

# On existence, uniqueness and numerical approximation of impulsive differential equations with adaptive state-dependent delays using equations with piecewise-constant arguments

Ferenc Hartung  
 Department of Mathematics  
 University of Pannonia  
 8201 Veszprém, P.O. Box 158, Hungary

January 6, 2026

## Abstract

In this paper we consider a class of impulsive nonlinear differential equations with adaptive state-dependent delays. We discuss the existence and uniqueness of solutions of the initial value problem using a Picard–Lindelöf type argument where we define approximate solutions with the help of equations with piecewise-constant arguments (EPCAs). Moreover, we show that the solutions of the associated EPCAs approximate the solutions of the original impulsive DDE with adaptive state-dependent delay uniformly on compact time intervals. The key assumption underlying both results is that the delayed time function is monotone, or piecewise strictly monotone.

**AMS(MOS) subject classification:** 34K43, 34K45, 65L03

**keywords:** Delay differential equation, state-dependent delay, adaptive delay, equations with piecewise-constant arguments, numerical approximation.

## 1 Introduction

State-dependent delay equations (SD-DDEs) are frequently used in mathematical models (see [24] for a survey of applications and basic theory, and, e.g., [15, 32, 37] for some recent papers). Therefore the qualitative properties of SD-DDEs is still an actively investigated research [4, 5, 13, 25, 26, 27, 30, 38]. In many applications the dependence of the delay on the state of the system is defined by an algebraic or an integral equation (see [24] for some applications). Another class of SD-DDEs is when the delay function is defined by an associated differential equation which depends on the state of the model. Such definition of a delay function is called adaptive delay. See [3, 7, 22, 24, 31, 33, 40, 41] for some applications and qualitative investigations of SD-DDEs with adaptive delay. In some models due to the sudden change in the environment such as weather, radiation, drug administration, harvesting, etc., impulsive delay differential equations are used (see, e.g., [11, 28, 35]). There are only a few papers which study SD-DDEs with impulses (see [1, 8, 12, 14, 22, 30]).

In this paper we consider a class of SD-DDEs of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t), x(t - \tau(t)), \theta), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad (1.1)$$

where the delay function is defined by the adaptive condition

$$\dot{\tau}(t) = g(t, x(t), \tau(t)), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad (1.2)$$

the impulsive conditions are

$$\Delta x(t_k) = I_k(x(t_k-)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (1.3)$$

where the associated initial condition to (1.1) is

$$x(t) = \varphi(t), \quad t \in (-\infty, 0], \quad (1.4)$$

and the initial condition associated to (1.2) is

$$\tau(0) = \lambda. \quad (1.5)$$

Here the initial delay value  $\lambda$  is a positive constant,  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_K < T$  are the impulsive moments, and  $\Delta x(t) := x(t) - x(t-)$ . We also assume that the initial function is piecewise continuous: on any finite interval the function  $\varphi$  can have only finitely many jump discontinuities, and at all such points it is right-continuous (see assumption (A4) below for details).

By a solution of the impulsive initial value problem (IIVP) (1.1)–(1.5) on the interval  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  we mean a function  $x: (-\infty, \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\tau: [0, \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $x$  is absolutely continuous on the intervals  $[t_k, t_{k+1}) \subset [0, \alpha]$  for all  $k$ ,  $x$  is right-continuous at the impulsive moments  $t_k$ , and  $\tau$  is continuous on  $[0, \alpha]$ , continuously differentiable on  $[0, \alpha]$  except at the points  $\{t_1, \dots, t_K\} \cap [0, \alpha]$ ,  $x$  is right-continuous at the impulsive moments  $t_k$ , and  $x$  and  $\tau$  satisfy (1.1)–(1.5).

The main goal of this manuscript is to investigate local existence and uniqueness of the solutions of the IIVP (1.1)–(1.5), and also the numerical approximation of the solutions. The recent paper [8] examines, among others, the existence and uniqueness of the solutions of impulsive SD-DDEs with explicitly defined delay function. The proof of the existence uses the Schauder Fixed Point Theorem and the assumption that the delayed time function is monotone increasing. We note that in [22] a variant of the IIVP (1.1)–(1.5) was studied where the formula of  $f$  and  $g$  depend on additional parameters, possibly on infinite dimensional parameters. The main goal of that paper was to study differentiability of the solution with respect to (wrt) those parameters. Therefore it was essential in [22] to assume continuous differentiability of the functions  $f$  and  $g$ . Moreover, the boundedness of the partial derivatives of  $f$  and  $g$  wrt their variables (except the time variable) was assumed, which clearly imply global Lipschitz continuity of  $f$  and  $g$ . This class of conditions was practical in the presence of the infinite dimensional parameters. But if we check the proof of the well-posedness result, Theorem 3.3 in [22], in fact, the continuous differentiability of  $f$  and  $g$  was not used, only Lipschitz continuity of  $f$  and  $g$  was needed for the proof of well-posedness. In this paper, for the class of the IIVP (1.1)–(1.5), we need only local Lipschitz continuity of the respective functions, which clearly allows larger classes of examples for the applications. Note that the assumption that the initial function  $\varphi$  is Lipschitz continuous is also standard for the uniqueness of the solutions for classes of SD-DDEs without impulses, see e.g. [10, 19]. We assume piecewise Lipschitz continuity of the initial function for the well-posedness and also for the convergence of the numerical method (see [18, 19, 23] for similar results for other classes of SD-DDEs without impulses).

In [22] it was assumed that  $g(t, u, w) \leq q < 1$  holds for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ , which guarantees that the delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is strictly monotone increasing. This property was essential in [22] in the proofs of differentiability wrt parameters. See also [3, 31] where similar condition was assumed. In Theorem 3.3 below, we assume this condition and establish existence and uniqueness when the delayed time function is monotone increasing. For convergence of our numerical approximation scheme (see Theorem 4.1 below), we require only the weaker hypothesis that the delayed time function is piecewise strictly monotone

(see Section 2 for the definition). We also present an existence and uniqueness result under this piecewise strict monotonicity assumption (see Theorem 4.3). But then we do not have any a priori lower estimate of the delayed time function. Therefore, we cannot assume that the initial interval has a predefined finite length. So we associate initial condition (1.4) to (1.1) on an infinite interval  $(-\infty, 0]$ . Of course, if a solution is defined on a finite interval, then the delayed time function is bounded below by a negative finite constant along the solution.

In [22] the Schauder Fixed Point Theorem combined with the method of steps was used to prove existence of the solution. In this manuscript we use the classical Picard–Lindelöf type method to show the existence of the IIVP. We define a numerical approximation scheme with the help of equations with piecewise-constant arguments (EPCAs). We take a sequence of approximate solutions, and show that a subsequence converges to a solution of our IIVP. A similar argument was used in [23] for a class of neutral SD-DDEs. EPCAs were first used in [16] to define a numerical approximation scheme and to prove its convergence for a class of linear delay and neutral equations with constant delays. Later, similar schemes were defined and studied in different classes of SD-DDEs [17, 18, 21, 23]. The investigation of EPCAs goes back to the works of Cooke and Wiener [9, 39], but it is still an active research area, see, e.g., [2, 6, 29].

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces some notations and preliminary results, Section 3 defines our numerical scheme and discusses the local existence and uniqueness results related to the IIVP (1.1)–(1.5). Section 4 contains the proof for the convergence of the numerical scheme, and Section 5 presents two numerical examples to illustrate the results of this manuscript.

## 2 Notations and preliminaries

We use  $\mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  to denote the sets of nonnegative integers and reals, respectively. For  $h > 0$  we use the notation  $\mathbb{N}_0 h = \{jh : j \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ . A fixed norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $|\cdot|$ . We will use the notation  $\bar{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : |u| \leq M\}$  for the closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with radius  $M$  centered at the origin.

Let  $r > 0$  be fixed, and consider a fixed finite sequence  $-r < t_{-\ell_0} < t_{-\ell_0+1} < \dots < t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k_0} < \alpha$ .  $PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$  denotes the space of piecewise continuous functions  $x : [-r, \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with discontinuity points at  $\{t_{-\ell_0}, \dots, t_{k_0}\}$ , where the left-hand limits  $x(t_k-)$  exist, and it is right-continuous, i.e.,  $x(t_k) = x(t_k+)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, k_0$ . Note that in the notation  $PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$  the dependence on the set  $\{t_{-\ell_0}, \dots, t_{k_0}\}$  of the fixed time discontinuity points is omitted for simplicity, but it always should be kept in mind. We have that  $PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$  is a Banach space with the norm  $|x|_{PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup\{|x(t)| : t \in [-r, \alpha]\}$ .

Associated to the discontinuity points we use the notations

$$t_{-\ell_0-1} = -r, \quad t_{k_0+1} = \alpha, \quad \mathcal{I}'_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}) \text{ for } k = -\ell_0 - 1, \dots, k_0 - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}'_{k_0} = [t_{k_0}, \alpha].$$

It is easy to check the following generalization of the Arzelà–Ascoli Theorem (see, e.g., [36]).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $U \subset PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then  $U$  is relatively compact if and only if*

- (i)  *$U$  is uniformly bounded, i.e., there exists a constant  $R > 0$  such that  $|x|_{PC([-r, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq R$  for  $x \in U$ ,*
- (ii)  *$U$  is quasiequicontinuous on  $[-r, \alpha]$ , i.e., for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x(t) - x(\bar{t})| \leq \varepsilon$  for  $x \in U$  and  $t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}'_k$  for  $k = -\ell_0 - 1, \dots, k_0$  and  $|t - \bar{t}| \leq \delta$ .*

Our proofs below will rely on the following estimate, which generalizes a delayed version of the Gronwall’s lemma for an impulsive integral inequality.

**Lemma 2.2** ([22], Lemma 2.3). *Let  $a_0, a_1, a_2, b, c \geq 0$ ,  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_K < T$ ,  $r > 0$  be fixed, and let  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_{K+1} = T$ . Suppose a function  $u : [-r, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is continuous on the intervals  $[t_k, t_{k+1})$  for  $k = 0, \dots, K-1$  and on  $[-r, 0]$  and  $[t_K, T]$ , has finite left-limits  $u(t_k-)$  at the points  $t_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t)| &\leq a_0, \quad t \in [-r, 0], \\ |u(t)| &\leq |u(t_k)| + a_1 + b \int_{t_k}^t \sup_{-r \leq \zeta \leq s} |u(\zeta)| ds, \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad k = 0, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\Delta u(t_k)| \leq c|u(t_k-)| + a_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Then

$$|u(t)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^K (1+c)^j (a_0 + a_1 + a_2) e^{bt}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.6)$$

An absolutely continuous function  $u : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *piecewise strictly monotone* on  $[a, b]$  if there exists a finite mesh  $a = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_{m-1} < s_m = b$  of  $[a, b]$  such that for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$  either

$$\text{ess inf}\{\dot{u}(s) : s \in [a', b']\} > 0, \quad \text{for all } [a', b'] \subset (s_i, s_{i+1})$$

or

$$\text{ess sup}\{\dot{u}(s) : s \in [a', b']\} < 0, \quad \text{for all } [a', b'] \subset (s_i, s_{i+1}).$$

This property was essential in [20] to prove differentiability of the solutions of a SD-DDE with piecewise strictly monotone delayed time function. An example was presented that in the lack of this property the differentiability result may fail.

### 3 Existence and uniqueness of solutions

Let  $T > 0$  be a finite constant. For given fixed impulsive time moments  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_K < T$ , let  $\mathcal{T} := \{t_1, \dots, t_K\}$  denote the set of the impulsive time moments.

Consider the nonlinear SD-DDE

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t), x(t - \tau(t))), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad (3.1)$$

where the delay function is defined by the adaptive condition

$$\dot{\tau}(t) = g(t, x(t), \tau(t)), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad (3.2)$$

the impulsive conditions are

$$\Delta x(t_k) = I_k(x(t_k-)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (3.3)$$

and the initial conditions are

$$x(t) = \varphi(t), \quad t \in (-\infty, 0], \quad (3.4)$$

and  $\tau(0) = \lambda$ , where  $\lambda > 0$  is a constant. For simplicity of the notations later, we extend  $\tau$  to  $(-\infty, 0)$  by a constant value, and consider the extended initial condition

$$\tau(t) = \lambda, \quad t \in (-\infty, 0]. \quad (3.5)$$

Next we list our assumptions.

- (A1) (i)  $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \supset [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is continuous,  
(ii)  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous wrt its second and third arguments, i.e., for every  $M > 0$  there exists  $L_1 = L_1(M) \geq 0$  such that

$$|f(t, u, v) - f(t, \bar{u}, \bar{v})| \leq L_1(|u - \bar{u}| + |v - \bar{v}|), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M).$$

- (A2) (i)  $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \supset [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous,  
(ii) the function  $g$  satisfies  

$$g(t, u, 0) > 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$
  
(iii)  $g$  is locally Lipschitz continuous wrt its second and third arguments, i.e., for every  $M > 0$  there exists a constant  $L_2 = L_2(M) \geq 0$  such that

$$|g(t, u, w) - g(t, \bar{u}, \bar{w})| \leq L_2(|u - \bar{u}| + |w - \bar{w}|), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u, \bar{u} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M), \quad w, \bar{w} \in [-M, M].$$

- (A3) The functions  $I_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  are globally Lipschitz continuous for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , i.e., there exists a constant  $L_3 \geq 0$  such that

$$|I_k(u) - I_k(\bar{u})| \leq L_3|u - \bar{u}|, \quad u, \bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K.$$

- (A4) (i) The initial function  $\varphi : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is locally piecewise Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists a sequence  $t_{-k}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ), where  $t_0 = 0$ , and the strictly monotone decreasing sequence  $t_{-k}$  tends to  $-\infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\varphi$  can have jump discontinuities only at the points  $t_{-k}$ ,  $\varphi$  is right-continuous at  $t_{-k}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , and for every  $M > 0$  there exists a constant  $L_4 = L_4(M) \geq 0$  such that

$$|\varphi(s) - \varphi(\bar{s})| \leq L_4|s - \bar{s}|, \quad s, \bar{s} \in [t_{-k-1}, t_{-k}) \cap [-M, 0], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

- (ii)  $\varphi$  is bounded on  $(-\infty, 0]$ , i.e., there exists  $N_\varphi \geq 0$  such that

$$|\varphi(s)| \leq N_\varphi, \quad s \in (-\infty, 0].$$

Consider the jump discontinuity points of the initial function  $t_{-k}$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ), and define  $\mathcal{T}^* = \mathcal{T} \cup \{t_{-k} : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ . To simplify the notation, we also introduce  $t_{K+1} := T$ , and we define the intervals

$$\mathcal{I}_k := [t_k, t_{k+1}) \quad \text{for } k = \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, K-1, \quad \text{and } \mathcal{I}_K := [t_K, T].$$

For a fixed stepsize  $h > 0$  we introduce the notation

$$[t]_h = \left\lceil \frac{t}{h} \right\rceil h,$$

where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  denotes the greatest integer part function. Then  $t - h < [t]_h \leq t$ , and hence

$$|[t]_h - t| \leq h, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.6)$$

The mesh points of our numerical approximation will be the points of the set  $\mathbb{N}_0 h$ .

Motivated by the numerical approximation scheme with the help of EPCAs introduced by I. Györi in [16], and later studied in [18, 21, 23] for different classes of FDEs, we consider the approximate system of impulsive delayed EPCA with an adaptive delay defined by

$$\dot{x}_h(t) = f([t]_h, x_h([t]_h), x_h([t]_h - [\tau_h([t]_h)]_h)), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.7)$$

$$\dot{\tau}_h(t) = g([t]_h, x_h([t]_h), \tau_h([t]_h)), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.8)$$

$$\Delta x_h(t_k) = I_k(x_h(t_k-)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (3.9)$$

$$x_h(t) = \varphi(t), \quad t \in (-\infty, 0], \quad (3.10)$$

$$\tau_h(t) = \lambda, \quad t \in (-\infty, 0]. \quad (3.11)$$

The function  $x_h$  has jump discontinuities at  $t_k \in \mathcal{T}$ , it is right-continuous at  $t_k$ , and  $\tau_h$  is a continuous function. At a point  $t \geq 0$  where  $[t]_h \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $[t]_h - [\tau_h([t]_h)]_h \in \mathcal{T}^*$  or for  $t \in \mathbb{N}_0 h$ , we interpret the derivatives in (3.7) and (3.8) as right-derivatives.

We define the positive constant

$$h_0 = \min\{t_{k+1} - t_k : k = 0, \dots, K\}. \quad (3.12)$$

If  $0 < h < h_0$ , then between two consecutive mesh points  $jh$  and  $(j+1)h$ , there is at most one impulsive time moment  $t_k$ , so in this paper we always assume that  $0 < h < h_0$ . First consider the following remark about the computation and the existence of solutions of (3.7)–(3.11).

**Remark 3.1.** Suppose  $t_k \leq jh < (j+1)h \leq t_{k+1}$ . Then integrating equations (3.7) and (3.8) from  $jh$  to  $t \in (jh, (j+1)h)$ , and taking the limit  $t \rightarrow (j+1)h-$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} x_h((j+1)h-) &= x_h(jh) + hf(jh, x_h(jh), x_h(jh - [\tau_h(jh)]_h)), \\ \tau_h((j+1)h) &= \tau_h(jh) + hg(jh, x_h(jh), \tau_h(jh)). \end{aligned}$$

If  $jh < t_k < (j+1)h$ , then similarly to the previous calculation, and using the impulsive condition (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_h(t_k-) &= x_h(jh) + (t_k - jh)f(jh, x_h(jh), x_h(jh - [\tau_h(jh)]_h)), \\ x_h(t_k) &= x_h(t_k-) + I_k(x_h(t_k-)), \\ x_h((j+1)h-) &= x_h(t_k) + ((j+1)h - t_k)f(jh, x_h(jh), x_h(jh - [\tau_h(jh)]_h)), \\ \tau_h((j+1)h) &= \tau_h(jh) + hg(jh, x_h(jh), \tau_h(jh)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if  $\tau_h(jh) \geq 0$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, j_0$ , then the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) has a unique solution on the interval  $(-\infty, (j_0+1)h]$ . If  $\tau_h(jh) < 0$  for some  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the relation defining  $x_h((j+1)h-)$  is no longer an explicit recursion, so the existence of  $x_h((j+1)h-)$  is not obvious.

By a solution of the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  for some  $\alpha \leq T$  we mean a pair of functions  $(x_h, \tau_h)$ , where the function  $\tau_h$  is continuous on  $[0, \alpha]$ , and it is linear between consecutive mesh points  $(\mathbb{N}_0 h \cap [0, \alpha]) \cup \{\alpha\}$ ; the function  $x_h$  is continuous on the intervals  $\mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \alpha]$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ , and it is linear between consecutive mesh points and impulsive time moments  $(\mathbb{N}_0 h \cap [0, \alpha]) \cup \{\alpha\} \cup (\mathcal{T} \cap [0, \alpha])$ ;  $x_h$  has finite left-sided limit, and it is right-continuous at each impulsive time moments  $t_k \in \mathcal{T} \cap [0, \alpha]$ ; and (3.7)–(3.11) are satisfied.

The following result will be essential in the proof of the existence and uniqueness theorem.

**Lemma 3.2.** Assume (A1)–(A4), and let  $\lambda > 0$ . Then there exist positive constants  $h^* \leq h_0$  and  $\alpha \leq T$  such that  $\alpha \notin \mathcal{T}$ , and for  $0 < h < h^*$  the IVP (3.7)–(3.11) has a unique solution  $(x_h(t), \tau_h(t))$  on  $[0, \alpha]$ . Moreover, there exist nonnegative constants  $M_1, M_2, M_3$  such that for  $0 < h < h^*$

$$\tau_h(t) > 0, \quad t \in [0, \alpha], \quad (3.13)$$

$$|x_h(t)| + \tau_h(t) < M_1, \quad t \in (-\infty, \alpha], \quad (3.14)$$

$$|x_h(t) - x_h(\bar{t})| \leq M_2|t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \alpha], \quad k = 0, \dots, K, \quad t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}_{-k} \cap [-M_1, 0], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (3.15)$$

$$|\tau_h(t) - \tau_h(\bar{t})| \leq M_3|t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in [0, \alpha], \quad (3.16)$$

*Proof.* Let  $L_3$  be the Lipschitz constant from (A3),  $N_\varphi > 0$  be the constant from (A4) (ii), and fix a constant  $M_1$  so that

$$M_1 > \left( N_\varphi + \lambda + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| + \max_{k=1, \dots, K} |I_k(0)| \right) \sum_{j=0}^K (1 + L_3)^j.$$

Consider the Lipschitz constants  $L_1 = L_1(M_1)$  and  $L_2 = L_2(M_1)$  from (A1) (ii) and (A2) (iii), respectively, and define

$$L = L_1 + L_2.$$

Fix  $0 < \alpha \leq T$  such that  $\alpha \notin \mathcal{T}$ , and

$$\left( N_\varphi + \lambda + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| + \max_{k=1, \dots, K} |I_k(0)| \right) \sum_{j=0}^K (1 + L_3)^j e^{2L\alpha} < M_1. \quad (3.17)$$

It follows from Remark 3.1 that if  $\tau_h$  takes a nonnegative value at a mesh point, then  $x_h$  and  $\tau_h$  is uniquely defined at the next mesh point, so the solution can be extended to a longer interval. Therefore, to prove that the IVP (3.7)–(3.11) has a unique solution on  $[0, \alpha]$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , it is enough to show that it generates a positive function  $\tau_h$  on  $[0, \alpha]$ .

Since we assumed that  $\tau_h(0) = \lambda > 0$ ,  $\tau_h(t)$  is positive for small  $t$ . Suppose there exists  $0 < \alpha_h^* \leq \alpha$  such that  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  exists on  $[0, \alpha_h^*]$ , and

$$\tau_h(t) > 0, \quad t \in [0, \alpha_h^*), \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_h(\alpha_h^*) = 0. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that the definitions of  $N_\varphi$  and  $M_1$  yield  $|x_h(0)| + |\tau_h(0)| \leq N_\varphi + \lambda < M_1$ , so for small  $t$  it follows  $|x_h(t)| + |\tau_h(t)| < M_1$ . We claim that

$$|x_h(t)| + |\tau_h(t)| < M_1, \quad t \in [0, \alpha_h^*]. \quad (3.19)$$

Suppose that there exists  $0 < T_h^* \leq \alpha_h^*$  such that

$$|x_h(t)| + |\tau_h(t)| < M_1, \quad t \in [0, T_h^*), \quad \text{and} \quad |x_h(T_h^*)| + |\tau_h(T_h^*)| \geq M_1. \quad (3.20)$$

Since  $x_h$  and  $\tau_h$  are continuous on  $\mathcal{I}_k$ , (3.7) and (3.8) yield for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$

$$x_h(t) = x_h(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) ds, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\tau_h(t) = \tau_h(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) ds. \quad (3.22)$$

Since (3.20) holds, we can use (A1) (ii) in the following estimate for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$

$$\begin{aligned} |x_h(t)| &\leq |x_h(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t |f([s]_h, 0, 0)| ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^t \left| f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) - f([s]_h, 0, 0) \right| ds \\ &\leq |x_h(t_k)| + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + \int_{t_k}^t L_1 \left( |x_h([s]_h)| + |x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)| \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_h(t)| &\leq |\tau_h(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t |g([s]_h, 0, 0)| ds + \int_{t_k}^t \left| g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) - g([s]_h, 0, 0) \right| ds \\ &\leq |\tau_h(t_k)| + T \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| + \int_{t_k}^t L_2 \left( |x_h([s]_h)| + |\tau_h([s]_h)| \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the two estimates and introducing the notation

$$\omega_h(t) = |x_h(t)| + |\tau_h(t)|, \quad t \in (-\infty, \alpha_h^*]$$

we get for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$

$$\omega_h(t) \leq \omega_h(t_k) + T \left( \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| \right) + \int_{t_k}^t L \left( \omega_h([s]_h) + \omega_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) \right) ds.$$

It follows from (3.20) that

$$[s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \geq -\tau_h([s]_h) \geq -M_1, \quad s \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*], \quad k = 0, \dots, K,$$

hence for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, T_h^*]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$

$$\omega_h(t) \leq \omega_h(t_k) + T \left( \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| \right) + \int_{t_k}^t 2L \max_{-M_1 \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds. \quad (3.23)$$

The continuity of  $\tau_h$ , the impulsive condition (3.9) and assumption (A3) yield for  $t_k \leq T_h^*$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \omega_h(t_k) &= \left| |x_h(t_k)| - |x_h(t_k-)| \right| \\ &\leq |\Delta x_h(t_k)| \\ &\leq |I_k(x_h(t_k-)) - I_k(0)| + |I_k(0)| \\ &\leq L_3 |x_h(t_k-)| + |I_k(0)| \\ &\leq L_3 \omega_h(t_k-) + |I_k(0)|. \end{aligned}$$

The initial conditions (3.10) and (3.11) and (A4) give

$$\omega_h(t) = |x_h(t)| + |\tau_h(t)| = |\varphi(t)| + \lambda \leq N_\varphi + \lambda, \quad t \in [-M_1, 0].$$

We apply Lemma 2.2 with  $r = M_1$ ,  $a_0 = N_\varphi + \lambda$ ,  $a_1 = T \left( \max_{s \in [0, T]} |f(s, 0, 0)| + \max_{s \in [0, T]} |g(s, 0, 0)| \right)$ ,  $a_2 = \max_{k=1, \dots, K} |I_k(0)|$ ,  $b = 2L$  and  $c = L_3$  to estimate (3.23), hence we get

$$\omega_h(t) \leq \left( N_\varphi + \lambda + T \max_{t \in [0, T]} |f(t, 0, 0)| + T \max_{t \in [0, T]} |g(t, 0, 0)| + \max_{k=1, \dots, K} |I_k(0)| \right) \sum_{j=0}^K (1 + L_3)^j e^{2LT_h^*}, \quad t \in (-\infty, T_h^*]. \quad (3.24)$$



For  $t = T_h^* \leq \alpha_h^* \leq \alpha$  relations (3.17) and (3.24) contradict to (3.20), hence such  $T_h^*$  cannot exist, i.e., relation (3.19) holds.

Note that  $t - \tau_h(t) \geq -M_1$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ . Let  $L_4 = L_4(M_1)$  be the Lipschitz constant from (A4) (i). Define the constants

$$M_2 = \max \left\{ \max \{ |f(t, u, v)| : t \in [0, T], u, v \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1) \}, L_4 \right\}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$M_3 = \max \{ |g(t, u, w)| : t \in [0, T], u \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1), w \in [0, M_1] \}. \quad (3.26)$$

Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} |x_h(t) - x_h(\bar{t})| &= \left| \int_{\bar{t}}^t f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) ds \right| \\ &\leq M_2 |t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \alpha_h^*], \quad k = 0, \dots, K, \\ |x_h(t) - x_h(\bar{t})| &= |\varphi(t) - \varphi(\bar{t})| \leq L_4 |t - \bar{t}| \leq M_2 |t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}_{-k} \cap [-M_1, 0], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ |\tau_h(t) - \tau_h(\bar{t})| &= \left| \int_{\bar{t}}^t g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) ds \right| \leq M_3 |t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in [0, \alpha_h^*]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

In view of (A2) (i) and (ii), we obtain that

$$A_0 = \min \{ g(t, u, 0) : t \in [0, T], u \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1) \} > 0.$$

The uniform continuity of  $g$  on the compact set  $[0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1) \times [0, M_1]$  yields that there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$g(t, u, w) \geq A_0/2 > 0, \quad t \in [0, T], u \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1), 0 \leq w < \delta_0. \quad (3.28)$$

Let  $j_0 h$  be the last mesh point less than  $\alpha_h^*$ . Then  $\alpha_h^* - j_0 h \leq h$ , and (3.18) yields  $\tau_h(j_0 h) > 0$ . Define  $h^* = \min \{ \delta_0/M_3, h_0 \}$ , where  $h_0$  is defined by (3.12). Using relation (3.27) and the definition of  $\alpha_h^*$  we get

$$0 < \tau_h(j_0 h) = \tau_h(j_0 h) - \tau_h(\alpha_h^*) \leq M_3(\alpha_h^* - j_0 h) \leq M_3 h < \delta_0, \quad 0 < h < h^*.$$

But then (3.28) implies

$$\dot{\tau}_h(j_0 h) = g(j_0 h, x_h(j_0 h), \tau_h(j_0 h)) > 0,$$

which contradicts to the selection of  $j_0 h$ . This contradiction means that  $\tau_h(\alpha_h^*) = 0$  cannot happen. Therefore  $\alpha_h^* = \alpha$ , and  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  exists on  $[0, \alpha]$ , moreover (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16) hold.  $\square$

For the rest of this section we use the following notation. Let  $\alpha \notin \mathcal{T}$  be defined by Lemma 3.2, and let  $k_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$  be the largest index such that  $t_{k_0} < \alpha$ ,  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  be the index such that  $-\lambda \in [t_{-\ell_0}, t_{-\ell_0+1})$ , and redefine  $t_{-\ell_0}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_{-\ell_0}$ ,  $t_{k_0+1}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}$  in the following way:

$$t_{-\ell_0} = -\lambda, \quad \mathcal{I}_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad k = -\ell_0, -\ell_0 + 1, \dots, k_0 - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad t_{k_0+1} = \alpha, \quad \mathcal{I}_{k_0} = [t_{k_0}, \alpha]. \quad (3.29)$$

Next we formulate our existence and uniqueness result. First we prove the result under a condition which implies that the delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is strictly monotone increasing. (See also Theorem 3.3 in [22] for a related statement.) For the proof of the uniqueness we apply the technique used in [8].

**Theorem 3.3.** *Assume (A1)–(A4), let  $\lambda > 0$ , and let  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $h^* > 0$ ,  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  be defined by Lemma 3.2, moreover*

$$g(t, u, w) < 1, \quad t \in [0, \alpha], \quad u \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1), \quad w \in [0, M_1]. \quad (3.30)$$

Then the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) has a unique solution  $(x, \tau)$  on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$ . Moreover,

$$\tau(t) > 0, \quad t \in [0, \alpha], \quad (3.31)$$

$$|x(t)| + \tau(t) \leq M_1, \quad t \in (-\infty, \alpha], \quad (3.32)$$

$$|x(t) - x(\bar{t})| \leq M_2|t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k = -\ell_0, \dots, k_0, \quad (3.33)$$

$$|\tau(t) - \tau(\bar{t})| \leq M_3|t - \bar{t}|, \quad t, \bar{t} \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (3.34)$$

*Proof.* Let  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  be defined by the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) for  $0 < h < h^*$ . Note that  $(x_h(t), \tau_h(t)) = (\varphi(t), \lambda)$  is independent of  $h$  on  $(-\infty, 0]$ . It follows from Lemmas 2.1, 3.2 and Arzelà–Ascoli Theorem that there exists a sequence  $h_i$  and functions  $x \in PC([-M_1, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\tau \in C([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R})$  such that  $h_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |x_{h_i} - x|_{PC([-M_1, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\tau_{h_i} - \tau|_{C([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R})} = 0. \quad (3.35)$$

Note that in the above relations the restrictions of  $x_{h_i}$  and  $\tau_{h_i}$  to  $[-M_1, \alpha]$  and  $[0, \alpha]$  are denoted simply by  $x_{h_i}$  and  $\tau_{h_i}$ , respectively. Consider equation (3.22) for  $h = h_i$ , and taking the limit  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , it is easy to check that  $x$  and  $\tau$  satisfy

$$\tau(t) = \tau(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t g(s, x(s), \tau(s)) ds, \quad t \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, k_0.$$

Then  $x$  and  $\tau$  fulfill (3.2) on  $[0, \alpha]$ . Relations (3.14) and (3.35) entail that  $|x(t)| + |\tau(t)| \leq M_1$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ , hence  $x(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1)$  and  $\tau(t) \in [0, M_1]$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ . Since  $g$  is continuous on the compact set  $[0, \alpha] \times \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_1) \times [0, M_1]$ , relation (3.30) yields

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{t \in [0, \alpha]} \frac{d}{dt}(t - \tau(t)) = 1 - \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0, \alpha]} g(t, x(t), \tau(t)) > 0,$$

i.e., the delayed time function is strictly monotone increasing on  $[0, \alpha]$ . Therefore the set

$$\mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{k=-\ell_0}^{k_0} \{s \in [0, \alpha] : s - \tau(s) = t_k\} \quad (3.36)$$

has Lebesgue measure 0. From the continuity of  $\tau$ , (3.6) and (3.35) we deduce

$$[s]_{h_i} - [\tau_{h_i}([s]_{h_i})]_{h_i} \rightarrow s - \tau(s), \quad \text{for } s \in [0, \alpha],$$

and since  $x$  has jump discontinuity only at  $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$ , we get

$$x_{h_i}([s]_{h_i}) \rightarrow x(s) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{h_i}([s]_{h_i} - [\tau_{h_i}([s]_{h_i})]_{h_i}) \rightarrow x(s - \tau(s)) \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in [0, \alpha] \quad (3.37)$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . From (3.21), using (3.6), (3.35), (3.37) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$x(t) = x(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) ds, \quad t \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, k_0.$$

Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_0\}$ . Using the uniform convergence of  $x_{h_i}$  to  $x$  on  $\mathcal{I}_{k-1}$ , we have (see, e.g., Theorem 7.11 in [34])

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{h_i}(t_k-) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow t_k-} x_{h_i}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow t_k-} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{h_i}(t) = x(t_k-).$$

Therefore the jump condition (3.9) and the continuity of  $I_k$  imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta x(t_k) &= x(t_k) - x(t_k-) \\
&= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (x_{h_i}(t_k) - x_{h_i}(t_k-)) \\
&= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} I_k(x_{h_i}(t_k-)) \\
&= I_k(x(t_k-)),
\end{aligned}$$

hence  $x$  satisfies (3.3).

Clearly,  $x$  satisfies (3.4) on  $[-M_1, 0]$ , and  $\tau(0) = \lambda$ . Using (3.4) and (3.5) we can extend the definition of  $x$  and  $\tau$  to the infinite interval  $(-\infty, 0]$ . Then  $(x, \tau)$  is a solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$ . To show (3.31) suppose there exists  $t^* \in (0, \alpha]$  such that

$$\tau(t) > 0, \quad t \in [0, t^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(t^*) = 0.$$

Then  $\dot{\tau}(t^*) \leq 0$ , but it contradicts to (A2) (ii). Therefore (3.31) holds. Since  $x_{h_i}$  and  $\tau_{h_i}$  satisfy (3.14)–(3.16), taking the limit  $i \rightarrow \infty$  yields (3.32)–(3.34).

To prove the uniqueness, let  $(x, \tau)$  be the solution obtained by the previous argument, and assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\tau})$  is an other solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  (which also satisfies (3.31) because of (A2) (ii), but does not necessarily satisfy (3.32)–(3.34)). Let  $M_1^* \geq M_1$  be such that

$$|\bar{x}(t)| + \bar{\tau}(t) \leq M_1^*, \quad t \in [0, \alpha]. \quad (3.38)$$

It follows from the monotonicity of the delayed time function that  $s - \bar{\tau}(s) \geq -\lambda$  for  $s \in [0, \alpha]$ . Let  $L_1 = L_1(M_1^*)$ ,  $L_2 = L_2(M_1^*)$  and  $L_4 = L_4(\lambda)$  be the Lipschitz constants from (A1) (ii), (A2) (iii) and (A4) (i). Let us introduce

$$\alpha_1 := \inf\{t \in [0, \alpha] : |x(t) - \bar{x}(t)| + |\tau(t) - \bar{\tau}(t)| \neq 0\}.$$

Suppose  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ . Let  $k \in \{0, \dots, k_0\}$  be such that  $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{I}_k$ , and let  $\delta_0 > 0$  be such that  $[\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta_0] \subset \mathcal{I}_k$ . Then it is easy to obtain for  $t \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta_0]$

$$\begin{aligned}
|x(t) - \bar{x}(t)| &\leq |x(t_k) - \bar{x}(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t |f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) - f(s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{x}(s - \bar{\tau}(s)))| ds \\
&= \int_{\alpha_1}^t |f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) - f(s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{x}(s - \bar{\tau}(s)))| ds \\
&\leq \int_{\alpha_1}^t L_1 \left( |x(s) - \bar{x}(s)| + |x(s - \tau(s)) - x(s - \bar{\tau}(s))| + |x(s - \bar{\tau}(s)) - \bar{x}(s - \bar{\tau}(s))| \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

The positivity of  $\tau$  and  $\bar{\tau}$  on  $[0, \alpha]$  guarantees that there exists  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that  $\tau(t) \geq \delta_1$  and  $\bar{\tau}(t) \geq \delta_1$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ . Suppose  $\alpha_1 - \tau(\alpha_1) = \alpha_1 - \bar{\tau}(\alpha_1) \in \mathcal{I}_j$  for some  $j \in \{-\ell_0, \dots, k\}$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$J := [\alpha_1 - \tau(\alpha_1), \alpha_1 - \tau(\alpha_1) + \varepsilon] \subset \mathcal{I}_j.$$

We have that both delayed time functions  $t - \tau(t)$  and  $t - \bar{\tau}(t)$  are increasing and continuous, hence there exist  $0 < \delta < \min\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$  such that

$$s - \tau(s) \in J \quad \text{and} \quad s - \bar{\tau}(s) \in J \quad \text{for } s \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta].$$

Therefore, for  $t \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta]$  we obtain  $|x(s - \bar{\tau}(s)) - \bar{x}(s - \bar{\tau}(s))| = 0$ , and

$$|x(t) - \bar{x}(t)| \leq \int_{\alpha_1}^t L_1 \left( |x(s) - \bar{x}(s)| + M_2 |\tau(s) - \bar{\tau}(s)| \right) ds.$$

Similarly, for  $t \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta]$

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(t) - \bar{\tau}(t)| &\leq |\tau(t_k) - \bar{\tau}(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t \left| g(s, x(s), \tau(s)) - g(s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{\tau}(s)) \right| ds \\ &= \int_{\alpha_1}^t \left| g(s, x(s), \tau(s)) - g(s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{\tau}(s)) \right| ds \\ &\leq \int_{\alpha_1}^t L_2 \left( |x(s) - \bar{x}(s)| + |\tau(s) - \bar{\tau}(s)| \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 &= L_1 \max\{1, M_2\} + L_2, \\ \omega(t) &= |x(t) - \bar{x}(t)| + |\tau(t) - \bar{\tau}(t)|, \quad t \in (-\infty, \alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

Then adding the previous estimates we get for  $t \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta]$

$$\omega(t) \leq \int_{\alpha_1}^t L_0 \sup_{-M_1 \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega(\zeta) ds.$$

Using  $\omega(\alpha_1) = 0$ , Gronwall's lemma implies that  $\omega(t) = 0$  for  $t \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \delta]$ , which contradicts to the definition of  $\alpha_1$ . So we obtain  $\omega(t) = 0$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ , and the uniqueness of the solution follows.  $\square$

The proofs of Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 imply immediately the following result.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\lambda > 0$ , and assume (A1)–(A4) where  $f$  and  $g$  are globally Lipschitz continuous on their domain, i.e.,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  do not depend on  $M$  in (A1) (ii) and (A2) (iii), respectively, moreover*

$$g(t, u, w) < 1, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad w \in [0, \infty).$$

*Then the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) has a unique solution  $(x, \tau)$  on  $(-\infty, T]$ , and relations (3.31)–(3.34) hold with  $\alpha = T$ .*

## 4 Numerical approximation

Now we study numerical approximation of solutions of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) with the help of EPCAs. The next theorem shows that the solutions of (3.7)–(3.11) approximate that of (3.1)–(3.5) uniformly on the compact interval  $[0, \alpha]$ . The key assumption for this result is the piecewise strict monotonicity of the delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose (A1)–(A4) hold, let  $\lambda > 0$ , and let  $0 < \alpha \leq T$  and  $h^* > 0$  be defined by Lemma 3.2. Let  $(x, \tau)$  be any solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$ , where the corresponding delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is piecewise strictly monotone on  $[0, \alpha]$ , and suppose the impulsive time moments  $t_k$  ( $k = -\ell_0, \dots, k_0$ ) are not local extreme values or extreme points of the delayed time function, and  $\dot{\tau}(0) \neq 1$  and  $\dot{\tau}(\alpha-) \neq 1$ . Let  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  be the solution of the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  for  $0 < h < h^*$ . Then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \max_{t \in [0, \alpha]} |x_h(t) - x(t)| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \max_{t \in [0, \alpha]} |\tau_h(t) - \tau(t)| = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  be defined by Lemma 3.2. We define

$$M_1^* := \max \left\{ \sup \{ |x(t)| + |\tau(t)| : t \in [0, \alpha] \}, M_1 \right\}.$$

Then  $t - \tau(t) \geq -M_1^*$  for  $t \in [0, \alpha]$ . Let  $M_2^*$  and  $M_3^*$  be defined by (3.25) and (3.26), respectively, where  $M_1$  is replaced with  $M_1^*$ , and let  $L_1 = L_1(M_1^*)$ ,  $L_2 = L_2(M_1^*)$ ,  $L_3$  and  $L_4 = L_4(M_1^*)$  be the Lipschitz constants from (A1)–(A4), respectively. Note that  $M_2^* \geq M_2$  and  $M_3^* \geq M_3$ . We use the notations defined by (3.29) with the modification that let  $\ell_0$  be the index for which  $-M_1^* \in [t_{-\ell_0}, t_{-\ell_0+1})$ , and redefine  $t_{-\ell_0} = -M_1^*$ . For  $h \in (0, h^*)$  we define the constants

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{1,h} &= \max_{k=0,\dots,k_0} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left| f([s]_h, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) - f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) \right| ds, \\ \mu_{2,h} &= \max_{k=0,\dots,k_0} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left| g([s]_h, x(s), \tau(s)) - g(s, x(s), \tau(s)) \right| ds. \end{aligned}$$

Relation (3.6), the continuity of  $f$ ,  $g$ ,  $x$  and  $\tau$  on the intervals  $\mathcal{I}_k$  and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem imply that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} (\mu_{1,h} + \mu_{2,h}) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Since  $x_h$  and  $\tau_h$  are continuous on  $\mathcal{I}_k$ , (3.7) and (3.8) yield for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, k_0$

$$x_h(t) = x_h(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) ds, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\tau_h(t) = \tau_h(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) ds. \quad (4.4)$$

Integrating (3.1) and (3.2) from  $t_k$  to  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$  we get

$$x(t) = x(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) ds, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\tau(t) = \tau(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^t g(s, x(s), \tau(s)) ds. \quad (4.6)$$

Taking the difference of (4.3) and (4.5), and using assumption (A1)(ii) and the definition of  $\mu_{1,h}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} |x_h(t) - x(t)| &\leq |x_h(t_k) - x(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t \left| f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) - f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) \right| ds \\ &\leq |x_h(t_k) - x(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t \left| f([s]_h, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) - f(s, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) \right| ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^t \left| f([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h)) - f([s]_h, x(s), x(s - \tau(s))) \right| ds \\ &\leq |x_h(t_k) - x(t_k)| + \mu_{1,h} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^t L_1 \left( |x_h([s]_h) - x(s)| + |x_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$ . We introduce further notations

$$\begin{aligned} z_h(t) &= |x_h(t) - x(t)|, & t &\in (-\infty, \alpha], \\ \eta_h(t) &= |\tau_h(t) - \tau(t)|, & t &\in (-\infty, \alpha], \\ \omega_h(t) &= z_h(t) + \eta_h(t), & t &\in (-\infty, \alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.7) combined with relations (3.6), (3.15) and (3.16) implies

$$\begin{aligned} z_h(t) &\leq z_h(t_k) + \mu_{1,h} + \int_{t_k}^t L_1 \left( |x([s]_h) - x(s)| + |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^t L_1 \left( z_h([s]_h) + z_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$ . Suppose  $t < t_k + h$ . Then

$$\int_{t_k}^t \left( |x([s]_h) - x(s)| + |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| \right) ds \leq 4M_1^* h.$$

For  $t \in (t_k + h, t_{k+1})$  we have  $[t]_h \geq t_k$ . Hence, applying the definition of  $M_1^*$ ,  $M_2^*$  and (3.6), we get

$$\int_{t_k}^t |x([s]_h) - x(s)| ds = \int_{t_k}^{t_k+h} |x([s]_h) - x(s)| ds + \int_{t_k+h}^t |x([s]_h) - x(s)| ds \leq 2M_1^* h + M_2^* h \alpha. \quad (4.9)$$

Note that (4.9) holds for all  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$ .

Fix  $t \in (t_k + h, t_{k+1})$ . Next we estimate the integral with the delayed terms

$$\int_{t_k}^t |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds.$$

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be defined by (3.36), and let  $s_0 = 0 < s_1 < \dots < s_m = \alpha$  be the points of local extrema of the delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$ , and define  $\mathcal{M} = \{s_1, \dots, s_{m-1}\}$ . Because of the assumption of the theorem,  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are disjoint sets. Let  $d_0 = \min\{s_{j+1} - s_j : j = 0, \dots, m-1\}$ , and  $0 < d_1 < d_0$  be the smallest distance between consecutive points of the set  $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup \{0, \alpha\}$ . Let us define  $\mathcal{M}^+$  and  $\mathcal{M}^-$  as the set of points  $p_j$  of  $\mathcal{M} \cup \{0\}$  for which the delayed time function is increasing and decreasing, respectively, on the intervals  $(p_j, p_{j+1})$ .

Let  $0 < \delta^* < d_1/4$ . Then the intervals  $(s_j - \delta^*, s_j + \delta^*)$  do not contain any point of  $\mathcal{U} \cap (0, \alpha)$  for all  $s_j \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{0, \alpha\}$ . Define the constants

$$\varepsilon_0 = \text{ess inf} \left\{ |1 - \dot{\tau}(s)| : s \in (s_0, s_1 - \delta^*) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-2} (s_j + \delta^*, s_{j+1} - \delta^*) \cup (s_{m-1} + \delta^*, s_m) \right\},$$

$$N_0 = \text{ess sup} \left\{ |1 - \dot{\tau}(s)| : s \in (0, \alpha) \right\}.$$

The definition of piecewise strict monotonicity, the assumption  $\dot{\tau}(0) \neq 1$  and  $\dot{\tau}(\alpha-) \neq 1$ , and (3.2) imply that  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $N_0$  are finite positive numbers. The assumed piecewise monotonicity of the delayed time function yields that  $\mathcal{U}$  has finitely many elements. Let  $u_{k,1} < u_{k,2} < \dots < u_{k,i_k}$  be the elements of  $\mathcal{U} \cap (t_k, t_{k+1})$ , moreover define  $u_{k,0} = t_k$  and  $u_{k,i_k+1} = t_{k+1}$ . Then for every  $k \in \{0, \dots, k_0\}$  and  $i \in \{0, \dots, i_k\}$  there exists  $j_{k,i} \in \{-\ell_0, \dots, k_0\}$  such that  $s - \tau(s) \in \mathcal{I}_{j_{k,i}}$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ .

It follows from (3.6) and the definition of  $M_3^*$  that

$$\begin{aligned} |([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - (s - \tau(s))| &\leq |[s]_h - s| + |[\tau_h([s]_h)]_h - \tau_h([s]_h)| + |\tau_h([s]_h) - \tau_h(s)| + |\tau_h(s) - \tau(s)| \\ &\leq Mh + \eta_h(s), \quad s \in [0, \alpha], \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where  $M = 2 + M_3^*$ .

Let  $e_0^*$  be the smallest distance between consecutive elements of the set  $\mathcal{T}^* \cup \{t_k - \tau(t_k) : k = 0, \dots, k_0\}$ ,  $e_1^*$  be the smallest distance between consecutive elements of the set  $\mathcal{T}^* \cup \{s_j - \tau(s_j) : j = 1, \dots, m-1\}$ , and we define  $\delta$  so that  $0 < \delta < \min\{\delta^*, e_0^*/(4\varepsilon_0), e_0^*/(N_0 + \varepsilon_0), e_1^*/\varepsilon_0\}$ . Then the intervals  $(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta)$  and  $(u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1})$  do not contain any element of  $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{M}$ , and the delayed time function is either monotone increasing or decreasing on these intervals.

We define the constants

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 &= \max\{i_k : k = 0, \dots, k_0\} + 1, \\ K_0 &= \frac{1 + L_2(1 + M_2^* + M_3^*)\delta}{\varepsilon_0}, \\ K_1 &= 2M_1^*n_0(2K_0 + 1) + \alpha M_2^*M, \\ K_2 &= L_1(2M_1^* + M_2^*\alpha + K_1), \\ K_3 &= L_2(2M_1^* + M_2^*\alpha + M_3^*\alpha), \\ K_4 &= \max\left\{\frac{2M_1^*}{\varepsilon_0}, 1\right\}, \\ D_h &= \mu_{1,h} + \mu_{2,h} + (K_2 + K_3)h, \\ L_0 &= \max\left\{L_1 \max\left\{1, \frac{L_2}{\varepsilon_0}\right\} + L_2, L_1M_2^*, L_1\right\}, \\ m^* &= 2(i_0 + \dots + i_{k_0}), \\ E^* &= 2^{m^*+k_0} K_4^{m^*+k_0} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k_0} (1 + L_3)^i\right)^{m^*+2k_0} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^{m^*+2k_0}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from relation (4.2) that there exists  $h_1 \in (0, h^*)$  such that

$$D_h E^* < \frac{\varepsilon_0 \delta}{2}, \quad 0 < h < h_1. \quad (4.11)$$

Let  $h_2 = \min\{h_1, \frac{\varepsilon_0 \delta}{2M}, \delta\}$  and  $h \in (0, h_2)$ . Since  $\eta_h(0) = 0$ , for small  $t$  we have  $\eta_h(t) < \frac{\varepsilon_0 \delta}{2}$ . Suppose  $0 < \beta \leq \alpha$  is such that

$$\eta_h(s) < \frac{\varepsilon_0 \delta}{2}, \quad s \in [0, \beta), \quad \eta_h(\beta) = \frac{\varepsilon_0 \delta}{2}. \quad (4.12)$$

Now we have the following observations. If the delayed time function is increasing on  $(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta)$ , then there is no  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta) \cap [0, \beta]$  such that  $[s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \geq t_{j_{k,i}+1}$ . If  $i > 0$ , then  $t_{j_{k,i}} = u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})$ . In fact, if the inequality were true, then the estimates

$$e_0^* \leq t_{j_{k,i}+1} - t_{j_{k,i}} \leq [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h - (u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})) \leq s - \tau(s) + \varepsilon_0 \delta - (u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})) \leq (N_0 + \varepsilon_0)\delta$$

would contradict the definitions of  $s$ ,  $\delta$  and  $h$ , (4.10) and (4.12). For  $i = 0$  the definition of  $e_0^*$  yields the contradiction

$$e_0^* \leq t_{j_{k,i}+1} - (t_k - \tau(t_k)) \leq [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h - (t_k - \tau(t_k)) \leq s - \tau(s) + \varepsilon_0 \delta - (t_k - \tau(t_k)) \leq (N_0 + \varepsilon_0)\delta.$$

In a similar manner we can check that if the delayed time function is decreasing on  $(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta)$ , then there is no  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta) \cap [0, \beta]$  such that  $[s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h < t_{j_{k,i}}$ . If the delayed time function is increasing on  $(u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1})$ , then there is no  $s \in (u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1}) \cap [0, \beta]$  such that  $[s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h < t_{j_{k,i}}$ . Finally, if the delayed time function is decreasing on  $(u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1})$ , then there is no  $s \in (u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1}) \cap [0, \beta]$  such that  $[s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \geq t_{j_{k,i}+1}$ .

We recall the notation that  $s - \tau(s) \in \mathcal{I}_{j_{k,i}} = [t_{j_{k,i}}, t_{j_{k,i}+1})$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ . We define the disjoint sets

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,i}^h &= \{s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta) : [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h < t_{j_{k,i}} \quad \text{or} \quad [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \geq t_{j_{k,i}+1}\}, \\ B_{k,i}^h &= \{s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1}) : [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \in \mathcal{I}_{j_{k,i}}\}, \\ C_{k,i}^h &= \{s \in (u_{k,i+1} - \delta, u_{k,i+1}) : [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h < t_{j_{k,i}} \quad \text{or} \quad [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \geq t_{j_{k,i}+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we show that

$$(u_{k,i} + \delta, u_{k,i+1} - \delta) \subset B_{k,i}^h. \quad (4.13)$$

We have four cases: (i)  $t_{j_{k,i}} = u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})$  and  $t_{j_{k,i}+1} = u_{k,i+1} - \tau(u_{k,i+1})$ ; (ii)  $t_{j_{k,i}+1} = u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})$  and  $t_{j_{k,i}} = u_{k,i+1} - \tau(u_{k,i+1})$ ; (iii)  $t_{j_{k,i}} = u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i}) = u_{k,i+1} - \tau(u_{k,i+1})$ , and  $s - \tau(s) > t_{j_{k,i}}$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ ; and (iv)  $t_{j_{k,i}+1} = u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i}) = u_{k,i+1} - \tau(u_{k,i+1})$ , and  $s - \tau(s) < t_{j_{k,i}+1}$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ . The definition of  $e_0^*$  yields that  $t_{j_{k,i}+1} - t_{j_{k,i}} \geq e_0^* > 4\varepsilon_0\delta$ .

In case (i) first suppose that the delayed time function is monotone increasing on  $(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ . The definition of  $\varepsilon_0$  yields that

$$(u_{k,i} + \delta) - \tau(u_{k,i} + \delta) - (u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})) \geq \varepsilon_0\delta,$$

hence  $s - \tau(s) > t_{j_{k,i}} + \varepsilon_0\delta$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i} + \delta, u_{k,i+1})$ . Similarly, we get that  $s - \tau(s) < t_{j_{k,i}+1} - \varepsilon_0\delta$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1} - \delta)$ . If the delayed time function is not monotone increasing, then it has local extrema between  $u_{k,i}$  and  $u_{k,i+1}$ . The definitions of  $e_1^*$  and  $\delta$  imply for any local maximum point  $s_1$  that  $s_1 - \tau(s_1) \leq t_{j_{k,i}+1} - e_1^* < t_{j_{k,i}+1} - \varepsilon_0\delta$ , and for any local minimum point  $s_2$ , it follows  $s_2 - \tau(s_2) > t_{j_{k,i}} + \varepsilon_0\delta$ . Therefore, in both cases, we have  $t_{j_{k,i}} + \varepsilon_0\delta < s - \tau(s) < t_{j_{k,i}+1} - \varepsilon_0\delta$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i} + \delta, u_{k,i+1} - \delta)$ . Then for  $s \in (u_{k,i} + \delta, u_{k,i+1} - \delta) \cap [0, \beta]$  it follows from (4.10), (4.12) and the above estimates that

$$t_{j_{k,i}} < s - \tau(s) - \varepsilon_0\delta \leq [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \leq s - \tau(s) + \varepsilon_0\delta < t_{j_{k,i}+1},$$

which proves (4.13) in case (i). In case (ii) the proof of relation (4.13) is similar.

In case (iii) the delayed time function has a maximal value at a point  $s^* \in (u_{k,i}, u_{k,i+1})$ . The definitions of  $e_1^*$  and  $\delta$  imply that  $t_{j_{k,i}+1} - \varepsilon_0\delta > t_{j_{k,i}+1} - e_1^* \geq s^* - \tau(s^*)$ . Then, as in case (i), it is easy to obtain that  $s - \tau(s) > t_{j_{k,i}} + \varepsilon_0\delta$  for  $s \in (u_{k,i} + \delta, u_{k,i+1} - \delta)$ , and hence for such  $s$  we get

$$t_{j_{k,i}} < s - \tau(s) - \varepsilon_0\delta \leq [s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h \leq s - \tau(s) + \varepsilon_0\delta \leq s^* - \tau(s^*) + \varepsilon_0\delta < t_{j_{k,i}+1}.$$

This proves (4.13) in case (iii). The proof of (4.13) for case (iv) is similar.

Next we estimate the Lebesgue measure of  $A_{k,i}^h$ . Let  $v_{k,i}^h$  be the largest element of  $A_{k,i}^h \cap [t_k, t] \cap \mathbb{N}_0 h$ . Then  $A_{k,i}^h \cap [t_k, t] \subset (u_{k,i}, v_{k,i}^h + h)$ . We have two cases: either (i)  $u_{k,i} \in (s_j + \delta, s_{j+1} - \delta)$  for some  $s_j \in \mathcal{M}^+$ , or (ii)  $u_{k,i} \in (s_j + \delta, s_{j+1} - \delta)$  for some  $s_j \in \mathcal{M}^-$ . In case (i) the definition of  $A_{k,i}^h$  implies

$$v_{k,i}^h - \tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) \leq v_{k,i}^h - [\tau_h(v_{k,i}^h)]_h < t_{j_{k,i}} \leq u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i}),$$

therefore we obtain from the definition of  $\varepsilon_0$  and the monotonicity of the delayed time function that

$$\varepsilon_0(v_{k,i}^h - u_{k,i}) \leq v_{k,i}^h - \tau(v_{k,i}^h) - (u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})) < \tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) - \tau(v_{k,i}^h).$$

In case (ii) the delayed time function is decreasing on  $(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta)$ , and

$$v_{k,i}^h - (\tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) - h) > v_{k,i}^h - [\tau_h(v_{k,i}^h)]_h \geq t_{j_{k,i}+1} \geq u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i}),$$



we get

$$-\varepsilon_0(v_{k,i}^h - u_{k,i}) \geq v_{k,i}^h - \tau(v_{k,i}^h) - (u_{k,i} - \tau(u_{k,i})) > \tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) - \tau(v_{k,i}^h) - h.$$

Therefore in both cases the Lebesgue measure of  $A_{k,i}^h$  can be estimated as

$$m\left(A_{k,i}^h \cap [t_k, t]\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} |\tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) - \tau(v_{k,i}^h)| + \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} + 1\right) h, \quad i = 0, \dots, i_{k,t}. \quad (4.14)$$

Using that  $\tau_h$  and  $\tau$  are absolutely continuous, we get from (3.2) and (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_h(v_{k,i}^h) - \tau(v_{k,i}^h)| &= \left| \tau_h(u_{k,i}^h) - \tau(u_{k,i}^h) + \int_{u_{k,i}^h}^{v_{k,i}^h} \left( g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h) - g(s, x(s), \tau(s))) \right) ds \right| \\ &\leq |\tau_h(u_{k,i}^h) - \tau(u_{k,i}^h)| + \int_{u_{k,i}^h}^{v_{k,i}^h} L_2 \left( h + |x_h([s]_h) - x([s]_h)| + |x([s]_h) - x(s)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\tau_h([s]_h) - \tau([s]_h)| + |\tau([s]_h) - \tau(s)| \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $i_{k,t}$  be the largest index such that  $u_{k,i_{k,t}} < t$ , and  $\bar{i}_{k,t}$  be the largest index so that  $u_{k,\bar{i}_{k,t}+1} - \delta < t$ . Since  $x$  and  $\tau$  are Lipschitz continuous on  $[u_{k,i}, u_{k,i} + \delta]$ , we get for  $i = 0, \dots, i_{k,t}$  that

$$\eta_h(v_{k,i}^h) \leq \eta_h(u_{k,i}^h) + L_2(1 + M_2^* + M_3^*)\delta h + \int_{u_{k,i}^h}^{\min\{u_{k,i}^h + \delta, t\}} L_2 \omega_h([s]_h) ds.$$

Hence, combining it with (4.14) yields

$$m\left(A_{k,i}^h \cap [t_k, t]\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \eta_h(u_{k,i}^h) + (K_0 + 1)h + \frac{L_2}{\varepsilon_0} \int_{u_{k,i}^h}^{\min\{u_{k,i}^h + \delta, t\}} \omega_h([s]_h) ds, \quad i = 0, \dots, i_{k,t}. \quad (4.15)$$

In a similar way we can show that

$$m\left(C_{k,i}^h \cap [t_k, t]\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \eta_h(u_{k,i+1}^h - \delta) + K_0 h + \frac{L_2}{\varepsilon_0} \int_{u_{k,i+1}^h - \delta}^{\min\{u_{k,i+1}^h, t\}} \omega_h([s]_h) ds, \quad i = 0, \dots, \bar{i}_{k,t}. \quad (4.16)$$

Now we are ready to estimate the integral with the delayed terms. On the set  $B_{k,i}^h$  we can use Lipschitz continuity of  $x$  with Lipschitz constant  $M_2^*$  and estimate (4.10), and on the sets  $A_{k,i}^h$  and  $C_{k,i}^h$  we use estimates

(4.15) and (4.16), hence for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \beta]$  we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_k}^t |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} \int_{A_{k,i}^h} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \int_{A_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} \int_{B_{k,i}^h} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \int_{B_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} \int_{C_{k,i}^h} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \int_{C_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)} |x([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) - x(s - \tau(s))| ds \\
&\leq 2M_1^* \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} m(A_{k,i}^h) + 2M_1^* m(A_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)) + \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} M_2^* \int_{B_{k,i}^h} (Mh + \eta_h(s)) ds \\
&\quad + M_2^* \int_{B_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)} (Mh + \eta_h(s)) ds + 2M_1^* \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}-1} m(C_{k,i}^h) + 2M_1^* m(C_{k,i_{k,t}}^h \cap [u_{k,i_{k,t}}^h, t)) \\
&\leq K_4 \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}} \eta_h(u_{k,i}^h) + K_4 \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{i}_{k,t}} \eta_h(u_{k,i+1}^h - \delta) + K_1 h + \frac{L_2}{\varepsilon_0} \int_{t_k}^t \omega_h([s]_h) ds + M_2^* \int_{t_k}^t \eta_h(s) ds. \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $K_1 \geq 2M_1^*$ , (4.17) holds for  $t \in (t_k, t_k + h)$  too.

We introduce the simplifying notations  $w_{k,2i}^h = u_{k,i}^h$  and  $w_{k,2i+1}^h = u_{k,i+1}^h - \delta$  for  $i = 0, \dots, i_k$ ,  $w_{k,2i_k+2}^h = u_{i_k+1} = t_{k+1}$ , and let  $i_{k,t}^*$  be the largest index such that  $w_{k,i_{k,t}^*}^h < t$ . Then

$$t_k = w_{k,0}^h < w_{k,1}^h < \dots < w_{k,i_{k,t}^*}^h < t < t_{k+1}.$$

We comment that  $z_h$ ,  $\eta_h$  and  $\omega_h$  are continuous at the points  $w_{k,1}^h, \dots, w_{k,i_{k,t}^*}^h$ .

Combining (4.8), (4.9) and (4.17), we get for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \beta]$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, k_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
z_h(t) &\leq z_h(t_k) + \mu_{1,h} + K_2 h + K_4 \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}^*} \eta_h(w_{k,i}^h) \\
&\quad + \int_{t_k}^t L_1 \left( z_h([s]_h) + z_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) + \frac{L_2}{\varepsilon_0} \omega_h([s]_h) + M_2^* \eta_h(s) \right) ds. \tag{4.18}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, taking the difference of (4.4) and (4.6), and using assumption (A2)(iii), and the definition of

$\mu_{2,h}$ , we get for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tau_h(t) - \tau(t)| &\leq |\tau_h(t_k) - \tau(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t |g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) - g(s, x(s), \tau(s))| ds \\
&\leq |\tau_h(t_k) - \tau(t_k)| + \int_{t_k}^t |g([s]_h, x(s), \tau(s)) - g(s, x(s), \tau(s))| ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_k}^t |g([s]_h, x_h([s]_h), \tau_h([s]_h)) - g([s]_h, x(s), \tau(s))| ds \\
&\leq |\tau_h(t_k) - \tau(t_k)| + \mu_{2,h} + \int_{t_k}^t L_2 \left( |x_h([s]_h) - x([s]_h)| + |x([s]_h) - x(s)| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\tau_h([s]_h) - \tau([s]_h)| + |\tau([s]_h) - \tau(s)| \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the definitions of  $z_h$  and  $\eta_h$  and relations (3.6), (3.15), (3.16) and (4.9), we get for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$

$$\eta_h(t) \leq \eta_h(t_k) + \mu_{2,h} + K_3 h + \int_{t_k}^t L_2 \left( z_h([s]_h) + \eta_h([s]_h) \right) ds, \quad t \in \mathcal{I}_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, k_0. \quad (4.19)$$

Adding (4.18) and (4.19) and using the definitions of  $\omega_h$ ,  $D_h$  and  $L_0$ , we get for  $t \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap [0, \beta]$  and  $k = 0, \dots, k_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_h(t) &\leq \omega_h(t_k) + D_h + K_4 \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}^*} \eta_h(w_{k,i}^h) + \int_{t_k}^t L_0 \left( \omega_h([s]_h) + \omega_h(s) + \omega_h([s]_h - [\tau_h([s]_h)]_h) \right) ds \\
&\leq \omega_h(t_k) + D_h + K_4 \sum_{i=0}^{i_{k,t}^*} \omega_h(w_{k,i}^h) + \int_{t_k}^t 3L_0 \sup_{-M_1^* \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

The continuity of  $\tau_h$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\eta_h$ , the impulsive conditions (3.3) and (3.9) and assumption (A3) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta \omega_h(t_k)| &= |\Delta z_h(t_k)| \\
&= \left| |x_h(t_k) - x(t_k)| - |x_h(t_k-) - x(t_k-)| \right| \\
&\leq |\Delta x_h(t_k) - \Delta x(t_k)| \\
&= |I_k(x_h(t_k-)) - I_k(x(t_k-))| \\
&\leq L_3 |x_h(t_k-) - x(t_k-)| \\
&\leq L_3 \omega_h(t_k-).
\end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

The initial conditions (3.4) and (3.10) give

$$\omega_h(t) = |x_h(t) - x(t)| + |\tau_h(t) - \tau(t)| = 0, \quad t \in (-\infty, 0].$$

Suppose  $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{k^*}$ , and  $i^*$  be the largest index such that  $w_{k^*,i^*}^h < \beta$ . We consider the consecutive intervals

$$[t_0, w_{0,1}^h), [w_{0,1}^h, w_{0,2}^h), \dots, [w_{0,2i_0+1}^h, t_1), [t_1, w_{1,1}^h), \dots, [w_{1,2i_1+1}^h, t_2), \dots, [t_{k^*}, w_{k^*,1}^h), \dots, [w_{k^*,i^*}^h, \beta].$$

We apply inequality (4.20) successively on the above intervals. Since  $\omega_h(t_0) = 0$ , on the interval  $[t_0, w_{0,1}^h)$  inequality (4.20) reduces to

$$\omega_h(t) \leq \omega_h(t_0) + D_h + \int_{t_0}^t 3L_0 \sup_{-M_1 \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds, \quad t \in [t_0, w_{0,1}^h). \quad (4.22)$$

Then inequality (4.22) and Lemma 2.2 with  $r = M_1^*$ ,  $a_0 = 0$ ,  $a_1 = D_h$ ,  $a_2 = 0$ ,  $b = 3L_0$ ,  $c = L_3$ ,  $K = 0$  and  $T = w_{0,1}^h$ , and  $w_{k,j}^h \leq \alpha$  and the continuity of  $\omega_h$  at  $w_{0,1}^h$  yield

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h e^{3L_0\alpha}, \quad t \in [0, w_{0,1}^h], \quad h \in (0, h_2). \quad (4.23)$$

Suppose

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h E_k 2^{j-1} K_4^{j-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{j-1} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^j, \quad t \in [0, w_{k,j}^h], \quad h \in (0, h_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 &= 0, & m_k &= 2i_0 + \dots + 2i_{k-1}, & k &= 1, \dots, k_0, \\ E_0 &= 1, & E_k &= 2^{m_k+k} K_4^{m_k+k} \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{m_k-2i_0+2k} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^{m_k+2k}, & k &= 1, \dots, k_0, \end{aligned}$$

and consider the next interval  $[w_{k,j}^h, w_{k,j+1}^h]$ . Then (4.20), the continuity of  $\omega_h$  at  $w_{k,i}^h$  for  $i < 2i_k + 2$  and  $K_4 \geq 1$  imply the following very rough estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_h(t) &\leq \omega_h(t_k) + D_h + K_4 \sum_{i=0}^j D_h E_k 2^{i-1} K_4^{i-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{i-1} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^i + \int_{t_k}^t 3L_0 \sup_{-M_1^* \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds \\ &\leq \omega_h(t_k) + D_h E_k \left( 1 + \sum_{i=0}^j 2^{i-1} \right) K_4^j \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{j-1} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^j + \int_{t_k}^t 3L_0 \sup_{-M_1^* \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds \\ &\leq \omega_h(t_k) + D_h E_k 2^j K_4^j \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{j-1} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^j + \int_{t_k}^t 3L_0 \sup_{-M_1^* \leq \zeta \leq s} \omega_h(\zeta) ds, \quad t \in [t_k, w_{k,j+1}^h]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Then inequality (4.24) and Lemma 2.2 with  $r = M_1^*$ ,  $a_0 = 0$ ,  $a_1 = D_h E_k 2^j K_4^j \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^{j-1} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^j$ ,  $a_2 = 0$ ,  $b = 3L_0$ ,  $c = L_3$ ,  $K = k$  and  $T = v_{k,j+1}^h$  yield

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h E_k 2^j K_4^j \left( \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i \right)^j (e^{3L_0\alpha})^{j+1}, \quad t \in [0, v_{k,j+1}^h], \quad h \in (0, h_2). \quad (4.25)$$

Then, applying (4.21),  $1 + L_3 \leq \sum_{i=0}^k (1+L_3)^i$ , (4.25) and the definition of  $E_{k+1}$ , we get

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h E_{k+1}, \quad t \in [0, t_{k+1}], \quad h \in (0, h_2), \quad k = 0, \dots, k^* - 1,$$

and (4.25) holds with  $k = k^*$  and  $j = j^*$ . But then

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h E_{k^*} 2^{j^*} K_4^{j^*} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k^*} (1+L_3)^i \right)^{j^*} (e^{3L_0\alpha})^{j^*+1} \leq D_h E^*, \quad t \in [0, \beta], \quad h \in (0, h_2),$$

which contradicts to (4.11) and (4.12). Therefore  $\beta = \alpha$ , and

$$\omega_h(t) \leq D_h E^*, \quad t \in [0, \alpha], \quad h \in (0, h_2) \quad (4.26)$$

holds. The definition of  $D_h$  and relations (4.2) and (4.26) prove the limit relations (4.1).  $\square$

The definition of  $D_h$  and (4.26) immediately have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Assume that  $T > 0$  is finite,  $\lambda > 0$ , (A1)–(A4) hold, let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $h^* > 0$  be defined by Lemma 3.2. Let  $(x, \tau)$  be any solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$ , where the corresponding delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is piecewise strictly monotone on  $[0, \alpha]$ , and suppose the impulsive time moments  $t_k$  ( $k = -\ell_0, \dots, k_0$ ) are not local extreme values or extreme points of the delayed time function, and  $\dot{\tau}(0) \neq 1$  and  $\dot{\tau}(\alpha-) \neq 1$ . Let  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  be the solution of the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  for  $0 < h < h^*$ . Then there exist real constants  $N > 0$  and  $h_1 \in (0, h^*)$  such that*

$$|x_h(t) - x(t)| \leq Nh \quad \text{and} \quad |\tau_h(t) - \tau(t)| \leq Nh, \quad t \in [0, \alpha], \quad h \in (0, h_1). \quad (4.27)$$

Next we formulate the following version of the existence and uniqueness result for the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) for a case when the delayed time function is piecewise strictly monotone.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Assume (A1)–(A4), let  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $h^* > 0$  be defined by Lemma 3.2, and  $(x_h, \tau_h)$  be the solution of the IIVP (3.7)–(3.11) on  $(-\infty, \alpha]$  for  $0 < h < h^*$ . Suppose further that there exists a positive sequence  $h_i$  tending to 0 such that*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |x_{h_i} - x|_{PC([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\tau_{h_i} - \tau|_{C([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R})} = 0$$

*for some functions  $x \in PC([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\tau \in C([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R})$ . Suppose that the corresponding delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is piecewise strictly monotone on  $[0, \alpha]$ , and the impulsive time moments  $t_k$  ( $k = -\ell_0, \dots, k_0$ ) are not local extreme values or extreme points of the delayed time function, and  $\dot{\tau}(0) \neq 1$  and  $\dot{\tau}(\alpha-) \neq 1$ . Then  $(x, \tau)$  is the unique solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) on  $[0, \alpha]$  which satisfies (3.31)–(3.34) with some nonnegative constants  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  and  $M_3$ .*

*Proof.* The proof that  $(x, \tau)$  is a solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5) which satisfies (3.31)–(3.34) follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem 3.3. The key observation is that if the delayed time function  $t - \tau(t)$  is piecewise strictly monotone, then the set  $\mathcal{U}$  defined by (3.36) has Lebesgue measure 0, consequently, relation (3.37) holds. The rest of the argument is identical to that used in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

For the proof of the uniqueness, assume that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\tau})$  is also a solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5). Theorem 4.1 yields that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |x_{h_i} - \bar{x}|_{PC([-M_1, \alpha], \mathbb{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\tau_{h_i} - \bar{\tau}|_{C([0, \alpha], \mathbb{R})} = 0,$$

which implies that  $(x, \tau) = (\bar{x}, \bar{\tau})$ , i.e.,  $(x, \tau)$  is the unique solution of the IIVP (3.1)–(3.5).  $\square$

## 5 Numerical examples

In this section we present two examples to illustrate the convergence of the numerical scheme (3.7)–(3.11).

**Example 5.1.** Consider the initial value problem (IVP)

$$\dot{x}(t) = -\left(x(t - \tau(t)) - 1\right) \exp\left(-0.3(x(t) - 1) \sin 5t - 2\right), \quad t \in [0, 4], \quad (5.1)$$

$$\dot{\tau}(t) = 2 - \tau(t) + 1.5(x(t) - 1) \cos 5t, \quad t \in [0, 4], \quad (5.2)$$

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} e^{-t} + 1, & t \in (-3, 0], \\ e^3 + 1, & t \in (-\infty, -3], \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

$$\tau(t) = 2, \quad t \in (-\infty, 0]. \quad (5.4)$$

Here we do not have an impulsive condition associated to the IVP.

Clearly, conditions (A1) (i)–(ii), (A2) (i), (iii), (A3) and (A4) (i), (ii) are satisfied. For condition (A2) (ii) consider

$$2 + 1.5(u - 1) \cos 5t.$$

Unfortunately, it is not positive for all  $(t, u) \in [0, 4] \times \mathbb{R}$ . But define the function

$$g(t, u, w) = \begin{cases} 2 - w - 1.5 \cos 5t, & u < 0, w \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 2 - w + 1.5(u - 1) \cos 5t, & u \in [0, 2.3], w \in \mathbb{R}, \\ 2 - w + 1.95 \cos 5t, & u > 2.3, w \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

Note that  $0 < \varphi(0) < 2.3$ . If we replace (5.2) with  $\dot{\tau}(t) = g(t, x(t), \tau(t))$ , then all conditions (A1)–(A4) are satisfied, so the corresponding IVP has a unique solution, and until  $x(t) \in [0, 2.3]$ , the solution coincides with that of the IVP (5.1)–(5.4).

It can be checked that the exact solution of the IVP (5.1)–(5.4) is

$$x(t) = e^{-t} + 1, \quad \tau(t) = 0.3e^{-t} \sin 5t + 2.$$

Note that the delayed argument function  $t - \tau(t)$  is not monotone increasing in this IVP. We use our numerical approximation scheme to approximate the solution. In the next table we show the numerical values and the corresponding errors for  $h = 0.1, 0.01$  and  $0.001$ . We observe convergence of the approximate solution to the exact solution, and it looks that the order of convergence is linear. In Figure 1 we plotted the exact and the approximate solution corresponding to  $h = 0.05$ .

$h = 0.1$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	10	1.32583334	1.91672237	4.205e-02	2.255e-02
2.0	20	1.08942499	2.00168457	4.591e-02	2.377e-02
3.0	30	1.00646891	2.00745845	4.332e-02	2.254e-03
4.0	40	0.97979564	1.99518831	3.852e-02	9.828e-03
$h = 0.01$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	100	1.36446215	1.89606294	3.417e-03	1.893e-03
2.0	200	1.13159363	1.98032187	3.742e-03	2.409e-03
3.0	300	1.04629895	2.00991036	3.488e-03	1.976e-04
4.0	400	1.01527840	2.00427610	3.037e-03	7.403e-04
$h = 0.001$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	1000	1.36753037	1.89435808	3.491e-04	1.886e-04
2.0	2000	1.13496055	1.97815354	3.747e-04	2.411e-04
3.0	3000	1.04943371	2.00973378	3.534e-04	2.101e-05
4.0	4000	1.01801021	2.00494219	3.054e-04	7.416e-05

Table 1: Approximate solution of the IVP (5.1)–(5.4).  $s_i = ih$ ,  $e_x(s_i) = |x_h(s_i) - x(s_i)|$  and  $e_\tau(s_i) = |\tau_h(s_i) - \tau(s_i)|$




Figure 1: Exact and approximate solution of the IVP (5.1)–(5.4),  $h = 0.05$

**Example 5.2.** Consider the IIVP

$$\dot{x}(t) = -\frac{1}{5}x(t - \tau(t)), \quad t \in [0, 5], \quad (5.5)$$

$$\dot{\tau}(t) = 1 + \frac{1}{4}x(t) - \frac{1}{2}\tau(t), \quad t \in [0, 5], \quad (5.6)$$

$$\Delta x\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) = 2, \quad \Delta x\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) = -\frac{3}{4}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$x(t) = 1, \quad t \in [-3, 0], \quad (5.8)$$

$$\tau(t) = 2, \quad t \in [-3, 0]. \quad (5.9)$$

In the region  $u > -4$  condition  $g(t, u, 0) > 0$  is satisfied, so similarly to the argument used in Example 5.1, Theorem 3.3 yields that the IIVP (5.5)–(5.9) has a unique solution on  $[0, \alpha]$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ .

Initially  $t - \tau(t)$  is negative, so  $x(t - \tau(t)) = 1$ . Hence integrating (5.5) and using  $x(0) = 1$  we get  $x(t) = -\frac{1}{5}t + 1$ . If we substitute this formula to (5.6), we can solve the corresponding ODE with the initial condition  $\tau(0) = 2$ , and we get  $\tau(t) = \frac{27}{10} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{7}{10}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}$ . We can check that  $t - \tau(t) < 0$  for  $t \in [0, 3/4]$ , hence this is the solution of the IIVP on  $[0, 3/4]$ .

Using the first impulsive condition of (5.7) we get  $x(t) = -\frac{1}{5}t + 3$  for  $t \geq 3/4$  but close to  $3/4$ . Then we can solve (5.6) using the initial condition  $\tau(3/4) = \frac{21}{8} - \frac{7}{10}e^{-3/8}$ , hence we get  $\tau(t) = \frac{37}{10} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{1}{10}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \cdot (10e^{3/8} + 7)$ . We have  $t - \tau(t) < 0$  for  $t \in [3/4, 3/2]$ , so this is the solution on this interval.

At  $t = \frac{3}{2}$  we use the second impulsive condition of (5.7), so we have  $x(t) = -\frac{1}{5}t + \frac{9}{4}$  for  $t \geq 3/2$  close to  $3/2$ . Then solving the corresponding (5.6) with the initial condition  $\tau(3/2) = \frac{71}{20} - e^{-3/8} - \frac{7}{10}e^{-3/4}$  we get  $\tau(t) = \frac{133}{40} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{1}{40}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}(-15e^{3/4} + 40e^{3/8} + 28)$ . We can check that  $t - \tau(t) < 0$  for  $t \in [3/2, T_1)$  and  $T_1 - \tau(T_1) = 0$  with  $T_1 = 2.702320978$ . Therefore we get  $(x(T_1), \tau(T_1)) = (2.459535804, 2.871755310)$ .

Hence for  $t > T_1$  but close to  $T_1$  we have  $x(t) = -\frac{1}{5}t + 1$ . Using this relation (5.5) and (5.6) are simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= \frac{1}{25} - \frac{1}{25}\tau(t) - \frac{1}{5}, \\ \dot{\tau}(t) &= 1 + \frac{1}{4}x(t) - \frac{1}{5}\tau(t). \end{aligned}$$

We solved this system of ODEs with the initial condition  $(x(T_1), \tau(T_1)) = (2.459535804, 2.871755310)$  using Maple to get the formula of the solution on the next interval:  $x(t) = -110.0000000 - 0.1490476191 \cdot$

$\exp(-0.4791287848t) + 112.5160738 \cdot \exp(-0.02087121525t) + 2.000000001t$  and  $\tau(t) = -55.00000002 + 58.70867993 \cdot \exp(-0.02087121525t) - 1.785325143 \cdot \exp(-0.4791287848t) + 1.000000001t$ . We get that  $0 \leq t - \tau(t) < \frac{3}{4}$  for  $t \in [T_1, T_2]$  and  $T_2 - \tau(T_2) = \frac{3}{4}$  for  $T_2 = 3.488254843$ . Then we have the solution of the IVP (5.5)–(5.9) on  $[T_1, T_2]$ . In a similar way we can solve the IVP on a next interval. We can obtain that the exact solution of the IVP (5.5)–(5.9) has the formula

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{5}t + 1, & t \in [0, 0.75), \\ -\frac{1}{5}t + 3, & t \in [0.75, 1.5), \\ -\frac{1}{5}t + \frac{9}{4}, & t \in [1.5, 2.702320978), \\ -110.0000000 - 0.1490476191e^{-0.4791287848t} + 112.5160738e^{-0.02087121525t} \\ \quad + 2.000000001t, & t \in [2.702320978, 3.488254843), \\ -130.0000000 - 0.3512993334e^{-0.4791287848t} + 134.0673650e^{-0.02087121525t} \\ \quad + 2.000000001t, & t \in [3.488254843, 4.218920247), \\ -122.5000000 - 0.2436621429e^{-0.4791287848t} + 125.8614408e^{-0.02087121525t} \\ \quad + 2.000000001t, & t \in [4.218920247, 5], \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tau(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{27}{10} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{7}{10}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}, & t \in [0, 0.75), \\ \frac{37}{10} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{1}{10}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \cdot (10e^{3/8} + 7), & t \in [0.75, 1.5), \\ \frac{133}{40} - \frac{1}{10}t - \frac{1}{40}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t}(-15e^{3/4} + 40e^{3/8} + 28), & t \in [1.5, 2.702320978), \\ -55.00000002 + 58.70867993e^{-0.02087121525t} - 1.785325143e^{-0.4791287848t} \\ \quad + 1.000000001t, & t \in [2.702320978, 3.488254843), \\ -65.00000002 + 69.95372081e^{-0.02087121525t} - 4.207940644e^{-0.4791287848t} \\ \quad + 1.000000001t, & t \in [3.488254843, 4.218920247), \\ -61.25000002 + 65.67203060e^{-0.02087121525t} - 2.918638192e^{-0.4791287848t} \\ \quad + 1.000000001t, & t \in [4.218920247, 5]. \end{cases}$$

Table 2 below contains the approximate solutions of the IVP (5.5)–(5.9) for  $h = 0.1, 0.01$  and  $0.001$ . Since the exact solution  $x(t)$  is linear on  $[0, 3/4]$ ,  $[3/4, 3/2]$  and on  $[3/2, T_1]$ , the approximate solution (3.7)–(3.11) gives back the exact solution. In the next table we observe rounding error only due to the calculations. But for  $t > T_1$  and for the  $\tau$  component we see that if the stepsize  $h$  decreases, the error decreases too. Figure 2 shows the numerical solution for  $h = 0.1$ . Even for this relatively big stepsize the approximation is good.



$h = 0.1$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	10	2.80000000	2.27838414	0.000e+00	1.455e-02
2.0	20	1.85000000	2.63913961	4.441e-16	1.487e-02
3.0	30	1.65120000	2.73410744	4.520e-04	1.277e-02
4.0	40	1.28120000	2.74384615	3.642e-03	1.213e-02
5.0	50	0.85780000	2.65671910	9.131e-03	8.423e-03
$h = 0.01$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	100	2.80000000	2.28930718	5.329e-15	3.624e-03
2.0	200	1.85000000	2.62435492	1.599e-14	8.166e-05
3.0	300	1.65165200	2.72176158	3.649e-09	4.283e-04
4.0	400	1.27822400	2.73245016	6.656e-04	7.387e-04
5.0	500	0.86738000	2.64907081	4.490e-04	7.750e-04
$h = 0.001$					
$s_i$	$i$	$x_h(s_i)$	$\tau_h(s_i)$	$e_x(s_i)$	$e_\tau(s_i)$
1.0	1000	2.80000000	2.29257085	2.220e-14	3.608e-04
2.0	2000	1.85000000	2.62428141	4.396e-14	8.156e-06
3.0	3000	1.65165184	2.72137602	1.636e-07	4.270e-05
4.0	4000	1.27825344	2.73185604	6.950e-04	1.446e-04
5.0	5000	0.86745468	2.64851590	5.237e-04	2.201e-04

Table 2: Approximate solution of the IIVP (5.5)–(5.9).  $s_i = ih$ ,  $e_x(s_i) = |x_h(s_i) - x(s_i)|$  and  $e_\tau(s_i) = |\tau_h(s_i) - \tau(s_i)|$




Figure 2: Exact and approximate solution of the IVP (5.5)–(5.9),  $h = 0.1$

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we considered a class of SD-DDEs with adaptive delays and impulses. Using a Picard–Lindelöf type argument, we showed local existence and uniqueness results under the condition that the delayed time function is monotone or piecewise strictly monotone. We introduced a numerical scheme with the help of EPCAs, and obtained a sequence of approximate solutions which converges to a solution of the SD-DDE under natural conditions. This simple, first-order approximation scheme could be used successfully in the proof of the existence of a solution in a more complex problem. An interesting future research problem is to prove the convergence of the numerical approximation under conditions where a more relaxed condition is used instead of the piecewise strict monotonicity.

Finally, we mention that if we replace the impulsive condition (3.9) with

$$\Delta x_h([t_k]_h) = I_k(x_h([t_k]_h-)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$

then the impulsive time moments appear at mesh points of the numerical scheme, which simplifies the computation of the approximation. On the other hand, since the jump times of the exact solution and the approximate solution are different (in general), the proof of the convergence becomes more complicated. This is an open problem which can be studied in a future work.

## Acknowledgements

The author thanks the support of the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office grant no. K139346.

## References

- [1] B. Ahmad. Instability of impulsive hybrid state dependent delay differential systems. *Vietnam J. Math.*, 35(3):285–298, 2007.
- [2] M. Akhmet. *Nonlinear Hybrid Continuous-Discrete-Time Models*. Atlantis Press, Amsterdam-Paris, 2011.
- [3] O. Arino, K. P. Hadeler, and M. L. Hbid. Existence of periodic solutions for delay differential equations with state dependent delay. *J. Differential Equations*, 144:263–301, 1990.
- [4] I. Balázs and T. Krisztin. A differential equation with a state-dependent queueing delay. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(4):3697–3737, 2020.
- [5] F.A. Bartha, Á. Garab, and T. Krisztin. Morse decomposition of scalar differential equations with state-dependent delay. *J. Dyn. Diff. Equat.*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10884-025-10414-w>.
- [6] S. Castillo, M. Pinto, and R. Torres. Asymptotic formulae for solutions to impulsive differential equations with piecewise constant argument of generalized type. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, 2019(40):1–22, 2019.
- [7] Y. Chen, Q. Hu, and J. Wu. Second-order differentiability with respect to parameters for differential equations with adaptive delays. *Front. Math. China*, 5(2):221–286, 2010.
- [8] K. E. M. Church. Uniqueness of solutions and linearized stability for impulsive differential equations with state-dependent delay. *J. Differential Equations*, 338:415–440, 2022.
- [9] K. Cooke and S. Busenberg. Models of vertically transmitted diseases with sequential-continuous dynamics. In *Nonlinear Phenomena in Mathematical Sciences: Proceedings of an International Conference on Nonlinear Phenomena in Mathematical Sciences, Held at the University of Texas at Arlington, June 16-20, 1980*, pages 179–187, New York, 1982. Academic Press.
- [10] R. D. Driver. Existence theory for a delay-differential system. *Contrib. Differential Equations*, 1:317–336, 1961.
- [11] T. Faria and J. J. Oliveira. Global asymptotic stability for a periodic delay hematopoiesis model with impulses. *Appl. Math. Model.*, 79:843–864, 2020.
- [12] M. Fečkan, S. G. Hristova, and K. Ivanova. Practical stability of differential equations with state dependent delay and non-instantaneous impulses. *Commun. Math. Anal.*, 22(2):1–17, 2019.

- [13] J. Froberg and M. Waurick. State-dependent delay differential equations on  $H^1$ . *J. Differential Equations*, 410:737–771, 2024.
- [14] A. Ganesan, M. Thangaraj, and Y.-K. Ma. Exponential stability for second-order neutral stochastic systems involving impulses and state-dependent delay. *Symmetry*, 15(12):2135, 2019.
- [15] T. Gedeon, A. R. Humphries, M. C. Mackey, H.-O. Walther, and Z. Wang. Dynamics of a state-dependent delay-differential equation. *Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ.*, 2025(37):1–97, 2025.
- [16] I. Györi. On approximation of the solutions of delay differential equations by using piecewise constant arguments. *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 14(1):111–126, 1991.
- [17] I. Györi and F. Hartung. On numerical approximation using differential equations with piecewise-constant arguments. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 56(1):1–12, 2008.
- [18] I. Györi, F. Hartung, and J. Turi. Numerical approximations for a class of differential equations with time- and state-dependent delays. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 8(6):19–24, 1995.
- [19] F. Hartung. On differentiability of solutions with respect to parameters in a class of functional differential equations. *Funct. Differ. Equ.*, 4(1-2):65–79, 1997.
- [20] F. Hartung. On second-order differentiability with respect to parameters for differential equations with state-dependent delays,. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 25(4):1089–1138, 2013.
- [21] F. Hartung. On numerical approximation of a delay differential equation with impulsive self-support condition. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 418:126818, 2022.
- [22] F. Hartung. On differentiability of solutions with respect to parameters in impulsive differential equations with adaptive state-dependent delay. *J. Differential Equations*, 413:751–804, 2024.
- [23] F. Hartung, T. L. Herdman, and J. Turi. On existence, uniqueness and numerical approximation for neutral equations with state-dependent delays. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 24:393–409, 1997.
- [24] 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. Elsevier, North-Holand, 2006.
- [25] E. Hernandez and J. Wu. Explicit abstract neutral differential equations with state-dependent delay: Existence, uniqueness and local well-posedness. *J. Differential Equations*, 365:750–811, 2023.
- [26] B. Lani-Wayda and J. Godoy Mesquita. Linearized instability for differential equations with dependence on the past derivative. *Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ.*, 2023(52):1–52, 2023.
- [27] X. Li and D. Peng. Uniform stability of nonlinear systems with state-dependent delay. *Automatica*, 137(110098):1–5, 2022.
- [28] X. Li and S. Song. *Impulsive Systems with Delays*. Springer Singapore, 2022.
- [29] W. Lu, D. O’Regan, and Y. Xia. Smooth invariant manifolds and foliations for the differential equations with piecewise constant argument. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 199:1–37, art. no. 103579, 2025.
- [30] W. Ma and Y. Li. Differentiability of semi-flow for impulsive evolution equation with state-dependent delay. *Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 23(Suppl 1):1–27, art. no. 278, 2024.

- [31] P. Magal and O. Arino. Existence of periodic solutions for a state-dependent delay differential equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 165:61–95, 2000.
- [32] K. Martinovich, G. Stepan, D. Bachrathy, and A. K. Kiss. Introducing state-dependent delay in the car-following model. *Nonlinear Dynam.*, 113(17):22923–22941, 2025.
- [33] S. H. Park and J. Lefebvre. Synchronization and resilience in the Kuramoto white matter network model with adaptive state-dependent delays. *J. Math. Neurosci.*, 10(16):1–25, 2020.
- [34] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976.
- [35] S. H. Saker and J. O. Alzabut. On the impulsive delay hematopoiesis model with periodic coefficients. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 39(5):1657–1688, 2009.
- [36] J. Shen and X. Liu. Global existence results for impulsive differential equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 314(2):546–557, 2006.
- [37] W. Sun, N. Wang, N. Li, Y. Lv, and S. Liu. A structured predator–prey model with a state-dependent maturation period. *Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos*, 35(10):2550123, 2025.
- [38] H.-O. Walther. On solution manifolds of differential systems with discrete state-dependent delays. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 16(3-4):627–638, 2023.
- [39] J. Wiener. Differential equations with piecewise constant delays. In *Trends in theory and practice of nonlinear differential equations (Arlington, Tex., 1982)*, pages 547–552, New York, NY, USA, 1983. Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics 90, Dekker.
- [40] J. Wu. High dimensional data clustering from a dynamical systems point of view. In Wayne Nagata and Navaratnam Sri Namachchivaya, editors, *Bifurcation Theory and Spatio-Temporal Pattern Formation*, volume 49 of *Fields Inst. Commun.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2006.
- [41] J. Wu, H. Zivari-Piran, J. D. Hunter, and J. G. Milton. Projective clustering using neural networks with adaptive delay and signal transmission loss. *Neural Comput.*, 23:1568–1604, 2011.