$ and for ∇n_m^k .

Lemma 5.1. *For $s \in (1, 2)$, there exists $C > 0$, independent of m and k , such that*

$$\left\| n_m^k - \tilde{n}_m^k \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^s)}^2 \leq C k. \quad (29)$$

Moreover, $(n_m^k + 1)^{s/2}$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; H^1)$, and

$$\nabla n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^s). \quad (30)$$

Proof. Testing n^i equation by $(n^i + 1)^{s-1}/(s-1)$, and using Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \delta_t \int (n^i + 1)^s + \frac{4}{s^2} \left\| \nabla (n^i + 1)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \int (b^i + 1)^{s-2} (n^i - n^{i-1})^2 \\ & = \int T^m (n^i) (n^i + 1)^{s-2} \nabla (z^i)^2 \cdot \nabla n^i. \end{aligned}$$

Then by using that $1 - s/2 > 0$ and $T^m(n^i) \leq n^i$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \delta_t \int (n^i + 1)^s + \frac{4}{s^2} \left\| \nabla (n^i + 1)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \int (b^i + 1)^{s-2} (n^i - n^{i-1})^2 \\ & = 2 \int T^m(n^i) (n^i + 1)^{s/2-1} z^i \nabla z^i \cdot \nabla n^i (n^i + 1)^{s/2-1} \\ & \leq \frac{4}{s} \int \frac{T^m(n^i)^{1-s/2}}{(n^i + 1)^{1-s/2}} T^m(n^i)^{s/2} z^i \nabla z^i \cdot \nabla (n^i + 1)^{s/2} \\ & \leq C \left\| z^0 \right\|_{L^\infty} \int T^m(n^i)^s \left| \nabla z^i \right|^2 + \frac{2}{s^2} \left\| \nabla (n^i + 1)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Note that by Lemma 2.7, $T^m(n^i)^s \leq s G^m(n^i)$, then from (25)

$$T^m(n^i)^{s/2} \nabla z^i \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2). \quad (32)$$

Now multiplying (31) by k and summing up, from 1 to i , for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \int (n^i + 1)^s + C_1 k \sum_{j=1}^i \left\| \nabla (n^j + 1)^{s/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^i \int (b^j + 1)^{s-2} (n^j - n^{j-1})^2 \\ & \leq C_1 k \sum_{j=1}^i \int T^m(n^j)^s \left| \nabla z^j \right|^2 + \frac{1}{s(s-1)} \int (n^0 + 1)^s \\ & \leq C_2(T) + \frac{C_3}{s(s-1)} \left(\int (n^0)^s + |\Omega| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we infer the estimates

$$\sum_{j=1}^i \int (b^j + 1)^{s-2} (n^j - n^{j-1})^2 \leq C T,$$

and

$$\nabla (n_m^k + 1)^{s/2} \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2).$$

Noting that we also get that $n_m^k + 1$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; L^s)$, then

$$(n_m^k + 1)^{1-s/2} \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; L^{2s/(2-s)}).$$

Since $s < 2$, we can write

$$\nabla n_m^k = \nabla (n_m^k + 1) = \nabla ((n_m^k + 1)^{s/2})^{2/s} = \frac{2}{s} (n_m^k + 1)^{1-s/2} \nabla (n_m^k + 1)^{s/2}, \quad (33)$$

implying that ∇n_m^k is bounded in $L^2(0, T; L^s)$ and $(n_m^k + 1)^{s/2}$ in $L^2(0, T; H^1)$.

With those bounds we can obtain that there exists $C > 0$, independent of m and k , such that $\|n_m^k - \tilde{n}_m^k\|_{L^2(0, T; L^s)}^2 \leq Ck$, by following line by line [14, Lemma 4.2]. \square

Note that Lemma 5.1 also implies, by interpolation, that

$$(n_m^k + 1)^{s/2} \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1) \cap L^{10/3}(0, T; L^{10/3}).$$

hence one also has

$$n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{5s/3}(0, T; L^{5s/3}). \quad (34)$$

We want to estimate $\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k$. Considering the chemotaxis term, as $s < 2$ we may write $T^m(n_m^k) \nabla(z_m^k)^2$ as

$$T^m(n_m^k) \nabla(z_m^k)^2 = 2T^m(n_m^k)^{1-s/2} T^m(n_m^k)^{s/2} z_m^k \nabla z_m^k.$$

Then, using estimate (24) and the equality $(T^m(n_m^k)^{1-s/2})^{2s/(2-s)} = T^m(n_m^k)^s$, we have that $T^m(n_m^k)^{1-s/2}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; L^{2s/(2-s)})$. From (32) we conclude

$$T^m(n_m^k) \nabla(z_m^k)^2 \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^s).$$

Lastly, we take into account the coupling term $u_m^k \cdot \nabla n_m^k$. From (34) and (27)

$$u_m^k n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{10s/(3s+6)}(0, T; L^{10s/(3s+6)}). \quad (35)$$

This finally allows us to bound the time derivative term for \tilde{n}_m^k as

$$\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{10/9}(0, T; (W^{1, q^*})'),$$

where q^* is the Hölder conjugate of $q = \min\{10/9, s\}$. In particular, for every $s > 1$, we get that

$$\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{10/9}(0, T; (W^{1, \infty})').$$

Next, we deduce some more estimates for z_m^k . Note that by (22) and Lemma 3.1,

$$\frac{|\nabla z_m^k|^2}{z_m^k} \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2).$$

Moreover as $sG^m(n_m^k) \leq (n_m^k)^s$, and using that (n_m^k) is bounded in $L^2(0, T; W^{1, s}) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^s)$, then by the embedding of $W^{1, s}$ into $L^{3s/(3-s)}$

$$\|(n_m^k)^s\|_{L^{3/2}}^2 \leq C \|n_m^k\|_{L^s}^{2(s-1)} \|n_m^k\|_{L^{3s/(3-s)}}^2,$$

therefore

$$G^m(n_m^k), \frac{G^m(n_m^k)}{z_m^k} \text{ are bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^{3/2}).$$

For the convective term, since ∇z_m^k is bounded in $L^2(0, T; L^6)$ and u_m^k in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$, it holds

$$u_m^k \cdot \nabla z_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^{3/2}).$$

From what we may conclude that

$$\partial_t \tilde{z}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^{3/2}). \quad (36)$$

5.3. Linear by part function estimates for $s < 2$. In order to obtain estimates for the continuous in-time functions we note that by the triangular inequality

$$\left\| \tilde{n}_m^k(t) \right\| \leq \left\| n_m^k(t) \right\| + \left\| n^{j-1} \right\|, \quad \forall t \in I_j.$$

So, for the linear by parts approximation there is a dependence on the previous time step when estimating, and this implies requiring a more regular initial data, as we have set in (5),(6) and (7). Then, from (30) and (34), using (33) we infer

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{5s/3}(0, T; L^{5s/3}) \cap L^{5s/(s+3)}(0, T; W^{1,5s/(s+3)}). \quad (37)$$

From (26) it follows

$$\tilde{z}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty \cap H^1) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2), \quad (38)$$

and from (23) and (25)

$$\tilde{u}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \cap L^2(0, T; V). \quad (39)$$

Also note that due to \hat{u}_m^k being defined as the previous time step it also has a dependence on the initial data, that is

$$\left\| \hat{u}_m^k \right\|_{X(0,T;Y)} = \left\| u^0 \right\|_{X(0,k;Y)} + \left\| u_m^k \right\|_{X(0,T-k;Y)}.$$

To estimate $\partial_t \tilde{u}_m^k$, we observe that $\hat{u}_m^k \otimes u_m^k$ and n_m^k are bounded in $L^{5/3}(0, T; L^{5/3})$, thus

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{5/3}(0, T; (W_{0,\sigma}^{1,5/2})').$$

5.4. Passing the limit as $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$ for the case $s \in (1, 2)$. Having all the necessary estimates we can start looking for strong convergence to pass to the limit on the nonlinear terms. For \tilde{n}_m^k , from estimate (37), there exist a subsequence of $\{\tilde{n}_m^k\}$ (reabeled the same) and a limit function n such that, as $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$,

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \rightharpoonup n \text{ in } L^{5s/3}(0, T; L^{5s/3}) \cap L^{5s/(s+3)}(0, T; W^{1,5s/(s+3)}).$$

We note that $W^{1,5s/(s+3)} \subset L^p$ with critical $p = 15s/(9-2s)$. As $s \in (1, 2)$, then $5s/3 < 15s/(9-2s)$, hence we have the compact embedding of $W^{1,5s/(s+3)} \subset L^{5s/3}$. By the compactness Lemma 2.4 one has

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \rightarrow n \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 5s/3).$$

By accounting (29), we also have the convergences for n_m^k towards the same limit function,

$$n_m^k \rightharpoonup n \text{ in } L^{5s/3}(0, T; L^{5s/3}) \cap L^{5s/(s+3)}(0, T; W^{1,5s/(s+3)}),$$

and

$$n_m^k \rightarrow n \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 5s/3). \quad (40)$$

By applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem jointly to (40),

$$T^m(n_m^k) \rightarrow n \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 5s/3).$$

On the other hand, we also have the limit

$$n_m^k \xrightarrow{*} n \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; L^s).$$

Similarly, since $G^m \in C^1$ and n^i is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T, L^s)$, then by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, (40) and Lemma 2.3 it follows that

$$G^m(n_m^k) \rightarrow \frac{n^s}{s} \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 5s/3). \quad (41)$$

Arguing now for \tilde{z}_m^k , using estimates (38) and (36), from the compactness Lemma 2.4 we get the strong convergence, up to subsequences,

$$\tilde{z}_m^k \rightarrow z \text{ in } L^2(0, T; H^1). \quad (42)$$

In particular, from the bound \tilde{z}_m^k of in L^∞ , one also has

$$\tilde{z}_m^k \rightarrow z \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty). \quad (43)$$

Due to (28), the same convergences will hold true to z_m^k towards the same limit function z . Also, from estimates (22) and Lemma 4.1, we have, up to a subsequence,

$$z_m^k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} z \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H^1) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty). \quad (44)$$

Moreover, (26) implies

$$z_m^k \rightharpoonup z \text{ in } L^2(0, T; H^2),$$

by (22) and (42)

$$\nabla z_m^k \rightharpoonup \nabla z \text{ in } L^4(0, T; L^4),$$

and by (36)

$$\partial_t \tilde{z}_m^k \rightharpoonup \partial_t z \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^{3/2}).$$

With respect to velocity, we use estimates (39), and that V is compactly embedded in H and H is continuously embedded in $(W_{0,\sigma}^{1,5/2})'$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.4, there follows, up to a subsequence,

$$\tilde{u}_m^k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^2(0, T; H). \quad (45)$$

In particular, since \tilde{u}_m^k is bounded in $L^{10/3}(0, T; L^{10/3})$, it will also ensure that

$$\tilde{u}_m^k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 10/3).$$

Again, by (28), those convergences will also hold for u_m^k . Moreover, from (27)

$$u_m^k \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^{10/3}(0, T; L^{10/3}), \quad (46)$$

and, from (23) and (25),

$$u_m^k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \quad \text{and} \quad u_m^k \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^2(0, T; V).$$

We now handle the nonlinear terms. Since $g(x) = x^{-1}$ is a Lipschitz function on $[\alpha, \infty)$, one has

$$\frac{1}{z_m^k} \rightarrow \frac{1}{z} \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty). \quad (47)$$

From (42) and (43)

$$\nabla(z_m^k)^2 \rightarrow \nabla(z^2) \text{ in } L^q(0, T; L^q) \quad \forall q < 2.$$

Moreover, from (22) and the fact that z_m^k is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty)$, we have that $\nabla(z_m^k)^2$ is also bounded in $L^4(0, T; L^4)$, hence

$$\nabla(z_m^k)^2 \rightharpoonup \nabla(z^2) \text{ in } L^4(0, T; L^4).$$

As $(5s + 12)/20s = 1/4 + 3/5s$, we infer

$$T^m(n_m^k)\nabla(z_m^k)^2 \rightharpoonup n\nabla(z^2) \text{ in } L^{20s/(5s+12)}(0, T; L^{20s/(5s+12)}),$$

because the product is bounded in the desired space and for any bigger space the product of a weak and a strong convergent sequence will produce a weak convergent sequence with the same limit function.

Arguing as above, from (42) and (47)

$$\frac{|\nabla z_m^k|^2}{z_m^k} \rightharpoonup \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z} \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^2);$$

from (41) and (44)

$$G^m(n_m^k)z_m^k \rightharpoonup \frac{1}{s}n^s z \text{ in } L^{5/3}(0, T; L^{5/3});$$

and from (41) and (47)

$$\frac{sG^m(n_m^k)}{z_m^k} \rightharpoonup \frac{n^s}{z} \text{ in } L^{5/3}(0, T; L^{5/3}).$$

Moreover, from (45) and (42)

$$u_m^k \cdot \nabla z_m^k \rightarrow u \cdot \nabla z \text{ in } L^1(0, T; L^1).$$

As for the convective term on n_m^k , note that due to (40) and (46), we can, for instance, assure that

$$u_m^k n_m^k \rightharpoonup u n \text{ in } L^1(0, T; L^1),$$

and therefore from (35), we get that

$$u_m^k n_m^k \rightharpoonup u n \text{ in } L^{10s/(3s+6)}(0, T; L^{10s/(3s+6)}).$$

For the fluid convective term, as

$$\hat{u}_m^k \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 10/3),$$

we can deduce that

$$\hat{u}_m^k \otimes u_m^k \rightarrow u \otimes u \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 5/3).$$

With all these bounds and convergences, it is possible to pass the limit in each term of system (20) as $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$ and obtain a weak solution for the system in terms of $z = \sqrt{c + \alpha^2}$

$$\begin{cases} n_t + u \cdot \nabla n = \Delta n - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla (z^2)), \\ z_t + u \cdot \nabla z = \Delta z - \frac{1}{2}n^s \left(z - \frac{\alpha^2}{z} \right) + \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z}, \\ u_t + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla P = \Delta u + n \nabla \Phi, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ \partial_\eta n|_\Gamma = \partial_\eta z|_\Gamma = u|_\Gamma = 0, \quad n(0) = n^0, \quad z(0) = z^0, \quad u(0) = u^0. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Note that the initial data is well-defined due to the weak continuity of the solutions in time.

As system (1) and (48) are equivalent in the sense that (n, z, u) is a weak solution of (48) if, and only if, (n, c, u) is a weak solution of (1), with $c = z^2 - \alpha^2$, we can deduce the existence of a weak solution to system (1).

This establishes the existence of a weak solution to the system (1) with a regularized set of initial data. However, since the derived estimates are independent of the regularization parameter δ associated with the initial data, we can extend the same reasoning to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 for $s < 2$.

5.5. Asymptotic estimates and passage to the limit as $(m, k) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$ for $s \geq 2$. From Lemma 4.3, we obtain all the same estimates from the previous case $s < 2$, and the additional estimate

$$\nabla(n_m^k)^{s/2} \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2).$$

Another advantage of the case $s \geq 2$ will be the global in-time estimates up to infinity time. Indeed, by defining

$$a_i := \frac{1}{4(s-1)} \|n^i\|_{L^s}^s + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C_1}{2} \|u^i\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$d_i := \frac{1}{2s} \|\nabla(n^i)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C_2 \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 + C_3 \left(\|D^2 z^i\|_{L^2}^2 + \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} \right) + \frac{s}{2} \int G^m(n^i) |\nabla z^i|^2,$$

then the energy inequality in Lemma 4.3 can be rewritten as the recursive inequality

$$\delta_t a_i + d_i \leq C_4.$$

The key point now is to show that there exist $C_5 > 0$ and $C_6 > 0$, such that (see Lemma 5.2 below)

$$d_i + C_5 \geq C_6 a_i,$$

which implies

$$\delta_t a_i + C_6 a_i \leq C_4 + C_5.$$

This allows us to obtain uniform in-time estimates. Indeed, by applying Lemma 2.5 with $\lambda = C_6$ and constant $C = C_4 + C_5$ yields, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$a_i \leq a_0 + C/C_3.$$

By taking into account the expression of a_i , one has the estimates

$$n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, \infty; L^s),$$

$$\nabla z_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2),$$

and

$$u_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, \infty; L^2).$$

To conclude this argument we establish the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *There exist $K_1 > 0$ and $K_2 > 0$ such that $a_i \leq K_1 d_i + K_2$, for all $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. We estimate each term of a_i separately. For n^i , we note that by applying Poincaré's inequality in $(n^i)^{s/2}$ one has

$$\|n^i\|_{L^s}^s \leq C \|\nabla(n^i)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|(n^i)^{s/2}\|_{L^1}^2.$$

For the second term, by interpolation, there exists some $a \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(n^i)^{s/2}\|_{L^1} &= \|n^i\|_{L^{s/2}}^{s/2} \leq \|n^i\|_{L^s}^{sa/2} \|n^i\|_{L^1}^{s(1-a)/2} \\ &\leq \epsilon \|n^i\|_{L^s}^{s/2} + C(\|n^0\|_{L^1}, \epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 4.1. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2} \|n^i\|_{L^s}^s \leq C \|\nabla(n^i)^{s/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + K_2 \leq K_1 d_i + K_2.$$

For z^i , we use its L^∞ bound

$$\|\nabla z^i\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|z^i\|_{L^\infty} \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^2}{z^i} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{|\nabla z^i|^4}{(z^i)^2} + K_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} d_i + K_2.$$

Finally, for u^i we just note that by Poincaré's inequality, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla u^i\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K_1 d_i.$$

□

Another new estimate, following a similar idea in [11], can be obtained by splitting the domain in terms of $n_m^k(t, \cdot)$ a.e. $t \in (0, T)$, by defining the sets

$$\{0 \leq n_m^k \leq 1\} = \{x \in \Omega \mid 0 \leq n_m^k(t, x) \leq 1\}$$

and

$$\{n_m^k > 1\} = \{x \in \Omega \mid n_m^k(t, x) > 1\}.$$

It holds that, a.e. in $(0, T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int T^m (n_m^k)^2 |\nabla z_m^k|^2 &= \int_{\{0 \leq n_m^k \leq 1\}} T^m (n_m^k)^2 |\nabla z_m^k|^2 + \int_{\{n_m^k \geq 1\}} T^m (n_m^k)^2 |\nabla z_m^k|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\{0 \leq n_m^k \leq 1\}} |\nabla z_m^k|^2 + \int_{\{n_m^k \geq 1\}} T^m (n_m^k)^s |\nabla z_m^k|^2 \\ &\leq \int |\nabla z_m^k|^2 + \int T^m (n_m^k)^s |\nabla z_m^k|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By integrating in time

$$\int_0^T \int T^m (n_m^k)^2 |\nabla z_m^k|^2 \leq \int_0^T \int |\nabla z_m^k|^2 + \int_0^T \int T^m (n_m^k)^s |\nabla z_m^k|^2,$$

which is bounded by Lemmas 4.1, 2.7 and 4.3. Therefore,

$$T^m (n_m^k) \nabla z_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2).$$

This will allow us to obtain other estimates for ∇n_m^k and $\tilde{n}_m^k n_m^k$. Indeed, testing n^i equation, by n^i , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t \frac{1}{2} \int |n^i|^2 + \frac{1}{2k} \int |n^i - n^{i-1}|^2 + \int |\nabla n^i|^2 &= 2 \int z^i T^m (n^i) \nabla z^i \cdot \nabla n^i \\ &\leq 2 \|z^i\|_{L^\infty} \|T^m (n^i) \nabla z^i\|_{L^2} \|\nabla n^i\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2} \int T^m (n^i)^2 |\nabla z^i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla n^i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then multiplying by $2k$ and summing in i , we end up with

$$\int |n^i|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^i \|n^j - n^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 + k \sum_{j=1}^i \int |\nabla n^j|^2 \leq C_1 + \int |n^0|^2,$$

concluding that

$$\nabla n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^2),$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^i \|n^j - n^{j-1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C T,$$

which implies in particular

$$\|n_m^k - \tilde{n}_m^k\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2)}^2 \leq C T k.$$

In summary

$$n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, \infty, L^s) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1).$$

Moreover, from the fact that $(n_m^k)^{s/2}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1)$, it follows

$$n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^{5s/3}(0, T; L^{5s/3}).$$

Finally, as

$$u_m^k \cdot \nabla n_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; L^1),$$

therefore, by n_m^k equation,

$$\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; (W^{1, \infty})').$$

As we now have that

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0, T; H^1),$$

we can apply compactness Lemma 2.4 yielding that, up to a subsequence, there exists a limit function n such that

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \rightarrow n \text{ in } L^p(0, T; L^p), \quad \forall p \in [1, 10/3),$$

as well as

$$\tilde{n}_m^k \rightharpoonup n \text{ in } L^2(0, T; H^1).$$

Thus, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} n_m^k &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} n \text{ in } L^\infty(0, \infty; L^s), \\ \nabla n_m^k &\rightharpoonup \nabla n \text{ in } L^2(0, T; L^2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_t \tilde{n}_m^k \rightharpoonup \partial_t n \text{ in } L^2(0, T; (W^{1,\infty})').$$

As in the case $s < 2$, we can conclude that a weak solution to the system (1) exists, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1.1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

D. Barbosa was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001 and CNPq-Brazil. G. Planas was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil grant 310274/2021-4, and FAPESP-Brazil grant 19/02512-5

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Arumugam and J. Tyagi. Keller-Segel chemotaxis models: a review. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 171:Paper No. 6, 82, 2021.
- [2] K. Baghaei and A. Khelghati. Boundedness of classical solutions for a chemotaxis model with consumption of chemoattractant. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 355(6):633–639, 2017.
- [3] N. Bellomo, A. Bellouquid, Y. Tao, and M. Winkler. Toward a mathematical theory of Keller-Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25(9):1663–1763, 2015.
- [4] N. Bellomo, N. Outada, J. Soler, Y. Tao, and M. Winkler. Chemotaxis and cross-diffusion models in complex environments: models and analytic problems toward a multiscale vision. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 32(4):713–792, 2022.
- [5] P. Biler, A. Boritchev, and L. Brandolese. Large global solutions of the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system in higher dimensions. *J. Differential Equations*, 344:891–914, 2023.
- [6] P. Biler, I. Guerra, and G. Karch. Large global-in-time solutions of the parabolic-parabolic Keller-Segel system on the plane. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 14(6):2117–2126, 2015.
- [7] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie. *Mathematical tools for the study of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and related models*, volume 183 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [8] M. Chae, K. Kang, and J. Lee. Global existence and temporal decay in Keller-Segel models coupled to fluid equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 39(7):1205–1235, 2014.
- [9] C. Dombrowski, L. Cisneros, S. Chatkaew, E. Raymond, and O. Kessler. Self-concentration and large-scale coherence in bacterial dynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93:098103, 2004.
- [10] E. Etienne. Discrete Versions of Gronwall’s Lemma and Their Application to the Numerical Analysis of Parabolic Problems. 2000.
- [11] A. L. Corrêa Vianna Filho and F. Guillén-González. Uniform in time solutions for a chemotaxis with potential consumption model. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 70:Paper No. 103795, 39, 2023.
- [12] M. Di Francesco, A. Lorz, and P. Markowich. Chemotaxis-fluid coupled model for swimming bacteria with nonlinear diffusion: global existence and asymptotic behavior. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 28(4):1437–1453, 2010.
- [13] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [14] F. Guillén-González and A. L. Corrêa Vianna Filho. Convergence of a time discrete scheme for a chemotaxis-consumption model. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 61(5):2509–2533, 2023.
- [15] N. A. Hill and T. J. Pedley. Bioconvection. *Fluid Dynam. Res.*, 37(1-2):1–20, 2005.
- [16] J. Jiang, H. Wu, and S. Zheng. Global existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions to a chemotaxis-fluid system on general bounded domains. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 92(3-4):249–258, 2015.
- [17] E. F. Keller and L. A. Segel. Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 26(3):399–415, 1970.

- [18] J. Lankeit and Y. Wang. Global existence, boundedness and stabilization in a high-dimensional chemotaxis system with consumption. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 37(12):6099–6121, 2017.
- [19] J. Lankeit and M. Winkler. Depleting the signal: analysis of chemotaxis-consumption models—a survey. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 151(4):1197–1229, 2023.
- [20] G. Li and M. Winkler. Relaxation in a Keller-Segel-consumption system involving signal-dependent motilities. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 21(2):299–322, 2023.
- [21] P. M. Murphy. Chemokines and the Molecular Basis of Cancer Metastasis. *N Engl J Med.*, 345(11):833–835, 2001.
- [22] R. E Parales, J. L Ditty, and C. S. Harwood. Toluene-degrading bacteria are chemotactic towards the environmental pollutants benzene, toluene, and trichloroethylene. *Appl Environ Microbiol.*, 66(9):4098–4104, 2000.
- [23] M. D. Stock, J. B. and Baker. Chemotaxis. In *Encyclopedia of Microbiology, Third Edition*, pages 71–78. Elsevier, Netherlands, 2009.
- [24] Y. Tao and M. Winkler. Eventual smoothness and stabilization of large-data solutions in a three-dimensional chemotaxis system with consumption of chemoattractant. *J. Differential Equations*, 252(3):2520–2543, 2012.
- [25] M. Winkler. Global large-data solutions in a chemotaxis-(Navier-)Stokes system modeling cellular swimming in fluid drops. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 37(2):319–351, 2012.
- [26] M. Winkler. Global weak solutions in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier-Stokes system. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33(5):1329–1352, 2016.