

Invertibility in nonassociative ordered rings and in weak-quasi-topological nonassociative rings

Nizar El Idrissi*

nizar.elidrissi@uit.ac.ma

Hicham Zoubeir*

hzoubeir2014@gmail.com

July 17, 2024

Abstract

Invertibility is important in ring theory because it enables division and facilitates solving equations. Moreover, rings can be endowed with extra "structure" such as order and topology allowing us to write more complex statements. The two main theorems of this article are contributions to invertibility in the context of ordered and weak-quasi-topological rings. Specifically, the first theorem asserts that the interval $[0, 1]$ in any suitable partially ordered ring consists entirely of invertible elements. The second theorem asserts that if f is a norm from a ring to a partially ordered ring endowed with interval topology, then under certain conditions, the subset of elements such that $f(1 - a) < 1$ consists entirely of invertible elements. The second theorem relies on the assumption of sequential Cauchy completeness of the topology induced by the norm f , which as we recall, takes values in an ordered ring endowed with the interval topology (an example of a coarse topology). The fact that a ring endowed with the topology associated with a seminorm into an ordered ring endowed with the interval topology is a locally convex quasi-topological group with an additional continuity property of the product is dealt with in a separate section. A brief application to frame theory is also included.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Basic concepts	3
2.2	A few relevant properties of groups and rings endowed with the topology induced by a "norm" into a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group or ring	5
2.3	The interval topology as an example of a locally convex poset topology	8

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 16W80, 16U60, 46B15, 46A35.

Key words and phrases. invertibility, ordered ring, weak-quasi-topological ring, quasi-topological group, interval topology, completeness, Archimedean property, frame theory.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

3	Invertibility in ordered and topological rings using geometric series	11
3.1	Preliminary lemmas	11
3.2	Theorem 1	11
3.3	Theorem 2	14

1 Introduction

Ring theory is a rich and deep mathematical subject [26, 24, 35]. Rings are, after groups, one the most pervasive structures in algebra, and therefore in mathematics. Like many other mathematical structures, rings have a diverse nature in that they can support different levels of extra "structure" (ordered ring, topological ring, algebra, bi-algebra, Hopf algebra, etc.) and "property" (associativity, commutativity, super-commutativity, etc.). Rings have two operations, a "+" and a "×": the important point is that the second operation is generally and purposely non-trivial, and this is key for the construction of highly interesting examples which find an application in other places of mathematics and related disciplines (such as theoretical physics [33, 36]). Since the second operation is often the most interesting, an important direction in ring theory is what is named "multiplicative ideal theory" [5], and in particular, the theory of inverses [31]. Invertibility is important in ring theory because it enables division, facilitates solving equations, allows defining the group of units, and plays a role in ideal theory. The questions that arise in this context are of the following type: how to define the inverse [8, 9]? Do inverses exist and are they unique? What is the size of the set of invertible elements [22, 21]? etc. While the preceding explanations and examples shall give an indication of the richness of this field, this article contributes exclusively to the answer of the last two questions in the specific additional context of ordered and topological structures. Certainly, topology in a well-established theory. Briefly, it consists of the idea of inspecting the nearly geometric properties of sets through the examination of the properties of a collection of their subsets. In his landmark paper [22], Kaplansky showed that rings endowed with a compatible topology enjoy some very rich properties. Since then, there have been many contributions to the theory of topological rings [41, 2]. Kaplansky also found a result, which is central to us, stating the invertibility of elements of rings under a condition involving what was previously called a metric, and using an argument involving geometric series. This particular result has not been developed so much after that, except in [13, 21, 20, 30, 6]. On the other hand, order theory is a powerful theory which uses the notion of "order relation" (a binary relation) to explore the properties of sets. This subject started to be mainstream in the '40's, with the book of Birkhoff [3] serving as an important foundation and source of future investigation. The book has been modernized several times, and many important notions from order theory were gradually discussed in this book, such as lattices, topologies on partially ordered sets (posets), etc. However, one of the first topologies to be introduced on posets, the interval topology, was by Frink [10]. Soon afterwards, Birkhoff, Frink and McShane [3, 10, 27] (who were all colleagues) introduced the concept of o -convergence. Since then, there has been an abundance of scientific publications in this field. We now know that a poset may be endowed with many possible topologies (the order topology, the lower topology, the upper topology, the interval topology [10], the ideal topology [11], the Lawson topology [16], the Scott topology [16, 1], the Alexandroff topology, etc.) or notions of convergence ($o1$ -convergence [3, 10, 27, 25], $o2$ -convergence [32, 40, 25], $o3$ -convergence [25], uo -convergence, $\lim - \inf$ convergence, MN-convergence [38], etc.), each one having its own peculiarities. For instance, the Scott topology is more often used when studying DCPO's in domain theory [16, 1], whereas the uo -convergence relation is only applied within lattices.

When rings are used alongside the notions of order and topology, we would expect to arrive at

the notion of "topological ordered ring" [14, 4]. The authors in [14] have explored this direction and shown for example that the order topology need not be abandoned in favor of other topologies as it can endow some rings with a valuable topological ordered ring structure. However, we must emphasize that this article is about ordered rings [37] and (weak-quasi-)topological rings. More precisely, our article is organized mainly around two theorems. In the first one, we prove that the interval $]0, 1]$ in any suitable partially ordered ring consists entirely of invertible elements. In the second one, we show that if f is a norm from a ring to a partially ordered ring endowed with the interval topology, then under certain conditions, the subset of elements such that $f(1 - a) < 1$ consists entirely of invertible elements. Throughout, the rings under consideration are by default nonassociative and non-commutative. We also dedicate a section to show that a ring endowed with the topology associated with a seminorm into an ordered ring endowed with the interval topology is an example of a locally convex quasi-topological group with an additional continuity property of the product, a structure we call in the introduction, abstract, and title a weak-quasi-topological ring. We shall cite here the work [23] in which the authors have introduced a very similar topology in a similar degree of generality. Finally, we finish our article by a brief application to frame theory, a subdiscipline within applied harmonic analysis.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic concepts

Definition 2.1. Let (P, \leq) be an ordered set. A subset $S \subseteq P$ is **convex** if

$$\forall x, y, z \in P : (x \in S) \wedge (z \in S) \wedge (x \leq y \leq z) \Rightarrow y \in S.$$

Definition 2.2. A **nonassociative and non-commutative ring** $(R, +, 0, \times)$ is a set R endowed with an element $0 \in R$ and two binary operations $+$: $R \times R \rightarrow R$ and \times : $R \times R \rightarrow R$ such that $(R, +, 0)$ is an Abelian group and \times is left and right distributive with respect to $+$ (i.e., \times is bi-additive).

For brevity, we'll call such a structure simply a **ring**.

Definition 2.3. An **algebra** $(\mathcal{A}, +, \cdot, 0, \times)$ over a ring $(R, +, 0, \times)$ is a set \mathcal{A} endowed with an element $0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and three binary operations $+$: $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, \cdot : $R \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, and \times : $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $(\mathcal{A}, +, \cdot, 0)$ is a module over $(R, +, 0, \times)$ and \times : $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is bi-additive.

If R is commutative, we also require that \times : $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is **bilinear** with respect to \cdot : $R \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, that is, it satisfies:

$$\forall r_1, r_2 \in R : \forall a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A} : (r_1 r_2) \cdot (a_1 a_2) = r_1 \cdot (a_1 (r_2 a_2)) = r_2 \cdot ((r_1 a_1) a_2) = (r_1 a_1) (r_2 a_2).$$

Definition 2.4. An **ordered group** $(G, \times, 1, \leq)$ is a group with a *compatible* order. Here, the compatibility means:

$$\forall x \in G : \forall y \geq z : [(xy \geq xz) \text{ and } (yx \geq zx)].$$

Definition 2.5. An **ordered ring** $(R, +, 0, \times, \leq)$ is a ring endowed with a *compatible* order. Here, the compatibility means that $(R, +, 0, \leq)$ is an ordered Abelian group, and that if $R^+ := \{x \in R : x \geq 0\}$, then $(R^+)^2 := (R^+)(R^+) \subseteq R^+$.

If R has a multiplicative unit 1, we may also require that $1 \geq 0$.

Definition 2.6. Let $(G_1, \times, 1)$ be a group and $(G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an ordered group.

An **even submultiplicative function** from G_1 to G_2 is any map f from G_1 to G_2 satisfying:

- $\forall x, y \in R_1 : f(xy) \leq f(x)f(y)$ (submultiplicativity/triangle inequality),

- $\forall x \in G_1 : f(x^{-1}) = f(x)$ (even function).

If f satisfies additionally:

- $\forall x \in G_1 : f(x) \geq 0$ (non-negativity),

then f is called a **seminorm**, and if f satisfies furthermore

- $\forall x \in G_1 : f(x) = 0 \Rightarrow x = 0$ (definiteness),

then f is called a **norm**.

Definition 2.7. Let $(R_1, +, 0, \times)$ be a ring and $(R_2, +, 0, \times, \leq)$ be an ordered ring.

An **even subadditive and submultiplicative function** from R_1 to R_2 is any map f from R_1 to R_2 satisfying:

- $\forall x, y \in R_1 : f(x + y) \leq f(x) + f(y)$ (subadditivity/triangle inequality),
- $\forall x \in R_1 : f(-x) = f(x)$ (even function),
- $\forall x, y \in R_1 : f(xy) \leq f(x)f(y)$ (submultiplicativity),
- if R_1 and R_2 are unitary, $f(1) \leq 1$.

If f satisfies additionally:

- $\forall x \in R_1 : f(x) \geq 0$ (non-negativity),

then f is called a **seminorm**, and if f satisfies furthermore

- $\forall x \in R_1 : f(x) = 0 \Rightarrow x = 0$ (definiteness),

then f is called a **norm**.

Definition 2.8. Let $(G, \times, 1)$ be a group endowed with a non-necessarily compatible topology τ .

We say that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ($u_n \in G$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$) is a **Cauchy sequence** if for any any neighborhood $V \subseteq G$ of $1 \in G$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n, m \geq N : u_n u_m^{-1} \in V$ and $u_n^{-1} u_m \in V$.

A poset can be endowed with many possible topologies or notions of convergence. For the purpose of this article, we focus on the interval topology. Importantly, a poset (P, \leq) endowed with the interval topology forms a T_0 space.

Definition 2.9. Let (P, \leq) be a poset. Then P can be endowed with a topology, called the **interval topology**, whose subbase of closed sets is formed by the union of the sets of the type $\{x \in P : x \geq a\}$ and $\{x \in P : x \leq b\}$ where a and b vary in P .

When the order is total, the interval topology is the same as the following topology:

Definition 2.10. Let (P, \leq) be a poset. Then P can be endowed with a topology, called the **order topology** (not to be confused with the topology associated to order convergence), whose subbase of open sets is formed by the union of the sets of the type $\{x \in P : x > a\}$ and $\{x \in P : x < b\}$ where a and b vary in P .

Some authors have shown that the order topology is still valuable in posets [14] even though closed intervals are not in general closed for this topology.

The following properties are known as "completeness" properties. The Archimedean property is also considered a completeness property since in a totally ordered field, it is equivalent to the existence of $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n+1}$ and the equality $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n+1} = 0$ ([39], Proposition 4 p.105).

Definition 2.11. Let $(G, \times, 1)$ be a partially ordered group. We say that G is **Archimedean** if

$$\forall a, b \in G : (\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} : a^n \leq b) \Rightarrow a \leq 1.$$

Example 2.1. We have:

- The rings $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}$, and \mathbb{C} are Archimedean.
- The rings $\mathbb{R}(x)$ and $\mathbb{R}((x))$ with the partial ordering $F = \sum_{k=v}^d c_k X^k \geq 0$ iff $F = 0$ or $c_v > 0$ are not Archimedean.

All Archimedean lattice-ordered groups are commutative. Totally ordered groups without non-trivial convex subgroups are Archimedean.

Definition 2.12. Let (P, \leq) be a poset. We say that (P, \leq) is **Dedekind-complete** if any bounded above subset of P has a supremum.

Definition 2.13. Let (P, \leq) be a poset. We say that (P, \leq) is **σ -complete** if any bounded above countable subset of P has a supremum.

Definition 2.14. Let (P, \leq) be a poset. We say that (P, \leq) is **monotone σ -complete** if any increasing bounded above sequence in P has a supremum.

Definition 2.15. Let $(G, \times, 1)$ be a group endowed with a non-necessarily compatible topology τ . We say that G is **sequentially Cauchy complete** if any Cauchy sequence in G converges to a **unique** limit.

2.2 A few relevant properties of groups and rings endowed with the topology induced by a "norm" into a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group or ring

Definition 2.16. A **quasi-topological group** is a group $(G, \times, 1)$ endowed with a topology τ satisfying

$$\begin{array}{l} \bullet \forall V \in \tau : \forall a \in G : aV \in \tau \text{ and } Va \in \tau, \\ \bullet \forall V \in \tau : V^{-1} \in \tau, \end{array}$$

Equivalently, a quasi-topological group must satisfy

$$\begin{array}{l} \bullet \times : \begin{cases} G \times G & \rightarrow G \\ (x, y) & \mapsto xy \end{cases} \text{ is separately continuous,} \\ \bullet \begin{cases} G & \rightarrow G \\ x & \mapsto x^{-1} \end{cases} \text{ is continuous.} \end{array}$$

and equivalently, that for any net $(u_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (A, \leq)}$ in G converging to $u \in G$,

$$\begin{array}{l} (u_\alpha u^{-1})_{\alpha \in (A, \leq)} \text{ converges to } 1 \text{ and } (u^{-1} u_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (A, \leq)} \text{ converges to } 1, \\ (u_\alpha^{-1})_{\alpha \in (A, \leq)} \text{ converges to } u^{-1}. \end{array}$$

Definition 2.17. A **locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group** $(G, \times, 1, \tau, \leq)$ is a quasi-topological group endowed with a compatible partial order (in the sense of definition 2.4) and admitting a base of convex open sets.

Definition 2.18. Let $(G_1, \times, 1)$ be a group and $(G_2, \times, 1, \tau, \leq)$ be a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group.

Let $f : (G_1, \times, 1) \rightarrow (G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an even submultiplicative function.

In this case, G_1 can be endowed with the **topology induced by f** , a topology whose base (see proposition 2.1) of open sets is $B_V(g) := \{x \in G_1 : f(xg^{-1}) \in V\}$ where g runs through G_1 and V runs through the neighborhoods of 1 in G_2 . This topology is more precisely **the right topology induced by f** , where "right" accounts for the possible non-commutativity of x and g^{-1} in the definition of $B_V(g)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $(G_1, \times, 1)$ be a group and $(G_2, \times, 1, \tau, \leq)$ be a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group.*

Let $f : (G_1, \times, 1) \rightarrow (G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an even submultiplicative function.

*Then the sets $B_V(g) := \{x \in G_1 : f(xg^{-1}) \in V\}$ where g runs through G_1 and V runs through the neighborhoods of 1 in G_2 , form a base of a topology on G_1 , called the **topology induced by f** .*

Proof. We need to show that for any $B_V(g)$ and $B_{V'}(g')$ such that $B_V(g) \cap B_{V'}(g') \neq \emptyset$, there exist V'' and g'' such that $B_{V''}(g'') \subseteq B_V(g) \cap B_{V'}(g')$.

Let $g'' \in B_V(g) \cap B_{V'}(g')$. First, notice that we can assume without loss of generality that V and V' are convex, since G_2 is a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group. Next, observe that since G_2 is a quasi-topological group,

$$V'' := (Vf(g''g^{-1})^{-1}) \cap (Vf(g''g^{-1})^{-1})^{-1} \cap (V'f(g''g'^{-1})^{-1}) \cap (V'f(g''g'^{-1})^{-1})^{-1}$$

is a neighborhood of 1 in G_2 .

Let $x \in B_{V''}(g'')$. We have

$$f(xg''^{-1})^{-1}f(g''g^{-1}) \leq f(xg^{-1}) \leq f(xg''^{-1})f(g''g^{-1}),$$

so there exist v_1 and v_2 in V such that

$$v_1 \leq f(xg^{-1}) \leq v_2.$$

By convexity of V , we get $f(xg^{-1}) \in V$, so $B_{V''}(g'') \subseteq B_V(g)$.

Similarly, $B_{V''}(g'') \subseteq B_{V'}(g')$, and the proof is finished. \square

Corollary 2.1. *Let $(G_1, \times, 1)$ be a group and $(G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group.*

Let $f : (G_1, \times, 1) \rightarrow (G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an even submultiplicative function.

Then a set $E \subseteq G_1$ is open $\Leftrightarrow \forall e \in E : \exists V_e$ neighborhood of 1 : $B_{V_e}(e) \subseteq E$.

Proof. The proof of the corollary in the direction (\Leftarrow) is clear. In the other direction, notice that in the proof of the previous proposition, g'' was chosen arbitrarily from $B_V(g) \cap B_{V'}(g')$. So if $E \subseteq G_1$ is open, then for any $e \in E$, we can choose $V' = V$ and $g' = g''$ such that $B_V(g)$ contains e (this is possible since E is an open subset of G_1 containing e), and deduce the existence of V_e such that $B_{V_e}(e) \subseteq B_V(g) \subseteq E$. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered group. Moreover, let $(G_1, \times, 1)$ be an abelian group and $f : (G_1, \times, 1) \rightarrow (G_2, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an even submultiplicative function.*

We endow G_1 with the topology induced by f .

Then G_1 is a quasi-topological group.

Proof. An open subset W of G_1 has the form

$$\bigcup_{e \in E} B_{V_e}(g_e),$$

where V_e are open sets in G_2 containing 1 and $g_e \in G_1$.

To prove that the assertions of definition 2.16 hold for W , note that it is sufficient to prove that they hold for $B_{V_e}(g_e)$ for any choice of $e \in E$, because

$$\begin{aligned} a \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} B_{V_e}(g_e) \right) &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (aB_{V_e}(g_e)) \\ \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} B_{V_e}(g_e) \right) a &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (B_{V_e}(g_e)a) \\ \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} B_{V_e}(g_e) \right)^{-1} &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (B_{V_e}(g_e))^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and an arbitrary union of open subsets is an open subset.

Since G_1 is abelian, we have for any $e \in E$,

$$aB_{V_e}(g_e) = B_{V_e}(g_e)a,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} y \in aB_{V_e}(g_e) &\Leftrightarrow ya^{-1} \in B_{V_e}(g_e) \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(ya^{-1}g_e^{-1}) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(y(g_e a)^{-1}) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow y \in B_{V_e}(g_e a) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\boxed{aB_{V_e}(g_e) = B_{V_e}(g_e)a = B_{V_e}(g_e a).}$$

is an open subset of G_1 .

Moreover, using again that G_1 is abelian, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y \in B_{V_e}(g_e)^{-1} &\Leftrightarrow y^{-1} \in B_{V_e}(g_e) \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(y^{-1}g_e^{-1}) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(g_e^{-1}y^{-1}) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow f((yg_e)^{-1}) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(yg_e) \in V_e \\ &\Leftrightarrow y \in B_{V_e}(g_e^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\boxed{B_{V_e}(g_e)^{-1} = B_{V_e}(g_e^{-1}).}$$

is an open subset of G_1 . □

The following proposition shows that multiplication by a (where $f(a) \leq 1$) is continuous when R_1 is endowed with the topology induced by a seminorm into a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered ring.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(R_1, +, 0, \times)$ be a ring and $(R_2, +, 0, \times, \leq)$ be a locally convex quasi-topological partially ordered ring. Let $f : (R_1, +, 0, \times) \rightarrow (R_2, +, 0, \times, \leq)$ be a seminorm. We endow R_1 with the topology induced by f .*

Then for all $a \in R_1$ such that $f(a) \leq 1$, the map $\phi_a : \begin{cases} R_1 & \rightarrow R_1 \\ x & \mapsto ax \end{cases}$ is continuous.

Proof. Let $r \in R_1$. Let W be a neighborhood of ar in R_1 . By corollary 2.1, there exists a neighborhood V of 0 in R_2 such that

$$B_V(ar) \subseteq W.$$

By local convexity, there exists a convex neighborhood V' of 0 such that

$$V' \subseteq V.$$

Let $x \in B_{V'}(r)$. We have

$$0 \leq f(ax - ar) \leq f(x - r),$$

so since 0 and $f(x - r)$ belong to V' , it follows by convexity of V' that $f(ax - ar) \in V' \subseteq V$, so $\phi_a(x) \in B_V(ar) \subseteq W$. Hence, ϕ_a is continuous at $r \in R_1$, which holds for any $r \in R_1$. \square

2.3 The interval topology as an example of a locally convex poset topology

The following proposition shows that all the properties of section 2.2 are true for $(G_2, \times, 1)$, a partially ordered group endowed with the interval topology.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $(G, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered group which we endow with the interval topology.*

Then G is a locally convex quasi-topological group.

Proof. • Let V be an open subset of G , and $a \in G$. To prove that the assertions of definition 2.16 hold for V , note that it is sufficient to prove that they hold when V is an element of the base of open subsets of G , because

$$\begin{aligned} a \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} V_e \right) &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (aV_e) \\ \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} V_e \right) a &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (V_e a) \\ \left(\bigcup_{e \in E} V_e \right)^{-1} &= \bigcup_{e \in E} (V_e)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and an arbitrary union of open subsets is an open subset.

So let V be an element of the base of open subsets of G . We can write

$$V = G \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in [1, n_1]}] - \infty, b_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in [1, n_2]} [a_j, +\infty[\right) \right].$$

$x \in aV$ is equivalent to $a^{-1}x \in V$, which is equivalent to

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : \neg(a^{-1}x \leq b_i), \\ \forall j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : \neg(a_j \leq a^{-1}x) \end{array}}$$

and is also equivalent to

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : \neg(x \leq ab_i), \\ \forall j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : \neg(aa_j \leq x) \end{array}}$$

Therefore

$$\boxed{aV = G \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket}] - \infty, ab_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket} [aa_j, +\infty[\right) \right]}$$

is an open subset of G . Similarly

$$\boxed{Va = G \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket}] - \infty, b_i a \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket} [a_j a, +\infty[\right) \right]}$$

is an open subset of G . Moreover, $x \in V^{-1}$ is equivalent to $x^{-1} \in V$, which is equivalent to

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : \neg(x^{-1} \leq b_i), \\ \forall j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : \neg(a_j \leq x^{-1}) \end{array}}$$

and is also equivalent to

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : \neg(b_i^{-1} \leq x), \\ \forall j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : \neg(x \leq a_j^{-1}) \end{array}}$$

Therefore

$$\boxed{V^{-1} = G \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket}] - \infty, a_j^{-1} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket} [b_i^{-1}, +\infty[\right) \right].}$$

is an open subset of G .

- Let's prove that G is locally convex, i.e., that G admits a base of convex open subsets. Let's just use the defining base of open subsets of G . An open subset of this base writes as follows:

$$\boxed{V = G \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket}] - \infty, b_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket} [a_j, +\infty[\right) \right].}$$

Let v_1 and v_2 be two elements of V , and $x \in G$ is such that

$$v_1 \leq x \leq v_2.$$

For the sake of contradiction, suppose that $x \notin V$. Then, we have either

- $\exists i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : x \leq b_i$, which leads to the contradiction $v_1 \leq b_i$.
- $\exists j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : a_j \leq x$, which leads to the contradiction $a_j \leq v_2$.

So $x \in V$, hence V is convex, and therefore G is locally convex. □

The following lemma will also be needed in the rest of the article.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (P, \leq) be a poset and $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence of elements of P admitting a supremum $u := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{u_n\}$.*

Then u is the unique limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for the interval topology.

Proof. • Let's show that u is a limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. It suffices to show that for any open subset of the form

$$V = P \setminus \left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket}] - \infty, b_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket} [a_j, +\infty[\right) \right]$$

containing u , there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $u_n \in V$. We have $u \in V$, so:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : \neg(u \leq b_i), \\ \forall j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : \neg(a_j \leq u) \end{array}}$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose by contradiction that $u_n \notin V$. Then we have either

- $\exists j \in \llbracket 1, n_2 \rrbracket : a_j \leq u_n$. In this case, we have $u \geq u_n \geq a_j$, so $u \geq a_j$, a contradiction.
- $\exists i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket : u_n \leq b_i$.

Since $\llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket$ is finite and \mathbb{N} is infinite, there exists $i \in \llbracket 1, n_1 \rrbracket$ and a subsequence $(u_{\phi(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a strictly increasing sequence, such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : u_{\phi(n)} \leq b_i$$

Since $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing, it follows that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : u_n \leq b_i$$

Passing to the supremum, we have $u \leq b_i$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u_n \in V$. Since the interval topology is locally convex and $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ increases to u , it follows that

$$\forall n \geq N : u_n \in V.$$

- Let's prove that u is the unique limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let u' be another limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and suppose that $u' \neq u$. Since $u' \neq u$, we have $\neg(u' \leq u)$ or $\neg(u \leq u')$. Suppose by contradiction that $\neg(u' \leq u)$. Then the open subset

$$V' = P \setminus] - \infty, u]$$

is a neighborhood of u' . Since u' is a limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $u_n \in V'$, that is, $\neg(u_n \leq u)$, a contradiction. So $\neg(u \leq u')$.

Suppose that $u_n \leq u'$ for an infinite number of indices $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, since $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing, it follows that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : u_n \leq u'$$

which implies $u \leq u'$, a contradiction. Since \mathbb{N} is infinite, there exists therefore $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\neg(u_m \leq u')$. Then the open subset

$$V'' = P \setminus [u_m, +\infty[$$

is a neighborhood of u' . Since u' is a limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $u_n \in V''$, that is, $\neg(u_m \leq u_n)$. Taking $n := \max(N, m)$, we see that this is a contradiction.

Hence the limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is unique. □

3 Invertibility in ordered and topological rings using geometric series

The following definition will be important in this section.

Definition 3.1. Let $(R, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered unitary ring such that $1 \geq 0$. Let $x > 0$.

If $\exists y > 0 : xy \geq 1$, we say that x admits a **right-sup-almost-inverse** y .

If $\exists y > 0 : yx \geq 1$, we say that x admits a **left-sup-almost-inverse** y .

3.1 Preliminary lemmas

Lemma 3.1. Let $(R, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be an Archimedean partially ordered unitary ring of characteristic 0 such that $1 > 0$. Then any $x > 0$ has a left-and-right-sup-almost-inverse y .

Proof. Indeed, for any such x , there exists by the Archimedean property an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $nx \geq 1$, and we can take $y = \underbrace{n \cdot 1}_{>0} \in R$. □

Lemma 3.2. Let $(F, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a monotone σ -complete partially ordered field.

For all $x \in F$, define by induction $x^0 = 1$ and $x^{\rightarrow n+1} = xx^{\rightarrow n}$.

Then $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} = 0$.

Proof. Indeed, for $x \in]0, 1[$ (the case $x = 0$ is obvious), we have $\forall m \in \mathbb{N} : \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} \leq x^{\rightarrow m+1}$, and so, since x is invertible in F , $\forall m \in \mathbb{N} : x^{-1} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} \leq x^{\rightarrow m}$, which implies $x^{-1} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} \leq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\}$, and so $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} \leq x \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\}$. Let $a := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\}$.

We have $a \leq xa \leq a$. Therefore $xa = a$, which is equivalent to $(x - 1)a = 0$ and so $a = 0$ since F has no zero-divisors. □

3.2 Theorem 1

The importance of the following theorem resides in the fact that there exist non obvious examples of rings satisfying its conditions, as stated in example 3.1 (by non trivial, we mean different from \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{Z}).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(R, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered ring with unit. For all $x \in R$, define by induction $x^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $x^{\rightarrow n+1} = xx^{\rightarrow n}$.*

Suppose that :

1. $1 \geq 0$.
2. R is monotone σ -complete.
3. Any $x \in]0, 1[$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse.
4. $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} = 0$.

Then we have:

- $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \sum_{k=0}^n x^{\rightarrow k} \}$ exists, which we denote by $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}$ since it is an actual limit (see lemma 2.1).
- $\forall x \in [0, 1[: x \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n+1} =: \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} x^{\rightarrow n}$,
- $\forall x \in]0, 1[: x$ admits a right inverse $x_R^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} = 1 + a \geq 1$ where $a := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} \geq 0$.

Proof. • Let $x \in [0, 1[$. Let $c > 0$ such that $(1-x)c \geq 1$. Let, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_n := \sum_{k=0}^n x^{\rightarrow k}$.

Let's show by induction that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : s_n \leq c$. We have $s_0 = 1 \leq (1-x)c \leq c$. Suppose that we have $s_n \leq c$ for a certain $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $s_{n+1} = xs_n + 1 \leq xc + 1 \leq c$. Hence by monotone σ -completeness $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{s_n\}$ exists.

- Let $x \in [0, 1[$. Let, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_n := \sum_{k=0}^n x^{\rightarrow k}$. We have $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : s_n \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}$.

Therefore, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{k=0}^n x^{\rightarrow k+1} = xs_n \leq x \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}$, and so $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n+1} \leq x \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}$ by the definition of the supremum. Conversely, we need to show that $x \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n} \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n+1} = (\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}) - 1$ (notice that for all bounded above countable subset $A \subseteq R$ and element $a \in R$ we have $\sup(A+a) = \sup(A) + a$). This is equivalent to $(1-x)(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}) \geq 1$. But we have $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}^* : (1-x)(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}) \geq 1 - x^m$. Passing to the supremum and using that $\inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow m}\} = 0$, we have the desired inequality $(1-x)(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x^{\rightarrow n}) \geq 1$.

- We have $1 = (1 - (1-x)) \left[\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} \right] = xx_R^{-1}$ where $x_R^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} = 1 + a \geq 1$ where $a := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} \geq 0$.

□

Corollary 3.1. *Let $(R, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered unitary ring.*

For all $x \in R$, define by induction $x^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $x^{\rightarrow n+1} = xx^{\rightarrow n}$.

For all $x \in R$, define by induction $x^{\leftarrow 0} = 1$ and $x^{\leftarrow n+1} = x^{\leftarrow n}x$.

Suppose that :

1. $1 \geq 0$,
2. R is monotone σ -complete,
3. Any $x \in]0, 1[$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse,
4. Any $x \in]0, 1[$ has a left-sup-almost-inverse,
5. $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\rightarrow n}\} = 0$,
6. $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^{\leftarrow n}\} = 0$,
7. $\forall x \in]0, 1[: (x \text{ is left and right invertible}) \Rightarrow (x_L^{-1} = x_R^{-1})$ (where x_L^{-1} is a left-inverse of x , and x_R^{-1} a right inverse),

then for all $x \in]0, 1[$, x is invertible with inverse $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n}$.

Proof. In an analogous way to the proof of theorem 3.1, we have $1 = \left[\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n} \right] (1 - (1-x)) = x_L^{-1}x$, where $x_L^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n} \geq 1$. This means that x has also a left inverse $x_L^{-1} = x_R^{-1}$. Therefore x is invertible with unique inverse $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n}$. \square

Remark 3.1. If :

1. $1 \geq 0$,
2. R is power-associative,
3. R is monotone σ -complete,
4. Any $x \in]0, 1[$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse or a left-sup-almost-inverse,
5. $\forall x \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^n\} = 0$,

then for all $x \in]0, 1[$, x is invertible with inverse $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^n$.

Example 3.1. For instance, theorem 3.1 holds in the rings \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{Z} with their usual total orderings, $\mathbb{R}[X]$ and $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ with the lexicographic partial ordering $P = \sum_{k=0}^d c_k X^k \geq 0$ iff $P = 0$ or $c_d > 0$.

Remark 3.2. Optimality of the result: the fact that in \mathbb{Z} , 1 is the only invertible element in the interval $]0, +\infty[$, shows that theorem 3.1 is somewhat optimal in the sense that an interval of the form $]0, a[$ with $a \geq 2$ cannot entirely contain invertible elements of a partially ordered ring in general.

Remark 3.3. Necessity of the hypotheses: the following examples show the necessity of the hypotheses of theorem 3.1, or more explicitly, that there exist rings which fail to satisfy one of its conditions and for which the conclusion of the theorem is also false.

- Consider \mathbb{Q}^2 with the lexicographic order $(a, b) \geq (0, 0)$ iff $a > 0$ or $(a = 0 \text{ and } b \geq 0)$. This ring is not monotone σ -complete (also $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^n\}$ doesn't exist for $x \in [(0, 0), (1, 1)[$), has a sup-almost-inverse for each $x \in](0, 0), (1, 1)[$, but doesn't have inverses for all $x \in](0, 0), (1, 1)[$.

- Obviously, a ring not admitting right-sup-almost-inverses for elements $x \in]0, 1]$ cannot admit right inverses. Consider for instance $\mathbb{R}[X]$ with the antilexicographic partial ordering $P = \sum_{k=v}^d c_k X^k \geq 0$ iff $P = 0$ or $c_v > 0$. This ring satisfies all the other conditions.
- Consider \mathbb{R}^2 with the component-wise sum and product, and the partial ordering $(a, b) \geq (0, 0)$ iff $(a \geq 0 \text{ and } b \geq 0)$. This ring satisfies all the conditions except $\forall x \in [(0, 0), (1, 1)[$: $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x^n\} = 0$.

3.3 Theorem 2

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(R_1, +, 0, \times, 1)$ be a unitary ring and $(R_2, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered unitary ring that we endow with the interval topology.*

We denote the elements of R_1 by latin letters and the elements of R_2 by Greek letters.

For all $x \in R_1$, define by induction: $x^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : x^{\rightarrow n+1} = xx^{\rightarrow n}$.

For all $\xi \in R_2$, define by induction: $\xi^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \xi^{\rightarrow n+1} = \xi\xi^{\rightarrow n}$.

Suppose that :

1. $1 \geq 0$,
2. R_2 is monotone σ -complete,
3. Any $\xi \in]0, 1]$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse,
4. $\forall \xi \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{\xi^{\rightarrow n}\} = 0$.

Let $f : (R_1, +, 0, \times, 1) \rightarrow (R_2, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a norm.

Suppose moreover that R_1 is sequentially Cauchy complete for the topology induced by the norm f .

Then for all $x \in R_1$ such that $f(1 - x) < 1$, x admits a right-inverse in R_1 .

Proof. By assumption, we have $0 \leq f(1 - x) < 1$. Therefore, by theorem 3.1, $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f(1 - x)^{\rightarrow n}$

exists. Let $v_n = \sum_{k=0}^n f(1 - x)^{\rightarrow k}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the sequence of remainders of the series

$\sum_{k=0}^n f(1 - x)^{\rightarrow k}$ is non-negative and decreasing to 0, it is easily seen that $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in R_2 for the interval topology.

Let $u_n = \sum_{k=0}^n (1 - x)^{\rightarrow k}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the triangle inequality and submultiplicativity, (u_n)

is a Cauchy sequence in R_1 for the topology induced by the norm f . Since R_1 is sequentially Cauchy complete for this topology, $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a unique limit, which we denote by

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - x)^{\rightarrow n}.$$

We'd like to show that x admits a right-inverse $x_R^{-1} := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - x)^{\rightarrow n}$. This follows from the

following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
xx_R^{-1} &= (x-1)x_R^{-1} + x_R^{-1} \\
&= (x-1)\lim_n u_n + x_R^{-1} \\
&= \lim_n (x-1)u_n + x_R^{-1} \\
&= \lim_n (1-u_{n+1}) + x_R^{-1} \\
&= 1 - x_R^{-1} + x_R^{-1} \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the limit of $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is unique and proposition 2.3. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let $(R_1, +, 0, \times, 1)$ be a unitary ring and $(R_2, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a partially ordered unitary ring that we endow with the interval topology.*

We denote the elements of R_1 by latin letters and the elements of R_2 by Greek letters.

For all $x \in R_1$, define by induction: $x^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : x^{\rightarrow n+1} = xx^{\rightarrow n}$.

For all $x \in R_1$, define by induction $x^{\leftarrow 0} = 1$ and $x^{\leftarrow n+1} = x^{\leftarrow n}x$.

For all $\xi \in R_2$, define by induction: $\xi^{\rightarrow 0} = 1$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \xi^{\rightarrow n+1} = \xi\xi^{\rightarrow n}$.

For all $\xi \in R_2$, define by induction: $\xi^{\leftarrow 0} = 1$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \xi^{\leftarrow n+1} = \xi\xi^{\leftarrow n}$.

Suppose that :

1. $1 \geq 0$ in R_2 ,
2. R_2 is monotone σ -complete,
3. Any $\xi \in]0, 1]$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse,
4. Any $\xi \in]0, 1]$ has a left-sup-almost-inverse,
5. $\forall \xi \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{\xi^{\rightarrow n}\} = 0$,
6. $\forall \xi \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{\xi^{\leftarrow n}\} = 0$,

Let $f : (R_1, +, 0, \times, 1) \rightarrow (R_2, +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ be a norm.

Suppose moreover that:

1. R_1 is sequentially Cauchy complete for the topology induced by the norm f ,
2. $\forall x \in]0, 1[: (x \text{ is left and right invertible}) \Rightarrow (x_L^{-1} = x_R^{-1})$ (where x_L^{-1} is a left-inverse of x , and x_R^{-1} a right inverse),

Then for all $x \in R_1$ such that $f(1-x) < 1$, x is invertible in R_1 .

Proof. In an analogous way to the proof of theorem 3.2, we have $1 = \left[\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n} \right] (1 - (1-x)) = x_L^{-1}x$, where $x_L^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n}$. This means that x has also a left inverse $x_L^{-1} = x_R^{-1}$.

Therefore x is invertible with unique inverse $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\rightarrow n} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^{\leftarrow n}$. \square

Remark 3.4. If :

1. $1 \geq 0$ in R_2 ,

2. R_1 and R_2 are power-associative,
3. $\forall \xi \in [0, 1[: \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{\xi^n\} = 0$,
4. Any $\xi \in]0, 1]$ has a right-sup-almost-inverse or a left-sup-almost-inverse,
5. R_1 is sequentially Cauchy complete for the topology induced by the norm f (we endow R_2 with the interval topology),

then for all $x \in]0, 1]$, x is invertible with inverse $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1-x)^n$.

Example 3.2. (Frame theory on Hilbert spaces)

Let H be a Hilbert space.

- Let $T \in B(H)$ such that $\|Id - T\| < 1$. Then T is invertible by remark 3.4.
- Let T be a selfadjoint operator in H such that $\kappa_1.Id \leq T \leq \kappa_2.Id$ where κ_1 and κ_2 are two positive constants in $(0, +\infty)$ and the ordering is that of self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces. Then T is invertible.
Indeed, we have by the non-negativity of $Id - \frac{T}{\kappa_2}$: $\|Id - \frac{T}{\kappa_2}\| \leq \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{\kappa_2} < 1$, so $\frac{T}{\kappa_2}$ is invertible by the first point, hence T is invertible.
Hence, if T is the frame operator of a frame in H , the inequality $\kappa_1.Id \leq T \leq \kappa_2.Id$ is satisfied, and the operator T is invertible. This gives rise to the two classical frame-dependent reproducing formulas on the Hilbert space H .

Example 3.3. (Frame theory on Banach lattices)

Let E be a Banach lattice.

- Let $T \in B(E)$ such that $\|Id - T\| < 1$. Then T is invertible by remark 3.4.
- Let T be a regular operator in E such that $\kappa_1.Id \leq T \leq \kappa_2.Id$ where κ_1 and κ_2 are two positive constants in $(0, +\infty)$ and the ordering is that of regular operators on Banach lattices. Then T is invertible.
Indeed, we have by ([28], Proposition 1.3.5, p.27) : $\|Id - \frac{T}{\kappa_2}\| \leq \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{\kappa_2} < 1$, so $\frac{T}{\kappa_2}$ is invertible by the first point, hence T is invertible.
Hence, if T is the frame operator of a Banach frame in E for which the inequality $\kappa_1.Id \leq T \leq \kappa_2.Id$ holds, the operator T is automatically invertible and we have up to two frame-dependent reproducing formulas on the Banach lattice E .

References

- [1] R. M. Amadio and P.-L. Curien. *Domains and lambda-calculi*. Number 46. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [2] V. I. Arnautov, S. T. Glavatsky, and A. V. Mikhalev. *Introduction to the Theory of Topological Rings and Modules*. Books in Soils, Plants, and the Environment. Taylor & Francis, 1996.
- [3] G. Birkhoff. *Lattice theory*, volume 25. American Mathematical Soc., 1940.
- [4] A. N. Branga and I. M. Oлару. Cone metric spaces over topological modules and fixed point theorems for lipschitz mappings. *Mathematics*, 8(5):724, 2020.

- [5] S. T. Chapman, M. Fontana, A. Geroldinger, and B. Olberding. Multiplicative ideal theory and factorization theory. *Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics*, 170, 2016.
- [6] P. L. Clark and N. J. Diepeveen. Absolute convergence in ordered fields. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 121(10):909–916, 2014.
- [7] M. Deveau and H. Teismann. $72+42$: Characterizations of the completeness and archimedean properties of ordered fields. *Real Anal. Exchange*, 39(2):261–304, 2013/2014.
- [8] M. P. Drazin. Pseudo-inverses in associative rings and semigroups. *The American mathematical monthly*, 65(7):506–514, 1958.
- [9] M. P. Drazin. A class of outer generalized inverses. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 436(7):1909–1923, 2012.
- [10] O. Frink. Topology in lattices. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 51:569–582, 1942.
- [11] O. Frink. Ideals in partially ordered sets. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 61(4):223–234, 1954.
- [12] F. J. García-Pacheco. Regularity in topological modules. *Mathematics*, 8(9):1580, 2020.
- [13] F. J. García-Pacheco, A. Miralles, and M. Murillo-Arcila. Invertibles in topological rings: a new approach. *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matemáticas*, 116(1):38, 2022.
- [14] F. J. García-Pacheco, M. A. Moreno-Frías, and M. Murillo-Arcila. Topological ordered rings and measures. *Results in Mathematics*, 78(6):212, 2023.
- [15] F. J. García-Pacheco and S. Sáez-Martínez. Normalizing rings. *Banach Journal of Mathematical Analysis*, 14(3):1143–1176, 2020.
- [16] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *A compendium of continuous lattices*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [17] A. M. W. Glass. *Partially ordered groups*, volume 7. World Scientific, 1999.
- [18] J. F. Hall. Completeness of ordered fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1101.5652*, 2011.
- [19] D. Handelman. Rings with involution as partially ordered abelian groups. *The Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, 11(3):337–381, 1981.
- [20] R. Kantrowitz and M. Neumann. Another face of the archimedean property. *The College Mathematics Journal*, 46(2):139–141, 2015.
- [21] R. Kantrowitz and M. Neumann. Normed algebras and the geometric series test. *Surveys in Mathematics and its Applications*, 12:203–217, 2017.
- [22] I. Kaplansky. Topological rings. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 69(1):153–183, 1947.
- [23] R. Kopperman and H. Pajoohesh. Representing topologies using partially ordered semi-groups. *Topology and its applications*, 249:135–149, 2018.
- [24] T.-Y. Lam. *A first course in noncommutative rings*, volume 131. Springer, 1991.

- [25] J. C. Mathews and R. F. Anderson. A comparison of two modes of order convergence. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 18(1):100–104, 1967.
- [26] H. Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*. Number 8. Cambridge university press, 1989.
- [27] E. J. McShane. *Order-preserving maps and integration processes*. Number 31. Princeton University Press, 1954.
- [28] P. Meyer-Nieberg. *Banach lattices*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [29] H. Pajoohesh. Representations of bornologies. *Applied General Topology*, 23(1):17–30, 2022.
- [30] J. Propp. Real analysis in reverse. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 120(5):392–408, 2013.
- [31] K.P.S. Bhaskara Rao. *Theory of generalized inverses over commutative rings*, volume 17. CRC Press, 2002.
- [32] B. C. Rennie. Lattices. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):386–400, 1950.
- [33] H. Sati and U. Schreiber. *Mathematical foundations of quantum field theory and perturbative string theory*, volume 83. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [34] H. H. Schaefer. *Banach Lattices and Positive Operators*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1974.
- [35] R. D. Schafer. *An introduction to nonassociative algebras*. Courier Dover Publications, 2017.
- [36] U. Schreiber. AQFT from n-functorial QFT. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 291:357–401, 2009.
- [37] S. A. Steinberg. *Lattice-ordered rings and modules*. Springer, 2010.
- [38] T. Sun, Q. Li, and N. Fan. MN-convergence and $\lim\text{-inf}_M$ -convergence in partially ordered sets. *Open Mathematics*, 16(1):1077–1090, 2018.
- [39] H. Teismann. Toward a more complete list of completeness axioms. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 120(2):99–114, 2013.
- [40] A. J. Ward. On relations between certain intrinsic topologies in partially ordered sets. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 51, pages 254–261. Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- [41] S. Warner. *Topological rings*. Elsevier, 1993.
- [42] E. S. Wolk. Order-compatible topologies on a partially ordered set. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(4):524–529, 1958.

Nizar El Idrissi.

Laboratoire : Equations aux dérivées partielles, Algèbre et Géométrie spectrales.
 Département de mathématiques, faculté des sciences, université Ibn Tofail, 14000 Kénitra.
 E-mail address : nizar.elidrissi@uit.ac.ma

Hicham Zoubair.

Laboratoire : Equations aux dérivées partielles, Algèbre et Géométrie spectrales.
 Département de mathématiques, faculté des sciences, université Ibn Tofail, 14000 Kénitra.
 E-mail address : hzoubair2014@gmail.com