

Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques for state-dependent delay differential equations

A.R. Humphries^a, F.M.G. Magpantay^b

^a*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, 805 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, QC, Canada H3A 0B9*

^b*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, 48 University Avenue, Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3N6*

Abstract

We present Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability theorems for steady state solutions of general state-dependent delay differential equations (DDEs) using Lyapunov-Razumikhin methods. Our results apply to DDEs with multiple discrete state-dependent delays, which may be nonautonomous for the Lyapunov stability result, but autonomous (or periodically forced) for the asymptotic stability result. Our main technique is to replace the DDE by a nonautonomous ordinary differential equation (ODE) where the delayed terms become source terms in the ODE. The asymptotic stability result and its proof are entirely new, and based on a contradiction argument together with the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem. This approach alleviates the need to construct auxiliary functions to ensure the asymptotic contraction, which is a feature of all other Lyapunov-Razumikhin asymptotic stability results of which we are aware.

We apply our results to a state-dependent model equation which includes Hayes equation as a special case, to directly establish asymptotic stability in parts of the stability domain along with lower bounds on the size of the basin of attraction.

Keywords: delay differential equations, asymptotic stability, Lyapunov-Razumikhin theorem

1. Introduction

We consider the following general delay differential equation (DDE) in d dimensions with N discrete state-dependent delays,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) = f(t, u(t), u(t - \tau_1(t, u(t))), \dots, u(t - \tau_N(t, u(t))))), & t \geq t_0, \\ u(t) = \varphi(t), & t \leq t_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

and prove Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability results using Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques. We apply our results to the model state-dependent DDE

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) = \mu u(t) + \sigma u(t - a - cu(t)), & t \geq 0, \\ u(t) = \varphi(t), & t \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Email addresses: tony.humphries@mcgill.ca (A.R. Humphries), felicia.magpantay@queensu.ca (F.M.G. Magpantay)

with $a > 0$, as an example of (1.1), to directly show asymptotic stability of the trivial solution in parts of the stability domain, and derive bounds on the basin of attraction.

Differential equations with state-dependent delays arise in many applications including milling [20], control theory [40], haematopoiesis [6] and economics [28]. There is a well-established theory for retarded functional differential equations (RFDEs) as infinite-dimensional dynamical systems on function spaces [7, 10, 14], which encompasses problems with constant or prescribed delay, but very little of this theory is directly applicable to state-dependent delay problems. Extending the theory to state-dependent DDEs, including equations of the form (1.1) is the subject of ongoing study. See [15] for further examples and a review of progress.

The model state-dependent DDE (1.2) includes the constant delay DDE sometimes known as Hayes equation [16] as a special case when $c = 0$. Hayes equation is a standard model problem used to illustrate stability theory for constant delay DDEs in most texts on the subject including [14, 19, 38], as well as being a standard numerical analysis test problem [2]. Hayes equation is also used to illustrate Lyapunov-Razumikhin stability results in [1, 14, 36].

The state-dependent DDE (1.2) was introduced by Mallet-Paret and Nussbaum, and is a natural generalisation of Hayes equation to a state-dependent DDE with a single delay which is linearly state-dependent. But whereas Hayes equation is linear, the DDE (1.2) is nonlinear and can admit limit cycles. Mallet-Paret and Nussbaum investigate the existence and form of the slowly oscillating periodic solutions of a singularly perturbed version of (1.2) in detail in [34] and use it as an illustrative example for more general problems in [31, 32, 33]. This DDE is also studied in [3, 17, 18, 23, 30].

To study the stability of steady states of RFDEs, Krasovskii [24] extended the method of Lyapunov functions for ODEs to Lyapunov functionals for RFDEs. Lyapunov theorems for RFDEs require the time derivative of the functional to be nonpositive or strictly negative, similar to the theorems for ODEs using Lyapunov functions [14, 24]. However, finding functionals with this property for RFDEs is much harder than in the ODE case. Razumikhin [37] developed the theory on how one might go from using the more difficult Lyapunov functionals back to Lyapunov functions again. His fundamental idea is that it is only necessary to require a constraint on the derivative of the Lyapunov function whenever the solution is about to exit a ball centered at the steady state. Following this approach, Barnea [1] presents a Lyapunov stability theorem for RFDEs and also considers Hayes equation. A comprehensive discussion of Lyapunov functionals and functions for general RFDEs is presented by Hale and Verduyn Lunel in chapter 5 of [14]. Other works with Razumikhin-type results include [13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 36, 43]. Of these [26, 36, 43] include results tailored for time-dependent delays.

Although state-dependent DDEs can be formulated as RFDEs, results tailored for RFDEs often do not apply directly to state-dependent DDEs. For example, Barnea [1] only establishes Lyapunov stability and to do so assumes a Lipschitz condition on a Banach space of continuous functions, which is well-known not to hold for general state-dependent DDEs of the form (1.1) [15], and is easily shown not to hold for (1.2). Other authors, such as Hale and Verduyn Lunel [14], make the weaker continuity assumptions, but use auxiliary functions to establish Lyapunov stability and uniform asymptotic stability. The construction of such functions is nontrivial in all but the simplest examples, and we have not seen them constructed for a state-dependent DDE.

Rather than try to circumvent the problems that arise with RFDEs, in Section 2 we will develop new proofs of Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability for the state-dependent DDE (1.1) with N discrete delays using Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques. In Assumption 2.2 we state the assumptions that we make on the nonautonomous DDE (1.1) with N (state-dependent) delays, the main ones being that f is locally Lipschitz with respect to its arguments in \mathbb{R}^d and the

delays are locally bounded near the steady state. Then in Theorem 2.6 we provide sufficient conditions for Lyapunov stability of a steady state of the DDE. The main idea behind the proof is the conversion of the DDE into an auxiliary ODE problem where the delayed terms are regarded as source terms. In Theorem 2.8 we establish asymptotic stability of the steady state when the DDE (1.1) is autonomous. For simplicity of exposition we present the proof for the case of a single delay, but the result remains true for multiple delays or periodically forced problems. This result is significantly different to previous Lyapunov-Razumikhin asymptotic stability results which require auxiliary functions to establish uniform asymptotic stability. In contrast, Theorem 2.8 does not require the construction of any auxiliary functions, and is proved using the auxiliary ODE by a contradiction argument, which shows there cannot exist a solution which is not asymptotic to the steady state.

Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 establish Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability when the solutions of the auxiliary ODE have certain properties, but to determine those properties exactly would require the solutions of the DDE. So, in Section 2, we also show how to define a family of ODE problems that are subject to constraints defined by bounds on the DDE solution and its derivatives, which can be determined without solving the DDE. Lemma 2.3 establishes bounds on the growth of solutions to (1.1) which are used to ensure solutions remain bounded for sufficiently long (k times the largest delay for some integer k) to acquire k bounded derivatives. Stability is then established from the solution properties of this family of constrained ODE problems.

In Section 3 we review the stability region of the steady state of the model equation (1.2) which is known [12] to be the same for the state-dependent ($c \neq 0$) and constant delay cases ($c = 0$). We also consider the properties of the auxiliary ODE we define for this problem, and define sets and functions that are required in the following sections to apply our Lyapunov-Razumikhin results.

In Section 4 we apply Theorem 2.8 to provide a proof of asymptotic stability of the steady state of (1.2) in subsets of the known stability region, together with lower bounds on the size of the basin of attraction. This result is given as Theorem 4.7. Since the delayed inputs to the auxiliary ODE have $k - 1$ bounded derivatives, for the $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ results we establish suitable bounds on the first and second derivatives of the ODE source terms, while the $k = 1$ result, does not require any differentiability of these terms.

The expressions for the stability regions derived in Sections 4 all involve a term that needs to be maximized over a closed interval (see the definitions of the $P(\delta, c, k)$ functions in Definition 3.5). For $k = 1$ this maximum is readily evaluated, while for $k = 2$ an expression for the maximum is established in Theorem 4.2 (whose proof is given in Appendix A). Plots and measurements of the derived asymptotic stability regions in (μ, σ) parameter space are given in Section 5, where it is seen that these regions grow with the integer k , but do not appear to fill out the entire stability region in the case $\mu \neq 0$. In Section 5, we also briefly review previous work on the $c = 0$ constant delay case of (1.2) with $\mu = 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$ and point out an error in the results of Barnea [1].

In Section 6 we present two examples of solutions which are not asymptotic to the steady state of the model equation (1.2) when $\mu \geq 0 > \sigma$, and which hence give upper bounds on the radius of the largest ball contained in the basin of attraction of the steady state. We compare these with the lower bounds on the basin of attraction given by Theorem 4.7 for $k = 1, 2$ and 3. In Section 7 we present brief conclusions, and compare and contrast our approach with linearization.

2. Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques for state-dependent DDEs

Here we state and prove our main theorems to establish the Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability of steady state solutions to state-dependent DDEs of the form (1.1).

Let \mathbb{R}^d be the d -dimensional linear vector space over the real numbers equipped with the Euclidean inner product \cdot and Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$. We denote by $B(0, \delta)$ the closed ball centred at zero with radius $\delta > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition 2.1. For any $\delta > 0$ define

$$r(\delta) = \sup_{\substack{t \geq t_0, |u| \leq \delta, \\ i=1, \dots, N}} \tau_i(t, u). \quad (2.1)$$

Let $\delta_0 > 0$, and let $C = C([t_0 - r(\delta_0), t_0], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Banach space of continuous functions mapping $[t_0 - r(\delta_0), t_0]$ to \mathbb{R}^d with the supremum norm denoted $\|\cdot\|$. We will consider continuous initial functions $\varphi \in C$, and by a solution of (1.1) we mean a function $u \in C^1([t_0, t_f], \mathbb{R}^d)$ which satisfies (1.1) for $t \in [t_0, t_f]$ with $t_f > t_0$ and $u(t_0) = \varphi(t_0)$. We will assume that (1.1) has a steady state at $u = 0$ and make the following assumptions throughout.

Assumption 2.2. Let d, N and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $d \geq 1$, $N \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

1. $f : [t_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tau_i : [t_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ are continuous functions of their variables.
2. $f(t, 0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$.
3. The constant $\tau_{\max} = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \sup_{t \geq t_0} \tau_i(t, 0)$ satisfies $\tau_{\max} \in (0, \infty)$.
4. There exist positive constants L_0, L_1, \dots, L_N and δ_0 such that

$$|f(t, u, v_1, \dots, v_N) - f(t, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_N)| \leq L_0|u - \tilde{u}| + L_1|v_1 - \tilde{v}_1| + \dots + L_N|v_N - \tilde{v}_N|$$

for all $t \geq t_0$ and $u, v_1, \dots, v_N, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_N \in B(0, \delta_0)$. Let $L = L_0 + L_1 + \dots + L_N$.

5. The delay terms $\tau_i(t, u)$ are nonnegative and Lipschitz continuous in u on $[t_0, \infty) \times B(0, \delta_0)$ with Lipschitz constants L_{τ_i} .
6. $f(t, u, v_1, \dots, v_N)$ is at least $\max\{k - 2, 0\}$ times differentiable in its u and v variables, and $\tau_i(t, u)$ is at least $\max\{k - 1, 0\}$ times differentiable in u .
7. $\varphi \in C := C([t_0 - r(\delta_0), t_0], \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Notice that Assumption 2.2 item 4 fixes our choice of $\delta_0 > 0$. Now, for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, Assumption 2.2, items 3 and 5 imply $0 < \tau_{\max} \leq r(\delta) \leq \tau_{\max} + \delta \max_j L_{\tau_j} < \infty$ with $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} r(\delta) = \tau_{\max} > 0$. In contrast, the bound on the delay terms used in RFDE theory by Hale and Verduyn Lunel [14] is a global bound on $\tau_i(t, u)$ over all t and u .

The Lipschitz continuity conditions in Assumption 2.2, items 4–5 are based on those of Driver [8]. From the results in [8], these conditions ensure local existence and uniqueness of a solution to (1.1) close to the steady state solution for all sufficiently small Lipschitz continuous initial functions φ , and existence of a solution for all sufficiently small continuous initial functions φ .

We will prove Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability by contradiction, by showing that there is no solution of (1.1) that does not have the required stability property. Thus we do not need to make assumptions specifically to ensure existence or uniqueness of solutions. Rather, we make sufficient assumptions so solutions that do exist have the properties we require.

Since with state-dependent delays it can be hard ensure *a priori* that the delays $\tau_j(t, u(t))$ are strictly positive along solutions, and problems with vanishing delays can be interesting, we do *not* assume that delays $\tau_j(t, u)$ are strictly positive in Assumption 2.2. This makes our results more widely applicable, allowing us to deal with state-dependent DDEs without having to first

impose or prove that the delays do not vanish along solutions. The possibility of vanishing delays will on the other hand complicate some of our proofs. Results similar to Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 below are well known for time-varying and nonvanishing delays and proved using a Gronwall lemma and the method of steps; however the method of steps is not applicable with vanishing delays, and we will need a more technical proof.

The following lemmas provide bounds on the growth of solutions to (1.1). For initial functions $\varphi \in C$ we will use Lemma 2.3 to ensure that solutions $u(t)$ remain bounded for a sufficiently long time interval so that $u(t)$ acquires the differentiability that we require.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. Let $T > t_0$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$. Let $|\varphi(t)| \leq \delta e^{L(t_0 - T)}$ for $t \leq t_0$. Then any solution of (1.1) defined for $t \in [t_0, T]$ satisfies*

$$|u(t)| \leq \delta e^{L(t-T)} \leq \delta \quad \forall t \in [t_0, T].$$

Proof. Let $w(t) = \sup_{s \leq t} |u(s)|$, then for $t \in [t_0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}(t) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |u(t)| < w(t) \text{ or } \frac{d}{dt}|u(t)| < 0, \\ \frac{d}{dt}|u(t)| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &\leq |\dot{u}(t)| = |f(t, u(t), u(t - \tau_1(t, u(t))), \dots, u(t - \tau_N(t, u(t))))|. \end{aligned}$$

But Assumption 2.2, items 2 and 4 imply that

$$|f(t, u, v_1, \dots, v_N)| \leq L_0|u| + L_1|v_1| + \dots + L_N|v_N|,$$

while $t - \tau_j(t, u(t)) \leq t$ implies $|u(t - \tau_j(t, u(t)))| \leq w(t)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}(t) &\leq L_0|u(t)| + L_1|u(t - \tau_1(t, u(t)))| + \dots + L_N|u(t - \tau_N(t, u(t)))| \\ &\leq (L_0 + L_1 + \dots + L_N)w(t) = Lw(t). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows easily. □

Lemma 2.4 below, which gives a bound on that rate that nearby trajectories diverge from one another, will be essential in the proof of asymptotic stability in Theorem 2.8. Winston's example [41] of nonuniqueness of solutions for a continuous but non-Lipschitz initial function φ , would provide a counter-example to the lemma if the Lipschitz continuity requirement on the initial function φ were relaxed. Although we require φ to be Lipschitz in Lemma 2.4, when we consider stability for the state-dependent DDE (1.1) we will not impose a Lipschitz condition on φ , but instead apply Lemma 2.3 to ensure that the solution remains bounded for sufficiently long to acquire the required smoothness.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. Let $T > t_0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and $L_\delta = (1 + \delta \sum_{j=1}^N L_j L_{\tau_j})L$. Suppose that $u(t)$ and $\tilde{u}(t)$ are solutions to (1.1) with initial functions φ and $\tilde{\varphi} \in C$ respectively, where both $|\varphi(t)| \leq \delta$ and $|\tilde{\varphi}(t)| \leq \delta$ for $t \leq t_0$, and $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ and $|\tilde{u}(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [t_0, T]$. Let φ be Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $L\delta$, and suppose $|\varphi(t) - \tilde{\varphi}(t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for $t \leq t_0$. Then*

$$|u(t) - \tilde{u}(t)| \leq \varepsilon e^{L_\delta(t-t_0)} \quad \forall t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. The proof is quite similar to the proof of the previous lemma, but care must be taken with the state-dependent delays. Since $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [t_0, T]$ it follows from Assumption 2.2, items 2 and 4 that

$$|\dot{u}(t)| \leq L_0|u(t)| + \sum_{j=1}^N L_j|u(t - \tau_j(t, u(t)))| \leq \delta \sum_{j=0}^N L_j = L\delta.$$

Since $u(t) = \varphi(t)$ for $t < 0$, and by assumption $\varphi(t)$ also has Lipschitz constant $L\delta$, it follows for all $t_1 \leq T$ and all $t_2 \leq T$ that

$$|u(t_1) - u(t_2)| \leq L\delta|t_1 - t_2|. \quad (2.3)$$

Let $w(t) = \sup_{s \leq t} |u(s) - \tilde{u}(s)|$, then for $t \in [t_0, T]$, similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}(t) &\leq |\dot{u}(t) - \dot{\tilde{u}}(t)| \\ &= \left| f(t, u(t), u(t - \tau_1(t, u(t))), \dots, u(t - \tau_N(t, u(t)))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f(t, \tilde{u}(t), \tilde{u}(t - \tau_1(t, \tilde{u}(t))), \dots, \tilde{u}(t - \tau_N(t, \tilde{u}(t)))) \right| \\ &\leq L_0|u(t) - \tilde{u}(t)| + \sum_{j=1}^N L_j|u(t - \tau_j(t, u(t))) - \tilde{u}(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t)))| \\ &\leq L_0w(t) + \sum_{j=1}^N L_j|u(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t))) - \tilde{u}(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t)))| \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^N L_j|u(t - \tau_j(t, u(t))) - u(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t)))|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t)) \leq t$ it follows that $|u(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t))) - \tilde{u}(t - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t)))| \leq w(t)$. Using this and (2.3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}(t) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^N L_j w(t) + L\delta \sum_{j=1}^N L_j |\tau_j(t, u(t)) - \tau_j(t, \tilde{u}(t))| \leq Lw(t) + L\delta \sum_{j=1}^N L_j L_{\tau_j} |u(t) - \tilde{u}(t)| \\ &\leq \left(1 + \delta \sum_{j=1}^N L_j L_{\tau_j}\right) Lw(t) = L_\delta w(t), \end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. \square

In this section we will develop a constructive technique for showing Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability based on Lyapunov-Razumikhin ideas. To establish Lyapunov stability in Theorem 2.6 we will show that solutions remain in a closed ball $B(0, \delta)$ of radius δ about the steady state. We are thus implicitly using the Lyapunov function $V(u) = |u|^2/2$, though it will not appear directly in our results. Asymptotic stability is established in Theorem 2.8, by showing that all solutions that remain in $B(0, \delta)$ must converge to the steady state. The application of these results to the model problem (1.2) is demonstrated in Sections 3–4.

We will prove Lyapunov stability (and later asymptotic stability) by contradiction. Suppose the DDE (1.1) has a solution which escapes the ball $B(0, \delta)$ at time t^* , by which we mean

$$t^* = \inf\{t : |u(t)| > \delta\}. \quad (2.4)$$

For such a solution $u(t^*) = x$ with $|x| = \delta$. Now letting $v(\theta) = u(t^* + \theta)$ and

$$\eta_i(\theta) = u(t^* + \theta - \tau_i(t^* + \theta, u(t^* + \theta))), \quad \theta \in [-r(\delta), 0], \quad i = 1, \dots, N$$

for this solution $u(t)$, we can rewrite the DDE (1.1) as a nonautonomous ODE

$$\dot{v}(\theta) = f(t^* + \theta, v(\theta), \eta_1(\theta), \dots, \eta_N(\theta))$$

where

$$v(-\tau_i(t^*, x)) = u(t^* - \tau_i(t^*, x)) = \eta_i(0), \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Hence for each i such that $\tau_i(t^*, x) > 0$ the escaping solution of the DDE (1.1) corresponds to a solution of an ODE boundary value problem (BVP) with $v(-\tau_i(t^*, x)) = \eta_i(0)$ and $v(0) = x$. To establish stability it is sufficient to show that the ODE BVP does not have any such solutions. We will use Lemma 2.3 to ensure that $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for $t \leq t_0 + kr(\delta)$ so that the forcing functions $\eta_i(\theta)$ acquire the regularity we require. Hence we define the set of forcing functions η_i which could correspond to an escaping trajectory as follows.

Definition 2.5. Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (1.1) and $k \geq 1$. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, $|x| = \delta$ and $t^* \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$. Define the set,

$$E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) : \eta_i \in C^{k-1}([-r(\delta), 0], B(0, \delta)), \\ \text{and conditions 1 and 2 are satisfied.} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

1. $x \cdot f(t^*, x, \eta_1(0), \dots, \eta_N(0)) \geq 0$,
2. For some initial function $\varphi \in C$, equation (1.1) has solution $u(t)$ such that $\eta_i(\theta) = u(t^* + \theta - \tau_i(t^*, u(t^* + \theta)))$ for $\theta \in [-r(\delta), 0]$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Condition (1) in the definition is equivalent to $\frac{d}{dt}|u(t)|_{t=t^*} \geq 0$, a necessary condition for the solution to escape the ball $B(0, \delta)$ at time t^* . In the following theorem we prove the first of our main results, that if certain conditions hold for all functions in the sets $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*)$ then the steady state of (2.11) is Lyapunov stable. The condition (2.7) implies that the ODE BVP discussed above has no solutions, while (2.8) allows solutions with $\frac{d}{d\theta}|v(\theta)|_{\theta=0} \leq 0$.

The sets $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*)$ however cannot be determined without solving (1.1), so it is not practical to actually solve for them. Instead, the conditions of the theorems can be shown to hold for larger sets that contain $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*)$. We prove the theorems first and then consider such larger sets.

Theorem 2.6. Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (1.1). For $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|x| = \delta$, define $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*)$ as in Definition 2.5. Consider the family of auxiliary ODE problems,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}(\theta) = f(t^* + \theta, v(\theta), \eta_1(\theta), \dots, \eta_N(\theta)), & \theta \in [-\tau_i(t^*, x), 0], \\ v(-\tau_i(t^*, x)) = \eta_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $t^* \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$. We denote the solution of (2.6) by $v(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(\theta)$ if we want to emphasize the dependence on x and η_i , or just $v(\theta)$ otherwise. Suppose there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0]$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$, and for every x such that $|x| = \delta$ and all $t^* \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$, for all $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) \in E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t^*)$ the solution of (2.6) for some $I \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfies $\tau_I(t^*, x) > 0$ and either

$$\frac{1}{\delta}v(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(0) \cdot x < \delta, \quad (2.7)$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\delta}v(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(0) \cdot x = \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{v}(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(0) \cdot x \leq 0, \quad (2.8)$$

then the zero solution to (1.1) is Lyapunov stable. Moreover if $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ and $|\varphi(s)| < \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)}$ for $s \in [t_0 - r(\delta), t_0]$ then the solution of (1.1) satisfies $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \geq t_0$.




Figure 1: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 2.6 in one dimension.

Proof. Let the hypothesis of the theorem hold and let $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$. By Lemma 2.3, the solution of (1.1) satisfies $u(t) \in B(0, \delta)$ for all $t \leq t_0 + kr(\delta)$. We will prove that $u(t) \in B(0, \delta)$ for all $t \geq t_0$ by contradiction.

Assume that a solution escapes the ball $B(0, \delta)$ for the first time at some time $t^* \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$, where t^* satisfies (2.4). Let $w(t) = \sup_{s \leq t} |u(s)|$, then $w(t^*) = |u(t^*)|$ and the fundamental theorem of calculus can be used to show that there exists a monotonically decreasing sequence t_j with $t_j > t^*$, $w(t_j) = |u(t_j)| > \delta$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j = t^*$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} w(t_j) = \delta$ and $\frac{d}{dt}|u(t_j)| > 0$ for each j .

Assuming $|\varphi(s)| < \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)}$ for $s \in [t_0 - r(\delta), t_0]$, there exists $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that $|\varphi(s)| \leq \lambda \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)}$ for $s \in [t_0 - r(\delta), t_0]$. It follows from Assumption 2.2 and equation (2.1) that $r(\delta)$ is a continuous function of δ and hence $\delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)}$ is a continuous function of δ as well. Thus for all j sufficiently large $\lambda \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)} < w(t_j) e^{-Lkr(w(t_j))}$. Let $t^{**} = t_j$ for such a j then the solution escapes the ball $B(0, \delta^{**})$ for the first time at $t^{**} > t^* \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$. Let $x = u(t^{**})$ so $|x| = \delta^{**}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |u(t^{**})|^2 = u(t^{**}) \cdot \dot{u}(t^{**}), \\ &= u(t^{**}) \cdot f(t^{**}, u(t^{**}), u(t^{**} - \tau_1(t^{**}, u(t^{**}))), \dots, u(t^{**} - \tau_N(t^{**}, u(t^{**}))), \\ &= x \cdot f(t^{**}, x, u(t^{**} - \tau_1(t^{**}, u(t^{**}))), \dots, u(t^{**} - \tau_N(t^{**}, u(t^{**}))). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Since $|\varphi(s)| \leq \lambda \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)} < \delta^{**} e^{-Lkr(\delta^{**})}$, it follows from Lemma 2.3 that $t^{**} \geq t_0 + kr(\delta^{**})$. Now consider the auxiliary ODE problem (2.6) for $I \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that either (2.7) or (2.8) holds. Let $v(\theta) = u(t^{**} + \theta)$, and noting that $[-\tau_I(t^{**}, x), 0] \subseteq [-r(\delta^{**}), 0]$, let $\eta_i(\theta) = u(t^{**} + \theta - \tau_i(t^{**} + \theta, u(t^{**} + \theta)))$ for $\theta \in [-r(\delta^{**}), 0]$. Then

$$t^{**} + \theta - \tau_i(t^{**} + \theta, u(t^{**} + \theta)) \geq t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) - 2r(\delta^{**}) = t_0 + (k-2)r(\delta^{**}), \quad \text{for } \theta \in [-r(\delta^{**}), 0].$$

It follows that $\eta_i \in C^{k-1}([-r(\delta^{**}), 0], B(0, \delta^{**}))$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. From (2.9) we deduce that

$$x \cdot f(t^{**}, x, \eta_1(0), \dots, \eta_N(0)) > 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Furthermore, we can consider

$$\eta_i(\theta) = U(t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) + \theta - \tau_i(t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) + \theta), U(t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) + \theta)), \quad \text{for } \theta \in [-r(\delta^{**}), 0],$$

where U is the solution to (1.1) with initial function Φ defined as

$$\Phi(s) = \begin{cases} \varphi(s - kr(\delta^{**}) + t^{**}), & s \leq t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) - t^{**}, \\ u(s - kr(\delta^{**}) + t^{**}), & s \in [t_0 + kr(\delta^{**}) - t^{**}, t_0]. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) \in E_{(k)}(\delta^{**}, x, t^{**})$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}(\theta) &= \dot{u}(t^{**} + \theta), \\ &= f(t^{**} + \theta, u(t^{**} + \theta), u(t^{**} + \theta - \tau_1(t^{**} + \theta, u(t^{**} + \theta))), \dots, u(t^{**} + \theta - \tau_N(t^{**} + \theta, u(t^{**} + \theta)))), \\ &= f(t^{**} + \theta, v(\theta), \eta_1(\theta), \dots, \eta_N(\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$v(-\tau_I(t^{**}, x)) = u(t^{**} - \tau_I(t^{**}, x)) = u(t^{**} - \tau_I(t^{**}, u(t^{**}))) = \eta_I(0).$$

Thus v is a solution to the ODE system (2.6) with $i = I$ and $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) \in E_{(k)}(\delta^{**}, x, t^{**})$. But $v(0) = u(t^{**}) = x$ with $|x| = \delta^{**}$ so $\frac{1}{\delta^{**}}v(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(0) \cdot x = \delta^{**}$ which contradicts (2.7). Meanwhile, equation (2.10) implies that $\dot{v}(x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)(0) \cdot x > 0$ which contradicts (2.8).

Thus any solution with $|\varphi(s)| < \delta e^{-Lkr(\delta)}$ which escapes the ball $B(0, \delta^{**})$ violates the conditions of the theorem, so $u(t) \in B(0, \delta^{**})$ for all $t \geq t_0$, and the zero solution to (1.1) is Lyapunov stable. Moreover, since this is true with $t^{**} = t_j$ for all j sufficiently large it follows that $u(t) \in B(0, \delta)$ for all $t \geq t_0$. \square

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is complicated by the auxiliary ODE (2.6) being nonautonomous. The solution of a nonautonomous ODE escaping the ball $B(0, \delta)$ for the first time at t^* neither implies that $\frac{d}{dt}|u(t^*)| > 0$ nor that there exists $t^{**} > t^*$ such that $|u(t)| > \delta$ for all $t \in (t^*, t^{**})$. As an illustration of this, consider the function $y(t) = \delta + t^3 \sin^2(2\pi/t)$ which is easily seen to be continuously differentiable and crosses δ at $t = 0$ with $y'(0) = 0$, and for which there does not exist any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $y(t) > \delta$ for all $t \in (0, \varepsilon)$.

Our second main result is to show asymptotic stability of the steady state $u = 0$ if the auxiliary ODE (2.6) satisfies the strict inequality (2.8). We will do this for autonomous DDEs, and for simplicity of notation we only present the derivation for problems with one delay term ($N = 1$). The extension to multiple delays is straightforward, and we discuss the extension to periodically forced nonautonomous DDEs after Theorem 2.8. Hence we consider autonomous DDEs of the form (1.1) with $N = 1$ for which $f(t, u, v) = f(0, u, v)$ and $\tau_1(t, u) = \tau(0, u)$ for all t . In this case we may set $t_0 = 0$, so $C = C([-r(\delta), 0], \mathbb{R}^d)$, and rewrite (1.1) as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) = f(0, u(t), u(t - \tau(0, u(t)))), & t \geq 0, \\ u(t) = \varphi(t), & t \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

By Assumption 2.2 item 2 the DDE (2.11) has the trivial steady state solution $u = 0$. We write the solution to (2.11) as $u(\varphi)(t)$ when we want to emphasize initial conditions, or just $u(t)$ otherwise. For equation (2.11) the auxiliary ODE introduced in (2.6) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}(\theta) = f(0, v(\theta), \eta(\theta)), & \theta \in [-\tau(0, x), 0], \\ v(-\tau(0, x)) = \eta(0), \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

and since we consider a single delay, there is one such auxiliary ODE associated with (2.11). We write the solution of (2.12) as $v(x, \eta)(\theta)$ if we want to emphasize the dependence on x and η , or just $v(\theta)$ otherwise. The sets $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$ defined in (2.5) are no longer dependent on t for an autonomous DDE, and so we denote them by $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ which for (2.11) is defined as follows.

Definition 2.7. Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (2.11) and $k \geq 1$. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and $|x| = \delta$. Define the set

$$E_{(k)}(\delta, x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \eta : \eta \in C^{k-1}([-\tau(0, x), 0], B(0, \delta)), \text{ such that } x \cdot f(0, x, \eta(0)) \geq 0, \\ \text{and for some initial function } \varphi \in C \text{ the solution } u(t) \text{ of (2.11) satisfies} \\ \eta(\theta) = u(kr(\delta) + \theta - \tau(0, u(kr(\delta) + \theta))) \text{ for } \theta \in [-\tau(0, x), 0] \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.13)$$

To show asymptotic stability of the zero solution to (2.11) it is sufficient to strengthen the conditions of Theorem 2.6 by requiring that solutions of the auxiliary ODE problem satisfy the strict inequality (2.7) and not the weaker condition (2.8). For the DDE (2.11) the condition (2.7) becomes

$$\frac{1}{\delta} v(x, \eta)(0) \cdot x < \delta, \quad (2.14)$$

and we now show asymptotic stability when all solutions of the auxiliary ODE satisfy (2.14).

Theorem 2.8 (Asymptotic stability). *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (2.11). For $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|x| = \delta$, define $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ as in Definition 2.7. If there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0]$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$, and for every x such that $|x| = \delta$, for all $\eta \in E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ the solution $v(x, \eta)(\theta)$ of the auxiliary ODE problem (2.12) satisfies (2.14) then the results of Theorem 2.6 hold and moreover, the zero solution of (2.11) is asymptotically stable. Furthermore, if $|\varphi(s)| < \delta_1 e^{-Lkr(\delta_1)}$ for $s \in [-r(\delta_1), 0]$ then $u(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. The only differences between the conditions of Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.8 is that Theorem 2.6 allows a finite number of delays and nonautonomous f and requires the solution of the auxiliary ODE problem (2.6) to satisfy (2.7) or (2.8), while Theorem 2.8 assumes autonomous f , one delay, and requires that the strict inequality (2.14) hold. Thus it trivially follows that the requirements of Theorem 2.6 are satisfied, and the results of Theorem 2.6 hold.

Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$, $r = r(\delta)$ and $|\varphi(s)| < \delta e^{-Lkr}$ for $s \in [-r, 0]$. Then by Theorem 2.6 we have $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \geq 0$. Consider such a solution. Since $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \geq 0$ we have $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |u(t)| = \delta_\infty$ with $\delta_\infty \in [0, \delta]$, and it remains only to show that $\delta_\infty = 0$.

Since $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |u(t)| = \delta_\infty$ and $\{u : |u| = \delta_\infty\}$ is compact in \mathbb{R}^d there exists t_i such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i = \infty$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u(t_i) = x_\infty$ with $|x_\infty| = \delta_\infty$. Assume without loss of generality that $t_i \geq (k+1)r$ for all i .

Since $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \geq 0$, and $|\varphi(t)| < \delta e^{-Lkr} \leq \delta$ for $t \leq 0$ it follows from Assumption 2.2 items 2 and 4 that $|\frac{d}{dt} u(t)| \leq (L_0 + L_1)\delta = L\delta$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Now, consider the sequence of functions $v_i(\theta) = u(t_i + \theta)$ for $\theta \in [-(k+1)r, 0]$. These functions and their derivatives are uniformly bounded with $\|v_i\| \leq \delta$ and $\|\frac{d}{dt} v_i\| \leq L\delta$. The set of all C^1 functions satisfying these bounds forms a uniformly bounded and equicontinuous closed family of functions defined on compact set $[-(k+1)r, 0]$. By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem the sequence of functions $v_i(\theta)$ has a uniformly convergent subsequence. Let $\{v_i\}$ now denote this subsequence and let $v(\theta)$ be the limiting function, which has Lipschitz constant $L\delta$, and satisfies $v(0) = x_\infty$. Note that $|v(\theta)| \leq \delta_\infty$ for all $\theta \in [-(k+1)r, 0]$, since the existence of a point with $|v(\theta)| > \delta_\infty$ would contradict that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |u(t)| = \delta_\infty$.

Let $\varphi^*(\theta) = v(-kr + \theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$ then we claim that the solution of (2.11) with initial function φ^* is $u^*(t) = v(t - kr)$ for $t \in [0, kr]$. To see that this is true, let $\sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |u^*(t) - v(t - kr)| = \varepsilon \geq 0$. Now let $u_i(t)$ solve (2.11) with corresponding initial functions $\varphi_i(\theta) = v_i(-kr + \theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$, so $u_i(t) = v_i(t - kr)$ for $t \in [0, kr]$. For all i sufficiently large we have $\sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |u_i(t) - v(t - kr)| = \sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |v_i(t - kr) - v(t - kr)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$ by the uniform convergence of the v_i to v . But also by the uniform convergence for all i sufficiently large we have $|\varphi_i(\theta) - \varphi^*(\theta)| = |v_i(-kr + \theta) - v(-kr + \theta)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon e^{-L\delta kr}$ for all $\theta \in [-r, 0]$, and hence by Lemma 2.4 we have $\sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |u_i(t) - u^*(t)| = \sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |v_i(t - kr) - u^*(t)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$. But now

$$\varepsilon = \sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |u^*(t) - v(t - kr)| \leq \sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |v_i(t - kr) - u^*(t)| + \sup_{t \in [0, kr]} |v_i(t - kr) - v(t - kr)| = \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon,$$

which can only be true if $\varepsilon = 0$ so the solution of (2.11) with $\varphi^*(\theta) = v(-kr + \theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$ is indeed $u^*(t) = v(t - kr)$ for $t \in [0, kr]$.

Now let $\eta(\theta) = v(\theta - \tau(0, v(\theta)))$ for $\theta \in [-\tau(0, x_\infty), 0]$ which implies that $\eta(\theta) = u^*(kr + \theta - \tau(0, u^*(kr + \theta)))$. Moreover $|v(\theta)| \leq \delta_\infty$ for all $\theta \in [-(k+1)r, 0]$ implies that $|\eta(\theta)| \leq \delta_\infty$ for $\theta \in [-\tau(0, x_\infty), 0]$ and hence $\eta \in C^{k-1}([-\tau(0, x_\infty), 0], B(0, \delta_\infty))$. To show that $\eta \in E_{(k)}(\delta_\infty, x_\infty)$ it remains only to show that $x_\infty \cdot f(0, x_\infty, \eta(0)) \geq 0$. But if this is false then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > x_\infty \cdot f(0, x_\infty, \eta(0)) &= v(0) \cdot f(0, v(0), \eta(0)) = u^*(kr) \cdot f(0, u^*(kr), u^*(kr - \tau(0, u^*(kr)))) \\ &= u^*(kr) \cdot \dot{u}^*(kr) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |u^*(kr)|. \end{aligned}$$

But, $|u^*(kr)| = \delta_\infty$ and $\frac{d}{dt} |u^*(kr)| < 0$ implies that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|u^*(t)| > \delta_\infty$ for $t \in (kr - \varepsilon, kr)$, or equivalently $|v(t)| > \delta_\infty$ for $t \in (-\varepsilon, 0)$. But this contradicts $|v(\theta)| \leq \delta_\infty$ for all $\theta \in [-(k+1)r, 0]$, so we must have $x_\infty \cdot f(0, x_\infty, \eta(0)) \geq 0$ and $\eta \in E_{(k)}(\delta_\infty, x_\infty)$.

Now $v(0) = x_\infty$ implies $v(0) \cdot x_\infty = \delta_\infty^2$. But unless $\delta_\infty = 0$ this contradicts that (2.14) holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$. The result follows. \square

Notice that Theorem 2.8 not only establishes asymptotic stability of the steady state, but also shows that the basin of attraction of the steady state contains the ball

$$\{\varphi : \|\varphi\| < \delta_1 e^{-Lkr(\delta_1)}\}. \quad (2.15)$$

We will consider the basin of attraction of the steady state of the model problem (1.2) in Section 6.

The proof of Theorem 2.8 given above would not be valid for nonautonomous DDEs, but would only fail in one crucial step; for a general nonautonomous DDE (1.1), the limiting function $v(t)$ would not in general define a solution of the DDE. The result is easily extended to periodically nonautonomous DDEs by choosing the initial sequence t_i to be $t_i = (k+1)r + iT$ where T is the period of f , and if necessary taking a subsequence so that $u(t_i)$ converges to x_∞ .

Our asymptotic stability result and its proof differs very significantly from other asymptotic stability results for RFDEs which are all similar to Theorem 4.2 of Hale and Verduyn Lunel [14]. Beyond the technical differences in continuity assumptions, and whether delays are locally or globally bounded, there are two fundamental but related differences between our result and results such as those in [14]. Firstly, in Theorem 2.8 we establish *asymptotic stability*, but in Theorem 4.2 of [14] the stronger property of *uniform asymptotic stability* is obtained. But secondly, auxiliary functions with specific properties are required (in Theorem 4.2 of [14] four auxiliary functions, u , v , ω and p appear) to obtain the contraction that leads to the uniform asymptotic stability. Construction of such functions is difficult even for constant delay DDEs, and a major

obstacle to the application of these theorems. In contrast, we use a proof by contradiction which shows that there does not exist a trajectory which is not asymptotic to the steady state. The contradiction argument establishes asymptotic stability rather than uniform asymptotic stability, but does not require any troublesome auxiliary functions, and thus is much easier to apply. In the following sections we will use Theorem 2.8 to study the asymptotic stability of the steady state of the model state-dependent DDE (1.2).

We next define the larger sets containing $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ in which we will later show that conditions of Theorem 2.8 hold to establish asymptotic stability for the model problem (1.2). By items 4–6 in Assumption 2.2, if a bound on $u(t)$ is given for $t \in [-r(\delta), (k-1)r(\delta)]$ we can also find bounds on up to the $k-1$ order derivatives of $u(t-\tau(0, u(t)))$ for $t \in [(k-1)r(\delta), kr(\delta)]$. These bounds can be derived from the bounds on f , τ and their derivatives. Recalling the definition of $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ in Definition 2.7 this leads us to the following definition.

Definition 2.9. Suppose that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (2.11) and $k \geq 1$. Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ while $|x| = \delta$. Let the functions $\mathcal{D}_j(\delta)$ be Lipschitz continuous in δ for $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ and satisfy

$$\mathcal{D}_j(\delta) \geq \sup_{t \in [(k-1)r(\delta), kr(\delta)]} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} u(t - \tau(t, u(t))) \right|, \quad (2.16)$$

given that $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [-r(\delta), kr(\delta)]$, where $u(t)$ is a solution to (2.11). Define the set

$$\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x) = \left\{ \eta : \eta \in PC^{k-1}([- \tau(0, x), 0], B(0, \delta)), \quad x \cdot f(0, x, \eta(0)) \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{d^j}{d\theta^j} \eta(\theta) \right| \leq \mathcal{D}_j(\delta) \text{ for } \theta \in [- \tau(0, x), 0], j = 0, \dots, k-1 \right\} \quad (2.17)$$

where $PC^{k-1}([- \tau(0, x), 0], B(0, \delta))$ denotes the space of C^{k-2} functions which are piecewise C^{k-1} .

Clearly, $E_{(k)}(\delta, x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$. It is convenient to consider piecewise C^{k-1} functions in Definition 2.9 because we will later seek the supremum of an integral over the set $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$. Even if all the functions in $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ were C^{k-1} , in general the maximiser could still be piecewise C^{k-1} .

In Section 4 we derive bounds $\mathcal{D}_j(\delta)$ for the model problem (1.2), and use these to identify parameter regions for which all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ satisfy (2.14), and hence the steady state of (1.2) is asymptotically stable by Theorem 2.8. For $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $|x| = \delta$, it is useful to define

$$\mathcal{G}(\delta, x) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)} \frac{1}{\delta} v(x, \eta)(0) \cdot x, \quad \mathcal{F}(\delta) = \sup_{|x|=\delta} \mathcal{G}(\delta, x), \quad (2.18)$$

where $v(x, \eta)$ is the solution to (2.12). Notice that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and $|x| = \delta$ we have

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)} \frac{1}{\delta} v(x, \eta)(0) \cdot x \leq \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)} \frac{1}{\delta} v(x, \eta)(0) \cdot x = \mathcal{G}(\delta, x) \leq \sup_{|x|=\delta} \mathcal{G}(\delta, x) = \mathcal{F}(\delta). \quad (2.19)$$

Thus if $\mathcal{F}(\delta) < \delta$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ then (2.14) holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ and Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 can be applied. Although $\mathcal{F}(\delta) < \delta$ is a somewhat stronger condition than (2.14) we will find it convenient to work with when considering the model problem (1.2).

The set $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$ given by (2.5) for the DDE (1.1) can be easily generalised to a larger set $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$, in a similar manner. For $t \geq t_0 + kr(\delta)$ we let

$$\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x, t) = \left\{ (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) : \eta_i \in PC^{k-1}([-r(\delta), 0], B(0, \delta)), \right. \\ \left. x \cdot f(t, x, \eta_1(0), \dots, \eta_N(0)) \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{d^j}{d\theta^j} \eta_i(\theta) \right| \leq \mathcal{D}_{ij}(\delta, t) \text{ for } \theta \in [-r(\delta), 0], i = 1, \dots, N, j = 0, \dots, k-1 \right\} \quad (2.20)$$

where for all solutions u to (1.1) which satisfy $|u(s)| \leq \delta$ for $s \in [t - (k + 1)r(\delta), t]$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{ij}(\delta, t) \geq \sup_{s \in [t-r(\delta), t]} \left| \frac{d^j}{dt^j} u(s - \tau_i(s, u(s))) \right|. \quad (2.21)$$

It follows that $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$, and hence establishing properties on the set $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$ is sufficient to apply Theorem 2.6. However, we will consider the autonomous model problem (1.2) in the following sections, and so will not need to consider $E_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$ or $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x, t)$ further.

3. Model Equation Properties

In the following sections we will apply the Lyapunov-Razumikhin theory of Section 2 to the model state-dependent DDE given in (1.2). In this section we consider the properties of the DDE (1.2) and its auxiliary ODE (2.12), and will define the sets and functions that we will use to apply our results to this model problem. We begin by considering boundedness and, existence and uniqueness of solutions of the DDE (1.2) with $\mu + \sigma < 0$, which generalise the results of Mallet-Paret and Nussbaum in [34] for $\sigma < \mu < 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $c \neq 0$ and $\mu + \sigma < 0 < a$. If $u \in C^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ solves (1.2) for $t \geq 0$ with $\varphi(0) \geq -a$ then $t - a - cu(t) < t$ for all $t > 0$.*

Proof. The model DDE (1.2) is invariant under the transformation $u \mapsto -u$, $c \mapsto -c$, so we consider only the case $c > 0$. Suppose first that $\varphi(0) > -a/c$ and assume there exists $t^* > 0$ for which $u(t^*) = -a/c$ for the first time. Since $u(t) > -a/c$ for $0 \leq t < t^*$ implies $\dot{u}(t^*) \leq 0$, but from (1.2) with $u(t^*) = -a/c$ we have $\dot{u}(t^*) = (\mu + \sigma)u(t^*) = -\frac{a}{c}(\mu + \sigma) > 0$, supplying a contradiction. Thus we must have $u(t) > -\frac{a}{c}$ for all $t \geq 0$ and the result follows. If $\varphi(0) = -a/c$ then $\dot{u}(0) > 0$ and the result follows similarly. \square

We will always consider the DDE (1.2) with $a > 0$ and $\mu + \sigma < 0$, then Lemma 3.1 assures that the deviating argument is always a delay. The lemma also gives the lower bound $u(t) > -a/c$ on solutions when $c > 0$ (or an upper bound on solutions when $c < 0$). When $\mu < 0$ we can bound solutions above and below. It is convenient to define

$$M_0 = -\frac{a}{c}, \quad N_0 = \frac{a\sigma}{c\mu}, \quad \tau = a + cN, \quad \tau_0 = a + cN_0. \quad (3.1)$$

Here N is used to denote a bound on solutions of the single delay DDE (1.2) (an upper bound if $c > 0$ and a lower bound if $c < 0$), in contrast to the multiple delay DDE (1.1) for which we used N to denote the number of delays. We use M to denote the other bound on the solution, and the notation $\text{sign}(c)[M, N]$ to denote $[M, N]$ if $c > 0$ and $[-N, -M]$ if $c < 0$ (and similar notation for open and half-open intervals).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $c \neq 0$ and $\mu + \sigma < 0 < a$ and $\mu < 0$. Suppose $u \in C^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ solves (1.2) for $t \geq 0$. If $\sigma > 0$ let $\text{sign}(c)M \in \text{sign}(c)[M_0, 0)$ and $\text{sign}(c)N > 0$, and suppose that $\text{sign}(c)\varphi(t) \in \text{sign}(c)[M, N]$ for all $t \in [-\tau, 0]$. If $\sigma \leq 0$ let $M = M_0$ and $N = \max\{N_0, \varphi(0)\}$ and suppose $\text{sign}(c)\varphi(t) \geq \text{sign}(c)M_0$ for all $t \in [-\tau, 0]$. Then*

$$\text{sign}(c)u(t) \in \text{sign}(c)(M, N), \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Again, we consider the $c > 0$ case, then it is sufficient to show that $\dot{u}(t) > 0$ if $u(t) = M$, and $\dot{u}(t) < 0$ if $u(t) = N$ given that $u(s) \in (M, N)$ for $s \in (0, t)$. The case where $u(t) = M_0$ is dealt with in the proof of Lemma 3.1, the other cases are straightforward. \square

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mu + \sigma < 0 < a$. Let the initial history function φ be continuous and for $\mu < 0$ satisfy the bounds given in Lemma 3.2. For $\mu \geq 0$ let $\text{sign}(c)\varphi(t) \geq \text{sign}(c)M_0$ for all $t \in (-\infty, 0]$. Then there exists at least one solution $u \in C^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ which solves (1.2) for all $t \geq 0$. If $\mu < 0$ any solution satisfies the bounds (3.2), while if $\mu \geq 0$ any solution satisfies $\text{sign}(c)u(t) \geq \text{sign}(c)M_0$ for all $t \geq 0$. If φ is locally Lipschitz the solution is unique.*

Proof. Local existence and uniqueness follows directly from the results of Driver [8], and for $\mu < 0$ global existence and uniqueness follows from the extended existence result of Driver [8] using the bounds on the delay and solution given by Lemma 3.1 and 3.2. The only delicate case is for $-\sigma > \mu > 0$ for which Lemma 3.1 gives one of the bounds, $\text{sign}(c)u(t) \geq M_0$. We consider this case with $c > 0$. Then, $\dot{u}(t) \leq \mu u(t) + \sigma M_0$ and the Gronwall lemma implies that

$$u(t) \leq (\varphi(0) + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}M_0)e^{\mu t} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu}M_0 = (\varphi(0) - N_0)e^{\mu t} + N_0. \quad (3.3)$$

Since $\varphi(0) \geq M_0 > N_0$ in this case, solutions cannot become unbounded in finite time, and global existence again follows. For this case $\varphi(t)$ should be defined for all $t \leq 0$ since with the exponentially growing bound (3.3) on $u(t)$ it is possible that $t - a - cu(t) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. \square

The constant delay DDE which corresponds to (1.2) with $c = 0$, known as Hayes equation, has been much studied. The (μ, σ) values for which its steady state is asymptotically stable when $a > 0$ and $c = 0$ are well known (see eg. [14]) and given in Definition 3.4.

Definition 3.4 (Stability region Σ_\star). *Let $a > 0$ and $c = 0$. Let Σ_\star be the open set of the (μ, σ) -parameter space between the curves*

$$\ell_\star = \{(s, -s) : s \in (-\infty, 1/a]\}, \quad g_\star = \{(\mu(s), \sigma(s)) : s \in (0, \pi/a)\}$$

where the functions $\mu(s)$ and $\sigma(s)$ are given by

$$\mu(s) = s \cot(as), \quad \sigma(s) = -s \csc(as). \quad (3.4)$$

The region Σ_\star is further divided into three subregions: the cone $\Sigma_\Delta = \{(\mu, \sigma) : |\sigma| < -\mu\}$, the wedge $\Sigma_w = (\Sigma_\star \setminus \Sigma_\Delta) \cap \{\mu < 0\}$ and the cusp $\Sigma_c = \Sigma_\star \cap \{\mu \geq 0\}$, which are shown in Figure 2.

The region Σ_\star is the parameter region in the (μ, σ) -plane for which the zero solution to the DDE (1.2) is locally asymptotically stable in both the constant and state-dependent delay cases. The cone Σ_Δ forms the delay-independent stability region (because this does not change when a is changed) while $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$ is often referred to as the delay-dependent stability region. For the constant delay case ($c = 0$) this region is found from the characteristic equation [9]. The results of Györi and Hartung [12] show the state-dependent case ($c \neq 0$) of (1.2) has the same (exponentially) asymptotic stability region. On the boundary of Σ_\star the steady-state is Lyapunov stable for the constant delay case, and the stability is delicate in the state-dependent case [39].

In this paper we derive new proofs of stability in parts of Σ_\star for the state-dependent case using Theorem 2.8. The asymptotic stability of the zero solution to (1.2) in all of the delay-independent region $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_\Delta$ will be shown in Theorem 4.1. In Theorem 4.7 we will also show asymptotic stability of the steady state of the model problem (1.2) for (μ, σ) in subsets of $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$, by applying Theorem 2.8 with $k = 1$ to 3. Here we define some notation that will be required. Let $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k \geq 1$, $\delta_0 \in (0, |a/c|)$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. It is easy to see that




Figure 2: The analytic stability region Σ_* in the (μ, σ) plane, divided into the delay-independent cone Σ_Δ , and the delay-dependent wedge Σ_w and cusp Σ_c .

Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (1.2) with $L_0 = |\mu|$, $L_1 = |\sigma|$, $\tau_{\max} = a$ and $r(\delta) = a + |c|\delta$. Thus for the model problem (1.2) the sets $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ from Definition 2.7 are given by

$$E_{(k)}(\delta, x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \eta : \eta \in C^{k-1}([-a - cx, 0], [-\delta, \delta]), \mu x^2 + \sigma x \eta(0) \geq 0, \\ \text{and for some initial function } \varphi \in C \text{ equation (2.11) has solution} \\ \eta(\theta) = u(kr(\delta) + \theta - a - cu(kr(\delta) + \theta)) \text{ for } \theta \in [-a - cx, 0] \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

To apply the stability theorems in the next section we will derive some bounds $\mathcal{D}_j(\delta)$ for $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ as in Definition 2.9. Once these bounds are determined, the sets $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ from Definition 2.9 are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \eta : \eta \in PC^{k-1}([-a - cx, 0], [-\delta, \delta]), \mu x^2 + \sigma x \eta(0) \geq 0, \\ \left| \frac{d^j}{d\theta^j} \eta(\theta) \right| \leq \mathcal{D}_j(\delta) \text{ for } \theta \in [-a - cx, 0], j = 0, \dots, k-1 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Since the DDE (1.2) is scalar the set of x such that $|x| = \delta$ consists of just two points $x = \delta$ and $x = -\delta$. Suppose first that $x = \delta$, then (3.6) implies that $\eta(0) \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$. Let $r_+ = a + c\delta$ so that we can write the auxiliary ODE problem (2.12) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}(\theta) = \mu v(\theta) + \sigma \eta(\theta), & \theta \in [-r_+, 0], \\ v(-r_+) = \eta(0). \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Integrating (3.7) yields,

$$v(0) = \eta(0)e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} \eta(\theta) d\theta. \quad (3.8)$$

Definition 3.5. Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. For any $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$ and $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$, define $r_+ = a + c\delta$ and $\eta_{(k)}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r_+, 0]$ by

$$\eta_{(k)}(\theta) = \inf_{\substack{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, \delta) \\ \eta(0) = \hat{u}}} \eta(\theta). \quad (3.9)$$

We also define the function $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ to be

$$\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k) = \hat{u}e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} \eta_{(k)}(\theta) d\theta. \quad (3.10)$$

The function $\eta_{(k)}$ given by (3.9) is the most negative one in $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, \delta)$ satisfying $\eta(0) = \hat{u}$, and so since $\sigma < 0$, this function maximizes $v(0)$ for fixed $\eta(0)$ by maximising the second term in (3.8). This is the reason for considering $\eta \in PC^{k-1}([-a - cx, 0], [-\delta, \delta])$ in the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$. We really want to maximise $v(0)$ for $\eta \in E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$, where the smaller set $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ is defined in (2.13). Even though all the functions $\eta \in E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ satisfy $\eta \in C^{k-1}([-a - cx, 0], [-\delta, \delta])$, the maximiser will in general only be piecewise C^{k-1} . With Definition 3.5 we can derive bounds on the solution $v(0)$ of the auxiliary ODE (3.7) for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ in both cases where $x = \pm\delta$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$. The solution of the auxiliary ODE system (3.7) satisfies*

$$v(0) \leq \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\delta]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k), \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, \delta), \quad v(0) \geq - \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\delta]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -c, k), \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, -\delta).$$

Proof. First consider $x = \delta$. The function $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ comes from (3.8) and depends on c and δ through r_+ . Since, as noted above, the choice of $\eta_{(k)}$ maximizes (3.10) for fixed \hat{u} , the first inequality in the statement of the lemma follows.

Next consider $x = -\delta$, then (3.6) implies that $\eta(0) \in [\delta\mu/\sigma, \delta]$. This time we should consider the most positive function in $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, -\delta)$ satisfying $\eta(0) = \hat{u} \in [\delta\mu/\sigma, \delta]$, to obtain a lower bound on $v(0)$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, -\delta)$. However, the model DDE (1.2) is invariant under the transformation $(u, c) \mapsto (-u, -c)$, so this function is $-\eta_{(k)}(\theta)$ and the second inequality follows. \square

Notice from (3.10) that the functions $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -c, k)$ only differ in their integration limits with $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ integrating $\eta_{(k)}$ over the interval $[-a - c\delta, 0]$ and $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -c, k)$ integrating over $[-a + c\delta, 0]$. The integration over the larger of these intervals will be important in the following sections and so it is convenient to define

$$P(\delta, c, k) = \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, k). \quad (3.11)$$

Comparing the cases when $x = \delta$ and $-\delta$ has to be done separately for each value of k , and we can also explicitly define the functions $\eta_{(k)}$ for each k . This is handled in the following section where we show that $P(\delta, c, k) < \delta$ implies $\mathcal{F}(\delta) < \delta$, and apply Theorem 2.8 to obtain asymptotic stability for $\{(\mu, \sigma) : P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}$.

Barnea [1] applied Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques to the $c = 0$ constant delay case of the model DDE (1.2). His results do not apply to state-dependent case, as they were based on a result for autonomous RFDEs which assumed F was Lipschitz, and he did not define an auxiliary ODE, nor sets similar to $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ or $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$. However, he did define functions $\eta_{(k)}$ for the constant delay case by considering the most negative bounded functions with $k - 1$ bounded derivatives as the function segments in the RFDE. In the limit as $c \rightarrow 0$ our $\eta_{(k)}$ functions reduce to those found by Barnea for the constant delay case. Because of the linearity of (1.2) with $c = 0$, Barnea did not have to consider the upper and lower bounds separately as we did in Lemma 3.6, but did define a function which is equivalent to $P(\delta, 0, k)$ in (3.11). Our asymptotic stability results for the state-dependent model DDE (1.2) constitute a significant generalisation of the Lyapunov stability results of Barnea [1] for the constant delay case, and moreover in Section 5 we will correct an error of Barnea for the $k = 2$ constant delay case.

4. Asymptotic stability for $\dot{u}(t) = \mu u(t) + \sigma u(t - a - cu(t))$ using $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$

In this section we consider the model state-dependent DDE (1.2) and use Theorem 2.8 to show that the steady state is asymptotically stable in various parameter sets. In Theorem 4.1 we use the set $\mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ to show that the steady state is asymptotically stable whenever the parameters values (μ, σ) are in the cone Σ_Δ . In the rest of the section we consider parameters in the wedge and the cusp $(\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c)$, and use Theorem 2.8 with $k = 1, 2$ and 3 to show the steady state is asymptotically stable for the parameter sets $\{(\mu, \sigma) : P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$, where $P(\delta, c, k)$ is defined in (3.11). We will often write $\{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ as shorthand for these sets which are nested in $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$, becoming larger with k . We also find lower bounds on the basin of attraction of the steady state. For the constant delay case ($c = 0$) the parameter regions found in $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$ are independent of the choice of δ in $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$. For the state-dependent case, these regions change with c and δ (see Figure 4) and converge to the region for the constant delay case as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

We begin by showing asymptotic stability in the cone Σ_Δ . The following result could also be shown by adapting a stability result for time-dependent delays, such as that of Yorke [43]. Recall that M_0 is defined by (3.1).

Theorem 4.1 (Asymptotic stability for (1.2) in Σ_Δ). *Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$ and $|\sigma| < -\mu$ so $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_\Delta$. If $|\varphi(t)| \leq |M_0|$ for $t \in [-a - c|M_0|, 0]$ then the solution $u(t)$ to (1.2) satisfies $u(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. With $|x| = \delta$ and $\mu < -|\sigma|$ it is impossible to satisfy $\mu x^2 + \sigma x \eta(0) \geq 0$ with $|\eta(0)| \leq \delta$. Thus $\mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ and also $E_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ are empty, and asymptotic stability of the steady state follows from Theorem 2.8. This holds for all $\delta \in (0, |M_0|]$ and it follows directly from Theorem 2.8 that $u(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ provided $|\varphi(t)| < |M_0|e^{-Lr(|M_0|)}$ for $t \in [-a - c|M_0|, 0]$. However, the exponential correction term $e^{-Lr(|M_0|)}$ comes from using Lemma 2.3 in the proof of Theorem 2.8 to ensure that $|\mu(t)| < |M_0|$ for $t \in [0, r(|M_0|)]$. But Lemma 3.2 already ensures that $|\mu(t)| < |M_0|$ for all $t > 0$ if $|\varphi(t)| \leq |M_0|$ for the model DDE (1.2) (note that in Σ_Δ we have $|M_0| > |N_0|$); the result follows. \square

We already noted in Section 3 that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied for (1.2), and derived an expression for $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ and indicated which are the most relevant functions in these sets. For $k = 1$ we do not need any bounds $\mathcal{D}_j(\delta)$ and the members of the set $\mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ need not be continuous. Then the function $\eta_{(1)}$ from (3.9) is given by,

$$\eta_{(1)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\delta, & \theta \in [-a - c\delta, 0), \\ \hat{u}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

For $k = 2$ we need to find $\mathcal{D}_1(\delta)$ such that $|\frac{d}{d\theta}\eta(\theta)| \leq \mathcal{D}_1(\delta)$ for all $\eta \in E_{(2)}(\delta, x)$, where $E_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ is defined by (3.5). For $\eta \in E_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ we have

$$\eta(\theta) = u(2r + \theta - a - cu(2r + \theta)) \text{ for } \theta \in [-a - cx, 0] \subseteq [-r, 0],$$

where $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for $t \in [-r, 2r]$ and solves (1.2) for $r \geq 0$. We easily derive that $|\dot{u}(t)| \leq |\mu u(t) + \sigma u(t - a - cu(t))| \leq (|\mu| + |\sigma|)\delta$ for $t \in [0, 2r]$. Then

$$\eta'(\theta) = \frac{d}{d\theta}u(2r + \theta - a - cu(2r + \theta)) = (1 - c\dot{u}(2r + \theta))\dot{u}(2r + \theta - a - cu(2r + \theta)).$$

Hence $|\eta'(\theta)| \leq D_1\delta$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$ where

$$D_1 = (|\mu| + |\sigma|)(1 + (|\mu| + |\sigma|)|c|\delta). \quad (4.2)$$

Thus we can choose $\mathcal{D}_1(\delta) = D_1\delta$ (note that D_1 also depends on δ) to define $\mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ and we obtain that $E_{(2)}(\delta, x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x)$. The function $\eta_{(2)}$ is given by (3.9), as

$$\eta_{(2)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \hat{u} + D_1\delta\theta, & \theta \in [-\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}, 0], \\ -\delta, & \theta \in [-a - c\delta, -\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}], \end{cases} \quad \text{when } \frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} < r_+ = a + c\delta. \quad (4.3)$$

where D_1 is defined by (4.2).

For $\eta \in E_{(3)}(\delta, x) \subseteq E_{(2)}(\delta, x)$, the same bound on the first derivative of η applies, and we also bound the second derivative as follows. We have

$$\eta(\theta) = u(3r + \theta - a - cu(3r + \theta)) \text{ for } \theta \in [-a - cx, 0] \subseteq [-r, 0],$$

where $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for $t \in [-r, 3r]$ and solves (1.2) for $r \geq 0$. As above we have that $|\dot{u}(t)| \leq (|\mu| + |\sigma|)\delta$ for $t \in [0, 3r]$. Now noting that $t - a - cu(t) \in [0, 2r]$ for $t \in [r, 3r]$ we have

$$|\ddot{u}(t)| = |\mu\dot{u}(t) + \sigma\dot{u}(t - a - cu(t)(1 - c\dot{u}(t)))| \leq (|\mu| + |\sigma|)^2(1 + |\sigma c|\delta)\delta,$$

for $t \in [r, 3r]$. Then, since $3r + \theta - a - cu(3r + \theta) \in [r, 2r]$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta''(\theta)| &= \left| \frac{d^2}{d\theta^2} u(3r + \theta - a - cu(3r + \theta)) \right| \\ &= \left| (1 - c\dot{u}(3r + \theta))^2 \ddot{u}(3r + \theta - a - cu(3r + \theta)) - c\ddot{u}(3r + \theta)\dot{u}(3r + \theta - a - cu(3r + \theta)) \right| \\ &\leq (D_1^2 + (|\mu| + |\sigma|)^3|c|\delta)(1 + |\sigma c|\delta)\delta = D_2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $\eta \in E_{(3)}(\delta, x)$ we have $|\eta''(\theta)| \leq \mathcal{D}_2(\delta) = D_2\delta$ where

$$D_2 = (D_1^2 + (|\mu| + |\sigma|)^3|c|\delta)(1 + |\sigma c|\delta), \quad (4.4)$$

and $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} D_2 = (\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} D_1)^2 = (|\mu| + |\sigma|)^2$. Taking D_1 and D_2 to satisfy (4.2) and (4.4) ensures that $\mathcal{E}_{(3)}(\delta, x) \subseteq E_{(3)}(\delta, x)$. Then the $\eta_{(k)}$ function from (3.9) for $k = 3$ can be defined by

$$\eta_{(3)}(\theta) = \bar{\eta}_{(3)}(\theta + \theta_{\text{shift}}), \quad \theta \in [-r_+, 0] \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\bar{\eta}_{(3)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\delta, & \theta \leq 0, \\ -\delta + \frac{\delta}{2}D_2\theta^2, & \theta \in (0, \frac{D_1}{D_2}), \\ -\delta - \frac{\delta D_1^2}{2D_2} + \delta D_1\theta, & \theta > \frac{D_1}{D_2}. \end{cases} \quad \theta_{\text{shift}} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2(\hat{u} + \delta)}{D_2\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta + \frac{\delta D_1^2}{2D_2}], \\ \frac{\hat{u} + \delta + \frac{\delta D_1^2}{2D_2}}{D_1\delta}, & \hat{u} > -\delta + \frac{\delta D_1^2}{2D_2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Here θ_{shift} is a convenient device which allows us to define $\eta_{(3)}(\theta)$ for all values of \hat{u} by the single function $\bar{\eta}_{(3)}(\theta)$ with the shift used to obtain the correct value of \hat{u} .

The $\eta_{(k)}$ functions define $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ via equation (3.10) and $P(\delta, c, k)$ through equation (3.11). For $k = 1$, using (4.1) we easily evaluate

$$P(\delta, c, 1) = \mathcal{I}(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta, |c|, 1) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\delta e^{\mu r} + \delta\frac{\sigma}{\mu}(1 - e^{\mu r}), & \mu \neq 0, \\ -\delta\sigma r, & \mu = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$




Figure 3: Sample $\eta_{(k)}(\theta)$ functions for $a = 1$, $c = 0$ and $\delta = 1$. The $\eta_{(k)}(\theta)$ functions are defined in (4.3) and (4.5).

For $k = 2$, from (3.10) and (4.3), if $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} \geq r_+$ then

$$\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) = \hat{u}e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} (\hat{u} + D_1\delta\theta) d\theta \quad (4.8)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \hat{u} \left[e^{\mu r_+} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1) \right] + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} D_1\delta \left[\frac{1}{\mu} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1) - r_+ e^{\mu r_+} \right], & \mu \neq 0, \\ \hat{u} + \sigma r_+ \hat{u} - \frac{\sigma D_1 r_+^2}{2} \delta, & \mu = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

while if $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} < r_+$ then we have to split the integral into two parts and

$$\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) = \hat{u}e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^{-\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}} e^{-\mu\theta} (-\delta) d\theta + \sigma \int_{-\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} (\hat{u} + D_1\delta\theta) d\theta \quad (4.10)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \hat{u} \left(e^{\mu r_+} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \delta \left[\frac{D_1}{\mu} \left(e^{\mu \frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}} - 1 \right) - e^{\mu r_+} \right], & \mu \neq 0, \\ \hat{u} - \sigma \delta r_+ + \frac{\sigma}{2D_1\delta} (\delta + \hat{u})^2, & \mu = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

To determine $P(\delta, c, 2)$ we perform the integration in $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, 2)$ and find \hat{u} to maximise this function. If $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} \geq r$ then $\hat{u} \in [(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$. This is only possible in the region where $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. From (4.9) we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, 2) = \mathcal{I}_1(\hat{u}, \delta) := \begin{cases} \hat{u} \left[e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} (e^{\mu r} - 1) \right] + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} D_1\delta \left[\frac{1}{\mu} (e^{\mu r} - 1) - r e^{\mu r} \right], & \mu \neq 0, \\ \hat{u} + \sigma r \hat{u} - \frac{\sigma D_1 r^2}{2} \delta, & \mu = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

If $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} < r$ then \hat{u} has another upper bound $\hat{u} < (rD_1 - 1)\delta$ so $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, \min\{(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\delta\}]$. Since the integration is broken down into two parts in this case we label the expression we derive as \mathcal{I}_2 , and from (4.11) we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, 2) = \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta) := \begin{cases} \hat{u} \left(e^{\mu r} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \delta \left[\frac{D_1}{\mu} \left(e^{\mu \frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta}} - 1 \right) - e^{\mu r} \right], & \mu \neq 0, \\ \hat{u} - \sigma \delta r + \frac{\sigma}{2D_1\delta} (\delta + \hat{u})^2, & \mu = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

The main differences between the expressions for $I(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2)$ and $I(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, 2)$ are that the former involve $r_+ = a + c\delta$, and the latter use $r = a + |c|\delta$ as well as being subject to different restrictions on the values of \hat{u} for which they apply. In (4.9),(4.11),(4.12) and (4.13) the $\mu = 0$ expressions equal the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit of the $\mu \neq 0$ expressions. Results for $\mu = 0$ thus follow from those for $\mu \neq 0$, and so we do not treat these cases separately below.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$. If $P(\delta, c, 2) < \delta$ then*

$$P(\delta, c, 2) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{I}_1(-\delta\mu/\sigma, \delta), & \text{if } rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_2(-\delta\mu/\sigma, \delta), & \text{if } rD_1 - 1 > -\mu/\sigma, \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

where \mathcal{I}_1 is defined by (4.12) and \mathcal{I}_2 is defined by (4.13).

Proof. See Appendix A. □

We will not state an explicit expression for $P(\delta, c, 3)$. When needed, this can be determined by evaluating (3.11) numerically for $k = 3$.

We now prove four lemmas which will be needed for the proof of Theorem 4.7 where we show asymptotic stability in the set $\{(\mu, \sigma) : P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$ and $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$ be fixed. Then $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 1)$ decreases with decreasing r_+ .*

Proof. For $r_+ > 0$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \left(\hat{u}e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} \eta_{(1)}(\theta) d\theta \right) = e^{\mu r_+} [\mu \hat{u} + \sigma \eta_{(1)}(-r_+)] = e^{\mu r_+} [\mu \hat{u} - \sigma \delta] > 0,$$

since $\sigma < -\mu$ and $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$. □

Lemma 4.4. *For $k = 2$ or 3 , let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$ and $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]$ be fixed. Let $\mathcal{I}(r_+)$ be the expression for $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ as a function of only r_+ ;*

$$\mathcal{I}(r_+) = \hat{u}e^{\mu r_+} + \sigma \int_{-r_+}^0 e^{-\mu\theta} \eta_{(k)}(\theta) d\theta, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) = e^{\mu r_+} [\mu \hat{u} + \sigma \eta_{(k)}(-r_+)]. \quad (4.15)$$

(A) *If $\mu \leq 0$, then $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) > 0$.*

(B) *If $\mu > 0$ and $\eta_{(k)}(-r_+) \leq 0$, then $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) > 0$.*

(C) *If $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) \leq 0$, then $\mu > 0$, $\eta_{(k)}(-r_+) > 0$, and $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k) < \delta$.*

Proof. Parts (A) and (B) are easy to show. Let $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) \leq 0$. From the first two cases, this is only possible if $\mu > 0$ and $\eta_{(k)}(-r_+) > 0$. Consider $k = 2$ first. Since $\eta_{(2)}(-r_+) > 0 \neq -\delta$ we are in the case $\frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial r_+} > r_+$. Thus $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2)$ is given by (4.9). In this case, $\eta_{(2)}(-r_+) = \hat{u} - D_1 \delta r_+ > 0$. From $\frac{\partial}{\partial r_+} \mathcal{I}(r_+) \leq 0$, we get $\hat{u} \leq -\frac{\sigma}{\mu} \eta_{(2)}(-r_+) = -\frac{\sigma}{\mu} (\hat{u} - D_1 \delta r_+)$ which we can rearrange to get $-(\mu + \sigma) \hat{u} \geq -\sigma D_1 \delta r_+$. Using this in (4.9) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) &\leq \hat{u} \left[e^{\mu r_+} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1) \right] + \delta \frac{\sigma D_1}{\mu^2} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1) - \frac{(\mu + \sigma)}{\mu} \hat{u} e^{\mu r_+}, \\ &= -\hat{u} \frac{\sigma}{\mu} + \delta \frac{\sigma D_1}{\mu^2} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1), \\ &\leq \delta + \delta \frac{\sigma D_1}{\mu^2} (e^{\mu r_+} - 1), \quad \text{since } \hat{u} \leq -\frac{\mu}{\sigma} \delta, \\ &< \delta. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 3$, from $D_1^2/D_2 \leq 1$ it follows that

$$\bar{\eta}_{(3)}(D_1/D_2) = -\delta + \frac{\delta D_1^2}{2D_2} \leq -\delta + \frac{\delta}{2} = -\frac{\delta}{2} < 0.$$

Since $\eta_{(3)}$ is an increasing function and we require $\eta_{(3)}(-r_+) > 0$, then $-r_+ + \theta_{\text{shift}} > \frac{D_1}{D_2}$. Thus $\theta + \theta_{\text{shift}} > D_1/D_2$ for all $\theta \in [-r_+, 0]$. By the definition of $\eta_{(3)}$, in this case $\eta_{(3)}(\theta) = \eta_{(2)}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r_+, 0]$ and $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 3) = \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) < \delta$. \square

Lemma 4.5. For $k = 1, 2$ or 3 , let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$. Then

$$\left\{ (\mu, \sigma) : P(\delta, c, k) = \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, k) < \delta \right\} \subseteq \left\{ (\mu, \sigma) : \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -|c|, k) < \delta \right\}.$$

Proof. Recall from Section 3 that changing the sign of c in $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k)$ only changes the value of $r_+ = a + c\delta$. For $k = 1$ the result follows from Lemma 4.3.

For $k = 2$ or 3 , let $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}$ and $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]$. Recall that $\sigma < 0$, while $\eta_{(k)}(\theta)$ is a nondecreasing function in θ . There are two cases to consider:

- (i) If $\mu\hat{u} + \sigma\eta_{(k)}(-(a - |c|\delta)) \leq 0$ then by Lemma 4.4(C), $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -|c|, k) < \delta$.
- (ii) If $\mu\hat{u} + \sigma\eta_{(k)}(-(a + |c|\delta)) \geq \mu\hat{u} + \sigma\eta_{(k)}(-(a - |c|\delta)) > 0$, then $\mu\hat{u} + \sigma\eta_{(k)}(-\tau) > 0$ for all $\tau \in (a - |c|\delta, a + |c|\delta)$. By equation (4.15), the expression for $\mathcal{I}(r_+)$ is increasing over this interval and thus, $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -|c|, k) \leq \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, |c|, k) \leq P(\delta, c, k) < \delta$.

Thus $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -|c|, k) < \delta$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma 4.6. For $k = 1, 2$ or 3 , let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. If $0 < \delta_* \leq \delta_{**} < |a/c|$ then

$$\{(\mu, \sigma) : P(\delta_{**}, c, k) < \delta_{**}\} \subseteq \{(\mu, \sigma) : P(\delta_*, c, k) < \delta_*\}.$$

Proof. Increasing δ increases $r = a + |c|\delta$ which is the only source of nonlinearity in δ in the first expression (4.7) for $P(\delta, c, 1)$. Thus for $\mu \neq 0$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \left(\frac{P(\delta, c, 1)}{\delta} \right) = -e^{\mu r} \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} (\mu r) = \mu |c| \left(\frac{\mu^2 + \sigma^2}{-\sigma \mu} \right) e^{\mu r} > 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Positivity also follows trivially from (4.7) when $\mu = 0$. The result follows for $k = 1$.

For $k = 2$ or 3 , consider $\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)/\delta$ and note that r , D_1 and D_2 are the only terms in the expression that depend on δ , and that increasing δ increases the value of each of those terms. Thus

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) |c| + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial D_j} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) \frac{\partial D_j}{\partial \delta}.$$

We focus on the first term on the right-hand side, since all the remaining terms are positive. From (3.10) we can write

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) = e^{\mu r} \left[\mu s + \frac{\sigma}{\delta} \eta_{(k)}(-r) \right] = e^{\mu r} \left[\mu s + \frac{\sigma}{\delta} \eta_{(k)}(-(a + |c|\delta)) \right].$$

Let $r^* = a + |c|\delta_*$, $r^{**} = a + |c|\delta_{**}$ and $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_{**}, c, k) < \delta_{**}\}$. Let $s \in [-1, -\mu/\sigma]$ and use the notation $\eta_{(k)}(\delta, \theta)$ to denote the function $\eta_{(k)}$ as a function of both θ and δ . Note that $\eta_{(k)}(\delta, -(a + |c|\delta))/\delta$ is a nonincreasing function of δ . Consider the following cases:

- (i) If $\mu s + \sigma \eta_{(k)}(\delta_*, -r^*)/\delta_* \leq 0$ then by Lemma 4.4(C), $\mathcal{I}(s\delta_*, \delta_*, |c|, k) < \delta_*$.
(ii) If $\mu s + \sigma \eta_{(k)}(\delta_{**}, -r^*)/\delta_{**} \geq \mu s + \sigma \eta_{(k)}(\delta_*, -r^*)/\delta_* > 0$ then $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) \geq 0$ for $\delta \in [\delta_*, \delta_{**}]$. Thus, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \left(\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)}{\delta} \right) \geq 0$ for $\delta \in [\delta_*, \delta_{**}]$ and,

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta_*, \delta_*, |c|, k)}{\delta_*} \leq \frac{\mathcal{I}(s\delta_{**}, \delta_{**}, |c|, k)}{\delta_{**}} \leq \frac{P(\delta_{**}, c, k)}{\delta_{**}} < 1.$$

Cases (i) and (ii) both yield $\mathcal{I}(s\delta_*, \delta_*, |c|, k) < \delta_*$. Since this holds for all $s \in [-1, -\mu/\sigma]$, $P(\delta_*, |c|, k) < \delta_*$ follows. \square

With these lemmas we can prove our main result.

Theorem 4.7 (Asymptotic stability for (1.2) using $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$). *For $k = 1, 2$ or 3 , let $a > 0, c \neq 0$, and $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ where $P(\delta, c, k)$ is defined by (3.11). Then $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_1, c, k) < \delta_1\}$ for some $\delta_1 \in (0, |a/c|)$. Furthermore, for $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ let $\delta_2 = \delta e^{-k(|\mu|+|\sigma|)(a+|c|\delta)}$ and $|\varphi(t)| < \delta_2$ for all $t \in [-a - |c|\delta, 0]$, then the solution to (1.2) satisfies $|u(t)| \leq \delta$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t) = 0$.*

Proof. For this proof define

$$J = \bigcup_{\delta \in (0, |a/c|)} \{P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}.$$

First we show that $J = \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$. When $c = 0$ it is seen that $\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, 0, k)/\delta$ is independent of δ for $k = 1, 2$ or 3 . From this it follows that $P(\delta, 0, k)/\delta = P(1, 0, k)$. Moreover, for all c , when $\delta \rightarrow 0$ then $r \rightarrow a$, and $\mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, |c|, k)/\delta \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(s\delta, \delta, 0, k)/\delta$, since c only appears multiplied by δ in these expressions. Thus $P(\delta, c, k)/\delta \rightarrow P(1, 0, k)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Because of this and Lemma 4.6, $J = \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$.

Let $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$. The existence of δ_1 such that $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_1, c, k) < \delta_1\}$ follows from the above discussion. It also follows that $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$.

Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$. Consider the auxiliary ODE (3.7). For all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, \delta)$ it follows from Lemmas 3.6 and 4.5 that $v(0) \leq \sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, k) \leq P(\delta, c, k) < \delta$. Similarly, for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, -\delta)$ we obtain $v(0) \geq -\sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\delta\mu/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, -c, k) \geq -P(\delta, c, k) > -\delta$. Thus (2.14) holds for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ or any $|x| = \delta$. This is true for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$. Since $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$, applying Theorem 2.8 completes the proof. \square

For (μ, σ) in the part of $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$ for which $P(1, 0, k) < 1$, equation (2.14) is satisfied for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ and hence Theorem 4.7 establishes asymptotic stability. These parameter sets are shown in Figure 4 for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. The stability region $\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$ shown in Figure 4(a) for the DDE (1.2) comprises a relatively small part of $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$, because it is derived by requiring that (2.14) holds for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$. But $\mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ is a very large set, with the main restrictions on η being that it is merely piecewise continuous with $\|\eta\| \leq \delta$.

We obtain a larger stability region by increasing k . This is seen in Figure 4(b) where $P(1, 0, 2) < 1$ ensures that (2.14) is satisfied for all $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ results in a significantly larger stability region than seen in Figure 4(a). Since $\mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x) \subset \mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$, with all functions $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ satisfying the derivative bound $|\eta'(\theta)| \leq D_1\delta$, the set $\mathcal{E}_{(2)}(\delta, x)$ is smaller than $\mathcal{E}_{(1)}(\delta, x)$ and it is possible to satisfy (2.14) over a larger region of (μ, σ) parameter space. We will compare the sizes of the stability regions $\{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ for different k in Section 5.

The boundary of $\{P(1/2, 1, k) < 1/2\}$ is also shown in Figure 4 for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. As $\delta \rightarrow 0$ the sets $\{P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}$ converge to the set $\{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$, and for $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ the inequality $P(\delta, c, k) < \delta$ can be used to determine the largest δ_1 and hence the largest δ_2 for




Figure 4: For (a) $k = 1$ and (b) $k = 2$, the set $\{P(1,0,k) < 1\}$ is shaded green and the boundary of $\{P(1/2,1,k) < 1/2\}$ is drawn in red. If $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1,0,k) < 1\}$ then the zero solution to (1.2) is asymptotically stable by Theorem 4.7. As $\delta \rightarrow 0$ the proof of Theorem 4.7 shows that $\{P(\delta, c, k) < \delta\}$ converges to $\{P(1,0,k) < 1\}$.

which Theorem 4.7 applies. This determines a ball which is contained in the basin of attraction of the steady state, and in Section 6 we consider how the size of this lower bound on the basin of attraction varies with k .

5. Comparison of the stability regions

In this section we compare the sets in which we can establish asymptotic stability of the steady state of the state-dependent DDE (1.2) using Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques. In Sections 4 we showed asymptotic stability for $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_\Delta$, and for (μ, σ) in the parts of the cusp Σ_c and wedge Σ_w for which $P(1,0,k) < 1$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Measurements of these sets and the exact stability region Σ_\star are presented in Tables 1–3, and they are illustrated in Figure 5.

To compute these stability regions, from Theorems 4.7 we need to compute $P(1,0,k)$ in the limiting case $c = 0, \delta = 1$. This was done in MATLAB [35]. For $k = 1$ and 2 we have exact expressions for $P(1,0,k)$ given by (4.7) and (4.14). Noting that $\sigma < 0$ in $\Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$, from (4.7) we find that (μ, σ) satisfies $P(1,0,1) < 1$ when

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}(1 - e^{\mu a}) - \sigma - \mu e^{\mu a} > 0. \quad (5.1)$$

The boundary of $\{P(1,0,1) < 1\}$ is defined by equality in (5.1).

For $k = 3$ the value of $P(1,0,3)$ was calculated by maximizing the function $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, 1, 0, k)$ over $\hat{u} \in [-1, -\mu/\sigma]$ using the MATLAB `fminbnd` function.

The boundary of $\{P(1,0,k) < 1\}$ is then found by fixing one of μ or σ and using the `fzero` function to find the value of the other one which solves $P(1,0,k) - 1 = 0$ (except in the case $k = 1$ where for given μ , applying the quadratic formula to (5.1) determines σ). The largest value of μ for each region (shown in Table 3) is then found by regarding the μ that solves $P(1,0,k) = 1$ as a function of σ and using `fminsearch` to find the σ that maximises μ . The boundary of the full stability domain Σ_\star , found by linearization, is given by Definition 3.4.




Figure 5: Stability regions found using Theorems 4.1 and 4.7 shaded in green. Parameter pairs $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_\star$ which are contained in the wedge Σ_w or cusp Σ_c but not in $\{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ are shaded dark or light grey respectively.

Region	σ at $\mu = -5$	σ at $\mu = -2$	σ at $\mu = 0$
$\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$	-5.0673855	-2.5578041	-1
$\{P(1, 0, 2) < 1\}$	-5.0676090	-2.5875409	-1.5 = -3/2
$\{P(1, 0, 3) < 1\}$	-5.0678325	-2.6127906	-1.5416667 = -37/24
Σ_\star	-5.6605586	-3.0396051	-1.5707963 = $-\pi/2$

Table 1: Boundaries of the stability regions: Values of σ for fixed μ with $a = 1$.

Since by Theorem 4.7, at least for $k \leq 3$, the Lyapunov-Razumikhin stability regions are given by $P(1, 0, k) < 1$ irrespective of the value of c , we obtain the same regions in the constant $c = 0$ and variable $c \neq 0$ delay cases. This is consistent with the linearization theory of Györi and Hartung [12] who showed that Σ_\star is the exponential stability region for both $c = 0$ and $c \neq 0$.

When $\mu = 0$ the DDE (1.2) becomes

$$\dot{u}(t) = \sigma u(t - a - cu(t)) \quad (5.2)$$

and the intervals of σ values in the stability regions, (shown in the last column of Table 1) can be found exactly. From (4.7) we have $P(1, 0, 1) = -\sigma a$ when $\mu = 0$ which implies $\sigma \in (-1/a, 0)$ for $P(1, 0, 1) < 1$. Similarly, when $\sigma < -1/a$ from (4.14) we have $P(1, 0, 2) = -\sigma a - 1/2$ and hence $\sigma = -3/(2a)$ on the boundary of $\{P(1, 0, 2) < 1\}$. Magpantay [29] shows that for $\mu = 0$ we require $\sigma \in (-37/(24a), 0)$ for $P(1, 0, 3) < 1$. For the constant delay case of (5.2), with $c = 0$, Barnea [1] showed Lyapunov stability for $\sigma \in [-3/(2a), 0]$, by applying Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques with $k = 2$. The stability bound $\sigma \geq -37/(24a)$ seems not to have been derived before for the constant delay case of (5.2), but is well-known for Wright's equation [42] which is a nonlinear constant delay DDE whose linear part corresponds to (5.2) with $c = 0$ (see [27, 42]).

When $\mu = 0$, the boundary of $\{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$ seems to converge rapidly to $-\pi/(2a)$, the boundary of Σ_\star , as $k \rightarrow \infty$, suggesting that the full stability interval can be recovered. Indeed, for constant delay with $\mu = c = 0$ Krisztin [25] showed Lyapunov stability for $\sigma \in (-\pi/(2a), 0]$ by considering $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Barnea [1] and Myshkis [36] also applied Razumikhin techniques to establish Lyapunov stability for (1.2) in the case of constant delay ($c = 0$) with $\mu \neq 0$. The regions in which they

Region	μ at $\sigma = -5$	μ at $\sigma = -2$	μ at $\sigma = -1$
$\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$	-4.9286634	-1.16401463	0
$\{P(1, 0, 2) < 1\}$	-4.9283941	-1.0040856	0.38774807
$\{P(1, 0, 3) < 1\}$	-4.9281247	-0.93607885	0.39925645
Σ_\star	-4.2734224	-0.63804505	1

Table 2: Boundaries of the stability regions: Values of μ for fixed σ with $a = 1$.

Region	Supremum of μ	Corresponding value of σ
$\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$	0.18822641 = $\ln((1 + \sqrt{2})/2)$	-0.45439453
$\{P(1, 0, 2) < 1\}$	0.45697166	-0.73935547
$\{P(1, 0, 3) < 1\}$	0.45700462	-0.74059482
Σ_\star	1	-1

Table 3: The values of μ and σ at the rightmost boundary point of each stability region with $a = 1$.

claim stability are shown in Figure 6. The region found by Myshkis [36] has $\sigma \geq -1/a$ and $\mu \leq \sigma(a\sigma + 1)/(a\sigma - 1)$, which for $a = 1$ always has $\mu \leq 3 - 2\sqrt{2}$ and is contained in $\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$.

Barnea [1] claimed that the Lyapunov stability region of (1.2) with $c = 0$ contains the region $\mathcal{X}_2 = \{(\mu, \sigma) : 0 \leq s^* \leq a, P < 1\}$ where

$$s^* = -\frac{e^{\mu a}}{\sigma}, \quad P = \frac{\sigma(\mu + \sigma)}{\mu^2} \left[e^{\mu s^*} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu + \sigma} \right].$$

We show this region in Figure 6(a), but Barnea did not actually graph \mathcal{X}_2 or give its derivation in [1]. He noted that setting $P = 1$ and letting $\mu \rightarrow 0$ yields that the point $\sigma = -3/2a$ is a boundary of \mathcal{X}_2 on the σ -axis. We observe that setting $s^* = 0$ and $\mu \rightarrow 0$ yields $\sigma = -1/a$ as the other boundary of \mathcal{X}_2 on the σ -axis. Thus the region \mathcal{X}_2 does not include the whole interval $\sigma \in (-3/2a, 0]$ on the σ -axis which Barnea had proven to be Lyapunov stable in the $\mu = 0$ case in the same paper [1]. Barnea's stability region \mathcal{X}_2 is hence incomplete. Although the $\eta_{(2)}$ function used by Barnea to show Lyapunov stability corresponds to (4.3) with $c = 0$, it appears that Barnea performed his integration assuming that $\frac{\delta + \hat{u}}{D_1 \delta} \leq r_+$ in all cases. The case when $\frac{\delta + \hat{u}}{D_1 \delta} > r_+$ occurs in the $\mu = c = 0$ case (as well as the general case $c \neq 0, \mu \neq 0$ considered in (4.12),(4.13)). Omitting this case results in the incorrect stability region \mathcal{X}_2 . The correct region is $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1, 0, 2) < 1\}$ as illustrated in Figure 5(b). Moreover within this region we show the stronger property of asymptotic stability for both the constant delay ($c = 0$) and state-dependent delay ($c \neq 0$) cases.

Tables 1 and 2 also show that for $\mu < 0$ we can show asymptotic stability in a larger part of Σ_\star by increasing k . However when $\mu \ll 0$ the improvement in going from $k = 1$ to 2 to 3 is very marginal and we can only show asymptotic stability in a slice of the wedge Σ_w whose width appears to go to zero as $\mu \rightarrow -\infty$. The problem here is that as $\mu \rightarrow -\infty$ the DDE (1.2) is singularly perturbed and can be written as the so-called saw-tooth equation

$$\varepsilon \dot{u}(t) = u(t) + Ku(t - a - cu(t))$$

where $\varepsilon = 1/\mu$ and $K = \sigma/\mu$. This DDE had been studied in detail in [34] and for $K > 1$ sufficiently large (corresponding to (μ, σ) outside Σ_\star) the steady state is unstable, but there is




Figure 6: (a) The set $\mathcal{X}_2 \setminus \Sigma_\Delta$ which is part of the stability region of (1.2) for the constant delay case ($c = 0$) according to Barnea [1]. (b) The part of the stability domain outside Σ_Δ for the same problem found by Myshkis [36].

an asymptotically stable slowly oscillating periodic solution. This periodic solution, known as the sawtooth solution, has unbounded gradient and a discontinuous profile in the singular limit. For parameter values inside the wedge Σ_w the steady state is asymptotically stable, and for large and negative μ there are no periodic solutions but a slowly decaying sawtooth-like oscillation can occur. Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques based on bounding derivatives of solutions cannot perform well when those derivatives can be arbitrarily large. To improve the results in this case it would be necessary to define different sets $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}^*(\delta, x)$ which take into account the structure of the oscillations and are hopefully much closer to $E_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ than the sets $\mathcal{E}_{(k)}(\delta, x)$ that we use here.

For $\mu > 0$ there is a significant improvement in the computed stability domain in going from $k = 1$ to $k = 2$ and a smaller improvement using $k = 3$. The largest value of μ which satisfies $P(1, 0, 1) \leq 1$ can be computed from (5.1) which is quadratic in σ . Then non-negativity of the discriminant imposes the bound that $\mu < (1/a) \ln((1 + \sqrt{2})/2) \approx 0.1882/a$, as seen in Table 3.

Although the parameter regions in which we can show asymptotic stability are independent of c , we will see in Section 6 that the basins of attraction do depend on c .

6. Basins of attraction

Theorem 4.7 shows that for $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_w \cup \Sigma_c$ the ball

$$\{\varphi : \|\varphi\| < \delta_2 = \delta_1 e^{-k(|\mu|+|\sigma|)(a+|c|\delta_1)}\} \quad (6.1)$$

is contained in the basin of attraction of the steady-state of the state-dependent DDE (1.2) for $k = 1, 2$ and 3. For fixed δ_1 the radius of this ball gets smaller as k increases, but the value of δ_1 depends on k, μ and σ , and some work is required to determine the largest such ball that is contained in the basin of attraction. In [30] we show that (6.1) can be improved when $\mu < 0$, so here we will consider $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_c$, where $\sigma < 0 \leq \mu$. Lemma 3.2 does not apply when $\mu \geq 0$, so there is no *a priori* bound on the solutions to (1.2) in this case. We present two examples which show that (1.2) can have unbounded solutions when $\mu \geq 0$, which also shows that the steady-state is not globally asymptotically stable when $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_c$ and gives an upper bound on




Figure 7: For fixed $a = c = 1, \mu = 0$ and $\sigma \in [-\pi/2, 0]$, (a) supremum of $\delta_1 \in (0, a/c)$ such that $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_1, c, k) < \delta_1\}$ with $k = 1, 2, 3$, and, (b) $\delta_2 = \delta_1 e^{-k|\sigma|(a+c|\delta_1)}$. The value of δ^* from Example 6.1 is also shown in both plots.

the largest ball contained in its basin of attraction. For simplicity of exposition we suppose $c > 0$ in this section, but the results can easily be extended to $c < 0$. We first consider $\mu = 0$.

Example 6.1. Consider (1.2) with $c > 0, a > 0, \mu = 0$ and $\sigma \in [-\pi/2a, -1/a]$ and for $\delta \in [-1/(c\sigma), a/c]$ let $\varphi(t)$ be Lipschitz continuous with

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(0) &= \delta, & \varphi(t) &= -\delta \text{ for } t \leq -a - c\delta, \\ \varphi(t) &\in (-\delta, \delta) \text{ for } t \in (-a - c\delta, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Then while the deviated argument $\alpha(t, u(t)) = t - a - cu(t) \leq -a - c\delta$ we have

$$u(t - a - cu(t)) = -\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{u}(t) = -\sigma\delta.$$

Hence,

$$u(t) = \delta(1 - \sigma t) \geq \delta + \frac{t}{c}, \quad \text{for } t \geq 0. \quad (6.2)$$

But now $\alpha(t, u(t)) \leq -a - c\delta$ for all $t \geq 0$ and (6.2) is valid for all $t \geq 0$. Thus for $\mu = 0, \sigma \in [-\pi/2a, -1/a]$ on the axis between the third and fourth quadrants of the stability region we have $\|\varphi\| = \delta$ and $|u(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that the steady state is not globally asymptotically stable and also that $B(0, \delta)$ is not contained in its basin of attraction. Thus $\delta^* = -1/c\sigma$ provides an upper bound on the radius of the largest ball contained in the basin of attraction.

Figure 7 shows three bounds on the basin of attraction of the steady state of (1.2). The value of δ^* from Example 6.1 gives an upper bound on the radius of the largest ball contained in the basin of attraction. Two lower bounds on the radius of the largest ball are also shown. The larger bound δ_1 gives the radius of the ball that Theorem 4.7 shows is contracted asymptotically to the steady state provided the solution is sufficiently differentiable. Lemma 2.3 is used to ensure that the solution remains bounded long enough to acquire sufficient regularity, and the growth in the solution allowed by that lemma results in the smaller radius δ_2 (as defined by (6.1)) of the ball that is contained in the basin of attraction for general continuous initial functions φ . We see that the bounds δ_1 increase monotonically with k , but because of the exponential term in (6.1), the largest value of δ_2 is achieved with $k = 1$ in most of the interval for which $P(1, 0, 1) < 1$.




Figure 8: For fixed $a = c = 1$, $\sigma = -1$ and $\mu > 0$, (a) supremum of $\delta_1 \in (0, a/c]$ such that $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_1, c, k) < \delta_1\}$ with $k = 2, 3$, and, (b) $\delta_2 = \delta_1 e^{-k(\mu+\sigma)(a+c|\delta_1)}$. The value of δ^* from Example 6.2 is also shown in (a).

Now consider the case of $\mu > 0$. We can again derive an upper bound on the basin of attraction of the steady state when $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_c$.

Example 6.2. Let $a > 0$, $c > 0$, $\mu > 0$ and $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_c$ so $\sigma < -\mu < 0$. Also let

$$q(\delta) = -a\mu - 1 - c\sigma\delta - \ln(c\delta(\mu - \sigma)).$$

Note that $q(1/(c(\mu - \sigma))) = -\mu(a + 1/(\mu - \sigma)) < 0$, while $q'(\delta) = -c\sigma - 1/\delta < 0$ for all $\delta \in (0, 1/(c(\mu - \sigma)))$. Also $q(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, hence there exists $\delta^* \in (0, 1/(c(\mu - \sigma)))$ such that $q(\delta^*) = 0$ and δ^* is unique in this interval.

Suppose that the parameters are chosen so that $\delta^* < a/c$. A sufficient (but not necessary) condition for this is $\sigma < \mu - 1/a$ since this implies $1/(c(\mu - \sigma)) \leq a/c$. Now let $\delta \in (\delta^*, a/c)$ so $q(\delta) < 0$ and consider (1.2) with $\varphi(t)$ Lipschitz continuous and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(0) &= \delta, & \varphi(t) &= -\delta \text{ for } t \leq \mu q(\delta), \\ \varphi(t) &\in (-\delta, \delta) \text{ for } t \in (\mu q(\delta), 0), \end{aligned}$$

Then (1.2) has solution

$$u(t) = \frac{\sigma\delta}{\mu} + \delta e^{\mu t} \left[\frac{\mu - \sigma}{\mu} \right] \quad (6.3)$$

with $u(t - a - cu(t)) = -\delta$ for all $t \geq 0$. To see this note that

$$\alpha(t, u(t)) = t - a - cu(t) = t - a - \frac{c\sigma\delta}{\mu} - c\delta e^{\mu t} \left[\frac{\mu - \sigma}{\mu} \right],$$

with $\alpha(t, u(t)) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Differentiating the expression for $\alpha(t, u(t))$ shows that $\alpha(t, u(t)) \leq \mu q(\delta) < 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, with $\alpha(t, u(t)) = \mu q(\delta)$ when $t = -\mu^{-1} \ln(c\delta(\mu - \sigma))$. Hence, as in Example 6.1, we have $\|\varphi\| = \delta$ and $|u(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The steady state is not globally asymptotically stable and the ball $B(0, \delta)$ is not contained in its basin of attraction. Thus δ^* provides an upper bound on the radius of the largest ball contained in the basin of attraction.




Figure 9: Plot of Σ_c for fixed $a = c = 1$ with contour plots of (a) the maximum $\delta_1 \in (0, a/c]$ such that $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(\delta_1, c, k) < \delta_1\}$, and (b) the δ_2 that maximizes $\delta_2 = \delta e^{-k(|\mu|+|\sigma|)(a+|c|\delta)}$ for $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$. Shading shows the value $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ for which the maximum is achieved. (c) The upper bound δ^* from Example 6.2 for the radius of the largest ball $B(0, \delta)$ contained in the basin of attraction of the zero solution to (1.2).

For $\sigma = -1$ and $\mu \geq 0$, Figure 8 shows the same bounds δ_1 , δ_2 and δ^* on the radius of the basin of attraction of the steady state as were shown in Figure 7. Since these parameters are outside the set $\{P(1, 0, 1) < 1\}$ no bound is shown for $k = 1$. On nearly all of this interval $k = 2$ gives the largest lower bound δ_2 on the radius of a ball contained in the basin of attraction.

Figure 9 shows these bounds on the basin of attraction in the cusp Σ_c . The shaded region in Figure 9(c) denotes the portion of Σ_c for which $\delta^* \leq a/c$ when $a = c = 1$, and hence δ^* from Example 6.2 gives an upper bound on the radius of the largest ball contained in the basin of attraction. The corresponding bounds δ^* are shown as contours within this region. Figure 9(a) and (b) shows the lower bounds δ_1 and δ_2 , along with the value of k that achieves the bound.

In all three figures in this section, δ_2 is computed using (6.1) and δ_1 is obtained from solving $P(\delta_1, c, k) = \delta_1$ similarly to computations described in Section 5.

7. Conclusions

In this paper we have expanded upon the existing work on Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques by providing results specifically tailored to DDEs with time-varying discrete delays including

problems with state-dependent delays and vanishing delays. Our main results provide sufficient conditions for Lyapunov and asymptotic stability of steady state solutions of DDEs in Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 respectively. These conditions involve converting the DDE into a corresponding ODE problem with the delay terms treated as source terms that satisfy constraints. Our results require a Lipschitz condition on the right-hand side function f in (1.1) instead of the more restrictive Lipschitz condition on F in (??) required in Barnea [1], and do not require the construction of auxiliary functions as required by Hale and Verduyn Lunel [14]. Nevertheless we are able to show asymptotic stability, using a proof by contradiction showing that there cannot exist a solution which is not asymptotic to the steady state.

We apply our results to the model state-dependent DDE (1.2) in Sections 4–6. The main result of the application of Lyapunov–Razumikhin techniques to (1.2) is given as Theorems 4.7 where we prove that the zero solution to (1.2) is asymptotically stable if $(\mu, \sigma) \in \{P(1, 0, k) < 1\}$, for $k = 1, 2$ or 3 and provide lower bounds on the basin of attraction.

The parameter regions in which stability is proven in these theorems are compared in Section 5. As shown in Figure 5, the derived parameter regions grow as larger values of k are used, though for $\mu \neq 0$, the derived stability region does not approach the entire known stability region Σ_\star as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (for reasons discussed in Section 5).

In Section 6 we consider (1.2) in the cusp Σ_c where $\mu > 0$ and the steady state would be unstable without the delay term. In Examples 6.1 and 6.2 we constructed solutions which do not converge to the steady state for $(\mu, \sigma) \in \Sigma_c$. These solutions provide us with an upper bound δ^* on the radius of the largest ball about the zero solution contained in the basin of attraction. In Figures 7–9 these upper bounds were compared with the lower bound δ_2 on the basin of attraction from (6.1).

In the current work have studied stability through Lyapunov–Razumikhin techniques, but let us briefly compare and contrast this approach to the alternative, namely linearization. State-dependent DDEs have long been linearized by freezing the delays at their steady-state values and linearizing the resulting constant delay DDE [4, 5]. This heuristic approach has recently been put on a rigorous footing. For a class of state-dependent DDEs which includes (1.2) with $\mu = 0$, Györi and Hartung [11] proved that the steady state of the state-dependent DDE is exponentially stable if and only if the steady state of the corresponding frozen-delay DDE is exponentially stable. In [12] they generalise this result to a class of nonautonomous problems which are linear except for the state-dependency.

To compare and contrast our results with the linearization results of [12], we note that our results apply to a larger class of problems (1.1) than was considered in [12], and we prove both Lyapunov stability and asymptotic stability results, whereas [12] is concerned with exponential stability. The results in [12] do apply directly to our model problem (1.2), and reveal the parameter region for which the steady state is exponentially stable. In contrast our Lyapunov–Razumikhin techniques are only able to deduce stability in part of this parameter region.

Even though Lyapunov–Razumikhin techniques do not provide a proof of stability in the entire known stability region for (1.2), just as Lyapunov functions for ODEs do not always do so, they can nevertheless still be a very useful tool for studying stability in state-dependent DDEs. In particular our Lyapunov stability result is applicable to nonautonomous problems (for some of which rigorous linearization has yet to be derived) and the asymptotic stability result yield bounds on the basins of attraction which cannot be derived through linearization.

Acknowledgments

ARH is grateful to Tibor Krisztin, John Mallet-Paret, Roger Nussbaum and Hans-Otto Walther for productive discussions and suggestions, and to the National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), Canada for funding through the Discovery Grant program. FMGM is grateful to Jianhong Wu for helpful discussions, and to McGill University, York University, the Institut des Sciences Mathématiques (Montreal, Canada) and NSERC for funding. We are grateful to an anonymous referee whose feedback significantly improved the manuscript.

References

- [1] D.I. Barnea. A method and new results for stability and instability of autonomous functional differential equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 17:681–697, 1969.
- [2] A. Bellen and M. Zennaro. *Numerical Methods for Delay Differential Equations*. Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation. Oxford Science Publications, New York, 2003.
- [3] R.C. Calleja, A.R. Humphries, and B. Krauskopf. Resonance phenomena in a scalar delay differential equation with two state-dependent delays. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 16:1474–1513, 2017.
- [4] K.L. Cooke. Asymptotic theory for the delay-differential equation $u'(t) = -au(t - r(u(t)))$. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 19:160–173, 1967.
- [5] K.L. Cooke and W. Huang. On the problem of linearization for state-dependent delay differential equations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 124:1417–1426, 1996.
- [6] M. Craig, A.R. Humphries, and M.C. Mackey. A mathematical model of granulopoiesis incorporating the negative feedback dynamics and kinetics of G-CSF/neutrophil binding and internalization. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 78:2304–2357, 2016.
- [7] O. Diekmann, S.A. van Gils, S.M. Verduyn Lunel, and H.-O. Walther. *Delay Equations Functional-, Complex-, and Nonlinear Analysis*, volume 110 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [8] R.D. Driver. Existence theory for a delay-differential system. *Contribs Diff. Eqns.*, 1:317–336, 1963.
- [9] L.E. El'sgol'ts and S.B. Norkin. *Introduction to the Theory and Application of Differential Equations with Deviating Arguments*. Academic Press, New York, 1973.
- [10] S. Guo and J. Wu. *Bifurcation Theory of Functional Differential Equations*, volume 184 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 2013.
- [11] I. Györi and F. Hartung. On the exponential stability of a state-dependent delay equation. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 66:71–84, 2000.
- [12] I. Györi and F. Hartung. Exponential stability of a state-dependent delay system. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 18:773–791, 2007.
- [13] J.K. Hale. *Theory of Functional Differential Equations*, volume 3 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [14] J.K. Hale and S.M. Verduyn Lunel. *Introduction to Functional Differential Equations*, volume 99 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [15] F. Hartung, T. Krisztin, H.-O. Walther, and J. Wu. Functional differential equations with state-dependent delays: theory and applications. In A. Cañada, P. Drábek, and A. Fonda, editors, *Handbook of Differential Equations: Ordinary Differential Equations*, volume 3, pages 435–545. Elsevier/North Holland, 2006.
- [16] N.D. Hayes. Roots of the transcendental equation associated with a certain difference-differential equation. *J. London Math. Soc.*, s1-25:226–232, 1950.
- [17] A.R. Humphries, D.A. Bernucci, R. Calleja, N. Homayounfar, and M. Snarski. Periodic solutions of a singularly perturbed delay differential equation with two state-dependent delays. *J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns.*, 28:1215–1263, 2016.
- [18] A.R. Humphries, O. DeMasi, F.M.G. Magpantay, and F. Upham. Dynamics of a delay differential equation with multiple state dependent delays. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 32:2701–2727, 2012.
- [19] T. Insperger and Stépán. *Semi-Discretization for Time-Delay Systems*, volume 178 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [20] T. Insperger, G. Stépán, and J. Turi. State-dependent delay in regenerative turning processes. *Nonlinear Dyn.*, 47:275–283, 2007.
- [21] A. Ivanov, E. Liz, and S. Trofimchuk. Halanay inequality, Yorke 3/2 stability criterion, and differential equations with maxima. *Tohoku Math. J.*, 54:277–295, 2002.
- [22] J. Kato. On Liapunov-Razumikhin type theorems for functional differential equations. *Funkcialaj Ekvacioj*, 16:225–239, 1973.

- [23] G. Kozyreff and T. Erneux. Singular Hopf bifurcation in a differential equation with large state-dependent delay. *Proc. Roy. Soc. A*, 470:0596, 2013.
- [24] N.N. Krasovskii. *Stability of Motion Applications of Lyapunov's Second Method to Differential Equations with Delay*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1963.
- [25] T. Krisztin. Stability for functional differential equations and some variational problems. *Tohoku Math. J.*, 42:402–417, 1990.
- [26] T. Krisztin. On stability properties for one-dimensional functional differential equations. *Funkcialaj Ekvacioj*, 34:241–256, 1991.
- [27] E. Liz, M. Pinto, G. Robledo, S. Trofimchuk, and V. Tkachenko. Wright type delay differential equations with negative Schwarzian. *Discrete and Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 9:309–321, 2003.
- [28] M.C. Mackey. Commodity price fluctuations: Price dependent delays and nonlinearities as explanatory factors. *J. Econ. Theory*, 48:497 – 509, 1989.
- [29] F.M.G. Magpantay. *On the stability and numerical stability of a model state dependent delay differential equation*. PhD thesis, McGill University, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, 2012.
- [30] F.M.G. Magpantay and A.R. Humphries. Generalised Lyapunov-Razumikhin techniques for scalar state-dependent delay differential equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 13:85–104, 2020.
- [31] J. Mallet-Paret and R.D. Nussbaum. Boundary layer phenomena for differential-delay equations with state-dependent time lags. I. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 120:99–146, 1992.
- [32] J. Mallet-Paret and R.D. Nussbaum. Boundary layer phenomena for differential-delay equations with state-dependent time lags: II. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 477:129–197, 1996.
- [33] J. Mallet-Paret and R.D. Nussbaum. Boundary layer phenomena for differential-delay equations with state-dependent time lags: III. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 189:640–692, 2003.
- [34] J. Mallet-Paret and R.D. Nussbaum. Superstability and rigorous asymptotics in singularly perturbed state-dependent delay-differential equations. *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 250:4037–4084, 2011.
- [35] Mathworks. *MATLAB 2017a*. Mathworks, Natick, Massachusetts, 2017.
- [36] A. Myshkis. Razumikhin's method in the qualitative theory of processes with delay. *J. Appl. Math. Stoch. Anal.*, 8:233–247, 1995.
- [37] B.S. Razumikhin. An application of Lyapunov method to a problem on the stability of systems with a lag. *Autom. Remote Control*, 21:740–748, 1960.
- [38] H. Smith. *An Introduction to Delay Differential Equations with Applications to the Life Sciences*. Texts in Applied Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [39] E. Stumpf. Local stability analysis of differential equations with state-dependent delay. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 36:3445–3461, 2016.
- [40] H.-O. Walther. On a model for soft landing with state dependent delay. *J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns.*, 19:593–622, 2003.
- [41] E. Winston. Uniqueness of solutions of state dependent delay differential equations. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 47:620 – 625, 1974.
- [42] E.M. Wright. A non-linear difference-differential equation. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 194:66–87, 1955.
- [43] J.A. Yorke. Asymptotic stability for one dimensional differential-delay equations. *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 7:189–202, 1970.

Appendix A. An explicit expression for the region $P(\delta, c, 2) < \delta$

Here we prove Theorem 4.2. Let \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 be defined by (4.12) and (4.13). Recall that \mathcal{I}_1 only applies when $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} \geq r$, in which case the integration does not have to be split into two intervals. For this case to occur we require $\hat{u} \in [(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]$, which is only possible in the region where $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. When $\frac{\delta+\hat{u}}{D_1\delta} < r$ the integration has to be broken into two parts and \mathcal{I}_2 applies. In that case $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, \min\{(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma\}]$. We require the following lemmas.

Lemma A.1. *Let $a > 0$, $c \neq 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$ and $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. If $\mu \geq 0$ then $\sigma \geq -1/r$. If $\mu < 0$ then $\mu \in [(-3 + 2\sqrt{2})/r, 0]$ and*

$$\sigma \geq -\frac{1}{r} \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu r) + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + 6\mu r + (\mu r)^2} \right] \geq -\frac{1}{r}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. Let $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} r(\text{sign}(\mu)\mu - \sigma) - 1 &= r(|\mu| + |\sigma|) - 1 \leq rD_1 - 1 \leq -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}, \\ \Rightarrow r\sigma^2 + (1 - \text{sign}(\mu)\mu r)\sigma - \mu &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The boundary of the region where this inequality holds is

$$\sigma = -\frac{1}{r} \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - \text{sign}(\mu)\mu r) \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 - \text{sign}(\mu)\mu r)^2 + 4\mu r} \right]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If $\mu \geq 0$ then this simplifies to $\sigma = -1/r$ and $\sigma = \mu$. Since $\sigma \leq 0$, and also $\mu = \sigma = 0$ satisfies (A.2) it follows that (A.1) holds for $\sigma \in [-1/r, 0]$ for the case $\mu \geq 0$.

If $\mu < 0$ then (A.3) simplifies to

$$\sigma = -\frac{1}{r} \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu r) \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + 6\mu r + (\mu r)^2} \right]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Requiring $1 + 6\mu r + (\mu r)^2 \geq 0$ yields $\mu r \in [-3 + 2\sqrt{2}, 0]$. The lower bound on σ can be found by taking the lower boundary in (A.4) which attains its minimum at $\mu = 0$. This yields (A.1). \square

Lemma A.2. Let $a > 0$, $\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\sigma < -\mu$. Let $\delta \in (0, |a/c|)$. Define

$$\hat{u}_* = \left[\frac{1}{\mu} D_1 \ln \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma} e^{\mu r} \right) - 1 \right] \delta.$$

The following statements are true:

- (A) If $rD_1 - 1 > -\mu/\sigma$ then the maximum of $\mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta)$ over $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]$ occurs at \hat{u}_* if $\hat{u}_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$, and at $-\mu\delta/\sigma$ otherwise.
- (B) If $rD_1 - 1 > -\mu/\sigma$ and $u_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$ then $P(\delta, c, 2) \geq \delta$.
- (C) If $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ then $\sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, (rD_1 - 1)\delta]} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta)$
- (D) If $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ then $\sup_{\hat{u} \in [(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}_1(\hat{u}, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta)$
- (E) If $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ then $\mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) \leq \mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta)$.

Proof of (A). To find \hat{u}_* which maximises $\mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}_*, \delta)$ consider the derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta) = e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \left(e^{\mu \frac{\delta + \hat{u}}{D_1 \delta}} - 1 \right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

At $\hat{u} = -\delta$ this is positive. Setting the derivative equal to zero in (A.5) yields

$$\hat{u}_* = \left[\frac{1}{\mu} D_1 \ln \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma} e^{\mu r} \right) - 1 \right] \delta.$$

Since $1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma} e^{\mu r} \in [0, 1]$ if $\mu < 0$ and $1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma} e^{\mu r} > 1$ if $\mu > 0$ then $\hat{u}_* > -\delta$ in both cases. \square

Proof of (B). First we need to prove that if $\hat{u}_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$ and $\mu > 0$ then $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. Let $\hat{u}_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$ and $\mu > 0$. Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta) < 0$. Consider the term D_1/μ ,

$$\frac{D_1}{\mu} = \frac{|\mu| + |\sigma|}{\mu} (1 + (|\mu| + |\sigma|)|c|\delta) \geq \frac{|\mu| + |\sigma|}{\mu} = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Now consider the exponent of the second term in (A.5) with $\hat{u} = -\mu\delta/\sigma$,

$$\mu \frac{1 - \mu/\sigma}{D_1} = \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma} \right) \frac{\mu}{D_1} \leq \frac{1 - \mu/\sigma}{1 - \sigma/\mu} = -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}.$$

Thus,

$$e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}(e^{-\mu/\sigma} - 1) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta) < 0.$$

Isolating r in this expression yields $r < \frac{1}{\mu} \ln\left[\frac{\sigma}{\mu}(1 - e^{-\mu/\sigma})\right]$. Let $x = \mu/\sigma$, then $x \in (-1, 0)$ and $(1 - e^{-x})/x > 1$. Also, $(1 - 1/x) \ln[(1 - e^{-x})/x] - 1 \leq -x$. These inequalities and (A.6) imply

$$rD_1 - 1 \leq \frac{D_1}{\mu} \ln\left[\frac{\sigma}{\mu}(1 - e^{-\mu/\sigma})\right] - 1 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\sigma}{\mu}\right) \ln\left[\frac{\sigma}{\mu}(1 - e^{-\mu/\sigma})\right] - 1 \leq -\frac{\mu}{\sigma}.$$

Thus if $rD_1 - 1 > -\mu/\sigma$ then $\hat{u}_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$ can only occur if $\mu < 0$.

Now let $\mu < 0$ and $\hat{u}_* < -\mu\delta/\sigma$. Then by setting $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}_*, \delta) = 0$ in (A.5), $e^{\mu \frac{\delta + \hat{u}_*}{D_1 \delta}} - 1 = -\frac{\mu}{\sigma} e^{\mu r}$. Also, $e^{\mu r} - \sigma/\mu < 0$ because $\mu < 0$ and $\sigma \leq \mu < 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}_*, \delta) &= \hat{u}_* \left(e^{\mu r} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \delta \left[\frac{D_1}{\mu} \left(e^{\mu \frac{\delta + \hat{u}_*}{D_1 \delta}} - 1 \right) - e^{\mu r} \right], \\ &\geq -\frac{\mu}{\sigma} \delta \left(e^{\mu r} - \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \delta \left[-\frac{D_1}{\sigma} e^{\mu r} - e^{\mu r} \right] = \delta - \left(\frac{D_1}{\mu} + \frac{\mu}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \right) \delta e^{\mu r}. \end{aligned}$$

But $D_1 \geq |\mu| + |\sigma| \geq |\mu/\sigma||\mu| + |\sigma| = -(\mu^2/\sigma + \sigma)$ which implies $\frac{D_1}{\mu} + \frac{\mu}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu} \leq 0$. Hence $\mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}_*, \delta) \geq \delta$ as required. \square

Proof of (C). Let $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) < 0$. Then, $e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}(e^{\mu r} - 1) < 0$, which can be rewritten as

$$\sigma < \frac{\mu e^{\mu r}}{1 - e^{\mu r}} = -\frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{-\mu r e^{\mu r}}{1 - e^{\mu r}} \right). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We show that the expression on the right-hand-side is continuous and decreases as μ increases. Let $x = \mu r$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} -\frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{-\mu r e^{\mu r}}{1 - e^{\mu r}} \right) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} -\frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{-x e^x}{1 - e^x} \right) = -\frac{1}{r}, \\ \frac{d}{d\mu} \left[-\frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{-\mu r e^{\mu r}}{1 - e^{\mu r}} \right) \right] &= \frac{d}{dx} \frac{x e^x}{1 - e^x} = \frac{e^x (1 + x - e^x)}{(1 - e^x)^2} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So when $\mu > 0$, a necessary condition for (A.7) to hold is $\sigma < -1/r$. From Lemma A.1, if $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ and $\mu > 0$ then $\sigma \geq -1/r$. Thus $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) \geq 0$ if $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ and $\mu > 0$.

Now let $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ and $\mu < 0$. From Lemma A.1, $\mu r \in [-3 + 2\sqrt{2}, 0]$ and $\sigma \geq -\frac{1}{r} \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu r) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 + 6\mu r + (\mu r)^2} \right]$. Since $\frac{-x e^x}{1 - e^x} \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + x) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 + 6x + x^2}$ for $x \in [-3 + 2\sqrt{2}, 0]$, then $\sigma \geq -\frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{-\mu r e^{\mu r}}{1 - e^{\mu r}} \right)$. This contradicts (A.7). Thus $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) \geq 0$ if $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ and $\mu < 0$. Thus,

$$rD_1 - 1 \leq -\frac{\mu}{\sigma} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) = e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}(e^{\mu r} - 1) \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

This is shown in Figure 10. To finish the proof of (C), observe from (A.5) that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta)$ decreases as \hat{u} increases. Then by (A.8), $\sup_{\hat{u} \in [-\delta, (rD_1 - 1)\delta]} \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta)$. \square




Figure 10: Region where $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ is shown in brown and the region where $e^{\mu r} + (\sigma/\mu)(e^{\mu r} - 1) < 0$ is shown in blue. These two regions do not intersect.

Proof of (D). Let $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. For all $\hat{u} \in [(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_1(\hat{u}, \delta) = e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}(e^{\mu r} - 1) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta).$$

From (A.8), $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}} \mathcal{I}_1(\hat{u}, \delta) > 0$ for all $\hat{u} \in [-\delta, (rD_1 - 1)\delta]$. Thus, $\sup_{\hat{u} \in [(rD_1 - 1)\delta, -\mu\delta/\sigma]} \mathcal{I}_1(\hat{u}, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta)$. \square

Proof of (E). From (4.12) and (4.13) we find that

$$\mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta) = \left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma} - (rD_1 - 1)\right) \delta \left[e^{\mu r} + \frac{\sigma}{\mu}(e^{\mu r} - 1) \right].$$

For $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$ it follows from (A.8) that this expression is non-negative. Thus, $\mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta) \geq \mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta)$. \square

Finally we can prove Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Note that this expression does not hold outside of $\{P(\delta, c, 2) < \delta\}$. In order to prove this theorem, we need items (A)-(E) in Lemma A.2 which require Lemma A.1.

Let $rD_1 - 1 > -\mu/\sigma$. Then we can only have the two-part integration so $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) = \mathcal{I}_2(\hat{u}, \delta)$. From (A) and (B), $P(\delta, c, 2) = \mathcal{I}(-\mu/\sigma, \delta)$ if $P(\delta, c, 2) < \delta$.

Let $rD_1 - 1 \leq -\mu/\sigma$. Then we can have either the one-part or the two-part integration. From (C) and (D), $\mathcal{I}(\hat{u}, \delta, c, 2) = \max\{\mathcal{I}_2((rD_1 - 1)\delta, \delta), \mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta)\}$. From (E), $P(\delta, c, 2) = \mathcal{I}_1(-\mu\delta/\sigma, \delta)$. \square