

The Banach lattice Lean library

David Muñoz-Lahoz[†]

August 10, 2026

Abstract

We present a Lean 4 library for the theory of Banach lattices. Its purpose is to support the systematic formalization of contemporary research in Banach lattices and related areas. As evidence of this, we describe three research-level formalizations built using the library. Writing the library at scale was made possible by the use of LLMs with careful human supervision and planning. Unlike autoformalization, this approach allows for an actual understanding of the code. This, in turn, led to new mathematical insights that are also discussed. Judging by the interest expressed by other researchers, we expect the library to become a communal effort in the near future. For this reason, we also describe several parts of the theory that could be added next.

1 Introduction

The Banach lattices Lean library [🟡banlat](#) is a [Lean 4](#) project that contains a body of elementary results in the theory of Banach lattices. The goal of this library is to allow for the systematic formalization of research-level results in Banach lattices and nearby fields (such as stable phase retrieval, where autoformalization is already being used [\[7\]](#)). In fact, in [Section 2](#) we will present three examples of research-level results in Banach lattices that have been formalized using the library. This was done by the author in a relatively short span of time; thus we expect that, as the library scales both in contributors and over time, we will be able to systematically formalize a significant part of the research in these fields.

[†]Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Email: david.munozl (at) uam (dot) es

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 46B42; Secondary 68V20.

Key words and phrases. Banach lattice, Lean 4 library, locally solid topology, lattice-linear expression, positive projection, Banach lattice algebra.

“Semiautoformalization” This formalization at scale has been made possible by the significant improvement of Large Language Models (LLMs). Even though LLMs were used intensively in the process of writing this code, we would not consider this an autoformalization project. Instead, it could be regarded as an exercise in *semiautoformalization*: most of the code was written by LLMs, but with close human steering and supervision. In the levels of quality of formalization introduced by T. Tao in [17], this project would lie somewhere between levels 2 (Publication-level formalization) and 3 (Prototype-level formalization).

This has several implications. On the one hand, the use of generative tools allows for sufficient speed and scale to verify research-level results in a reasonable amount of time and with reasonable effort. The scientific implications of this are well-known: the amount of literature being published is costly and difficult to check; if formalization of papers is systematized, in order to check the correctness of a paper we would only need to check the correctness of the formalization. This may still not be entirely trivial, but it is certainly easier. Notice that, in the process of checking these formalized papers, having a trusted base of knowledge (a library) is critical (for instance, in order to avoid checking the tree of definitions back to mathlib every single time).

On the other hand, the careful human supervision of these generative tools has several advantages. First, it allows for a careful organization of the library. Second, we can correct certain approaches proposed by the LLM that feel unnatural to humans, thus making the library more transparent for future users and contributors. And third, since we have an understanding of what is going on in our code, we can even gain some mathematical insights in the process (see Section 3). In practice, doing this requires a certain expertise both in Banach lattices and in Lean, careful planning of how to approach the library, and making sure that we always ask the LLM to write definitions and results that are close and within reach, so as not to let it make design decisions. This keeps LLM usage efficient, another feature of this approach that could become relevant if LLM token prices increase in the future.

While working on this project, [6] announced a library in computational economics with a similar philosophy. We also highlight [3], which is used to formalize [4]. Very recently, members of the Lean FRO and the Mathlib initiative announced Tau Ceti [18], a “repository of formal mathematics, directed by human-written roadmaps, implemented and maintained by AI contributors, subject to adversarial review.” We believe the philosophy behind this new project is closely aligned with the one presented below.

Formalization vs “Semiautoformalization” vs Autoformalization Of course, the previous benefits are amplified in manual formalization: it is more readable, it is properly implemented, and it provides more mathematical insights. This is, of course, what happens with `mathlib4`, the mathematics Lean library [19]. Then, what is the point of this “semiautoformalization”? The answer is scale. It is a trade-off: we are sacrificing code quality (especially inside the proofs, since these are generally not checked) for scale. For instance, as mentioned above, sometimes we had to redirect the LLM’s proposed approach, but we certainly also missed several occasions to do so because of speed and scale. (At other times it was the LLM that taught us how to approach certain results, see Section 3.)

We do not feel that “semiautoformalization” is better or worse in any way: it is just a different approach, with different goals in mind. We believe that with this scale, and proper training of our fellows, formal verification of new mathematical results can become truly systematic in our field. How we are facing this community-level change is addressed in more detail in [10].

As a proof of concept, we present in Section 2 the formalization of three research-level results that the library has made possible: the first is the construction of an object that has sparked considerable interest in our community in recent years, the second is the solution to an open problem recently published by the author, and the third is a relatively simple counterexample answering an open question that is part of an ongoing project.

We must clarify that, once all the necessary preliminaries have been added to the library, we expect the formalization of papers to be an actual autoformalization. For this process, there already exist tools like LEAP [11] and LeanMarathon [23]. However, this kind of autoformalization, which assumes the necessary preliminaries are already in the library, is significantly cheaper than most autoformalization projects, and much easier to check because of the shared body of results that the library provides.

Why Banach lattices? Banach lattices can be approached both from analysis, as Banach spaces with some additional structure, and from order theory, as vector lattices with a complete lattice norm. This second approach has proved to be very apt for formalization, because it starts very close to the contents already available in `mathlib4`. Thus we could get to the elementary theory of vector and Banach lattices without much preliminary material, progressing then to more analytic concepts involving convergence, continuity, functionals, measures, compacta, and more categorical constructions such as completions and free objects, which play a central role in the modern theory.

Beyond the mathematical details, the field of Banach lattices has a cohesive and supportive community that has been willing to join forces to contribute to this project, and to learn the new tools needed to do so. Several researchers in Banach lattices have already expressed their interest in contributing. This will make expanding the library in a variety of directions relatively easy, leveraging the expertise of the different researchers. A detailed account of how this process is unfolding can be found in [10].

Future steps Short-term goals of the library include its extension (see Section 5 for some candidate directions) and the formalization of more research-level papers. In the near future, we also expect to have our own systematic pipeline for formalizing papers using the library. In the long term, we expect to distill from the library the contents that could be welcome in `mathlib4`, rewrite them to have the appropriate code quality, and contribute them. Since we are building on top of the enormous communal effort that `mathlib` represents, we feel that this could be an opportunity to give back.

Future improvements in technology (particularly, artificial intelligence) could significantly increase the quality and scalability of the project. We are not used to this in pure mathematics, where, unlike in other sciences, progress has been essentially detached from technological advances. However, projects like the one presented here are highly dependent on technology. This means that procedures and techniques could become obsolete as technology advances.

Notation and conventions No code appears in this paper. All pieces of code are provided as external links to [GitHub repositories](#). This way, the code is always presented in its full context. A link to a GitHub repository appears as `banlat`; a folder inside the repository as `BanLat`; a file inside a folder as `BanLat/Basic.lean`; and a line inside a file as `BanLat/Basic.lean L34`. Often, instead of citing a particular line, we want to cite a particular named Lean term (generally a theorem or definition). In this case, the name instead of the line number will appear in the reference, with the link pointing to the particular line where the term is introduced. For instance, `abs_eq_zero_iff_zero` points to the same line as `BanLat/Basic.lean L34`.

Most of the time we cite the repositories `banlat` and `mathlib4`. These are libraries that change with time. Hence all references are to the commit tagged as `v0.1.0` in `banlat`, and to the commit tagged as `v4.30.0` in `mathlib4`.

2 Some use cases

In this section we present three research-level results that have been formalized using the library. Section 2.1 presents the formalization of the free Banach lattice generated by a Banach space; Section 2.2 the formalization of a solution to an open problem by A. W. Wickstead recently solved by the author; and Section 2.3 the formalization of a counterexample to an open question that is part of an ongoing project of the author together with M. A. Taylor and P. Tradacete.

2.1 The free Banach lattice generated by a Banach space

The free Banach lattice generated by a Banach space was first constructed explicitly by A. Avilés, J. Rodríguez, and P. Tradacete in their 2018 paper [5]. This object has sparked a lot of research over the last decade, and has been used to solve open problems as well as to better understand the interaction between Banach spaces and Banach lattices (see for instance [16]). For this reason, it seemed the best candidate to add a modern object to the library on which a significant amount of recent research depends.

As the name indicates, the free Banach lattice generated by a Banach space E is a Banach lattice $\text{FBL}[E]$ together with a canonical isometric embedding $\delta: E \rightarrow \text{FBL}[E]$ that satisfies the following universal property: for every Banach lattice X and every bounded operator $T: E \rightarrow X$, there exists a unique lattice homomorphism $\hat{T}: \text{FBL}[E] \rightarrow X$ with $\|\hat{T}\| = \|T\|$ satisfying $\hat{T}\delta = T$. As usual, if such an object exists, then it is unique up to a unique lattice isometry. The major accomplishment of [5] was to provide an explicit description of $\text{FBL}[E]$. Next we describe this construction, together with its formalization in `banlat`. Throughout this section, E will denote a Banach space.

Definition 2.1. `freeNormExt` Define the (*extended*) *free norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FBL}[E]}: C(B_{E^*}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$\|f\|_{\text{FBL}[E]} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n |f(x_k^*)| : n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1^*, \dots, x_n^* \in B_{E^*}, \sup_{x \in B_E} \sum_{k=1}^n |x_k^*(x)| \leq 1 \right\}$$

for every $f \in C(B_{E^*})$.

Proposition 2.2. `instBanachLatticeFunctionSpace` *The space*

$$C_0 = \{f \in C(B_{E^*}) : \|f\|_{\text{FBL}[E]} < \infty\},$$

with the order and linear structures inherited from $C(B_{E^})$, and the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FBL}[E]}$ as a norm, is a Banach lattice.*

For every $x \in E$, define $\delta_x \in C_0$ by $\delta_x(x^*) = x^*(x)$ for all $x^* \in B_{E^*}$ (`∀ dualEval`). Define $\text{FBL}[E]$ as the closed sublattice generated by $\{\delta_x : x \in E\}$ in $(C_0, \|\cdot\|_{\text{FBL}[E]})$ (`∀ FBL`). Then $(\text{FBL}[E], \|\cdot\|_{\text{FBL}[E]})$ is certainly a Banach lattice (`∀ instBanachLattice FBL`). Define also $\delta: E \rightarrow \text{FBL}[E]$ by $\delta(x) = \delta_x$ for $x \in E$ (`∀ of`); this map is a linear isometry (`∀ ofLinearIsometry`). Then $\text{FBL}[E]$, together with δ , is the free Banach lattice generated by E :

Theorem 2.3. `∀ exists_unique_lift` *Let X be a Banach lattice, and let $T: E \rightarrow X$ be a bounded linear operator. Then there exists a unique lattice homomorphism $\hat{T}: \text{FBL}[E] \rightarrow X$ with $\|\hat{T}\| = \|T\|$ satisfying $\hat{T}\delta = T$.*

2.2 Non-representable Banach lattice algebras

In [22], A. W. Wickstead formulated the following question. Let X be an order complete Banach lattice, and let $P: X \rightarrow X$ be a positive projection for which there exists an $\alpha \geq 0$ satisfying:

- (i) $\alpha \text{id}_X \leq P$, and
- (ii) whenever T is a positive operator such that both $T \leq \lambda \text{id}_X$, for some $\lambda \geq 0$, and $T \leq P$, then also $T \leq \alpha \text{id}_X$.

Which values can α take? Wickstead conjectured that either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1/n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and showed this for finite-dimensional X . In [15], it was shown that this holds for arbitrary X . In `Wickstead` the main results of [15] have been formalized using the Banach lattices Lean library. More precisely, the general result is a consequence of the $C(K)$ -case, which can be proved without assuming order completeness.

Theorem 2.4. `∀ main_CK` *Let K be a non-empty compact Hausdorff space. Let $P: C(K) \rightarrow C(K)$ be a positive projection with $P\mathbb{1}_K = \mathbb{1}_K$. Suppose there exists some $\alpha \geq 0$ satisfying:*

- (i) $\alpha \text{id}_{C(K)} \leq P$, and
- (ii) if $0 \leq M_f \leq P$, then $\|f\|_\infty \leq \alpha$.

Then either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1/n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollary 2.5. `∀ main` *Let X be a non-zero Dedekind complete vector lattice. Let $P: X \rightarrow X$ be a positive projection with constant diagonal α . Then either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1/n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

This question in operator theory arose while studying the representation problem for Banach lattice algebras. A *Banach lattice algebra* ([\$\forall\$ BanachLatticeAlgebra](#)) is a Banach lattice together with a Banach algebra structure for which the product of positive elements is positive. It was an open problem [20, Question 5.3] and [21, Problem 2] whether every Banach lattice algebra is faithfully representable (as a lattice and as an algebra) in the space of regular operators on an order complete vector lattice. Wickstead showed in [22] that, if Theorem 2.5 is true, then there exist unital Banach lattice algebras that are not unitarily representable. In [15], we were able to extend this approach to show that, in fact, Theorem 2.5 implies a negative answer to the general representation problem for Banach lattice algebras.

Proposition 2.6. [\$\forall\$ non_representable](#) *Let A be a Banach lattice algebra. Suppose there exist non-zero positive elements $e, p \in A_+$ satisfying:*

- (i) $e^2 = e, p^2 = p$,
- (ii) $ep = pe = p$, and
- (iii) $p = \alpha e + x$, for some $x \in A$ with $x \wedge e = 0$, and some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

If $\alpha \notin \{0\} \cup \{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then A has no faithful representation on $\mathcal{L}_r(X)$, for any order complete vector lattice X .

2.3 σ -Lebesgue locally convex-solid topologies

The following question appears in [1, Open Problem 8.1]: is the completion of a σ -Lebesgue Hausdorff locally convex-solid vector lattice also σ -Lebesgue? The answer turns out to be negative, and a counterexample is formalized in [\$\sigma\$ SigmaLebesgueCompletion](#).

Proposition 2.7. [\$\forall\$ sigmaLebesgueTopology_not_preserved_by_completion](#) *There exists a σ -Lebesgue Hausdorff locally convex-solid vector lattice whose completion is not σ -Lebesgue.*

3 Some mathematical insights

This section collects some mathematical ideas that appeared in the process of building the library and that we believe are relevant enough to deserve a detailed explanation. Throughout this section, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes a natural number, and X denotes a vector lattice.

3.1 Vanishing lattice-linear expressions

A classical result in the theory of vector lattices states that every expression involving the linear and lattice operations (i.e., sums, scalar multiplications, suprema, and infima) that holds in $\mathbb{R}$ must also hold in every vector lattice. This result has important pragmatic implications (it is relatively easy to check expressions in the reals, because the order is total) and theoretical implications (for instance, it is key in the concrete construction of the free vector lattice).

When trying to formalize this result in Lean, we were expecting to do it for Archimedean vector lattices using Kakutani’s theorem. This is the approach traditionally taken in Banach lattices monographs; see, for example, [13, Section 1.d] and [14, Theorem 2.1.10].[†] We even pointed the LLM toward this approach. However, the LLM took a different route that surprised us, providing a proof that is elementary, does not depend on the axiom of choice, and works for every vector lattice (Archimedean or not). This is remarkable, since in the more general context of vector lattices, the result is proved using the representation of a vector lattice inside the direct product of totally ordered vector lattices, a technique that also relies on the axiom of choice (see, for instance, [12]).

For these reasons, we believe it is worth explaining the details of this new proof, together with its formalization. Even though the idea of the proof is very clear, writing down all the details is cumbersome because doing so requires manipulating formal expressions, which are defined recursively. However, since Lean is by design very good at dealing with recursive definitions, this is one of those rare instances in which an argument is more elegant and direct in Lean than in written natural language!

To state the theorem properly, we first need the formal definition of “expressions involving the linear and lattice operations.”

Definition 3.1. ▼LLexpr A *lattice-linear expression* Φ in the formal variables $t_1, \dots, t_n$ is a formal expression constructed inductively in the following way:

- (i) 0 is a lattice-linear expression;
- (ii) $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n$ are lattice-linear expressions;
- (iii) if Φ_1 and Φ_2 are lattice-linear expressions in $t_1, \dots, t_n$, then $\Phi_1 + \Phi_2$, $\lambda\Phi_1$ (for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$), $\Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2$, and $\Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$ are lattice-linear expressions in $t_1, \dots, t_n$.

[†]This technique can be used to prove something stronger, namely, positively homogeneous function calculus, which is what the cited monographs end up proving.

Remark. To abbreviate, we denote the fact that Φ is a lattice-linear expression in the formal variables $t_1, \dots, t_n$ by $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$. Note that not all the variables need appear explicitly in Φ ; for example, $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = t_1$ is a lattice-linear expression in $t_1, \dots, t_n$. In particular, every lattice-linear expression in $t_1, \dots, t_n$ is also a lattice-linear expression in $t_1, \dots, t_m$ for all $m \geq n$.

It should be intuitively clear that every lattice-linear expression in n variables can be “evaluated” at n arbitrary elements of a vector lattice in the “obvious way.” This notion is defined recursively as follows.

Definition 3.2. ▼eval Let $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be a lattice-linear expression, and let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$. We define the *evaluation* of Φ at $x_1, \dots, x_n$ as the element $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X$ defined recursively by

- (i) if $\Phi = 0$, $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$.
- (ii) if $\Phi = t_i$, $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$.
- (iii) if $\Phi = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2$, for some lattice-linear expressions Φ_1 and Φ_2 , $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Phi_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) + \Phi_2(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- (iv) if $\Phi = \lambda\Phi_1$, for some lattice-linear expression Φ_1 and some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda\Phi_1(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- (v) if $\Phi = \Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2$, for some lattice-linear expressions Φ_1 and Φ_2 , $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Phi_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \vee \Phi_2(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- (vi) if $\Phi = \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$, for some lattice-linear expressions Φ_1 and Φ_2 , $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Phi_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \Phi_2(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

The above is an example of a definition that is shorter to write in Lean than in L^AT_EX, all thanks to Lean’s pattern matching.

Definition 3.3. ▼Vanishes We say that a lattice-linear expression $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ *vanishes on* X if $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$.

We can now state the theorem.

Theorem 3.4. ▼vanishes_of_vanishes_real *A lattice-linear expression that vanishes on $\mathbb{R}$ must also vanish on every vector lattice.*

The idea of the proof is the following. Consider two arbitrary lattice-linear expressions $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ and $\Psi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ that are suprema of linear expressions, that is, that can be written as

$$\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} t_k \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk} t_k,$$

for some $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_{ik}, b_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$. First we are going to show, using elementary computations, that if $\Phi(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \Psi(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ for all $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in an arbitrary vector lattice X .

Next we are going to prove that, if now $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ is an arbitrary lattice-linear expression, then there exists an “equivalent” lattice-linear expression $\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ (equivalent in the sense that $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \tilde{\Phi}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$) of the form

$$\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk} t_k.$$

This is the step that requires working recursively on the definition of Φ , and that is very clean in Lean but technical in written math. Once this is proved, it is easy to conclude: if Φ vanishes on the reals, so does $\tilde{\Phi}$, which by the previous paragraph implies that the two suprema appearing in the expression of $\tilde{\Phi}$ must evaluate to the same element on every vector lattice. Thus $\tilde{\Phi}$ vanishes on every vector lattice, and so does Φ .

We now turn to the actual details of the proof. We start with two elementary lemmas. For $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\text{conv}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m)$ their convex hull.

Lemma 3.5. `∀mem_convexHull_of_forall_le_sup` *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{a}_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If, for every $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j p_j \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j a_{ij},$$

then $\mathbf{p} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m)$.

Proof. Since $\text{conv}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m)$ is compact, the result is an immediate consequence of the hyperplane separation theorem (see, for instance, [9, Section 2.5.1]; or `∀geometric_hahn_banach_point_closed` in `mathlib4`). $\square$

Lemma 3.6. `∀linearCombination_le_eval_of_mem_convexHull` *Let $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be a lattice-linear expression of the form $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} t_j$, for some*

$m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$. Set $\mathbf{a}_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in})$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$. If $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m)$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i \leq \Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

for every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{p} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m)$, there exist $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \mathbf{a}_i.$$

To conclude, simply compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j x_j &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i a_{ij} \right) x_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j \\ &= \Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Now we can prove the theorem for lattice-linear expressions that are suprema of linear expressions.

Lemma 3.7. ▼eval_eq_of_forall_real_eq Let $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ and $\Psi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be lattice-linear expressions of the form

$$\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} t_k \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk} t_k,$$

for some $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_{ik}, b_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\Phi(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \Psi(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ for every $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$.

Proof. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$. Since the roles of Φ and Ψ are interchangeable, it suffices to prove that

$$\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} x_k \leq \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

This, in turn, is the same as showing that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} x_k \leq \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (1)$$

holds for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. By assumption, for all $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} \lambda_k \leq \Psi(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk} \lambda_k.$$

According to Theorem 3.5, this implies that $\mathbf{a}_i \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_l)$, where $\mathbf{a}_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in})$ and $\mathbf{b}_j = (b_{j1}, \dots, b_{jn})$ for $j = 1, \dots, l$. Now (1) follows immediately from Theorem 3.6. $\square$

Definition 3.8. Let $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ and $\Psi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be lattice-linear expressions. We say that Φ and Ψ are *equivalent* if $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for every $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in a vector lattice X .

Definition 3.9. ▼NormalForm We say that a lattice-linear expression $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ is in *normal form* if it is of the form

$$\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk} t_k.$$

for some $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$, and some $a_{ik}, b_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following is the last ingredient needed to complete the proof of Theorem 3.4. The proof of the following fact in Lean is more elegant, and even shorter, than the one provided here. Also, the computational nature of the proof makes it prone to typos, whereas the formulas that appear in the Lean code are certainly correct.

Theorem 3.10. ▼normalize_eval For every lattice-linear expression $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ there exists a lattice-linear expression $\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ in normal form that is equivalent to Φ .

Proof. We prove it by induction on the definition of Φ . If $\Phi = 0$ or $\Phi = t_i$, for some i , then Φ is already in normal form and there is nothing to do. This proves the base case. Now suppose that there exist lattice-linear expressions Φ_1 and Φ_2 such that precisely one of the following holds:

- (i) $\Phi = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2$.

(ii) $\Phi = \lambda\Phi_1$, for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iii) $\Phi = \Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2$,

(iv) $\Phi = \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$.

Use the induction hypothesis to obtain lattice-linear expressions $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ in normal form equivalent to Φ_1 and Φ_2 , respectively. We can write, explicitly,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_1[t_1, \dots, t_{n_1}] = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} a_{ik} t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^{l_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} b_{jk} t_k,$$

and

$$\tilde{\Phi}_2[t_1, \dots, t_{n_2}] = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} c_{ik} t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^{l_2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} d_{jk} t_k,$$

for some $n_1, n_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $m_1, m_2, l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and $a_{ik}, b_{jk}, c_{ik}, d_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Below we give an explicit expression for $\tilde{\Phi}$ depending on how Φ is constructed. In each of the cases, it is clear that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is in normal form, and it is immediate to check that it is equivalent to Φ using the basic properties of vector lattices. Let $m = \max\{m_1, m_2\}$ and $l = \max\{l_1, l_2\}$. By convention, the coefficients that are not defined are set equal to 0.

(i) If $\Phi = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2$, then

$$\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{ik} + c_{ik}) t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n (b_{jk} + d_{jk}) t_k.$$

(ii) If $\Phi = \lambda\Phi_1$, with $\lambda \geq 0$, then

$$\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (\lambda a_{ik}) t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^{l_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (\lambda b_{jk}) t_k,$$

whereas if $\lambda < 0$, then

$$\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^{l_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (-\lambda b_{ik}) t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (-\lambda a_{jk}) t_k.$$

(iii) If $\Phi = \Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n] = & \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\max\{m,l\}} \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{ik} + d_{ik})t_k \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\max\{m,l\}} \sum_{k=1}^n (c_{ik} + b_{ik})t_k \right) \\ & - \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n (b_{jk} + d_{jk})t_k. \end{aligned}$$

(iv) If $\Phi = \Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2$, then Φ is equivalent to $-((-\Phi_1) \vee (-\Phi_2))$, and we can iterate (ii) and (iii) to obtain the desired lattice-linear expression. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\Phi[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be a lattice-linear expression that vanishes on $\mathbb{R}$. By Theorem 3.10, there exists a lattice-linear expression $\tilde{\Phi}$ in normal form that is equivalent to Φ . Thus it suffices to show that $\tilde{\Phi}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ for every $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in a vector lattice X . Write

$$\tilde{\Phi}[t_1, \dots, t_n] = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik}t_k - \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk}t_k$$

for some $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$, and some $a_{ik}, b_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$. By assumption,

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik}\lambda_k = \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk}\lambda_k \quad \text{for every } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows from Theorem 3.7 that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik}x_k = \bigvee_{j=1}^l \sum_{k=1}^n b_{jk}x_k.$$

Therefore $\Phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$. $\square$

This result was then used to implement `valarith`, a tactic that closes non-strict inequalities in vector lattices by checking that the inequality holds in $\mathbb{R}$. This in turn is done using the `linarith` tactic. The tactic also supports assumptions of the type $0 \leq x$.

We believe that this tactic could be useful in the process of autoformalizing papers in order to manipulate lattice-linear identities quickly and conveniently. However, for performance reasons, we try to avoid its use in the library files that are high in the import hierarchy. This tactic was implemented using heavy LLM assistance, and it is far from optimal; we could certainly use the advice from more experienced metaprogrammers to improve it.

3.2 The Archimedean property

In `mathlib4`, the Archimedean property is defined for ordered commutative monoids as follows.

Definition 3.11. `Archimedean` An ordered commutative monoid R is said to be *Archimedean* if for every two elements $x, y \in R$ such that $0 < y$, there exists a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \leq ny$.

This definition, although standard in the theory of linearly ordered groups, is stronger than the one used in the theory of lattice-ordered groups and vector lattices. For this reason, in `banlat`, we had to introduce the following alternative definition.

Definition 3.12. `IsVLAchimedean` A lattice-ordered group G is said to be *Archimedean* if whenever $x, y \in G$ are such that $ny \leq x$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $y \leq 0$.

Definitions 3.11 and 3.12 are equivalent in linearly ordered groups. However, Theorem 3.11 is in general stronger than Theorem 3.12: $\mathbb{R}^2$, with the order defined pointwise, satisfies Theorem 3.12 but not Theorem 3.11.

This is not the only notational subtlety that arose when building the library. For instance, what in ordered vector spaces and vector lattices is usually called order completeness or Dedekind completeness, in lattice theory (and, therefore, in `mathlib`) is known as conditionally completeness (`ConditionallyCompleteLattice`).

3.3 Locally convex-solid topologies

A subset $S \subseteq X$ is *solid* if $[-|x|, |x|] \subseteq S$ holds for every $x \in S$. A linear topology on X is *locally solid* if 0 has a neighbourhood basis of solid sets; X equipped with a locally solid topology is called a *locally solid vector lattice* (`IsLocallySolidVectorLattice`). Locally solid topologies abstract many of the order-topological properties of Banach lattices. Recall that, in a vector space, a linear topology is locally convex if 0 has a neighbourhood basis of convex sets. A particularly relevant family of locally solid topologies are the ones that are also locally convex.

Definition 3.13. `IsLocallyConvexSolidVectorLattice` A linear topology on a vector lattice that is at the same time locally solid and locally convex is called a *locally convex-solid topology*. A vector lattice together with a locally convex-solid topology is called a *locally convex-solid vector lattice*.

This definition is, almost verbatim, the one given in the monograph [2, Page 59]. In the same book, and without any further comment on the definition, it is

assumed that locally convex-solid topologies admit a neighbourhood basis at the origin formed by sets that are both convex and solid. But this is not strictly what the definition says: the definition establishes that there exist both a neighbourhood basis of convex sets and a neighbourhood basis of solid sets. That there exists a basis with both properties at the same time is reasonably easy, but not entirely obvious.

This subtlety arose when trying to formalize the notion of locally convex-solid topology in Lean. Since this is not addressed in [2], the main reference monograph on the topic, it seems relevant to provide the mathematical details next. These ideas can be found in much greater generality in [8, Section 2].

Definition 3.14. $\forall$ **solidInterior** Given $S \subseteq X$, we define its *solid interior* as the subset

$$\text{SolInt}(S) = \{ x \in S : [-|x|, |x|] \subseteq S \}.$$

Clearly, the solid interior of S is the largest solid set contained in S . The following is the key fact we need about the solid interior.

Proposition 3.15. $\forall$ **convex_solidInterior** *In a vector lattice, the solid interior of a convex set is convex.*

Proof. Let $C \subseteq X$ be a convex set. Let $x, y \in \text{SolInt}(C)$ and let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be such that $\lambda + \mu = 1$. We want to show that $[-|\lambda x + \mu y|, |\lambda x + \mu y|] \subseteq C$. If $\lambda = 0$ or $\mu = 0$, the result is immediate, so we may assume that $\lambda, \mu > 0$. Let $z \in X$ be such that $|z| \leq |\lambda x + \mu y|$. Then $|z| \leq \lambda|x| + \mu|y|$, and by the Riesz decomposition theorem there exist $w_1, w_2 \in X$ with $|w_1| \leq \lambda|x|$ and $|w_2| \leq \mu|y|$ such that $z = w_1 + w_2$. Since $x, y \in \text{SolInt}(C)$, which of course is a solid set, it follows that $\lambda^{-1}w_1, \mu^{-1}w_2 \in \text{SolInt}(C) \subseteq C$. Convexity of C then implies

$$z = \lambda(\lambda^{-1}w_1) + \mu(\mu^{-1}w_2) \in C. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.16. $\forall$ **hasBasis_convex_solid** *Let τ be a locally convex-solid topology on X . Then 0 has a neighbourhood basis formed by sets that are both convex and solid.*

Proof. Let U be a neighbourhood of 0 . By assumption, there exist neighbourhoods $S' \subseteq C \subseteq S \subseteq U$ of 0 such that S, S' are solid and C is convex. Then $\text{SolInt}(C) \subseteq U$ is solid, convex by Theorem 3.15, and it is a neighbourhood of 0 because it contains S' . $\square$

4 Overview of the library

The following is an overview of what is currently available in the library.

- `BanLat.lean`: General import file for the whole library.
- `BanLat/Basic.lean`: Develops the basic definitions and identities of lattice-ordered groups and real vector lattices. Defines the Archimedean property and proves equivalent characterizations.
- `BanLat/Normed.lean`: Defines normed vector lattices and Banach lattices. It proves continuity of lattice operations, Lipschitz continuity of the modulus map, closedness of the positive cone and order intervals, boundedness of order-bounded sets, and monotone convergence facts.
- `BanLat/Disjoint.lean`: Introduces the notion of disjoint vectors in a vector lattice, and proves basic facts related to disjointness.
- `BanLat/RieszDec.lean`: Proves the Riesz decomposition theorem and closely related results.
- `BanLat/OrderComplete.lean`: Defines order and σ -order completeness, and proves basic characterizations (e.g., it suffices to check completeness for increasing positive nets).
- `BanLat/OrderDense.lean`: Defines order dense subsets, and proves some basic properties.
- `BanLat/OrderUnit.lean`: Defines weak and strong order units.
- `BanLat/Pi.lean`: Introduces a natural vector lattice structure in the arbitrary product of vector lattices. It also introduces p -sums, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, of normed and Banach lattices. Records that the ∞ -sum of AM-spaces is an AM-space, and the 1-sum of AL-spaces is an AL-space.
- `BanLat/Atom.lean`: Defines atoms in vector lattices. Defines the continuous and atomic part of a vector lattice. Shows that every infinite-dimensional Archimedean vector lattice contains a sequence of pairwise disjoint non-zero vectors. Shows that an Archimedean vector lattice is finite-dimensional if and only if it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$.

-  `BanLat/QuasiInteriorPoint.lean`: Defines quasi-interior points. Proves that every separable Banach lattice has a quasi-interior point.
-  `BanLat/Quotient.lean`: Constructs quotients of vector lattices by order ideals. Defines the quotient lattice structure, proves the canonical quotient map is a vector lattice homomorphism, develops inequality-lifting lemmas, factors positive and lattice homomorphisms through quotients, characterises Archimedean quotients by uniform closedness of the ideal, and builds normed and Banach lattice quotients by closed ideals.
-  `BanLat/Dual.lean`: Develops the order dual of vector lattices and the norm dual of Banach lattices.
-  `BanLat/Bidual.lean`: Introduces the bidual of a Banach lattice and proves that the canonical embedding is a lattice homomorphism.
-  `BanLat/LLexpr.lean`: Defines formal lattice-linear expressions in finitely many variables and their evaluation in arbitrary vector lattices. It proves that lattice-linear identities valid over $\mathbb{R}$ hold in every vector lattice.
-  `BanLat/Substructures`: Collects definitions and basic facts about the classical substructures of Banach lattices: sublattices, ideals, bands, and projection bands.
 -  `BanLat/Substructures/Sublattice.lean`: Defines vector sublattices. It proves that closure under one lattice operation or under absolute value suffices, constructs sublattices generated by a set, describes them through sup/inf closures and lattice-linear combinations, and handles topological closures.
 -  `BanLat/Substructures/Ideal.lean`: Defines order ideals in vector lattices. It develops generated and principal ideals, the induced norm on principal ideals, sums of ideals, closed order ideals, and the connection between strong order units and principal ideals.
 -  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/Basic.lean`: Defines bands and proves basic properties.
 -  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/Lattice.lean`: Builds the complete lattice structure on bands ordered by inclusion. Intersections give infima, with the whole space as top and the zero band as bottom.

-  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/DisjointComplement.lean`: Defines the disjoint complement of a set and proves its basic laws. It shows disjoint complements are bands, and are closed in normed vector lattices.
-  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/Generated.lean`: Defines the band generated by a set. In Archimedean lattices, the band generated by a set is its double disjoint complement. Relates weak order units to principal bands. Proves that bands are norm closed in normed lattices.
-  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/Projection.lean`: Defines projection bands, band projections, and proves the basic properties and characterizations.
-  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/PPP.lean`: Defines the projection property and principal projection property. It proves that order complete lattices have the projection property, σ -order complete lattices have the principal projection property, projection property implies principal projection property, and these properties imply the Archimedean property.
-  `BanLat/Substructures/Band/Decomposition.lean`: Develops infinite decompositions using principal band projections under PPP.
-  `BanLat/Operators`: Collects operator theory in vector and Banach lattices.
 -  `BanLat/Operators/Hom.lean`: Defines vector lattice homomorphism, both as a bundled structure and as a predicate. Proves their basic properties. Defines a vector lattice equivalence as a bijective vector lattice homomorphism. Defines a Banach lattice equivalence as a vector lattice homomorphism that is a surjective isometry.
 -  `BanLat/Operators/Positive.lean`: Defines positive linear operators. Proves the extension lemma from additive maps defined on the positive cone. Proves automatic continuity of positive operators from Banach lattices to normed vector lattices.
 -  `BanLat/Operators/OrderBounded.lean`: Defines order bounded linear maps. It proves positive operators are order bounded, order boundedness is stable under algebraic operations, order bounded maps from Banach lattices are continuous, and the space of order bounded operators is an ordered vector space.
 -  `BanLat/Operators/Regular.lean`: Defines regular operators. It proves every regular operator is order bounded.

-  `BanLat/Operators/RieszKantorovich.lean`: Proves the Riesz–Kantorovich formulas for order bounded operators into order complete vector lattices.
-  `BanLat/Convergences`: The various notions of convergence in a vector lattice.
 -  `BanLat/Convergences/Order.lean`: Defines order convergence of nets and its basic properties.
 -  `BanLat/Convergences/Uniform.lean`: Defines uniform convergence and uniformly complete vector lattices.
 -  `BanLat/OrderContinuous/Basic.lean`: Defines σ -order continuous and order continuous norms. Proves that every order continuous Banach lattice is order complete.
 -  `BanLat/OrderContinuous/Ando.lean`: Ando’s theorem: a Banach lattice has order continuous norm if and only if every norm-closed order ideal is a band, and in that situation every norm-closed ideal is a projection band.
 -  `BanLat/OrderContinuous/Decomposition.lean`: Proves a decomposition theorem for order continuous Banach lattices.
 -  `BanLat/OrderContinuous/MeyerNieberg.lean`: Formalises Meyer–Nieberg’s characterization of order continuous Banach lattices.
 -  `BanLat/OrderContinuous/Nakano.lean`: Formalises Nakano’s theorem: a Banach lattice is order continuous if and only if it is σ -order complete and σ -order continuous if and only if every increasing order bounded sequence converges.
-  `BanLat/AMSpace`: The theory of AM-spaces.
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Basic.lean`: Defines AM-spaces and AM-spaces with unit. Principal ideals in Archimedean vector lattices, equipped with the induced norm, are AM-spaces with unit.
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Max.lean`: Proves the AM-norm formula for general nonnegative elements (not necessarily disjoint).
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Maximal.lean`: Proves that every proper order ideal lies inside a maximal proper order ideal.
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Characters.lean`: Defines characters on an AM-space with unit as functionals that are lattice homomorphisms and send the

- unit to 1. Proves a key fact about characters: positive elements attain their norm at a character.
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Kakutani.lean`: Proves Kakutani’s representation theorem for AM-spaces.
 -  `BanLat/AMSpace/Dual.lean`: Shows that the dual of an AM-space is an AL-space.
-  `BanLat/ALSpace`: The theory of AL-spaces.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/Basic.lean`: Defines an AL-space as a Banach lattice whose norm is additive on disjoint positive sums.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/Add.lean`: Strengthens the definition to additivity of the norm on the positive cone.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/Dual.lean`: Constructs a functional on the dual that agrees with the norm on positive elements.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/DualALAM.lean`: Shows that the dual of an AL-space is an AM-space with unit. Shows that if the dual is an AL-space, the original space is an AM-space, and conversely.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/OrderContinuous.lean`: Shows every AL-space has order continuous norm.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/Sublattice.lean`: Proves that closed vector sublattices of AL-spaces are again AL-spaces with their inherited order and norm structure.
 -  `BanLat/ALSpace/Kakutani.lean`: Proves Kakutani’s representation theorem for AL-spaces.
-  `BanLat/Examples`: Standard examples of Banach lattices.
 -  `BanLat/Examples/CofK/Basic.lean`: Shows that $C(K)$ is a Banach lattice, with the usual norm and pointwise operations.
 -  `BanLat/Examples/CofK/Dual.lean`: Proves that the dual of $C(K)$, as a Banach lattice, is $M(K)$.
 -  `BanLat/Examples/Lp/Basic.lean`: Shows that $L_p(\mu)$ is a Banach lattice, for all $1 \leq p$.
 -  `BanLat/Examples/Lp/Sublattice.lean`: Characterizes sublattices of $L_p(\mu)$, for μ a finite measure and $1 \leq p < \infty$, containing the constant 1 function.

- `BanLat/Examples/SignedMeasure/Basic.lean`: Proves that finite signed measures on a measurable space form a Banach lattice.
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/Basic.lean`: Defines $M(K)$, the space of regular signed Borel measures on a compact Hausdorff space K , as a closed vector sublattice of the Banach lattice of finite signed measures on K .
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/ALspace.lean`: Shows $M(K)$ is an AL-space.
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/Atom.lean`: Characterises atoms in $M(K)$ as positive scalar multiples of Dirac measures.
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/Band.lean`: Describes principal bands in $M(K)$.
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/Decomposition.lean`: Develops the decomposition of an element of $M(K)$ into its atomic and discrete parts.
- `BanLat/Examples/MofK/L1space.lean`: Proves that $M(K)$ is lattice isometric to $L_1(\mu)$, for some measure μ .
- `BanLat/Free`
 - `BanLat/Free/FVL.lean`: Constructs the free vector lattice on a type of generators α as a concrete vector sublattice of real-valued functions on the space $\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.
 - `BanLat/Free/FVLv.lean`: Constructs the free vector lattice generated by a Banach space as a sublattice of continuous functions on the dual unit ball.
 - `BanLat/Free/FBL.lean`: Constructs the free Banach lattice over a Banach space.
- `BanLat/LocallySolid`: The theory of locally solid topologies.
 - `BanLat/LocallySolid/Basic.lean`: Defines locally solid topological vector lattices, and proves basic properties.
 - `BanLat/LocallySolid/Completion.lean`: Builds the completion of a Hausdorff locally solid vector lattice, endowing it with the structure of a Hausdorff locally solid vector lattice.
 - `BanLat/LocallySolid/Lebesgue.lean`: Defines Lebesgue, σ -Lebesgue, and pre-Lebesgue properties for locally solid vector lattices.
 - `BanLat/LocallySolid/LocallyConvexSolid.lean`: Defines locally convex-solid vector lattices as locally solid vector lattices with locally convex

topology. It proves the neighbourhoods of zero admit a basis of sets that are at the same time solid and convex.

-  `BanLat/LocallySolid/WithSeminorms.lean`: Introduces lattice seminorms. Characterises locally convex-solid linear topologies as those induced by families of lattice seminorms.
-  `BanLat/Preliminaries`: Preliminary facts required for the library. For now, they are only facts about measure theory.
 -  `BanLat/Preliminaries/SignedMeasure.lean`: Collects facts about signed measures. It proves that a sequence of measures that is Cauchy for the total variation norm converges.
 -  `BanLat/Preliminaries/Regularity.lean`: Defines regularity of signed measures on compact Hausdorff spaces by regularity of their total variation.
 -  `BanLat/Preliminaries/HasNoAtoms.lean`: Proves that, if μ is a non-atomic measure and A is a μ -measurable set, then for every $0 \leq \lambda \leq \mu(A)$ there exists $B \subseteq A$ measurable such that $\mu(B) = \lambda$.
-  `BanLat/Tactic`: New tactics implemented in the library.
 -  `BanLat/Tactic/LLexpr.lean`: Implements the `!llarith` tactic for lattice-linear identities and non-strict inequalities.

5 Extending the library

The following are some natural directions in which the library could be extended.

Locally solid topologies Several results about convergence in Banach lattices (such as the Meyer-Nieberg and Andô theorems in order continuous Banach lattices) can be extended to the more general context of locally solid topologies.

Order continuous operators Develop the theory of (σ) -order continuous operators. In particular, prove Ogasawara’s theorem: the families of order continuous and σ -order continuous operators are band projections on the space of order bounded operators, whenever the codomain is order complete.

Orthomorphisms, f -algebras, and universal completions Develop the theory of orthomorphisms. This will also require introducing f -algebras, and constructing universal completions.

Nakano theory Define carriers, null ideals, and prove Nakano’s theorem relating the carrier and null ideals of disjoint order continuous functionals.

Free Banach lattices Develop further the theory of free Banach and vector lattices, proving properties about these spaces.

Atomic and order continuous Banach lattices Develop the theory of Banach lattices that are at the same time atomic and order continuous.

Enrich the examples Prove further properties about $C(K)$ and $L_p(\mu)$: characterize their ideals, bands, and projection bands; characterize when $C(K)$ is (σ) -order complete, etc. In general, lay down the bridges between Banach lattice theory and topology/measure theory.

Positively homogeneous function calculus Construct the positively homogeneous function calculus on uniformly complete vector lattices. Define p -sums.

Convex/concave Banach lattices and operators Develop the theory of convexity of Banach lattices and operators.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank M. A. Taylor and P. Tradacete for their feedback and continued support. We are also indebted to J. de Dios for his feedback, and for suggesting the idea of creating the **vllarith** tactic. Finally, we thank E. Bilokopytov for feedback on Section 3.

Research supported by an FPI–UAM 2023 contract (funded by Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), by grants PID2024-162214NB-I00 and CEX2023-001347-S (funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033), and by the CSIC cooperation grant COOPB25033 under the i-COOP program.

AI disclosure

GPT-5.5 and Claude Opus 4.6 were used to write the code in **banlat**. In the process of writing the paper, GPT-5.5 was only used to search for typos and other obvious errors in final versions of the text, and to generate the list of files with their docstrings (which were later rewritten) in Section 4.

References

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis. “On the completion of Hausdorff locally solid Riesz spaces”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 196:105–125, 1974.
- [2] C. D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw. *Locally solid Riesz spaces with applications to economics*, volume 105 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2003, pages xii+344.
- [3] S. Armstrong. *Formalizing Stochastic Homogenization in Lean*. <https://www.scottnarmstrong.com/2026/06/formalizing-stochastic-homogenization-in-lean/>. [Accessed 03-07-2026].
- [4] S. Armstrong and T. Kuusi. “Renormalization group and elliptic homogenization in high contrast”. *Invent. Math.*, 242(3):895–1086, 2025.
- [5] A. Avilés, J. Rodríguez, and P. Tradacete. “The free Banach lattice generated by a Banach space”. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 274(10):2955–2977, 2018.
- [6] X. Bei, J. Ma, Z. Jing, H. Fu, and Z. G. Tang. *Econcslib: a lean library for computational economics and ai-assisted research*, 2026.
- [7] S. Bertolini, J. de Dios Pont, B. Pineau, M. A. Taylor, and J. P. G. Ramos. *L^2 -stability for stft phase retrieval*, 2026.
- [8] E. Bilokopytov. “Locally hulled topologies”. *Quaest. Math.*, 48(12):1781–1797, 2025.
- [9] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, pages xiv+716.
- [10] J. de Dios Pont, L. Liehr, D. Muñoz-Lahoz, M. A. Taylor, and P. Tradacete. “Banach lattices and phase retrieval: a case study for the use of AI in mathematics”. 2026.
- [11] P.-N. Kung, L. Song, D. Hwang, J. Yoon, C.-L. Li, S. Severini, M. Olšák, E. Lockhart, Q. V. Le, B. Gokturk, T. Luong, T. Pfister, and N. Peng. *Leap: supercharging llms for formal mathematics with agentic frameworks*, 2026.
- [12] C. C. A. Labuschagne and C. J. van Alten. “On the variety of Riesz spaces”. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 18(1):61–68, 2007.
- [13] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri. *Classical Banach spaces. II*, volume 97 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979, pages x+243. Function spaces.

- [14] P. Meyer-Nieberg. *Banach lattices*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991, pages xvi+395.
- [15] D. Muñoz-Lahoz. *Wickstead’s conjecture on positive projections and non-representable banach lattice algebras*, 2026.
- [16] T. Oikhberg, M. A. Taylor, P. Tradacete, and V. G. Troitsky. “Free Banach lattices”. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 28(10):4387–4514, 2026.
- [17] T. Tao. *The integrated explicit analytic number theory network : a progress report*. Conference talk at Techniques and Tools for the Formalization of Analysis, Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics (ICERM), 2026.
- [18] Tau Ceti Project. *Tau ceti*. 2026. URL: <https://github.com/TauCetiProject/TauCeti> (visited on 07/28/2026).
- [19] The mathlib Community. “The Lean mathematical library”. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 367–381. ACM, 2020.
- [20] A. W. Wickstead. “Banach lattice algebras: some questions, but very few answers”. *Positivity*, 21(2):803–815, 2017.
- [21] A. W. Wickstead. “Ordered Banach algebras and multi-norms: some open problems”. *Positivity*, 21(2):817–823, 2017.
- [22] A. W. Wickstead. “Two dimensional unital Riesz algebras, their representations and norms”. *Positivity*, 21(2):787–801, 2017.
- [23] Y. Zhang, Y. Sun, T. Suzuki, J. D. Lee, and F. Liu. *Leanmarathon: toward reliable ai co-mathematicians through long-horizon lean autoformalization*, 2026.