

UNIQUENESS OF WEAK SOLUTIONS  
TO A KELLER-SEGEL-NAVIER-STOKES MODEL  
WITH A LOGISTIC SOURCE

MIAOCHAO CHEN, Hefei, SHENGQI LU, QILIN LIU, Nanjing

Received March 7, 2020. Published online February 15, 2021.

*Abstract.* We prove a uniqueness result of weak solutions to the  $nD$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) Cauchy problem of a Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system with a logistic term.

*Keywords:* Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system; uniqueness; weak solution

*MSC 2020:* 22E46, 53C35, 57S20, 35Q30

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following model of a Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes with a logistic source [11], [17]:

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \pi - \Delta u = n \nabla \varphi,$$

$$(1.2) \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0,$$

$$(1.3) \quad \partial_t n + u \cdot \nabla n - \Delta n + n^2 - an = -\nabla \cdot (n \nabla p) - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla q),$$

$$(1.4) \quad \partial_t p + u \cdot \nabla p - \Delta p = -np,$$

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_t q + u \cdot \nabla q - \Delta q + q = n \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty),$$

$$(1.6) \quad (u, n, p, q)(\cdot, 0) = (u_0, n_0, p_0, q_0)(\cdot) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ } (N \geq 3),$$

where  $u$  is the velocity of the fluid,  $\pi$  is the pressure,  $n$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  denote the density of amoebae, oxygen and chemical attractant, respectively. The smooth function  $\varphi := \varphi(x)$  is a potential,  $a$  is a real constant.

---

This paper is supported by the key project of University natural science of Anhui province (No. KJ2017A453; No. KJ2017A454).

When  $\varphi = 0$ , system (1.1) and (1.2) reduces to the incompressible Navier-Stokes system. Ogawa and Taniuchi [14] obtained the uniqueness criterion

$$(1.7) \quad \nabla u \in L \log L(0, T; \dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0(\mathbb{R}^N))$$

with

$$(1.8) \quad L \log L(0, T; \dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0) := \left\{ f; \int_0^T \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0} \log(e + \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0}) dt < \infty \right\}.$$

We note that Kozono et al. [12] showed that  $u$  is smooth if

$$(1.9) \quad \nabla u \in L^1(0, T; \dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0).$$

Here  $\dot{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0$  is the homogeneous Besov space.

On the other hand, when  $u = 0$ , system (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5) reduces to the Keller-Segel system [8], [9], [10], which has been dealt with in many studies [1], [2], [6], [7], [15], [16], [18].

Very recently, Fan-Zhao [5] (see also [3], [4]) established some regularity criteria when  $q = 0$ .

We will assume that

$$(1.10) \quad \nabla p \in L^{2/(1-r)}(0, T; \dot{X}_r), \nabla q \in L^{2/(1-s)}(0, T; \dot{X}_s) \quad \text{with } 0 < r, s < 1$$

and

$$(1.11) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{X}_r} := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|fg\|_{L^2}}{\|g\|_{\dot{H}^r}}, g \neq 0 \right\}.$$

The space  $\dot{X}_r$  of pointwise multipliers maps  $\dot{H}^r$  into  $L^2$ . The pointwise multipliers between different spaces of differentiable functions have been studied [13]. They are a useful tool for stating minimal regularity requirements on the coefficients of partial differential operators for proving uniqueness or regularity of solutions.

The aim of this paper is to prove a uniqueness result:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $u_0 \in L^2$ ,  $n_0 \in L^1 \cap H^{-1} \cap L^\infty$ ,  $p_0 \in L^2 \cap L^\infty$ ,  $q_0 \in L^2$ ,  $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ ,  $n_0, p_0, q_0 \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Suppose that  $\varphi := \varphi(x)$  is a smooth function. If (1.7) and (1.10) hold, then problem (1.1)–(1.6) has at most one weak solution.*

Let  $\eta_j$ ,  $j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, \dots$ , be the Littlewood-Paley dyadic decomposition of unity that satisfies  $\hat{\eta} \in C_0^\infty(B_2 \setminus B_{1/2})$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_j(\xi) = \hat{\eta}_j(2^{-j}\xi)$  and  $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\eta}_j(\xi) = 1$  except for  $\xi = 0$ . To fill the origin, we put a smooth cut of  $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\widehat{\psi}(\xi) \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$  such that

$$(1.12) \quad \widehat{\psi} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{\eta}_j(\xi) = 1.$$

The homogeneous Besov space  $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s := \{f \in \mathcal{S}' : \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s} < \infty\}$  is introduced by the norm

$$(1.13) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s} := \left( \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \|2^{js} \eta_j * f\|_{L^p}^q \right)^{1/q}$$

for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ .

**Definition 1.1** (Weak solutions). We say that  $(u, n, p, q)$  is a *weak solution* to problem (1.1)–(1.6) if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i)  $0 \leq n, p, q, u, p, q \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1)$ ,  $n \in L^\infty(0, T; L^l) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1)$  with  $2 \leq l < \infty$ ;
- (ii)  $\int_0^T \int (-uw_t - u \otimes u : \nabla w + \nabla u : \nabla w) dx dt = \int_0^T \int n \nabla \varphi w dx dt$  holds for any  $T > 0$ , and any  $w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T))$  with  $\operatorname{div} w = 0$ , and  $u$  satisfies the energy inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \int |u|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int |\nabla u|^2 dx ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \int |u_0|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int n \nabla \varphi u dx ds, \text{ a.e. } 0 \leq t < T;$$

- (iii)  $\int_0^T \int u \nabla v dx dt = 0$  holds for any  $T > 0$  and any  $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T))$ ;
- (iv)  $\int_0^T \int (-n\xi_t - un\nabla\xi + \nabla n \nabla \xi + n^2 \xi - an\xi) dx dt = \int_0^T \int (n \nabla p + n \nabla q) \nabla \xi dx dt$  holds for any  $T > 0$  and any  $\xi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T))$ ;
- (v)  $\int_0^T \int (-p\eta_t - up\nabla\eta + \nabla p \nabla \eta + np\eta) dx dt = 0$  holds for any  $T > 0$  and any  $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T))$ ;
- (vi)  $\int_0^T \int (-q\xi_t - uq\nabla\xi + \nabla q \nabla \xi + q\xi) dx dt = \int_0^T \int n\xi dx dt$  holds for any  $T > 0$  and any  $\xi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, T))$ .

It is easy to prove the existence of weak solutions [17] and thus we omit the details here; we only need to prove the uniqueness.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. First, from the equations of  $n, p, q$  and the maximum principle we see that

$$(2.1) \quad n, p, q \geq 0, \quad p \leq C.$$

For any  $l \geq 2$ , testing (1.3) by  $n^{l-1}$ , using (1.10) and denoting  $w := n^{l/2}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \frac{d}{dt} \int w^2 dx + \frac{4(l-1)}{l^2} \int |\nabla w|^2 dx + \int n^{l+1} dx \\ &= C \int w(\nabla p + \nabla q) \nabla w dx + \int an^l dx \\ &\leq C(\|w\nabla p\|_{L^2} + \|w\nabla q\|_{L^2})\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C\|w\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla p\|_{\dot{X}_r}\|w\|_{\dot{H}^r} + \|\nabla q\|_{\dot{X}_s}\|w\|_{\dot{H}^s})\|\nabla w\|_{L^2} + C\|w\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\|\nabla p\|_{\dot{X}_r}\|w\|_{L^2}^{1-r}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{1+r} + C\|\nabla q\|_{\dot{X}_s}\|w\|_{L^2}^{1-s}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^{1+s} + C\|w\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{l-1}{l^2} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\|\nabla p\|_{\dot{X}_r}^{2/(1-r)} + \|\nabla q\|_{\dot{X}_s}^{2/(1-s)})\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|w\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(2.2) \quad \|n\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^l)} + \|n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C \quad \text{for any } l \geq 2.$$

Testing (1.1) by  $u$ , using (1.2) and (2.2), we observe that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |u|^2 dx + \int |\nabla u|^2 dx = - \int n \nabla \varphi u dx \leq \|n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2} \leq C\|u\|_{L^2},$$

which implies

$$(2.3) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C.$$

Testing (1.4) by  $p$  and using (1.2) and (2.1), we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int p^2 dx + \int |\nabla p|^2 dx + \int np^2 dx = 0,$$

which implies

$$(2.4) \quad \|p\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|p\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C.$$

Similarly, testing (1.5) by  $q$  and using (1.2), (2.1) and (2.2), we infer that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int q^2 dx + \int |\nabla q|^2 dx + \int q^2 dx = \int nq dx \leq \|n\|_{L^2} \|q\|_{L^2} \leq C \|q\|_{L^2},$$

which gives

$$(2.5) \quad \|q\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|q\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \leq C.$$

Now we are in a position to show the uniqueness of weak solutions. Let  $(u_j, \pi_j, n_j, p_j, q_j)$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) be the two weak solutions. We denote

$$u := u_1 - u_2, \quad \pi := \pi_1 - \pi_2, \quad n := n_1 - n_2, \quad p := p_1 - p_2, \quad q := q_1 - q_2.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(2.6) \quad \partial_t u + u_1 \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \pi - \Delta u = n \nabla \varphi - u \cdot \nabla u_2,$$

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t n - \Delta n &= -\nabla \cdot (u_2 n + u n_1) - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla p_1 + n_2 \nabla p) \\ &\quad - \nabla \cdot (n \nabla q_1 + n_2 \nabla q) + an - (n_1 + n_2)n, \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.8) \quad \partial_t p + u_1 \cdot \nabla p - \Delta p + n_1 p = -u \cdot \nabla p_2 - np_2,$$

$$(2.9) \quad \partial_t q + u_1 \cdot \nabla q - \Delta q + q = n - u \cdot \nabla q_2.$$

Define  $\xi$  satisfying

$$(2.10) \quad -\Delta \xi = n.$$

Testing (2.6) by  $u$  and using (1.2), we deduce by a formal argument:

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |u|^2 dx + \int |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int n \nabla \varphi u dx - \int u \cdot \nabla u_2 \cdot u dx =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Indeed, this process can be justified by a very similar argument in [14] and thus we omit it.

We bound  $I_1$  as follows:

$$(2.12) \quad I_1 \leq \|n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We decompose  $u_2$  into three parts in the phase variable:

$$(2.13) \quad u_2 = \sum_{j < -M} \eta_j * u_2 + \sum_{j=-M}^M \eta_j * u_2 + \sum_{j > M} \eta_j * u_2 =: u_2^l + u_2^m + u_2^h.$$

Thus,

$$(2.14) \quad I_2 = \int u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_2^l \, dx - \int u \cdot \nabla u_2^m \cdot u \, dx + \int u \cdot \nabla u \cdot u_2^h \, dx =: I_2^l + I_2^m + I_2^h.$$

Recalling the Bernstein inequality

$$(2.15) \quad \|\eta_j * u\|_{L^q} \leq C 2^{jN(1/p-1/q)} \|\eta_j * u\|_{L^p}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty,$$

the low-frequency part is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} (2.16) \quad I_2^l &\leq \|u\|_{L^{2N/(N-2)}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u_2^l\|_{L^N} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{j < -M} 2^{jN(1/2-1/N)} \|\eta_j * u_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \left( \sum_{j < -M} 2^{(N-2)j} \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \|\eta_j * u_2\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 2^{-(N-2)M/2} \|u_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 2^{-(N-2)M/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (2.17) \quad I_2^m &\leq \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2^m\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{j=-M}^M \|\eta_j * \nabla u_2\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq CM \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the last term is simply bounded by the Hausdroff-Young inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} (2.18) \quad I_2^h &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \|u_2^h\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \sum_{j>M} \|\{(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(\eta_{j-1} + \eta_j + \eta_{j+1})\} * \eta_j * (-\Delta)^{1/2} u_2\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \sum_{j>M} 2^{-j} \|\eta_j * (-\Delta)^{1/2} u_2\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C 2^{-M} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0} \\ &\leq C 2^{-M} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0}^2 + C 2^{-M} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $M$  properly large so that  $C 2^{-M/2} \leq \frac{1}{36}$  and  $C 2^{-M} \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0} \leq 1$ , we arrive at

$$(2.19) \quad I_2 \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0} (1 + \log(e + \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0})).$$

Testing (2.7) by  $\xi$  and using (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.20) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |\nabla \xi|^2 dx + \int (\Delta \xi)^2 dx \\
&= - \int u_2 \nabla \xi \Delta \xi dx + \int u n \nabla \xi dx + \int (n \nabla p_1 + n_2 \nabla p) \nabla \xi dx \\
&\quad + \int (n \nabla q_1 + n_2 \nabla q) \nabla \xi dx + \int a n \xi dx + \int (n_1 + n_2) \xi \Delta \xi dx \\
&=: \sum_{j=3}^8 I_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (2.19), we have

$$(2.21) \quad I_3 \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0} (1 + \log(e + \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0})).$$

We bound  $I_j$  ( $j = 4, \dots, 8$ ) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.22) \quad I_4 &\leq \|u\|_{L^2} \|n_1\|_{L^{2N}} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^{2N/(N-1)}} \leq C \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^{2N/(N-1)}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$(2.23) \quad \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^{2N/(N-1)}} \leq C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.24) \quad I_5 &\leq \|n\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi \cdot \nabla p_1\|_{L^2} + \|n_2\|_{L^{2N}} \|\nabla p\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^{2N/(N-1)}} \\
&\leq C \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|\nabla p_1\|_{\dot{X}_r} \|\nabla \xi\|_{\dot{H}^r} + C \|\nabla p\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \|\nabla p_1\|_{\dot{X}_r} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^{1-r} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^{1+r} + C \|\nabla p\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla p_1\|_{\dot{X}_r}^{2/1-r} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla p\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to  $I_5$ , we have

$$(2.25) \quad I_6 \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla q_1\|_{X_s}^{2/(1-s)} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla q\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$(2.26) \quad I_7 = a \int |\nabla \xi|^2 dx,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.27) \quad I_8 &\leq \|n_1 + n_2\|_{L^N} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|\xi\|_{L^{2N/(N-2)}} \leq C \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above estimates into (2.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.28) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int |\nabla \xi|^2 dx + \frac{11}{16} \int |\Delta \xi|^2 dx \\
& \leq C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0} (1 + \log(e + \|\nabla u_2\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^0})) \\
& \quad + C \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla p_1\|_{\dot{X}_r}^{2/(1-r)} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \quad + C \|\nabla q_1\|_{\dot{X}_s}^{2/(1-s)} \|\nabla \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla p\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla q\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Testing (2.8) by  $p$ , using (1.2) and (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.29) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int p^2 dx + \int |\nabla p|^2 dx + \int n_1 p^2 dx \\
& = - \int u \cdot \nabla p_2 \cdot p dx - \int n p_2 p dx = \int u p_2 \nabla p dx - \int n p_2 p dx \\
& \leq \|u\|_{L^2} \|p_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla p\|_{L^2} + \|p_2\|_{L^\infty} \|n\|_{L^2} \|p\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla p\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|p\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Testing (2.9) by  $q$  and using (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.30) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int q^2 dx + \int |\nabla q|^2 dx + \int q^2 dx \\
& = \int n q dx - \int u \cdot \nabla q_2 q dx \\
& \leq \|n\|_{L^2} \|q\|_{L^2} + \|u \cdot \nabla q_2\|_{L^2} \|q\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|q\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla q_2\|_{\dot{X}_s} \|u\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|q\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2} \|q\|_{L^2} + C \|\nabla q_2\|_{\dot{X}_s} \|u\|_{L^2}^{1-s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^s \|q\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{16} \|\Delta \xi\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|q\|_{L^2}^2 + C \|\nabla q_2\|_{\dot{X}_s}^{2/(1-s)} \|u\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.12) and (2.19) into (2.11), then adding up to (2.28), (2.29) and (2.30) and using the Gronwall inequality, we conclude that

$$u = 0, \quad n = p = q = 0,$$

and thus

$$u_1 = u_2, \quad n_1 = n_2, \quad p_1 = p_2 \quad \text{and} \quad q_1 = q_2.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** The authors are indebted to the referee and editor Milan Pokorný for some nice suggestions.

## References

- [1] *P. Biler*: Global solutions to some parabolic-elliptic systems of chemotaxis. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.* **9** (1999), 347–359. [zbl](#) [MR](#)
- [2] *L. Corrias, B. Perthame, H. Zaag*: Global solutions of some chemotaxis and angiogenesis systems in high space dimensions. *Milan J. Math.* **72** (2004), 1–28. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [3] *J. Fan, L. Jing, G. Nakamura, K. Zhao*: Qualitative analysis of an integrated chemotaxis-fluid model: Global existence and extensibility criterion. *Commun. Math. Sci.* **18** (2020), 809–836. [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [4] *J. Fan, F. Li*: Global strong solutions to a coupled chemotaxis-fluid model with subcritical sensitivity. *Acta Appl. Math.* **169** (2020), 767–791. [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [5] *J. Fan, K. Zhao*: Improved extensibility criteria and global well-posedness of a coupled chemotaxis-fluid model on bounded domains. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. B* **23** (2018), 3949–3967. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [6] *T. Hillen, K. J. Painter*: A user’s guide to PDE models for chemotaxis. *J. Math. Biol.* **58** (2009), 183–217. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [7] *D. Horstmann*: From 1970 until present: The Keller-Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences I. *Jahresber. Dtsch. Math.-Ver.* **105** (2003), 103–165. [zbl](#) [MR](#)
- [8] *E. F. Keller, L. A. Segel*: Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability. *J. Theor. Biol.* **26** (1970), 399–415. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [9] *E. F. Keller, L. A. Segel*: Model for chemotaxis. *J. Theor. Biol.* **30** (1971), 225–234. [zbl](#) [doi](#)
- [10] *E. F. Keller, L. A. Segel*: Traveling bands of chemotactic bacteria: A theoretical analysis. *J. Theor. Biol.* **30** (1971), 235–248. [zbl](#) [doi](#)
- [11] *H. Kozono, M. Miura, Y. Sugiyama*: Existence and uniqueness theorem on mild solutions to the Keller-Segel system coupled with the Navier-Stokes fluid. *J. Func. Anal.* **270** (2016), 1663–1683. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [12] *H. Kozono, T. Ogawa, Y. Taniuchi*: The critical Sobolev inequalities in Besov spaces and regularity criterion to some semi-linear evolution equations. *Math. Z.* **242** (2002), 251–278. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [13] *V. G. Maz’ya, T. O. Shaposhnikova*: Theory of Multipliers in Spaces of Differentiable Functions. Monographs and Studies in Mathematics 23. Pitman, Boston, 1985. [zbl](#) [MR](#)
- [14] *T. Ogawa, Y. Taniuchi*: The limiting uniqueness criterion by vorticity for Navier-Stokes equations in Besov spaces. *Tohoku Math. J., II. Ser.* **56** (2004), 65–77. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [15] *B. D. Sleeman, M. J. Ward, J. C. Wei*: The existence and stability of spike patterns in a chemotaxis model. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **65** (2005), 790–817. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [16] *M. Winkler*: Global solutions in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **34** (2011), 176–190. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [17] *M. Winkler*: A three-dimensional Keller-Segel-Navier-Stokes system with logistic source: Global weak solutions and asymptotic stabilization. *J. Funct. Anal.* **276** (2019), 1339–1401. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)
- [18] *D. Wrzosek*: Long-time behaviour of solutions to a chemotaxis model with volume filling-effect. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb., Sect. A, Math.* **136** (2006), 431–444. [zbl](#) [MR](#) [doi](#)

*Authors’ addresses:* *Miaochao Chen* (corresponding author), School of Mathematics and Statistics, Chaohu University, Hefei 238000, P. R. China, e-mail: chenmiaochao@chu.edu.cn; *Shengqi Lu*, Department of Mathematics and Physics, Sanjiang University, Nanjing 210012, P. R. China, e-mail: 001336@sju.edu.cn; *Qilin Liu*, School of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, P. R. China, e-mail: liuqlseu@126.com.