

STABILITY CONDITIONS FOR POLARISED VARIETIES

RUADHAÍ DERVAN

ABSTRACT. We introduce an analogue of Bridgeland’s stability conditions for polarised varieties. Much as Bridgeland stability is modelled on slope stability of coherent sheaves, our notion of Z -stability is modelled on the notion of K -stability of polarised varieties. We then introduce an analytic counterpart to stability, through the notion of a Z -critical Kähler metric, modelled on the constant scalar curvature Kähler condition. Our main result shows that a polarised variety which is analytically K -semistable and asymptotically Z -stable admits Z -critical Kähler metrics in the large volume regime. We also prove a local converse, and explain how these results can be viewed as producing local wall-crossing phenomena. A special case of our framework gives a manifold analogue of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Two notions of stability have dominated much of algebraic geometry over the last twenty years: these are the notions of K -stability of a polarised variety [54, 22] and *Bridgeland stability* of an object in a triangulated category [5]. Bridgeland stability is modelled on the more classical notion of *slope stability* of a coherent sheaf over a polarised variety, and slope stability can be viewed as the “large volume limit” of Bridgeland stability. One then expects to obtain moduli spaces of Bridgeland stable objects (and one frequently does [56, 44, 1]), with the usefulness of Bridgeland stability arising from the fact that one can vary the stability condition, which often leads to a good geometric understanding of the birational geometry of these moduli spaces. This, in turn, frequently leads to interesting geometric consequences [4].

In the simplest case that the object of the triangulated category in question is a holomorphic vector bundle, there is a differential-geometric counterpart to Bridgeland stability, though the dictionary is not exact and theory is in its infancy. This counterpart is the notion of a Z -critical connection [13], recently introduced by the author, McCarthy and Sektnan, which concretely is a solution to a partial differential equation on the space of Hermitian metrics on the holomorphic vector bundle. Z -critical connections should play an analogous role to Hermite-Einstein metrics in the study of slope stability of vector bundles, and indeed the “large volume limit” of the Z -critical condition is the Hermite-Einstein condition.

K -stability of a polarised variety originated directly through from Kähler geometry, through the search for *constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK) metrics* on smooth polarised varieties, whose existence is conjectured by Yau, Tian and Donaldson is to be equivalent to K -stability [60, 54, 22]. Already through the early work of Fujiki and Schumacher it was apparent that the cscK condition (hence, *a posteriori*, the K -stability condition) should be the appropriate condition to form moduli of polarised varieties, and there is now much compelling evidence for this [27, 28, 14, 33], especially in the Fano setting [42, 40, 59]. With these moduli spaces

being increasingly well understood, it is natural to ask what the geometry of these spaces is, and whether their birational geometry can be understood through other notions of stability; this is a heavily studied problem for moduli spaces of curves [32]. Thus one is led to the question: is there an analogue of Bridgeland stability for polarised varieties?

Here we begin a programme to answer this question. The definitions and techniques in the present work are most relevant in the “large volume” regime, where categorical input is less necessary, and the links with differential geometry are currently strongest. We expect that a more categorical approach will lead to notions that apply beyond the large volume regime, and we briefly discuss this below.

The main input into a Bridgeland stability condition is a *central charge*; our analogue for varieties is essentially a complex polynomial in cohomology classes of the polarised variety (X, L) , including Chern classes of X . Fixing such a central charge Z , one obtains a complex number $Z(X, L)$ with *phase* $\varphi(X, L) = \arg Z(X, L)$, which we always assume to be non-zero. On the differential-geometric side, we introduce the notion of a *Z-critical Kähler metric*, which is a solution to a partial differential equation of the form

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) = 0,$$

where $\tilde{Z}(\omega)$ is a complex-valued function defined using representatives of the cohomology classes associated to the central charge $Z(X, L)$, with appropriate Chern-Weil representatives chosen to represent the Chern classes. The condition is equivalent to asking that the function

$$\tilde{Z}(\omega) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

has constant argument. The equation has formal similarities to the notion of a *Z-critical connection* on a holomorphic vector bundle, leading us to mirror the terminology.

On the algebro-geometric side, the notion of stability involves *test configurations*, which are the \mathbb{C}^* -degenerations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ of (X, L) crucial to the definition of K-stability. We associate a numerical invariant $Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ to each test configuration, which is again a complex number whose phase we denote $\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. The notion of *Z-stability* we introduce, which is roughly analogous to Bridgeland stability, means that for each test configuration the phase inequality

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right) > 0$$

holds. These definitions allow us to state the following analogue of the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. *Let (X, L) be a smooth polarised variety with discrete automorphism group. Then the existence of a Z-critical Kähler metric in $c_1(L)$ is equivalent to Z-stability of (X, L) .*

We should say immediately that this conjecture is only plausible in sufficiently “large volume” regions of the space of central charges; this is a condition which we expect to be explicit in concrete situations. Away from this region, categorical phenomena should enter. Thus Conjecture 1.1 should be seen as a first approximation of a larger conjecture involving a more categorical framework. When the values $Z(X, L)$ and $Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ lie in the upper half plane, the inequality is equivalent to asking for the phase inequality $\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > \varphi(X, L)$ to hold, and the “large volume”

hypothesis should imply that for the relevant test configuration, $Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ does lie in the upper half plane. We also note that, much as with the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture, it seems reasonable that one may need to impose a uniform notion of stability [12, Conjecture 1.1]; see [39] for recent progress.

Here we prove the “large volume limit” of this conjecture, for what seems to be the most interesting class of central charge. For this “admissible” class of central charge defined in Section 3, when one scales the polarisation L to kL for $k \gg 0$, the central charge takes values in the upper half plane and the leading order term in k of the phase inequalities $\varphi_k(X, L) < \varphi_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is simply the usual inequality on the Donaldson-Futaki invariant involved in the definition of K-stability. It follows that the natural notion of *asymptotic Z-stability* implies *K-semistability*. A K-semistable polarised variety conjecturally admits a test configuration with central fibre K-polystable, and we say that (X, L) is *analytically K-semistable* if the central fibre is a smooth polarised variety admitting a cscK metric.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, L) be an analytically K-semistable variety which has discrete automorphism group. Then (X, kL) admits Z-critical Kähler metrics for all $k \gg 0$ provided it is asymptotically Z-stable.*

The converse, namely that existence of Z-critical Kähler metrics implies asymptotic Z-stability, also holds in a local sense. To discuss the sense in which this is true, we must discuss some of the elements of the proof of Theorem 1.1. We denote the cscK degeneration of (X, L) by (X_0, L_0) , and consider the Kuranishi space B of (X_0, L_0) . This space admits a universal family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$, and from its construction \mathcal{L} admits a relatively Kähler metric which induces the cscK metric on (X_0, L_0) . There are then three steps:

- (i) We show that the Z-critical equation can, locally, be viewed as a moment map. More precisely, the automorphism group of (X_0, L_0) acts on B , and we show that with respect to a natural Kähler metric we produce on B , the condition that the Kähler metric on the fibre is Z-critical is equivalent to being a zero of the moment map. This can be viewed as a local analogue of the Fujiki-Donaldson moment map picture for the cscK equation [27, 21], but we take a new approach that gives slightly weaker results but much greater flexibility. It is then important that the phase inequalities involved in the definition of Z-stability correspond exactly to the weight inequalities arising from the finite dimensional moment map problem.
- (ii) We reduce to a finite dimensional problem by perturbing the relatively Kähler metric on \mathcal{L} in such a way that the only obstruction to solving the Z-critical equation arise from the automorphisms of the central fibre (X_0, L_0) . This uses a quantitative version of the implicit function theorem, and in this and the previous step we make systematic use of the analytic approach to Deligne pairings [15, 48].
- (iii) This step is really the heart of the matter. We show that, in our local finite-dimensional moment map problem, stability implies the existence of a zero of the moment map; this does not follow from any Kempf-Ness type results due to the locality of our problem. The main tool is the equivariant Darboux theorem, which allows us to reduce to a more linear problem in symplectic geometry. We expect this step to be broadly applicable to questions in Kähler geometry.

As part of step (i), we obtain analogues of several important tools in the study of cscK metrics, such as the Futaki invariant associated to holomorphic vector fields, and an energy functional analogous to Mabuchi's K-energy. The local moment map picture also quite formally produces the local converse to Theorem 1.1. Let us say that (X, L) is *locally asymptotically Z-stable* if the phase inequality holds for all test configurations produced from the Kuranishi space B of its cscK degeneration.

Theorem 1.2. *With the above setup, (X, kL) admits Z-critical Kähler metrics for all $k \gg 0$ if and only if it is locally asymptotically Z-stable.*

Thus we have proven a version of the large volume limit of Conjecture 1.1. There is an interesting interpretation of this result as a local wall-crossing result. Wall-crossing phenomena arise when one can vary the stability condition, and one then expects the resulting moduli spaces to undergo birational transformations. The strictly stable locus is unchanged by suitably small changes of the stability condition, and the interesting question concerns the semistable locus. The above then gives a differential-geometric explanation of which smooth polarised varieties transition from (K-)semistable to (asymptotically Z-)stable under the change of stability condition via a finite dimensional moment map problem.

Our results can be seen as manifold analogues of results established in [13] for holomorphic vector bundles. There it is proven that the existence of Z-critical connections on a holomorphic vector bundle is equivalent to asymptotic Z-stability of the bundle; the latter notion is a variant of Bridgeland stability. The techniques used there (and similarly in related work of Leung [36] and Sektnan-Tipler [47]) do not apply to our situation, as there the basic idea is to induct using an appropriate filtration of the bundle, which seems to have no analogue in the manifold setting considered here. The direction that existence implies stability again uses techniques that are specific to the bundle setting. Our approach here has the advantage of generality; it should apply to many problems in Kähler geometry. The disadvantage is that one loses some of the explicit geometry involved in the bundle setting, but this seems inevitable when passing from the bundle theory to the more challenging manifold theory.

Continuing with the comparison with the bundle story, we must mention that the general notion of a Z-critical connection is modelled on the specific notion of a *deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills connection* associated with a special central charge of particular relevance to mirror symmetry. Indeed, the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation was introduced through SYZ mirror symmetry to be the mirror of the special Lagrangian equation [38]. The quite beautiful theory of this equation on holomorphic line bundles has developed with speed over the past few years [34, 7, 10, 11], and these developments have emphasised that the special form of the central charge in this case has significant geometric implications. We thus emphasise that there is a direct analogue of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation for manifolds, which one might call the *deformed cscK equation* and which seems to be the natural avenue for further research. Fixing normal coordinates for the Kähler metric ω in which $\text{Ric}\omega$ is diagonal, let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $\text{Ric}\omega$ and let $\sigma_j(\omega)$ denote the j^{th} elementary symmetric polynomial in these

eigenvalues. Then this equation takes the form

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi} \left(\sum_{j=0}^n (-i)^j (\sigma_j(\omega) - \Delta\sigma_{j-1}(\omega)) \right) \right) = 0.$$

We remark that the name is misleading, as it is only truly a “deformation” of the cscK equation in the large volume limit. We also remark that the phase range in which existence of solutions to the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation is equivalent to stability is the full supercritical phase range [7], which emphasises that in explicit situations one should expect the large volume hypothesis of Conjecture 1.1 to be similarly explicit.

Categorification. For arbitrary central charges, or with more singular objects, one should expect the need to categorify the problem in order to have a reasonable theory, especially by making sense of an analogue of the derived category of coherent sheaves for polarised varieties. While we do not pursue this important question in the current work, we make one remark which hints at how one should begin to approach the question. The main reason one can extend stability from coherent sheaves to complexes, hence objects in the derived category, is that the central charge is additive in short exact sequences of sheaves. Roughly speaking, filtrations of sheaves correspond to \mathbb{C}^* -degenerations of the variety, and there is a closely analogous property to additivity of the central charge which is crucial to our proof of Theorem 1.1.

To explain this, it is clearer to view the central charge as a function on schemes endowed with a \mathbb{C}^* -action; we use suggestive additive notation for composition of commuting \mathbb{C}^* -actions. We firstly note that the central charge Z is *equivariant* in the sense that if (X, L) admits a \mathbb{C}^* -action α (producing a product test configuration), and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is an α -equivariant test configuration, there is a \mathbb{C}^* -action on X_0 induced by α and Z can equally be calculated on X or X_0 , or rather through the two induced product test configurations. That is, writing the dependence on the scheme and \mathbb{C}^* -action explicitly

$$Z(\alpha; X) = Z(\alpha; X_0).$$

Turning to the general case, if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is a test configuration for (X, L) with central fibre (X', L') and \mathbb{C}^* -action α arising from the structure of the test configuration, and $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}')$ is a test configuration for (X', L') which is α -equivariant and with central fibre (X'', L'') with \mathbb{C}^* -action $a\alpha + b\beta$, then viewed as a function on the space of \mathbb{C}^* -actions one has the additivity property

$$Z(a\alpha + b\beta; X'') = aZ(\alpha; X') + bZ(\beta; X'') = aZ(\alpha; X'') + bZ(\beta; X'').$$

Thus, schemes endowed with \mathbb{C}^* -actions seem to play a roughly analogous role to coherent sheaves, with test configurations being roughly analogous to morphisms of sheaves. An (abstract) central charge should then be a function with the additive property described above. Pushing the analogy with Bridgeland stability further appears very challenging however, not least because the analogue of the “Harder-Narasimhan property” of a Bridgeland stability condition is completely open even for K-stability of polarised varieties.

Stability of maps. While we have thusfar emphasised the case of polarised varieties, and while our main result only holds in that setting, the basic framework is more general and links with interesting questions in enumerative geometry. While for a broad and interesting class of central charge, the “large volume condition” is K-stability, in general one obtains the notion of twisted K-stability [12], which is linked to the existence of twisted cscK metrics. The appropriate geometric context in which to study twisted K-stability is when one has a map $p : (X, L) \rightarrow (Y, H)$ of polarised varieties, where it is essentially equivalent to K-stability of the map p [16, 17].

From the moduli theoretic point of view, one expects to be able to form moduli of K-stable maps to a fixed (Y, H) . The definition of K-stability of maps generalises Kontsevich’s notion when (X, L) is a curve, and the resulting (entirely conjectural) higher dimensional moduli spaces would thus be higher dimensional analogues of the moduli space of stable maps; there is also a version of theory involving divisors, as a higher dimensional analogue of the maps of marked curves used in Gromov-Witten theory [2][16, Section 5.3]. What seems most interesting is that our work suggests that there should be variants of stability of maps even in the curves case, which may even lead to an understanding of wall-crossing phenomena for Gromov-Witten invariants; this seems likely to require developing a more categorical approach to the problem as discussed above.

Acknowledgements. I thank Michael Hallam, Frances Kirwan, John McCarthy, Jacopo Stoppa and especially Lars Sektnan for several interesting discussions on this circle of ideas, and Gábor Székelyhidi for inspiring comments on another deformation problem. I was funded by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship for the duration of this work.

2. Z -STABILITY AND Z -CRITICAL KÄHLER METRICS

Here we define the key algebro-geometric and differential-geometric criteria of interest to us: Z -stability and Z -critical Kähler metrics. The definitions involve a central charge, which involves various Chern classes of X . The differential geometry is substantially more complicated when higher Chern classes (rather than merely the first Chern class) appear in the central charge, and so we postpone the definitions and results in that case to Section 4. The difference is roughly analogous to the difference between the theory of Z -critical connections on holomorphic line bundles and bundles of higher rank, and so we call the situation in which higher Chern classes appear the “higher rank case”. The analogy is far from exact, and the case in which only the first Chern class and its powers appear in the central charge already exhibits many of the main difficulties in the study of Z -critical connections on arbitrary rank vector bundles.

2.1. Stability conditions.

2.1.1. *Z -stability.* We work throughout over the complex numbers, in order to preserve links with the complex differential geometry. We also fix a normal polarised variety (X, L) of dimension n , with L an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle. Normality implies that the canonical class K_X of X exists as a Weil divisor, we always assume that K_X exists as a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle.

In addition to our ample line bundle, we will fix a *stability vector*, a *unipotent cohomology class* and a *polynomial Chern form*; we define these in turn.

Definition 2.1. A *stability vector* is a sequence of complex numbers

$$\rho = (\rho_0, \dots, \rho_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$$

such that $\rho_n = i$.

The condition $\text{Im}(\rho_n) = i$ is a harmless normalisation condition which, when it is not satisfied, can be achieved by multiplying the stability vector by a fixed complex number. In Bridgeland stability, one normally assumes $\rho \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$; this will be unnecessary for us.

Definition 2.2. A *unipotent cohomology class* is a complex cohomology class $\Theta \in \oplus_j H^{j,j}(X, \mathbb{C})$ which is of the form $\Theta = 1 + \Theta'$, where $\Theta' \in H^{>0}(X, \mathbb{C})$.

Note that Θ' must satisfy

$$\overbrace{\Theta' \cdot \dots \cdot \Theta'}^{j \text{ times}} = 0$$

for $j \geq n+1$. A typical example of a choice of Θ is to fix a class $\beta \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and set $\Theta = e^{-\beta}$, which is analogous to a “ B -field” in Bridgeland stability.

Definition 2.3. A *polynomial Chern form* is a sum of the form

$$f(K_X) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j K_X^j,$$

where $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and K_X^j denotes the j^{th} -intersection product $K_X \cdot \dots \cdot K_X$, viewed as a cycle. We always assume the normalisation condition $a_0 = a_1 = 1$, and interpret $K_X^0 = 1$ as a cycle.

As mentioned above, in the current section we restrict ourselves to central charges only involving $c_1(X) = c_1(-K_X)$, with the case of higher Chern classes postponed to Section 4.

Definition 2.4. A *polynomial central charge* is a function $Z : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ taking the form

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l k^l \int_X L^l \cdot f(K_X) \cdot \Theta,$$

for some ρ and Θ . A *central charge* is a polynomial central charge with k fixed, such that $Z(X, L) \neq 0$.

We will sometimes simply call a polynomial central charge a central charge when the dependence on k is clear from context. The information of a polynomial central charge on a polarised variety is thus the information of a stability vector and a unipotent cohomology class. The point of the definition is that a polynomial central charge generates a sequence of central charges depending on k , and is motivated by an analogous definition of Bayer in the bundle setting [3, Theorem 3.2.2]. For a polynomial central charge it is automatic that $Z_k(X, L)$ lies in the upper half plane in \mathbb{C} for $k \gg 0$, since $\text{Im}(\rho_n) > 0$. Thus we can make the following definition.

Definition 2.5. We define the *phase* of X to be

$$\varphi_k(X, L) = \arg Z_k(X, L),$$

the argument of the non-zero complex number. We denote this by $\varphi(X, L)$ when k is fixed, and for fixed (X, L) often simply denote this by φ .

Here we consider \arg as a function $\arg : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\arg(1) = 0$. We now turn to our definition of stability, which depends on a choice of central charge Z . As in the definition of K-stability of polarised varieties, we require the notion of a test configuration, which is essentially a \mathbb{C}^* -degeneration of (X, L) to another polarised scheme.

Definition 2.6. [54][22, Definition 2.1.1] A *test configuration* for (X, L) consists of a pair $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ where:

- (i) \mathcal{X} is a normal polarised variety such that $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle;
- (ii) \mathcal{L} is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle;
- (iii) there is a \mathbb{C}^* -action on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ making π an equivariant flat map with respect to the standard \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathbb{C} ;
- (iv) the fibres $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$ are each isomorphic to (X, L) for each $t \neq 0 \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (v) the family is equivariantly trivial away from $0 \in \mathbb{C}$.

A test configuration is a *product* if $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0) \cong (X, L)$, hence inducing a \mathbb{C}^* -action on (X, L) ; it is further *trivial* if this \mathbb{C}^* -action is the trivial one.

Remark 2.7. One typically does not require $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ to be a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle in the usual definition of a test configuration, but one should not expect this discrepancy to play a significant role in either K-stability or the theory of Z -stability we are describing.

A test configuration admits a canonical compactification to a family over \mathbb{P}^1 by equivariantly compactifying trivially over infinity [57, Section 3]. This compactification produces a flat family endowed with a \mathbb{C}^* -action, which we abusively denote $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, such that each fibre over $t \neq \infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$ is isomorphic to (X, L) . The reason to compactify is that it allows us to perform intersection theory on the resulting projective variety \mathcal{X} .

It will also be convenient to be able to consider classes on X as inducing classes on \mathcal{X} , so we pass to a variety with a surjective map to X as follows. \mathcal{X} then admits a natural equivariant birational map

$$f : (X \times \mathbb{P}^1, p_1^*L) \dashrightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}),$$

with $p_1 : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow X$ the projection, and we take an equivariant resolution of indeterminacy of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Y} & & \\ q \downarrow & \searrow r & \\ X \times \mathbb{P}^1 & \dashrightarrow & \mathcal{X}, \end{array}$$

where we may assume \mathcal{Y} is smooth. In particular the unipotent cohomology class Θ on X involved in the definition of a central charge induces a class $(q \circ p_1)^*\Theta$ on \mathcal{Y} , which we still denote Θ . The classes \mathcal{L} and $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ on \mathcal{X} induce also classes $r^*\mathcal{L}$ and $r^*K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}$ on \mathcal{Y} , we in addition set $K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} = K_{\mathcal{X}} - \pi^*K_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ to be the relative canonical class. Thus to a given intersection number $L^d \cdot K_X^j \cdot U$ we can associate the intersection number on \mathcal{Y} which we (slightly abusively) denote

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}^j \cdot \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (r^*\mathcal{L})^{l+1} \cdot r^*(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}^j) \cdot \Theta,$$

which is computed in \mathcal{Y} . In computing this intersection number, note that $\dim \mathcal{X} = \dim \mathcal{Y} = n + 1$. The following elementary result justifies the notation omitting \mathcal{Y} .

Lemma 2.8. *This intersection number is independent of resolution of indeterminacy \mathcal{Y} chosen.*

Proof. Given two such resolutions of indeterminacy \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}' , there is a third resolution of indeterminacy \mathcal{Y}'' with commuting maps to both \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}' . The result then follows from an application of the push-pull formula in intersection theory. \square

Definition 2.9. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ be a test configuration and Z be a polynomial central charge. We define the *central charge* of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ to be

$$Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{l=0}^n \frac{\rho_l k^l}{l+1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot f(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \Theta,$$

and set $\varphi_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \arg Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ when $Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \neq 0$. Note that $f(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}^j$ arises from the polynomial Chern form. With k fixed we denote these by $Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and $\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ respectively.

The stability condition, for fixed k , is then the following.

Definition 2.10. We say that (X, L) is

- (i) *Z-stable* if for all non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right) > 0.$$

- (ii) *Z-polystable* if for all test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right) \geq 0,$$

with equality holding for product test configurations;

- (iii) *Z-semistable* if for all test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right) \geq 0.$$

- (iv) *Z-unstable* otherwise.

The natural asymptotic notion is the following.

Definition 2.11. We say that (X, L) is *asymptotically Z-stable* if for all non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ and for all $k \gg 0$ we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_k(X, L)} \right) > 0.$$

Asymptotic Z-polystability, semistability and instability are defined similarly.

Note that, as $\operatorname{Im}(\rho_n) > 0$ by assumption, both $Z_k(X, L)$ and $Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ are non-vanishing and lie in the upper half plane for $k \gg 0$. Here, strictly speaking to ensure that $Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ lies in the upper half plane we may need to modify \mathcal{L} to $\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{O}(m)$ for some $\mathcal{O}(m)$ pulled back from \mathbb{P}^1 ; this leaves the various stability inequalities unchanged by Lemma 2.13 below. Thus asymptotic Z -stability can be rephrased as asking for all test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ to have for $k \gg 0$

$$\varphi_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > \varphi_k(X, L).$$

Remark 2.12. In Bridgeland stability much work goes into ensuring that the central charge has image in the upper half plane, and this is one of the most challenging aspects of constructing Bridgeland stability conditions. We have essentially ignored this, at the expense of having a notion that should only be the correct one near the “large volume regime” when k is taken to be large; this should be thought of as producing a “large volume” region in the space of central charges.

We note that in the better understood story of deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills connections, the link between analysis and a simpler (non-categorical) stability conditions holds in the “supercritical phase” [10, 7], which can be thought of as an explicit description of the “large volume regime”. Away from the large volume situation, it seems likely that categorical techniques must be used and, for example, more structure should be required of the stability vector by analogy with Bayer’s hypotheses [3, Theorem 3.2.2]. Thus our algebro-geometric definitions should be seen as the first approximation of a larger story, which is appropriate only in an explicit large volume region.

The factor $l + 1$ in the definition of $Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ ensures that the key inequality defining stability is invariant under certain changes of \mathcal{L} . For this, note that one can modify the polarisation of a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ by adding the pullback $\mathcal{O}(m)$ of the (m^{th} tensor power of the) hyperplane line bundle from \mathbb{P}^1 for any j .

Lemma 2.13. *The phase inequality remains unchanged under the addition of $\mathcal{O}(m)$. That is,*

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{O}(m))}{Z(X, L)} \right) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right).$$

Proof. A single intersection number changes as

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{O}(m))^{l+1} \cdot K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}^j \cdot \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}^j \cdot \Theta + m(l+1) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^l \cdot K_X^j \cdot \Theta,$$

since by flatness intersecting with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ can be viewed as intersecting with a fibre $\mathcal{X}_t \cong X$ for $t \neq 0$, and $\mathcal{L}, K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}$ and Θ restrict to L, K_X and Θ respectively on X . It follows that

$$Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{O}(m)) = Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + mZ(X, L),$$

which means since $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ is real

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{O}(m))}{Z(X, L)} \right) &= \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + mZ(X, L)}{Z(X, L)} \right), \\ &= \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.14. The central charge that appears most interesting is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k(X, L) &= - \int_X e^{-ikL} \cdot e^{-K_X}, \\ &= - \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-i)^j}{j!(n-j)!} \int_X (kL)^j \cdot (-K_X)^{n-j}. \end{aligned}$$

This can be viewed as an analogue of the central charge on the Grothendieck group $K(X)$ (in the sense of Bridgeland stability) associated to the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on a holomorphic line bundle [11, Section 9].

We will not consider a completely arbitrary central charge in the present work, as we require that the large volume limit of our conditions is “non-degenerate” in a suitable sense. Let Θ_1 denote the $(1, 1)$ -part of the unipotent cohomology class $\Theta \in \oplus_j H^{j,j}(X, \mathbb{C})$.

Definition 2.15. We say that Z is

- (i) *non-degenerate* if $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$ and Θ_1 vanishes;
- (ii) *of map type* if $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$ and there is a map $p : X \rightarrow Y$ such that Θ is the pullback of a cohomology class from Y and with $-\Theta_1$ is the class of the pullback of an ample line bundle from Y .

The motivation for these definition is through the link with K-stability and its variants.

2.1.2. *K-stability.* The definition of asymptotic Z -stability given is motivated not only by the vector bundle theory, but also by the notion of *K-stability* of polarised varieties due to Tian and Donaldson [54, 22]. As before, we take (X, L) to be a normal polarised variety such that K_X is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle.

Definition 2.16. We define the *slope* of (X, L) to be the topological invariant, computed as an integral over X

$$\mu(X, L) = \frac{-K_X \cdot L^{n-1}}{L^n}.$$

We further define the *Donaldson-Futaki invariant* of a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ to be

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{n\mu(X, L)}{n+1} \mathcal{L}^{n+1} + \mathcal{L}^n \cdot K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} \right).$$

We remark that this is not Donaldson’s original definition, but is rather proven by Odaka and Wang to be an equivalent one [41, Theorem 3.2] [57, Section 3] (see also [22, Proposition 4.2.1]).

Definition 2.17. We say that (X, L) is

- (i) *K-stable* if for all non-trivial test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) we have $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > 0$;
- (ii) *K-polystable* if for all test configurations we have $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$, with equality exactly when $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is a product;
- (iii) *K-semistable* if for all test configurations we have $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$;
- (iv) *K-unstable* otherwise.

The following is immediate from the definitions.

Lemma 2.18. *K-semistability is equivalent to asymptotic Z-semistability where*

$$Z_k(X, L) = \int_X (ik^n L^n - k^{n-1} K_X \cdot L^{n-1}).$$

That is, with $\rho = (i, -1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\Theta = 0$.

Of course, the same is true for K-stability and K-polystability, modulo our slightly non-standard requirement that $K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle, which is irrelevant for K-semistability as in that situation one can assume \mathcal{X} is smooth.

Example 2.19. K-semistability of *maps* can be recovered as a special case of Z -stability. Indeed, supposing $p : (X, L) \rightarrow (Y, H)$ is a map of polarised varieties, then setting

$$Z_k(X, L) = \int_X (ik^n L^n - k^{n-1}(K_X + p^*H).L^{n-1})$$

recovers the notion of *K-semistability of the map* p [16, Definition 2.9]. That is, we take Θ to be the (class of) p^*H .

Slightly more generally, twisted K-stability fits into this picture [12, Definition 2.7], though this is less geometric than K-stability of maps and we hence do not discuss it. Similarly, the “fully degenerate” case $a_j = 0$ for $j \leq n-1$ produces variants of J-stability [35, Section 2] and has links with Z -stability of holomorphic line bundles [13, Conjecture 1.6]. In general, asymptotic Z -stability is related to K-stability as follows:

Proposition 2.20. *For an arbitrary central charge Z , asymptotic Z -semistability implies*

- (i) *K-semistability if Z is non-degenerate;*
- (ii) *K-semistability of the map p if Z is of map type.*

Proof. We only give the proof for K-semistability, as the proof is the same for the map type situation. By non-degeneracy, there is an expansion

$$Z_k(X, L) = k^n i \int_X L^n + k^{n-1} \rho_{n-1} \int_X K_X.L^{n-1} + O(k^{n-2}),$$

where we have used that $\Theta_1 = 0$ and that our normalisation for the polynomial Chern form assumes $a_0 = a_1 = 1$. Thus

$$Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{i}{n+1} k^n \int_X \mathcal{L}^{n+1} + \frac{\rho_{n-1}}{n} k^{n-1} \int_X K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}.L^{n-1} + O(k^{n-2}),$$

meaning that

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_k(X, L)} \right) = \frac{-\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})}{nL^n} \operatorname{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}).$$

Thus since $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$ by non-degeneracy, the asymptotic Z -stability hypothesis demands that this be negative for $k \gg 0$, forcing $\operatorname{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$. \square

2.2. Z -critical Kähler metrics. We now turn to the differential-geometric counterpart of stability, and thus assume that (X, L) is a *smooth* polarised variety. We wish to define a notion of a “canonical metric” in $c_1(L)$, adapted to the central charge Z . We recall our notation that the central charge takes the form

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l k^l \int_X L^l \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^n a_j K_X^j \right) \cdot \Theta,$$

with the induced phase being denoted $\varphi_k(X, L) = \arg Z_k(X, L)$; we take k to be fixed and omit it from our notation.

Associated to any Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$ is its Ricci form

$$\operatorname{Ric} \omega = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \partial \bar{\partial} \log \omega^n \in c_1(X) = c_1(-K_X)$$

and a Laplacian operator Δ . We also fix a representative of the unipotent class Θ , which we denote $\theta \in \Theta$. When Z is non-degenerate in the sense of Definition

2.15, so that $\Theta_1 = 0$, we always take the $(1, 1)$ -component $\theta_1 \in \Theta_1$ to vanish, and similarly when Z is of map type we take θ_1 to be the pullback of a Kähler metric from Y . To the intersection number $L^l \cdot (-K_X)^j \cdot \Theta$ we associate the function

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{\omega^l \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \theta}{\omega^n} - \frac{j}{l+1} \Delta \left(\frac{\omega^{l+1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-1} \wedge \theta}{\omega^n} \right) \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C}),$$

with the second term taken to be zero when $j = 0$. The presence of the Laplacian terms will be crucial to link with the algebraic geometry. By linearity, this produces a function $\tilde{Z}(\omega)$ defined in such a way that

$$\int_X \tilde{Z}(\omega) \omega^n = Z(X, L);$$

we with our algebro-geometric discussion, we always assume that $Z(X, L) \neq 0$.

Definition 2.21. We say that ω is a *Z-critical Kähler metric* if

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) = 0.$$

We view this as a partial differential equation on the space of Kähler metrics in $c_1(L)$, or equivalently on the space of Kähler potentials with respect to a fixed Kähler metric. Viewed on the space of Kähler potentials, provided $\rho_j \neq 0$ for some $j < n$, the equation is a fourth-order fully-nonlinear partial differential equation. The condition is equivalent to asking that the function

$$\tilde{Z}(\omega) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

has constant argument, which must then equal that of $Z(X, L) \in \mathbb{C}$.

In the vector bundle theory, rather than working with arbitrary connections one works with “almost-calibrated connections”, [11, Section 8.1]. This is a positivity condition which depends on the choice of $\theta \in \Theta$ and which is trivial in the large volume limit [13, Lemma 2.8], and it is likely one needs to restrict to a subset of Kähler metrics for the above to produce a reasonable partial differential equation. The notion of a “subsolution” also plays a prominent role in the bundle theory [10], which for example forces the equation to be elliptic in that situation [13, Lemma 2.32]. We note that, also in the manifold case, ellipticity of the Z -critical equation cannot hold in general, and hence for that reason and others it is natural to ask if there are manifold analogues of these concepts.

The appearance of the phase is justified by the following.

Lemma 2.22. *For any Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$, the integral*

$$\int_X \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n = 0$$

vanishes.

Proof. Since $\int_X \tilde{Z}(\omega) \omega^n = Z(X, L)$ and $\varphi(X, L) = \arg(Z(X, L))$, we see

$$e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} = \frac{r(X, L)}{Z(X, L)}$$

with $r(X, L)$ real. Thus

$$\int_X \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n = \text{Im} \left(\frac{r(X, L)}{Z(X, L)} Z(X, L) \right) = 0.$$

□

The Z -critical condition can be reformulated as follows. The analogous reformulation, in the special case of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation [34], has been crucial to all progress in understanding the equation geometrically, and an analogous reformulation holds for Z -critical connections on holomorphic line bundles [13, Example 2.24].

Lemma 2.23. *Write*

$$\tilde{Z}(X, L) = \operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}(X, L) + i \operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}(X, L).$$

Then ω is a Z -critical Kähler metric if and only if

$$\arctan \left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}(X, L)} \right) = \varphi(X, L) \pmod{2\pi\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Proof. We calculate

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(X, L)) = \operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \exp \left(i \arctan \left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}(X, L)} \right) \right) \right),$$

which vanishes if and only if

$$\arctan \left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}(X, L)} \right) = \varphi(X, L) \pmod{2\pi\mathbb{Z}}.$$

□

Example 2.24. Consider the central charge

$$Z(X, L) = - \int_X e^{-iL} \cdot e^{-K_X} = - \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-i)^j}{j!(n-j)!} \int_X L^j \cdot (-K_X)^{n-j}$$

described in Example 2.14. The induced representative $\tilde{Z}(\omega)$ is given by

$$\tilde{Z}(\omega) = - \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-i)^j}{j!(n-j)!} \left(\frac{\omega^{n-j} \wedge \operatorname{Ric} \omega^j}{\omega^n} - \frac{j}{n-j+1} \Delta \left(\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^{j-1} \wedge \omega^{n-j+1}}{\omega^n} \right) \right),$$

which produces what one might call the *deformed cscK equation*

$$(2.2) \quad \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) = 0,$$

which is the manifold analogue of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on a holomorphic line bundle.

Each component of this equation, of the form

$$\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^j \wedge \omega^{n-j}}{\omega^n} - \frac{j}{n-j+1} \Delta \left(\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^{j-1} \wedge \omega^{n-j+1}}{\omega^n} \right),$$

has appeared previously in the work of Chen-Tian [9, Definition 4.1] and Song-Weinkove [49, Section 2] in relation to the Kähler-Ricci flow. To understand the equation more fully, choose a point p and normal coordinates at p so that $\operatorname{Ric} \omega$ is diagonal with diagonal entries $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. Letting $\sigma_j(\omega)$ be the j^{th} elementary symmetric polynomial in these eigenvalues, so that

$$(\omega + t \operatorname{Ric} \omega)^n = \sum_{j=0}^n t^j \sigma_j(\omega) \omega^n,$$

the deformed cscK equation takes the much simpler form

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi} \left(\sum_{j=0}^n (-i)^j (\sigma_j(\omega) - \Delta \sigma_{j-1}(\omega)) \right) \right) = 0.$$

This is a close analogue of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on a holomorphic line bundle, but the presence of the terms involving the Laplacian seems to present significant new challenges.

We also remark that Schlitzer-Stoppa have studied a coupling of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation to the constant scalar curvature equation [46], which should be related to a combination of Bridgeland stability of the bundle and K-stability of the polarised variety, and which is of quite a different flavour to Equation (2.2).

We now focus on the large volume regime of the Z -critical equation.

Lemma 2.25. *Suppose the central charge Z_k is of map type, with $\theta_1 \in \Theta_1$ a real $(1, 1)$ -form. Then there is an expansion as $k \rightarrow \infty$ of the form*

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_k} \tilde{Z}_k(\omega)) = k^{-1}(\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})L^n)(S(\omega) - \Lambda_\omega \theta_1 - n\mu_{\Theta_1}(X, L)) + O(k^{-2}),$$

where $\mu_{\Theta_1}(X, L) = \frac{-L^{n-1} \cdot (K_X + \Theta_1)}{L^n}$.

Proof. We first calculate

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_k(\omega)}{Z_k(X, L)} \right) = \frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}_k(\omega) \operatorname{Re} Z_k(X, L) - \operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}_k(\omega) \operatorname{Im} Z_k(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} Z_k(X, L)^2 + \operatorname{Im} Z_k(X, L)^2}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k(X, L) &= iL^n k^n + \rho_{n-1} L^{n-1} \cdot (K_X + \Theta_1) k^{n-1} + O(k^{n-2}), \\ \tilde{Z}_k(\omega) &= i - \frac{\rho_{n-1}}{n} (S(\omega) - \Lambda_\omega \theta_1) k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

this is given by

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_k(\omega)}{Z_k(X, L)} \right) = k^{-n-1} (\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})(S(\omega) - \Lambda_\omega \theta_1 - n\mu_{\Theta_1}(X, L)) + O(k^{-n-2})).$$

Writing $Z_k(X, L) = r_k e^{i\varphi_k}$, we have

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_k(X, L)} \tilde{Z}_k(\omega)) = r_k(X, L) \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_k(\omega)}{Z_k(X, L)} \right),$$

which since $r_k = L^n k^n + O(k^{n-1})$ implies the result. \square

Thus, up to multiplication by the non-zero (in fact strictly negative) constant $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})$, the “large volume limit” of the Z -critical equation is the *twisted cscK equation*

$$S(\omega) - \Lambda_\omega \theta_1 = n\mu_{\Theta_1}(X, L);$$

the geometry of this equation is linked with that of the map $p : X \rightarrow Y$ [17, Section 4], where we have assumed θ_1 is the pullback of a Kähler metric from Y since the central charge is of map type.

This result can be seen as a differential-geometric counterpart to Proposition 2.20. When Z is actually non-degenerate, it follows that the “large volume limit” of the Z -critical equation is the cscK equation, whereas on the algebro-geometric side,

Proposition 2.20 shows that asymptotic Z -semistability implies K -semistability, so that K -stability is the “large volume limit” of asymptotic Z -stability. In order to more fully understand the links between the various concepts, we will later be interested in the analytic counterpart to K -semistability:

Definition 2.26. We say that (X, L) is *analytically K -semistable* if there is a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) for which $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ is a smooth polarised variety which admits a cscK metric.

It is conjectured that a K -semistable polarised variety admits a test configuration whose central fibre is K -polystable. The assumption of analytic K -semistability is thus a smoothness assumption, since a smooth K -polystable polarised variety is itself expected to admit a cscK metric. It follows from work of Donaldson that analytically K -semistable varieties are actually K -semistable [23, Theorem 2].

3. Z -CRITICAL METRICS ON ASYMPTOTICALLY Z -STABLE MANIFOLDS

Here we prove our main result:

Theorem 3.1. *Let Z be an admissible central charge. Suppose that (X, L) is a polarised variety with discrete automorphism group which is analytically K -semistable. Then if (X, L) is asymptotically Z -stable, (X, L) admits Z_k -critical Kähler metrics for all $k \gg 0$.*

We will also state and prove a local converse, namely that existence implies stability in a local sense, later in Section 3.6. Here we consider only the case that the central charge Z involves powers of K_X and no higher Chern classes, with the general case, in which the equation has a different flavour, being dealt with in Section 4. In comparison with the statement in the introduction, we are varying the central charge by k rather than scaling L ; these operations are clearly equivalent.

Admissibility requires three conditions. All of these conditions hold in the case of the deformed cscK equation described in Example 2.24. Firstly, we require that Z is non-degenerate, meaning the large volume limit of the Z -critical equation is the cscK equation. Secondly, with the central charge given by

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l k^l \int_X L^l \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j K_X^j \right) \cdot \Theta,$$

we require that $a_2 \neq 0$. This will imply that, when $k \gg 0$, our equation is elliptic. Ellipticity is all that is used, so this condition can be removed provided one assumes that the equation is elliptic when $k \gg 0$.

The third condition is the most delicate, and is automatic when $\theta = 0$ is trivial. The condition is modelled on the bundle situation [13], where the differential forms θ are forms on the base Y of the vector bundle E . Then if the polystable degeneration of E is F , there is still a map $F \rightarrow Y$, meaning one can still make sense of the relevant equation on Y . Thus we essentially assume that the auxiliary form θ on X is pulled back from a map to some Y in such a way that θ extends to the polystable degeneration. As an illustrative example, one should think of the situation when $X = \mathbb{P}(E)$ is the projectivisation of a bundle, and the cscK degeneration is to $\mathbb{P}(F)$.

Formally, we require that there is a map $p : X \rightarrow Y$ such that θ is pulled-back from Y , such that p is compatible with the cscK degeneration of (X, L) . To make sense of this, we consider the Kuranishi space B of the cscK degeneration X_0 of

X . As we recall in Theorem 3.11, B admits a local action of $\text{Aut}(X_0, L_0)$, and the third condition of admissibility requires that the map p extends to a \mathbb{C}^* -invariant holomorphic map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$, meaning that θ extends to a \mathbb{C}^* -invariant differential form on the universal family over the Kuranishi space.

3.1. Preliminaries on analytic Deligne pairings. As outlined in the Introduction, there are three steps to our work. The final step is to solve an abstract finite dimensional problem in symplectic geometry, whereas the first two steps involve reducing to this finite dimensional problem. A key tool for the first two steps is the theory of analytic Deligne pairings, established in [15, Section 4][48, Section 2.2], which give a direct approach to the properties of Deligne pairings in algebraic geometry. The additional flexibility of analytic Deligne pairings will allow us to include the extra forms θ into the theory, which do not fit into the usual algebro-geometric approach. Although the techniques developed in [15, 48] are essentially equivalent, our discussion is closer to that of Sjöström Dyrefelt [48].

The setup is as follows. Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ be a smooth morphism with projective fibres, of relative dimension n . From the differential-geometric point of view, the morphism π is a holomorphic submersion. We wish to relate the Kähler geometry of the fibres to the Kähler geometry of the base. We thus suppose $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-p}$ are $n-p+1$ closed $(1,1)$ -forms on \mathcal{X} . Any other forms $\eta'_j \in [\eta_j]$ are of the form $\eta'_j = \eta_j + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j$ for some real-valued function ψ_j . We in addition suppose that there is a map $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$, and θ is a closed real (p,p) -form on \mathcal{X} pulled back from Y which we will not be varied in our discussion and which has cohomology class $[\theta] = \Theta$. In our application we will allow θ to be a closed *complex* (p,p) -form, but linearity of our constructions will allow us to reduce to the real case.

Definition 3.2. We define the *Deligne functional* to be the function

$$\langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \varphi_0(\eta_1 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_{n-p} + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{n-p}) \wedge \theta \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \psi_1 \eta_0 \wedge (\eta_2 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_2) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_{n-p} + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{n-p}) \wedge \theta + \dots \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \psi_{n-p} \eta_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \eta_{n-p-1} \wedge \theta. \end{aligned}$$

The fibre integral formula simply means that the value of the function at a point b is the corresponding integral over the fibre $\mathcal{X}_b = \pi^{-1}(b)$. At our reference metric, this function is then denoted $\langle 0, \dots, 0; \theta \rangle$. This definition is due to Sjöström Dyrefelt [48, Definition 2.1] and is implicit in [15, Section 4], in both cases with $\theta = 0$. The inclusion of θ makes essentially no difference to the fundamental properties of the functional.

Proposition 3.3. *The Deligne functional $\langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_n \rangle$ satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) *it is symmetric in $\psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}$;*

(ii) it satisfies the “change of potential” formula

$$\langle \psi'_0, \dots, \psi_n \rangle - \langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_n \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} (\psi'_0 - \psi_0)(\eta_1 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_m + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{n-p}) \wedge \theta,$$

and analogous formulae hold when varying other ψ_j ;

(iii) its curvature

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}\langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} (\eta_0 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_0) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_{n-p} + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{n-p}) \wedge \theta$$

is a closed $(1, 1)$ -form.

Proof. (i) This follows from an integration by parts formula when $\theta = 0$ [48, Proposition 2.3], and the proof in the general case is identical. The reason is that our form θ is fixed, so the fact that it is a form of higher degree is irrelevant.

(ii) This is immediate from the definition; this property is really the motivation for the chosen definition. Note that the statement when one changes other ψ_j follows from the symmetry described as (i).

(iii) When $B = \Delta$ is a copy of the unit disc, this is proven in [48, Proposition 2.8] when $\theta = 0$, but the general case is the same. An essentially equivalent approach in a special case is proven in [15, Proposition 4.5]. Covering B by discs produces the result directly. This sort of property seems to have first been noticed by Tian for traditional algebro-geometric Deligne pairings [55, Proposition 1.4], and we are merely emphasising that the same property also holds with this direct approach to Deligne functionals which allows the use of the extra form θ . \square

An interesting class of holomorphic submersions $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ are given by test configurations $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 smooth. In fact it is equivalent to work with test configurations over twice the unit disc $2\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ (with the \mathbb{C}^* -action then meant only locally on 2Δ), and we will sometimes pass between the two conventions. The use of 2Δ is only for notational convenience, to ensure $1 \in 2\Delta$. In this case, we assume $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-p}$ are S^1 -invariant forms on \mathcal{X} with $[\eta_0], \dots, [\eta_{n-p}]$ \mathbb{C}^* -invariant cohomology classes, and that the map $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$ is also \mathbb{C}^* -invariant. This gives a holomorphic map $p : \mathcal{X}_0 \rightarrow Y$ such that θ pulls back to a \mathbb{C}^* -invariant form on \mathcal{X}_0 .

We now fix a fibre \mathcal{X}_1 which we denote as X , so that $\mathcal{X}_t \cong X$ for all $t \neq 0$. Let $\beta(t)$ denote the \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathcal{X} , so that the forms $\beta(t)^*\eta_j - \eta_j$ are in the same cohomology class on \mathcal{X} for all t . Here when working with test configurations defined over Δ , we only consider $t \in \Delta$. It follows that

$$\beta(t)^*\eta_j - \eta_j = i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j^t$$

for some smooth family of functions ψ_j^t depending on t . We next restrict ψ_j^t to our fixed fibre $\mathcal{X}_1 = X$. Set $\tau = -\log|t|^2$, so that $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $t \rightarrow 0$. The following then links the differential geometry with the intersection numbers of interest. To link with the algebraic geometry to come, we assume $\eta_j \in c_1(\mathcal{L}_j)$ for some line bundles \mathcal{L}_j on \mathcal{X} , though this is not essential.

Lemma 3.4. [48, Theorem 4.9][15, Theorem 1.4] *We have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_0 \cdot \dots \cdot \mathcal{L}_{n-p} \cdot \Theta = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\tau} \langle \psi_0^\tau, \dots, \psi_{n-p}^\tau; \theta \rangle(X).$$

Here the intersection number on the left hand side is computed over the compactification of the test configuration $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. The value on the right hand side is

the value of the function at the point $1 \in \mathbb{C}$, which means that the corresponding fibre integral is computed over $X = \mathcal{X}_1$. The class Θ is really the pullback of the corresponding class from the morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$. This Lemma is proven in [48, 15] only in the case $\Theta = 0$, but as above the inclusion of the class Θ makes no difference to the proofs as θ extends smoothly to a \mathbb{C}^* -invariant form on \mathcal{X}_0 by assumption.

3.2. The Z -energy. We next fix a smooth polarised variety (X, L) . We fix the value k , so that the central charge takes the form

$$Z(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l \int_X L^l \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^n a_j K_X^j \right) \cdot \Theta.$$

We also fix a Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$ and denote by \mathcal{H}_ω the space of Kähler potentials with respect to ω . We then wish to define an energy functional

$$E_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

whose Euler-Lagrange equation is the Z -critical equation.

We proceed by first defining a functional

$$F_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

using the central charge, and then define

$$E_Z(\psi) = \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi} F_Z(\psi)).$$

Our process is linear in the (n, n) -forms involved in the definition of $\tilde{Z}(\omega)$, so we fix a term $\int_X L^l \cdot K_X^j \cdot \Theta$, where we may assume Θ is a real cohomology class of degree $(n-l-j, n-l-j)$ again by linearity.

For this fixed term, we can use the theory of Deligne functionals to produce the desired functional

$$F_{Z,l} : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Our reference metric ω induces a reference form $\text{Ric} \omega \in c_1(X)$. Any potential $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ with associated Kähler metric $\omega_\psi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$ induces a change in Ricci curvature

$$\text{Ric}(\omega_\psi) - \text{Ric}(\omega) = i\partial\bar{\partial} \log \left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_\psi^n} \right).$$

Thus the theory of Deligne functionals over a point (i.e., taking the base B to be a point) produces a value

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{l+1} \left\langle \overbrace{\psi, \dots, \psi}^{l+1 \text{ times}}, \overbrace{\log \left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_\psi^n} \right), \dots, \log \left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_\psi^n} \right)}^{j \text{ times}}; \theta \right\rangle \in \mathbb{R}$$

associated to our term $\int_X L^l \cdot K_X^j \cdot \Theta$ involved in the central charge. We emphasise that we are abusing notation slightly; θ is really only one component of the full representative of the unipotent class Θ . But by linearity, with real and imaginary terms handled separately, this produces the functional $E_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, whose Euler-Lagrange equation we must calculate.

Remark 3.5. In the special case $\theta = 0$, the Deligne functional given by Equation (3.1) was introduced by Chen-Tian [9, Section 4] in relation to the Kähler-Ricci flow, where it was defined through its variation. Song-Weinkove later showed that these functionals can, again in the case $\theta = 0$, be obtained through Deligne pairings [49, Section 2.1]. Their work highlights the analytic significance of these functionals. Collins-Yau have introduced an energy functional designed to detect the existence of deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills connections on holomorphic line bundles [11, Section 2], and their functional bears some formal similarities with our Z -energy.

Definition 3.6. We define the Z -energy to be the functional $E_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated to the central charge Z .

Proposition 3.7. *Given a path of metrics $\psi_t \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ with associated Kähler metric ω_t , we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_Z(\psi_t) = \int \dot{\varphi}_t \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n.$$

Thus the Euler-Lagrange equation for the Z -functional is the Z -critical equation.

Proof. By linearity, it suffices to calculate the variation of the operator $F_{Z,l} : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given through Equation (3.1) as a Deligne pairing, along the path ψ_t . We will demonstrate that this variation is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} F_{Z,l}(\psi_t) = \int_X \dot{\varphi}_t \left(\frac{\omega_t^l \wedge \operatorname{Ric} \omega_t^j \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} - \frac{j}{l+1} \Delta_t \left(\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega_t^{j-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t} \right) \right) \omega_t^n,$$

which will imply the result we wish to prove, since by definition of $\tilde{Z}(\omega_t)$ it is a sum of terms of the form

$$\tilde{Z}_l(\omega_t) = \frac{\omega_t^l \wedge \operatorname{Ric} \omega_t^j \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} - \frac{j}{l+1} \Delta_t \left(\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega_t^{j-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t} \right).$$

The calculation from here is closely analogous to that of Song-Weinkove [49, Proposition 2.1], who proved the desired variational formula when $\theta = 0$. By the change of potential formula, our functional is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (l+1)F_{Z,l}(\psi) &= \sum_{m=0}^l \int_X \varphi \omega_\psi^m \wedge \operatorname{Ric} \omega^j \wedge \omega^{l-m} \wedge \theta \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \int_X \log \left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_\psi^n} \right) \operatorname{Ric}(\omega_\psi)^m \wedge \operatorname{Ric} \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_\psi^{l+1} \wedge \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating along the path ψ_t gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(l+1)\frac{d}{dt}F_{Z,l}(\psi_t) &= \sum_{m=0}^l \int_X \dot{\varphi}_t \omega_t^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \omega^{l-m} \wedge \theta \\
&+ \sum_{m=0}^l m \int_X \varphi_t i\partial\bar{\partial}\dot{\psi}_t \omega_t^{m-1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \omega^{l-m} \wedge \theta \\
&- \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \int_X \Delta_t \dot{\psi}_t \text{Ric}(\omega_t)^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta \\
&- \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} m \int_X \log\left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_t^n}\right) i\partial\bar{\partial}\Delta_t \dot{\psi}_t \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^{m-1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta \\
&+ \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} (l+1) \int_X \log\left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_t^n}\right) \text{Ric } \omega_t^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge i\partial\bar{\partial}\dot{\psi}_t \wedge \omega_t^l \wedge \theta,
\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_t is the Laplacian with respect to the volume form ω_t , and where any term with negative exponent is taken to vanish. We note that this is self-adjoint with respect to ω_t^n . We use that

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t = \omega_t - \omega, \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}\log\left(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_t^n}\right) = \text{Ric } \omega_t - \text{Ric } \omega$$

and the self-adjointness of the Laplacian just mentioned to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(l+1)\frac{d}{dt}F_{Z,l}(\psi_t) &= \sum_{m=0}^l \int_X \dot{\varphi}_t \omega_t^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \omega^{l-m} \wedge \theta \\
&+ \sum_{m=0}^l m \int_X \psi_t (\omega_t - \omega) \omega_t^{m-1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^j \wedge \omega^{l-m} \wedge \theta \\
&- \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric}(\omega_t)^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n \\
&- \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} m \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{(\text{Ric } \omega_t - \text{Ric } \omega) \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^{m-1} \wedge \text{Ric}(\omega)^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n \\
&+ \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} (l+1) \int_X \dot{\psi}_t (\text{Ric } \omega_t - \text{Ric } \omega) \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^l \wedge \theta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use that θ is a closed form. We consider first the two terms involving Laplacians, which we see equal

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} (m+1) \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric } \omega_t^m \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^{j-m-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n \\ & + \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} m \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric } \omega_t^{m-1} \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^{j-m} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n \\ & = -j \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric } \omega_t^{j-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n. \end{aligned}$$

One similarly calculates that the remaining three terms sum to

$$(l+1) \int_X \dot{\varphi}_t \omega_t^l \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^j \wedge \theta,$$

meaning that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} F_{Z,l}(\psi_t) &= -\frac{j}{l+1} \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric}(\omega_t)^{j-1} \wedge \omega_t^l \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \omega_t^n + \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \omega_t^l \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^j \wedge \theta, \\ &= \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \left(\frac{\omega_t^l \wedge \text{Ric } \omega_t^j \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} - \frac{j}{l+1} \Delta_t \left(\frac{\text{Ric}(\omega_t)^{j-1} \wedge \omega_t^{l+1} \wedge \theta}{\omega_t^n} \right) \right) \omega_t^n, \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted to show. \square

We now suppose that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is a test configuration for (X, L) with smooth central fibre, and with $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$ a relatively Kähler S^1 -invariant metric. This relatively Kähler metric induces a Hermitian metric on the relative holomorphic tangent bundle $T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}$. Here $T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}$ exists as the test configuration has smooth central fibre, meaning that $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a holomorphic submersion. This induces a metric on the relative anti-canonical class $-K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}$ whose curvature we denote ρ . Following the process explained immediately before Lemma 3.4, we set

$$\beta(t)^* \omega_{\mathcal{X}} - \omega_{\mathcal{X}} = i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t,$$

and we similarly obtain a path of functions through pulling-back ρ .

Let Jv be the real holomorphic vector field inducing the S^1 -action on \mathcal{X} preserving $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$, and define a function h on \mathcal{X} by

$$\mathcal{L}_v \omega_{\mathcal{X}} = i\partial\bar{\partial}h,$$

so that $\dot{\psi}_0 = h$. The form $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ restricts to an S^1 -invariant Kähler metric ω_0 on \mathcal{X}_0 .

Lemma 3.8. [30, Equation 2.1.4] *The function h restricted to \mathcal{X}_0 is a Hamiltonian function with respect to ω_0 .*

Note that $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ is merely a Kähler form on each fibre, hence not actually a symplectic form on \mathcal{X} ; nevertheless, one could call h the Hamiltonian even in this situation. In the below we will also use the related property that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \beta(t)^* \omega_{\mathcal{X}} = i\partial\bar{\partial} \beta(t)^* h,$$

see [51, Example 4.26]. We can now relate the Z -energy to the algebro-geometric invariants of interest.

Proposition 3.9. *We have equalities*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_0} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_0)) \omega_0^n = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\tau} E_Z(\varphi_\tau) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right).$$

Proof. The second equality is an immediate consequence of our definition of E_Z through Deligne functionals and Lemma 3.4, using that

$$E_Z(\psi) = \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} F_Z(\psi)) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{F_Z(\psi)}{Z(X, L)} \right),$$

which is analogous to the fact used in Lemma 2.22. To prove the first equality, unravelling the definition of τ and the variational formula for E_Z proven in Proposition 3.7 with $\omega_t = \beta(t)^* \omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{X=\mathcal{X}_t}$ we see that

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} E_Z(\varphi_\tau) = \int_X (\beta(t)^* h) \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n,$$

where we have used that $\frac{d}{dt} \omega_t = i\partial\bar{\partial}\beta(t)^* h$ by Equation (3.2). But

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_t} (\beta(t)^* h) \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n = \int_{\mathcal{X}_t} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{X}_t})) \omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{X}_t}^n,$$

which converges to $\int_{\mathcal{X}_0} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_0)) \omega_0^n$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, proving the result. \square

This also produces an analogue of the classical Futaki invariant associated to a holomorphic vector field.

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose (X, L) admits a Z -critical Kähler metric, and suppose there is an S^1 -action on (X, L) . Then for any S^1 -invariant Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$ with associated Hamiltonian h we have*

$$\int_X h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n = 0.$$

Proof. Note that a product test configuration, just as with any other test configuration, can be compactified to a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ over \mathbb{P}^1 . By the previous result, this integral is actually independent of $\omega \in c_1(L)$ as it equals

$$\int_X h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n = \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right),$$

which is patently independent of ω . But if ω' is the Z -critical Kähler metric, the corresponding integral on the left hand side clearly vanishes, as desired. \square

3.3. Moment maps in finite dimensions. We next use the Deligne functional approach to the Z -critical equation to explain how the equation arises as a moment map, which will be an important step in proving our main result. In this application it will be important to work with Sobolev spaces as we will use the implicit function theorem, though this makes little difference to the discussion in practice. It will be convenient to set $\varepsilon = k^{-1}$, so that we are interested in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Analogously to the Fujiki-Donaldson moment map interpretation to the cscK equation [27, 21], we consider a fixed compact symplectic manifold (M, ω) with varying almost-complex structure. We denote by $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$ the space of L_k^2 -almost complex structures compatible with (M, ω) , which has the structure of an infinite

dimensional complex manifold. This space admits a natural action of the exact symplectomorphism group \mathcal{G} . For $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ Denote

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} P &: C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow T_J \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2, \\ P(h) &= \bar{\partial} v_h, \end{aligned}$$

with v_h the Hamiltonian vector field associated to h , which can be viewed as the infinitesimal action of the exact symplectomorphism group \mathcal{K} on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$ [51, Section 6.1]. We also denote by P^* the L^2 -adjoint of P .

As our polarised variety (X, L) of interest is analytically K-semistable, there is a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for \mathcal{X} with central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 which admits a cscK metric ω_0 . By Moser's Theorem, after a diffeomorphism we may assume $\omega_0 = \omega$, and we denote by J_0 the resulting integrable almost complex structure on M producing X_0 and making ω cscK. Thus our test configuration has fixed symplectic structure and varying complex structure. We denote by L_0 the line bundle $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{X}_0}$.

We now recall some standard aspects of Kuranishi theory, which produces a versal deformation space for $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ through the space $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$. Our setup and discussion is closely based on that of Székelyhidi [52, Section 3], to which we refer for more details (see also Inoue [33, Section 3.2] for another clear exposition). As in the work of Székelyhidi we denote

$$\tilde{H}^1 = \{\alpha \in T_{J_0} \mathcal{J} : P^* \alpha = \bar{\partial} \alpha = 0\};$$

this is a finite dimensional vector space as it is the kernel of the elliptic operator $P^*P + \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial}$. Denote by K the stabiliser of J_0 under the action of \mathcal{G} , so that K is the group of biholomorphisms of (X_0, L_0) preserving the Kähler metric ω and the complexification $K^\mathbb{C}$ equals $\text{Aut}(X_0, L_0)$ by a result of Matsushima [30, Theorem 3.5.1]. The vector space \tilde{H}^1 admits a linear K -action. It will be convenient to fix a maximal torus $T \subset K$ with complexification $T^\mathbb{C} \subset K^\mathbb{C}$. The linear T -action induces a $T^\mathbb{C}$ -action on \tilde{H}^1 . Note that any holomorphic map $q : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$ from a complex manifold B produces a family of complex manifolds $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ where the fibre is given by $\mathcal{X}_b = (M, J_{q(b)})$. Fixing a point $b \in B$, recall that we say that \mathcal{X} is a *versal deformation space* for \mathcal{X}_b if every other holomorphic family $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow B'$ with $\mathcal{U}_{b'} \cong \mathcal{X}_b$ is locally the pullback of \mathcal{X} through some holomorphic map $B' \rightarrow B$. We recall Kuranishi's result:

Theorem 3.11. [52, Proposition 7] *There is a ball $B' \subset \tilde{H}^1$, a complex subspace $B \subset B'$ and a K -equivariant holomorphic embedding*

$$\Phi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$$

with $\Phi(0) = J_0$ and which produces a versal deformation space for X_0 . Points in B inside the same $T^\mathbb{C}$ -orbit correspond to biholomorphic complex manifolds. The universal family $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ admits a holomorphic line bundle \mathcal{L} and a local $T^\mathbb{C}$ -action making $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ a $T^\mathbb{C}$ -equivariant map. The form ω induces a T -invariant relatively Kähler metric which we denote $\omega \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$.

Here points of B' may induce non-integrable complex structures, while $B \subset B'$ parametrises the integrable ones. We note that the properties of \mathcal{L} and the induced Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$ are discussed for Székelyhidi only for an S^1 -action [52, Proof of Theorem 2], but the same applies for a higher rank T -action.

Here a local $T^\mathbb{C}$ -action means an action induced by sufficiently small elements of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}^\mathbb{C}$. The reason this is not a genuine $T^\mathbb{C}$ -action is simply that

$B \subset \tilde{H}^1$ is only contained in a small neighbourhood of the origin, hence cannot admit a genuine $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action. Note that given any point $q \in B$ and any $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$, we obtain a test configuration induced by considering the (universal family over the) closure of the \mathbb{C}^* -orbit of q inside B , as in Székelyhidi's work [52, Proof of Theorem 2].

Returning to our polarised manifold (X, L) of interest, since there is a test configuration for our polarised manifold with central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 , by versality of B there is a sequence of points p_t in B with $\mathcal{X}_{p_t} \cong X$ and $p_t \rightarrow 0 \in B$, and we set $p = p_1$. We claim that in fact there is a $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that p specialises to zero (that is, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \alpha(t).p = 0$, where α denotes the \mathbb{C}^* -action). To see this, note that the only point with fibre isomorphic to X_0 is 0 itself, and that by a result of Székelyhidi there is *some* $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the specialisation of p corresponds to a complex structure admitting a cscK metric [52, Theorem 2]. But cscK specialisations are actually unique by a result of Chen-Sun [8, Corollary 1.8], producing the desired $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$. We note that we do not need to rely on the quite deep result of Chen-Sun to prove our main result: without appealing to this, one could instead consider the cscK degeneration (X_{p_0}, L_{p_0}) of p in B produced by Székelyhidi, and consider (X, L) as a deformation of (X_{p_0}, L_{p_0}) instead, arguing in the same way.

We now restrict to the closure of the $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit of our fixed semistable point, which is itself a complex manifold as the action is linear; by comparison, B may be singular. We replace B with this orbit-closure, so that there is a $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on B with a dense orbit.

We recall a version of the Fujiki-Donaldson moment map interpretation of the scalar curvature, which uses the natural Kähler metric Ω on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$ [51, Section 6.1]. Denote by \mathfrak{t} the Lie algebra of T , which can be identified with Hamiltonian functions, and let \mathfrak{t}^* be its dual.

Theorem 3.12. *Define a map*

$$\mu : B \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$$

by

$$\langle \mu, h \rangle = \int_M h(S(J_b) - \hat{S})\omega^n.$$

Then μ is a moment map for the K -action on B with respect to the Kähler metric $\Phi^*\Omega$.

Proof. Using the K -equivariance of Φ , this is a direct consequence of the work Fujiki and Donaldson which gives a moment map interpretation of the scalar curvature [21, Proposition 9][27, Theorem 5.1]. \square

Our aim is to prove an analogous result for the Z -critical equation. As we are changing the equation, the Kähler metric on B will also need to change. We use the following result of Fujiki, which gives a geometric description of the Kähler metric $\Phi^*\Omega$ on B in terms of the universal family. As in Section 3.2, the form $\omega \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$ induces a metric on the relative holomorphic tangent bundle $T_{\mathcal{X}/B}$, hence on its determinant $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$, with curvature which we denote ρ .

Proposition 3.13. [27, Theorem 8.3] *The Kähler metric $\Phi^*\Omega$ is given by*

$$\Phi^*\Omega = - \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \rho \wedge \omega^n + \frac{n}{n+1} \mu(X, L) \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \omega^{n+1}.$$

In fact the second term in the integral vanishes, since the symplectic form ω does not vary in the fibres; we include it since it will arise later when we vary the Kähler metric ω .

We now use admissibility of our central charge, which concretely means that the universal family admits a $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -equivariant map $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$, with θ pulled back from Y . Here Y is simply some auxiliary complex manifold, with the hypothesis on the existence of the map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$ analogous to the existence of a map $E \rightarrow Y$ in the vector bundle theory, where Y is the base of the bundle; note that if F is some degeneration of the bundle E , then F also admits a map to Y . Equivariance of $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$ implies that the pull-back θ is a $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -invariant form on \mathcal{X} . To show that the Z -critical equation arises as a moment map, we must first produce a Kähler metric on B . We associate to $Z(X, L)$ an $(n+1, n+1)$ -form on \mathcal{X} as follows. With our notation $\varepsilon = k^{-1}$, our central charge can be written

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l \varepsilon^{-l} \int_X L^l \cdot f(K_X) \cdot \Theta,$$

We will define the $(n+1, n+1)$ -form on \mathcal{X} linearly in the terms of this expression, and hence it is sufficient to define an $(n+1, n+1)$ -form associated to a term of the form $\int_X L^l \cdot K_X^j \cdot \Theta$, to which we associate $\frac{1}{l+1} \omega^{l+1} \wedge \rho^j \wedge \theta$. This induces a form $\tilde{Z}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, and we set

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \text{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \tilde{Z}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \right).$$

Lemma 3.14. *The form Ω_ε is a T -invariant Kähler metric on B for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.*

Proof. T -invariance follows from T -invariance of the map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$, while from general properties of fibre integrals Ω_ε is a closed $(1, 1)$ -form. Thus we need only demonstrate that the $(1, 1)$ -form is positive. This follows from non-degeneracy of Z , which implies that

$$Z_\varepsilon(X, L) = \varepsilon^{-n} \int_X (iL^n + \text{Re}(\rho_{n-1})\varepsilon K_X \cdot L^{n-1}) + O(\varepsilon^{-n+2}),$$

which in turn implies that

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \text{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \tilde{Z}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \right) = -\varepsilon \text{Re}(\rho_{n-1})n\Phi^*\Omega + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

by a calculation completely analogous to Lemma 2.25. Here we note that non-degeneracy requires $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$. \square

It will be useful to set $-\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1})n\Phi^*\Omega = \Omega_0$, so that

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \varepsilon\Omega_0 + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

In the following we view the symplectic form ω as a Kähler metric on each fibre \mathcal{X}_b , since we are considering the complex structure as changing, but the symplectic structure as fixed.

Theorem 3.15. *The map*

$$\mu_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$$

defined by

$$\langle \mu_\varepsilon, v \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(X, L)) \omega^n$$

is a moment map for the T -action on B with respect to Ω_ε . Here h is the Hamiltonian function associated with v .

Proof. Fix $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ corresponding to a Hamiltonian h with respect to ω . We must show that

$$d\langle \mu_\varepsilon, v \rangle = -\iota_v \Omega_\varepsilon.$$

Note that by continuity it is enough to prove this on the open dense orbit inside B , since

$$\langle \mu_\varepsilon, h \rangle(b) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(X, L)) \omega^n$$

extends to a function on B , as do the form Ω_ε and vector field v . Fixing an orbit allows us to shift our perspective to having fixed complex structure and varying Kähler metric.

We fix a point $b \in B$ around which we wish to prove the moment map equality. Consider the flow $z \rightarrow \exp(Jvt).z$ of the vector field v on B . By continuity, we may assume for convenience that v is rational and hence generates a local \mathbb{C}^* -action. Restricting to a small neighbourhood of b under this \mathbb{C}^* -action, we obtain a new family $\mathcal{X}_U \rightarrow U$ where $U \subset B$ is a disc containing b . Viewed as structures on the underlying smooth manifold, the complex structure on the fibres is changing, while the symplectic form is fixed. Since all fibres over U are isomorphic, the Fischer-Grauert Theorem allows us to change perspective to having a fixed complex structure, since it provides a biholomorphism

$$F : X \times U \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_U$$

which commutes with the projections to U [26]. Pulling back ω through F then produces a family with varying Kähler structure and fixed complex structure, as we desired.

We need to understand the resulting change in Kähler metric in more detail. By construction, the complex structures inducing \mathcal{X}_U vary infinitesimally by

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} J_t \right|_{t=0} = P_t(\psi_t)$$

for some functions $\psi_t \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{C})$; this is described by Székelyhidi [52, Proposition 7], following Donaldson [21], as the $K^\mathbb{C}$ -orbits in B having image in the $\mathcal{G}^\mathbb{C}$ -orbits of $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_k^2$. To prove the result, we must calculate $\dot{\psi}_0$. As we are flowing the complex structures along Jv , the induced change in the Kähler metric is given by

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \omega_t \right|_{t=0} = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\dot{\psi}_0.$$

But the definition of the action means that, when we flow along the vector field Jv , the complex structure changes infinitesimally by $P_t(h)$ [52, Section 3][21, p. 400]. It follows that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \omega_t \right|_{t=0} = i\partial\bar{\partial}h;$$

in particular, $\dot{\psi}_0$ is indeed real.

We now use the theory of Deligne functionals. Consider the Z -energy $E_{Z_\varepsilon} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated with the family $X \times U \rightarrow U$. Consider the family $\omega_t = \exp(tJv)^*\omega =$

$\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t$ of Kähler metrics on our fixed fibre over b , so that ω_0 is simply ω . Then by Proposition 3.7, the derivative of the Z -energy derivative satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_Z(\psi_t) = \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n,$$

and hence since $\dot{\varphi}_0 = h$, we see that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n = \int_X h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n.$$

As the action of interest is given by a torus, there must be *some* moment map as our space B is an open ball in a vector space, and all we need to demonstrate is that it is the one we claim. By Proposition 3.3 (iii), as a general property of Deligne functionals we know that

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}E_{Z_\varepsilon} = \Omega_\varepsilon.$$

But this is then all we need: by a standard calculation [50, Lemma 12]

$$(3.4) \quad \iota_v(i\partial\bar{\partial}E_{Z_\varepsilon}) = \frac{1}{2}d(Jv(E_{Z_\varepsilon})),$$

so it follows that

$$\iota_v(\Omega_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}d(Jv(E_{Z_\varepsilon})) = \frac{1}{2}d\left(\frac{d}{dt}E_{Z_\varepsilon}(\exp(Jvt).p)\right) = \frac{1}{2}d\left(\frac{d}{dt}E_{Z_\varepsilon}(\psi_t)\right) = -d\langle\mu_\varepsilon, h\rangle,$$

as required. \square

Remark 3.16. Our approach is partially inspired by an early use of Deligne pairings by Zhang, where he considered a family of Kähler metrics induced by embeddings of a fixed projective variety into projective space, and where he showed that the existence of a balanced embedding is equivalent to Chow stability [61]. The approach above seems to be new even in the limiting case that $Z_\varepsilon(X, L) = \varepsilon^{-n} \int_X (iL^n - \varepsilon K_X \cdot L^{n-1})$, in which case we have given a new “local” proof of Theorem 3.12, namely that the scalar curvature is a moment map, using a completely different technique to Donaldson. The advantage in comparison with the Donaldson-Fujiki approach is that this locality allows us to include the form θ , which will not in general be a (p, p) -form with respect to more general complex structures. The other main advantage is the flexibility: one needs to know almost nothing about the form of the central charge, whereas the Donaldson-Fujiki approach crucially relies on the scalar curvature. The main disadvantage is that it cannot deal with the almost-complex case, which is more challenging than the integrable case.

Remark 3.17. The above approach can actually recover Proposition 3.13, whose proof is only sketched by Fujiki. Indeed, the Kähler metric $\Phi^*\Omega$ is determined by the values $\iota_v\Phi^*\Omega$ for all v , as it is T -invariant, but the form

$$\iota_v\left(\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})^n \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \rho \wedge \omega^n\right)$$

agrees with $\iota_v\Phi^*\Omega$ on the dense orbit inside B by what we have proven. Thus the two must be equal.

In our application, instead of having a relatively Kähler metric ω induced by a fixed symplectic form, we will consider a new form $\hat{\omega} = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi$ for some T -invariant function $\Psi \in L_k^2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$, which vanishes on the fibre \mathcal{X}_0 over zero. For k sufficiently large, all of our calculations thusfar apply verbatim. As the function vanishes along \mathcal{X}_0 , the resulting form $\hat{\omega}$ remains Kähler provided we shrink B , which we do. We now repeat the above calculations in this situation, in which *both* the complex and symplectic structures are changing in the fibres. We denote by $\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ the resulting form on B produced as in Lemma 3.14, which is again a Kähler metric after perhaps shrinking B .

Proposition 3.18. *Denote by $\hat{\omega}_b$ the restriction of $\hat{\omega}$ to \mathcal{X}_b . With respect to the Kähler metric $\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$, a moment map for the T -action on B is given by*

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} \hat{h} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\hat{\omega}_b)) \hat{\omega}_b^n$$

where \hat{h} is the Hamiltonian for the action of T on $(\mathcal{X}, \hat{\omega})$.

Here, as in Section 3.2, since $\hat{\omega}$ is merely relatively Kähler, we must explain what we mean by a Hamiltonian. We follow an identical procedure and define the function \hat{h} to be the function which satisfies

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_{J_{\mathcal{X}}v} \hat{\omega} = i\partial\bar{\partial}\hat{h},$$

with $J_{\mathcal{X}}$ the complex structure of \mathcal{X} . It will be later be useful to normalise \hat{h} , so we note that once the result has been proven, since the condition only relies on the behaviour of \hat{h} restricted to each fibre \mathcal{X}_b , any other function $\hat{h} + f$ would also satisfy the moment map hypothesis since provided f is constant on each fibre, or equivalently is pulled back from B . This follows since $\operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\hat{\omega}_b))$ has integral zero over \mathcal{X}_b with respect to $\hat{\omega}_b^n$ for all $b \in B$. In particular, we may assume that \hat{h} has integral zero over each fibre.

Proof. The proof is identical to the above. Indeed, proceeding as before we reduce to a neighbourhood U of a point $b \in B$, and denoting

$$\exp(tJv)^* \hat{\omega} = \hat{\omega}|_t, \quad \hat{\omega}_{t,b} = \hat{\omega}|_{\mathcal{X}_b} = \omega_t + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t,$$

the key equality

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi_t \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} Z(\hat{\omega}_{t,b})) \hat{\omega}_{t,b}^n = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{h} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} Z(\hat{\omega}_b)) \hat{\omega}_b^n$$

still holds by definition of the Hamiltonian and Equation (3.2), meaning an identical proof applies. \square

We will use the following corollary of this combined with Proposition 3.9.

Corollary 3.19. *Consider a fixed point $b \in B$ of $S^1 \hookrightarrow T$ with generator v . Then we have*

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} \hat{h}_v \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(\hat{\omega}_b)) \omega_b^n = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right),$$

with \hat{h} the Hamiltonian. The same applies to any \mathbb{C}^* -action on B inducing a test configuration; the value $-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right)$ equals the value $\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b)$ with b corresponding to the central fibre of the test configuration.

3.4. Reducing to a finite dimensional problem. We next analyse certain analytic aspects of the Z -critical equation necessary to prove our main result, for which we assume Z is non-degenerate. We consider the Z -critical operator as an operator on the space of Kähler potentials with respect to ω

$$G_\varepsilon : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

$$G_\varepsilon(\psi) = \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi)).$$

We set $\omega_\psi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$.

We recall our central charge takes the form

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l \varepsilon^{-l} \int_X L^l \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j K_X^j \right) \cdot \Theta.$$

The simplest case of this equation is when $a_j = 0$ for all $j \geq 2$, which means that the terms in the definition of the Z -critical equation involving the Laplacian vanishes; see Equation (2.1). In this case, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ the equation is a *fourth* order elliptic partial differential equation. In the general case, the equation jumps from a fourth order equation at $\varepsilon = 0$ to a sixth order equation for $\varepsilon > 0$, which causes several additional difficulties.

Lemma 3.20. *Suppose $a_2 \neq 0$. Then for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, the Z -critical equation is a sixth order elliptic partial differential equation.*

Proof. Clearly G_ε is a sixth order partial differential operator as $a_2 \neq 0$, and we must show that it is elliptic, which means that we must show that its linearisation is elliptic. This is a condition on the highest order derivatives, so we replace the Z -critical operator with the sum of the terms involving six derivatives. Since we are interested in the case $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we need only consider the lowest order terms in ε . When one scales $0 \ll \varepsilon < 1$, the lowest order term in ε is then

$$\psi \rightarrow c\Delta_\psi \left(\frac{\text{Ric } \omega_\psi \wedge \omega_\psi^{n-1}}{\omega_\psi^n} \right),$$

where Δ_ψ is the Laplacian with respect to ω_ψ and $c \neq 0$, since any forms involving the unipotent class Θ will be of higher order in ε . By the product rule, the linearisation of this operator along the path $t\psi$ is given by

$$\Delta^3\psi + \text{lower order derivatives},$$

since the linearisation of the scalar curvature operator is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} S(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi) = \Delta^2\psi - S(\omega)\Delta\psi + n(n-1) \frac{i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi \wedge \text{Ric } \omega \wedge \omega^{n-2}}{\omega^n}.$$

This demonstrates ellipticity. \square

In particular this applies to the deformed cscK equation defined in Example 2.24. Note that the condition $a_2 \neq 0$ is part of our hypothesis that Z is admissible, used to prove our main result. More generally the results hold when $a_2 = 0$, assuming a positivity condition, as follows. Let d be the smallest integer $d \geq 2$ such that $a_d \neq 0$. Then ellipticity holds for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ assuming $\text{Ric } \omega^{d-1} \wedge \omega^{n-d}$ is either a positive or negative $(n-1, n-1)$ -form.

Let

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

denote the linearisation of the operator G_ε . We next consider the mapping properties of \mathcal{F}_ε , by characterising its kernel. While the operator \mathcal{F}_ε can be explicitly described through directly linearising the equation, and this approach could in principle be used calculate its kernel, it will be simpler to instead take advantage of the moment map properties we have already established. We note also that while we use smooth functions, all of our results go through considering the operator on weak Kähler potentials in a suitable Sobolev space.

To this end, we will compare its properties to the linearisation of the scalar curvature at a cscK metric, which is given by the Lichnerowicz operator, defined as follows. Let

$$\mathcal{D}\psi = \partial\bar{\nabla}^{1,0}\psi : C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \Gamma(T^{1,0}X \otimes \Omega^{0,1}(X)),$$

so that $\ker \psi = \mathfrak{t}$ consists of functions inducing holomorphic vector fields on X ; such functions are called holomorphy potentials. Here $C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ denotes functions of integral zero with respect to the volume form ω^n . Let \mathcal{D}^* be the L^2 -adjoint of \mathcal{D} with respect to the inner product induced by ω . Then the Lichnerowicz operator is given by $\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$; this is a fourth order elliptic linear partial differential operator, whose kernel consists of the constants provided $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete. We first aim to establish the following. Denote by \mathfrak{t}^\perp denotes the L^2 -orthogonal complement to \mathfrak{t} , and consider the operator

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \mathfrak{t}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^\perp$$

where we project onto $\mathfrak{t}^\perp \subset C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ to obtain that the image of \mathcal{F}_ε lies in \mathfrak{t}^\perp .

Proposition 3.21. *Let Z be a non-degenerate central charge, with $a_2 \neq 0$. Suppose ω is a cscK metric. Then for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, the linearisation*

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \mathfrak{t}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^\perp$$

is an isomorphism.

The proof will use the moment map techniques we have developed, with a slightly different setup, for which we refer to Gauduchon for further details [30, Section 8.1]. Fix a complex structure J_X on X and let $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \subset \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ denote the set $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ such that there is a diffeomorphism γ , which lies in the connected component of the identity inside the space of diffeomorphisms of M , such that $\gamma \cdot J = J_X$. As we have assumed that $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete, such a γ is actually unique. The space $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is further a Kähler subspace of $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ [30, Proposition 8.2.3]. As in the work of Fujiki [27, Section 8], the space $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ admits a universal family $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ which hence restricts to a family $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{U})$ over $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$. It is worth remarking that, ultimately, all of our constructions can be reduced to questions about finite dimensional submanifolds of $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$, so we do not need to delve into any of the technicalities of infinite dimensional geometry.

The form θ on X induces a form, which we still denote θ , on \mathcal{U} . Locally, this is constructed as follows. For any $B \subset \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ a finite dimensional submanifold, we can use the Fischer-Grauert theorem as in Theorem 3.15 to trivialise $\mathcal{U}|_B \cong X \times B$, where X is given the fixed complex structure J_X . The form α on X then pulls back to a closed form on $\mathcal{U}|_B$, and this process is actually unique since the diffeomorphism bringing J_b to J_X is unique by our previous discussion. Uniqueness means this process is well-defined on all of \mathcal{U} . This process allows us to construct on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$

a family of $(1, 1)$ -forms

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \text{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)} \tilde{Z}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}\mathcal{U}) \right),$$

analogous to Fujiki's construction of the natural Kähler metric on $\mathcal{J}(X, \omega)$. Note that this is just a "global" version of Lemma 3.14.

Any functions $u, v \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ induce tangent vectors on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ through the assignment $u \rightarrow \bar{\partial}v_u$ of Equation (3.3). As in the work of Székelyhidi [52, Section 3] and Donaldson [21], this process can be integrated. Suppose ψ is sufficiently small so that $\omega_t = \omega + ti\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}\psi$ is a Kähler metric for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Then there is a sequence of diffeomorphisms f_t such that f_0 is the identity and $f_t^*\omega_t = \omega$, meaning that $J_t = f_t \cdot J$ is a path in $J_X(M, \omega)$. Setting $F_\psi(J) = f_1 \cdot J$, the differential of the map $\psi \rightarrow F_\psi(J)$ at $\psi = 0$ is then [52, Equation 3]

$$DF_0(u) = JP(u),$$

so that this is the integral of the infinitesimal action.

Proof of Proposition 3.21. We use many of the ideas of Section 3.3. Consider $\omega_t = \omega + ti\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}v$, so that the derivative of

$$\int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n$$

is given by

$$\int_X u \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon v \omega^n + \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v \omega^n.$$

We are interested in the first of these terms, but the advantage of this perspective is that from the proof of Theorem 3.15 we know that for each t

$$\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} E_Z(tv + su) = \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n,$$

so that

$$\frac{d^2}{dtds} \Big|_{s,t=0} E_Z(tv + su) = \int_X u \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon v \omega^n + \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v \omega^n.$$

We now link with the space $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$. The functions u, v can be viewed as inducing tangent vectors to $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ at the point J_X and we see from Equation (3.4) that

$$(3.6) \quad \Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPv) = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} E_Z(tv + su).$$

Now at the point J_X under consideration the pairing $\Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPv)$ on $T_{J_X} \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ admits an expansion

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \Omega_0 + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

where Ω_0 is the positive-definite pairing arising from the Donaldson-Fujiki Kähler structure on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \subset \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$. In particular, for ε sufficiently small this still produces a positive definite pairing, just as in Lemma 3.14. Our situation is slightly different to the situation considered there, as Lemma 3.14 considered the case that the finite dimensional setting, so it was clear that the pairing remained positive for ε sufficiently small. But the claim in general follows from boundedness of the bilinear operators $\Omega_\varepsilon - \Omega$ at the point J_X . Note that in fact Ω_ε is determined by the finitely many terms consisting $\tilde{Z}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}\mathcal{U})$, and for each of these terms boundedness

follows from Equation (3.6), which relates Ω_ε to differential operators on the space of Kähler potentials whose boundedness is clear.

This is all we need. By positivity we know that $\Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPu) \geq 0$ with equality only when $Pu = 0$ at J_X , which means that $\Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPu) > 0$ unless $u \in \mathfrak{t}$. By Equation (3.6) and Lemma 3.20 this implies that the operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon : v \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v + \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v$$

is a self-adjoint elliptic operator with kernel \mathfrak{t} , so is an isomorphism $\mathfrak{t}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^\perp$. But then $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon)$, so for ε sufficiently small \mathcal{L}_ε is also an isomorphism $\mathfrak{t}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^\perp$. \square

The main point in the above is that \mathcal{F}_ε is a perturbation of an operator whose kernel is easier to understand. Note that one can directly obtain that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = -\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} + O(\varepsilon)$, but since $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$ is a fourth-order operator it is difficult to infer mapping properties of \mathcal{L}_ε from those of $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$. The same proof as the above applies to appropriate Sobolev spaces. For clarity we set $\mathfrak{t}_k^2 \subset L_k^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ the holomorphy potentials viewed as elements of $L_k^2(X, \mathbb{R})$, where we work with k sufficiently large.

Corollary 3.22. *For all ε sufficiently small operator*

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \mathfrak{t}_k^{2,\perp} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^{2,\perp}$$

is an isomorphism.

The main result of this section allows us to reduce the problem of constructing Z -critical Kähler metrics to a finite dimensional moment map problem. A special case is when (X, L) itself actually admits a cscK metric, where we begin by proving the following. The same technique will be used in a more involved fashion in reducing to a finite dimensional problem, so we separate the arguments for clarity.

Theorem 3.23. *Suppose (X, L) has discrete automorphism group and admits a cscK metric ω . Then (X, L) admits Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics for all ε sufficiently small.*

The main issue is that the equation jumps from a fourth order equation at $\varepsilon = 0$ to a sixth order one when $\varepsilon > 0$, so we cannot naïvely use the inverse function theorem. This issue is analogous to one overcome by Hashimoto when passing from a second order equation to a fourth order one [31], and our technique is similar. We will apply the quantitative inverse function theorem:

Theorem 3.24. [25, Theorem 4.1] *Let $G : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ be a differentiable map between spaces, whose derivative at a fixed point $0 \in B_1$ is an isomorphism with inverse P . Let*

- (i) δ' be the radius of the closed ball in B_1 around the origin on which $G - dG$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $1/(2\|P\|)$, where we use the operator norm;
- (ii) $\delta = \delta'/(2\|P\|)$.

Then whenever $y \in B_2$ satisfies $\|y - G(0)\| < \delta$, there is an $x \in B_1$ such that $G(x) = y$.

To use this we will employ Sobolev spaces $L_k^2(X, \mathbb{R})$, where we always work with functions with integral zero, and will ultimately use elliptic regularity to produce smooth Z -critical Kähler metrics. Working with functions integrating to zero means that the kernels of both the Lichnerowicz operator $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{F}_ε are actually trivial.

We begin by noting that it is straightforward to construct approximate solutions to any order.

Lemma 3.25. *For any m there is a sequence of functions ψ_j such that*

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z} \left(\omega + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon^j i \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_j \right) \right) = O(\varepsilon^{m+1}).$$

Proof. Writing

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z} \left(\omega + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon^j i \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_j \right) \right) = e_1 \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

by invertibility of the Lichnerowicz operator there is a function ψ_1 such that $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} \psi_1 = e_1$ since $\operatorname{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete. Since $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = -\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} + O(\varepsilon)$, it follows that

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z} \left(\omega + \varepsilon \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_1 \right) \right) = O(\varepsilon^2),$$

and iterating this process gives the result. \square

Denote by $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}$ the linearisation of the Z -critical operator at

$$\omega_m = \omega + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon^j i \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_j.$$

The next point is to obtain a bound on the operator norm of $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}^{-1}$. Recall the following consequence of ellipticity:

Proposition 3.26. [53, Chapter 5, Theorem 11.1] *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\psi \in L_k^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ there is a bound of the form*

$$\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi\|_{L_2^k} \leq c \left(\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi\|_{L^2} + \|\psi\|_{L_2^{k-6}} \right).$$

It is of course important here that the inverse actually exists, which is the content of Proposition 3.21. This allows us to show that the operator norm of $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}^{-1}$ is essentially that of $(\varepsilon \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D})^{-1}$ when ε is suitably small. Here we use the metric ω to measure the Sobolev norms, where the bounds follow from those with respect to ω_m since $\omega_m - \omega = O(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 3.27. *There is a bound $\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \varepsilon C$ independent of ε .*

Proof. By definition the operator norm involves the L_{k-6}^2 and L_k^2 -norms on the domain and codomain respectively. Thus the term which we must estimate satisfies

$$\frac{\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi\|_{L_k^2}}{\|\psi\|_{L_{k-6}^2}} \leq c + c \frac{\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi\|_{L^2}}{\|\psi\|_{L_{k-6}^2}}.$$

Now

$$\|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi\|_{L^2} = -(\varepsilon \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D})^{-1} \psi + O(\varepsilon),$$

so for ε sufficiently small we obtain the desired L^2 -bound since the analogous bound for $-(\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D})^{-1}$ is well-known [25, Section 6.2]. \square

The non-linear terms can be controlled as follows. Denote $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m} = G_{\varepsilon, m} - \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}$ the non-linear terms of the Z -critical operator.

Lemma 3.28. *For all ε sufficiently small, there are constants $c, C > 0$ such that for all sufficiently small ε , if $\psi, \psi' \in L_k^2(X, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\|\psi\|_{L_k^2}, \|\psi'\|_{L_k^2} \leq c$ then*

$$\|\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m}(\psi) - \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m}(\psi')\|_{L_{k-6}^2} \leq C\varepsilon(\|\psi\|_{L_k^2} + \|\psi'\|_{L_k^2})\|\psi - \psi'\|_{L_k^2}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to [25, Lemma 7.1], and is a straightforward consequence of the mean value theorem, which gives a bound

$$\|\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m}(\psi) - \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m}(\psi')\|_{L_{k-6}^2} \leq \sup_{\chi_t} \|(D\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m})_{\chi_t}\|_{op} \|\psi - \psi'\|_{L_k^2},$$

where $\chi_t = t\psi + (1-t)\psi'$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. But

$$(D\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon, m})_{\chi_t} = \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m, \chi_t} - \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m},$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m, \chi_t}$ is the linearisation of the Z_ε -critical operator at $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}(\psi_m + \chi)$. So we seek a bound on the difference of the linearisations when we change the Kähler potential, but for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ this can be bounded by

$$\|\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m, \chi_t} - \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}\|_{op} \leq c'\varepsilon\|\chi\|_{L_k^2},$$

where c' is independent of ε , which completes the proof. \square

In fact, as explained by Fine [25, Section 2.2 and Lemma 8.10], the above proof applies very generally, even varying in addition the complex structure. In the case the complex structure is varying, one obtains a bound where $\|\psi\|_{L_k^2} + \|\psi'\|_{L_k^2}$ is replaced by the norm of the difference $(J, \psi) - (J', \psi')$ [25, Lemma 2.10], so the constant obtained can be taken to be continuous when varying the complex structure. Fine explains this for the linearisation of the scalar curvature, but all that is needed is that the operator in question is a polynomial operator in the curvature tensor, which is true for \tilde{Z}_ε and which implies the same result for $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon)$. We will shortly use this continuity of the bound when varying the complex structure. For the moment, this is everything needed to apply the quantitative inverse function theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.23. There are three ingredients which we have established necessary to apply the inverse function theorem:

- (i) Firstly, note that $\|G_{\varepsilon, m}(0)\| = O(\varepsilon^{m+1})$ by Lemma 3.25.
- (ii) Secondly, note that the operator $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, m}$ is an isomorphism for ε small and the inverse $P_{\varepsilon, m}$ satisfies

$$\|P_{\varepsilon, m}\|_{op} \leq \varepsilon K_1$$

by Lemma 3.27.

- (iii) Finally, note that there is a constant M such that for all sufficiently small κ , the operator $G_{\varepsilon, m} - DG_{\varepsilon, m}$ is Lipschitz with constant $\varepsilon\kappa$ on $B_{M\kappa}$.

The second and third of these imply that the radius $\delta'_{\varepsilon, m}$ of the ball around the origin on which $G_{\varepsilon, m} - DG_{\varepsilon, m}$ is Lipschitz with constant $(2\|P_{\varepsilon, m}\|)^{-1}$ is bounded below by a constant. It follows that for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ there is a constant such that if $\|G_{\varepsilon, m}(0)\| \leq C$, there is a $z \in B_1$ such that $G_{\varepsilon, m}(z) = 0$, which is what we wanted to produce. Note that this produces solutions in some Sobolev space, but elliptic regularity produces smooth solutions as our equation is elliptic for sufficiently small ε by Lemma 3.20. \square

In fact one sees that we did not need to produce the approximate solutions in this case, but since this will be necessary in a later analogous situation we have included this superfluous step. Denote by \mathfrak{t}_ψ the space of holomorphy potentials with respect to $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$ with integral zero. When $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is not discrete we obtain:

Corollary 3.29. *Suppose (X, L) admits a cscK metric ω . Then for all ε sufficiently small there are Kähler metrics $\omega_\varepsilon = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_\varepsilon \in c_1(L)$ such that for ε sufficiently small*

$$\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\psi_\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We only briefly sketch the proof since it is very similar to the case $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete. Note first of all that $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\psi_\varepsilon}$ is equivalent to

$$\Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_\psi^\perp} \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) = 0,$$

where $\Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_{\psi_\varepsilon}^\perp}$ denotes the L^2 -projection with respect to ω_ε . When one changes ω to ω_ψ a given holomorphy potential changes as [50, Lemma 12]

$$h \rightarrow h + \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \psi \rangle.$$

It follows that for ε sufficiently small the linearisation of the operator

$$\psi \rightarrow \Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_\psi^\perp} \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) = 0$$

viewed as a map $\mathfrak{t}_\psi^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_\psi^\perp$ has mapping properties that are the same as those of

$$\psi \rightarrow \Pi_{\mathfrak{t}^\perp} \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) = 0$$

viewed as a map $\mathfrak{t}^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^\perp$; we established in Proposition 3.21 that the latter is actually an isomorphism. Here all we are using is that the projection involves integrating the holomorphy potential against $\text{Im}(e^{-\psi}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\psi))$, which has operator norm bounded by ε for ε sufficiently small. Thus we can proceed as before and produce approximate solutions as in Lemma 3.25. The bound on the operator norm of the inverse operator only used that the operator is a perturbation of $-\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$, while the bounds for the Lichnerowicz operator orthogonal to the kernel are also well-known, see for example [17, Lemma 6.5]. The application of the mean value theorem to control the non-linear terms is also the same. Thus the quantitative inverse function theorem applies as before. To produce smooth solutions, observe that the condition in the statement of the Corollary is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^*\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon}(\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))) = 0,$$

which is an eighth order elliptic equation for ε sufficiently small, so elliptic regularity produces smooth solutions. The notation here means that $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^*\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$ is the Lichnerowicz operator with respect to ω_ε . \square

Note that this can be thought of as producing the “extremal” analogue of Z -critical Kähler metrics, and it is straightforward to show that these “ Z -extremal Kähler metrics” are actually Z -critical Kähler metrics if and only if the analogue of the Futaki invariant produced by Corollary 3.19 vanishes. Note also that very little was used in the proof above about the space \mathfrak{t}_ψ itself, all that was really used was that the change in the projection had operator norm bound by ε .

3.4.1. *Varying complex structure.* We now apply the above with varying complex structure. We recall the relevant setup. We denote by J_0 the integrable almost complex structure corresponding to the cscK degeneration of the analytically K-semistable polarised variety (X, L) . The stabiliser of J_0 under the action of the group of exact symplectomorphisms \mathcal{G} on $\mathcal{J}_k^2(M, \omega)$ has Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}_k^2 \subset L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$, where the identification arises through the Hamiltonian construction. These Hamiltonians are actually smooth functions, as they are even independent of the complex structure, but we will later be interested in the orthogonal complement to \mathfrak{t}_k^2 inside $L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ and hence we include the Sobolev index in the notation. We fix a maximal torus as before, and identify each element of a rational basis of the Lie algebra of this torus \mathfrak{t}_k^2 with the corresponding S^1 -action on M .

A function $\Psi : B \rightarrow L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ with $\Psi(0) = 0$ induces a function \hat{h} on \mathcal{X} through Equation (3.5), where one thinks of Ψ as the resulting change in Kähler potential. That is,

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{L}_{J_{\mathcal{X}v}}(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi) = i\partial\bar{\partial}\hat{h},$$

with the difference between h and \hat{h} then given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{J_{\mathcal{X}v}}i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi = i\partial\bar{\partial}(\hat{h} - h).$$

Taking a basis of vector fields v_j produces a family of such functions, which form a vector subspace of the space of all functions on \mathcal{X} .

Denote by ω_b the Kähler metric on \mathcal{X}_b induced by $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi$. One can then think of \hat{h} as a function $B \rightarrow L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$, sending b to $\hat{h}|_{\mathcal{X}_b}$, where we think of \mathcal{X}_b as a fixed smooth manifold with varying complex and Kähler structure. We denote by $\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^2$ the vector space of functions spanned by the $\hat{h}|_{\mathcal{X}_b}$ for each S^1 -action, normalised to have integral zero with respect to ω_b^n , and let $\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^{2,\perp}$ denote the L^2 -complement with respect to the volume form ω_b^n . We set $\Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^{2,\perp}}$ to be the L^2 -projection onto $\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^{2,\perp}$. Note that when $b = 0$ this is simply the L^2 -projection orthogonal to \mathfrak{t}_k^2 with respect to ω itself. We set $\mathfrak{t}_{k,B}^{2,\perp}$ to be the induced subspace of $B \times L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$, and $\Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,B}^{2,\perp}}$ the induced orthogonal projection. This can be viewed as the total space of a vector bundle over B , simply because it is the fibrewise orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{t}_{k,B}^2$, which is a (finite rank) vector bundle over B with fibre $\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^2$ over B ; note here that the rank is clearly independent of $b \in B$. Through Equation (3.7) one could be more explicit about the exact form of the functions forming $\mathfrak{t}_{k,b}^2$, but this will be unnecessary for us.

Denote by $G_\varepsilon : \mathfrak{t}_{k,B}^{2,\perp} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,B}^{2,\perp}$ the function

$$\Psi \rightarrow \Pi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6,B}^{2,\perp}}(\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_b, \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi_b))),$$

where we have explicitly written the dependence of \tilde{Z} on the complex structure, $J_b = \Phi(b)$ and Ψ_b is the value of Ψ over b .

Proposition 3.30. *There is a T -invariant function $\Psi : B \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k,B}^{2,\perp}$ such that*

$$G(\varepsilon, \Psi) \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,B}^2.$$

Proof. This follows from another application of the quantitative inverse function theorem much like Corollary 3.29 and so we again only briefly sketch the details. As

in that situation, Proposition 3.21 implies that for each $b \in B$ and for ε sufficiently small

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\varepsilon,b} : v \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,b}v + \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon,b}(\omega_b))\Delta v$$

is a self-adjoint elliptic operator with kernel $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,b}^2$, where this denotes holomorphy potentials on \mathcal{X}_b with respect to ω_b . Thus this operator is an isomorphism $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,b}^{2,\perp} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k-6,b}^{2,\perp}$. The operator $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,b}$ is thus also an isomorphism for ε and b small, since $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon,b}(\omega_b)) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon, b \rightarrow 0$. But just as in Corollary 3.29, the operator of genuine interest

$$\psi \rightarrow \Pi_{\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,b}^2} \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon,b}(\omega_b + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_b))$$

sending $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,b}^{2,\perp} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k-6,b}^{2,\perp}$ has linearisation which is a perturbation of this, so is again an isomorphism. As in Corollary 3.29, the bounds on the inverse of the linearised operator are inherited from those of $-\mathcal{D}_b^* \mathcal{D}_b^*$, where the bounds hold, and the bounds on the non-linear terms hold for the same reason as in the previous situations. Here we note that, as discussed after Lemma 3.28, when the complex structure varies one still obtains analogous bounds, where the bound also involves the norm of the change in complex structure. The use of $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,b}^2$ here rather than $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k,\psi_\varepsilon}^2$ in that situation makes no substantial difference, as both projection operators are perturbations of the projection orthogonal to $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_k^2$ with small operator norm. Thus the quantitative inverse function theorem produces a unique solution to

$$\Pi_{\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k-6,b}^2} \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon,b}(\omega_b + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{b,\varepsilon})) = 0,$$

which vary continuously in the L_k^2 -norm with ε, b . The L_k^2 -continuity can be seen by instead directly applying the quantitative implicit function theorem to the operator

$$\Psi \rightarrow \Pi_{\hat{\mathfrak{t}}_{k-6,B}^{2,\perp}} (\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_b, \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi_b))),$$

or by using uniqueness of solutions for each $b \in B$. Finally, T -invariance is a consequence of T -invariance of the input. \square

Note here that we cannot conclude smoothness of Ψ , but that will be dealt with in the subsequent section.

Remark 3.31. Our approach of reducing to a finite dimensional problem is inspired by the work of Brönnle [6] and Székelyhidi [52] on deformations of cscK manifolds, though the actual implementation is quite different.

3.5. Solving the finite dimensional problem. We now come to the crux of our argument, having reduced to a finite dimensional moment map problem. We recall that we have an open ball B inside a vector space, endowed with a linear T -action and a local $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action which is again linear. By perhaps replacing $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ with a subtorus, we may assume the action is effective. There is a universal family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$ endowed with a relatively Kähler metric $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi$ produced from Proposition 3.30, we denote the restriction of this to \mathcal{X}_b as ω_b and let the induced Hamiltonian be \hat{h}_b . In addition we have a sequence of T -invariant Kähler metrics

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \varepsilon\Omega_0 + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

on B for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, such that Ω_0 is itself Kähler, from Proposition 3.18. With respect to these Kähler metrics, the same result gives moment maps which we denote

$$\varepsilon\mu + \nu_\varepsilon : B \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*,$$

with μ the moment map with respect to Ω_0 . Here the Sobolev index is fixed and hence omitted from the notation. The $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action has a dense open orbit on which all points correspond to biholomorphic complex structures. Summarising what we have proven so far:

Lemma 3.32. *Suppose for some $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a point b in the open dense orbit of B such that*

$$(\mu + \nu_\varepsilon)(b) = 0.$$

Then (M, J_b, ω_b) is a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric.

Proof. Proposition 3.30 implies that for all $b \in B$ we have

$$\mathrm{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_b, \omega_b)) \in \mathfrak{t}_b.$$

But then Proposition 3.18 shows that a zero of the moment map must satisfy

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_b} \hat{h}_b \mathrm{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_b, \omega_b)) \omega_b^n = 0$$

for all $\hat{h}_b \in \mathfrak{t}_b$, which implies that $\mathrm{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_b, \omega_b))$ actually vanishes, producing a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric on \mathcal{X}_b , as required. \square

Thus, to construct Z_ε -critical Kähler metric on our analytically K-semistable polarised variety (X, L) , it is enough to find a zero of the moment map $\varepsilon\mu + \nu_\varepsilon$ inside B . The argument will in essence use the contraction mapping theorem, meaning that the condition that $b \in B$ will automatically be satisfied.

It will be convenient to change our notation by a factor of ε , so that

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \Omega_0 + O(\varepsilon)$$

and our moment map is given as $\mu + \nu_\varepsilon$.

The main idea is to use the equivariant Darboux Theorem to produce a simpler linear problem, at the expense of leaving Kähler geometry for symplectic geometry. The symplectic form $\Phi^*\Omega$ induces the standard symplectic form on the tangent space T_0B , which is compatible with the standard complex structure on the tangent space. We denote this symplectic form by η . The tangent space T_0B admits a linear $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action, as it is a fixed point of the $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on B itself.

The equivariant Darboux Theorem produces a T -equivariant symplectomorphism $\chi : B \rightarrow T_0B$, after again shrinking B [24, Theorem 3.2]. Here B is given the symplectic form $\Omega_0|_B$, while T_0B is given the linear one induced by $\Omega_{0,b}$ on T_bB . We denote this symplectic form by η . Thus there is a moment map $\tilde{\mu} : T_0B \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$, with respect to η and the linear K -action, which satisfies

$$\chi \circ \tilde{\mu} = \mu.$$

Similarly we produce moment maps

$$\tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon = \tilde{\mu} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j \tilde{\nu}_j,$$

defined by

$$\chi \circ \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon = \nu_\varepsilon$$

with respect to the induced symplectic forms; we use here that χ is a diffeomorphism. Thus the ν_ε satisfy the defining property of moment maps, but with respect to closed two-forms which are not necessarily non-degenerate and are hence not

necessarily genuine symplectic forms. As the diffeomorphism is T -equivariant, the open dense $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit of B is characterised in T_0B by having trivial stabiliser under the T -action and also not being the origin in T_0B . The following is then a consequence of χ being a diffeomorphism.

Corollary 3.33. *To construct Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics, it is enough to produce a zero of the moment map $\tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon$ inside the image of the open dense orbit of B .*

Now that we have reduced to a more linear problem, we choose coordinates. We assume the dimension of the complex vector space T_0B is k , so that the torus $T^{\mathbb{C}} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^k$ is k -dimensional. As the action is linear, we may simultaneously diagonalise the action and choose a basis of eigenvectors. Since the points in the image of the open dense orbit in B are characterised by having trivial stabiliser and not being the origin, under the $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action, their images remain characterised by being the set of $(z_1, \dots, z_k) \in V = T_0B$ with no component equal to zero. It follows that we wish to find a point (z_1, \dots, z_k) in a neighbourhood of the origin in V , with no component equal to zero, and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(\tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon)(z_1, \dots, z_k) = 0.$$

We now wish to understand the moment map $\tilde{\mu} : V \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$ itself, which takes the simplest possible form. Through the equivariant Darboux Theorem, the flat symplectic form takes the form

$$\eta = \sum_l \frac{i}{2} dz_l \wedge d\bar{z}_l.$$

We take a basis $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathfrak{t}$ of the Lie algebra of the torus \mathfrak{t} . We have some choice over this basis, as it makes little difference whether we choose an integral basis and the orbits of the torus action are easily understood. Thus we choose this basis to be the simplest possible one, meaning in such a way that

$$\langle \tilde{\mu}, v_l \rangle = |z_l|^2.$$

To construct a point (z_1, \dots, z_k) of the form we desire, it is enough to show that

$$\langle \tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon, v_l \rangle(z_1, \dots, z_k) = 0$$

for all l . It is then convenient to set

$$\langle \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon, v_l \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{l,j},$$

where the $h_{l,j}$ are functions $h_{l,j} : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and where this should be understood as a Taylor series expansion.

The following gives appropriate conditions on the functions $h_{l,j}$ such that an approximate solution to our problem exists. We will then make another use of the quantitative inverse function theorem to produce a genuine solution.

Proposition 3.34. *Suppose that, for each l , we have*

$$dh_{l,j}(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k) = 0,$$

where this denotes the differential at the point $(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k)$. Suppose moreover that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{l,j}(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k) = c_\varepsilon < 0$$

is a negative constant independent of $(z_1, \dots, 0, \dots, z_k)$ for all ε sufficiently small and for all $(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k)$. Then for all ε sufficiently small and for all m , there is a point $(z_{1,m}, \dots, z_{k,m}) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^k$ such that

$$(\tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon)(z_{1,m}, \dots, z_{k,m}) = O(\varepsilon^m).$$

We explain why these conditions hold in our situation. Firstly note that $\langle \tilde{\mu}, v_l \rangle = |z_l|^2$, so it is necessarily the case that

$$\langle \tilde{\mu}, v_l \rangle(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k) = 0.$$

Thus the hypothesis on the Hamiltonians can be rephrased as

$$\langle \tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon, v_l \rangle(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k) < 0$$

holds for all ε sufficiently small. Note that $v_l \in \mathfrak{t}_{(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k)}$, with the subscript denoting the Lie algebra of the stabiliser of $(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k)$. This is a stability hypothesis, which follows from asymptotic Z -stability of (X, L) . Indeed, as demonstrated by Székelyhidi [52, Proof of Theorem 2], a \mathbb{C}^* -action on B induces a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ through the universal family over B , and by Corollary 3.19 we have

$$\langle \tilde{\mu}, v_l \rangle(z_1, \dots, 0, \dots, z_k) = -\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right) < 0.$$

We note here that any test configuration produced in this manner cannot be a product test configuration for (X, L) , as (X, L) has discrete automorphism group by assumption.

The condition that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{l,j}(z_1, \dots, 0, \dots, z_k)$ is, for fixed ε , independent of $(z_1, \dots, 0, \dots, z_k)$ corresponds to the statement that these numerical invariants are independent of choice of complex structure in a given biholomorphism class, and is similarly a consequence of Corollary 3.19.

The remaining hypothesis, namely that

$$dh_{l,j}(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k) = 0,$$

is also a consequence of the moment map property of the Z -critical equation. Namely, by the moment map interpretation of the Z -critical equation the function

$$|z_l|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{l,j} = \langle \tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon, v_l \rangle$$

is a Hamiltonian for the vector field v_l with respect to the natural sequence of symplectic forms $\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ on T_0B induced by the diffeomorphism χ constructed by the equivariant Darboux Theorem. Since the vector field associated with v_l vanishes at $(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, 0, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_k)$, it follows that

$$|z_l|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{l,j} = \langle \tilde{\mu} + \nu_\varepsilon, v_l \rangle = \iota_{v_l} \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon = 0$$

for all such $(z_1, \dots, 0, \dots, z_k)$ by the Hamiltonian condition.

Proof. We only consider the case $k = 2$, as it will be clear from the proof that an identical proof is still valid in general, with the only additional challenge being considerable notational difficulty. The functions $h_{1,\varepsilon} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{1,j}$ and $h_{2,\varepsilon} =$

$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^j h_{2,j}$ admit Taylor series expansions around the origin. By hypothesis, there are constants p_1, p_2 such that

$$h_{1,p_1}(0, z_2) < 0 \text{ and } h_{2,p_2}(z_1, 0) < 0;$$

we fix the lowest such (p_1, p_2) .

We claim that there is an expansion

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 t_1, \gamma_1 t_2) &= |\lambda_1 t_1|^2 + h_{1,p_1}(0, z_2) \varepsilon^{p_1} + O(\varepsilon t_1^2) + O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 t_1, \gamma_1 t_2) &= |\gamma_1 t_2|^2 + h_{2,p_2}(z_1, 0) \varepsilon^{p_2} + O(\varepsilon t_2^2) + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We only justify this expansion for $h_{1,\varepsilon}$, with the case of $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ being completely analogous. Firstly, there can be no term of the form $O(\varepsilon t_2)$, as $h_{1,\varepsilon}(0, z_2)$ is independent of z_2 . Secondly, there can be no term of the form $O(\varepsilon t_1)$, as $dh_{1,\varepsilon}(0, z_2) = 0$, which implies terms linear in z_1 must vanish. Thus the lowest order terms are of the form $O(\varepsilon t_1^2)$ and $O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1})$.

We take

$$t_1 = \varepsilon^{p_1/2} \text{ and } \lambda_1^2 = -h_{1,p_1}(0, z_2) > 0;$$

these are chosen so that

$$|\lambda_1 t_1|^2 + h_{1,p_1}(0, z_2) \varepsilon^{p_1} = 0.$$

With this choice

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}, \gamma_1 t_2) &= O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}, \gamma_1 t_2) &= |\gamma_1 t_2|^2 + h_{2,p_2}(z_1, 0) \varepsilon^{p_2} + O(\varepsilon t_2^2) + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We next take

$$t_2 = \varepsilon^{p_2/2} \text{ and } \gamma_1^2 = -h_{2,p_2}(z_1, 0) > 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2}) &= O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2}) &= O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We next explain how to correct for higher order errors, for which we may assume $p_1 \leq p_2$. We begin with the ε^{p_1+1} -term. Write

$$h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}, \gamma_1 t_2) = e_{p_1+1} \varepsilon^{p_1+1} + O(\varepsilon^{p_1+3/2}).$$

Then

$$h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + \lambda_2 \varepsilon^{p_1/2+1}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2}) = (e_{p_1+1} + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2) \varepsilon^{p_1+1} + O(\varepsilon^{p_1+3/2}).$$

Taking

$$\lambda_2 = -\frac{\varepsilon^{p_1+1}}{2\lambda_1}$$

corrects the error; note that this is valid as $\lambda_1 \neq 0$.

Essentially the same phenomenon happens in correcting higher order terms. We assume for the moment that $p_2 \geq p_1 + 1$ in order to explain the process more clearly. Writing $e_{p_1+3/2}$ for the $\varepsilon^{p_1+3/2}$ -error, we see

$$h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + \lambda_2 \varepsilon^{p_1/2+1} + \lambda_3 \varepsilon^{p_1/2+3/2}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2}) = (e_{p_1+3/2} + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_3) \varepsilon^{p_1+3/2} + O(\varepsilon^{p_1+3/2}),$$

and we can choose λ_3 so that this term vanishes as before. Note that in this process, new errors can be introduced at higher order, but the main point is that to leading order, one only needs to solve a linear equation with the error term $e_{p_1+j/2}$ fixed.

In general, we work inductively to construct approximate solutions to arbitrary order. The fractional exponents $\varepsilon^{p_1/2}$ and $\varepsilon^{p_2/2}$ force us to work with half integers in our approximate solution. Using the same strategy as above we construct λ_j to remove errors in $h_{1,\varepsilon}$ up to order $\varepsilon^{p_2+1/2}$. We next remove the errors order by order, in both variables. Thusfar we have produced λ_j such that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2}, \gamma_1 t_2 \right) &= e_{p_2+1/2} \varepsilon^{p_2+1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2}, \gamma_1 t_2 \right) &= f_{p_2+1/2} \varepsilon^{p_2+1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2} + \lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2} + \gamma_2 \varepsilon^{(p_2+1)/2} \right) \\ = (e_{p_2+1/2} + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}) \varepsilon^{p_2+1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{2,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2} + \lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}, \gamma_1 \varepsilon^{p_2/2} + \gamma_2 \varepsilon^{(p_2+1)/2} \right) \\ = (f_{p_2+1/2} + 2\lambda_1 \lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}) \varepsilon^{p_2+1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

This follows immediately from the formula (3.8). Thus we can still solve for γ_2 and $\lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}$ separately as before, as the error terms $e_{p_2+1/2}$ and $f_{p_2+1/2}$ are independent of choice of γ_2 and $\lambda_{p_2-p_1+2}$. So to leading order, the system decouples.

Proceeding in the same manner produces approximate solutions to all orders, meaning we can assume that we have produced λ_j and γ_j such that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2}, \sum_{j=1}^{m-p_2+1} \gamma_j \varepsilon^{(p_2+j-1)/2} \right) &= O(\varepsilon^{m+1/2}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2}, \sum_{j=1}^{m-p_2+1} \gamma_j \varepsilon^{(p_2+j-1)/2} \right) &= O(\varepsilon^{m+1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

As is clear, the case when $k > 2$ is exactly the same, ordering $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_k$. \square

Remark 3.35. Although our technique is dissimilar to the analogous results in the setting of Z -critical connections on holomorphic vector bundles [13, Section 4], there is a formal analogy between the dimension k of the torus action and the geometry of the slope semistable vector bundle considered there. Roughly speaking, the case when the graded object (the ‘‘slope polystable degeneration of the slope semistable bundle’’) has two components is analogous to the simplest case $k = 1$, while the case $k = 2$, which captures all of the main challenges, is analogous to the case when the graded objects has three components.

What we need to show to complete the proof is that these approximate solutions actually converge. This uses a quantitative version of the inverse function theorem much like Section 3.4. We continue to consider the case $k = 2$ for notational convenience, with the general case being the same. We write

$$x_m = \sum_{j=1}^{m-p_1+1} \lambda_j \varepsilon^{(p_1+j-1)/2}, \quad y_m = \sum_{j=1}^{m-p_2+1} \gamma_j \varepsilon^{(p_2+j-1)/2}$$

for the approximate solutions produced so that we need to show that

$$(x_m, y_m) \rightarrow (x_\infty, y_\infty) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^2.$$

We then aim to apply the quantitative inverse function theorem, stated in Theorem 3.24, to the maps

$$G_{\varepsilon,m}(a, b) = (h_{1,\varepsilon}(x_m + a, y_m + b), h_{2,\varepsilon}(x_m + a, y_m + b)).$$

Note that $\|G_{\varepsilon,m}(0, 0)\| = O(\varepsilon^{m+1/2})$, while a genuine solution to our equation is a pair (a, b) such that $G_{\varepsilon,m}(a, b) = 0$. So in order to apply the above, we need to control both the inverse of the linearisation of $G_{\varepsilon,m}$ and the nonlinear terms $G_{\varepsilon,m} - DG_{\varepsilon,m}$.

We begin with an understanding of the linearised operator. We harmlessly assume as before that $p_1 \leq p_2$. The number m is fixed for the moment.

Lemma 3.36. *Fix m . For all $\varepsilon \ll 1$ the operator $DG_{\varepsilon,m}$ is invertible; denote its inverse by $P_{\varepsilon,m}$. Then there is a bound of the form*

$$\|P_{\varepsilon,m}\| \leq K_1 \varepsilon^{-p_2/2}.$$

Proof. From the explicit description of the map $G_{\varepsilon,m}$ we see that its linearisation takes the form

$$DG_{\varepsilon,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{(p_1+1)/2}) & O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1}) \\ O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}) & \lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{(p_1+1)/2}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is clearly invertible for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ since λ_1, γ_1 are strictly positive. The eigenvalues of $dG_{\varepsilon,m}$ take the form $\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{(p_1+1)/2})$ and $\lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{(p_1+1)/2})$, so the eigenvalues of the matrix inverse $P_{\varepsilon,m}$ take the form $\lambda_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{-p_1/2} + O(\varepsilon^{-(p_1+1)/2})$ and $\gamma_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{p_2/2} + O(\varepsilon^{-(p_2+1)/2})$. It follows that there is a bound of the form

$$\|P_{\varepsilon,m}\| \leq K_2 \varepsilon^{-p_2/2},$$

as required. \square

The required bound on the non-linear terms is again straightforward.

Lemma 3.37. *Fix m . Then there is a constant K_2 such that for all $(a, b) \in B_\kappa$, the ball of radius κ , we have*

$$\|(G_{\varepsilon,m} - DG_{\varepsilon,m})(a, b)\| \leq \kappa K_2 \|(a, b)\|.$$

Proof. The mean value theorem produces a bound

$$\|(G_{\varepsilon,m} - DG_{\varepsilon,m})(a, b)\| \leq \left(\sup_{\chi \in B_\kappa} \|DG_{\varepsilon,m;\chi} - DG_{\varepsilon,m;0}\| \right) \|(a, b)\|,$$

where $DG_{\varepsilon,m;\chi}$ denotes the linearisation of $G_{\varepsilon,m}$ at χ and $DG_{\varepsilon,m;0}$ denotes the linearisation at $0 \in B_1$. Thus we need to bound this operator norm, which follows by taking a Taylor series expansion in χ . Indeed, for $\chi \in B_\kappa$ the operator

$DG_{\varepsilon,m;\chi} - DG_{\varepsilon,m;0}$ has all entries at least of linear order in κ (as the constant terms independent of κ cancel), so the operator norm for κ small is bounded by κK_2 for some K_2 independent of ε . This produces the desired bound. \square

We can now finish the proof.

Theorem 3.38. *Under the same hypotheses as Proposition 3.34, for all $\varepsilon \ll 1$, there is a point $(z_1, \dots, z_k) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^k$ such that*

$$(\tilde{\mu} + \tilde{\nu}_\varepsilon)(z_1, \dots, z_k) = 0.$$

Proof. With the results we have established, this is essentially identical to the proof of Theorem 3.23, but we give the details. We again prove the result just when $k = 2$ as the general case is the same. We firstly apply the quantitative implicit function theorem to produce solutions in \mathbb{C}^2 , and then show that they lie in $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. We first consider m fixed. There necessary ingredients are:

- (i) A bound $\|G_{\varepsilon,m}(0)\| = O(\varepsilon^{m+1/2})$.
- (ii) The operator $DG_{\varepsilon,m}$ is an isomorphism for ε small, with inverse $P_{\varepsilon,m}$ satisfying

$$\|P_{\varepsilon,m}\| \leq K_1 \varepsilon^{-p_2/2}.$$

- (iii) There is a constant M such that for all sufficiently small κ , the operator $G_{\varepsilon,m} - DG_{\varepsilon,m}$ is Lipschitz with constant κ on $B_{M\kappa}$. Indeed, set $M = K_2^{-1}$ in the statement of Lemma 3.37.

From the second and third points, the radius $\delta'_{\varepsilon,m}$ of the ball around the origin on which $G_{\varepsilon,m} - DG_{\varepsilon,m}$ is Lipschitz with constant $(2\|P_{\varepsilon,m}\|)^{-1}$ is bounded below by $\varepsilon^{p_2/2}$. Thus as

$$\delta_{\varepsilon,m} = \delta'_{\varepsilon,m} / (2\|P_{\varepsilon,m}\|)$$

we have

$$\delta_{\varepsilon,m} \geq C' \varepsilon^{p_2}.$$

This implies that whenever $\|G_{\varepsilon,m}(0)\| \leq C' \varepsilon^{p_2}$, there is a $z \in B_1$ such that $F_{\varepsilon,m}(z) = 0$. But this corresponds to a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric, as desired. Note that this produces solutions in some Sobolev space, but elliptic regularity produces smooth solutions as our equation is elliptic for sufficiently small ε by Lemma 3.20.

It only remains to show that $x \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. For this, we denote $z = (x, y)$ and note that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|x - \lambda_1 \varepsilon^{p_1/2}\| \leq C \varepsilon^{(p_1+1)/2};$$

this is a standard consequence of the quantitative inverse function theorem, see for example [18, Remark 3.8]. In particular, taking ε small but positive shows that $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The same argument applies to y , showing that $x \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. \square

3.6. Existence implies stability. We return to B itself, and recall that we have a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$ with $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$, and a sequence of moment maps $\mu + \nu_\varepsilon$ on B such that a zero of the moment map corresponds to a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric.

Theorem 3.39. *Suppose (X, L) admits a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric arising through a zero of the moment map $\mu + \nu_\varepsilon$. Then for each test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ arising from the action of $T^{\mathbb{C}}$, we have*

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right) > 0.$$

This of course is equivalent to our definition of asymptotic Z -stability, which used $k = \varepsilon^{-1}$ rather than ε . We note that, in principle, (X, L) could admit Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics which are “far” from the cscK degeneration (X_0, L_0) and hence do not arise from this construction. Thus this is a truly local result.

Proof. This is a formal consequence of standard finite dimensional moment map theory. Since our assumption is that there is a zero b of the moment map $\mu + \nu_\varepsilon$, it follows by convexity of the log norm functional associated to the moment map that for any \mathbb{C}^* -action induced by Jv , with b_0 the specialisation of b , the value $\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b_0)$ is negative. But by Proposition 3.19, we have

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b_0) = -\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right),$$

proving the result. \square

4. THE HIGHER RANK CASE

We now extend our results to central charges involving higher Chern classes. Our exposition is brief, as the details are broadly similar to the “rank one” case, with a small number of exceptions. The first main difficulty is to extend the slope formula for the Z -energy to the setting where higher Chern classes are involved. The idea to overcome this is to reduce to the “rank one” case by projectivising, so we use of the Segre classes $s_k(X)$ of X . The second difficulty is that it is not clear what the right hypotheses are in general to obtain an elliptic PDE in the limit $\varepsilon \ll 1$ through taking the variation of the Z -energy, so we simply include this as a hypothesis.

We thus consider a central charge of the form

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \rho_l k^l \int_X L^l \cdot f(s(X)) \cdot \Theta,$$

for some ρ , Θ and $f(s(X))$ now an arbitrary polynomial in the Segre classes $s_1(X), \dots, s_n(X)$ of X . The substantial difference is in the equation itself: the Euler-Lagrange equation of the Z -energy no longer produces a partial differential equation.

4.1. Stability. It is straightforward to extend the notion of stability, provided the central fibre of the test configuration is smooth, which we hence assume. Given such a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) , we associate to a term of the central charge of the form

$$\int_X L^l \cdot s_{m_1}(X) \cdot \dots \cdot s_{m_j}(X) \cdot \Theta$$

an intersection number

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot s_{m_1}(T_{\mathcal{X}/B}) \cdot \dots \cdot s_{m_j}(T_{\mathcal{X}/B}) \cdot \Theta,$$

where $s_m(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})$ is the m^{th} Segre class of the relative holomorphic tangent bundle $T_{\mathcal{X}/B}$, which is a holomorphic vector bundle as $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is a holomorphic submersion. The notion of stability is then just as before: we require

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right) > 0 \text{ for } 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$$

Remark 4.1. One approach to defining the numerical invariant of interest more generally, when \mathcal{X} is smooth but \mathcal{X}_0 is singular, is as follows. Recall that the Segre classes are multiplicative in short exact sequences. Thus when $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is a smooth morphism, we have

$$s(T_{\mathcal{X}}) = s(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})s(T_{\mathbb{P}^1}),$$

where each of these denotes the holomorphic tangent bundle. When \mathcal{X} has smooth total space but \mathcal{X}_0 is singular, so that $s(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})$ and $s(T_{\mathbb{P}^1})$ are both defined, one can use this to define analogues of $s(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})$ and as \mathcal{X} is smooth, one can still make sense of the intersection of cycles on \mathcal{X} itself. It seems challenging to give a reasonable definition when \mathcal{X} is singular, meaning intersection theory of cycles is not defined.

4.2. Z-energy. We now fix a Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$ and recall some general theory of Bott-Chern forms. Good expositions are given by Donaldson [20, Section 1.2] and Tian [55, Section 1]. The Kähler metric ω induces a Hermitian metric on the holomorphic tangent bundle, and hence induces a Chern-Weil representative $s_j(\omega)$ of the Segre classes $s_j(X)$ for all j through the general theory of Bott-Chern forms. Suppose now that $\omega_\psi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$ is another Kähler metric in the same class, producing another representative of $s_j(X)$. Then the theory of Bott-Chern forms implies that there is a $(j-1, j-1)$ -form $\text{BC}_j(\psi)$ such that

$$s_j(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi) - s_j(\omega) = i\partial\bar{\partial}\text{BC}_j(\psi).$$

To draw the parallel with the theory we have developed in the rank one case, note that that $s_1(\omega) = -\text{Ric}(\omega)$, so

$$\text{BC}_1(\psi) = \log\left(\frac{\omega_\psi^n}{\omega^n}\right),$$

which is a function that appeared many times in Section 3.2.

With this in hand, we define Deligne functionals in an analogous manner to Section 3.1. Consider a holomorphic submersion $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$, and let ω be a relatively Kähler metric, which hence induces a metric on the relative holomorphic tangent bundle $T_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. This produces representatives of the Segre classes $s_j(T_{\mathcal{X}/B})$, and changing ω to ω_ψ changes the representatives of the Segre classes through the Bott-Chern forms. We also fix a representative $\theta \in \Theta$.

We associate to the intersection number $\int_{\mathcal{X}} L^l \cdot s_{m_1}(X) \cdots s_{m_j}(X) \cdot \Theta$ a function

$$\frac{1}{l+1} \langle \psi, \dots, \psi; \text{BC}_{m_1}(\psi), \dots, \text{BC}_{m_j}(\psi); \theta \rangle : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

with this functional given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi, \dots, \psi; \text{BC}_{m_1}(\psi), \dots, \text{BC}_{m_j}(\psi); \theta \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \psi \omega_\psi^l \wedge s_{m_1}(\omega_\psi) \wedge \dots \wedge s_{m_j}(\omega_\psi) \wedge \theta \\ &+ \dots + \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \text{BC}_{m_j}(\psi) \omega^l \wedge s_{m_1}(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge s_{m_{j-1}}(\omega) \dots \wedge \theta, \end{aligned}$$

by analogy with the usual theory of Deligne functionals. The basic properties of this functional extend directly: there is a natural analogue of the ‘‘change of metric’’ formula, which follows by definition, and the curvature property of Proposition 3.3 (iii) still holds. The curvature property is proven by Tian when $\theta = 0$ [55, Proposition 1.4], but the proof applies to the general case.

Taking B to be a point, by linearity we have produced a functional $E_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the space of Kähler metrics, which we call the Z -energy as before. In the case that $\theta = 0$, a variational formula for the Deligne functional can be found in the work of Donaldson [20, Proposition 6 (ii)], and a similar result holds in general. We will not make use of the precise variational formula, beyond the fact that the Euler-Lagrange equation is *independent of initial Kähler metric* ω chosen. Thus the Euler-Lagrange equation is only a condition on ω_ψ and not ω itself. We note, however, that to phrase the Euler-Lagrange equation as a partial differential equation requires a further understanding of the linearisation of the Bott-Chern classes.

Definition 4.2. We say that ω_ψ is a Z -critical Kähler metric if it is a critical point of the Z -energy.

To clarify this condition, let

$$(4.1) \quad F_{Z,\psi} : f \rightarrow \frac{d}{dt} E_Z(\omega_\psi + ti\partial\bar{\partial}f)$$

be the derivative of the Z -energy. Then a Z -critical Kähler metric is a zero of the map

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})^*, \\ \psi &\rightarrow F_{Z,\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

In the “rank one” case, from Proposition 3.7 the map $F_{Z,\psi}$ is given by

$$F_{Z,\psi}(f) = \int f \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_\psi)) \omega_\psi^n,$$

resulting in the Euler-Lagrange equation being equivalent to the partial differential equation

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_\psi)) = 0.$$

Note in general that the operator $F_{Z,\psi}$ is linear in ψ and so takes the form

$$F_{Z,\psi} = \int_X L(\psi) \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \omega^n,$$

for some linear differential operator L and some $\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)$ which we do not explicitly derive. Let L^* denote the formal adjoint of L .

Definition 4.3. We say that Z is *asymptotically elliptic* if the condition

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} L^* \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) = 0$$

is an elliptic partial differential equation for ω for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

We are slightly abusing notation here in that our definition of $\tilde{Z}(\omega)$ does not agree with our previous notation in the rank one case, due to the presence of the adjoint L^* . In general, to check for a given central charge that this even actually produces a partial differential equation seems challenging, with ellipticity more challenging again. So we emphasise that this is a strong hypothesis. We remark however that Pingali has, in a special case, linearised $c_2(\omega)$ and established an ellipticity result under hypotheses on the geometry of the manifold in question [43, Lemma 3.1]. Of course, asymptotic ellipticity is also a condition on the choice of form θ rather than only the central charge.

Example 4.4. Set

$$Z_k(X, L) = \sum_{l=0}^n \int_X k^l i^{n-l+1} L^l \cdot c_{n-l}(X).$$

The variation of the Deligne functional associated to each term $\int_X L^l \cdot c_{n-l}(X)$ has been calculated by Weinkove [58, Lemma 5.1] (who does not use the Deligne functional terminology) to be

$$\int_X \psi c_{n-l}(\omega) \wedge \omega^l,$$

so the induced equation is a fourth order partial differential equation only involving the Chern forms of ω . In fact, for $k \gg 0$ small variants of the resulting Z -critical equation have been studied by Leung (under the name ‘‘almost Kähler-Einstein metrics’’ [37]) and Futaki (under the name ‘‘constant perturbed scalar curvature Kähler metrics’’ [29]). Note that, as the equation is fourth order, it is automatically elliptic for $k \gg 0$ as the leading order term of the linearisation is Δ^2 , with this term coming from the linearisation of the scalar curvature. Thus this is an asymptotically elliptic central charge. Leung and Futaki both use the inverse function theorem to produce solutions to their equations for $k \gg 0$; as these equations are fourth order, their applications of the inverse function theorem do not require the techniques we developed in Theorem 3.23, where the main difficulties were caused by the jump from a fourth order to a sixth order partial differential equation.

We must produce an analogue of the slope formula of Proposition 3.9, which is the reason we make use of Segre classes rather than Chern classes. As in that situation, a test configuration smooth over \mathbb{C} gives rise to a path ψ_t of Kähler potentials, which in addition induces representatives of the Segre classes. Denote, as was done in the earlier situation of Section 3.1, h the function on \mathcal{X} induced by the \mathbb{C}^* -action and the relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$. In addition denote ω_0 the restriction of $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ to \mathcal{X}_0 and set $\tau = -\log |t|^2$.

Proposition 4.5. *We have equalities*

$$F_{Z, \mathcal{X}_0, \omega_0}(h) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\tau} E_Z(\psi_\tau) = \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z(X, L)} \right).$$

Proof. The Segre classes are defined in such a way that

$$s_j(X) = \sigma_*(\mathcal{O}(1)^{n-1+j}),$$

where σ_* denotes the push-forward of a cycle through the map $\sigma : \mathbb{P}(T_X) \rightarrow X$ and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is the relative hyperplane class. On the analytic side, the Hermitian metric on T_X induces a Hermitian metric on $\mathcal{O}(1)$, with curvature ω_{FS} which restricts to a Fubini-Study metric on each fibre. We then have, for example from [19, Proposition 1.1], an equality of forms

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(T_X)/X} \omega_{FS}^{n-1+j} = s_j(\omega),$$

which is simply the metric counterpart of the usual defining property of the Segre classes.

Now suppose ω_ψ is another Kähler metric on X , giving representatives $s_j(\omega_\psi)$ of the Segre classes. Then

$$s_j(\omega_\psi) - s_j(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(T_X)/X} (\omega_{\psi,FS}^{n-1+j} - \omega_{FS}^{n-1+j}).$$

Writing

$$\omega_{\psi,FS} - \omega_{FS} = i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{FS},$$

this means that

$$(4.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{P}(T_X)/X} \psi_{FS} \wedge \left(\sum_{q=0}^{n-2+j} \omega_{\psi,FS}^q \wedge \omega_{FS}^{n-2+j-q} \right) = \text{BC}_j(\psi),$$

since taking $i\partial\bar{\partial}$ commutes with the fibre integral and

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(T_X)/X} (\omega_{\psi,FS}^{n-1+j} - \omega_{FS}^{n-1+j}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(T_X)/X} i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{FS} \wedge \left(\sum_{q=0}^{n-2+j} \omega_{\psi,FS}^q \wedge \omega_{FS}^{n-2+j-q} \right).$$

We note here that Bott-Chern classes are only defined modulo closed forms of one degree lower, and so strictly speaking this is merely a representative of the Bott-Chern class.

We return to our integral $E_Z(\psi_\tau)$ of interest, and as usual we focus on one term of the form

$$\langle \psi, \dots, \psi; \text{BC}_{m_1}(\psi), \dots, \text{BC}_{m_j}(\psi); \theta \rangle.$$

The Segre class construction allows us to reduce to the line bundle case, where the result has already been established.

Suppose first that $j = 1$, meaning we only have one Segre class involved in the intersection number. Then the equality

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(TX)} \psi_{FS} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{n-2+j} \omega_{\psi,FS}^l \wedge \omega_{FS}^{n-2+j-l} \right) \wedge \sigma^* \beta = \int_X \text{BC}_j(\psi) \wedge \beta$$

that we have established in Equation (4.2) allows us to conclude that the Deligne functional

$$\langle \psi, \dots, \psi, \text{BC}_m(\psi); \theta \rangle$$

can be computed on $\mathbb{P}(T_X)$ as

$$\langle \psi, \dots, \psi, \psi_{FS}, \dots, \psi_{FS}; \theta \rangle_{\mathbb{P}(TX)},$$

where we pull back ω_ψ to $\mathbb{P}(TX)$ to consider it as a form on $\mathbb{P}(TX)$.

In the case that multiple Bott-Chern forms are involved, we simply iterate this construction as follows. After following this procedure once, we have only $j-1$ Segre classes remaining on $\mathbb{P}(TX)$. But we can pull back T_X through $\sigma : \mathbb{P}(TX) \rightarrow X$, and in this way by functoriality the Segre forms computed with respect to the metric induced by $\sigma^*\omega$ are the pullback of the Segre form computed on X . Thus applying the same procedure, we reduce to only $j-2$ higher Segre classes, and repeating we eventually reduce to the line bundle case. What remains is to compute the asymptotic slope of the Deligne functional along the path of metrics induced by the test configuration.

Projectivising $T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}$, we obtain a family $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which admits a \mathbb{C}^* -action, and is essentially a smooth test configuration for $\mathbb{P}(T_X)$ without a choice of line bundle. The relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ produces a Hermitian metric on $T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}}$ and,

assuming there is only one Segre class $s_m(X)$ involved in the intersection number, we obtain that the limit derivative of the Deligne functional is

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot \mathcal{O}(1)^{m+n-1} \cdot \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}^{l+1} \cdot s_m(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \cdot \Theta.$$

Iterating this procedure by pulling back the relative tangent bundle to $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{C}})$ produces the slope formula in general. The computation of the slope as an integral over \mathcal{X}_0 is completely analogous. \square

4.3. Final steps. We finally explain how to prove our main result in the higher rank case:

Theorem 4.6. *Let Z be an asymptotically elliptic admissible central charge. Suppose (X, L) has discrete automorphism group and is analytically K -semistable. If it is in addition asymptotically Z -stable, then it admits Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics for all ε sufficiently small.*

The proof is, from here, very similar to the “rank one” case. The moment map interpretation is exactly as in the “rank one” case. Indeed, the construction of the sequence of Kähler metrics Ω_ε on B is identical to Proposition 3.18, as it does not use anything concerning the structure of the equation. Then the moment map property proven there does not actually use that the Euler-Lagrange equation is actually a partial differential equation, but rather just uses formal properties. Thus we see that the moment map in the situation of fixed symplectic form and varying complex structure takes the form $\mu_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$ where

$$\langle \mu_\varepsilon, h \rangle = F_{Z, \mathcal{X}_b}(h)$$

and $F_{Z, \mathcal{X}_b} \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})^*$ is defined as in Equation (4.1). Similarly, if one perturbs the Kähler structure, the same applies.

The application of the implicit function theorem is much the same. By asymptotic ellipticity of the central charge, the same reasoning as Section 3.4 demonstrates that the linearisation is an isomorphism, and the quantitative inverse function theorem allows us to construct a potential Ψ such that the Z_ε -critical operator lies in $\mathfrak{t}_{k, B}^2$, where we use the same notation as Section 3.4. Note here that we are using that asymptotic ellipticity, by definition, implies ellipticity of the equation, and the fact that the equation is actually a partial differential equation.

The solution to the finite dimensional problem applies, as it is a general result in Kähler geometry. We note that this produces Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics in an appropriate Sobolev space, but our assumption of ellipticity produces smooth solutions.

The local converse is, again, identical in the higher rank case.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Arcara and A. Bertram, *Bridgeland-stable moduli spaces for K -trivial surfaces*. With an appendix by Max Lieblich. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 15 (2013), no. 1, 1–38.
- [2] V. Alexeev, *Moduli spaces $M_{g,n}(W)$ for surfaces*. Higher-dimensional complex varieties (Trento, 1994), 1–22, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996.
- [3] A. Bayer, *Polynomial Bridgeland stability conditions and the large volume limit*. Geom. Topol. 13 (2009), no. 4, 2389–2425.
- [4] A. Bayer, *Wall-crossing implies Brill-Noether: applications of stability conditions on surfaces*. Algebraic geometry: Salt Lake City 2015, 3–27, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 97.1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2018.

- [5] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on triangulated categories*. Ann. of Math. (2) 166 (2007), no. 2, 317–345.
- [6] T. Brönnle, *Deformation constructions of extremal metrics*. PhD Thesis (2009).
- [7] G. Chen, *The J -equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation*. To appear in Invent. Math.
- [8] X. Chen and S. Sun, *Calabi flow, geodesic rays, and uniqueness of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*. Ann. of Math. (2) 180 (2014), no. 2, 407–454.
- [9] X. X. Chen and G. Tian, *Ricci flow on Kähler-Einstein surfaces*. Invent. Math. 147 (2002), no. 3, 487–544.
- [10] T. C. Collins, A. Jacob, S. T. Yau, *(1,1) forms with specified Lagrangian phase: a priori estimates and algebraic obstructions*. Camb. J. Math. 8 (2020), no. 2, 407–452.
- [11] T. C. Collins and S. T. Yau, *Moment maps, nonlinear PDE, and stability in mirror symmetry*. arXiv:1811.04824 94pp.
- [12] R. Dervan, *Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2016, no. 15, 4728–4783.
- [13] R. Dervan, J. B. McCarthy and L. M. Sektnan, *Z -critical connections and Bridgeland stability conditions*. 2020, arXiv:2012.10426, 67pp.
- [14] R. Dervan and P. Naumann, *Moduli of polarised manifolds via canonical Kähler metrics*. 2018, arXiv:1810.02576, 28pp
- [15] R. Dervan and J. Ross, *K -stability for Kähler manifolds*. Math. Res. Lett. 24 (2017), no. 3, 689–739.
- [16] R. Dervan and J. Ross, *Stable maps in higher dimensions*. Math. Ann. 374 (2019), no. 3-4, 1033–1073.
- [17] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan, *Extremal metrics on fibrations*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 120 (2020), no. 4, 587–616.
- [18] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan, *Uniqueness of optimal symplectic connections*. To appear in Forum Math. Sigma.
- [19] S. Diverio, *Segre forms and Kobayashi-Lübke inequality*. Math. Z. 283 (2016), no. 3-4, 1033–1047.
- [20] S. K. Donaldson, *Anti self-dual Yang-Mills connections over complex algebraic surfaces and stable vector bundles*. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 50 (1985), no. 1, 1–26.
- [21] S. K. Donaldson, *Remarks on gauge theory, complex geometry and 4-manifold topology*. Fields Medallists’ lectures, 384–403, World Sci. Ser. 20th Century Math., 5, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1997.
- [22] S. K. Donaldson, *Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties*. J. Differential Geom. 62 (2002), no. 2, 289–349.
- [23] S. K. Donaldson, *Lower bounds on the Calabi functional*. J. Differential Geom. 70 (2005), no. 3, 453–472.
- [24] S. Dwivedi, J. Herman, L. Jeffrey and T. van den Hurk, *Hamiltonian group actions and equivariant cohomology*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019. xi+132 pp.
- [25] J. Fine, *Constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics on fibred complex surfaces*. J. Differential Geom. 68 (2004), no. 3, 397–432.
- [26] W. Fischer and H. Grauert, *Lokal-triviale Familien kompakter komplexer Mannigfaltigkeiten*. Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math.-Phys. Kl. II 1965 (1965), 89–94.
- [27] A. Fujiki, *Moduli space of polarized algebraic manifolds and Kähler metrics*. Sugaku Expositions Vol. 5 no. 2 (1992) 173–191.
- [28] A. Fujiki and G. Schumacher, *The moduli space of extremal compact Kähler manifolds and generalized Weil-Petersson metrics*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 26 (1990), no. 1, 101–183.
- [29] A. Futaki, *Harmonic total Chern forms and stability*. Kodai Math. J. 29 (2006), no. 3, 346–369.
- [30] P. Gauduchon, *Calabi’s extremal Kähler metrics: An elementary introduction*. Book available online.
- [31] Y. Hashimoto, *Existence of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics with a large twist*. Math. Z. 292 (2019), no. 3-4, 791–803.
- [32] B. Hassett and D. Hyeon, *Log minimal model program for the moduli space of stable curves: the first flip*. Ann. of Math. (2) 177 (2013), no. 3, 911–968.
- [33] E. Inoue, *The moduli space of Fano manifolds with Kähler-Ricci solitons*. Adv. Math. no. 357 (2019). 1–65.

- [34] A. Jacob and S. T. Yau, *A special Lagrangian type equation for holomorphic line bundles*. Math. Ann. 369 (2017), no. 1-2, 869–898.
- [35] M. Lejmi and G. Székelyhidi, *The J-flow and stability*. Adv. Math. 274 (2015), 404–431.
- [36] N. C. Leung, *Einstein type metrics and stability on vector bundles*. J. Differential Geom. 45 (1997), no. 3, 514–546.
- [37] N. C. Leung, *Bando Futaki invariants and Kähler Einstein metric*. Comm. Anal. Geom. 6 (1998), no. 4, 799–808.
- [38] N. C. Leung, S. T. Yau and E. Zaslow, *From special Lagrangian to Hermitian-Yang-Mills via Fourier-Mukai transform*. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 4 (2000), no. 6, 1319–1341.
- [39] C. Li, *Geodesic rays and stability in the cscK problem*. To appear in Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.
- [40] C. Li, X. Wang and C. Xu, *On the proper moduli spaces of smoothable Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties*. Duke Math. J. 168 (2019), no. 8, 1387–1459.
- [41] Y. Odaka, *A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory*. Osaka J. Math. 50 (2013), no. 1, 171–185.
- [42] Y. Odaka, *Compact moduli spaces of Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 51 (2015), no. 3, 549–565.
- [43] V. P. Pingali, *A note on higher extremal metrics*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 370 (2018), no. 10, 6995–7010.
- [44] D. Piyaratne and Y. Toda, *Moduli of Bridgeland semistable objects on 3-folds and Donaldson-Thomas invariants*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 747 (2019), 175–219.
- [45] J. Ross and R. Thomas, *A study of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion for the stability of projective varieties*. J. Algebraic Geom. 16 (2007), no. 2, 201–255.
- [46] E. Schlitzer and J. Stoppa, *Deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills connections, extended gauge group and scalar curvature*. To appear in J. Lond. Math. Soc.
- [47] L. M. Sektnan and C. Tipler, *Hermitian Yang-Mills connections on pullback bundles*. 2020, arXiv:2006.06453, 48pp.
- [48] Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, *K-semistability of cscK manifolds with transcendental cohomology class*. J. Geom. Anal. 28 (2018), no. 4, 2927–2960.
- [49] J. Song and B. Weinkove, *Energy functionals and canonical Kähler metrics*. Duke Math. J. (1) 137, 159–184.
- [50] G. Székelyhidi, *On blowing up extremal Kähler manifolds*. Duke Math. J. 161 (2012), no. 8, 1411–1453.
- [51] G. Székelyhidi, *An introduction to extremal Kähler metrics*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 152. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2014). xvi+192 pp.
- [52] G. Székelyhidi, *The Kähler-Ricci flow and K-polystability*. Amer. J. Math. (4) 132 (2014), 1077–1090.
- [53] M. Taylor, *Partial differential equations I. Basic theory*. Second edition. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 115. Springer, New York, 2011. xxii+654 pp.
- [54] G. Tian, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*. Invent. Math. 130 (1997), no. 1, 1–37.
- [55] G. Tian, *Bott-Chern forms and geometric stability*. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems 6 (2000), no. 1, 211–220.
- [56] Y. Toda, *Moduli stacks and invariants of semistable objects on K3 surfaces*. Adv. Math. 217 (2008), no. 6, 2736–2781.
- [57] X. Wang, *Height and GIT weight*. Math. Res. Lett. 19 (2012), no. 4, 909–926.
- [58] B. Weinkove, *Higher K-energy functionals and higher Futaki invariants*. 2002, arXiv:math/0204271, 14pp.
- [59] C. Xu, *K-stability of Fano varieties: an algebro-geometric approach*. 2020, arXiv:2011.10477, 84pp.
- [60] S. T. Yau, *Open problems in geometry*. Differential geometry: partial differential equations on manifolds (Los Angeles, CA, 1990), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. 54, 1–28.
- [61] S. Zhang, *Heights and reductions of semi-stable varieties*. Compositio Math. 104 (1996), no. 1, 77–105.

RUADHAÍ DERVAN, DPMMS, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: R.Dervan@dpmms.cam.ac.uk