

ON CERTAIN EXTENSIONS OF VECTOR BUNDLES IN P-ADIC GEOMETRY

SERIN HONG

ABSTRACT. Given three arbitrary vector bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve where one of them is assumed to be semistable, we give an explicit and complete criterion in terms of Harder-Narasimhan polygons on whether there exists a short exact sequence among them. Our argument is based on a dimension analysis of certain moduli spaces of bundle maps and bundle extensions using Scholze's theory of diamonds.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. The main result	1
1.2. Outline of the proof	3
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. The Fargues-Fontaine curve	4
2.2. Diamonds	6
2.3. Moduli of bundle maps	8
2.4. Dimension counting lemmas	9
3. Extensions of vector bundles	11
3.1. Moduli spaces of extensions	11
3.2. Main theorem	15
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The main result.

Over the past decade, p -adic Hodge theory has undergone a remarkable development driven by a series of new geometric ideas. Of particular importance among such ideas are the theory of perfectoid spaces introduced by Scholze [Sch12] and the geometric reformulation of p -adic Hodge theory by Fargues and Fontaine [FF18] using a regular noetherian one-dimensional \mathbb{Q}_p -scheme called the *Fargues-Fontaine curve*. Some notable applications of these ideas are the geometrization of the local Langlands correspondence by Fargues [Far16] and the construction of local Shimura varieties by Scholze [SW].

This article aims to address the question of determining whether there exists a short exact sequence among three given vector bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve. This question naturally arises in the study of various objects in p -adic geometry. For example, a partial answer to this question obtained by the author and his collaborators in [BFH⁺17] leads to the work of Hansen [Han17] that describes precise closure relations among the Harder-Narasimhan

strata on the stack of vector bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve. In addition, a general answer to this question can be used to describe the geometry of the weakly admissible locus on the flag variety, in line with the work of Caraiani-Scholze [CS17] and Chen-Fargues-Shen [CFS17].

In order to state our main result, let us introduce some notations and terminologies. Let F be an algebraically closed perfectoid field of characteristic $p > 0$. Denote by $X = X_F$ the Fargues-Fontaine curve associated to F . By a result of Fargues-Fontaine [FF18] (and also Kedlaya [Ked08]), every vector bundle \mathcal{V} on X admits a unique *Harder-Narasimhan decomposition*

$$\mathcal{V} \simeq \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)$ denotes the unique stable vector bundle of slope λ_i . In particular, the isomorphism class of \mathcal{V} is determined by its Harder-Narasimhan polygon $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$. Let us write

$$\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu} := \bigoplus_{\lambda_i \geq \mu} \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i} \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

We say that \mathcal{V} *strongly slopewise dominates* another bundle \mathcal{W} on X if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\text{rank}(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu}) \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{W}^{\geq \mu})$ for every $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{V} \simeq \mathcal{W}$ whenever equality holds in (i).

In terms of the Harder-Narasimhan polygons $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{W})$, the conditions (i) and (ii) can be stated as follows:

- (i)' For each $i = 1, \dots, \text{rank}(\mathcal{W})$, the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{W})$ on the interval $[i-1, i]$ is less than or equal to the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ on this interval.
- (ii)' If both $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{W})$ have vertices at some integer j , then the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{W})$ on $[j-1, j]$ is less than or equal to the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ on $[j, j+1]$ unless $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{W})$ agree on $[0, j]$.




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the conditions (i)' and (ii)'.

We can now state our main result as follows:

Theorem 1.1.1. *Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X such that the maximum slope in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{D})$ is less than the minimum slope in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$. Assume that one of $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$ is semistable. Then there exists a short exact sequence of vector bundles on X*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0$$

if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) \mathcal{E} strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{D} .
- (ii) \mathcal{E}^\vee strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{F}^\vee .
- (iii) $\text{HN}(\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{F})$ lies above $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ with the same endpoints.

It seems reasonable to expect that Theorem 1.1.1 holds without the semistability assumption on one of $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$. If this is true, then we should also get a complete classification of all vector bundles \mathcal{E} which admits a filtration with specified successive quotients.

1.2. Outline of the proof.

Let us briefly explain our proof of Theorem 1.1.1, which closely follows the main argument of [BFH⁺17]. The necessity part of Theorem 1.1.1 is a standard consequence of the slope formalism. Hence the main part of our proof is to establish the sufficiency part of Theorem 1.1.1.

We consider various moduli spaces of bundle maps and bundle extensions which are represented by *diamonds* in the sense of Scholze [Sch18]. We are particularly interested in diamonds

- $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ whose F -points parametrize surjective bundle maps $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ with the kernel isomorphic to a specified vector bundle \mathcal{K} , and
- $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{V}}$ whose F -points parametrize exact sequences $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$ of vector bundles on X .

We establish the sufficiency part of Theorem 1.1.1 by proving the following two statements:

- (1) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}$ is not empty if either \mathcal{D} or \mathcal{F} is semistable.
- (2) $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is not empty if \mathcal{E} is semistable.

Each statement follows from a quantitative statement as stated in Proposition 3.2.4 or Proposition 3.2.6 by the main result of [Hon19a] and the dimension theory for diamonds. The proof of the quantitative statement is based on a combinatorial argument that extends the main argument of §5 in [BFH⁺17].

The main novelty of our proof lies in establishing a dimension formula for the diamonds $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{V}}$. If \mathcal{F} is semistable, our formula for $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ recovers the formula obtained in [BFH⁺17]. To obtain our general formula, we give another description of the diamond $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ by constructing some auxiliary diamonds such as $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ which (roughly) parametrizes bundle maps $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ whose kernel contains \mathcal{K} as a subbundle. In particular, we construct a diamond $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ which admits a clean dimension formula along with the maps

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

When $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is not empty these maps are respectively $\mathcal{A}ut(\mathcal{K})$ -torsor and $\mathcal{A}ut(\mathcal{V})$ -torsor, where $\mathcal{A}ut(\mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{A}ut(\mathcal{V})$ denote the diamonds which respectively parametrize the bundle automorphisms of \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{V} . Our formula then follows by some standard facts from the dimension theory for diamonds.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. The Fargues-Fontaine curve.

Throughout this paper, we fix an algebraically closed perfectoid field F of characteristic $p > 0$. We denote by F° the ring of integers of F , and choose a pseudouniformizer ϖ of F . We write $W(F^\circ)$ for the ring of Witt vectors over F° , and $[\varpi]$ for Teichmüller lift of ϖ . Then the Frobenius map on $W(F^\circ)$ induces a properly discontinuous automorphism ϕ on the adic space

$$\mathcal{Y} := \mathrm{Spa}(W(F^\circ)) \setminus \{|p[\varpi]| = 0\}$$

defined over $\mathrm{Spa}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

Definition 2.1.1. We define the *adic Fargues-Fontaine curve* (associated to F) by

$$\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{Y}/\phi^{\mathbb{Z}},$$

and the *schematic Fargues-Fontaine curve* by

$$X := \mathrm{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}})^{\phi = \varpi^n} \right).$$

Remark. More generally, for any finite extension E of \mathbb{Q}_p with ring of integers E° , we can define the Fargues-Fontaine curve as an adic space or a scheme over E by replacing $W(F^\circ)$ in the above construction with $W_{E^\circ}(F^\circ)$, the ring of ramified Witt vectors over F° with coefficients in E° . There is also an analogous construction of the equal characteristic Fargues-Fontaine curve as an adic space or a scheme over a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$. Our main result equally holds in these settings with identical proofs.

The two incarnations of the Fargues-Fontaine curve are essentially equivalent to us because of the following GAGA type result:

Proposition 2.1.2 (“GAGA for the Fargues-Fontaine curve”, [KL15, Theorem 6.3.12]). *There is a natural map of locally ringed spaces*

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X$$

which induces by pullback an equivalence of the categories of vector bundles.

From now on, we will always consider the Fargues-Fontaine curve as a scheme. While the scheme X is not of finite type over \mathbb{Q}_p , it behaves very much like a proper curve over \mathbb{Q}_p as indicated by the following fact:

Proposition 2.1.3 ([FF18]). *The scheme X is noetherian and regular of dimension 1 over \mathbb{Q}_p . Moreover, it is complete in the sense that every principal divisor on X has degree 0.*

In particular, the degree map is well-defined on the Picard group of X , thereby allowing us to define the notion of slope for vector bundles on X as follows:

Definition 2.1.4. Let \mathcal{V} be a vector bundle on X . Let us denote by $\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{V})$ the rank of \mathcal{V} . We define the *degree* and *slope* of \mathcal{V} respectively by

$$\mathrm{deg}(\mathcal{V}) := \mathrm{deg}(\wedge^{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{V})} \mathcal{V}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\mathcal{V}) := \frac{\mathrm{deg}(\mathcal{V})}{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{V})}.$$

Let k be the residue field of F , and let K_0 be the fraction field of the ring of Witt vectors over k . Recall that an *isocrystal* over k is a finite dimensional vector space over K_0 with a Frobenius semi-linear automorphism.

Lemma 2.1.5. *There exists a functor from the category of isocrystals over k to the category of vector bundles on X which is compatible with direct sums, duals, ranks, degrees, and slopes.*

Proof. Let us write

$$B := H^0(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \quad \text{and} \quad P := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} B^{\phi = \varpi^n}.$$

The desired functor is given by associating to each isocrystal N over k the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}(N)$ on X which corresponds to the graded P -module

$$\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} (N^\vee \otimes_{K_0} B)^{\phi = \varpi^n},$$

where N^\vee denotes the dual isocrystal of N . □

Definition 2.1.6. Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$, we write $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ for the vector bundle on X that corresponds to the unique simple isocrystal over k of slope λ under the functor in Lemma 2.1.5.

Proposition 2.1.7 ([FF18], [Ked08]). *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ we have the following statements:*

- (1) $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}(\lambda)) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda < 0$.
- (2) $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}(\lambda)) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda \geq 0$.

Let us also recall the notion of semistability for vector bundles on X .

Definition 2.1.8. A vector bundle \mathcal{V} on X is *semistable* if $\mu(\mathcal{W}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{V})$ for every subbundle \mathcal{W} of \mathcal{V} .

Proposition 2.1.9 ([FF18]). *Semistable bundles on X are precisely those of the form $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)^{\oplus m}$.*

We can now state the classification theorem for vector bundles on X as follows:

Theorem 2.1.10 ([FF18]). *Every vector bundle \mathcal{V} on X admits a unique direct sum decomposition of the form*

$$\mathcal{V} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_l$.

Definition 2.1.11. Let \mathcal{V} be a vector bundle on X .

- (1) We refer to the decomposition (2.1) in Theorem 2.1.10 as the *Harder-Narasimhan (HN) decomposition* of \mathcal{V} .
- (2) We refer to the numbers λ_i in the HN decomposition as the *Harder-Narasimhan (HN) slopes* of \mathcal{V} , or often simply as the *slopes* of \mathcal{V} .
- (3) We write $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{V})$ (resp. $\mu_{\min}(\mathcal{V})$) for the maximum (resp. minimum) HN slope of \mathcal{V} ; in other words, we write $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{V}) := \lambda_1$ and $\mu_{\min}(\mathcal{V}) := \lambda_l$.
- (4) For every $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define the direct summands

$$\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu} := \bigoplus_{\lambda_i \geq \mu} \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V}^{\leq \mu} := \bigoplus_{\lambda_i \leq \mu} \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i},$$

and similarly define $\mathcal{V}^{> \mu}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{< \mu}$.

- (5) We define the *Harder-Narasimhan (HN) polygon* of \mathcal{V} , denoted by $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$, as the upper convex hull of the points $(0, 0)$ and $(\text{rk}(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \lambda_i}), \text{deg}(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \lambda_i}))$.
- (6) Given a convex polygon P adjoining $(0, 0)$ and $(\text{rk}(\mathcal{V}), \text{deg}(\mathcal{V}))$, we write $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V}) \leq P$ if each point on $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ lies on or below P .

Corollary 2.1.12. *The isomorphism class of \mathcal{V} is completely determined by the HN polygon $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$. In particular, the slopes of \mathcal{V} are precisely the slopes in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$.*

We conclude this subsection by extending the construction of the Fargues-Fontaine curve to relative settings. Let $S = \text{Spa}(R, R^+)$ be an affinoid perfectoid space over $\text{Spa}(F)$, and let ϖ_R be a pseudouniformizer of R . We write $W(R^+)$ for the ring of Witt vectors over R^+ and $[\varpi_R]$ for the Teichmüller lift of ϖ_R . As in the absolute setting, the Frobenius map on $W(R^+)$ induces a properly discontinuous automorphism ϕ on the adic space

$$\mathcal{Y}_S := \text{Spa}(W(R^+)) \setminus \{[p[\varpi_R]] = 0\}$$

defined over $\text{Spa}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

Definition 2.1.13. Given an affinoid perfectoid space $S = \text{Spa}(R, R^+)$ over $\text{Spa}(F)$, we define the *adic Fargues-Fontaine curve* associated to S by

$$\mathcal{X}_S := \mathcal{Y}_S / \phi^{\mathbb{Z}},$$

and the *schematic Fargues-Fontaine curve* associated to S by

$$X_S := \text{Proj} \left(\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} H^0(\mathcal{Y}_S, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}^{\phi = \varpi^n}) \right).$$

More generally, for an arbitrary perfectoid space S over $\text{Spa}(F)$ with an affinoid cover $S = \bigcup S_i$, we define the adic Fargues-Fontaine curve \mathcal{X}_S and the schematic Fargues-Fontaine curve X_S respectively by gluing the \mathcal{X}_{S_i} and the X_{S_i} .

Proposition 2.1.2 extends to relative settings, as proved in [KL15, Theorem 8.7.7]. Thus we will henceforth consider the relative Fargues-Fontaine curve as a scheme over \mathbb{Q}_p .

2.2. Diamonds.

In this subsection we collect some basic facts about diamonds following [Sch18].

Definition 2.2.1. Let Perfd denote the category of perfectoid spaces of characteristic p .

- (1) A morphism $Y \rightarrow Z$ of affinoid perfectoid spaces is *affinoid pro-étale* if it can be written as a cofiltered limit of étale morphisms $Y_i \rightarrow Z$ of affinoid perfectoid spaces.
- (2) A morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ is *pro-étale* if there exist open affinoid covers $Z = \bigcup U_i$ and $Y = \bigcup V_{i,j}$ such that $f|_{V_{i,j}}$ factors through an affinoid pro-étale morphism $V_{i,j} \rightarrow U_i$.
- (3) A pro-étale morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ of perfectoid spaces is called a *pro-étale cover* if for any quasicompact open subset $U \subset Z$, there exists some quasicompact open subset $V \subset Y$ with $f(V) = U$.
- (4) The *big pro-étale site* is the site on Perfd with covers given by pro-étale covers.
- (5) A sheaf Y for the big pro-étale site on Perfd is called a *diamond* if Y can be written as a quotient Z/R , where Z is representable by a perfectoid space with a pro-étale equivalence relation R on Z .
- (6) For a diamond $Y \simeq Z/R$ with a perfectoid space Z and a pro-étale equivalence relation R , we define its topological space by $|Y| := |Z|/|R|$, where $|Z|$ and $|R|$ denote the topological spaces for Z and R .

We often identify a characteristic p perfectoid space Z with the functor $\text{Hom}(-, Z)$ on Perfd . There is little harm from doing this because of the following fact:

Proposition 2.2.2 ([Sch18, Corollary 8.6]). *The big pro-étale site on Perfd is subcanonical. That is, for every $Z \in \text{Perfd}$ the functor $\text{Hom}(-, Z)$ is a sheaf for the big pro-étale site.*

Let us now recall some important classes of diamonds.

Definition 2.2.3. Let Y be a diamond such that $Y \simeq Z/R$ for some perfectoid space Z and a pro-étale equivalence relation R on Z .

- (1) We say that Y is *quasicompact* if Z is quasicompact.
- (2) We say that Y is *quasiseparated* if $U \times_Y V$ is quasicompact for any morphisms $U \rightarrow Y$ and $V \rightarrow Y$ of diamonds with U, V quasicompact.
- (3) We say that Y is *partially proper* if it is quasiseparated with the property that for all characteristic p affinoid perfectoid pair (R, R^+) the restriction map

$$Y(R, R^+) \rightarrow Y(R, R^\circ)$$

is bijective where R° denotes the ring of power-bounded elements in R .

- (4) We say that Y is *spatial* if it is quasicompact and quasiseparated with a neighborhood basis of $|Y|$ given by $\{ |U| : U \subset Y \text{ quasicompact open subdiamonds} \}$.
- (5) We say that Y is *locally spatial* if it admits a covering by spatial open subdiamonds.

We review some key notions and facts regarding locally spatial diamonds.

Proposition 2.2.4 ([Sch18, Proposition 11.19 and Corollary 11.29]). *Let Y be a locally spatial diamond.*

- (1) *The topological space $|Y|$ is locally spectral.*
- (2) *Y is quasicompact (resp. quasiseparated) if and only if $|Y|$ is quasicompact (resp. quasiseparated).*
- (3) *For any morphisms $U \rightarrow Y$ and $V \rightarrow Y$ of locally spatial diamonds, the fiber product $U \times_Y V$ is a locally spatial diamond.*
- (4) *For any morphism $Y \rightarrow Z$ of locally spatial diamonds, the associated topological map $|Y| \rightarrow |Z|$ is spectral and generalizing.*

Definition 2.2.5. For an adic space Z over $\mathrm{Spa}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, we define the functor Z^\diamond on Perfd by

$$Z^\diamond(S) := \left\{ (S^\#, \iota) : S^\# \text{ is a perfectoid space over } Z \text{ with an isomorphism } \iota : (S^\#)^\flat \simeq S \right\}$$

where $(-)^{\flat}$ denotes the tilting functor for perfectoid spaces. We write $\mathrm{Spd}(F) := \mathrm{Spa}(F)^\diamond$.

Proposition 2.2.6 ([Sch18, Lemma 15.6]). *Let Z be an arbitrary adic space over $\mathrm{Spa}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Then Z^\diamond is a locally spatial diamond with a homeomorphism $|Z| \simeq |Z^\diamond|$.*

Definition 2.2.7. Let Y be a locally spatial diamond.

- (1) A point $y \in |Y|$ is called a *rank one point* if it has no proper generalizations in $|Y|$.
- (2) For every rank one point $y \in |Y|$, we denote by y^\diamond a unique quasicompact spatial subdiamond of Y with $|y^\diamond| = y$.

Proposition 2.2.8 ([BFH⁺17, Lemma 3.2.5]). *Let $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ be a morphism of partially proper and locally spatial diamonds over $\mathrm{Spd}(F)$. Write $|f|$ for the associated map of topological spaces $|Y| \rightarrow |Z|$, and $\mathrm{im}(|f|)$ for its image. Assume that for every rank one point $z \in \mathrm{im}(|f|)$ the fiber $Y_z := Y \times_Z z^\diamond$ is of dimension d . Then we have*

$$\dim \mathrm{im}(|f|) = \dim |Y| - d.$$

Proposition 2.2.9 ([BFH⁺17, Lemma 3.2.3 and Lemma 3.3.4]). *Let Y be a spatial diamond with a free \underline{G} -action for some profinite group G . Then Y/\underline{G} is a spatial diamond with*

$$\dim Y/\underline{G} = \dim Y.$$

2.3. Moduli of bundle maps.

Let us denote by $\text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ the category of perfectoid spaces over $\text{Spa}(F)$. By construction, the relative Fargues-Fontaine curve X_S for any $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ comes with a natural map $X_S \rightarrow X$.

Definition 2.3.1. Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve X . For any $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$, we write \mathcal{E}_S and \mathcal{F}_S for the pullbacks of \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} along the map $X_S \rightarrow X$.

- (1) $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the functor which associates $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ to the set of \mathcal{O}_{X_S} -module maps $\mathcal{E}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_S$.
- (2) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the functor which associates $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ to the set of surjective \mathcal{O}_{X_S} -module maps $\mathcal{E}_S \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_S$.
- (3) $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the functor which associates $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ to the set of \mathcal{O}_{X_S} -module maps $\mathcal{E}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_S$ whose pullback along the map $X_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow X_S$ for any geometric point $\bar{x} \rightarrow S$ gives an injective $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\bar{x}}}$ -module map.
- (4) $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ is the functor which associates $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ to the group of \mathcal{O}_{X_S} -module automorphisms of \mathcal{E}_S .

Proposition 2.3.2 ([BFH⁺17, Propositions 3.3.2, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, and 3.3.7]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X .*

- (1) $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond over $\text{Spd}(F)$, equidimensional of dimension $\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}$.
- (2) Every nonempty open subdiamond of $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ has an F -point.
- (3) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ are both open, partially proper and locally spatial subdiamonds of $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.
- (4) $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond over $\text{Spd}(F)$, equidimensional of dimension $\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0}$.

Remark. While the diamond $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ also has the structure of a Banach-Colmez space as defined by Colmez [Col02], the other three diamonds are not Banach-Colmez spaces.

We recall the notion of (strong) slopewise dominance which provides a criterion for nonemptiness of $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ for any given vector bundles \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} over X .

Definition 2.3.3. Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X .

- (1) We say that \mathcal{E} *slopewise dominates* \mathcal{F} if $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}^{\geq \mu}) \leq \text{rk}(\mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu})$ for every $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$.
- (2) We say that \mathcal{E} *strongly slopewise dominates* \mathcal{F} if $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}^{\geq \mu}) \leq \text{rk}(\mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu})$ for every $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ with equality if and only if $\mathcal{E}^{\geq \mu} \simeq \mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu}$.

Proposition 2.3.4 ([Hon19a, Lemma 4.2.2 and Proposition 4.3.1]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X . Then \mathcal{E} strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{F} if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) For each $i = 1, \dots, \text{rk}(\mathcal{F})$, the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ on the interval $[i-1, i]$ is less than or equal to the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ on this interval.
- (ii) If both $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ have vertices at some integer j , then the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ on $[j-1, j]$ is less than or equal to the slope of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ on $[j, j+1]$ unless $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ agree on $[0, j]$.

In addition, \mathcal{E} slopewise dominates \mathcal{F} if and only if the condition (i) is satisfied.




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 2.3.4.

Proposition 2.3.5 ([Hon19a, Theorem 4.1.1] and [Hon19b, Theorem 3.1.1]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X .*

- (1) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is not empty if and only if \mathcal{E}^\vee strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{F}^\vee .
- (2) $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is not empty if and only if \mathcal{F} slopewise dominates \mathcal{E} .

2.4. Dimension counting lemmas.

In this subsection, we collect some useful computational lemmas for dimension counting arguments based on Proposition 2.3.2.

Definition 2.4.1. Let \mathcal{V} be a vector bundle on X with HN decomposition

$$\mathcal{V} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}$$

where $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_l$. We define the *HN vectors* of \mathcal{V} by

$$\vec{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{V}) := (v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq l}$$

where $v_i := (\text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}), \text{deg}(\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}))$ is the vector that represents the i -th segment in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$, and write $\mu(v_i) := \lambda_i$ for the slope of v_i .




FIGURE 3. Vector representation of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$.

Lemma 2.4.2 ([BFH⁺17, Lemma 2.3.4]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X with HN vectors $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{E}) = (e_i)$ and $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{F}) = (f_j)$. Then we have an identity*

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = \sum_{\mu(e_i) \leq \mu(f_j)} e_i \times f_j$$

where $e_i \times f_j$ denotes the two-dimensional cross product of the vectors e_i and f_j .

Lemma 2.4.3. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X . Then for any $\lambda \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\lambda' \geq \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$ we have*

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}^{>\lambda})^{\geq 0} = \deg((\mathcal{E}^{<\lambda'})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.4.2 we find $\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}^{\leq \lambda})^{\geq 0} = 0$, which in turn yields

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} &= \deg\left(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes (\mathcal{F}^{\leq \lambda} \oplus \mathcal{F}^{>\lambda})\right)^{\geq 0} \\ &= \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}^{\leq \lambda})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}^{>\lambda})^{\geq 0} \\ &= \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}^{>\lambda})^{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we find $\deg((\mathcal{E}^{\geq \lambda'})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = 0$ by Lemma 2.4.2 and consequently obtain

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = \deg((\mathcal{E}^{<\lambda'})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.4.4. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X with $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$. Let P, Q , and R respectively denote the right endpoint of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}), \text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$, and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{F})$, and let O denote the origin. Then $\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}$ equals the area of the parallelogram $OPRQ$.*




FIGURE 4. Illustration of Lemma 2.4.4

Proof. Let us write $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{E}) := (e_i)$ and $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{F}) := (f_j)$. Note that we have $\mu(e_i) \leq \mu(f_j)$ for all i and j by the assumption $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$. Hence by Lemma 2.4.2 we find

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = \sum e_i \times f_j = \sum e_i \times \sum f_j = \overrightarrow{OP} \times \overrightarrow{OQ} = \text{Area}(OPRQ)$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.4.5 ([BFH⁺17, Proposition 2.3.5]). *Let \mathcal{V} be a vector bundle on X . Then $\deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0}$ is equal to twice the area of the region enclosed by $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ and the line segment joining the two endpoints of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$. In particular, we have $\deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} = 0$ if and only if \mathcal{V} is semistable.*




FIGURE 5. Illustration of Lemma 2.4.5

Definition 2.4.6. Given a vector bundle \mathcal{V} on X , we write $\mathcal{V}(\lambda) := \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Lemma 2.4.7 ([Hon19a, Lemma 3.2.7]). *Given two vector bundles \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} on X , we have*

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}(\lambda)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}(\lambda))^{\geq 0} = \text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(\lambda))^2 \cdot \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Lemma 2.4.8 ([Hon19a, Lemma 3.2.8]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ denote the vector bundles on X such that $\text{HN}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ and $\text{HN}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ are respectively obtained by vertically stretching $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ by some positive integer factor C . Then we have*

$$\deg(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\vee \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{F}})^{\geq 0} = C \cdot \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}.$$

Lemma 2.4.9 ([Hon19a, Lemma 4.2.3]). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X such that \mathcal{E} slopewise dominates \mathcal{F} . Then we have an inequality*

$$\deg(\mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} \geq \deg(\mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}.$$

3. EXTENSIONS OF VECTOR BUNDLES

3.1. Moduli spaces of extensions.

In this subsection, we define and study diamonds that parametrize extensions between two given vector bundles on X .

Definition 3.1.1. Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X .

- (1) $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{E})$ is the pro-étale sheafification of the functor which associates to each $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ the set $H^i(X_S, \mathcal{E}_S)$.
- (2) $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is the functor which associates to each $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ the set of isomorphism classes of extensions of \mathcal{F} by \mathcal{D} .
- (3) $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the functor which associates to each $S \in \text{Perfd}_{/\text{Spa}(F)}$ the set of all isomorphism classes of short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_S \longrightarrow 0.$$

Remark. We have canonical identifications

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \cong \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) \cong \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D}).$$

Proposition 3.1.2. *Let \mathcal{E} be a vector bundle on X with $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{E}) < 0$. Then $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{E})$ is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond over $\mathrm{Spd}(F)$, equidimensional of dimension $\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee) \geq 0$. Moreover, every nonempty open subdiamond of $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{E})$ has an F -point.*

Proof. Let us write the HN decomposition of \mathcal{E} as

$$\mathcal{E} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}$$

where $\lambda_i < 0$ for each $i = 1, \dots, l$. We also set

$$r_i := \mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}) \quad \text{and} \quad d_i := \deg(\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}).$$

By [BFH⁺17, Theorem 1.1.2] each $\mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}$ fits into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r_i-d_i)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus-d_i} \longrightarrow 0$$

We then take the direct sum of all such sequences to obtain a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r-d)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus-d} \longrightarrow 0.$$

where $r = \mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{E})$ and $d = \deg(\mathcal{E})$, and consequently find a long exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r-d)}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus-d}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r-d)}).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.1.7 we have

$$\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{E}) = 0, \quad \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r-d)}) = \underline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^{\oplus(r-d)}, \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O}^{\oplus(r-d)}) = 0.$$

We thus find a presentation

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus-d}) / \underline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^{\oplus(r-d)} \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus-d}) / \underline{\mathbb{Q}_p}^{\oplus(r-d)},$$

thereby deducing the desired statements by Proposition 2.2.9 and Proposition 2.3.2. \square

Remark. The above argument is largely inspired by the proof of [BFH⁺17, Proposition 3.3.2]. It is also presented by Hansen in the workshop for the geometrization of the local Langlands program held at McGill in 2019.

Lemma 3.1.3. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X , and let \mathcal{K} be a subbundle of \mathcal{E} . Consider the map of diamonds*

$$\mathrm{Inj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\mathrm{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}) \quad (3.1)$$

induced by composition of bundle maps. Then the fiber $(\mathrm{Inj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\mathrm{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ of the rank one point $0 \in |\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F})|$ that represents the zero map is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond with

$$\dim(\mathrm{Inj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\mathrm{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 = \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) \geq 0 + \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}) \geq 0 - \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Observe that $(\mathrm{Inj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\mathrm{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ is a locally spatial diamond by Proposition 2.2.4. Moreover, the partial properness is a formal consequence of the fact from [KL15, Theorem 8.7.7] that for each affinoid perfectoid space $S = \mathrm{Spa}(R, R^+)$ over $\mathrm{Spa}(F)$ the category of vector bundles on X_S is canonically independent of the choice of R^+ . Hence it remains to establish the dimension formula.

Let $i \in |\mathrm{Inj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})|$ be an arbitrary rank one point. Then the map (3.1) induces a map of diamonds

$$r_i : i^\diamond \times_{\mathrm{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}).$$

Let $y \in |\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F})|$ be an arbitrary rank one point, and let $(r_i)^{-1}(y)$ denote the fiber of y under r_i . By definition, $(r_i)^{-1}(y)$ parametrizes bundle maps $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ which extends the bundle

map $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ corresponding to y . Hence $r_i^{-1}(y)$ has a constant isomorphism type, and thus has a constant dimension. By Proposition 2.3.2 and Proposition 2.2.8 we find

$$\dim r_i^{-1}(y) = \dim \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) - \dim \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}) = \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}. \quad (3.2)$$

We now note that the projection map

$$\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$$

induces a map of diamonds

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$$

For each rank one point $i \in |\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})|$, the fiber of i under this map is $r_i^{-1}(0)$, which has a constant dimension given by (3.2). Hence we obtain the desired dimension formula by Proposition 2.3.2 and Proposition 2.2.8. \square

Proposition 3.1.4. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X , and let \mathcal{K} be a subbundle of \mathcal{E} with $\text{rk}(\mathcal{K}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) - \text{rk}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\deg(\mathcal{K}) = \deg(\mathcal{E}) - \deg(\mathcal{F})$. Define $(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ as in Lemma 3.1.3. Let $\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ be the image of $(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ under the projection*

$$\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}),$$

and set $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}} := \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$.

- (1) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond over $\text{Spd}(F)$.
- (2) $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ is either empty or equidimensional of dimension

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{K})^{\geq 0}.$$

Proof. Let S be a perfectoid space over $\text{Spa}(F)$. Then we have

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0(S) = \{ (\iota, \psi) \in \mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})(S) \times \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(S) : \psi \circ \iota = 0 \}.$$

Hence $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}(S)$ is the set of surjective bundle maps $\phi : \mathcal{E}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_S$ such that \mathcal{K} is a subbundle of $\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}}$ for any geometric point $\bar{x} \rightarrow S$, where $\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}}$ denotes the pullback of $\ker(\psi)$ along the map $X_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow X_S$. Moreover, for any $\phi \in \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(S)$ and any geometric points $\bar{x} \rightarrow S$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}}) &= \text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) - \text{rk}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{K}), \\ \deg(\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}}) &= \deg(\mathcal{E}) - \deg(\mathcal{F}) = \deg(\mathcal{K}). \end{aligned}$$

We thus see that $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}(S)$ is the set of surjective bundle maps $\psi : \mathcal{E}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_S$ with $\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}} \simeq \mathcal{K}$ for any geometric point $\bar{x} \rightarrow S$. The statement (1) now follows from [BFH⁺17, Proposition 3.3.13].

Let us now assume that $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ is not empty. Let $(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ denote the preimage of $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ under the map

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}).$$

Then we have a cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are open embeddings by Proposition 2.3.2. We thus find

$$\dim (\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 = \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} \quad (3.3)$$

by Lemma 3.1.3. Moreover, for any rank one point $\psi \in |\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}|$ the fiber under the map

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0 \longrightarrow \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$$

is an $(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{K}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \psi^\diamond)$ -torsor, which can be identified with $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{K}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \bar{\psi}^\diamond$ for some geometric point $\bar{\psi}$ with a pro-étale cover $\bar{\psi} \rightarrow \psi$. Since $\dim \text{Aut}(\mathcal{K}) = \deg(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{K})^{\geq 0}$ by Proposition 2.3.2, the desired dimension formula for $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}$ now follows by (3.3) and Proposition 2.2.8. \square

Proposition 3.1.5. *Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X .*

- (1) $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a partially proper and locally spatial diamond over $\text{Spd}(F)$.
- (2) $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is either empty or equidimensional of dimension

$$\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0}.$$

Proof. Let us choose a presentation $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) \simeq T/R$ for some perfectoid space T and a pro-étale equivalence relation R . Let \mathcal{V} be the vector bundle on X_T which fits into the ‘‘universal’’ exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_T \longrightarrow 0.$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} |T|_{\leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})} &:= \{x \in |T| : \text{HN}(\mathcal{V}_x) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})\}, \\ |T|_{\geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})} &:= \{x \in |T| : \text{HN}(\mathcal{V}_x) \geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})\}. \end{aligned}$$

By [KL15, Theorem 7.4.5], the function $x \mapsto \text{HN}(\mathcal{V}_x)$ on $|T|$ is lower semicontinuous. Hence $|T|_{\leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ (resp. $|T|_{\geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$) is an open (resp. closed) subset of $|T|$. Moreover, both $|T|_{\leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ and $|T|_{\geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ are stable under generalizations. Therefore the image of $|T|_{\leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})} \cap |T|_{\geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ under the quotient map $|T| \rightarrow |\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|$ is a locally closed and generalizing subset $|\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|_{\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ of $|\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|$. Arguing as in the proof of [Sch18, Proposition 11.20], we find that $|\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|_{\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ gives rise to a locally spatial subdiamond $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ of $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ with an identification

$$\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})} \cong \mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$$

as a functor on $\text{Perfd}/_{\text{Spa}(F)}$. Therefore we deduce that $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a locally spatial diamond over $\text{Spd}(F)$. We also obtain the partial properness as in the proof of Lemma 3.1.3.

Let us now assume that $\mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is not empty. Define $(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0$ as in the proof of Proposition 3.1.4. Let S be an arbitrary perfectoid space of $\text{Spa}(F)$. By definition we have

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0(S) = \{(\iota, \psi) \in \mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E})(S) \times \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}(S) : \psi \circ \iota = 0\}.$$

Hence every element $(\iota, \psi) \in (\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0(S)$ yields a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_S \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{E}_S \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{F}_S \longrightarrow 0$$

where the exactness at the middle term follows from the fact that $\ker(\psi)_{\bar{x}} \simeq \mathcal{K}$ for every geometric point $\bar{x} \rightarrow S$. We thus have a natural map

$$(\mathcal{I}\text{nj}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}) \times_{\text{Spd}(F)} \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))_0(S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}\text{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}},$$

which is an $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$ -torsor. Since $\dim \text{Aut}(\mathcal{E}) = \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0}$ by Proposition 2.3.2, we obtain the desired dimension formula by (3.3) and Proposition 2.2.8. \square

3.2. Main theorem.

Our goal in this subsection is to prove the following result:

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X with $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) < \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$. Assume that one of $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$ is semistable. Then there exists a short exact sequence of vector bundles on X*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0$$

if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) \mathcal{E} strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{D} .
- (ii) \mathcal{E}^\vee strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{F}^\vee .
- (iii) $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{F})$.

Remark. By Proposition 2.1.7, we have $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) = 0$ if $\mu_{\min}(\mathcal{D}) > \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$.

It is relatively easy to verify the necessity part of Theorem 3.2.1.

Proposition 3.2.2. *Assume that vector bundles \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} on X fit into an exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Then \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} should satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3.2.1.

Proof. The exact sequence in the statement gives a surjective bundle map $\mathcal{E} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}$, which in turn implies the condition (ii) by Proposition 2.3.5 (and Proposition 2.3.2). Similarly, the dual exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}^\vee \longrightarrow 0$$

implies the condition (i). In addition, the exact sequence in the statement yields the condition (iii) as a formal consequence of the slope formalism as shown in [Ked17, Lemma 3.4.17]. \square

We now aim to prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.2.1 when either \mathcal{D} or \mathcal{F} is semistable.

Lemma 3.2.3. *Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{K} be vector bundles on X with the following properties:*

- (i) \mathcal{D} is semistable while \mathcal{K} is not.
- (ii) $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) < \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$.
- (iii) $\text{rk}(\mathcal{D}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\text{deg}(\mathcal{D}) = \text{deg}(\mathcal{K})$.

Then we have $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K}) \geq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D})$ with the common part of the two polygons given by $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{K})})$.




FIGURE 6. Illustration of Lemma 3.2.3.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} denote the (not necessarily convex) polygon obtained by concatenating $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{K})$, as illustrated by the red polygon and the blue polygon (including the dotted line segment) in Figure 6. The properties (i) and (iii) together imply $\text{HN}(\mathcal{D}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{K})$ with no common parts other than the endpoints. In addition, the property (ii) implies that $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D})$ is a concatenation of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{D})$. Therefore \mathcal{P} lies above $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D})$ with the common part given by $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$.

Observe that $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ is obtained from \mathcal{P} by rearranging the line segments in order of descending slope. The rearrangement only applies to the line segments of slopes in the interval $[\mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F}), \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{K})]$. The resulting rearrangement of these line segments, illustrated by the green polygon in Figure 6, lies above the corresponding parts in \mathcal{P} with no common parts; in fact, $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D})$ is the upper convex hull of the set of points $(\text{rk}(\mathcal{W}), \text{deg}(\mathcal{W}))$ for all subbundles \mathcal{W} of $\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D}$, as shown in [Ked17, Lemma 3.4.15]. Hence we establish the desired assertion. \square

Proposition 3.2.4. *Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X that satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3.2.1. In addition, we assume that \mathcal{D} is semistable. For every subbundle \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{E} with $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$, we have an inequality*

$$\text{deg}(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} - \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{K})^{\geq 0} \leq 0$$

with equality if and only if $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. The desired inequality can be written as

$$\text{deg}(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} \leq \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}^\vee \otimes (\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K}))^{\geq 0}. \quad (3.4)$$

Let us write the HN decomposition of \mathcal{K} as

$$\mathcal{K} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^l \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i},$$

and set $\mathcal{K}_i := \mathcal{O}(\lambda_i)^{\oplus m_i}$. Let P_i, Q_i , and R_i respectively denote the right endpoint of $\text{HN}((\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})^{>\lambda_i})$, $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}^{>\lambda_i})$, and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{K}_i)$. We also let O denote the origin. By Lemma 2.4.3 and Lemma 2.4.4 we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} &= \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}^{>\lambda_i})^{\geq 0} = 2 \cdot \text{Area}(OQ_iR_i), \\ \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes (\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K}))^{\geq 0} &= \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes (\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})^{>\lambda_i})^{\geq 0} = 2 \cdot \text{Area}(OP_iR_i). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Let ℓ_i and ℓ'_i be respectively the line of slope λ_i passing through P_i and R_i . We find that Q_i must lie on or below the line ℓ_i by the assumption $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ and the convexity of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$. We also observe that Q_i must on or lie above the line ℓ'_i as it is connected to O by line segments of slope greater than λ_i . Hence Q_i must lie on or between ℓ_i and ℓ'_i , thereby yielding an inequality

$$\text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} \leq \text{deg}(\mathcal{K}_i^\vee \otimes (\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K}))^{\geq 0}. \quad (3.6)$$

by (3.5). We then obtain the desired inequality (3.4) by taking the sum of the above inequality for $i = 1, \dots, l$.





FIGURE 7. Illustration of the inequality (3.6).

We now verify that equality in (3.4) holds if $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{D}$. Let P and Q respectively denote the right endpoint of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$. Since \mathcal{D} is a semistable vector bundle with $\mu(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$, the condition (iii) in Theorem 3.2.1 implies $\mu(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$, as illustrated in Figure 8. Hence we use Lemma 2.4.4 and Lemma 2.4.5 to find

$$\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^{\geq 0} = 2 \cdot \text{Area}(OPQ) = \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} \quad \text{and} \quad \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})^{\geq 0} = 0,$$

thereby deducing that equality in (3.4) holds when $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{D}$.


 FIGURE 8. Illustration of the condition (iii) in Theorem 3.2.1 when \mathcal{D} is semistable.

It remains to show that equality in (3.4) implies $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{D}$. Note that the conditions $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{D})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ together yield

$$\text{rk}(\mathcal{D}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{K}) \quad \text{and} \quad \deg(\mathcal{D}) = \deg(\mathcal{K}). \quad (3.7)$$

Since \mathcal{D} is semistable, we have $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{D}$ if and only if \mathcal{K} is semistable. It is thus sufficient to show that equality in (3.4) never holds if \mathcal{K} is not semistable.

Let us now assume that \mathcal{K} is not semistable. By (3.7) and the assumption $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) < \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$, we can use Lemma 3.2.3 to find $\text{HN}(\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{F}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ with $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{K})})$ as the common part. Then by the condition (iii) in Theorem 3.2.1 we obtain $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ with the common part included in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{F}^{\geq \mu_{\max}(\mathcal{K})})$. This implies that each ℓ_i must lie above $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$, which means that each Q_i does not lie on ℓ_i . Hence by (3.5) we find that equality in (3.6) never holds, thereby deducing that equality in (3.4) does not hold as desired. \square

Proposition 3.2.5. *Theorem 3.2.1 holds when either \mathcal{D} or \mathcal{F} is semistable.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2.2, we only need to establish the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.2.1. Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3.2.1. Observe that the conditions in Theorem 3.2.1 remain valid if \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} are replaced by their dual bundles. Moreover, the existence of an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0$$

is equivalent to the existence of an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}^\vee \longrightarrow 0.$$

Hence it suffices to consider the case where \mathcal{D} is semistable.

We wish to show that $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}(F)$ is not empty. As remarked in the proof of [BFH⁺17, Lemma 3.3.14], the diamond $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}$ is an open subdiamond of $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, which is an open subdiamond of $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Hence by Proposition 2.3.2 it is enough to show that $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}$ is not empty.

Suppose for contradiction that $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}}$ is empty. By Proposition 2.3.5, the condition (ii) in Theorem 3.2.1 implies the nonemptiness of $\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Hence Proposition 2.3.2 yields

$$\dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \deg(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F}) \geq 0.$$

Let S be the set of isomorphism classes of all proper subbundles \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{E} with $\text{rk}(\mathcal{K}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) - \text{rk}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\deg(\mathcal{K}) = \deg(\mathcal{E}) - \deg(\mathcal{F})$. By Proposition 2.3.5 we find that S is a finite set. Since $\dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$ by our assumption, Proposition 3.1.4 and Proposition 3.2.4 together yield

$$\dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}} < \dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \quad \text{for all } \mathcal{K} \in S.$$

Moreover, by definition we have a decomposition

$$|\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})| = \coprod_{\mathcal{K} \in S} |\text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}}|.$$

We thus obtain

$$\dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \sup_{\mathcal{K} \in S} \dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathcal{K}} < \dim \text{Surj}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}),$$

thereby completing the proof by contradiction. \square

It remains to verify the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.2.1 when \mathcal{E} is semistable.

Proposition 3.2.6. *Let $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$, and \mathcal{V} be vector bundles on X with the following properties:*

- (i) \mathcal{V} strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{D} .
- (ii) \mathcal{V}^\vee strongly slopewise dominates \mathcal{F}^\vee .
- (iii) $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V}) \leq \text{HN}(\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{F})$.
- (iv) \mathcal{E} is semistable with $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{rk}(\mathcal{D}) + \text{rk}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\deg(\mathcal{E}) = \deg(\mathcal{D}) + \deg(\mathcal{F})$.
- (v) $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) < \mu(\mathcal{E}) < \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$.

Then we have an inequality

$$\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} \leq \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}$$

with equality if and only if $\mathcal{V} \simeq \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. The desired inequality can be written as

$$\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} + \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - 2 \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} \leq \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0}. \quad (3.8)$$

Let P and Q respectively denote the right endpoint of $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$. Observe that we have

$$\deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0} + \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0} \leq \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0}, \quad (3.9)$$

since by Lemma 2.4.5 the left side and the right side are respectively equal to twice the area of the shaded region in Figure 9 and twice the area of the region enclosed by $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\text{HN}(\mathcal{E})$. Moreover, equality in (3.9) holds if and only if the area of the triangle OPQ is zero, or equivalently $\mathcal{V} \simeq \mathcal{E}$. Hence by (3.8) and (3.9) it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0}, \\ \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$




FIGURE 9. Illustration of (3.9).

Let us write $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{D}) := (d_i)$, $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{F}) := (f_j)$, and $\overrightarrow{\text{HN}}(\mathcal{V}) := (v_k)$. By Lemma 2.4.4 and the condition (v) we find

$$\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} = \sum d_i \times \sum f_j.$$

In addition, the condition (iii) implies

$$\sum v_i = \sum d_i + \sum f_j.$$

Then by Lemma 2.4.2 and Lemma 2.4.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} &= \sum_{\mu(d_i) \leq \mu(v_k)} d_i \times v_k - \sum d_i \times (\sum v_k - \sum d_i) \\
&= \sum_{\mu(d_i) \leq \mu(v_k)} d_i \times v_k - \sum d_i \times \sum v_k \\
&= - \sum_{\mu(d_i) > \mu(v_k)} d_i \times v_k = \sum_{\mu(v_k) < \mu(d_i)} v_k \times d_i \\
&= \deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})^{\geq 0} = \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D}\right)^{\geq 0}, \\
\deg(\mathcal{V}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} - \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0} &= \sum_{\mu(v_l) \leq \mu(f_j)} v_l \times f_j - (\sum v_k - \sum f_j) \times \sum f_j \\
&= \sum_{\mu(v_k) \leq \mu(f_j)} v_l \times f_j - \sum v_k \times \sum f_j \\
&= - \sum_{\mu(v_k) > \mu(f_j)} v_k \times f_j = \sum_{\mu(f_j) < \mu(v_k)} f_j \times v_k \\
&= \deg(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{V}^\vee)^{\geq 0} = \deg\left(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0}.
\end{aligned}$$

We may thus write (3.10) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D}\right)^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0}, \\
\deg\left(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

For each k , let \mathcal{V}_k denote the vector bundle on X such that $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V}_k)$ consists of a single vector v_k . In other words, each \mathcal{V}_k is the semistable vector bundle that represents the line segment in $\text{HN}(\mathcal{V})$ corresponding to v_k . We write $\lambda_k := \mu(\mathcal{V}_k)$. Then by (3.11) it is enough to show

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg(\mathcal{V}_k^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left(\mathcal{V}_k^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}\right)^{\geq 0} && \text{if } \lambda_k < \mu(\mathcal{E}), \\
\deg(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k)^{\geq 0} &\leq \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k\right)^{\geq 0} && \text{if } \lambda_k \geq \mu(\mathcal{E}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Let us consider the case $\lambda_k < \mu(\mathcal{E})$. Since $\mu(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k)) = 0$ by definition, we use Lemma 2.4.7 to find

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg(\mathcal{V}_k^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})^{\geq 0} &= \frac{1}{\text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D}(-\lambda_k))^{\geq 0} \\
&= \frac{\text{rk}(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k))}{\text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{D}(-\lambda_k))^{\geq 0}, \\
\deg(\mathcal{V}_k^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})})^{\geq 0} &= \frac{1}{\text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg\left(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k)\right)^{\geq 0} \\
&= \frac{\text{rk}(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k))}{\text{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k))^{\geq 0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the conditions (i) and (v) together imply the slopewise dominance of $\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}$ on \mathcal{D} , which in turn yields the slopewise dominance of $\mathcal{V}^{< \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k)$ on $\mathcal{D}(-\lambda_k)$. We thus verify (3.12) by Lemma 2.4.9.

It remains to consider the case $\lambda_k \geq \mu(\mathcal{E})$. As $\mu(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k)) = 0$ by definition, we use Lemma 2.4.7 to find

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k)^{\geq 0} &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{F}(-\lambda_k)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k))^{\geq 0} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k))}{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{F}(-\lambda_k)^\vee)^{\geq 0}, \\ \deg\left((\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k\right)^{\geq 0} &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg\left(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k)^\vee \otimes \mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k)\right)^{\geq 0} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{V}_k(-\lambda_k))}{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{O}(-\lambda_k))^2} \cdot \deg(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k)^\vee)^{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the conditions (ii) and (v) together yield the slopewise dominance of $(\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})})^\vee$ on \mathcal{F}^\vee , thereby implying the slopewise dominance of $\mathcal{V}^{\geq \mu(\mathcal{E})}(-\lambda_k)^\vee$ on $\mathcal{F}(-\lambda_k)^\vee$. Hence we verify (3.12) by Lemma 2.4.9. \square

Proposition 3.2.7. *Theorem 3.2.1 holds when \mathcal{E} is semistable.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2.2, we only need to establish the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.2.1. Let \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} , and \mathcal{F} be vector bundles on X with \mathcal{E} semistable such that the conditions of Theorem 3.2.1 are satisfied. By Proposition 2.3.4, the conditions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 3.2.1 imply

$$\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Moreover, when either equality holds we have $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{F}$ by the condition (iii) in Theorem 3.2.1, thereby obtaining a (splitting) exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Hence we may henceforth assume $\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) < \mu(\mathcal{E}) < \mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$.

We wish to show that $\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}(F)$ is not empty. The proof of Proposition 3.1.5 shows that $|\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}(F)| = |\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|_{\mathrm{HN}(\mathcal{E})} = |\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|_{\leq \mathrm{HN}(\mathcal{E})}$ is an open subset of $|\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})|$, which means that $\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is an open subdiamond of $\mathrm{Ext}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) \cong \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})$. Hence by Proposition 3.1.2 it suffices to show that $\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is not empty.

Suppose for contradiction that $\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}}$ is empty. By Proposition 3.1.2 we have

$$\dim \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) = \dim \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{D})^{\geq 0} = \deg(\mathcal{D}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F})^{\geq 0}. \quad (3.13)$$

Let T be the set of all isomorphism classes of vector bundles \mathcal{V} on X which fit into an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proposition 3.2.2 implies that T is a finite set. Moreover, as $\dim \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{E}} = 0$ by our assumption, we use Proposition 3.1.5, Proposition 3.2.6, and (3.13) to find

$$\dim \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{V}} < \dim \mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}) \quad \text{for all } \mathcal{V} \in T.$$

However, this is impossible since we have a decomposition

$$|\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})| = \coprod_{\mathcal{V} \in T} |\mathcal{E}\mathrm{xt}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})_{\mathcal{V}}|.$$

We thus complete the proof by contradiction. \square

Hence we conclude the proof of Theorem 3.2.1 by Proposition 3.2.2, Proposition 3.2.5, and Proposition 3.2.7.

REFERENCES

- [BFH⁺17] Christopher Birkbeck, Tony Feng, David Hansen, Serin Hong, Qirui Li, Anthony Wang, and Lynelle Ye, *Extensions of vector bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, to appear.
- [CFS17] Miaofen Chen, Laurent Fargues, and Xu Shen, *On the structure of some p -adic period domains*, arXiv:1710.06935.
- [Col02] Pierre Colmez, *Espaces de banach de dimension finie*, Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu **1** (2002), no. 3, 331439.
- [CS17] Ana Caraiani and Peter Scholze, *On the generic part of the cohomology of compact unitary Shimura varieties*, Annals of Math. **186** (2017), no. 3, 649–766.
- [Far16] Laurent Fargues, *Geometrization of the local langlands correspondence: an overview*, arXiv:1602.00999.
- [FF18] Laurent Fargues and Jean-Marc Fontaine, *Courbes et fibrés vectoriels en théorie de Hodge p -adique*, Astérisque **406** (2018).
- [Han17] David Hansen, *Degenerating vector bundles in p -adic Hodge theory*, preprint.
- [Hon19a] Serin Hong, *Classification of quotient bundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve*, arXiv:1904.02918.
- [Hon19b] ———, *Classification of subbundles on the Fargues-Fontaine curve*, arXiv:1911.04119.
- [Ked08] Kiran S. Kedlaya, *Slope filtrations for relative Frobenius*, Astérisque **319** (2008), 259–301, Représentations p -adiques de groupes p -adiques. I. Représentations galoisiennes et (ϕ, Γ) -modules.
- [Ked17] ———, *Sheaves, stacks, and shtukas*, Lecture notes for 2017 Arizona Winter School.
- [KL15] Kiran S. Kedlaya and Ruochuan Liu, *Relative p -adic Hodge theory: foundations*, Astérisque **371** (2015), 239.
- [Sch12] Peter Scholze, *Perfectoid spaces*, Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS **116** (2012), no. 1, 245–313.
- [Sch18] ———, *Étale cohomology of diamonds*, arXiv:1709.07343.
- [SW] Peter Scholze and Jared Weinstein, *Lectures on p -adic geometry*.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 530 CHURCH STREET, ANN ARBOR MI 48109
E-mail address: `serinh@umich.edu`