Weierstraß-Institut
für Angewandte Analysis und Stochastik
Leibniz-Institut im Forschungsverbund Berlin e. V.

Preprint ISSN 2198-5855

Analysis of a tumor model as a multicomponent deformable porous medium

Pavel Krejčí[1], Elisabetta Rocca[2], Jürgen Sprekels[3]

submitted: May 26, 2021

[1] Faculty of Civil Engineering
Czech Technical University
Thákurova 7
CZ-16629 Praha 6
Czech Republic
E-Mail: Pavel.Krejci@cvut.cz

[2] Dipartimento di Matematica "F. Casorati"
Università degli Studi di Pavia
and I.M.A.T.I. - CNR
via Ferrata 5
Pavia I-27100
Italy
E-Mail: elisabetta.rocca@unipv.it

[3] Weierstrass Institute
Mohrenstr. 39
10117 Berlin
Germany
E-Mail: juergen.sprekels@wias-berlin.de

No. 2842
Berlin 2021

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q92, 35Q35, 35K57, 76S05, 92B05, 92C37.

Key words and phrases. Tumor model, porous medium, diffuse interface model, Cahn–Hilliard equation, reaction-diffusion equation.

This research was supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR): Dipartimenti di Eccellenza Program (2018–2022) – Dept. of Mathematics "F. Casorati", University of Pavia, by the GAČR Grant No. 20-14736S and by the European Regional Development Fund, Project No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000778. In addition, it has been performed in the framework of the project Fondazione Cariplo-Regione Lombardia MEGAsTAR "Matematica d'Eccellenza in biologia ed ingegneria come acceleratore di una nuova strateGia per l'ATtRattività dell'ateneo pavese". The present paper also benefits from the support of the GNAMPA (Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni) of INdAM (Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica) for E. R.

Edited by
Weierstraß-Institut für Angewandte Analysis und Stochastik (WIAS)
Leibniz-Institut im Forschungsverbund Berlin e. V.
Mohrenstraße 39
10117 Berlin
Germany

Fax: +49 30 20372-303
E-Mail: preprint@wias-berlin.de
World Wide Web: http://www.wias-berlin.de/

Analysis of a tumor model as a multicomponent deformable porous medium

Pavel Krejčí, Elisabetta Rocca, Jürgen Sprekels

Abstract

We propose a diffuse interface model to describe tumor as a multicomponent deformable porous medium. We include mechanical effects in the model by coupling the mass balance equations for the tumor species and the nutrient dynamics to a mechanical equilibrium equation with phase-dependent elasticity coefficients. The resulting PDE system couples two Cahn–Hilliard type equations for the tumor phase and the healthy phase with a PDE linking the evolution of the interstitial fluid to the pressure of the system, a reaction-diffusion type equation for the nutrient proportion, and a quasistatic momentum balance. We prove here that the corresponding initial-boundary value problem has a solution in appropriate function spaces.

Introduction

Tumor growth is nowadays one of the most active area of scientific research, especially due to the impact on the quality of life for cancer patients. Starting with the seminal work of Burton [10] and Greenspan [35], many mathematical models have been proposed to describe the complex biological and chemical processes that occur in tumor growth, with the aim of better understanding and ultimately controlling the behavior of cancer cells. In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the mathematical modelling of cancer, see for example [1, 2, 5, 9, 16, 20, 22]. Mathematical models for tumor growth may have different analytical features: in the present work, we are focusing on the subclass of continuum models, namely diffuse interface models. There are various ways to model the interaction between the tumor and the surrounding host tissue. A classical approach is to represent the interfaces between the tumor and healthy tissues as idealized surfaces of zero thickness, leading to a sharp interface description that differentiates the tumor and the surrounding host tissue cell-by-cell. These sharp interface models are often difficult to analyze mathematically, and may fail when the interface undergoes a topological change. Metastasis, which is the spreading of cancer to other parts of the body, is one important example of a change of topology. In such an event, the interface can no longer be represented as a mathematical surface, and thus the sharp interface models do no longer properly describe the reality.

On the other hand, diffuse interface models consider the interface between the tumor and the healthy tissues as a layer of non-infinitesimal thickness in which tumor and healthy cells can coexist. The main advantage of this approach is that the mathematical description is less sensitive to topological changes. This is the reason why recent efforts in the mathematical modeling of tumor growth have been mostly focused on diffuse interface models, see for example [15, 16, 21, 30, 33, 36, 43, 50], and their numerical simulations demonstrating complex changes in tumor morphologies due to mechanical stresses and interactions with chemical species such as nutrients or toxic agents. Regarding the recent literature on the mathematical analysis of diffuse interface models for tumor growth, we can further refer to [11, 12, 13, 18, 24, 25, 27, 29] as mathematical references for Cahn–Hilliard-type models and [6, 28, 37, 41] for models also including a transport effect described by Darcy's law.

DOI 10.20347/WIAS.PREPRINT.2842 Berlin 2021

A further class of diffuse interface models that also include chemotaxis and transport effects has been subsequently introduced (cf. [30, 33]); moreover, in some cases the sharp interface limits of such models have been investigated generally by using formal asymptotic methods (cf. [42, 45]).

Including mechanics in the model is clearly an important issue that has been discussed in several modeling papers, but has been very poorly studied analytically. Hence, the main aim of this paper is to find a compromise between the applications and the rigorous analysis of the resulting PDE system: we would like to introduce here an application-significant model which is tractable also analytically. Regarding the existing literature on this subject, we can quote the paper [46], where, using multiphase porous media mechanics, the authors represented a growing tumor as a multiphase medium containing an extracellular matrix, tumor and host cells, and interstitial liquid. Numerical simulations were also performed that characterize the process of cancer growth in terms of the initial tumor-to-healthy cell density ratio, nutrient concentration, mechanical strain, cell adhesion, and geometry. However, referring to [47] for more details on this topic, we mention here that many models in the literature are based on the assumption that the tumor mass presents a particular geometry, the so-called spheroid, and in that case the models mainly focus on the evolution of the external radius of the spheroid. The resulting mathematical problem is an integro-differential free boundary problem, which has been proved to have solutions (cf. [8, 23]) and to predict the evolution of the system. Variants of this approach have been then considered, e.g., in [17] differentiating between viable cells and the necrotic core. Further extensions of the model introduced in [47] can be found in [44].

Very recently, in [32], a new model for tumor growth dynamics including mechanical effects has been introduced in order to generalize the previous works [38, 39] with the goal to take into account cell-cell adhesion effects with the help of a Ginzburg–Landau type energy. In their model an equation of Cahn–Hilliard type is then coupled to the system of linear elasticity and a reaction-diffusion equation for a nutrient concentration, and several questions regarding well-posedness and regularity of solutions have been investigated.

In this paper, following the approach of [47], we introduce a diffuse interface multicomponent model for tumor growth, where we include mechanics in the model, assuming that the tumor is a porous medium. In [47], the tumor is regarded as a mixture of various interacting components (cells and extracellular material) whose evolution is ruled by coupled mass and momentum balances. The cells usually are subdivided into subpopulations of proliferating, quiescent and necrotic cells (cf., e. g., [15, 16]), and the interactions between species are determined by the availability of some nutrients. Here, we restrict ourselves to the case where we distinguish only healthy and tumor cells, even if we could, without affecting the analysis, treat the case where we differentiate also between necrotic and proliferating tumor cells. Hence, we represent the tumor as a porous medium consisting of three phases: healthy tissue φ_1, tumor tissue φ_2, and interstitial fluid φ_0 satisfying proper mass balance equations including mass source terms depending on the nutrient variable ϱ. The nutrient satisfies a reaction-diffusion equation nonlinearly coupled with the tumor and healthy tissue phases by a coefficient characterizing the different consumption rates of the nutrient by the different cell types. We couple the phases and nutrient dynamics with a mechanical equilibrium equation. This relation is further coupled with the phase dynamics through the elasticity modulus depending on the proportion between healthy and tumor phases. We refer to [19] for a mathematical model of a multicomponent flow in deformable porous media from which we take inspiration. The mass balance relations are derived from a free energy functional which, in the domain Ω where the evolution takes place, can be written as

$$\mathcal{F} = \int_\Omega \left(\hat{F}(p) + \frac{|\nabla \varphi_1|^2}{2} + \frac{|\nabla \varphi_2|^2}{2} + (\psi + g)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) + \frac{|\varrho|^2}{2} \right) \mathrm{d}x \,,$$

where p denotes the fluid pressure and $\hat{F}$ is a suitable nonnegative function of the pressure. The sum $\psi + g$ represents the interaction potential between tumor and healthy phases, with dominant component ψ which is convex with bounded domain, while g is its smooth nonconvex perturbation, which is typically of double-well character. The quantity ϱ represents the mass content of the nutrient. Notice that the gradient terms in the free energy are due to the modeling assumption that the interface between healthy and tumor phases is diffuse (we take the parameters in front of the gradients equal to 1 here for simplicity, but, in practice, they determine the thickness of the interface and have to be chosen properly). The quantities $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ are relative mass contents, so that only their nonnegative values are meaningful. We also assume that all the other substances present in the system are of negligible mass, that is, the identity $\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 = 1$ is to be satisfied as part of the problem. Hence, we choose the domain of ψ to be included in the set $\Theta := \{(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \varphi_1 \geq 0,\ \varphi_2 \geq 0,\ \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 \leq 1\}$. Classically, ψ can be taken as the indicator function of Θ or a logarithmic type potential (cf. [26]).

Under proper assumptions on the data, we prove the existence of weak solutions for the resulting PDE system, which we will introduce in the next Section 1, coupled with suitable initial and conditions. The PDEs consist of two Cahn–Hilliard type equations for the tumor phase and the healthy phase with a PDE linking the evolution of the interstitial fluid to the pressure of the system, a reaction-diffusion type equation for the nutrient proportion and the momentum balance. The technique of the proof is based on a regularization of the system, where, in particular, the nonsmooth potential ψ is replaced by its Yosida approximation ψ_ε. Then, we prove existence of the approximated problem by means of a Faedo–Galerkin scheme, and we pass to the limit by proving suitable uniform (in ε) a priori estimates and applying monotonicity and compactness arguments. A key point in the estimates consists in proving that the mean value of the phases belong to the interior of the domain Θ of ψ, which in turns leads to the estimate of the mean value of the corresponding chemical potentials in the two Cahn–Hilliard type equations (cf. [14, 26]). Uniqueness could be proved only in very particular situations, for example, for smooth potentials ψ satisfying suitable growth conditions, and under some restrictions on the interaction coefficients in the Cahn–Hilliard type equations for the phase. We prefer to leave this argument for further studies of the model.

Plan of the paper. In the next Section 1, we introduce the model deduced from the modeling hypothesis of [47] . In Section 2, we state the mathematical problem and the main results of the paper concerning the existence of suitable weak solutions for the corresponding PDE system. The proof relies on the passage to the limit (in Section 4) in a regularized problem, whose well-posedness is obtained in Section 3.

1 Modeling

We follow the modeling hypotheses of [47] and represent the tumor as a porous medium consisting of three phases: healthy tissue, tumor tissue, and interstitial fluid. We choose the Lagrangian formalism and assume that the evolution of the system takes place in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with Lipschitzian boundary.

The state of the system is described by the following scalar quantities:

φ_0: Relative mass content of the interstitial fluid

φ_1: Relative mass content of the healthy tissue

φ_2: Relative mass content of the tumor tissue

μ_1: Chemical potential controlling the growth of the healthy tissue

μ_2: Chemical potential controlling the growth of the tumor tissue

p: Fluid pressure

w: Volume difference with respect to the referential state

ϱ: Mass content of the nutrients

We consider the following evolution system in a given time interval $(0,T)$:

$$\dot{\varphi}_i + \sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \operatorname{div} \xi_j = S_i, \quad i = 0,1,2, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\dot{\varrho} + \operatorname{div} \zeta + A(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)\, \varrho = 0, \quad \zeta = -D\nabla\varrho, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\nu\dot{w} + E(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)\, w - p = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega \big(E(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)\, w - p\big)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}\mu_1\\ \mu_2\end{pmatrix} \in -\begin{pmatrix}\Delta\varphi_1\\ \Delta\varphi_2\end{pmatrix} + \partial\psi(\varphi_1,\varphi_2) + \nabla_\varphi g(\varphi_1,\varphi_2), \tag{1.4}$$

$$S_0 = -\gamma(\varrho)\,\bar{\varphi}_0(1-\varphi_0), \quad S_1 = \gamma(\varrho)\,\bar{\varphi}_0\varphi_1, \quad S_2 = \gamma(\varrho)\,\bar{\varphi}_0\varphi_2, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\xi_j = -\nabla\mu_j \quad j = 0,1,2, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\mu_0 = p, \quad w = \varphi_0 - f(p), \tag{1.7}$$

where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to $t \in (0,T)$, $\partial\psi$ is the subdifferential of a convex potential ψ, g is a smooth, bounded, and possibly nonconvex (typically “double-well”) perturbation of ψ, ∇ is the gradient with respect to the space variable $x = (x_1,x_2,x_3)$, ∇_φ is the gradient with respect to $\varphi = (\varphi_1,\varphi_2)$, Δ is the Laplace operator, and ξ_j, ζ are fluxes of the components φ_j, ϱ, respectively. The above system is coupled with the initial and boundary conditions

$$\varphi_i(0) = \varphi^0 \text{ for } i = 1,2, \quad w(0) = w^0, \quad \varrho(0) = \varrho^0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.8}$$

$$\nabla\varphi_i \cdot n = 0 \text{ for } i = 1,2, \quad \xi_i \cdot n = 0 \text{ for } i = 0,1,2, \quad \zeta \cdot n = \kappa(\varrho - \varrho^*) \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \tag{1.9}$$

where $n = n(x)$ is the unit outward normal vector at the point $x \in \partial\Omega$.

In (1.5), as well as in what follows, for a generic function $v \in L^1(\Omega \times (0,T))$ we denote by

$$\bar{v}(t) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega v(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{1.10}$$

for $t \in (0,T)$ the mean value of v over Ω.

Eqs. (1.1) represent the mass balance for the three components $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ of the system, where S_i are the source terms, and where c_{ij} are the constant interaction coefficients. Eq. (1.2) is a diffusion equation describing the mass balance for the nutrients, with a constant positive diffusion coefficient $D > 0$ and with a nonnegative coefficient A depending on φ_1, φ_2 and characterizing the different consumption rates of the nutrient by the different cell types. The coefficient $\kappa > 0$ in the boundary condition (1.9) for ζ is the diffusivity of the boundary for the nutrients, and ϱ^* is the (given) nutrient concentration outside the domain. Eq. (1.3) is the mechanical equilibrium equation, with constant viscosity coefficient $\nu > 0$ and with positive elasticity modulus $E(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)$ of the tissue which may differ for different proportions of φ_1 and φ_2. The constitutive functions A, E, f, γ, the convex potential ψ, the interaction constants, and the initial and boundary conditions satisfy Hypothesis 2.1 below.

2 Statement of the problem

The quantities $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \varphi_2$ are relative mass contents, so that only their nonnegative values are meaningful. We also assume that all the other substances present in the system are of negligible mass, that is, the identity $\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 = 1$ is to be satisfied as part of the problem. The convex functional ψ has to be chosen in such a way that the closure $\overline{\mathrm{Dom}\,\psi}$ of its domain $\mathrm{Dom}\,\psi$ is the set

$$\overline{\mathrm{Dom}\,\psi} = \Theta := \{\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \varphi_1 \ge 0,\ \varphi_2 \ge 0,\ \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 \le 1\}, \tag{2.1}$$

and for $\delta \in (0, 1 - (1/\sqrt{2}))$ we define

$$\Theta_\delta := \{\varphi \in \mathrm{Int}\,\Theta : \mathrm{dist}(\varphi, \partial\Theta) \ge \delta\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Let us first specify the hypothesis about the data of the problem.

Hypothesis 2.1. *We fix a constant $K \ge 1$ and assume the following hypothesis to hold.*

(i) $\sum_{i=0}^{2} c_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $j = 0,1,2$, $\sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{ij} = 0$ *for all* $i = 0,1,2$, *and there exists some* $\hat{c} > 0$ *such that* $-\sum_{i \ne j} c_{ij} |\xi_i - \xi_j|^2 \ge \hat{c}\big(|\xi_1 - \xi_0|^2 + |\xi_2 - \xi_0|^2\big)$ *for all* $\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$*;*

(ii) $E, A : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, K]$ *are Lipschitz continuous functions;*

(iii) $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to [-K, K]$ *is a continuously differentiable function,* $|\gamma'(\varrho)| \le K$ *for all* $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$*;*

(iv) $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a continuously differentiable function,* $f'(p) \ge f_0$ *for some* $f_0 > 0$ *and all* $p \in \mathbb{R}$*;*

(v) $\psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, +\infty]$ *is a proper, convex, and lower semicontinuous function satisfying* (2.1)*. We further assume that there exist positive constants* δ, b', c', r' *such that, putting* $\delta_T = \delta\, \mathrm{e}^{-KT-2}$ *with* K *from Hypothesis (iii), the following implications hold:*

(v1) $\mathrm{dist}(\hat{\varphi}, \Theta_{\delta_T}) \le \delta_T/2 \implies |\hat{\xi}| \le b' \quad \forall \hat{\xi} \in \partial\psi(\hat{\varphi})$*;*

(v2) $\hat{\varphi} \in \Theta_{\delta_T},\ |\varphi - \hat{\varphi}| \ge \delta_T/4,\ \varphi \in \Theta \implies r'|\xi - \hat{\xi}| \le \Big\langle \xi - \hat{\xi}, \varphi - \hat{\varphi} \Big\rangle + c'$
$\forall \xi \in \partial\psi(\varphi), \quad \forall \hat{\xi} \in \partial\psi(\hat{\varphi})$*;*

(vi) $g : \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a given function of class* C^2*;*

(vii) $\varphi_0^0, \varphi_1^0, \varphi_2^0, w^0, \varrho^0 \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ *are given initial conditions such that* $\overline{w^0} = 0$, $(\overline{\varphi_1^0}, \overline{\varphi_2^0}) \in \Theta_\delta$ *with* δ *from Hypothesis (v),* $\varphi_0^0(x) + \varphi_1^0(x) + \varphi_2^0(x) = 1$ *for a. e.* $x \in \Omega$*;*

(viii) $\varrho^* \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))$ *is a given function with* $\dot{\varrho}^* \in L^2(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))$.

Conditions (v1), (v2) need some comments. They slightly differ from those in [14, Proposition 2.10], but it is easy to check that they are still satisfied if, for example, ψ is the indicator function of the set Θ. Indeed, (v1) holds trivially. To verify that (v2) holds, take any $\varphi \in \Theta$ and $\xi \in \partial\psi(\varphi)$. We first notice that $\hat{\xi} = 0$, and

$$\langle \xi, \varphi - v \rangle \ge 0 \quad \forall v \in \Theta.$$

We are done if $\xi = 0$. Otherwise,

$$v = \hat{\varphi} + \delta_T \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}$$

is an admissible choice, and we obtain that $\langle \xi, \varphi - \hat{\varphi} \rangle \geq \delta_T |\xi|$, which is precisely (v2) with $r' = \delta_T$ and $c' = 0$.

In the proof, we need to extend the function g to the whole of $\mathbb{R}^2$. We consider an extension such that

$$C_g := \sup\{|g(\varphi)|, |\nabla_\varphi g(\varphi)|, |\langle \nabla_\varphi g(\varphi), \varphi \rangle| : \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2\} < \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

The main result of the paper reads as follows.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Hypothesis 2.1 hold. Then the system* (1.1)–(1.8) *admits a solution with the regularity* $\varphi_i \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$, $\nabla \varphi_i \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega))$, $\dot{\varphi}_i \in L^2(0,T; W^{-1,2}(\Omega))$, $\mu_i, \nabla \mu_i \in L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))$ *for* $i = 0,1,2$, $(\varphi_1(x,t), \varphi_2(x,t)) \in \Theta$ *a. e.,* $\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 = 1$ *a. e.,* $w \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$, $\dot{w}, \nabla w, \nabla \dot{w} \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega))$, $\dot{\varrho} \in L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))$, $\varrho, \nabla \varrho \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega))$. *The equations* (1.3)*,* (1.5)–(1.7) *are satisfied almost everywhere in* $\Omega \times (0,T)$*,* (1.1)–(1.2) *and* (1.4) *are to be interpreted respectively as*

$$\int_\Omega \left(\dot{\varphi}_i\, v_i + \sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \langle \nabla \mu_j, \nabla v_i \rangle \right) \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega S_i\, v_i \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad i = 0,1,2, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\int_\Omega \big(\dot{\varrho} \hat{v} + D \langle \nabla \varrho, \nabla \hat{v} \rangle + A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\, \varrho \hat{v} \big) \,\mathrm{d}x + \kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} (\varrho - \varrho^*)\, \hat{v} \,\mathrm{d}s(x) = 0, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \big((\mu_1 - \partial_1 g(\varphi_1, \varphi_2))(v_1 - \varphi_1) + (\mu_2 - \partial_2 g(\varphi_1, \varphi_2))(v_2 - \varphi_2) \big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \big(\langle \nabla \varphi_1, \nabla (v_1 - \varphi_1) \rangle + \langle \nabla \varphi_2, \nabla (v_2 - \varphi_2) \rangle \big) \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_\Omega \big(\psi(v_1, v_2) - \psi(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \big) \,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for a. e. $t \in (0,T)$ *and for all test functions* $v_0, v_1, v_2, \hat{v} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is divided into several steps. We introduce a small regularizing parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and approximate the convex potential ψ by its Yosida approximation ψ^ε defined by the formula

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |\varphi - z|^2 + \psi(z) \right\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Let us recall the main properties of the Yosida approximation, see [3, 4, 7] for proofs.

Proposition 2.3. *The mapping* $\psi^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, \infty)$ *is convex and continuously differentiable, and the so-called* resolvent J^ε *of* $\partial \psi$*, defined as*

$$J^\varepsilon = (I + \varepsilon\, \partial \psi)^{-1}, \tag{2.8}$$

where I *is the identity, is nonexpansive in* $\mathbb{R}^2$*. The mapping* $\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon$ *is monotone and Lipschitz con-*

tinuous and has for every $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the properties

$$\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\varphi - J^\varepsilon \varphi) \in \partial\psi(J^\varepsilon\varphi) \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}\partial\psi \implies \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) - m(\partial\psi(\varphi))| \to 0 \\ |\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi)| \nearrow |m(\partial\psi(\varphi))| \end{array} \right. \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi)|^2 + \psi(J^\varepsilon\varphi) \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) \nearrow \psi(\varphi) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0, \tag{2.12}$$

where $m(\partial\psi(\varphi))$ is the element of $\partial\psi(\varphi)$ with minimal modulus.

From (2.9)–(2.11) it follows that for every $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}|\varphi - J^\varepsilon\varphi|^2 + \psi(J^\varepsilon\varphi), \tag{2.13}$$

and from the trivial inequalities $\psi(J^\varepsilon\varphi) \geq |J^\varepsilon\varphi|^2 - 1$ and

$$2\,\langle \varphi, J^\varepsilon\varphi \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon + 1}|\varphi|^2 + (2\varepsilon + 1)|J^\varepsilon\varphi|^2$$

we obtain that

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon + 1}|\varphi|^2 - 1 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.14}$$

We consider the following weak formulation of the regularized problem (1.1)–(1.8):

$$\int_\Omega \left(\dot\varphi_i\, v_i + \sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \left\langle \nabla\mu_j, \nabla v_i \right\rangle \right) \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega S_i\, v_i \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\int_\Omega \left(\dot\varrho \hat v + D \left\langle \nabla\varrho, \nabla\hat v \right\rangle + A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\, \varrho\hat v \right) \mathrm{d}x + \kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} (\varrho - \varrho^*)\, \hat v \,\mathrm{d}s(x) = 0, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\nu\dot w + E(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\, w - \frac{p}{|\varphi_0| + |\varphi_1| + |\varphi_2|} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega \left(E(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\, w - \frac{p}{|\varphi_0| + |\varphi_1| + |\varphi_2|} \right) \mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix} = -\begin{pmatrix} \Delta\varphi_1 \\ \Delta\varphi_2 \end{pmatrix} + \nabla_\varphi \left(\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) + g(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \right), \tag{2.18}$$

$$S_0 = -Q\,(1 - \varphi_0), \ \ S_1 = Q\,\varphi_1, \ \ S_2 = Q\,\varphi_2, \tag{2.19}$$

$$Q = \frac{\gamma(\varrho)\,\bar\varphi_0}{(|\varphi_0| + |\varphi_1| + |\varphi_2|)(|\bar\varphi_0| + |\bar\varphi_1| + |\bar\varphi_2|)}, \tag{2.20}$$

$$\xi_j = -\nabla\mu_j \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\mu_0 = p, \quad w = \varphi_0 - f(p), \tag{2.22}$$

for a. e. $t \in (0, T)$ and for all test functions $v_0, v_1, v_2, \hat v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Assuming that (2.15)–(2.22),(1.8) has a solution, choosing $v_0 = v_1 = v_2 = v$ in (2.15), and summing up over $i = 0, 1, 2$, we obtain formally from Hypothesis 2.1 (i) the identity

$$\int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2} \dot\varphi_i \right) v \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega Q \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2} \varphi_i - 1 \right) v \,\mathrm{d}x$$

for all $v \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, which implies together with Hypothesis 2.1 (vii) that, still formally,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2} \varphi_i(x,t) = 1 \tag{2.23}$$

for all x and t. In particular, the denominators in (2.17) and (2.20) are greater or equal to unity. We show below that in the limit, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, all of the φ_i will be nonnegative, and all of the denominators will be equal to 1.

3 Galerkin approximations

We solve the problem (2.15)–(2.22), (1.8) by Galerkin approximations. We choose the orthonormal basis $\{e_k : k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$-\Delta e_k = \lambda_k e_k \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \nabla e_k \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad \lambda_0 = 0,$$

and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i^{(m)}(x,t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{m} \tilde\varphi_{ik}(t) e_k(x), \quad \mu_i^{(m)} = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \tilde\mu_{ik}(t) e_k(x) \text{ for } i = 0,1,2, \\ \varrho^{(m)}(x,t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{m} \tilde\varrho_k(t) e_k(x), \end{aligned}$$

with time dependent coefficients $\tilde\varphi_{ik}(t), \tilde\mu_{ik}(t), \tilde\varrho_k(t)$ which are to be found as solutions to the ODE system for $k = 0,1,\dots,m$,

$$\int_\Omega \left(\dot\varphi_i^{(m)} e_k + \sum_{j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \left\langle \nabla\mu_j^{(m)}, \nabla e_k \right\rangle \right) \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega S_i^{(m)} e_k \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad i = 0,1,2, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\int_\Omega \left(\dot\varrho^{(m)} e_k + D \left\langle \nabla\varrho^{(m)}, \nabla e_k \right\rangle + A(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)})\, \varrho^{(m)} e_k \right) \mathrm{d}x + \kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} (\varrho^{(m)} - \varrho^*) e_k \,\mathrm{d}s(x) = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu \dot w^{(m)} + E(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)})\, w^{(m)} - \frac{f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)})}{|\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|} \\ &\qquad = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \left(E(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)})\, w^{(m)} - \frac{f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)})}{|\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|} \right) \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mu_0^{(m)} = P_m(f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)})), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mu_i^{(m)} = -\Delta\varphi_i^{(m)} + P_m \left(\partial_i \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)}) + \partial_i g(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)}) \right), \ i = 1,2, \tag{3.5}$$

$$S_0^{(m)} = -Q^{(m)}\,(1 - \varphi_0^{(m)}), \ \ S_1^{(m)} = Q^{(m)}\, \varphi_1^{(m)}, \ \ S_2^{(m)} = Q^{(m)}\, \varphi_2^{(m)}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$Q^{(m)} = \frac{\gamma(\varrho^{(m)})\, \bar\varphi_0^{(m)}}{(|\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|)(|\bar\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\bar\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\bar\varphi_2^{(m)}|)}, \tag{3.7}$$

where $P_m : L^2(\Omega) \to H_m := \mathrm{Span}(e_0, \dots, e_m)$ is the orthogonal projection of $L^2(\Omega)$ onto H_m, $\bar\varphi_i^{(m)} = (1/|\Omega|)\int_\Omega \varphi_i^{(m)}\,\mathrm{d}x$. The initial conditions are

$$\tilde\varphi_{ik}(0) = \int_\Omega \varphi_i^0(x)\,e_k(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\ \ \tilde\varrho_k(0) = \int_\Omega \varrho^0(x)\,e_k(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\ \ \tilde w^{(m)}(x,0) = w^0(x). \tag{3.8}$$

System (3.1)–(3.2) is a locally well-posed system of $4(m+1)$ first-order ordinary differential equations for $4(m+1)$ scalar unknowns $\tilde\varrho_k, \tilde\varphi_{ik}$, $i = 0,1,2,\ k = 0,1,\dots m$, while it is convenient to interpret (3.3)–(3.6) as constitutive relations. We shall see below in Eq. (3.12) that the expressions in the denominators of (3.3) and (3.7) are greater or equal to 1, hence the formulas are meaningful. In particular, since f^{-1} is Lipschitz continuous by Hypothesis 2.1 (iv), the equation (3.3) defines a Lipschitz continuous solution operator $W : C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{3(m+1)}) \to C^1([0,T];W^{1,2}(\Omega))$ which with given functions $\tilde\varphi_{ik}$, $i = 0,1,2,\ k = 0,1,\dots m$, associates the solution $w^{(m)}$ of (3.3). The existence of a unique local solution to (3.1)–(3.6) is therefore guaranteed on a nondegenerate time interval $[0,T_m)$, $0 < T_m \le T$.

In order to show that the solution (3.1)–(3.6) is global, we derive some estimates for the solution on the whole interval $[0,T_m)$.

3.1 Estimates independent of m

In the series of estimates to be derived in the formulas below, we denote by C any positive constant which is independent of m and ε, and by C^ε any constant which is independent of m and possibly depends on ε. For simplicity, we denote by $|\cdot|_H$ the norm in $L^2(\Omega)$, and by $\|\cdot\|_V$ the norm in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

We first handle Eq. (3.2), which is easy. We multiply it by $\tilde\varrho_k$ and sum up over $k = 0,\dots,m$ to obtain that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + D\int_\Omega |\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{\kappa}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega} |\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}s(x) \le C. \tag{3.9}$$

We proceed similarly, multiplying (3.2) by $\dot{\tilde\varrho}_k$ and summing up over $k = 0,\dots,m$, to obtain that

$$\int_\Omega |\dot\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(D\int_\Omega |\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \kappa\int_{\partial\Omega} |\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}s(x)\right) \le C\left(1 + \int_\Omega |\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\right), \tag{3.10}$$

hence,

$$\int_0^{T_m}\int_\Omega |\dot\varrho^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{t\in(0,T_m)}\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|^2(t)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\partial\Omega} |\varrho^{(m)}|^2(t)\,\mathrm{d}s(x)\right) \le C. \tag{3.11}$$

Equation (3.1) is more delicate. We choose an arbitrary $v = \sum_{k=0}^m v_k e_k \in H_m$, multiply (3.1) by v_k, and sum up over $k = 0,\dots,m$ and $i = 0,1,2$. From Hypothesis 2.1 (i), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_\Omega (\varphi_0^{(m)}+\varphi_1^{(m)}+\varphi_2^{(m)})\,v\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega (S_0^{(m)}+S_1^{(m)}+S_2^{(m)})\,v\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &= \int_\Omega Q^{(m)}\big(\varphi_0^{(m)}+\varphi_1^{(m)}+\varphi_2^{(m)} - 1\big)v\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

so that necessarily, by Hypothesis 2.1 (vii),

$$\varphi_0^{(m)}(x,t) + \varphi_1^{(m)}(x,t) + \varphi_2^{(m)}(x,t) = 1 \tag{3.12}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \Omega \times [0,T_m)$.

We further multiply the (i,k)-th equation of (3.1) by $\tilde{\mu}_{ik}$ and sum up over $i = 0,1,2$ and $k = 0,1,\dots,m$ to obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2} \int_\Omega \dot{\varphi}_i^{(m)} \mu_i^{(m)} \,\mathrm{d}x + \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \int_\Omega \left\langle \nabla \mu_j^{(m)}, \nabla \mu_i^{(m)} \right\rangle \mathrm{d}x = \sum_{i=0}^{2} \int_\Omega S_i^{(m)} \mu_i^{(m)} \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.13}$$

We treat the three integrals in (3.13) separately. The first integral on the left-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{2} \int_\Omega \dot{\varphi}_i^{(m)} \mu_i^{(m)} \,\mathrm{d}x = &\int_\Omega \dot{w}^{(m)} f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)}) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int_\Omega \Big(\hat{F}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)}) + \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)}) + g(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)}) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\big(|\nabla \varphi_1^{(m)}|^2 + |\nabla \varphi_2^{(m)}|^2\big)\Big) \,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where we denote $\hat{F}(p) = \int_0^p f^{-1}(p') \,\mathrm{d}p'$ for $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that by (3.3) for $k = 0$ we have $\int_\Omega \dot{w}^{(m)} \,\mathrm{d}x = 0$, hence $\int_\Omega w^{(m)} \,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ by Hypothesis 2.1 (vii).

It is easy to see that $w^{(m)}$, as a solution to the ODE (3.3), admits an L^∞-bound independently of m and ε, namely

$$\operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{(x,t)\in\Omega\times(0,T_m)} |w^{(m)}(x,t)| \le C. \tag{3.15}$$

Indeed, we first add to both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (3.3) the term

$$\frac{f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)})}{|\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|}$$

which is bounded by Hypothesis 2.1 (iv). We then multiply (3.3) by $w^{(m)}$, use the fact that the mean value of $w^{(m)}$ is zero and that f is increasing, integrate over Ω, and obtain that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int_\Omega |w^{(m)}(x,t)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \le C \left(1 + \int_\Omega |w^{(m)}(x,t)| \,\mathrm{d}x \right)$$

for a. e. $t \in (0,T_m)$, hence, $\int_\Omega |w^{(m)}(x,t)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \le C$ for $t \in [0,T_m)$. In particular, the right-hand side of (3.3) is bounded independently of m and ε. We now repeat the same procedure, multiplying (3.3) by $\operatorname{sign} w^{(m)}$ without integration over Ω, to get that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} |w^{(m)}(x,t)| \le C \quad \text{a. e. in } \Omega \times (0,T_m),$$

and we conclude that (3.15) holds true.

Using (3.3) and (3.15) we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \dot{w}^{(m)} f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)}) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad = \int_\Omega (|\varphi_0^{(m)}| + |\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|) \dot{w}^{(m)} \big(\dot{w}^{(m)} + E(\varphi_1^{(m)}, \varphi_2^{(m)}) w^{(m)}\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad \ge \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\dot{w}^{(m)}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x - C \int_\Omega \Big(|\varphi_0^{(m)}|^2 + |\varphi_1^{(m)}|^2 + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|^2 \Big) \,\mathrm{d}x\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ which is independent of m and ε.

To estimate the second integral in (3.13), we use the vector formula

$$\langle u, v\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}(|u-v|^2 - |u|^2 - |v|^2)$$

to conclude, using Hypothesis 2.1 (i), that

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^{2} c_{ij} \left\langle \nabla\mu_j^{(m)}, \nabla\mu_i^{(m)} \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j} c_{ij}|\nabla\mu_j^{(m)} - \nabla\mu_i^{(m)}|^2 \geq \frac{\hat{c}}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}|\nabla\mu_i^{(m)} - \nabla\mu_0^{(m)}|^2. \quad (3.17)$$

Finally, the integral on the right-hand side of (3.13) can be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{2}\int_\Omega S_i^{(m)}\,\mu_i^{(m)}\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega S_0^{(m)}\,f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)})\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_\Omega S_i^{(m)}\left(-\Delta\varphi_i^{(m)} + P_m(\partial_i\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)}))\right)\mathrm{d}x. \qquad (3.18)\end{aligned}$$

The function $Q^{(m)}$ defined in (3.7) is bounded in absolute value by the constant K from Hypothesis 2.1 (iii), and also

$$|S_i^{(m)}(x,t)| \leq K \quad \text{for all } x\in\Omega,\ t\in[0,T_m),\ i = 0,1,2\,. \qquad (3.19)$$

By Proposition 2.3, the gradient $\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon$ of ψ^ε is Lipschitz continuous with a constant depending on ε. We thus obtain from (3.18) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega S_0^{(m)}\,f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)})\,\mathrm{d}x + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_\Omega S_i^{(m)}\,P_m(\partial_i\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)}) + \partial_i g(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)}))\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\qquad \leq C^\varepsilon\left(1 + |\varphi_0^{(m)}|_H + |\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H + |w^{(m)}|_H\right). \qquad (3.20)\end{aligned}$$

The remaining term in (3.18) can be estimated using integration by parts as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}-\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_\Omega S_i^{(m)}\,\Delta\varphi_i^{(m)}\,\mathrm{d}x &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_\Omega \left\langle\nabla S_i^{(m)}, \nabla\varphi_i^{(m)}\right\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C\left(|\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2\right). \qquad (3.21)\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.13)–(3.21), we thus obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_\Omega\left(\hat{F}(\varphi_0^{(m)} - w^{(m)}) + \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)}) + g(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)}) + |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}|^2 + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega\left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}|\nabla\mu_i^{(m)} - \nabla\mu_0^{(m)}|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega|\dot{w}^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C^\varepsilon\left(1 + |\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\varphi_0^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2 + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2\right). \qquad (3.22)\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (2.14), (3.11), (3.15), and Gronwall's argument, we derive from (3.22) the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in(0,T_m)}\text{ess}\left(|\varphi_0^{(m)}|_H^2(t) + |\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2(t) + |\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2(t) + |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2(t) + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2(t)\right) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{T_m}\int_\Omega\left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}|\nabla\mu_i^{(m)} - \nabla\mu_0^{(m)}|^2 + |\dot{w}^{(m)}|^2\right)(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \leq C^\varepsilon. \qquad (3.23)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, differentiating (3.3) with respect to the spatial variables, we obtain that

$$\nu\nabla\dot{w}^{(m)} + E(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)})\,\nabla w^{(m)} + w^{(m)}\left(\partial_1 E(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)})\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)} + \partial_2 E(\varphi_1^{(m)},\varphi_2^{(m)})\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}\right)$$
$$+\,(\nabla w^{(m)}-\nabla\varphi_0^{(m)})\frac{(f^{-1})'(\varphi_0^{(m)}-w^{(m)})}{|\varphi_0^{(m)}|+|\varphi_1^{(m)}|+|\varphi_2^{(m)}|} = f^{-1}(\varphi_0^{(m)}-w^{(m)})\nabla\left(\frac{1}{|\varphi_0^{(m)}|+|\varphi_1^{(m)}|+|\varphi_2^{(m)}|}\right). \tag{3.24}$$

Testing (3.24) by $\nabla w^{(m)}$ and using (3.15) yields

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}|\nabla w^{(m)}|_H^2 + c\,|\nabla w^{(m)}|_H^2 \le C\left(1+|\nabla\varphi_0^{(m)}|_H^2+|\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}|_H^2+|\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}|_H^2\right), \tag{3.25}$$

with some constants $C > c > 0$. From (3.12), we immediately obtain the pointwise bound

$$|\nabla\varphi_0^{(m)}| \le |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}| \quad \text{a.e.} \tag{3.26}$$

It follows from (3.23), (3.25), and by comparison in (3.24), that

$$\operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{t\in(0,T_m)}\left(|\nabla\dot{w}^{(m)}|_H + \nabla w^{(m)}|_H\right) \le C. \tag{3.27}$$

By virtue of (3.4), we have that

$$|\nabla\mu_0^{(m)}| \le |\nabla\varphi_1^{(m)}| + |\nabla\varphi_2^{(m)}| + |\nabla w^{(m)}| \quad \text{a.e.} \tag{3.28}$$

Since $\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon$ is Lipschitz continuous for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain from (3.4) that

$$\bar{\mu}_i^{(m)}(t) \le C^\varepsilon\left(1+\int_\Omega\sum_{i=1}^2|\varphi_i^{(m)}|^2(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/2} \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega|\mu_0^{(m)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \le C\left(1+\int_\Omega\left(|\varphi_0^{(m)}|^2+|w^{(m)}|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\right). \tag{3.30}$$

We now summarize the above computations in (3.23)–(3.30) and obtain for all $t\in(0,T_m)$ that

$$\int_\Omega\left(\sum_{i=0}^2\left(|\varphi_i^{(m)}|^2+|\nabla\varphi_i^{(m)}|^2\right)+|\varrho^{(m)}|^2+|\nabla\varrho^{(m)}|^2+|\nabla w^{(m)}|^2+|\nabla\dot{w}^{(m)}|^2\right)(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x$$
$$+\int_0^t\int_\Omega\left(\sum_{i=0}^2\left(|\mu_i^{(m)}|^2+|\nabla\mu_i^{(m)}|^2\right)+|\dot{w}^{(m)}|^2+|\dot{\varrho}^{(m)}|^2\right)(x,\tau)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}\tau \le C^\varepsilon, \tag{3.31}$$

with a constant $C^\varepsilon > 0$ which is independent of m. By comparison in (3.5), we have a bound for $\Delta\varphi_i^{(m)}$ in $L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$ which is independent of m, $i=1,2$. Finally, by comparison in (3.1), we obtain bounds in $L^2(0,T;W^{-1,2}(\Omega))$, which are independent of m, for $\dot{\varphi}_i^{(m)}$, $i=0,1,2$. We thus have sufficient estimates which on the one hand guarantee that the solution exists on the whole time interval $[0,T]$ and, on the other hand, enable us to pass to the limit as $m\to\infty$ in (3.1)–(3.7) and check that the following statement holds true.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Hypothesis 2.1 hold and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then the system* (2.15)–(2.22)*,* (1.8) *admits a solution with the regularity $\varphi_i,\mu_i,\nabla\mu_i,\Delta\varphi_i\in L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$, $\nabla\varphi_i\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $\dot{\varphi}_i\in L^2(0,T;W^{-1,2}(\Omega))$ for $i=0,1,2$, $\varphi_0+\varphi_1+\varphi_2=1$ a.e., $w\in L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))$, $\dot{w},\nabla w,\nabla\dot{w}\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $\dot{\varrho}\in L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$, $\varrho,\nabla\varrho\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$.*

We can indeed pass to the limit in the initial conditions for ρ and w by virtue of (3.11) and (3.27). For the initial conditions for φ_i, the argument is standard as well: it is easy to check for each $i = 0, 1, 2$ that

$$\forall \eta > 0\, \forall v_i \in L^2(\Omega)\, \exists t_\eta > 0 : \\ t \in (0, t_\eta) \implies \exists m_\eta \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall m > m_\eta : \left| \int_\Omega (\varphi_i^{(m)}(x,t) - \varphi_i^{(m)}(x,0)) v_i(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \right| < \eta \,. \tag{3.32}$$

4 Limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$

In the previous section, we have proved that system (2.15)–(2.22) coupled with initial conditions (1.8) admits a global solution. The estimates that we have derived so far depend on ε. We split this section into two subsections. In Subsection 4.1, we derive estimates independent of ε for the solution to (2.15)–(2.22), and in Subsection 4.2, we prove Theorem 2.2 by passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

4.1 Estimates independent of ε

Let us start with the following result which is a simple modification of [14, Propositions 2.10, 2.13].

Proposition 4.1. *Let ψ satisfy Hypothesis 2.1 (v). Then there exist some $\bar\varepsilon > 0$ and positive constants b, c, r such that, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar\varepsilon)$, the Yosida approximations ψ^ε of ψ have the following properties:*

(i) $\operatorname{dist}(\hat\varphi, \Theta_{\delta_T}) \le \delta_T/2 \implies |\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\hat\varphi)| \le b$;

(ii) $\hat\varphi \in \Theta_{\delta_T},\ \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ |\varphi - \hat\varphi| \ge \delta_T/2$

$$\implies r|\nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\hat\varphi)| \le \langle \nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\hat\varphi), \varphi - \hat\varphi \rangle + c.$$

Proof. We prove the statement for $b = b'$, $r = r'$, $c = c' + 2r'b'$, where b', c', r' are as in Hypothesis 2.1 (v). Let us start with part (i), and consider $\hat\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\hat\varphi, \Theta_{\delta_T}) \le \delta_T/2$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define $J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi$ as in Proposition 2.3, and choose any $\hat\xi \in \partial\psi(\hat\varphi)$. We have by (2.9) that

$$\hat\xi^\varepsilon := \nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\hat\varphi) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat\varphi - J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi) \in \partial\psi(J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi),$$

hence $-\varepsilon \left\langle \hat\xi^\varepsilon, \hat\xi^\varepsilon - \hat\xi \right\rangle = \left\langle J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi - \hat\varphi, \hat\xi^\varepsilon - \hat\xi \right\rangle \ge 0$, by the monotonicity of $\partial\psi$. We thus have $|\hat\xi^\varepsilon| \le b'$ by Hypothesis 2.1 (v), and part (i) is proved.

To prove part (ii), let $\hat\varphi \in \Theta_{\delta_T}$ be given, and put $\bar\varepsilon = \delta_T/(4b')$. For $\varepsilon < \bar\varepsilon$ we have

$$|\hat\varphi - J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi| = \varepsilon |\hat\xi^\varepsilon| < \frac{\delta_T}{4},$$

by virtue of part (i). Hence, $\operatorname{dist}(J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi, \Theta_{\delta_T}) < \delta_T/4$. Let further $|\varphi - \hat\varphi| \ge \delta_T/2$ for some $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We denote $\xi^\varepsilon = \nabla_\varphi \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi)$. We have either

$$|J^\varepsilon \varphi - J^\varepsilon \hat\varphi| < \frac{\delta_T}{4}, \tag{4.1}$$

or

$$|J^\varepsilon\varphi - J^\varepsilon\hat{\varphi}| \geq \frac{\delta_T}{4}. \tag{4.2}$$

In the case (4.1), we have $\mathrm{dist}(J^\varepsilon\hat{\varphi}, \Theta_{\delta_T}) < \delta_T/2$, and we obtain from (i) simply that

$$r|\xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon| \leq r(|\xi^\varepsilon| + |\hat{\xi}^\varepsilon|) \leq 2rb.$$

If (4.2) holds, then we have by Hypothesis 2.1 (v) that

$$r|\xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon| \leq \Big\langle \xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon, J^\varepsilon\varphi - J^\varepsilon\hat{\varphi}\Big\rangle + c' = \Big\langle \xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon, \varphi - \hat{\varphi}\Big\rangle - \varepsilon|\xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon|^2 + c' \leq \Big\langle \xi^\varepsilon - \hat{\xi}^\varepsilon, \varphi - \hat{\varphi}\Big\rangle + c'.$$

Combining the two inequalities, and using the monotonicity of $\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon$, we obtain the assertion. ■

We actually need the following consequence of Proposition 4.1.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\psi, \bar{\varepsilon}, b, c, r$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then there exists a constant $\hat{c} > 0$ with the property that, for every $\varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$, for every $\hat{\varphi} \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\hat{\varphi}(x) \in \Theta_{\delta_T}$ a. e., and for every $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)$, we have that*

$$r\int_\Omega |\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x))|\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_\Omega \langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x)), \varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}(x)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}x + \hat{c}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)$ be arbitrarily chosen. We define $\Omega_+ := \{x \in \Omega : \mathrm{dist}(\varphi(x), \Theta_{\delta_T}) \geq \delta_T/4\}$, $\Omega_- = \Omega \setminus \Omega_+$. For a. e. $x \in \Omega_-$, we have by Proposition 4.1 (i) that

$$|\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x))| \leq 2b\,.$$

For a. e. $x \in \Omega_+$, Proposition 4.1 (ii) yields that

$$r|\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x))| \leq \langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x)), \varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}(x)\rangle + c\,.$$

Using the fact that $\langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x)), \varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}(x)\rangle \geq 0$ a. e., we can combine the two inequalities and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} r\int_\Omega |\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x))|\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_\Omega \langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x)) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}(x)), \varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}(x)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}r \\ + c|\Omega_+| + 2rb|\Omega_-|\,. \end{aligned}$$

Putting $\hat{c} := |\Omega|(c + 2rb)$, we complete the proof. ■

We now estimate the distance of the functions $\bar{\varphi}_i(t)$ from the boundary of Θ. To this end, we choose $v_0 = v_1 = v_2 = 1$ and put

$$\Gamma = \frac{\gamma(\varrho)}{(|\varphi_0| + |\varphi_1| + |\varphi_2|)(|\bar{\varphi}_0| + |\bar{\varphi}_1| + |\bar{\varphi}_2|)}\,.$$

We obtain

$$\dot{\bar{\varphi}}_0(t) = \frac{\bar{\varphi}_0(t)}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega \Gamma(x,t)\,(1 - \varphi_0(x,t))\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\dot{\bar{\varphi}}_1(t) = \frac{\bar{\varphi}_0(t)}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\dot{\bar{\varphi}}_2(t) = \frac{\bar{\varphi}_0(t)}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_2(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.6}$$

From Hypothesis 2.1 (iii) it follows that $|\Gamma(x,t)\,(1-\varphi_0(x,t))| \le |\Gamma(x,t)|\,(|\varphi_1(x,t)|+|\varphi_2(x,t)|) \le K$ for a. e. $(x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T)$. By Hypothesis 2.1 (vii), we have $\bar\varphi_0(0) \ge \delta/\sqrt{2} > 0$, hence,

$$\bar\varphi_0(t) \ge \bar\varphi_0(0)\,\mathrm{e}^{-Kt} > 0 \ \text{ for all } \ t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.7}$$

Lower bounds for $\bar\varphi_1, \bar\varphi_2$ are more delicate to obtain. These functions are continuously differentiable. Therefore, there exists some $T_\varepsilon \in [0,T]$ such that

$$\bar\varphi_i(t) \ge \delta\,\mathrm{e}^{-KT-1} \ \text{ for all } \ t \in [0,T_\varepsilon],\ i = 1,2. \tag{4.8}$$

Put $T^*_\varepsilon = \max\{T_\varepsilon \in [0,T] :$ inequality (4.8) holds$\}$, and assume that $T^*_\varepsilon < T$ for some $\varepsilon < \bar\varepsilon$. For definiteness, we can assume that

$$\bar\varphi_1(T^*_\varepsilon) = \delta\,\mathrm{e}^{-KT-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Taking into account (4.7), we have that $1 - \bar\varphi_1(t) - \bar\varphi_2(t) = \bar\varphi_0(t) > (\delta/2)\,\mathrm{e}^{-Kt}$ in $[0,T^*_\varepsilon]$. Hence, denoting $\varphi = (\varphi_1,\varphi_2)$, we have $\mathrm{dist}(\bar\varphi(t),\partial\Theta) \ge (\delta/2)\,\mathrm{e}^{-KT-1} > \delta_T$, so that $\bar\varphi(t) \in \Theta_{\delta_T}$ for all $t \in [0,T^*_\varepsilon]$.

Let us denote $\bar\mu = (\bar\mu_1,\bar\mu_2)$. From (2.18) and (2.3) it follows that

$$|\bar\mu(t)| \le \int_\Omega (|\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi)|+|\nabla_\varphi g(\varphi)|)\,\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega |\nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\bar\varphi)|\,\mathrm{d}x + (b+C_g)|\Omega|, \tag{4.10}$$

where we have used Hypothesis 2.1 (vi) and Proposition 4.1 (i). We further obtain from Corollary 4.2 and (2.18) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar\mu(t)| &\le \frac{1}{r}\int_\Omega \langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) - \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\bar\varphi), \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x + (b+C_g)|\Omega| + \frac{c}{r}\\
&= \frac{1}{r}\int_\Omega \langle \nabla_\varphi\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi), \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x + (b+C_g)|\Omega| + \frac{c}{r}\\
&= \frac{1}{r}\left(-\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \langle \nabla_\varphi g(\varphi), \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \langle \mu, \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x\right)\\
&\quad + (b+C_g)|\Omega| + \frac{c}{r}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

We now use again (2.3), the fact that $\int_\Omega \langle \mu, \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \langle \mu - \bar\mu, \varphi - \bar\varphi\rangle\ \mathrm{d}x$, and the elementary inequalities

$$\int_\Omega |\varphi - \bar\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \le C\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad \int_\Omega |\mu - \bar\mu|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \le C\int_\Omega |\nabla\mu|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\,, \tag{4.12}$$

to conclude that there exists a constant M, which is independent of ε, such that for all $t \in [0,T^*_\varepsilon]$ we have

$$|\bar\mu(t)| \le M\left(1 + \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla\mu|^2(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/2}\right). \tag{4.13}$$

We now repeat the estimation procedure from Subsection 3.1, test the i-th equation in (2.15) by $v = \mu_i$, and sum up to obtain, similarly as in (3.13)–(3.16),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_\Omega \left(\hat F(\varphi_0 - w) + \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) + g(\varphi) + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|w|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \frac{\hat c}{2}\int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2}(|\nabla\mu_i - \nabla\mu_0|^2) + \frac{1}{2}|\dot w|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \le \sum_{i=0}^{2}\int_\Omega S_i\mu_i\,\mathrm{d}x + K\int_\Omega |w|^2\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

for a. e. $t \in (0, T_\varepsilon^*)$. We have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2} \int_\Omega S_i \mu_i \,\mathrm{d}x \le C \sum_{i=0}^{2} \int_\Omega |\varphi_i||\mu_i| \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

hence, by virtue of (4.12), (4.13), and the hypotheses on $\hat{F}$ and g,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \left(|\varphi_0|^2 + \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) + |\nabla\varphi|^2 + |w|^2\right)(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} (|\nabla\mu_i - \nabla\mu_0|^2) + |\dot{w}|^2 \right)(x,\tau)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\le C \int_0^t \left(1 + \int_\Omega \left(|w|^2 + |\nabla\varphi|^2 + |\varphi_0|^2 + |\nabla\mu_1|^2 + |\nabla\mu_2|^2\right)(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) \mathrm{d}\tau. \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

We have for all $(x,t) \in \Omega \times [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$ the identity $\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 = 1$ and $\nabla\varphi_0 = -\nabla\varphi_1 - \nabla\varphi_2$, hence, $|\nabla\mu_0| \le C(|\nabla\varphi_0| + |\nabla w|)$. Note that, repeating the computations leading to (3.15) and (3.27), we derive the estimates

$$\operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{(x,t)\in\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon^*)} |w(x,t)| \le C, \quad \operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{t\in(0,T_\varepsilon^*)} (|\nabla\dot{w}|_H + |\nabla w|_H) \le C, \qquad (4.16)$$

with $C > 0$ independent of ε. The Gronwall argument and (2.14) now yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \left(|w|^2 + \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi) + \sum_{i=0}^{2} \left(|\varphi_i|^2 + |\nabla\varphi_i|^2\right) \right)(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(|\mu_i|^2 + |\nabla\mu_i|^2\right) + |\dot{w}|^2 \right)(x,\tau)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}\tau \le C^* \qquad (4.17)
\end{aligned}$$

for every $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$, with a constant $C^* > 0$ which is independent of ε. By comparison in (2.15), we get the bound

$$\int_0^{T_\varepsilon^*} \|\dot{\varphi}_i(t)\|^2_{W^{-1,2}(\Omega)}\,\mathrm{d}t \le C\,, \quad i = 0, 1, 2\,. \qquad (4.18)$$

To make the list of estimates complete, recall that the upper bound in (3.9)–(3.10) is independent of m and ε, so that

$$\operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{t\in(0,T_\varepsilon^*)} (|\varrho(t)|_H + |\nabla\varrho(t)|_H) \le C, \quad \int_0^{T_\varepsilon^*} |\dot{\varrho}(t)|_H^2\,\mathrm{d}t \le C\,. \qquad (4.19)$$

The next step consists in proving that $T_\varepsilon^* = T$. To this end, we split for each $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon^*]$ the domain Ω into three parts, namely

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_0(t) &= \{x \in \Omega : \varphi_1(x,t) \ge 0\}, \\
\Omega_1(t) &= \{x \in \Omega : 0 > \varphi_1(x,t) \ge -\varepsilon^{1/4}\}, \\
\Omega_2(t) &= \{x \in \Omega : -\varepsilon^{1/4} > \varphi_1(x,t)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us start with $\Omega_2(t)$. By definition (2.7) of ψ^ε, we have for $x \in \Omega_2(t)$ that

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi(x,t)) \ge \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \min_{z\in\Theta} |\varphi_1(x,t) - z_1|^2 \ge \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\,. \qquad (4.20)$$

By virtue of (4.17), we have

$$|\Omega_2(t)| \le \frac{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{C^*}\,. \tag{4.21}$$

We now rewrite Eq. (4.5) in the form

$$\dot{\bar\varphi}_1(t) = \bar\varphi_0(t)\left(\int_{\Omega_0(t)} + \int_{\Omega_1(t)} + \int_{\Omega_2(t)}\right)\Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_0(t)} \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge -K\bar\varphi_1(t),\\
&\int_{\Omega_1(t)} \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge -K|\Omega|\varepsilon^{1/4},\\
&\int_{\Omega_2(t)} \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge -K\int_{\Omega_2(t)} |\varphi_1(x,t)|\,\mathrm{d}x \ge -K|\Omega_2(t)|^{1/2}\left(\int_\Omega |\varphi_1(x,t)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/2}\\
&\qquad\qquad \ge -\sqrt{2}K\varepsilon^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\dot{\bar\varphi}_1(t) = \bar\varphi_0(t)\int_\Omega \Gamma(x,t)\,\varphi_1(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge -K(\bar\varphi_1(t) + \Lambda\varepsilon^{1/4}) \tag{4.22}$$

with a constant $\Lambda > 0$ which is independent of ε. We thus obtain a lower bound for $\bar\varphi_1(t)$, namely (note that $\bar\varphi_1(0) \ge \delta$ by Hypothesis 2.1 (vii)),

$$\bar\varphi_1(t) \ge \delta\,\mathrm{e}^{-Kt} - \Lambda\varepsilon^{1/4}\left(1-\mathrm{e}^{-Kt}\right) \ge \delta\,\mathrm{e}^{-Kt} - \Lambda\varepsilon^{1/4} \tag{4.23}$$

for $t \in [0, T^*_\varepsilon]$. We see that for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, condition (4.9) is violated. Hence, by (4.8), $T^*_\varepsilon = T$ and the estimate (4.17) holds globally in $[0,T]$.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

We show that passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (2.15)–(2.22) we obtain a solution to (1.1)–(1.7) in the sense of Theorem 2.2. We label here the solution $(\mu_i, \varphi_i, w, \varrho)$ of (2.15)–(2.22) with the upper index ε in order to emphasize the dependence on ε.

The estimates (4.17)–(4.19) are independent of ε and hold globally on $[0,T]$. We can therefore extract a subsequence $\varepsilon \to 0$ such that

- $\nabla\varphi_i^\varepsilon \to \nabla\varphi_i$ for $i = 0,1,2$, $\nabla\varrho^\varepsilon \to \nabla\varrho$, $\nabla w^\varepsilon \to \nabla w$ weakly-star in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$;
- $\dot\varrho^\varepsilon \to \dot\varrho$, $\mu_i^\varepsilon \to \mu$, $\nabla\mu_i^\varepsilon \to \nabla\mu_i$ for $i = 0,1,2$, $\dot w^\varepsilon \to \dot w$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$;
- $\dot\varphi_i^\varepsilon \to \dot\varphi_i$ for $i = 0,1,2$ weakly in $L^2(0,T;W^{-1,2}(\Omega))$.

Using the Sobolev embedding theorems, the trace theorem, and the Lions compactness lemma [40, Theorem 5.1], we obtain the convergences, passing again to a subsequence of $\varepsilon \to 0$ if necessary,

- $\varrho^\varepsilon \to \varrho$, $w^\varepsilon \to w$, strongly in $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$;
- $\varphi_i^\varepsilon \to \varphi_i$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$, for $i = 0,1,2$;

- $\varrho^\varepsilon \to \varrho$ strongly in $L^2(0,T;L^2(\partial\Omega))$.

We can pass to the limit in all of the terms in (2.15)–(2.22), and the limit initial condition (1.8) is obtained by an argument similar to (3.32). The variational inequality (2.6) needs to be paid some attention. Since ψ^ε is convex, we can rewrite (2.18) as

$$\int_\Omega \big((\mu_1^\varepsilon - \partial_1 g(\varphi_1^\varepsilon,\varphi_2^\varepsilon))(v_1-\varphi_1^\varepsilon) + (\mu_2^\varepsilon - \partial_2 g(\varphi_1^\varepsilon,\varphi_2^\varepsilon))(v_2-\varphi_2^\varepsilon)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ - \int_\Omega \big(\langle\nabla\varphi_1^\varepsilon,\nabla(v_1-\varphi_1^\varepsilon)\rangle + \langle\nabla\varphi_2^\varepsilon,\nabla(v_2-\varphi_2^\varepsilon)\rangle\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega \big(\psi^\varepsilon(v_1,v_2) - \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^\varepsilon,\varphi_2^\varepsilon)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{4.24}$$

for a. e. $t\in(0,T)$ and for all test functions $v_1,v_2\in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. We now choose an arbitrary test function $\lambda\in L^2(0,T)$, $\lambda(t)\ge 0$ a. e. From the above convergences, it follows that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_0^T\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi_i^\varepsilon(x,t)|^2\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \ge \int_0^T\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi_i(x,t)|^2\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\,,$$

and, using (2.12), we obtain the pointwise limit $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\psi^\varepsilon(v_1,v_2) = \psi(v_1,v_2)$. We multiply both sides of the inequality (4.24) by $\lambda(t)$, integrate over $t\in(0,T)$ and pass to the limit to obtain

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega \big((\mu_1 - \partial_1 g(\varphi_1,\varphi_2))(v_1-\varphi_1) + (\mu_2 - \partial_2 g(\varphi_1,\varphi_2))(v_2-\varphi_2)\big)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ - \int_0^T\int_\Omega \big(\langle\nabla\varphi_1,\nabla(v_1-\varphi_1)\rangle + \langle\nabla\varphi_2,\nabla(v_2-\varphi_2)\rangle\big)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ \le \int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi(v_1,v_2)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^\varepsilon,\varphi_2^\varepsilon)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{4.25}$$

for all test functions $v_1,v_2\in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. It remains to prove that we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi_1^\varepsilon(x,t),\varphi_2^\varepsilon(x,t))\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \ge \int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi(\varphi_1(x,t),\varphi_2(x,t))\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{4.26}$$

If (4.26) is fulfilled, then, on the one hand, (2.6) holds and, on the other hand, we conclude that $\psi(\varphi_1(x,t),\varphi_2(x,t))<\infty$ almost everywhere. This means, in particular, that $(\varphi_1(x,t),\varphi_2(x,t))\in\Theta$ for a. e. $(x,t)\in\Omega\times(0,T)$. Hence, as mentioned on the last line of Section 2, the identity $|\varphi_0|+|\varphi_1|+|\varphi_2| = \varphi_0+\varphi_1+\varphi_2 = 1$ holds almost everywhere, so that (2.17) coincides with (1.3), and (2.19)–(2.20) coincides with (1.5).

To prove (4.26), we first notice that by (4.14) we have

$$\operatorname*{sup\,ess}_{t\in(0,T)}\int_\Omega \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon(x,t))\,\mathrm{d}x \le C.$$

For simplicity, we omit for a moment the arguments (x,t) and write simply $\varphi^\varepsilon,\varphi$ instead of $\varphi^\varepsilon(x,t)$, $\varphi(x,t)$. By (2.13), we have

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon) \ge \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}|\varphi^\varepsilon - J^\varepsilon\varphi^\varepsilon|^2 \quad \text{a. e.} \tag{4.27}$$

Hence, for a. e. $t\ge 0$,

$$\int_\Omega |\varphi^\varepsilon - J^\varepsilon\varphi^\varepsilon|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \le 2\varepsilon\int_\Omega \psi^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x \le C\varepsilon\,. \tag{4.28}$$

We thus have for a. e. $t \geq 0$, by the triangle inequality, that

$$|J^\varepsilon \varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi(t)|_H \leq |J^\varepsilon \varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi^\varepsilon(t)|_H + |\varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi(t)|_H \leq C\varepsilon + |\varphi^\varepsilon(t) - \varphi(t)|_H. \quad (4.29)$$

We know that φ^ε converge to φ in $L^2(\Omega\times(0,T))$. In particular, it follows from (4.29) that $J^\varepsilon\varphi^\varepsilon(x,t) \to \varphi(x,t)$ a. e. in $\Omega\times(0,T)$. On the other hand, by (2.11) we have

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon) \geq \psi(J^\varepsilon\varphi^\varepsilon) \quad \text{a. e.,} \quad (4.30)$$

and (4.26) follows from (4.29)–(4.30) and from the lower semicontinuity of ψ. We thus obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T\int_\Omega \big((\mu_1 - \partial_1 g(\varphi_1,\varphi_2))(v_1{-}\varphi_1) + (\mu_2 - \partial_2 g(\varphi_1,\varphi_2))(v_2{-}\varphi_2)\big)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \int_0^T\int_\Omega \big(\,\langle\nabla\varphi_1, \nabla(v_1{-}\varphi_1)\rangle + \langle\nabla\varphi_2, \nabla(v_2{-}\varphi_2)\rangle\,\big)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad \leq \int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi(v_1,v_2)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^T\int_\Omega \psi(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)\lambda(t)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

for all test functions $v_1, v_2 \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $\lambda \in L^2(0,T)$, $\lambda(t) \geq 0$ a. e., which is equivalent to (2.6). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

References

[1] A. Agosti, C. Cattaneo, C. Giverso, D. Ambrosi, and P. Ciarletta, A computational framework for the personalized clinical treatment of glioblastoma multiforme. *ZAMM* **98**(12) (2018), 2307–2327.

[2] R. P. Aranjo and D. L. S. McElwain, A history of the study of solid tumor growth: the contribution of mathematical modelling. *Bull. Math. Biol.* **66** (2004), 1039–1091.

[3] J.-P. Aubin and I. Ekeland, *Applied Nonlinear Analysis.* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1984.

[4] V. Barbu, *Nonlinear Semigroups and Differential Equations in Banach Spaces*. Noordhoff, Leyden, 1976.

[5] N. Bellomo, N. K. Li, and P. K. Maini, On the foundations of cancer modelling: selected topics, speculations, and perspectives. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **18** (2008), 593–646.

[6] S. Bosia, M. Conti, and M. Grasselli, On the Cahn–Hilliard–Brinkman system. *Comm. Math. Sci.* **13** (2015), 1541–1567.

[7] H. Brezis, *Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semi-groupes de contractions dans les espaces de Hilbert.* North-Holland Math. Stud. **5**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.

[8] H. Bueno, G. Ercole, and A. Zumpano, Asymptotic behaviour of quasi-stationary solutions of a nonlinear problem modelling the growth of tumours. *Nonlinearity* **18** (2005), 1629–1642.

[9] H. M. Byrne, T. Alarcón, M. Owen, S. Webb, and P. Maini, Modeling aspects of cancer dynamics: a review. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **364** (2006), 1563–1578.

[10] A. C. Burton, Rate of growth of solid tumors as a problem of diffusion. *Growth* **30** (1966), 157–176.

[11] P. Colli, G. Gilardi, and D. Hilhorst, On a Cahn–Hilliard type phase field model related to tumor growth. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **35** (2015), 2423–2442.

[12] P. Colli, G. Gilardi, E. Rocca, and J. Sprekels, Asymptotic analyses and error estimates for a Cahn–Hilliard type phase field system modelling tumor growth. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S* **10** (2017), 37–54.

[13] P. Colli, G. Gilardi, E. Rocca, and J. Sprekels, Vanishing viscosities and error estimate for a Cahn–Hilliard type phase field system related to tumor growth. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* **26** (2015), 93–108.

[14] P. Colli, P. Krejčí, E. Rocca, and J. Sprekels, Nonlinear evolution inclusions arising from phase change models. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **57** (2007), 1067–1098.

[15] V. Cristini, X. Li, J. S. Lowengrub, and S. W. Wise, Nonlinear simulations of solid tumor growth using a mixture model: invasion and branching. *J. Math. Biol.* **58** (2009), 723–763.

[16] V. Cristini and J. Lowengrub, *Multiscale modeling of cancer. An Integrated Experimental and Mathematical Modeling Approach.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[17] S. Cui and A. Friedman, Analysis of a mathematical model of the growth of necrotic tumors. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **255** (2001), 636–677.

[18] M. Dai, E. Feireisl, E. Rocca, G. Schimperna, and M. Schonbek, Analysis of a diffuse interface model for multispecies tumor growth. *Nonlinearity* **30** (2017), 1639–1658.

[19] B. Detmann and P. Krejčí, A multicomponent flow model in deformable porous media. *Math. Methods in the Applied Sciences* **42** (6) (2019), 1894–1906.

[20] A. Fasano, A. Bertuzzi, and A. Gandolfi, Mathematical modeling of tumor growth and treatment. In A. Quarteroni, L. Formaggia and A. Veneziani, editors, *Complex Systems in Biomedicine*, Springer, Milan, 2006, 71–108.

[21] H. B. Frieboes, F. Jin, Y.-L. Chuang, S. M. Wise, J. S. Lowengrub, and V. Cristini, Three-dimensional multispecies nonlinear tumor growth - II: Tumor invasion and angiogenesis. *J. Theor. Biol.* **264** (2010), 1254–1278.

[22] A. Friedman, Mathematical analysis and challenges arising from models of tumor growth. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **17** (2007), 1751–1772.

[23] A. Friedman and F. Reitich, Analysis of a mathematical model for the growth of tumors. *J. Math. Biol.* **38** (1999), 262–284.

[24] S. Frigeri, M. Grasselli, and E. Rocca, On a diffuse interface model of tumor growth. *European J. Appl. Math.*, **26** (2015), 215–243.

[25] S. Frigeri, K. F. Lam, and E. Rocca, On a diffuse interface model for tumour growth with non-local interactions and degenerate mobilities. In: P. Colli, A. Favini, E. Rocca, G. Schimperna, J. Sprekels (eds.), *Solvability, Regularity, Optimal Control of Boundary Value Problems for PDEs*, Springer INdAM Series, Springer, Milan, 2017, 217–254.

[26] S. Frigeri, K. F. Lam, E. Rocca, and G. Schimperna, On a multi-species Cahn–Hilliard–Darcy tumor growth model with singular potentials. *Comm. Math. Sci.* **16** (2018), 821–856.

[27] H. Garcke and K. F. Lam, Analysis of a Cahn–Hilliard system with non-zero Dirichlet conditions modeling tumor growth with chemotaxis. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Sys.* **37** (2017), 4277–4308.

[28] H. Garcke and K. F. Lam, Global weak solutions and asymptotic limits of a Cahn–Hilliard–Darcy system modelling tumour growth. *AIMS Mathematics* **1** (2016), 318–360.

[29] H. Garcke and K. F. Lam, Well-posedness of a Cahn–Hilliard system modelling tumour growth with chemotaxis and active transport. *European J. Appl. Math.* **28** (2017), 284–316.

[30] H. Garcke, K. F. Lam, R. Nürnberg, and E. Sitka, A multiphase Cahn–Hilliard–Darcy model for tumour growth with necrosis. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **28** (2018) 525–577.

[31] H. Garcke, K. F. Lam, and E. Rocca, Optimal control of treatment time in a diffuse interface model for tumour growth. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **78** (2018), 495–544.

[32] H. Garcke, K. F. Lam, and A. Signori, On a phase field model of Cahn–Hilliard type for tumour growth with mechanical effects. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* **57** (2021), 103–192.

[33] H. Garcke, K. F. Lam, E. Sitka, and V. Styles, A Cahn–Hilliard–Darcy model for tumour growth with chemotaxis and active transport. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **26** (2016), 1095–1148.

[34] A. Giorgini, M. Grasselli, and H. Wu. The Cahn–Hilliard–Hele–Shaw system with singular potential. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **35** (2018), 1079–1118.

[35] H. P. Greenspan, Models for the growth of a solid tumor by diffusion. *Studies in Applied Mathematics* **51** (1972), 317–340.

[36] A. Hawkins-Daarud, K. G. van der Zee, and J. T. Oden, Numerical simulation of a thermodynamically consistent four-species tumor growth model. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Biomed. Eng.* **28** (2012), 3–24.

[37] J. Jiang, H. Wu, and S. Zheng, Well-posedness and long-time behavior of a non-autonomous Cahn–Hilliard–Darcy system with mass source modeling tumor growth. *J. Diff. Equations* **259** (2015), 3032–3077.

[38] E. A. B. F. Lima, J. T. Oden, D. A. Hormuth II, T. E. Yankeelov, and R. C. Almeida, Selection, calibration, and validation of models of tumor growth. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **26** (2016), 2341–2368.

[39] E. A. B. F. Lima, J. T. Oden, B. Wohlmuth, A. Shahmoradi, D. A. Hormuth II, T. E. Yankeelov, L. Scarabosio, and T. Horger, Selection and validation of predictive models of radiation effects on tumor growth based on noninvasive imaging data. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* **327** (2017), 277–305.

[40] J.-L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*. Paris, Dunod, 1969.

[41] J. S. Lowengrub, E. Titi, and K. Zhao, Analysis of a mixture model of tumor growth. *European J. Appl. Math.* **24** (2013), 691–734.

[42] S. Melchionna and E. Rocca, Varifold solutions of a sharp interface limit of a diffuse interface model for tumor growth. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries* **19** (2017), 571–590.

[43] J. T. Oden, A. Hawkins, and S. Prudhomme, General diffuse-interface theories and an approach to predictive tumor growth modeling. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **58** (2010), 723–763.

[44] L. Preziosi and A. Tosin, Multiphase modelling of tumour growth and extracellular matrix interaction: Mathematical tools and applications. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **58**, 625–656.

[45] E. Rocca and R. Scala, A rigorous sharp interface limit of a diffuse interface model related to tumor growth. *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **27** (2017), 847–872.

[46] G. Sciumè, S. Shelton, W. G. Gray, C. T. Miller, F. Hussain, M. Ferrari, P. Decuzzi, and B. A. Schrefler, A multiphase model for three-dimensional tumor growth. *New Journal of Physics* **15** (2013), 015005.

[47] A. Tosin, Multiphase modeling and qualitative analysis of the growth of tumor cords. *Netw. Heterog. Media* **3** (2008), 43–83.

[48] X. Wang and H. Wu, Long-time behavior for the Hele–Shaw–Cahn–Hilliard system. *Asymptot. Anal.* **78** (2012), 217–245.

[49] X. Wang and Z. Zhang, Well-posedness of the Hele–Shaw–Cahn–Hilliard system. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, **30** (2013), 367–384.

[50] S. M. Wise, J. S. Lowengrub, H. B. Frieboes, and V. Cristini, Three-dimensional multispecies nonlinear tumor growth – I: model and numerical method. *J. Theor. Biol.* **253** (2008), 524–543.

[51] S. M. Wise, J. S. Lowengrub, and V. Cristini, An adaptive multigrid algorithm for simulating solid tumor growth using mixture models. *Math. Comput. Modelling* **53** (2011), 1–20.

[52] S. M. Wise, J. S. Lowengrub, H. B. Frieboes, and V. Cristini, Three-dimensional multispecies nonlinear tumor growth-I: Model and numerical method. *J. Theoret. Biol.* **253** (2008), 524–543.

[53] X. Wu, G. J. van Zwieten, and K. G. van der Zee, Stabilized second-order convex splitting schemes for Cahn–Hilliard models with applications to diffuse-interface tumor-growth models. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Biomed. Engng.* **30** (2014), 180–203.