

On regularity of mild solutions for autonomous linear retarded functional differential equations

Junya Nishiguchi^{*†}

Abstract

The notion of mild solutions for autonomous linear retarded functional differential equations (RFDEs) has been introduced in [J. Nishiguchi, *Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ.* **2023**, No. 32, 1–77] for the purpose of defining fundamental matrix solutions and obtaining a variation of constants formula for the RFDEs. This notion gives a straightforward definition of solutions to the RFDEs under discontinuous history functions compared with previous studies in the literature. For a given autonomous linear RFDE, it holds that the fundamental matrix solutions are locally Lipschitz continuous on the interval $[0, \infty)$. However, it is not apparent whether a similar property is true for the mild solutions. Here we obtain a result which shows the regularity of mild solutions on $[0, \infty)$ for autonomous linear RFDEs. The result makes clear a connection between the mild solutions and solution concepts in previous studies.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 34K05, 34K06; Secondary 34K99, 26A42.

Keywords. Retarded functional differential equations; mild solutions; discontinuous history functions; regularity; Riemann–Stieltjes integrals.

1 Introduction

A *delay differential equation (DDE)* is a differential equation where the time derivative of the unknown function x depends on the past information of x . When such a past dependence in a DDE is expressed as the dependence of $\dot{x}(t)$ on $x|_{[t-r,t]}$ with a given constant $r > 0$, the dynamics concept of the DDE can be understood as the time evolution of x_t . Here $x_t: [-r, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ is a function defined by

$$x_t(\theta) := x(t + \theta) \quad (\theta \in [-r, 0]),$$

which is called the *history segment* of x at t . Throughout this paper, let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , and $r > 0$ be a constant. Since x_t is a function on the interval $[-r, 0]$, we need to choose a function space in which the history segment x_t lives in order to consider the time evolution of x_t . We call such a function space a *history function space* of the DDE.

As a history function space, it is usual to choose the Banach space $C := C([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n)$ of continuous functions from $[-r, 0]$ to \mathbb{K}^n with the supremum norm given by

$$\|\phi\| := \sup_{\theta \in [-r, 0]} |\phi(\theta)| \quad (|\cdot| \text{ is a fixed norm on } \mathbb{K}^n)$$

^{*}Mathematical Science Group, Advanced Institute for Materials Research (AIMR), Tohoku University, Katahira 2-1-1, Aoba-ku, Sendai, 980-8577, Japan

[†]E-mail: junya.nishiguchi.b1@tohoku.ac.jp, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0326-2845>

for $\phi \in C$. Viewing the dynamics of DDEs as the time evolution of the history segment in the Banach space C goes back to Krasovskii [11]. See also [6], [8] as reviews of this matter.

With this point of view, DDEs are formulated as *retarded functional differential equations (RFDEs)*, where a linear RFDE has the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = Lx_t \quad (t \geq 0) \quad (1.1)$$

for a given continuous linear map $L: C \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$. The usual notion of solutions to the linear RFDE (1.1) is defined under an initial condition $x_0 = \phi \in C$, where the function ϕ is called the *initial history function*. Then a continuous function $x: [-r, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ is a *solution* of (1.1) under the initial condition $x_0 = \phi \in C$ if and only if it satisfies both the initial condition and an integral equation

$$x(t) = \phi(0) + \int_0^t Lx_s ds \quad (t \geq 0). \quad (1.2)$$

We refer the reader to [7], [9] as general references of the theory of RFDEs.

The above solution concept does not allow us to choose an initial history function from discontinuous functions. Such a need can be seen in various perspectives, e.g., in the problem of the choice of a history function space as a Hilbert space, and in the problem of a definition of the fundamental matrix solution of linear RFDEs. For the former problem, there have been extensive researches from the mid 1970s, represented by e.g., Delfour and Mitter [4], Bernier and Manitius [1], Delfour [2], Delfour and Manitius [3]. See also the references therein. However, the understanding of the solution concepts in the above references are not straightforward.

Compared with these, there is a straightforward way to accomplish a solution concept under discontinuous history functions. This is the notion of *mild solutions* introduced in [12], which is obtained by replacing the integral $\int_0^t Lx_s ds$ in (1.2) by $L \int_0^t x_s ds$. Here for each $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, $\int_0^t x_s ds \in C$ is defined by

$$\left(\int_0^t x_s ds \right)(\theta) := \int_0^t x(s + \theta) ds \quad (\theta \in [-r, 0]).$$

In this paper, for each interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ and each $p \in [1, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p(J, \mathbb{K}^n)$ denote the set of all locally Lebesgue p -integrable functions from J to \mathbb{K}^n defined almost everywhere. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(J, \mathbb{K}^n)$ denote the set of all locally essentially bounded functions from J to \mathbb{K}^n defined almost everywhere.

The purpose of this paper is to reveal a connection between the solution concepts in [4], [1], [2], [3] and the notion of mild solutions in [12] by showing a regularity property of mild solutions to the linear RFDE (1.1). We now state the precise definition of mild solutions given in [12, Definition 2.5]. We will use the following notation.

Notation 1 (cf. [4]). For each $p \in [1, \infty]$, let

$$\mathcal{M}^p([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n) := \{ \phi \in \mathcal{L}^p([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n) : \phi \text{ is defined at } 0 \}.$$

$\mathcal{M}^p([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n)$ will be abbreviated as \mathcal{M}^p .

Definition 1.1 ([12]). Let $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$ be given. We call a function $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ a *mild solution* of the linear RFDE (1.1) under the initial condition $x_0 = \phi$ if (i) x is defined

on $[0, \infty)$, and (ii) a system of equations

$$\begin{cases} x(t) = \phi(0) + L \int_0^t x_s ds & (t \geq 0), \\ x(t) = \phi(t) & (\text{a.e. } t \in [-r, 0]) \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

is satisfied.

We note that the property that ϕ is defined at 0 is necessary to give the initial value $\phi(0)$ in Definition 1.1. Based on this definition, one can show that a mild solution of (1.1) under an initial condition $x_0 = \phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$ coincides with the usual solution if $\phi \in C$. We also have the existence and uniqueness of a mild solution of (1.1) under each initial condition $x_0 = \phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$, where the unique mild solution is denoted by

$$x(\cdot; \phi): \text{dom}(\phi) \cup [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n.$$

See [12, Subsections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3] for the details. It holds the mild solution $x(\cdot; \phi)$ of (1.1) under $x_0 = \phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$ is continuous on $[0, \infty)$ because the function

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \int_0^t x_s ds \in C \quad (1.4)$$

is continuous for any $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ (see [12, Lemma 2.8]), which implies that the function

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto L \int_0^t x_s ds \in \mathbb{K}^n \quad (1.5)$$

is also continuous because of the continuity of L .

For a special class of initial history functions, we have a more nicer regularity property of mild solutions. This class is given by the set of instantaneous inputs of vectors in \mathbb{K}^n . Here an *instantaneous input* $\hat{\xi}: [-r, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ of a vector $\xi \in \mathbb{K}^n$ is defined by

$$\hat{\xi}(\theta) := \begin{cases} 0 & (\theta \in [-r, 0)) \\ \xi & (\theta = 0). \end{cases}$$

For any $\xi \in \mathbb{K}^n$, the instantaneous input $\hat{\xi}$ belongs to \mathcal{M}^1 . Therefore, one can consider the mild solution $x(\cdot; \hat{\xi}): [-r, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ of (1.1) under $x_0 = \hat{\xi}$.

For this class of mild solutions, the following result holds (cf. [12, Theorems 3.10 and 3.5]).

Theorem 1.2 (cf. [12]). *For each $\xi \in \mathbb{K}^n$, the mild solution $x(\cdot; \hat{\xi})$ of (1.1) under $x_0 = \hat{\xi}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and differentiable almost everywhere on $[0, \infty)$. Furthermore, $x := x(\cdot; \hat{\xi})$ satisfies a differential equation*

$$\dot{x}(t) = \int_{-t}^0 d\eta(\theta) x(t + \theta) \quad (1.6)$$

for almost all $t \geq 0$.

For the statement, $\eta: (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ is a matrix-valued function with the properties that η is of bounded variation on $[-r, 0]$, η is constant on $(-\infty, -r]$, and

$$L\phi = \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta) \phi(\theta) \quad (1.7)$$

holds for all $\phi \in C$. Here the right-hand side is a Riemann–Stieltjes integral of a vector-valued function ϕ with respect to the matrix-valued function η . The existence of such an η is ensured by a corollary of the Riesz representation theorem. See [12, Appendix A] for Riemann–Stieltjes integrals for matrix-valued functions. We note that (1.6) is not a differential equation of *infinite retardation* because the right-hand side of (1.6) becomes

$$\int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta)x(t+\theta) = Lx_t$$

for all $t \in [r, \infty)$.

For the proof of Theorem 1.2, the Riemann–Stieltjes convolution plays a fundamental role. Here for a continuous function $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ and a function $\alpha: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ of locally bounded variation (i.e., of bounded variation on any closed and bounded interval of $[0, \infty)$), the function $d\alpha * f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ is defined by

$$(d\alpha * f)(t) := \int_0^t d\alpha(u)f(t-u) \quad (t \geq 0).$$

Since the right-hand side is a Riemann–Stieltjes integral, the function $d\alpha * f$ is called a *Riemann–Stieltjes convolution*. It holds that the function $d\alpha * f$ is a sum of a continuous function and a function of locally bounded variation (e.g., see [12, Theorem 3.5]). Therefore, $d\alpha * f$ is Riemann integrable on any closed and bounded interval of $[0, \infty)$. By defining a function $\tilde{\eta}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ by

$$\tilde{\eta}(t) := -\eta(-t) \quad (t \geq 0), \tag{1.8}$$

the differential equation (1.6) can be expressed as $\dot{x}(t) = (d\tilde{\eta} * x|_{[0, \infty)})(t)$.

In this paper, we give an extension of Theorem 1.2. The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.3. *For every $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^p$, where $p \in [1, \infty]$, the mild solution $x(\cdot; \phi)$ of the linear RFDE (1.1) under $x_0 = \phi$ is locally absolutely continuous on $[0, \infty)$. Furthermore, the following statements hold:*

1. $x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ is differentiable almost everywhere and its derivative belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$.
2. There exists a function $f(\cdot; \phi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ vanishing on $[r, \infty)$ such that

$$\dot{x}(t; \phi) = \int_{-t}^0 d\eta(\theta)x(t+\theta; \phi) + f(t; \phi) \quad (\text{a.e. } t \geq 0) \tag{1.9}$$

holds.

For an interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, a function $f: J \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ is said to be *locally absolutely continuous* if $f|_K: K \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ is absolutely continuous for any closed and bounded interval K contained in J . Let $\text{AC}_{\text{loc}}(J, \mathbb{K}^n)$ denote the set of all locally absolutely continuous functions from J to E .

We give a comment on an extension of Theorem 1.3 to the case that \mathbb{K}^n is replaced with an infinite-dimensional Banach space E . Such an extension is of course natural, however, some additional assumptions should be imposed. On a condition on L , we need to assume the existence of an operator-valued function $\eta: (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(E)$ such that $\eta|_{[-r, 0]}: [-r, 0] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(E)$ is of strong bounded variation, η is constant on $(-\infty, -r]$, and

(1.7) holds for all $\psi \in C$. The above integral is a Riemann–Stieltjes integral of a vector-valued function with respect to an operator-valued function. See [5, Section 2] for details of this type of integrals. For the above mentioned extension, the extent to which there is a difference between the boundedness of L and the above assumption on L should be discussed.

This paper is organized as follows. The situation of the statement and its proof of Theorem 1.3 are different depending on the cases $p = 1$, $p = \infty$, and $1 < p < \infty$. In Section 2, we give proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$. For the proof for $p = 1$, a difficulty is that the function (1.4) is not necessarily locally absolutely continuous for $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$. In Subsection 2.1, we resolve this difficulty by directly showing the local absolute continuity of the function (1.5). In Subsection 2.2, we obtain the differential equation (1.9) by adopting methods used in [12]. Contrary to the case $p = 1$, the case $p = \infty$ is easier to handle because one can show that the function (1.4) is locally Lipschitz continuous for $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^\infty([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$. Subsection 2.3 is on the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the cases $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$. In Section 3, we give proof of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$ by adopting a density argument used by Delfour and Manitius [3]. Finally, in Section 4, we see a connection between the notion of mild solutions and the solution concept used by Delfour and Manitius [3]. In Appendix A, we collect results on Riemann–Stieltjes integrals.

2 Proof of the main result for $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$

In this section, we show Theorem 1.3 for $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$. The proof is divided into the following two parts for each $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$:

- Proof of the local absolute continuity of $x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$.
- To obtain the differential equation (1.9) which $x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$ satisfies.

2.1 Local absolute continuity

We use the following notation.

Notation 2. Let $[a, b]$ be a closed and bounded interval of \mathbb{R} . For each matrix-valued function $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ of bounded variation with respect to the operator norm $|\cdot|$ on $M_n(\mathbb{K})$, let $V_\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote its total variation function. Namely,

$$V_\alpha(t) := \text{Var}(\alpha|_{[a, t]})$$

holds for all $t \in [a, b]$. Here $\text{Var}(\alpha)$ denotes the total variation of α , and we interpret $V_\alpha(a) = 0$.

We refer the reader to [15, Chapter 9] for a reference of scalar-valued functions of bounded variation. The following is a key result.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, the function (1.5)*

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto L \int_0^t x_s ds \in \mathbb{K}^n$$

is locally absolutely continuous.

The following lemma is necessary for the proof of Theorem 2.1. The corresponding statement for scalar-valued case is given in [16, Theorem 5b of Chapter I] without proof.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $[a, b]$ be a closed and bounded interval of \mathbb{R} . Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ be continuous and $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ be of bounded variation. Then*

$$\left| \int_a^b d\alpha(t) f(t) \right| \leq \int_a^b |f(t)| dV_\alpha(t) \quad (2.1)$$

holds. Here the right-hand side is the Riemann–Stieltjes integral of the real-valued continuous function $[a, b] \ni t \mapsto |f(t)| \in \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the monotonically increasing function V_α .

Proof. As in scalar-valued case,

$$\text{Var}(\alpha|_{[a,c]}) + \text{Var}(\alpha|_{[c,b]}) = \text{Var}(\alpha)$$

holds for any $c \in (a, b)$. Therefore, for any subinterval $[c, d] \subset [a, b]$,

$$|\alpha(d) - \alpha(c)| \leq \text{Var}(\alpha|_{[c,d]}) = V_\alpha(d) - V_\alpha(c) \quad (2.2)$$

holds.

Let $(t_k)_{k=0}^m$ give a partition of $[a, b]$ and $(\tau_k)_{k=1}^m$ be given so that $t_{k-1} \leq \tau_k \leq t_k$ holds for each $1 \leq k \leq m$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m [\alpha(t_k) - \alpha(t_{k-1})] f(\tau_k) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha(t_k) - \alpha(t_{k-1})| |f(\tau_k)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m |f(\tau_k)| [V_\alpha(t_k) - V_\alpha(t_{k-1})], \end{aligned}$$

where (2.2) is used. By taking the limit as $\max_{1 \leq k \leq m} (t_k - t_{k-1}) \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (2.1). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For a given $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, we define $y \in \text{AC}_{\text{loc}}([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ by

$$y(t) := \int_0^t x(s) ds \quad (t \in [-r, \infty)). \quad (2.3)$$

Then we have

$$\left(\int_0^t x_s ds \right) (\theta) = \int_\theta^{t+\theta} x(s) ds = y(t+\theta) + \int_\theta^0 x(s) ds$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $\theta \in [-r, 0]$, which yields

$$L \int_0^t x_s ds = Ly_t + \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta) \left(\int_\theta^0 x(s) ds \right)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore, the local absolute continuity of (1.5) is reduced to that of $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto Ly_t \in \mathbb{K}^n$.

We fix $T > 0$ and show that $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto Ly_t \in \mathbb{K}^n$ is absolutely continuous. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. By the absolute continuity of $y|_{[-r, T]}$, one can choose a $\delta > 0$ with the

following property: for any pairwise disjoint finite open intervals $(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_m, t_m)$ in $[-r, T]$, $\sum_{j=1}^m (t_j - s_j) < \delta$ implies

$$\sum_{j=1}^m |y(t_j) - y(s_j)| < \varepsilon.$$

Let $(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_m, t_m)$ be pairwise disjoint finite open intervals in the interval $[0, T]$ with $\sum_{j=1}^m (t_j - s_j) < \delta$. From Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m |Ly_{t_j} - Ly_{s_j}| &= \sum_{j=1}^m \left| \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta) [y(t_j + \theta) - y(s_j + \theta)] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{-r}^0 |y(t_j + \theta) - y(s_j + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

where the last term is equal to $\int_{-r}^0 \sum_{j=1}^m |y(t_j + \theta) - y(s_j + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta)$. Since for each $\theta \in [-r, 0]$,

$$(s_1 + \theta, t_1 + \theta), \dots, (s_m + \theta, t_m + \theta)$$

are pairwise disjoint finite open intervals in $[-r, T]$ with

$$\sum_{j=1}^m [(t_j + \theta) - (s_j + \theta)] = \sum_{j=1}^m (t_j - s_j) < \delta,$$

an estimate

$$\sum_{j=1}^m |Ly_{t_j} - Ly_{s_j}| \leq \text{Var}(\eta) \cdot \varepsilon$$

is obtained. This shows the absolute continuity of $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto Ly_t \in \mathbb{K}^n$. \square

Remark 2.3. For a given $y \in \text{AC}_{\text{loc}}([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, the function

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto y_t \in C \tag{2.4}$$

is not necessarily locally absolutely continuous. The reason is that one cannot change the order of summation and supremum in

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \sup_{\theta \in [-r, 0]} |y(t_j + \theta) - y(s_j + \theta)|.$$

Here $(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_m, t_m)$ are pairwise disjoint finite open intervals.

Theorem 2.4. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$, the mild solution $x(\cdot; \phi): \text{dom}(\phi) \cup [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ of (1.1) under $x_0 = \phi$ is locally absolutely continuous on $[0, \infty)$.

Proof. By definition, $x := x(\cdot; \phi)$ satisfies

$$x(t) = \phi(0) + L \int_0^t x_s ds$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since the function x belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, it holds that the right-hand side of the above equation is locally absolute continuous with respect to $t \in [0, \infty)$ from Theorem 2.1. \square

2.2 Differential equations for mild solutions

We use the following notations.

Notation 3. For each $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$, we define a function $\bar{\phi}: \text{dom}(\phi) \cup [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ by

$$\bar{\phi}(t) := \begin{cases} \phi(t) & (t \in \text{dom}(\phi)) \\ \phi(0) & (t \in [0, \infty)), \end{cases}$$

which is called the *static prolongation* of ϕ .

Notation 4 ([12]). For each $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$, we define a function $G(\cdot; \phi): [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ by

$$G(t; \phi) := \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta) \left(\int_{\theta}^0 \phi(s) ds \right) + \int_{-r}^{-t} d\eta(\theta) \left(\int_0^{t+\theta} \bar{\phi}(s) ds \right) \quad (t \geq 0).$$

Since η is constant on $(-\infty, -r]$, the function $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is constant on $[r, \infty)$.

Notation 5. For each locally Riemann integrable function $h: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$, we define a function $\mathcal{V}h: [0, \infty) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{K})$ by

$$(\mathcal{V}h)(t) := \int_0^t h(s) ds \quad (t \in [0, \infty)),$$

where the integral is a Riemann integral. We call \mathcal{V} the *Volterra operator*.

In this subsection, we show the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^1$ be given. Then $x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$ is differentiable almost everywhere, and there exists a function $f(\cdot; \phi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ vanishing at $[r, \infty)$ such that (1.9)*

$$\dot{x}(t; \phi) = \int_{-t}^0 d\eta(\theta) x(t + \theta; \phi) + f(t; \phi) \quad (\text{a.e. } t \geq 0)$$

holds.

Proof. Let $x := x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$. As in [12, Section 6.2], we have

$$x(t) = \phi(0) + (d\check{\eta} * \mathcal{V}x)(t) + G(t; \phi) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Here $x \in \text{AC}_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ holds from Theorem 2.4. Furthermore,

$$d\check{\eta} * \mathcal{V}x = \mathcal{V}(d\check{\eta} * x)$$

holds from [12, Theorem 3.7], where $d\check{\eta} * x$ is a locally Riemann integrable function. Therefore, (2.5) yields that $G(\cdot; \phi) \in \text{AC}_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ holds. It also implies that $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is differentiable almost everywhere, whose derivative belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$. Thus, differentiating both sides of (2.5), we have

$$\dot{x}(t) = (d\check{\eta} * x)(t) + \dot{G}(t; \phi) \quad (\text{a.e. } t \geq 0).$$

Since $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is constant on $[r, \infty)$, (1.9) is obtained with $f(\cdot; \phi) = \dot{G}(\cdot; \phi)$. \square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = 1$ or $p = \infty$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = 1$ is obtained by combining the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5. We now give the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = \infty$. For the proof, the following proposition is used.

Proposition 2.6. *For any $x \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^\infty([-r, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$, the function (1.4)*

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \int_0^t x_s ds \in C$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous. Consequently, the function (1.5)

$$[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto L \int_0^t x_s ds \in \mathbb{K}^n$$

is also locally Lipschitz continuous.

Proof. By defining a locally Lipschitz continuous function $y: [-r, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ by (2.3), it is sufficient to show the local Lipschitz continuity of $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto y_t \in C$.

Let $T > 0$ be fixed. The Lipschitz continuity of $y|_{[-r, T]}$ yields that

$$\|y_{t_1} - y_{t_2}\| = \sup_{\theta \in [-r, 0]} |y(t_1 + \theta) - y(t_2 + \theta)| \leq \text{lip}(y|_{[-r, T]}) \cdot |t_1 - t_2|$$

holds for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$. Here $\text{lip}(y|_{[-r, T]})$ denotes the (best) Lipschitz constant of the function $y|_{[-r, T]}$. The above argument shows the local Lipschitz continuity. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = \infty$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.4, $x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous from Proposition 2.6. By combining with this property, (2.5) yields that $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is also locally Lipschitz continuous. This implies that $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is differentiable almost everywhere, whose derivative belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$. Therefore, the statements of Theorem 1.3 for $p = \infty$ are obtained with $f(\cdot; \phi) = \dot{G}(\cdot; \phi)$ as the proof of Theorem 2.5. \square

3 Proof of the main result for $1 < p < \infty$

To prove Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$, we need to show that the derivative $\dot{G}(\cdot; \phi)$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$ for any $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^p$. For this purpose, we adopt a density argument used by Delfour and Manitius [3].

3.1 Forcing term for $\phi \in C$

We use the following notation.

Notation 6 ([12]). For each $\phi \in C$, we define a function $g(\cdot; \phi): [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ by

$$g(t; \phi) := \int_{-r}^{-t} d\eta(\theta) \bar{\phi}(t + \theta) = \int_t^r d\check{\eta}(u) \bar{\phi}(t - u) \quad (t \geq 0).$$

Since η is constant on $(-\infty, -r]$, $g(\cdot; \phi)$ vanishes on $[r, \infty)$. Let $g_\phi := g(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, r]}$ for each $\phi \in C$.

The following result is obtained in [12, Lemma 6.8 and Theorem 6.12].

Theorem 3.1 ([12]). *For each $\phi \in C$, the function $g(\cdot; \phi)$ is locally Riemann integrable. Furthermore, $G(\cdot; \phi) = \mathcal{V}g(\cdot; \phi)$ holds.*

Another proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $x := x(\cdot; \phi)|_{[0, \infty)}$. Since $x(\cdot; \phi)$ coincides with the (usual) solution of (1.1) under $x_0 = \phi \in C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta)x(t+\theta; \phi) \\ &= \int_{-t}^0 d\eta(\theta)x(t+\theta) + \int_{-r}^{-t} d\eta(\theta)\bar{\phi}(t+\theta) \\ &= (d\check{\eta} * x)(t) + g(t; \phi) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. By combining the above and the continuity of $\dot{x}|_{[0, \infty)}$, the local Riemann integrability of $g(\cdot; \phi)$ is obtained. By integrating the above, we have

$$x(t) = \phi(0) + \mathcal{V}(d\check{\eta} * x)(t) + (\mathcal{V}g(\cdot; \phi))(t).$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{V}(d\check{\eta} * x) = d\check{\eta} * \mathcal{V}x$ (see [12, Theorem 3.7]), the conclusion is obtained by comparing with (2.5). \square

Eq. (3.1) and the definition of $g(\cdot; \phi)$ should be compared with [3, (2.6)].

3.2 Dependence of $g(\cdot; \phi)$ on ϕ with respect to L^p -norm

In this subsection, we investigate an integrability property of the function $g(\cdot; \phi)$ for $\phi \in C$. The following lemma will be used to obtain the integrability property.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $f: [-r, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, $\alpha: [-r, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function of bounded variation, and $g: [0, r] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Riemann integrable function. Then*

$$\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} f(t+\theta) d\alpha(\theta) \right) g(t) dt = \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^{-\theta} f(t+\theta) g(t) dt \right) d\alpha(\theta) \quad (3.2)$$

holds. Here the function

$$[0, r] \ni t \mapsto \int_{-r}^{-t} f(t+\theta) d\alpha(\theta) \in \mathbb{R} \quad (3.3)$$

is Riemann integrable, and the function

$$[-r, 0] \ni \theta \mapsto \int_0^{-\theta} f(t+\theta) g(t) dt \in \mathbb{R} \quad (3.4)$$

is continuous.

Proof. We extend the domain of definition of f to $[-r, r]$ by defining $f(t) := f(0)$ for $t \in [0, r]$. Then the extended function $f: [-r, r] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Let $G: [0, r] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz continuous function defined by

$$G(t) := \int_0^t g(s) ds \quad (t \in [0, r]).$$

Then

$$\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^0 f(t+\theta) d\alpha(\theta) \right) dG(t) = \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^r f(t+\theta) dG(t) \right) d\alpha(\theta)$$

holds by applying Theorem A.1. By the continuity of the functions

$$\begin{aligned} [0, r] \ni t &\mapsto \int_{-r}^0 f(t + \theta) d\alpha(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}, \\ [0, r] \ni t &\mapsto f(t + \theta) \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

the above equality becomes (e.g., see [12, Theorem A.20])

$$\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^0 f(t + \theta) d\alpha(\theta) \right) g(t) dt = \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^r f(t + \theta) g(t) dt \right) d\alpha(\theta).$$

Therefore, (3.2) is obtained by showing

$$\int_0^r \left(\int_{-t}^0 f(t + \theta) d\alpha(\theta) \right) g(t) dt = \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_{-\theta}^r f(t + \theta) g(t) dt \right) d\alpha(\theta). \quad (3.5)$$

We now show that the equality (3.5) holds. The left-hand side and the right-hand side of (3.5) are calculated as

$$f(0) \int_0^r [\alpha(0) - \alpha(-t)] g(t) dt, \quad f(0) \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_{-\theta}^r g(s) ds \right) d\alpha(\theta),$$

respectively. Here the integration by parts formula for Riemann–Stieltjes integrals yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_{-\theta}^r g(s) ds \right) d\alpha(\theta) &= \left[\int_{-\theta}^r g(s) ds \cdot \alpha(\theta) \right]_{-r}^0 - \int_{-r}^0 g(-\theta) \alpha(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \int_0^r g(s) [\alpha(0) - \alpha(-s)] ds. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that equality (3.5) holds. The above argument also shows the Riemann integrability of (3.3) and the continuity of (3.4). \square

The following is a key lemma for the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 3.3 (cf. [3]). *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ be given. Then for any $\phi \in C$,*

$$\|g_\phi\|_{L^p[0, r]} \leq \text{Var}(\eta) \|\phi\|_{L^p[-r, 0]}$$

holds.

Proof. From Lemma 2.2,

$$|g(t; \phi)| = \left| \int_{-r}^{-t} d\eta(\theta) \phi(t + \theta) \right| \leq \int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta)$$

holds for all $t \in [0, r]$. Therefore, we have

$$\left(\int_0^r |g(t; \phi)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} \leq \left[\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) \right)^p dt \right]^{1/p}.$$

We now show that

$$\left[\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) \right)^p dt \right]^{1/p} \leq \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} dV_\eta(\theta) \quad (3.6)$$

holds. Let I be the left-hand side of (3.6). The inequality (3.6) with $p = 1$ trivially holds from Lemma 3.2. Therefore, we only have to consider the case $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $I \neq 0$. Let

$$M(t) := \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) \right)^{p-1}$$

for each $t \in [0, r]$. Since

$$\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) = \int_{-r}^0 |\bar{\phi}(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) - |\phi(0)| \cdot [V_\eta(0) - V_\eta(-t)],$$

the left-hand side is a Riemann integrable function of $t \in [0, r]$. Therefore, the function $[0, r] \ni t \mapsto M(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is also Riemann integrable. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^p &= \int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) \right) M(t) dt \\ &= \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)| M(t) dt \right) dV_\eta(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 3.2. By applying Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)| M(t) dt &\leq \left(\int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} \cdot \left(\int_0^{-\theta} M(t)^q dt \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} \cdot \left(\int_0^r M(t)^q dt \right)^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

hold, where $q \in (1, \infty)$ is the exponent conjugate to p . Since $q = p/(p-1)$, the constant in the right-hand side is calculated as

$$\left(\int_0^r M(t)^q dt \right)^{1/q} = \left[\int_0^r \left(\int_{-r}^{-t} |\phi(t + \theta)| dV_\eta(\theta) \right)^p dt \right]^{1/q} = I^{p/q}.$$

Thus, the above argument shows

$$I^p \leq I^{p/q} \cdot \int_{-r}^0 \left(\int_0^{-\theta} |\phi(t + \theta)|^p dt \right)^{1/p} dV_\eta(\theta),$$

which yields (3.6). Since the right-hand side of (3.6) is estimated by $\text{Var}(\eta) \|\phi\|_{L^p[-r, 0]}$, the inequality is obtained. \square

Remark 3.4. Lemma 3.3 for the case of $p = 2$ has been discussed in [3, Theorem 2.1] with a different argument of the proof and with a different definition of $g(\cdot; \phi)$.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$

In this subsection, we give the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{M}^p$ be given. By showing

$$\dot{G}(\cdot; \phi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n),$$

the statements of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$ are obtained with $f(\cdot; \phi) = \dot{G}(\cdot; \phi)$ as the proof of Theorem 2.5.

Step 1: Definition of $G(\cdot; \psi)$ for $\psi \in L^p([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n)$. Since

$$G(t; \phi) = \int_{-r}^0 d\eta(\theta) \left(\int_{\theta}^0 \phi(s) ds \right) + \int_{-r}^{-t} d\eta(\theta) \left(\int_0^{t+\theta} \phi(s) ds \right)$$

holds for all $t \in [0, r]$ and $G(\cdot; \phi)$ is constant on $[r, \infty)$, one can define $G(\cdot; \psi): [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ for $\psi \in L^p := L^p([-r, 0], \mathbb{K}^n)$ in the same way. Then the definition yields that

$$|G(t; \psi)| \leq 2 \text{Var}(\eta) \|\psi\|_{L^1[-r, 0]} \quad (3.7)$$

holds for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ and all $\psi \in L^p$.

Step 2: Extension of $g(\cdot; \psi)$ for $\psi \in C$. From Lemma 3.3, $(C, \|\cdot\|_{L^p[-r, 0]}) \ni \psi \mapsto g_\psi \in L^p([0, r], \mathbb{K}^n)$ is a bounded linear operator. Since the subset C is dense in L^p , there exists a unique bounded linear operator $T: L^p \rightarrow L^p([0, r], \mathbb{K}^n)$ such that

$$T\psi = g_\psi$$

holds for all $\psi \in C$.

Step 3: Derivative of $G(\cdot; \psi)|_{[0, r]}$ for $\psi \in L^p$. For each given $\psi \in L^p$, we choose a sequence $(\psi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ in C so that $\|\psi - \psi_j\|_{L^p[-r, 0]} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then for all $t \in [0, r]$, we have

$$G(t; \psi) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} G(t; \psi_j) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t g_{\psi_j}(s) ds$$

from (3.7) and Theorem 3.1. By combining this and $\|T\psi\|_{L^p[0, r]} \leq \|T\| \|\psi\|_{L^p[-r, 0]}$ for all $\psi \in L^p$,

$$G(t; \psi) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (T\psi_j)(s) ds = \int_0^t (T\psi)(s) ds$$

is concluded.

Step 4: Conclusion. Step 3 shows $\dot{G}(\cdot; \phi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}}^p([0, \infty), \mathbb{K}^n)$. This completes the proof. \square

4 Discussion

We compare Theorem 1.3 with results obtained by Delfour and Manitius [3]. In that paper, the authors interpret the linear RFDE (1.1) under an initial condition $x_0 = \phi \in \mathcal{M}^2$ as a differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = \int_{-t}^0 d\eta(\theta) x(t + \theta) + \begin{cases} (H\phi)(-t) & (\text{a.e. } t \in [0, r]) \\ 0 & (t \in (r, \infty)). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Here $H\phi$ is an L^2 -function determined by ϕ with the density argument which appeared at the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $1 < p < \infty$. See [3, Subsection 2.1] for the detail. Theorem 1.3 reveals a connection between the differential equation (4.1) used in [3] and the mild solutions introduced in [12].

A Theorems on Riemann–Stieltjes integrals

A.1 A result on iterated Riemann–Stieltjes integrals

The following is a result on iterated Riemann–Stieltjes integrals (e.g., see [16, Theorem 15a], [10]). See also [12, Theorem 3.8] for a related result.

Theorem A.1. Let $[a, b]$, $[c, d]$ be closed and bounded intervals of \mathbb{R} , and $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $\beta: [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be functions of bounded variation. If $f: [a, b] \times [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is a continuous function, then

$$\int_c^d \left(\int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \right) d\beta(y) = \int_a^b \left(\int_c^d f(x, y) d\beta(y) \right) d\alpha(x) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

holds.

We note that the functions

$$\begin{aligned} [c, d] \ni y &\mapsto \int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{K}, \\ [a, b] \ni x &\mapsto \int_c^d f(x, y) d\beta(y) \in \mathbb{K} \end{aligned}$$

are continuous by the uniform continuity of f . Therefore, both the left-hand side and right-hand side of (A.1) make sense as Riemann–Stieltjes integrals. The proof of Theorem A.1 mentioned in [10] relies on the Stone–Weierstrass theorem (e.g., see [13, 7.32 Theorem]).

A.2 A variant of Minkowski’s integral inequality

The following is a result on a variant of Minkowski’s integral inequality. See [14, Exercise 16 of Chapter 8] for a statement in the setting of measure theory.

Theorem A.2. Let $[a, b]$, $[c, d]$ be closed and bounded intervals of \mathbb{R} , and $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\beta: [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be monotonically increasing functions. If $f: [a, b] \times [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then for any $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\left(\int_c^d \left| \int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \right|^p d\beta(y) \right)^{1/p} \leq \int_a^b \left(\int_c^d |f(x, y)|^p d\beta(y) \right)^{1/p} d\alpha(x) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

holds.

We note that the statement in the above theorem also holds when $p = 1$.

A proof of Theorem A.2. Let I be the left-hand side of (A.2). When $I = 0$, the inequality (A.2) is trivial. Therefore, we may assume $I \neq 0$. Let

$$M(y) := \left| \int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \right|^{p-1}$$

for each $y \in [c, d]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^p &= \int_c^d \left| \int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \right| M(y) d\beta(y) \\ &\leq \int_c^d \left(\int_a^b |f(x, y)| d\alpha(x) \right) M(y) d\beta(y) \\ &= \int_a^b \left(\int_c^d |f(x, y)| M(y) d\beta(y) \right) d\alpha(x) \end{aligned}$$

by applying Theorem A.1, where the monotonically increasing property of α, β and the continuity of the function

$$[a, b] \times [c, d] \ni (x, y) \mapsto |f(x, y)|M(y) \in \mathbb{R}$$

are used. By applying Hölder's inequality for Riemann–Stieltjes integrals,

$$\int_c^d |f(x, y)|M(y) d\beta(y) \leq \left(\int_c^d |f(x, y)|^p d\beta(y) \right)^{1/p} \cdot \left(\int_c^d M(y)^q d\beta(y) \right)^{1/q}$$

holds, where $q \in (1, \infty)$ is the exponent conjugate to p . Since $q = p/(p - 1)$, the constant in the right-hand side is calculated as

$$\left(\int_c^d M(y)^q d\beta(y) \right)^{1/q} = \left(\int_c^d \left| \int_a^b f(x, y) d\alpha(x) \right|^p d\beta(y) \right)^{1/q} = I^{p/q}.$$

Thus, the above argument shows

$$I^p \leq I^{p/q} \int_a^b \left(\int_c^d |f(x, y)|^p d\beta(y) \right)^{1/p} d\alpha(x),$$

which yields (A.2). □

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists Grant Number JP23K12994.

Conflict of Interest

The author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Data Availability

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

References

- [1] C. Bernier and A. Manitius, *On semigroups in $\mathbb{R}^n \times L^p$ corresponding to differential equations with delays*, Canadian J. Math. **30** (1978), 897–914. <https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1978-078-6>.
- [2] M. C. Delfour, *The largest class of hereditary systems defining a C_0 semi-group on the product space*, Canad. J. Math. **32** (1980), no. 4, 969–978. <https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1980-074-8>.
- [3] M. C. Delfour and A. Manitius, *The structural operator F and its role in the theory of retarded systems. I*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **73** (1980), no. 2, 466–490. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X\(80\)90292-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(80)90292-9).

- [4] M. C. Delfour and S. K. Mitter, *Hereditary differential systems with constant delays. I. General case*, J. Differential Equations **12** (1972), 213–235; erratum, *ibid.* **14** (1973), 397. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396\(72\)90030-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(72)90030-7).
- [5] O. Diekmann, M. Gyllenberg and H. R. Thieme, *Perturbing semigroups by solving Stieltjes renewal equations*, Differential Integral Equations **6** (1993), no. 1, 155–181. <https://doi.org/10.57262/die/1371214985>.
- [6] J. K. Hale, *A stability theorem for functional-differential equations*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **50** (1963), 942–946. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.50.5.942>.
- [7] J. K. Hale, *Theory of functional differential equations*, Second edition. Appl. Math. Sci., Vol. 3. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-9892-2>.
- [8] J. K. Hale, *History of delay equations*, in: Delay differential equations and applications, 1–28, NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., Vol. 205, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3647-7_1.
- [9] J. K. Hale and S. M. Verduyn Lunel, *Introduction to functional differential equations*, Appl. Math. Sci., Vol. 99. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4342-7>.
- [10] E. Hewitt, *Integration by parts for Stieltjes integrals*, Amer. Math. Monthly **67** (1960), 419–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00029890.1960.11989522>.
- [11] N. N. Krasovskii, *Stability of motion. Applications of Lyapunov's second method to differential systems and equations with delay*, Translated by J. L. Brenner Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif. 1963.
- [12] J. Nishiguchi, *Mild solutions, variation of constants formula, and linearized stability for delay differential equations*, Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ. **2023**, No. 32, 1–77. <https://doi.org/10.14232/ejqtde.2023.1.32>.
- [13] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, Third edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, 1976.
- [14] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, Third edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.
- [15] J. H. Shapiro, *Volterra adventures*, Student Mathematical Library, Vol. 85. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1090/stml/085>.
- [16] D. V. Widder, *The Laplace transform*, Princeton Mathematical Series, Vol. 6. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941.