arXiv:2611.20169v1 [math.AP] 15 Nov 2026

A FORMALLY VERIFIED CONVERGENCE THEOREM FOR THE TUG-OF-WAR SCHEME OF THE NORMALIZED p-LAPLACIAN

JUAN J. MANFREDI AND BEHROOZ MOOSAVI

Abstract. We present a complete formalization, using Lean 4, of the convergence of p-harmonious functions to the viscosity solution of the Dirichlet problem for the normalized p-Laplacian, $2 \le p < \infty$, as the step size goes to zero. By p-harmonious functions we mean solutions of the dynamic programming principle of tug-of-war with noise. Our proof follows the argument of Barles and Souganidis and is formalized in full, depending only on Mathlib and the standard axioms of Lean. In particular, we include the asymptotic expansion of the scheme, the viscosity properties of the half-relaxed limits, existence and uniqueness for the discrete problem, the comparison principle and uniqueness for the homogeneous equation, Aleksandrov's theorem, and Jensen's lemma.

1. Introduction

For $1 < p < \infty$ the normalized p-Laplacian is

$$\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = \Delta u + (p-2)\,\Delta_\infty^{\mathrm{N}} u, \qquad \Delta_\infty^{\mathrm{N}} u = \Big\langle D^2 u\, \tfrac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}, \tfrac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \Big\rangle. \tag{1}$$

Here u is a function defined on an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \ge 1$, with gradient ∇u and Hessian $D^2 u$. The Euclidean inner product is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, and (1) is defined where $\nabla u \neq 0$. The operator is homogeneous of degree one and not in divergence form, so the natural notion of solution is the viscosity one. Its connection with stochastic games goes back to Peres, Schramm, Sheffield and Wilson, who identified the infinity Laplacian as the limit of tug-of-war [19], and to Peres and Sheffield, who reached finite p by adding noise [20]. Manfredi, Parviainen and Rossi characterized p-harmonic functions by an asymptotic mean value property [16] and introduced p-harmonious functions, the solutions of the discrete dynamic programming principle

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{\alpha}{2}\Big(\sup_{B_\varepsilon(x)} u_\varepsilon + \inf_{B_\varepsilon(x)} u_\varepsilon \Big) + \beta \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)} u_\varepsilon, \qquad \alpha = \frac{p-2}{p+d}, \quad \beta = \frac{d+2}{p+d}. \tag{2}$$

Here $\varepsilon > 0$ is the step size, and $B_\varepsilon(x)$ is the open ball of radius ε centred at x. For a ball B we denote by $|B|$ its volume, and by

$$\fint_B v = \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B v(y)\, dy$$

the average of v over B with respect to Lebesgue measure. For $p \ge 2$ the weights satisfy $\alpha \ge 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha + \beta = 1$. In the game, α is the probability of a tug-of-war move, in which the choices of the two players produce the supremum and the infimum, and β is the probability of a random move, uniformly distributed in $B_\varepsilon(x)$, which produces the average. Manfredi, Parviainen and Rossi showed that bounded p-harmonious functions in bounded Lipschitz domains, with boundary values prescribed by a fixed bounded continuous function F, converge as ε goes to zero to the viscosity solution of the Dirichlet problem with boundary values F [17].

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J92, 35D40, 49L20, 68V20.

Key words and phrases. normalized p-Laplacian, p-harmonious functions, tug-of-war, viscosity solutions, comparison principle, Lean, formal verification.

Main result. We report a complete formalization of a version of this convergence theorem, for domains satisfying the exterior sphere condition, in Lean 4 [6] on top of the Mathlib library [21]. The development builds with Lean 4.34.0-rc2 (toolchain `leanprover/lean4:v4.34.0-rc2`) against Mathlib at commit `85e3a25`.[1]

Recall that an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies the *exterior sphere condition* if for every $y \in \partial\Omega$ there is a ball $B(z,\delta)$ with $B(z,\delta) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$ and $y \in \partial B(z,\delta)$.

Main Theorem (`PLaplacian.pharmonious_exists_converge`)**.** *Let $2 \le p < \infty$ and $d \ge 1$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded open set satisfying the exterior sphere condition, and let $F\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and continuous. Then:*

1. *for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a unique function u_ε, p-harmonious in Ω with data F (Definition 2.1), equal to F outside Ω, with $\sup|u_\varepsilon| \le \sup|F|$;*
2. *the half-relaxed limits $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ of this family (Section 2.4) coincide on $\overline{\Omega}$ and equal F on $\partial\Omega$, and $u_\varepsilon \to \overline{u}$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$.*

The limit is a viscosity solution of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in Ω (Definition 2.2). The uniqueness of u_ε in part (1) is proved in Theorem 7.3. Part (2) holds for every uniformly bounded family of p-harmonious functions with data F that equal F outside Ω (`pharmonious_converge`)*.*

In Lean, the Main Theorem reads as follows; the exterior sphere condition is the hypothesis `hext`, and the conclusion lists the existence of the family, its bounds, and the three statements of part (2).

```
theorem pharmonious_exists_converge [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (hd : 0 < d)
    {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p) (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ)) {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)}
    (hΩo : IsOpen Ω) (hΩb : Bornology.IsBounded Ω) {F : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    (hFc : Continuous F) {C : ℝ} (hFC : ∀ y, |F y| ≤ C)
    (hext : ∀ y ∈ frontier Ω, ∃ (z : EuclSpace d) (δ : ℝ), 0 < δ ∧
      ‖y - z‖ = δ ∧ ∀ x ∈ Ω, δ ≤ ‖x - z‖) :
    ∃ u : ℝ → EuclSpace d → ℝ,
      (∀ ε > 0, IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F (u ε)) ∧
      (∀ ε > 0, ∀ x, x ∉ Ω → u ε x = F x) ∧
      (∀ ε y, |u ε y| ≤ C) ∧
      (∀ x ∈ closure Ω, ubar u x = lbar u x) ∧
      (∀ x ∈ frontier Ω, ubar u x = F x) ∧
      (∀ η > 0, ∃ ε₀ > 0, ∀ ε, 0 < ε → ε < ε₀ → ∀ x ∈ closure Ω,
        |u ε x - ubar u x| ≤ η)
```

The development contains no unproved statements. Lean reports that `pharmonious_exists_converge` depends only on the axioms `propext`, `Classical.choice` and `Quot.sound`, that is, on classical mathematics. The source is available at https://github.com/BehroozMoosavi/tugofwar_formalization, tag `v1.3`; a technical companion [14] documents every layer of the development file by file.

Remarks. We make the following remarks.

Scope. The mathematical results are established; this paper describes their formalization in Lean.

An analytic proof. The dynamic programming principle is the definition of the discrete problem; existence follows the analytic argument of Luiro, Parviainen and Saksman [11], applied to the operator restricted to the domain, and convergence follows as in del Teso, Manfredi and Parviainen [7].

Aleksandrov's theorem and Jensen's lemma. Neither was available in Mathlib. Our proof of Aleksandrov's theorem [1] obtains subgradients from the proximal map, rather than from a

[1] The full commit hash is `85e3a25e006c35636f0e53b0e9296caca2685bc0`.

supporting-hyperplane argument based on the Hahn–Banach theorem, and derives the second-order expansion from the subgradient inequalities by Riemann sums, rather than by integrating the gradient along segments. Our proof of Jensen's lemma [9] uses neither mollification nor the area formula.

Precise statements. Several statements of the informal theory had to be made precise; Section 8 collects a few examples.

Related work. Formalized analysis of partial differential equations is relatively recent. Van Doorn and Macbeth formalized the Gagliardo–Nirenberg–Sobolev inequality [22], and Armstrong and Kempe the interior De Giorgi–Nash–Moser theory [2]. Both concern divergence-form equations and weak solutions. In probability, Marion formalized the Ionescu–Tulcea theorem and infinite products of probability measures in Mathlib [18]. Manfredi has also formalized in Lean the regularity of p-harmonic functions in the plane of Iwaniec and Manfredi [12], with Shirsho Mukherjee the comparison principles for degenerate sub-elliptic equations in non-divergence form of Manfredi and Mukherjee [15], and interior $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates for infinity-harmonic functions [13].

Organization. In Section 2 we fix the definitions, and in Section 3 we give the plan of the proof. In Sections 4–7 we carry out its main steps. Section 8 collects a few examples from the formalization.

2. Setting

Throughout the paper we fix the exponent p with $2 \le p < \infty$, the dimension $d \ge 1$, and the step size $\varepsilon > 0$.

2.1. **The scheme.** A function $v\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is *admissible* if it is Borel measurable and bounded. For admissible v the step operator is

$$T_\varepsilon v(x) = \frac{\alpha}{2}\Big(\sup_{B_\varepsilon(x)} v + \inf_{B_\varepsilon(x)} v\Big) + \beta \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)} v, \tag{3}$$

with α, β as in (2). The balls are open (see Section 8). The operator is monotone, commutes with the addition of constants, and is therefore nonexpansive in the supremum norm. Monotonicity uses $p \ge 2$: for $p < 2$ the weight α is negative.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $F\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded; F is the boundary data. An admissible u is *p-harmonious in Ω with data F* if $u = T_\varepsilon u$ on Ω and $u = F$ on the strip $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \{x \notin \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(x, \Omega) \le \varepsilon\}$.

2.2. **Viscosity solutions.** We write the equation as $\mathcal{F}(\nabla u, D^2 u) = 0$, where

$$\mathcal{F}(q, X) = -\operatorname{tr} X - (p-2)\left\langle X \tfrac{q}{|q|}, \tfrac{q}{|q|} \right\rangle, \qquad q \ne 0.$$

Here $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, X ranges over the symmetric $d \times d$ matrices, and $\operatorname{tr} X$ is the trace of X. We also write $\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}(q, X) = -\mathcal{F}(q, X)$, so that $\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = \Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}(\nabla u, D^2 u)$. The operator $\mathcal{F}$ is degenerate elliptic, that is, $\mathcal{F}(q, X) \le \mathcal{F}(q, Y)$ whenever $X - Y$ is positive semidefinite.

The function $\mathcal{F}$ is not defined at $q = 0$. To state the equation at points where the gradient vanishes, we use the lower semicontinuous envelope $\mathcal{F}_*$ of $\mathcal{F}$, the largest lower semicontinuous function below $\mathcal{F}$, and the upper semicontinuous envelope $\mathcal{F}^*$, the smallest upper semicontinuous function above $\mathcal{F}$. Both agree with $\mathcal{F}$ where $q \ne 0$. For $p \ge 2$ their values at $q = 0$ are

$$\mathcal{F}_*(0, X) = -\operatorname{tr} X - (p-2)\lambda_{\max}(X), \qquad \mathcal{F}^*(0, X) = -\operatorname{tr} X - (p-2)\lambda_{\min}(X), \tag{4}$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(X)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ denote the smallest and the largest eigenvalue of X. We use these formulas directly, so that no general envelope construction is needed.

Definition 2.2. An upper semicontinuous u is a *viscosity subsolution* of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in an open set Ω if, whenever $\varphi \in C^2$ and $u - \varphi$ has a local maximum at $x_0 \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{F}(\nabla\varphi(x_0), D^2\varphi(x_0)) \le 0 \ \text{ if } \nabla\varphi(x_0) \neq 0, \qquad \mathcal{F}_*(0, D^2\varphi(x_0)) \le 0 \ \text{ otherwise.}$$

A lower semicontinuous u is a *viscosity supersolution* of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in Ω if, whenever $\varphi \in C^2$ and $u - \varphi$ has a local minimum at $x_0 \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{F}(\nabla\varphi(x_0), D^2\varphi(x_0)) \ge 0 \ \text{ if } \nabla\varphi(x_0) \neq 0, \qquad \mathcal{F}^*(0, D^2\varphi(x_0)) \ge 0 \ \text{ otherwise.}$$

A function is a *viscosity solution* if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution; in particular, it is continuous.

2.3. **Jets and second-order expansions.** Let u be a real function defined near x_0. We say that u has a *second-order expansion* (q, X) at x_0, with $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and X a symmetric matrix, if

$$u(x_0 + h) = u(x_0) + \langle q, h\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\langle Xh, h\rangle + o(|h|^2) \qquad (h \to 0).$$

Here $o(|h|^2)$ denotes a remainder $r(h)$ with $r(h)/|h|^2 \to 0$ as $h \to 0$; for this notion, see [8, Section 6.4]. If $u \in C^2$, this is the second-order Taylor expansion, with $q = \nabla u(x_0)$ and $X = D^2u(x_0)$; the definition, however, does not require u to be differentiable near x_0. The pair (q, X) is a *superjet* of u at x_0 if

$$u(x_0 + h) \le u(x_0) + \langle q, h\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\langle Xh, h\rangle + o(|h|^2) \qquad (h \to 0).$$

The pair is a *subjet* if the reverse inequality holds. Definition 2.2 can equivalently be stated with jets: its conditions then apply to superjets (for subsolutions) and subjets (for supersolutions) (q, X) in place of $(\nabla\varphi(x_0), D^2\varphi(x_0))$.

2.4. **Half-relaxed limits.** For a uniformly bounded family (u_ε), we define its upper and lower half-relaxed limits by

$$\overline{u}(x) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0^+,\ y \to x} u_\varepsilon(y), \qquad \underline{u}(x) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0^+,\ y \to x} u_\varepsilon(y).$$

The limits are taken along the product of the punctured right neighbourhood of 0 with the neighbourhood of x. They are defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and finite, $\underline{u} \le \overline{u}$, and $\overline{u}$ is upper and $\underline{u}$ lower semicontinuous. Since $-u_\varepsilon$ is p-harmonious with data $-F$ whenever u_ε is (the operator is odd), $\underline{u} = -\overline{(-u)}$, and every statement about $\underline{u}$ below is read off from the corresponding statement about $\overline{u}$.

3. Plan of the proof

Let $(u_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ be the family given by part (1) of the Main Theorem: for each $\varepsilon > 0$, the function u_ε is p-harmonious in Ω with data F and equals F outside Ω. Let $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ be its half-relaxed limits. The argument of Barles and Souganidis [4] reduces part (2) of the Main Theorem to three statements:

(A) The upper half-relaxed limit $\overline{u}$ is a viscosity subsolution, and the lower half-relaxed limit $\underline{u}$ is a viscosity supersolution in Ω (Section 5).
(B) The boundary inequalities $\overline{u} \le F \le \underline{u}$ hold on $\partial\Omega$ (Section 7).
(C) The comparison principle holds: a bounded upper semicontinuous subsolution lies below a bounded lower semicontinuous supersolution in Ω if it does so on $\partial\Omega$ (Section 6).

Part (1) of the Main Theorem, the existence and uniqueness of u_ε for each $\varepsilon > 0$, is proved separately: existence by iteration, and uniqueness by a propagation argument (Section 7.1). Given (A), (B) and (C), $\overline{u} \le \underline{u}$ in Ω, hence equality on $\overline{\Omega}$; the common value is continuous, and uniform convergence follows by a compactness argument against the semicontinuity of the relaxed limits. Statement (A) rests on the asymptotic expansion of the scheme (Section 4).

The formal development is organized in four layers, summarized in Table 1; Figure 1 shows how the main results depend on each other.

Layer	Content	Lines (approx.)
1	the scheme: operator, measurability, existence, uniqueness, comparison	3 300
2	viscosity framework: generator, predicates, consistency, stability	1 100
3	the asymptotic expansion of T_ε, with an explicit error rate	5 500
4	relaxed limits, comparison principle, boundary, convergence	19 100
	total (225 files)	29 400

TABLE 1. The four layers of the development. Layer 4 includes Aleksandrov's theorem and Jensen's lemma.




FIGURE 1. Dependencies among the main results; an arrow means that the target uses the source.

4. Consistency: the asymptotic expansion

Theorem 4.1 (`expansion_uniform`, `eventually_bound_le`). *Let $\varphi \in C^3$ with $\nabla\varphi(x_0) \neq 0$. There is $\rho > 0$ such that, for every $y \in B_\rho(x_0)$ and every $0 < \varepsilon \leq \rho$,*

$$T_\varepsilon\varphi(y) = \varphi(y) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(p+d)}\,\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi(y) + E_\varepsilon(y), \qquad \text{where} \qquad \sup_{y \in B_\rho(x_0)} |E_\varepsilon(y)| = o(\varepsilon^2) \quad (\varepsilon \to 0^+).$$

In Lean, the first declaration gives the expansion with an explicit bound on the error, uniform in y, and the second shows that this bound is eventually at most $\eta\varepsilon^2$ for every $\eta > 0$.

```
theorem expansion_uniform [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (hd : 0 < d)
    {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p) (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ))
    {φ : EuclSpace d → ℝ} (hφ : ContDiff ℝ 3 φ) {x₀ : EuclSpace d}
    (hx₀ : gradient φ x₀ ≠ 0) :
    ∃ ρ > 0, ∃ H K Ka g : ℝ, 0 < g ∧ 0 ≤ K ∧ 0 ≤ H ∧ 0 ≤ Ka ∧
      ∀ y ∈ ball x₀ ρ, ∀ ε : ℝ, 0 < ε → ε ≤ ρ →
        ∃ E : ℝ,
          tugOfWarOp p ε φ y
```

```
    = φ y + ε ^ 2 / (2 * (p + (d : ℝ)))
        * normPLapOf p (gradient φ y)
            (fderiv ℝ (fderiv ℝ φ) y) + E
∧ |E| ≤ (H * ε * Real.sqrt
        (2 * ε * ((H * ε ^ 2 + 2 * K * ε ^ 3) / g))
      + K * ε ^ 3) + Ka * ε ^ 3

theorem eventually_bound_le {H K Ka g η : ℝ} (hη : 0 < η) :
    ∀ᶠ ε in nhdsWithin (0 : ℝ) (Set.Ioi 0),
      (H * ε * Real.sqrt (2 * ε * ((H * ε ^ 2 + 2 * K * ε ^ 3) / g))
          + K * ε ^ 3) + Ka * ε ^ 3 ≤ η * ε ^ 2
```

The right-hand side of (3) is the sum of two terms: the mean of the supremum and the infimum of v over $B_\varepsilon(x)$, multiplied by α, and the average of v over $B_\varepsilon(x)$, multiplied by β. We expand each term for $v = \varphi$.

The average yields the Laplacian through the second moments of Lebesgue measure on the ball,

$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon(0)} z_i z_j \, dz = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{d+2}\,\delta_{ij},$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. This identity is exact. Averaging the second-order Taylor expansion gives

$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \varphi = \varphi(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(d+2)}\,\Delta\varphi(x) + O(\varepsilon^3).$$

The first moments vanish, and the remainder of the second-order Taylor expansion of $\varphi \in C^3$ is bounded by $C\varepsilon^3$ on $B_\varepsilon(x)$. The constant C is independent of ε and can be chosen uniformly for x in a fixed sufficiently small neighbourhood of x_0. Thus the $O(\varepsilon^3)$ remainder is also $o(\varepsilon^2)$, since $C\varepsilon^3/\varepsilon^2 \to 0$. The mean of the supremum and the infimum yields the infinity Laplacian: the maximizer of φ on $\overline{B}_\varepsilon(x)$ lies within $O(\varepsilon^{3/2})$ of $x + \varepsilon\,\nabla\varphi(x)/|\nabla\varphi(x)|$, the first-order terms of the two extreme values cancel, and

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\sup_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \varphi + \inf_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \varphi\Big) = \varphi(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\,\Delta_\infty^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi(x) + o(\varepsilon^2).$$

The weights then combine as

$$\alpha\,\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\,\Delta_\infty^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi + \beta\,\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(d+2)}\,\Delta\varphi = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(p+d)}\,\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi,$$

the factor $d+2$ cancelling against the numerator of β.

Theorem 4.1 is uniform in the base point y, as the viscosity property requires, since near-maximizers move with ε. The error bound is explicit: the Taylor remainder is cubic in the increment, and the $O(\varepsilon^{3/2})$ distance of an extremizer from the corresponding point $y \pm \varepsilon\nabla\varphi(y)/|\nabla\varphi(y)|$ contributes $O(\varepsilon^{5/2})$ to the function-value remainder [14, §5]. At critical points the extreme-value term is controlled instead by the eigenvalues of the Hessian, which is where the envelopes (4) appear.

5. The viscosity property of the relaxed limits

Theorem 5.1 (`ubar_isViscositySubsolution`, `lbar_isViscositySupersolution`). *If (u_ε) is uniformly bounded and each u_ε is p-harmonious in an open set Ω, then $\overline{u}$ is a viscosity subsolution of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in Ω, in the sense of Definition 2.2, and $\underline{u}$ is a viscosity supersolution.*

In Lean:

```
theorem ubar_isViscositySubsolution [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (hd : 0 < d)
    {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p) (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ))
    {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)} (hΩ : IsOpen Ω) {F : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    {u : ℝ → EuclSpace d → ℝ} {C : ℝ} (hC : ∀ ε y, |u ε y| ≤ C)
    (hu : ∀ ε > 0, IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F (u ε)) :
    IsViscositySubsolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) (ubar u)

theorem lbar_isViscositySupersolution [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (hd : 0 < d)
    {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p) (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ))
    {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)} (hΩ : IsOpen Ω) {F : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    {u : ℝ → EuclSpace d → ℝ} {C : ℝ} (hC : ∀ ε y, |u ε y| ≤ C)
    (hu : ∀ ε > 0, IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F (u ε)) :
    IsViscositySupersolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) (lbar u)
```

The statement uses C^2 test functions, arbitrary local maxima, and both the regular and the singular conditions. The proof has three main steps.

Near-maximizers without extraction. Suppose $\overline{u} - \varphi$ has a strict maximum at x_0. For each ε choose x_ε nearly maximizing $u_\varepsilon - \varphi$ on a ball about x_0, measured against that parameter's own supremum. Applying the monotone operator to $u_\varepsilon \le \varphi + c_\varepsilon$ and using $u_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon$ gives

$$T_\varepsilon \varphi(x_\varepsilon) - \varphi(x_\varepsilon) \ge -\eta_\varepsilon, \qquad \eta_\varepsilon = o(\varepsilon^2).$$

The uniform expansion turns this into the subsolution inequality in the limit. That the near-maximizers approach x_0 is shown by a compactness argument on an annulus, using strictness, rather than by extracting a convergent sequence.

The singular case without a gradient. When $\nabla\varphi(x_0) = 0$, the consistency estimate is unavailable. Instead, the extreme values of a quadratic over a ball are compared with its extreme eigenvalue by reflecting the ball through its centre, which gives the inequality involving $\lambda_{\max}$ in (4) directly.

From smooth to C^2 test functions. The core argument is carried out for C^3 test functions at strict extrema. The passage to C^2 functions and non-strict extrema adds a quartic $|x - x_0|^4$ and replaces φ by its second-order Taylor polynomial. This needs neither mollification nor the symmetry of the Hessian, because every operator in the predicates sees the Hessian only through its quadratic form $X(v, v)$.

6. The comparison principle

Theorem 6.1 (`visc_comparison`). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and open, and let $U, V \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be bounded, with U upper semicontinuous and V lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose that U is a viscosity subsolution and V a viscosity supersolution of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in Ω. If $U(y) \le V(y)$ for every $y \in \partial\Omega$, then $U \le V$ in Ω.*

In Lean, where the boundedness hypotheses appear as bounds on the ranges:

```
theorem visc_comparison (hd : 0 < d) {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p) {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)}
    (hΩo : IsOpen Ω) (hΩb : Bornology.IsBounded Ω) {U V : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    (hU : UpperSemicontinuous U) (hV : LowerSemicontinuous V)
    (hUb : BddAbove (range U)) (hUb' : BddBelow (range U))
    (hVb : BddBelow (range V)) (hVb' : BddAbove (range V))
    (hsub : IsViscositySubsolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) U)
    (hsup : IsViscositySupersolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) V)
    (hbd : ∀ x ∈ frontier Ω, U x ≤ V x) :
    ∀ x ∈ Ω, U x ≤ V x
```

The boundary condition is pointwise. Since U and V are semicontinuous on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$, it implies the usual boundary inequality

$$\limsup_{x\to y,\ x\in\Omega} U(x) \le U(y) \le V(y) \le \liminf_{x\to y,\ x\in\Omega} V(x) \qquad (y\in\partial\Omega).$$

In the application $U=\overline{u}$ and $V=\underline{u}$, which are defined and semicontinuous on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Applying Theorem 6.1 in both directions gives uniqueness.

Theorem 6.2 (`visc_unique`)**.** *Two bounded continuous viscosity solutions of $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} u = 0$ in a bounded open set Ω that agree on $\partial\Omega$ agree in Ω. In particular, the limit in the Main Theorem does not depend on the family (u_ε).*

In Lean:

```
theorem visc_unique (hd : 0 < d) {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p)
    {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)} (hΩo : IsOpen Ω) (hΩb : Bornology.IsBounded Ω)
    {u₁ u₂ : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    (h₁c : Continuous u₁) (h₂c : Continuous u₂)
    (h₁a : BddAbove (range u₁)) (h₁b : BddBelow (range u₁))
    (h₂a : BddAbove (range u₂)) (h₂b : BddBelow (range u₂))
    (h₁sub : IsViscositySubsolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) u₁)
    (h₁sup : IsViscositySupersolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) u₁)
    (h₂sub : IsViscositySubsolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) u₂)
    (h₂sup : IsViscositySupersolution p Ω (fun _ => 0) u₂)
    (hbd : ∀ x ∈ frontier Ω, u₁ x = u₂ x) :
    ∀ x ∈ Ω, u₁ x = u₂ x
```

6.1. **The obstruction.** For a strict subsolution, $-\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}} U \le -c < 0$, the classical doubling argument with the theorem of sums [5] applies, and we formalize it first. The relaxed limits, however, satisfy the equation with $c = 0$. Adding $\frac{\delta}{2}|x|^2$ to the subsolution shifts the Hessian by δI but also the gradient by δx, and in the doubling argument the resulting error in the *direction* of the gradient is of order $\delta|x|/|x-y|$, unbounded as the doubled points merge. A monotone change of unknown keeps the direction, but the strictness it creates vanishes at critical points. Another route to comparison uses the equivalence of viscosity solutions with weak solutions [10]; the argument below uses only viscosity theory.

6.2. **The change of values.** Following Barles and Busca [3], let $\psi(s) = s - \eta s^2$ with $\eta > 0$ small, and $W = \psi \circ V$. If V has the second-order expansion (q, X) at a point, as at the points given by Aleksandrov's theorem [8, Section 6.4], then W has the second-order expansion

$$(cq,\ cX - 2\eta\, q\otimes q), \qquad c = \psi'(V) > 0,$$

where $q\otimes q$ is the matrix $(q_i q_j)_{i,j}$, and the supersolution inequality gives

$$\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}\big(cq,\ cX - 2\eta\, q\otimes q\big) \le -2\eta(p-1)|q|^2. \tag{5}$$

This is strict exactly where $q \neq 0$. The composition is used only at points where V is twice differentiable, so no viscosity chain rule is needed.

6.3. **No maximum with nonzero gradient.** After regularization (Section 6.5), U is semiconvex and V and W are semiconcave: there are constants $\lambda, \mu \ge 0$ such that $U + \frac{\lambda}{2}|\cdot|^2$ is convex and $W - \frac{\mu}{2}|\cdot|^2$ is concave. A vector q is a *lower support* of U at x if

$$U(x+h) \ge U(x) + \langle q, h\rangle - \tfrac{\lambda}{2}|h|^2 \qquad \text{for all } h;$$

by semiconvexity, U has a lower support at every point. Let x be a local maximum of $U - W$. We show that every lower support q of U at x vanishes. Suppose not. Jensen's lemma, applied to $U - W - \delta|\cdot - x|^2$, gives a set of positive measure of points at which small linear perturbations

attain their maximum; by Aleksandrov's theorem U and $-V$ are twice differentiable almost everywhere, so the set contains a point y_0 of twice differentiability of both. There the first- and second-order conditions at a maximum, together with (5) and the subsolution inequality for U, give

$$0 \le -\kappa + \tfrac{\kappa}{3} + \tfrac{\kappa}{3}, \qquad \kappa = 2\eta(p-1)\Big(\frac{|q|}{2C}\Big)^2 > 0,$$

where C is an upper bound for $\psi' \circ V$; this is a contradiction. A quantitative gradient estimate, $|a - q| \le (\lambda + 2\mu)|y - x|$ for lower supports a at nearby points y, allows all parameters to be fixed in advance, so that a single point of the positive-measure set suffices and no sequence of points is extracted.

6.4. **The translated maximum.** On a connected open set G with $U - W$ larger inside than on ∂G, consider $M(h) = \max_{\overline{G}}\big(U(\cdot + h) - W\big)$. For small h its maximizers are interior, and the previous step applies to the translate: its lower support vanishes. Hence $M(h+k) \ge M(h) - \frac{\lambda}{2}|k|^2$, and subdividing a segment into N steps loses at most $\frac{\lambda}{2N}|k|^2$, so M is constant near 0. On the contact set $K = \{U - W = M(0)\}$, then, U has local maxima and V local minima; the strong maximum and minimum principles make both locally constant, so K is open. It is also relatively closed and nonempty, so $K = G$, which contradicts the gap at the boundary.

The strong maximum principle is proved with the barrier $(|x-y_0|^2 - B)^2$ on a thin annulus, and is stated for functions whose superjets with nonzero gradient satisfy the subsolution inequality. In that form it applies to the regularizations directly, without proving that they are viscosity subsolutions.

6.5. **Regularization.** We replace U by its sup-convolution and V by its inf-convolution, which are semiconvex and semiconcave; by the magic property of sup-convolutions [5, Lemma A.5] their jets satisfy the jet inequalities wherever the maximizers of the convolution lie in Ω. This needs U and V bounded on both sides. Semicontinuity and compactness give a band near $\partial\Omega$ on which the regularized difference is small, and the connected component of a superlevel set containing a point where $U - V$ is positive supplies the set G of the previous step.

6.6. **Aleksandrov's theorem and Jensen's lemma.** Aleksandrov's theorem gives the following second-order expansion [8, Section 6.4].

Theorem 6.3 (`alexandrov`)**.** *A convex function f on $\mathbb{R}^d$ has a second-order expansion at almost every point: for almost every x there are $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a symmetric bilinear form X with*

$$f(x+h) = f(x) + \langle q, h\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}X(h,h) + o(|h|^2) \qquad (h \to 0).$$

In Lean, where `AlexandrovThm d` is the proposition stated above:

```
theorem alexandrov : AlexandrovThm d
```

For convex f, the proximal map $J(y) = \operatorname{argmin}_x\big(f(x) + \frac{1}{2}|x-y|^2\big)$ is one-Lipschitz and onto, and $y - J(y)$ is a subgradient at $J(y)$; subgradients at every point are obtained as limits of rescaled proximal differences, without a separation theorem. Rademacher's theorem and the area formula, both in Mathlib, show that almost every x is of the form $J(y)$ with $DJ(y)$ invertible. At such points the subgradient has a linear approximation, and the second-order expansion follows from the subgradient inequalities alone, by a Riemann sum for $\int_0^1 t\,dt$; no integral is used.

Theorem 6.4 (`jensen_positive_measure`)**.** *Let $r > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, and let W be semiconvex on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that W is larger at some point of $\overline{B}(x_0, r)$ than $2\delta r$ plus its values on the sphere. Then the set of points of $B(x_0, r)$ at which some $W + \langle \xi, \cdot\rangle$ with $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\xi| \le \delta$, attains its maximum over the closed ball $\overline{B}(x_0, r)$ has positive measure.*

In Lean:

```
theorem jensen_positive_measure {n : ℕ} (W : EuclSpace n → ℝ) (C : ℝ)
    (hC : 0 ≤ C) (hconv : ConvexOn ℝ Set.univ (fun x => W x + C / 2 * ‖x‖ ^ 2))
    (x₀ xs : EuclSpace n) (r δ : ℝ) (hr : 0 < r) (hδ : 0 < δ)
    (hxs : xs ∈ closedBall x₀ r)
    (hsphere : ∀ y, ‖y - x₀‖ = r → W y + 2 * δ * r < W xs) :
    0 < volume {x | x ∈ ball x₀ r ∧ ∃ p : EuclSpace n, ‖p‖ ≤ δ ∧
      ∀ y ∈ closedBall x₀ r, W y + inner ℝ p y ≤ W x + inner ℝ p x}
```

The tilt at such a point is determined by a subgradient map g, which sends the set onto a ball and is Lipschitz on the parts of the set away from the sphere, where W is squeezed between its semiconvex lower bound and the upper bound given by the maximum. A null set would have a null image.

7. Boundary behaviour, existence and convergence

Theorem 7.1 (`ubar_le_bdry`). *Under the hypotheses of the Main Theorem, $\overline{u}(y_0) \le F(y_0)$ at every $y_0 \in \partial\Omega$; by negation, $F(y_0) \le \underline{u}(y_0)$.*

In Lean, where the exterior ball at y_0 is $B(z_0, \delta_0)$:

```
theorem ubar_le_bdry [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (hd : 0 < d) {p : ℝ} (hp : 2 ≤ p)
    (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ)) {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)} {F : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    {u : ℝ → EuclSpace d → ℝ} {C : ℝ} (hC : ∀ ε y, |u ε y| ≤ C)
    (hu : ∀ ε > 0, IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F (u ε))
    (hout : ∀ ε > 0, ∀ x, x ∉ Ω → u ε x = F x)
    {y₀ : EuclSpace d} (hFc : ContinuousAt F y₀)
    {z₀ : EuclSpace d} {δ₀ : ℝ} (hδ₀ : 0 < δ₀) (hy₀z : ‖y₀ - z₀‖ = δ₀)
    (hext : ∀ x ∈ Ω, δ₀ ≤ ‖x - z₀‖) :
    ubar u y₀ ≤ F y₀
```

The proof compares u_ε with a barrier through a discrete comparison principle: *if $u = T_\varepsilon u$ and $T_\varepsilon v \le v - \kappa$ on a set D, for some $\kappa > 0$, and $u \le v$ within ε outside D, then $u \le v$ on D.* Unlike comparison of two solutions, this needs no attained maximum.

The exterior ball. Let $B(z_0, \delta_0)$ be an exterior ball at y_0, so that $|y_0 - z_0| = \delta_0$ and $|x - z_0| \ge \delta_0$ for every $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. We replace it by the ball of half the radius whose centre is the midpoint of y_0 and z_0,

$$z = \tfrac{1}{2}(y_0 + z_0), \qquad \delta = \tfrac{1}{2}\delta_0.$$

Apollonius's identity expresses the distance to a midpoint through the distances to the two endpoints: for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|x - z|^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}|x - y_0|^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}|x - z_0|^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}|y_0 - z_0|^2,$$

which follows by expanding the squares (it is the parallelogram law). For $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ the middle term is at least $\frac{1}{2}\delta_0^2$ and the last equals $\frac{1}{4}\delta_0^2$, so

$$|x - z|^2 \ge \delta^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}|x - y_0|^2 \qquad (x \in \overline{\Omega}). \tag{6}$$

Thus y_0 is the only point of $\overline{\Omega}$ on the sphere $\partial B(z, \delta)$, and the points of $\overline{\Omega}$ with $|x - z|^2 \le \delta^2 + \tau$ lie within $\sqrt{2\tau}$ of y_0: the comparison region shrinks to y_0 as $\tau \to 0$. For the original ball, every point of the sphere $\partial B(z_0, \delta_0)$ could lie on $\partial\Omega$, and no such localization would hold.

The barrier. With $t = |x - z|^2 - \delta^2$, let

$$\psi = t - Mt^2, \qquad M = \frac{2(d + p - 2) + 1}{8(p - 1)\,\delta^2}.$$

On the shell $0 \le t \le 1/(4M)$ the gradient of ψ does not vanish and $\Delta_p^{\mathrm{N}}\psi \le -1$, so by the expansion, uniform on the compact shell,

$$T_\varepsilon(c + A\psi) \le c + A\psi - \frac{A\varepsilon^2}{4(p+d)}$$

on the shell, for all constants $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A > 0$ and all sufficiently small ε. The barrier is a polynomial, hence globally smooth as the expansion requires; the classical barrier $|x - z|^{-\sigma}$ is not. By (6), $t \ge \frac{1}{2}|x - y_0|^2 \ge 0$ on $\overline{\Omega}$, and the comparison is made on the part of Ω near y_0 where t is small.

Note. Under the exterior sphere condition used here, this proof is simpler than the corresponding argument of del Teso, Manfredi and Parviainen [7].

7.1. **Existence with exterior data.**

Theorem 7.2 (`exists_pharmonious`)**.** *Let Ω be bounded and measurable, $\varepsilon > 0$, and F measurable with $|F| \le C$. Then there is a p-harmonious function in Ω with data F, equal to F outside Ω and bounded by C.*

In Lean:

```
theorem exists_pharmonious (p ε : ℝ) (hp : 2 ≤ p) (hε : 0 < ε) (hd : 0 < d)
    (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ)) {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)} (hΩm : MeasurableSet Ω)
    (hΩb : Bornology.IsBounded Ω)
    {F : EuclSpace d → ℝ} (hFm : Measurable F) {C : ℝ}
    (hFC : ∀ y, |F y| ≤ C) :
    ∃ u : EuclSpace d → ℝ, IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F u
      ∧ (∀ x, x ∉ Ω → u x = F x) ∧ ∀ y, |u y| ≤ C
```

The proof iterates the operator restricted to Ω, $\widetilde{T}u = T_\varepsilon u$ on Ω and $\widetilde{T}u = u$ elsewhere, starting from $u_0 = -C$ on Ω and $u_0 = F$ outside. The iterates increase, stay bounded by C, and are never moved outside Ω. For uniform convergence we use the argument of [11]: with M the limit of $\sup_\Omega(u - u_j)$, u the limit and $x_0 \in \Omega$ a point nearly attaining the supremum,

$$M - 2\delta \le T_\varepsilon u_\ell(x_0) - T_\varepsilon u_k(x_0) \le \alpha \sup_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} (u - u_k) + \beta \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} (u - u_k) \le \alpha(M + \delta) + \delta$$

for suitable indices $k < \ell$, the average being small by dominated convergence and the independence of the ball volume from its centre. Hence $\beta M \le (3 + \alpha)\delta$ for every $\delta > 0$, and $M = 0$. Because the deficit vanishes outside Ω, the convergence is uniform on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the limit is a fixed point of $\widetilde{T}$ by nonexpansiveness.

Theorem 7.3 (`pharmonious_unique`)**.** *Let Ω be bounded. Two p-harmonious functions in Ω with data F that both equal F outside Ω are equal.*

In Lean:

```
theorem pharmonious_unique [Nontrivial (EuclSpace d)] (p ε : ℝ) (hp : 2 ≤ p)
    (hε : 0 < ε) (hpd : 0 < p + (d : ℝ)) {Ω : Set (EuclSpace d)}
    (hΩb : Bornology.IsBounded Ω) {F u v : EuclSpace d → ℝ}
    (hu : IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F u) (hv : IsPHarmonious p ε Ω F v)
    (huF : ∀ x, x ∉ Ω → u x = F x) (hvF : ∀ x, x ∉ Ω → v x = F x) :
    u = v
```

We follow the strategy of Luiro, Parviainen and Saksman [11, Theorem 2.2]: near-maxima of the difference of two solutions propagate in a fixed direction until they leave the bounded

domain. Let $w = v - u$ and $M = \sup w$, and suppose $M > 0$. Since $w = 0$ outside Ω, every point where $w > 0$ lies in Ω. If $w(x) > M - \delta$, then the dynamic programming principle gives

$$w(x) \le \alpha M + \beta \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)} w, \qquad \text{hence} \qquad \fint_{B_\varepsilon(x)} w > M - \frac{\delta}{\beta}.$$

Comparing integrals of $M - w$ over $B_\varepsilon(x)$ and over the ball $S = B(x + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon e, \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon)$, for a fixed unit vector e, shows that $w > M - C\delta$ at some point of S, which lies at least $\varepsilon/2$ further in the direction e; the constant C depends only on d, p and ε. After N such steps, with $N\varepsilon/2$ larger than the width of Ω, the point has left Ω, yet $w > M - C^N\delta_0 > 0$ there if $\delta_0 = M/(2C^N)$: a contradiction.

Note. In [11] the maximum is first shown to be attained almost everywhere on a ball, by compactness, and the exact maximal set is propagated; our proof propagates near-maxima with geometrically growing errors instead, which avoids the compactness step. The resulting argument is simpler than the one in [11].

With (A), (B), (C) and Theorems 7.2 and 7.3 in hand, the Main Theorem follows as described in Section 3.

Remark 7.4. The Main Theorem assumes $u_\varepsilon = F$ outside Ω, not only on the strip Γ_ε. This is needed: the relaxed limits at a boundary point see values at points farther than ε from Ω, where the dynamic programming principle imposes nothing.

8. Examples from the formalization

This section collects a few examples of statements and estimates that had to be made precise in the formalization. The companion [14, §9] gives further details.

8.1. **Open balls and measurability.** If the extreme values in (3) are taken over *closed* balls, the operator need not preserve Borel measurability: there are bounded Borel functions whose supremum over closed balls is not Borel. The admissible class is then not invariant under the operator. Over open balls, the set

$$\{x : \sup_{B_\varepsilon(x)} v > \lambda\}$$

is a union of open balls, which gives measurability.

8.2. **The restricted operator.** Iterating T_ε on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ gives a fixed-point equation $T_\varepsilon u = u$ everywhere, without imposing the boundary data. The estimate of [11] controls the deficit only near Ω, while passing the operator through the limit needs uniform convergence on every ball used by the operator. With the operator restricted to Ω, the deficit vanishes outside Ω and the same estimate closes the argument.

8.3. **The boundary strip.** Every exterior point sampled by an open ball of radius ε centred in Ω lies at distance strictly less than ε from Ω. The definition above prescribes data on the strip with distance at most ε; prescribing values also at distance exactly ε does not affect the operator inside Ω.

8.4. **Analytic existence and uniqueness arguments.** The proofs of [17] use the tug-of-war game, with supermartingales and optional stopping. We follow the analytic arguments of [11]. In the existence argument, the uniformity needed follows from the independence of the volume of a ball from its centre.

8.5. **Two representations of higher derivatives.** Mathlib represents second derivatives in two ways: as the curried derivative of the derivative and as the flat iterated derivative. The Taylor estimates of Section 4 use explicit identities between these representations for differentiation and norm estimates.

8.6. **Polynomial barriers.** To avoid computing the Hessians of explicit functions, both barriers of the proof enter only through exact polynomial expansions: for the strong maximum principle, the expansion turns a maximum into a superjet; for the boundary barrier, uniqueness of the coefficients in a second-order expansion identifies the operator value with its value at the explicit expansion.

8.7. **Quantifiers in error estimates.** For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the inequality

$$|E| \le K\varepsilon^2$$

holds for any E with $K = |E|/\varepsilon^2$. An error estimate for the expansion in Theorem 4.1 requires constants independent of ε, so the bounds must be established uniformly in that parameter. For its $o(\varepsilon^2)$ conclusion, the error bound must be at most $\eta\varepsilon^2$ for every $\eta > 0$, once ε is sufficiently small, uniformly in the base point. In the development, the propositions used by subsequent results were stated before their proofs. For example, Aleksandrov's theorem and Jensen's lemma were hypotheses of the comparison principle until both were proved.

8.8. **How the development was produced.** As in [2], the formalization was carried out with extensive use of a large language model, which proposed formal statements and drafted Lean files under the authors' direction. Every draft was compiled against the pinned toolchain, and corrections were driven by the compiler's output. The mathematical route was fixed by the authors. The Lean code is checked by Lean's kernel, and the Main Theorem depends only on the standard axioms.

9. Conclusion

We have formalized existence, uniqueness and convergence for the tug-of-war scheme of the normalized p-Laplacian, including the comparison principle for the limit equation, in about 29 400 lines of Lean.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Mathlib community, on whose library this development is built, and the developers of Lean. J. J. Manfredi was partially supported by Simons Foundation gift no. 962828.

References

1. A. D. Aleksandrov, *Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it*, Uchenye Zapiski Leningrad. Gos. Univ. Math. Ser. **6** (1939), 3–35, (in Russian).
2. Scott Armstrong and Jules Kempe, *Formalization of De Giorgi–Nash–Moser theory in Lean*, arXiv:2604.05984, 2026.
3. Guy Barles and Jérôme Busca, *Existence and comparison results for fully non linear degenerate elliptic equations without zeroth order terms*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001), 2323–2337.
4. Guy Barles and Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *Convergence of approximation schemes for fully nonlinear second order equations*, Asymptotic Anal. **4** (1991), 271–283.
5. Michael G. Crandall, Hitoshi Ishii, and Pierre-Louis Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (1992), 1–67.
6. Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich, *The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language*, Automated Deduction – CADE 28, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 12699, Springer, 2021, pp. 625–635.

7. Félix del Teso, Juan J. Manfredi, and Mikko Parviainen, *Convergence of dynamic programming principles for the p-Laplacian*, Adv. Calc. Var. **15** (2022), no. 2, 191–212.
8. Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, revised ed., Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.
9. Robert Jensen, *The maximum principle for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order partial differential equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **101** (1988), 1–27.
10. Petri Juutinen, Peter Lindqvist, and Juan J. Manfredi, *On the equivalence of viscosity solutions and weak solutions for a quasi-linear equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **33** (2001), 699–717.
11. Hannes Luiro, Mikko Parviainen, and Eero Saksman, *On the existence and uniqueness of p-harmonious functions*, Differential Integral Equations **27** (2014), no. 3–4, 201–216, arXiv:1211.0430.
12. Juan J. Manfredi, *Regularity of p-harmonic functions on the plane, in Lean 4*, https://github.com/na0b/iwaniecmanfredi-lean, Lean formalization of T. Iwaniec and J. J. Manfredi, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **5** (1989).
13. ———, *Uniform interior $c^{1,\alpha}$ estimates for infinity-harmonic functions, in Lean 4*, https://github.com/na0b/infharmonic-lean, 2026.
14. Juan J. Manfredi and Behrooz Moosavi, *A formalized convergence theory for the dynamic programming scheme of the normalized p-Laplacian: technical companion*, Available with the source at https://github.com/BehroozMoosavi/tugofwar_formalization, 2026.
15. Juan J. Manfredi and Shirsho Mukherjee, *Comparison principles for degenerate sub-elliptic equations, in Lean 4*, https://github.com/na0b/compnd-lean, 2026.
16. Juan J. Manfredi, Mikko Parviainen, and Julio D. Rossi, *An asymptotic mean value characterization for p-harmonic functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), 881–889.
17. ———, *On the definition and properties of p-harmonious functions*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **11** (2012), no. 2, 215–241.
18. Etienne Marion, *A formalization of the Ionescu–Tulcea theorem in Mathlib*, J. Automat. Reason. **70** (2026), Paper No. 20.
19. Yuval Peres, Oded Schramm, Scott Sheffield, and David B. Wilson, *Tug-of-war and the infinity Laplacian*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009), 167–210.
20. Yuval Peres and Scott Sheffield, *Tug-of-war with noise: a game-theoretic view of the p-Laplacian*, Duke Math. J. **145** (2008), 91–120.
21. The mathlib Community, *The Lean mathematical library*, Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP 2020), 2020, pp. 367–381.
22. Floris van Doorn and Heather Macbeth, *Integrals within integrals: a formalization of the Gagliardo–Nirenberg–Sobolev inequality*, 15th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP 2024), LIPIcs, vol. 309, 2024, pp. 37:1–37:18.

Department of Mathematics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA
Email address: manfredi@pitt.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA
Email address: behroozmoosavi@pitt.edu