

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 in terms of local wall crossing. 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 [58, 23] 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 [60, 48, 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 [14], 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 [64, 58, 23]. 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 [28, 29, 15, 36], especially in the Fano setting [46, 43, 63]. 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 [35]. 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. We also require the positivity condition $\operatorname{Re}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) > 0$. The Z -critical condition is then 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 [13, Conjecture 1.1]; see [42] 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 closely related to being a zero of the moment map. This can be viewed as an analogue of the Fujiki-Donaldson moment map picture for the cscK equation [28, 22], 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 the above finite dimensional moment map problem on B 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.
- (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 in terms of local wall-crossing. 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 demonstrates that the algebro-geometric walls, governed by Z -stability, agree with the differential-geometric walls, governed by the existence of Z -critical Kähler metrics.

Our results can be seen as manifold analogues of results established in [14] 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 [39] and Sektnan-Tipler [51]) 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 [41]. The quite beautiful theory of this equation on holomorphic line bundles has developed with speed over the past few years [37, 8, 11, 12], 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

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

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 [8], 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 [13], 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 [17, 18].

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][17, 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 Frances Kirwan, John McCarthy, Jacopo Stoppa and especially Lars Sektnan for several interesting discussions on this circle of ideas, Michael Hallam, Yoshi Hashimoto and Eiji Inoue for technical advice 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 $\Theta \in \bigoplus_j H^{j,j}(X, \mathbb{C})$ 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

$$f(K_X) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j K_X^j,$$

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 often set $\varepsilon = k^{-1}$ and denote the induced quantity by $Z_\varepsilon(X, L)$.

We will sometimes simply call a polynomial central charge a central charge when the dependence on k is clear from context. The definition 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. [58][23, 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 $t \neq 0 \in \mathbb{C}$.

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 [61, 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. There is 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, so 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 only 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” [11, 8], 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

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

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. A central charge of special interest 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 [12, 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 [58, 23]. 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 rather is proven by Odaka and Wang to be an equivalent one [45, Theorem 3.2] [61, Section 3] (see also [23, 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 [17, 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 [13, Definition 2.7], though this notion 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 [38, Section 2] and has links with Z -stability of holomorphic line bundles [14, 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

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

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

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

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

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

as 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

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

and the positivity condition $\text{Re}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) > 0$ holds.

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, for a generic choice of central charge ensuring the presence of a non-zero term involving the Laplacian, the equation is a sixth-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 $Z(X, L) \in \mathbb{C}$, as we have assumed the positivity condition $\text{Re}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) > 0$ (in fact one only needs that this function is never zero, and the sign is irrelevant).

Remark 2.22. In the vector bundle theory, rather than working with arbitrary connections one works with “almost-calibrated connections” [12, 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 [14, Lemma 2.8], and is analogous to the positivity condition $\text{Re}(e^{-i\varphi(X, L)} \tilde{Z}(\omega)) > 0$ that we have imposed. The notion of a “subsolution” also plays a prominent role in the bundle theory [11], which for example forces the equation to be elliptic in that situation [14, Lemma 2.32]. We note that, also in the manifold case, ellipticity of the Z -critical equation cannot hold in general, and hence for this reason and others it is natural to ask if there is a manifold analogue of the notion of a subsolution.

The appearance of the phase is justified by the following.

Lemma 2.23. 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

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

□

The Z -critical condition can be reformulated as follows. The analogous reformulation, in the special case of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation [37], has been crucial to all progress in understanding the equation geometrically, and an analogous reformulation holds for Z -critical connections on holomorphic line bundles [14, Example 2.24].

Lemma 2.24. *Write*

$$\tilde{Z}(\omega) = \operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}(\omega) + i \operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}(\omega).$$

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

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

Proof. We calculate

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

which vanishes if and only if

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

□

Example 2.25. 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*

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

which is the manifold analogue of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on a holomorphic line bundle. Strictly speaking this equation does not conform to our normalisation of the central charge, but the central charge $-n!(-i)^{3n+1} \overline{Z(X, L)}$ (with $\overline{Z(X, L)}$ denoting the complex conjugate of $Z(X, L)$), which produces an equivalent partial differential equation, does.

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 [10, Definition 4.1] and Song-Weinkove [53, 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 $\text{Ric } \omega$ 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

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

the deformed cscK equation takes the much simpler form

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

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 [50], 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 2.26. *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*

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

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

Proof. We first calculate

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

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

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

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

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

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 $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1})$, 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 $p : X \rightarrow Y$ [18, 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 2.27. 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 [24, 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 2.25. 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

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

we require that $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$, $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-2}) > 0$ and $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-3}) = 0$. We also assume that $a_j = 1$ for all j for simplicity, though all that one needs is that the real parts are positive for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. These assumptions are used to control the behaviour of the linearisation of the equation. We expect that the condition on ρ_{n-3} can be removed.

The third condition concerns the form $\theta \in \Theta$. A basic technical assumption we make is that $\theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$, though we also expect this assumption can be removed. We furthermore require that θ extends to a smooth, equivariant form on the test

configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ producing the cscK degeneration of (X, L) (which exists by analytic K-semistability), and also that θ extends to certain other deformations of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$. More precisely, as we will recall in Section 3.3.3, the Kuranishi space of \mathcal{X}_0 admits an action of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$, and we require that θ extends smoothly to an equivariant form on the universal family over the Kuranishi space. The condition is modelled on the bundle situation [14], 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 F over Y .

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 [16, Section 4] and [52, 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 [16, 52] are essentially equivalent, our discussion is closer to that of Sjöström Dyrefelt [52].

The setup is simple case of the general theory, where we have a fixed smooth polarised variety; in general one considers holomorphic submersions. We thus let (X, L) be a smooth polarised variety of dimension n and suppose that $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-p}$ are $n-p+1$ closed $(1,1)$ -forms on 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 θ is a closed real (p,p) -form on X 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*, denoted

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

by

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

The Deligne functional can be considered as an operator taking $n-p+1$ functions to a real number. The definition is due to Sjöström Dyrefelt [52, Definition 2.1] and is implicit in [16, 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 $\langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle$ satisfies the following properties:*

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

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

$$\langle \psi'_0, \dots, \psi'_{n-p}; \theta \rangle - \langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle = \int_X (\psi'_0 - \psi_0) (\eta_1 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (\eta_m + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_{n-p}) \wedge \theta,$$

and analogous formulae hold when varying other ψ_j .

Proof. (i) This follows from an integration by parts formula when $\theta = 0$ [52, 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 any other ψ_j follows from the symmetry described as (i). \square

We will be interested in the behaviour of Deligne functionals in families. The most basic property of these functionals in families is the following.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose B is a complex manifold, and let $\pi : X \times B \rightarrow B$ be the projection, and write $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-p}, \theta$ as the forms on $X \times B$ induced by pullback of the corresponding forms on X . Let $\psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}$ be functions on $X \times B$, and denote by*

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

the function of $b \in B$

$$\langle \psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-p}; \theta \rangle_B(b) = \langle \psi_0|_{X \times \{b\}}, \dots, \psi_{n-p}|_{X \times \{b\}}; \theta|_{X \times \{b\}},$$

where this denotes the Deligne functional computed on the fibre $X \times \{b\}$ over $b \in B$. Then

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

This result will produce Kähler potentials for natural Kähler metrics produced on holomorphic submersions via fibre integrals.

A closely related property of Deligne functionals allows the differential-geometric computation of intersection numbers on the total space of test configurations. To explain this, consider a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with central fibre \mathcal{X}_0 smooth. 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 $1 \in 2\Delta$. Fixing a fibre $\mathcal{X}_1 \cong X$, we obtain a form $\rho(t) \cdot \theta$ on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0$ which we assume extends to a smooth form with cohomology class Θ on \mathcal{X} , where $\rho(t)$ denotes the \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathcal{X} .

Let $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_{n-p}$ be S^1 -invariant forms on \mathcal{X} with $[\Omega_0], [\Omega_1], \dots, [\Omega_{n-p}]$ \mathbb{C}^* -invariant cohomology classes on \mathcal{X} . Thus

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

for some smooth family of functions ψ_j^t depending on t , with ψ_0 induced by the analogous procedure using $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$. 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 3.5. [52, Theorem 4.9][16, Theorem 1.4] *We have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_0 \cdot \mathcal{L}_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \mathcal{L}_{n-p} \cdot \Theta = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\tau} \langle \psi_0^\tau, \dots, \psi_{n-p}^\tau; \theta \rangle (X).$$

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 Deligne functional on $X = \mathcal{X}_1$. This Lemma is proven in [52, 16] 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 3.6. In the special case $\theta = 0$, the Deligne functional given by Equation (3.1) was introduced by Chen-Tian [10, 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 [53, 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 [12, Section 2], and their functional bears some formal similarities with our Z -energy.

Definition 3.7. We define the Z -energy to be the functional $E_Z : \mathcal{H}_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated to the central charge Z .

Remark 3.8. It is straightforward to check that $E_Z(\psi + c) = E_Z(\psi)$, so that one can view E_Z as a functional on Kähler metrics rather than Kähler potentials.

The most important aspect of the Z -energy is its Euler-Lagrange equation.

Proposition 3.9. *Given a path of metrics $\psi_t \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ with associated Kähler metric ω_t , we have*

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

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

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

The calculation from here is closely analogous to that of Song-Weinkove [53, 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 3.5, we set

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

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 3.10. [31, 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 [55, Example 4.26]. We can now relate the Z -energy to the algebro-geometric invariants of interest.

Proposition 3.11. *We have equalities*

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

Proof. The second equality is an immediate consequence of our definition of E_Z through Deligne functionals and Lemma 3.5, using that

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

which is analogous to the fact used in Lemma 2.23. To prove the first equality, unravelling the definition of τ and the variational formula for E_Z proven in Proposition 3.9 with $\omega_t = \beta(t)^* \omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{X=\mathcal{X}_t}$ we see that

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

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

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_1} (\beta(t)^* h) \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n = \int_{\mathcal{X}_t} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{X}_t})) \omega_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{X}_t}^n,$$

which converges to $\int_{\mathcal{X}_0} h \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi} \tilde{Z}(\omega_0)) \omega_0^n$ 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 3.12. *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*

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

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

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

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.

3.3.1. Moment maps in finite dimensions. Many geometric equations have an interpretation through moment maps; this has been especially influential for the cscK equation. We will give two ways of viewing the Z -critical equation as a moment map. The first is a finite-dimensional geometric interpretation, on the base of a holomorphic submersion, while the second is closer in spirit to the infinite dimensional viewpoint of Fujiki-Donaldson for the cscK equation [28, 22].

The setup is modelled on the situation of a test configuration $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for (X, L) with smooth central fibre. The properties of interest are firstly that there is an S^1 -action on both \mathbb{C} and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, making π an S^1 -equivariant map, secondly that all fibres over the open dense orbit under the associated \mathbb{C}^* -action are isomorphic, and thirdly that we may choose an S^1 -invariant relatively Kähler

metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$. If we had considered test configurations over the unit disc Δ , the same properties would be true with the \mathbb{C}^* -action meant only locally, in the sense that one only obtains an action induced by sufficiently small elements of the Lie algebra of \mathbb{C}^* .

More generally, we consider a holomorphic submersion $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$ over a complex manifold B , with \mathcal{L} a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle. We assume that B admits an effective action of a compact Lie group, which induces an effective local action of the complexification G of K . In addition we assume that there is a K -action on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ making π an equivariant map, and fix a K -invariant relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$. We lastly assume that there is an open dense orbit associated to G such that all fibres are isomorphic to (X, L) ; we denote this orbit as $\mathcal{X}^o \rightarrow B^o$.

Let v be a holomorphic vector field on \mathcal{X} induced by an element of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{k} of K . Denote by h_v the function on \mathcal{X} defined by the equation

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

where J denotes the almost-complex structure of \mathcal{X} and the differentials on the right hand side are also computed on \mathcal{X} . As in Section 3.1 we will refer to h as a Hamiltonian, even though $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ is only relatively Kähler. Note that h_v does restrict to a genuine Hamiltonian for v on the fibres over B on which v induces a holomorphic vector field; these are the fibres over points for which the corresponding vector field on B vanishes.

We now fix the input of the Z -critical equation. Setting $\varepsilon = k^{-1}$, our central charge can be written

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

We have fixed a representative $\theta \in \Theta$, and we assume that the form $G\theta$ defined on the dense orbit \mathcal{X}^o extends to a smooth form on \mathcal{X} itself, and denote this form abusively by θ , which is automatically a G -invariant closed form on \mathcal{X} . The form $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ induces a metric on the relative holomorphic tangent bundle $T_{\mathcal{X}/B}$, and hence on its top exterior power $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$, and we denote the curvature of the latter metric as $\rho \in c_1(-K_{\mathcal{X}/B})$.

We associate to $Z_{\varepsilon}(X, L)$ an $(n+1, n+1)$ -form on \mathcal{X} as follows. 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 $\frac{1}{l+1} \omega_{\mathcal{X}}^{l+1} \wedge \rho^j \wedge \theta$. This induces a form $\tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, and we set

$$(3.3) \quad \Omega_{\varepsilon} = \text{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi_{\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathcal{X}/B} \tilde{Z}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \right)$$

to be the associated fibre integral. By general properties of fibre integrals, this produces a closed $(1, 1)$ -form on \mathcal{X} . K -invariance of the forms on \mathcal{X} and of the map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ imply that Ω_{ε} is K -invariant. In general, the form Ω_{ε} may not be Kähler, which in addition requires positivity. In our applications, Ω_{ε} will however be Kähler for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

We let ω_b denote the restriction of $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ to the fibre \mathcal{X}_b over b , and denote $\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_{\varepsilon}} \tilde{Z}_{\varepsilon}(\omega_b))$ the Z -critical operator computed on \mathcal{X}_b with respect to ω_b . We

similarly set $h_{v,b}$ be the restriction of a Hamiltonian h_v to the fibre \mathcal{X}_b . Define a map $\mu_\varepsilon : B \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}^*$ by

$$\langle \mu_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} h_{v,b} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_b)) \omega_b^n,$$

where $v \in \mathfrak{k}$ is viewed as inducing a holomorphic vector field on \mathcal{X} to induce the Hamiltonian h_v .

Theorem 3.13. *μ_ε is a moment map with respect to the K -action on B and with respect to the form Ω_ε .*

Here we mean that the defining conditions of a moment map are satisfied, namely that

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

and μ is K -equivariant when \mathfrak{k}^* is given the coadjoint action; in general we emphasise that Ω_ε is not actually a symplectic form (although for ε sufficiently small it will be in our applications, producing genuine moment maps). In the contraction $\iota_v \Omega_\varepsilon$ we view $v \in \mathfrak{k}$ as inducing a holomorphic vector field on B .

Proof. We first show that the equation $d\langle \mu_\varepsilon, v \rangle = -\iota_v \Omega_\varepsilon$ holds. Note that it is enough to show that this holds on the dense locus B° , since both sides of the equation extend continuously to B .

We fix a point $b \in B$ at which we wish to demonstrate the moment map equation, and consider the orbit U of $b \in B$ under the G -action. We fix an isomorphism $(\mathcal{X}_b, \mathcal{L}_b) \cong (X, L)$ and simply write $\omega_b = \omega$. The G -action induces an isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \cong (X \times U, L)$$

where $B^\circ \cong U \subset G$ is a submanifold. Since we only obtain a local action of G on B , U may not consist of all of G in general. The isomorphism $\mathcal{X} \cong X \times U$ is in addition compatible with the projections to B° . The relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$ thus induces a form $\omega_{X \times U}$ on $X \times U$ and we can define

$$E_Z : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

defined as the Z -energy with respect to the reference metric ω (or rather its pullback to $X \times U$) and the varying metric $\omega_{X \times U}$ on the fibres over U . Proposition 3.4 then implies that on $U \cong B^\circ$ we have

$$(3.4) \quad i\partial\bar{\partial}E_{Z_\varepsilon} = \Omega_\varepsilon.$$

By Proposition 3.9, the derivative of the Z -energy along any path $\omega_t = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_{Z_\varepsilon}(\psi_t) = \int_X \dot{\psi}_t \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n.$$

Considering the path ω_t defined above, the defining property of the Hamiltonian h means that $\dot{\psi}_0 = h_{v,b}$ on $\mathcal{X}_b \cong X$. Thus

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

But this is then all we need: by a standard calculation [54, Lemma 12]

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

so it follows that

$$(3.5) \quad \iota_v(\Omega_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}d(Jv(E_{Z_\varepsilon})) = \frac{1}{2}d\left(\frac{d}{dt}E_{Z_\varepsilon}(\exp(Jvt).p)\right) = \frac{1}{2}d\left(\frac{d}{dt}E_{Z_\varepsilon}(\psi_t)\right) = -d\langle\mu_\varepsilon, h\rangle,$$

proving the first defining property of a moment map with respect to v at the point b . But by continuity this implies that the same property holds on all of B .

What remains to prove is K -equivariance of μ_ε , which requires us to show for all $g \in K$

$$\langle\mu_\varepsilon(g.b), v\rangle = \langle\mu_\varepsilon(g.b), g^{-1}.v\rangle,$$

where K acts on \mathfrak{k} by the adjoint action. However the Hamiltonian on \mathcal{X} with respect to $g^{-1}.v$ is simply the pullback g^*h_v , meaning $g^*h_{v,g(b)} = h_{g^{-1}.v,b}$. Thus, using K -invariance of $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$, the equality

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_{g(b)}} h_{v,g(b)} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_{g(b)})) \omega_{g(b)}^n = \int_{\mathcal{X}_b} g^*h_{v,g(b)} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_b)) \omega_b^n$$

is enough to imply equivariance. \square

Remark 3.14. All results in this section hold assuming less regularity than smoothness, for example considering L_k^2 -Kähler metrics for k sufficiently large.

Remark 3.15. 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 [65]. The approach above seems to be new even in the limiting case that $Z_\varepsilon(X, L) = \varepsilon^{-n} \int_X (iL^n - \varepsilon K_X.L^{n-1})$, where this gives a new interpretation of the scalar curvature as a moment map.

3.3.2. Moment maps in infinite dimensions. We next demonstrate how the Z -critical equation appears as a moment map in infinite dimensions. Analogously to the Fujiki-Donaldson moment map interpretation of the cscK equation [28, 22], we fix a compact symplectic manifold (M, ω) and consider the space $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ of almost complex structures compatible with ω . We refer to Scarpa [49, Section 1.3] and Gauduchon [31, Section 8] for a good exposition of this space its properties. $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ naturally has the structure of an infinite dimensional complex manifold; its tangent space at $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ is given by

$$T_J\mathcal{J}(M, \omega) = \{A : TM \rightarrow TM \mid AJ + JA = 0, \omega(\cdot, A\cdot) = \omega(A\cdot, \cdot)\},$$

with complex structure defined by $A \rightarrow JA$ on $T_J\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$. At an almost complex structure J , the tangent space can be identified with $\Omega^{0,1}(TX^{1,0})$, the space of $(0, 1)$ -forms with values in holomorphic vector fields [49, p. 14].

We let \mathcal{G} denote the group of exact symplectomorphisms of (M, ω) , which acts naturally on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$. The Lie algebra of \mathcal{G} can be identified with $C_0^\infty(M)$, the functions which integrate to zero, through the Hamiltonian construction. For $h \in C_0^\infty(M)$, we denote by v_h the associated Hamiltonian vector field. The infinitesimal action of \mathcal{G} is then given by

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} P : C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow T_J\mathcal{J}(M, \omega), \\ Ph &= \mathcal{L}_{v_h}J. \end{aligned}$$

Under the identification of $T_J\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ with $\Omega^{0,1}(TX^{1,0})$, the operator P corresponds to the operator [49, Lemma 1.4.3]

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} : C_0^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(TX^{1,0}), \\ \mathcal{D}h &= \bar{\partial}\nabla^{1,0}h. \end{aligned}$$

The operator \mathcal{D} plays a central role in the theory of cscK metrics. Note, for example, that its kernel consists of functions generating global holomorphic vector fields, there are called *holomorphy potentials*.

Now let (X, L) be a smooth polarised variety with complex structure $J_X \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$. We assume for the moment that $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is trivial, and will later consider the other case of interest for our main results, namely that $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is finite. We denote by $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \subset \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ the set of $J' \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ such that there is a diffeomorphism γ , which lies in the connected component of the identity inside the space of diffeomorphisms of M , with $\gamma \cdot J = J_X$. Thus $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ corresponds to complex structures producing manifolds biholomorphic to X . This space is discussed by Gauduchon [31, Section 8.1]; for us an important point will be that $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is actually a complex submanifold of $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ [31, Proposition 8.2.3]. As in the work of Fujiki [28, 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 $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$. The fibre over a complex structure $J_b \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ is simply the complex manifold (M, J_b) .

We next induce a form $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$ on $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ associated to the form θ on \mathcal{U} , using the fact that each fibre of $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is isomorphic to X . For any $B \subset \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ a finite dimensional complex submanifold, the Fischer-Grauert theorem produces an isomorphism $\mathcal{U}|_B \cong X \times B$ commuting with the maps to B . One can extend this isomorphism to an isomorphism of line bundles

$$(3.8) \quad \Psi_B : (\mathcal{U}|_B, \mathcal{L}|_B) \cong (X, L) \times B,$$

perhaps after shrinking B [44, Lemma 5.10] (while the proof given by Newstead assumes algebraicity of B , it also holds in the holomorphic category [33, Lemma 6.3]). Then as we have assumed $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is actually trivial, the isomorphism Ψ_B is actually unique. Pulling back θ on X via Ψ_B induces a closed form θ_B on $\mathcal{U}|_B$, and uniqueness then means that the forms θ_B glue to a closed form $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$ on all of \mathcal{U} . Similarly, using these isomorphisms, the Z -energy induces a function

$$(3.9) \quad E_Z : \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

after fixing the reference Kähler metric ω on X .

Denote by Ω_ε the family of closed $(1, 1)$ -forms on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ given by

$$(3.10) \quad \Omega_\varepsilon = \text{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}}) \right),$$

where $\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{U}})$ is defined just as in Equation (3.3) using the relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$, the form $\rho \in c_1(-K_{\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)})$ induced by the relatively Kähler metric $\omega_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$. The forms Ω_ε are then closed \mathcal{G} -invariant $(1, 1)$ -forms which are not, however, positive in general.

The Z -critical operator can be viewed as a function

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}) : \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \rightarrow C_0^\infty(X),$$

which we wish to demonstrate is a moment map with respect to the Ω_ε . Thus we need to understand the behaviour of $\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z})$ under a change in complex

structure. We will use a similar idea to Section 3.3.1, namely to realise the Z -energy as a Kähler potential, which requires us to relate the change in complex structure to the change in metric structure. Consider a path $J_t \in \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$, and let $F_t \cdot J_t = J_X$ for F_t diffeomorphisms of X . Then we obtain a corresponding path of Kähler metrics $F_t^* \omega = \omega_t = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t$ compatible with J_X . Then the key fact we need is that the path J_t satisfies [56, p. 1083]

$$(3.11) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} J_t = JP\dot{\psi}_0.$$

Theorem 3.16. *The map*

$$\mu_\varepsilon = \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}) : \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega) \rightarrow C_0^\infty(X)$$

is a moment map for the \mathcal{G} -action on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ with respect to the forms Ω_ε .

Here the statement means that the moment map condition is satisfied, note again that Ω_ε may not actually be positive (hence Kähler) in general.

Proof. Fix a point $b \in \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ at which we wish to demonstrate the moment map property, and let Ph be the tangent vector at b induced the element $h \in \text{Lie } \mathcal{G} \cong C_0^\infty(M)$. We show that for any finite dimensional complex submanifold $B \subset \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ containing Ph , the moment map equality

$$-\iota_{Ph}\Omega_\varepsilon = d\langle \mu_\varepsilon, Ph \rangle$$

holds. The proof of this is essentially the same as that of Theorem 3.13.

Perhaps after shrinking B , the family $(\mathcal{U}_B, \mathcal{L}_B) \rightarrow B$ satisfies

$$(3.12) \quad (\mathcal{U}_B, \mathcal{L}_B) \cong (X, L) \times B$$

by the argument of Equation (3.8). We thus obtain a function

$$E_Z : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

by Equation 3.9, which by the argument of Theorem 3.13 satisfies

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}E_Z = \Omega_\varepsilon,$$

an equality of (1,1)-forms on B . Since this holds for each B , it also holds on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$.

Consider a path $J_{b_t} \in B$ of almost complex structures such that the induced tangent vector at $t = 0$ is given by JPh . Then we obtain a corresponding path of Kähler metrics $\omega_t = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_t$ through the isomorphism of Equation (3.12), and Equation (3.11) implies that $\dot{\psi}_0 = h$. It follows that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} E_Z(J_t) = \int_X h \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(J_b)) \omega^n,$$

which means that as functions on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ we have

$$\langle dE_Z, JPh \rangle = \int_X h \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(J_b)) \omega^n = -\langle \mu_\varepsilon(b), Ph \rangle.$$

Then the same argument as Equation (3.5) implies that

$$\iota_{Ph}\Omega_\varepsilon = \iota_{Ph}i\partial\bar{\partial}E_Z = -d\langle \mu_\varepsilon(b), Ph \rangle,$$

which proves the defining equation of the moment map.

The \mathcal{G} -action on $\text{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$ is the adjoint action, which corresponds to pullback of Hamiltonians [49, Equation (1.5)]. Then equivariance follows by the same argument as Theorem 3.13. \square

Remark 3.17. Gauduchon has given another proof that the scalar curvature is a moment map on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ in a similar spirit, but using more direct properties of the Mabuchi functional rather than Deligne pairings [31, Proposition 8.2].

While positivity is not guaranteed for all ε , it will be important to have positivity for finite-dimensional submanifolds and for ε sufficiently small.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $B \subset \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ be a complex submanifold. Then Ω_ε restricts to a Kähler metric for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.*

Proof. Fujiki proves that the form

$$\Omega_0 = - \int_{\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)} \rho \wedge \omega^n + \frac{n}{n+1} \mu(X, L) \int_{\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)} \omega^{n+1}$$

is actually a Kähler metric on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$, and agrees with the usual Kähler metric on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ used in the moment map interpretation of the scalar curvature on $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ [28, Theorem 8.3]. Thus since

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

we have

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

which implies the result.

One can also prove Fujiki's result, namely the equality of the fibre integral Ω_0 and the usual Kähler metric on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$, directly, giving another proof. By [31, Equation 8.1.10], the tangent space $T_J\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is spanned by elements of the form Ph, JPh , for $h \in C_0^\infty(M, \omega)$. But it follows from the argument of Theorem 3.16 that the moment map for the \mathcal{G} -action on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is given by the scalar curvature. But then since

$$\iota_{Ph}\Omega_{\mathcal{J}} = \iota_{Ph}\Omega_0$$

for all $h \in C_0^\infty(M)$, it follows that the forms actually agree on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$. \square

In particular, if $B \subset \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ is a complex submanifold invariant under $K \subset \mathcal{G}$, we obtain a genuine sequence of moment maps μ_ε for $\varepsilon \ll 0$ with respect to genuine Kähler metrics Ω_ε .

Remark 3.19. In the case $\operatorname{Aut}(X, L)$ is non-trivial, but still finite, we denote by $G = \operatorname{Aut}(X, L)$, assume θ is G -invariant and work G -equivariantly. Let $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)^G$ denote the fixed locus of the G -action on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$. Then while the isomorphisms

$$(\mathcal{U}_B, \mathcal{L}_B) \cong (X, L) \times B$$

of Equation 3.12, which were used to construct the form $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$ on \mathcal{U} and function E_Z on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ are no longer unique, they are unique up to the action of G . But since θ is G -invariant by assumption, working on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)^G$ instead allows us to construct functions E_Z on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)^G$ and a form $\theta_{\mathcal{U}^G}$ on $\mathcal{U}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)^G$. The proof of the moment map property is then identical to the case G is trivial.

Remark 3.20. As with the previous section, all results in this section hold assuming less regularity than smoothness, for example considering L_k^2 -complex structures for k sufficiently large.

3.3.3. *Kuranishi theory.* The next step is to employ deformation theory. 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 $\omega \in c_1(\mathcal{L}_0)$. We let $J_0 \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ be the complex structure of \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 $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$. Our setup and discussion is closely based on that of Székelyhidi [56, Section 3], to which we refer for more details (see Inoue [36, 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 $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ preserving the Kähler metric ω and the complexification $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ equals $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ by a result of Matsushima [31, 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 $T^{\mathbb{C}} \subset K^{\mathbb{C}}$, so that we also have a linear action of $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ on \tilde{H}^1 .

Note that any holomorphic map $q : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ from a complex manifold B and with image lying in the space of integrable complex structures 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 3.21. [56, Proposition 7][9, Lemma 6.1] *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 \mathcal{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 [56, Proof of Theorem 2], but the same applies for a higher rank T -action.

By a local $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action we mean 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 [56, 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 [56, Theorem 2]. But cscK specialisations are actually unique by a result of Chen-Sun [9, Corollary 1.8], producing the desired $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$. We note that we do not need to rely on the 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 local $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on B with a dense orbit. Note that since integrability is a closed condition, all complex structures associated to points of B are then integrable. As the map $\Phi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ is K -equivariant, we obtain a sequence of moment maps μ_ε with respect to the Kähler metrics Ω_ε given by restricting the natural family on $J(M, \omega)$. We write \mathfrak{t} for the Lie algebra of T and view elements of \mathfrak{t} as Hamiltonian functions on (M, ω) . Letting h_j denote a basis of Hamiltonians forming the Lie algebra \mathfrak{t} of T , a zero $b \in B$ of such a moment map corresponds to a complex structure J_b such that

$$\int_M h_j \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(J_b)) \omega^n = 0$$

for all h_j forming the basis.

We wish to modify the embedding Φ such that a zero of the finite dimensional moment map is actually a Z -critical Kähler metric. By definition of the moment map, this would be the case if we could arrange that

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(J_b)) \in \mathfrak{t}$$

for all $b \in B$. For a fixed complex structure J , a function $\psi \in L_k^2$ of sufficiently small norm produces a new complex structure $F_\psi(J)$ in the following manner described by Székelyhidi [56, Section 3] and Donaldson [22]. Consider the family of Kähler metrics

$$\omega_t = \omega - tdJd\psi,$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \omega_t = d\alpha$$

for a fixed one-form $\alpha = Jd\psi$. Next let v_t denote the vector field dual to $-\alpha$ with respect to ω_t , so that $\iota_{v_t} \omega_t = -\alpha$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \omega_t = -\mathcal{L}_{v_t} \omega_t$$

by Cartan's formula. Integrating the family of vector fields v_t for $t \in [0, 1]$ gives a family of diffeomorphisms f_t with $\frac{d}{dt} f_t = v_t$. Defining

$$F_\psi J = f_1^* J$$

gives the required map, which satisfies $F_\psi^* \omega_1 = \omega$. So the map F_ψ corresponds to perturbing ω in its class. These results can be used to give a proof of the property earlier used as Equation (3.11).

Letting $U_k \subset L_k^2$ denote a small neighbourhood of the origin, we obtain an induced map

$$B \times U_k \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)_{k-2}^2$$

which is T -equivariant, where T acts on U_k by pullback of functions. It will be important to the analysis to work with functions which are not smooth, but we recall from Remark 3.20 that all of our moment map constructions hold for k sufficiently large. The aim of the subsequent section will be to produce a T -invariant map $\Psi : B \rightarrow U_k$ such that

$$(3.13) \quad \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}(F_{\Psi(b)}(J_b))) \in \mathfrak{t}$$

for all $b \in B$. We view this as modifying the embedding $\Phi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ to a new embedding $\Phi' : B \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ obtained by defining

$$\Phi'(b) = F_{\Psi(b)}(J_b).$$

Since we have worked equivariantly, we obtain a sequence of moment maps via the embedding Φ' . We record the following summary of the above.

Corollary 3.22. *Suppose Ψ satisfies Equation (3.13). Then a zero of the moment map $\mu_\varepsilon : B \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}$ with respect to the symplectic forms $\Phi'^*\Omega_\varepsilon$ corresponds to a Z -critical Kähler metric. Moreover, $\Phi'^*\Omega_0$ is itself a symplectic form.*

One aspect of this, namely that one obtains a *smooth* solution of the Z -critical equation, will follow from ellipticity of the equation. We will also use the following corollary of Proposition 3.11.

Corollary 3.23. *Consider a fixed point $b \in B$ of $S^1 \hookrightarrow T$ with generator v . Then we have*

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

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

This follows from our previous discussion since the action remains a holomorphic one on $(\mathcal{X}_b, \mathcal{L}_b)$.

Remark 3.24. When $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete but not finite, we have assumed that the test configuration producing the cscK degeneration of (X, L) is $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ -equivariant, producing an $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ -action on $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$. In this case we use the equivariant Kuranishi family as in the work of Inoue [36, Section 3.2], which has a universal family admitting an $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ -action, and which has the property that maps to the equivariant Kuranishi space correspond to deformations of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ which are $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ -equivariant.

3.4. Reducing to a finite dimensional problem. We next turn to analytic aspects of the Z -critical equation necessary to prove our main result, for which we assume Z is admissible. The goal is to reduce to the situation where Corollary 3.22 applies, namely where the Z -critical operator lies in a finite dimensional space corresponding to holomorphy potentials of the cscK degeneration of our manifold of interest.

We begin by considering the cscK degeneration itself, which for simplicity we denote (X, L) . We then consider the Z -critical operator as an operator on the space of Kähler potentials with respect to a reference metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$

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

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

We set $\omega_\psi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$. The main goal will be to understand the mapping properties of the linearisation of G_ε and variants of G_ε , in order to apply a quantitative version of the implicit function theorem. This will allow us to reduce the problem of finding Z -critical Kähler metric to a finite dimensional problem, in which we will see explicitly the role of stability in understanding the existence of solutions. The basic strategy is based on work of Székelyhidi [56] and Brönnle [6], though the analytic challenges are more involved in our work.

As in practice we will be interested in $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$, the cscK degeneration of the analytically K-semistable manifold of interest, we must allow automorphisms. Thus we let $T \subset \text{Aut}(X, L)$ be a maximal compact torus, which will be non-trivial in the main case of interest. We then assume that θ is actually invariant under the full complex Lie group $\text{Aut}(X, L)$, analogously to the hypothesis of Section 3.3.1. We will ultimately need to work T -invariantly, by considering T -invariant Kähler potentials. As this makes no difference to the arguments, we only mention this occasionally. The reason this makes no difference to the arguments is that all operators we consider are T -equivariant, and the cscK metric itself is automatically invariant under a maximal compact subgroup of its automorphism group [31, Theorem 3.5.1]. At a key point in understanding the structure of the linearised operator, we will actually use that the manifold is a cscK degeneration of a polarised manifold with discrete automorphism group, and will emphasise this point when it arises.

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, but rather degenerate, 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 which is of interest to us, the equation jumps from a fourth order equation at $\varepsilon = 0$ to a sixth order equation for $\varepsilon > 0$, which causes several additional analytic difficulties.

Lemma 3.25. *Suppose $\rho_{n-2} \neq 0$ and $a_2 \neq 0$. 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 $\rho_{n-2} \neq 0$ and $a_2 \neq 0$, 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

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

This demonstrates ellipticity. \square

Note that the condition $a_2 \neq 0$ is part of our hypothesis that Z is admissible, used to prove our main result.

3.4.1. *Understanding the model operator.* Let

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

denote the linearisation of the Z -critical operator G_ε . In order to understand the mapping properties of \mathcal{F}_ε , we will compare it to a simpler model operator. Much as with the linearisation of the scalar curvature, a key operator will be the operator

$$\mathcal{D}\psi = \partial\nabla^{1,0}\psi,$$

as mentioned in Equation (3.7), whose kernel $\ker \mathcal{D}$ consists of functions inducing holomorphic vector fields on X . We denote the vector space of such functions, namely the holomorphy potentials, by \mathfrak{t} ; we include the constant functions in our definition. Letting \mathcal{D}^* be the L^2 -adjoint of \mathcal{D} with respect to the inner product induced by ω , the Lichnerowicz operator is given by $\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$; this is a fourth order elliptic linear partial differential operator, whose kernel consists of holomorphy potentials [55, Definition 4.3]. It is then well-known that the linearisation of the scalar curvature at a cscK metric is given by $-\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$ [55, Lemma 4.4].

Another important term involved in the model operator is a sixth order elliptic operator, defined as follows. As the vector bundle $TX^{1,0}$ is a holomorphic vector bundle, it admits a $\bar{\partial}$ -operator; we let $\bar{\partial}^*$ denote its L^2 -adjoint. We will then also consider the operator $\mathcal{D}^*\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}\mathcal{D}$, which can also be written

$$\nabla^{1,0*}(\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial})^2\nabla^{1,0} = \nabla^{1,0*}\Delta_{\bar{\partial}}^2\nabla^{1,0},$$

where $\Delta_{\bar{\partial}}$ denotes the $\bar{\partial}$ -Laplacian. In particular its symbol agrees with that of Δ^3 .

We will also need to consider two further operators H_1, H_2 , which are arbitrary self-adjoint operators satisfying for $j = 1, 2$

$$\int_X \gamma H_j \psi \omega^n = \int_X (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_{g_j} d\mu_j,$$

where each $d\mu_j$ is a smooth (n, n) -form and each

$$g_j : \Gamma(T^{1,0}X \otimes \Omega^{0,1}(X)) \otimes \Gamma(T^{1,0}X \otimes \Omega^{0,1}(X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a smooth bilinear pairing, but not necessarily a metric. Our model operator will then take the form

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = c_0 \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} + \varepsilon (c_1 \mathcal{D}^* \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{D} + H_1) + \varepsilon^2 (c_2 \mathcal{D}^* \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{D} + H_2),$$

where c_0 and c_1 are strictly positive. Note that this is a self-adjoint elliptic operator for ε sufficiently small, as its symbol agrees with that of $\varepsilon c_1 \Delta^3 + \varepsilon^2 c_2 \Delta^3$, which is elliptic for ε sufficiently small since $c_1 > 0$.

We now work with Sobolev spaces L_k^2 for some large k . We let $\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$ denote the L^2 -orthogonal complement of the holomorphy potentials inside L_k^2 . Note that the holomorphy potentials themselves are actually smooth, being the kernel of the elliptic operator $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$, but we will sometimes also denote the space of holomorphy potentials as \mathfrak{t}_k^2 when considered as a subspace of L_k^2 .

Lemma 3.26. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for all sufficiently small ε and for all $\psi \in \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$ we have*

$$\langle \psi, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi \rangle_{L^2} \geq c \|\psi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Furthermore, the kernel of \mathcal{G}_ε consists of holomorphy potentials.

Proof. We first consider the operator

$$c_0 \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} + \varepsilon H_1 + \varepsilon^2 H_2.$$

The desired bound for the operator $\mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$ is well-known: there is a constant c' such that for all $\psi \in \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$ we have

$$\langle \psi, \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} \psi \rangle_{L^2} \geq c' \|\psi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

see for example Brönnle [7, Lemma 37]. We can obtain uniform bounds for $j = 1, 2$

$$-C_1 (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_\omega \leq (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_{g_j} \leq C_j (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_\omega$$

for some $C_j > 0$, independent of ψ, γ and hence can obtain uniform bounds for some possibly different C_j

$$-C_j \int_X (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_\omega \omega^n \leq \int_X (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_{g_j} d\mu_j \leq C_j \int_X (\mathcal{D}\gamma, \mathcal{D}\psi)_\omega \omega^n.$$

Here we view ω as inducing a metric on $TX^{1,0} \otimes \Omega^{0,1}$. It follows that for ε sufficiently small we have a bound

$$\langle \psi, c_0 \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} \psi + \varepsilon H_1 + \varepsilon H_2 \psi \rangle_{L^2} \geq c \|\psi\|_{L^2}^2$$

for some $c > 0$.

The remaining terms are non-negative for ε sufficiently small. Indeed for ε sufficiently small the coefficient $\varepsilon c_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2$ is positive and

$$\langle \psi, (\varepsilon c_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2) \mathcal{D}^* \bar{\partial}^* \bar{\partial} \mathcal{D} \psi \rangle_{L^2} = (\varepsilon c_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2) \|\bar{\partial}^* \mathcal{D} \psi\|_{L^2}^2 \geq 0.$$

It follows that

$$\langle \psi, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi \rangle_{L^2} \geq c \|\psi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

as required.

What remains is to characterise the kernel of \mathcal{G}_ε . Note that certainly $\mathfrak{t} \subset \ker \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$, since $\mathfrak{t} = \ker \mathcal{D}$. Otherwise we may write $\psi \in L_k^2$ as $\psi = \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_k^2} + \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2}$ where $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_k^2} \in \mathfrak{t}_k^2$ and $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2} \in \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$ are L^2 -orthogonal and we may assume $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2} \neq 0$, and we see that

$$\langle \psi, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi \rangle_{L^2} = \langle \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2}, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2} \rangle_{L^2} \geq c \|\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2}\|_{L^2}^2 > 0,$$

where we have used that

$$\langle \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_k^2}, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2} \rangle = 0$$

since \mathcal{G}_ε is self-adjoint and $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_k^2} = 0$. \square

Corollary 3.27. *For sufficiently small ε , the operator*

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

is an isomorphism. Furthermore, the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} &\rightarrow L_{k-6}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi + h \end{aligned}$$

is surjective, and admits a right inverse.

Proof. We first show that \mathcal{G}_ε does actually send $\mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$ to $\mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$. In fact, for any $\psi \in L_k^2$ and any $h \in \mathfrak{t}$ we have

$$\langle h, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \psi \rangle_{L^2} = 0$$

again by self-adjointness of \mathcal{G}_ε . Since

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

has trivial kernel by Lemma 3.26, it is a self-adjoint elliptic partial differential operator with trivial kernel, hence is an isomorphism by the Fredholm alternative.

Surjectivity of the induced map $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow L_{k-6}^2$, is an immediate consequence, while a right inverse can be constructed explicitly. Indeed, since the operator $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon : \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$ is an isomorphism, it admits some inverse $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1} : \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$. Write $\psi \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$ as $\psi = \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2} + \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2}$ where $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2} \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2$ and $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2} \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$ are L^2 -orthogonal. Note that $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2}$ is actually smooth as it is a holomorphy potential. Then a right inverse is given by

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\psi) = (\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1} \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2}, \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2}).$$

\square

Note that in the presence of a non-trivial compact torus T of automorphisms, the conclusion holds T -equivariantly as all operators are T -equivariant.

We next obtain an operator norm of the inverse operator $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1} : \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$. We will use the Schauder estimates for this, so it is more convenient to consider the rescaled operator $\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$, so that the ellipticity constants are actually uniformly bounded in ε ; here we recall that ellipticity follows from the fact that the sixth order coefficient of \mathcal{G}_ε is $(\varepsilon c_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2) \Delta^3$, where we have assumed $c_1 > 0$, so scaling by ε^{-1} gives a family of operators whose ellipticity constants are actually bounded independently of ε .

Proposition 3.28. [57, Chapter 5, Theorem 11.1] *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $\psi \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$ and for all sufficiently small ε there is a bound of the form*

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

The point here is that our model operator $(\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon)^{-1}$ has uniformly bounded ellipticity constants, but the norm of the coefficients of the equation are actually only bounded uniformly by $C \varepsilon^{-1}$ for some constant C , and hence are blowing up as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Explicitly, the term which is blowing up is the leading term $\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D}$. In this

situation, one obtains a Schauder estimate where the Schauder coefficient is $c\varepsilon^{-1}$. We learned that such a Schauder estimate holds from an observation of Hashimoto for general elliptic operators [34, p. 800]; the dependence of the Schauder constant on the norm of the coefficients is standard for second-order elliptic operators [32, p. 92].

Corollary 3.29. *There is a bound of the form*

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}$$

for the operator $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1} : \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{k,\perp}^2$, for some $C > 0$.

Proof. Let $\psi \in \mathfrak{t}_{k-6,\perp}^2$ and set $\gamma = \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi$, so that $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma = \psi$. The Schauder estimate gives

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

By Cauchy-Schwarz we have

$$\|\gamma\|_{L^2} \|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma\|_{L^2} \geq \langle \gamma, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma \rangle_{L^2},$$

so the bound

$$\langle \gamma, \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma \rangle_{L^2} \geq \tilde{c} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}^2$$

for some $\tilde{c} > 0$ given by Lemma 3.26 implies

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma\|_{L^2} \geq \tilde{c} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{\|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi\|_{L^2}}{\|\psi\|_{L_{k-6}^2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi\|_{L^2}}{\|\psi\|_{L^2}} = \frac{\|\gamma\|_{L^2}}{\|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\gamma\|_{L^2}} \leq \tilde{c}^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\|(\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon)^{-1}\psi\|_{L_k^2}}{\|\psi\|_{L_{k-6}^2}} \leq c\varepsilon^{-1} + c(\tilde{c}^{-1}) \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}$$

for ε sufficiently small and some $C > 0$, as required. \square

Recall that a right inverse to the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} &\rightarrow L_{k-6}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\psi + h \end{aligned}$$

is given through Equation (3.15) by

$$\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(\psi) = (\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2}, \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2}),$$

where $\psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2} \in \mathfrak{t}$ is the L^2 -projection of ψ onto \mathfrak{t} .

Corollary 3.30. *There is a bound on the operator norm of \mathcal{M}_ε of the form*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}$$

for some $C > 0$.

Proof. The operator $\psi \rightarrow \psi_{\mathfrak{t}_{k-6}^2}$ has operator norm bounded independently of ε , so this is a direct consequence of Corollary 3.29. \square

We will eventually be interested in perturbations of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon$. The following is then a consequence of standard linear algebra (see for example [7, Lemma 4.3] for the result in linear algebra).

Corollary 3.31. *Suppose $L_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \rightarrow L_{k-6}^2$ is a sequence of bounded operators with $\|L_\varepsilon\|_{op} \leq K$ for some K independent of ε . Then for all sufficiently small ε the operator*

$$(\psi, h) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon \psi + \varepsilon^3 L_\varepsilon \psi + h$$

is surjective and admits a right inverse $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_\varepsilon$. Moreover there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}.$$

Remark 3.32. This result is the reason we must include the ε^2 term in our model operator: our bound on the operator norm of the right inverse means we can only add additional terms at order ε^3 and retain the desired mapping properties.

3.4.2. *The approximate solution.* We now assume that $\omega \in c_1(L)$ is cscK. Lemma 2.26 then implies that we have

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) = O(\varepsilon^2).$$

In order for our model linear operator to be a good approximation of the genuine linearised operator, we will need to consider a better approximation to a Z -critical Kähler metric. Since we are considering the general case when the Lichnerowicz operator $\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$ may have non-trivial kernel, or equivalently the case when $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ may not be discrete, rather than finding approximate Z -critical Kähler metrics, we will instead try to find a ω_ε approximately solving the condition that

$$(3.16) \quad \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon)) \in \ker \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon,$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = \bar{\partial}\nabla_\varepsilon^{1,0}$ is defined using ω_ε . That is to say, the function $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon))$ is a holomorphy potential with respect to ω_ε . To this end, we recall that if ν is a Kähler potential and if h is the holomorphy potential with respect to ω for some holomorphic vector field, then the function

$$(3.17) \quad h + \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla \nu, \nabla h \rangle$$

is the holomorphy potential with respect to the Kähler metric $\omega_\nu = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\nu$ (see for example [54, Lemma 12]).

Analogously to Corollary 3.27, the operator

$$\begin{aligned} L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} &\rightarrow L_{k-4}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}\psi + h \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. Although we have worked in Sobolev spaces, since the operator is elliptic the same holds for smooth functions. Thus given $e \in C^\infty(X)$, there is a pair (ψ, h) with

$$(3.18) \quad \mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}\psi + h = e.$$

Lemma 3.33. *Suppose ω is a cscK metric. Then for any m there is a sequence ψ_j and holomorphy potentials h_j such that*

$$\text{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z} \left(\omega + \sum_{j=1}^m \varepsilon^j i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j \right) \right) = \sum_{j=2}^{m+1} \varepsilon^2 \left(h_j + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle h_j, \sum_{l=1}^m \varepsilon^l \psi_l \right\rangle \right) + O(\varepsilon^{m+2}).$$

These are approximate solutions to Equation (3.16).

Proof. The linearisation of the scalar curvature at a cscK metric is the operator $-\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$ [55, Lemma 4.4]. As we have assumed ω is cscK, we have

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)\right) = e_2\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^3).$$

By right-invertibility of the Lichnerowicz operator there is a function ψ_2 and a holomorphy potential $h_2 \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that

$$(\mathrm{Re}(\rho_{n-1})L^n)\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}\psi_1 = e_2 - h_2.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mathrm{Re}(\rho_{n-1})L^n)\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D} + O(\varepsilon^2)$, it follows that

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + \varepsilon\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_1)\right) = h_2\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^3).$$

Next consider the error term

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + \varepsilon\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_1)\right) - \varepsilon^2\left(h_2 + \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla h_2, \nabla\varepsilon\psi_1\rangle\right) = e_3\varepsilon^3.$$

Then we can find a function ψ_2 and a holomorphy potential h_3 such that

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}(\varepsilon\psi_1 + \varepsilon^2\psi_2))\right) = \left(h_2 + \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla h_2, \nabla\varepsilon\psi_1\rangle\right)\varepsilon^2 + h_3\varepsilon^3 + O(\varepsilon^4).$$

In particular

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}(\varepsilon\psi_1 + \varepsilon^2\psi_2))\right) = \sum_{j=2}^3\varepsilon^2\left(h_j + \frac{1}{2}\left\langle h_j, \sum_{l=1}^2\varepsilon^l\psi_l \right\rangle\right) + O(\varepsilon^4).$$

Iterating this process gives the result. \square

Note again that the conclusion also holds T -invariantly, producing T -invariant functions ψ_j , since all operators are T -equivariant.

We will only require the approximate solution

$$(3.19) \quad \omega_\varepsilon = \omega + \sum_{j=1}^5\varepsilon^j i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j,$$

which satisfies

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon\left(\omega + \sum_{j=1}^5\varepsilon^j i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j\right)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^5\varepsilon^2\left(h_j + \frac{1}{2}\left\langle\nabla h_j, \nabla\left(\sum_{i=1}^5\varepsilon^i\psi_i\right)\right\rangle\right) + O(\varepsilon^7).$$

We then set

$$\gamma_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=1}^5\varepsilon^j i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi_j,$$

so that if h is a holomorphy potential with respect to ω , then $h + \frac{1}{2}\langle\nabla h, \nabla\gamma_\varepsilon\rangle$ is a holomorphy potential with respect to ω_ε by Equation (3.17).

We return to the model operator \mathcal{G}_ε , however now defined with respect to the approximate solution ω_ε . In order to understand its properties, for clarity we consider the Kähler metric ω_δ the approximate solution to order $O(\delta^7)$ given by Equation (3.19) (namely we replace ε with δ). Denote by \mathfrak{t}_δ the space of holomorphy

potentials with respect to ω_δ . Then the results we have already established imply that for each fixed δ , the operator

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t}_\delta &\rightarrow L_{k-6}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\psi + h\end{aligned}$$

is surjective for ε sufficiently small.

We claim that one can take the ε for which surjectivity of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ holds to be independent of δ for δ sufficiently small. More precisely, we claim that there is an ε_0 and a δ_0 such that $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is surjective for all $\delta \leq \delta_0$ and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$. But this follows since in the ‘‘eigenvalue bound’’ of Lemma 3.26

$$\langle \psi, \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\psi \rangle_{L^2} \geq c_\delta \|\psi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for ψ orthogonal to \mathfrak{t}_δ , the value c_δ is actually continuous in δ . Similar continuity statements in δ then further imply that the right inverse $\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : L_{k-6}^2 \rightarrow L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t}_\delta$ has operator norm which satisfies a uniform bound

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2},$$

where C is independent of both δ and ε . Here the continuity used is in the Schauder estimate of Proposition 3.28. It follows that we can take $\delta = \varepsilon$ and obtain a bound with respect to the approximate solution ω_ε . We will rephrase this in a form in which we will use these results.

Corollary 3.34. *Denote by \mathcal{G}_ε model operator with respect to the approximate solution ω_ε . Then the operator*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} &\rightarrow L_{k-6}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\psi + h + \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle\end{aligned}$$

is surjective and admits a right inverse $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_\varepsilon$. There is a bound on the operator norm of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_\varepsilon$ of the form $\|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_\varepsilon\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}$.

Thus if $L_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \rightarrow L_{k-6}^2$ is a sequence of operators satisfying a uniform bound $\|L_\varepsilon\|_{op} \leq K$ independent of ε , then the operator

$$(\psi, h) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon\psi + h + \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle + \varepsilon^3 L_\varepsilon$$

is surjective and right-invertible. The resulting right inverse also has operator norm satisfying a uniform bound by $C'\varepsilon^{-2}$ for some $C' > 0$.

Proof. We first consider the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\varepsilon$ itself. In comparison to the discussion immediately preceding the statement, the only difference is in the range of the operator. The discussion involves \mathfrak{t}_ε rather than \mathfrak{t} itself. But if $h \in \mathfrak{t}$, then $h + \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle \in \mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon$. So the statement of the Corollary is simply a rephrasing of the discussion. The statements about perturbations are consequences of linear algebra as in Corollary 3.31. \square

3.4.3. Understanding the expansion of the operator. We next consider some general aspects of the structure of the Z -critical equation. We will consider its expansion in powers of ε , and to match with what we have considered it will be convenient to consider the ‘‘rescaled’’ equation

$$-\varepsilon^{-1} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right) = \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})L^n S(\omega) + O(\varepsilon),$$

so that if ω is a cscK metric its linearisation takes the form $-\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})L^n\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D} + O(\varepsilon)$. We will be interested in understanding the terms of order ε and ε^2 ; controlling these will allow us to see the full linearised operator as a perturbation of the sum involving only terms of order up to ε^2 which will be sufficiently by Corollary 3.34. We will begin only by considering ω , and will then later consider the approximate solution ω_ε .

We use our assumptions that:

- (i) $\theta_1 = 0 = \theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$. The condition on θ_1 is used so that the leading order term in the expansion is the scalar curvature, rather than the twisted scalar curvature, while the conditions on θ_2 and θ_3 are of a more technical nature and allow us to understand the ε^2 -term of the linearised operator. We expect that the conditions on θ_2 and θ_3 can be removed.
- (ii) $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$, $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-2}) > 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-3}) = 0$. The condition on $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})$ is essentially a sign convention, what is really needed is that these two real parts have opposite sign. This is essential to the analysis and is used in the L^2 -bound for the model operator proved in Lemma 3.26. The condition on $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-3})$ is a technical assumption which we expect can be removed.

As in Lemma 2.26 we write $Z_\varepsilon(X, L) = r_\varepsilon e^{i\varphi_\varepsilon}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon(X, L)} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) &= r_\varepsilon(X, L) \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right), \\ &= r_\varepsilon(X, L) \frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \operatorname{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L) - \operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \operatorname{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2 + \operatorname{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\varepsilon(X, L) &= iL^n\varepsilon^{-n} + \rho_{n-1}L^{n-1}.K_X\varepsilon^{-n+1} + \rho_{n-2}L^{n-2}.K_X^2\varepsilon^{-n+2} + \dots, \\ \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) &= i - \rho_{n-1} \frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n} \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used our assumptions

Our equation takes the form

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right) = \frac{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \operatorname{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L) - \operatorname{Re} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \operatorname{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2 + \operatorname{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2},$$

where explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\varepsilon(X, L) &= iL^n\varepsilon^{-n} + \rho_{n-1}\alpha_1\varepsilon^{-n+1} + \rho_{n-2}\alpha_2\varepsilon^{-n+2} + \rho_{n-1}\alpha_3\varepsilon^{-n+3} + O(\varepsilon^{-n+4}), \\ \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) &= i + \rho_{n-1}\tilde{\alpha}_1\varepsilon + \rho_{n-2}\tilde{\alpha}_2\varepsilon^2 + \rho_{n-3}\tilde{\alpha}_3\varepsilon^3 + O(\varepsilon^4), \end{aligned}$$

and where $\alpha_1 = L^{n-1}.K_X$, $\alpha_2 = L^{n-2}.K_X^2$, $\alpha_3 = L^{n-3}.K_X^3$, while

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_1 &= -\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n}, & \tilde{\alpha}_2 &= \frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^2 \wedge \omega^{n-2}}{\omega^n} - \frac{2}{n-1} \Delta \frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n}, \\ \tilde{\alpha}_3 &= -\frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^3 \wedge \omega^{n-3}}{\omega^n} + \frac{3}{n-2} \Delta \frac{\operatorname{Ric} \omega^2 \wedge \omega^{n-2}}{\omega^n}. \end{aligned}$$

The factor

$$\frac{r_\varepsilon(X, L)}{\operatorname{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2 + \operatorname{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L)^2}$$

plays only a minor role in our expansion of $\text{Im} \left(\frac{\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)}{Z_\varepsilon(X, L)} \right)$. Indeed, we will have good control over the leading order two terms in ε , while the third order (for our rescaled equation) ε^2 term will require the most care to manage. So we can ignore this factor in controlling the linearisation. Thus we need only understand the leading order three terms in the expansion of

$$\text{Im} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \text{Re} Z_\varepsilon(X, L) - \text{Re} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \text{Im} Z_\varepsilon(X, L).$$

Recall that we have assumed $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$. We see that the leading order term is

$$\varepsilon^{-n+1} \text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) \left(L^{n-1} \cdot K_X + \frac{\text{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n} \right).$$

For the ε^{-n+2} -term, we will for the moment only be interested in the degree six operator, which we see is given by

$$-\varepsilon^{-n+2} \frac{2 \text{Re}(\rho_{n-2})}{n-1} \Delta \left(\frac{\text{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n} \right).$$

For the ε^{-n+3} -term, we see that the sixth order component is given by, for some topological constant c

$$(3.20) \quad -\frac{3 \text{Re}(\rho_{n-3})}{n-2} \Delta \left(\frac{\text{Ric} \omega^2 \wedge \omega^{n-2}}{\omega^n} \right) + c \text{Im}(\rho_{n-2}) \Delta \left(\frac{\text{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n} \right).$$

In particular if $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-3}) = 0$, the first of these two terms vanishes.

While we have considered ω rather than the approximate solution $\omega_\varepsilon = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon$, essentially the same statements hold using ω_ε . If we write $\alpha_{j,\varepsilon}$ for the coefficients of ε^j in $\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon)$, then we still have

$$\tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon) = i + \rho_{n-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{1,\varepsilon} \varepsilon + \rho_{n-2} \tilde{\alpha}_{2,\varepsilon} \varepsilon^2 + \rho_{n-3} \tilde{\alpha}_{3,\varepsilon} \varepsilon^3 + O(\varepsilon^4),$$

implying the linearisation has similar properties up to order ε^4 , but for example with the leading order term replaced with

$$\varepsilon^{-n+1} \text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) \left(L^{n-1} \cdot K_X + \frac{\text{Ric} \omega_\varepsilon \wedge \omega_\varepsilon^{n-1}}{\omega_\varepsilon^n} \right).$$

3.4.4. Properties of the linearisation. We now turn to the linearisation of the Z -critical equation. The aim is to compare the linearisation at the approximate solution $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\gamma_\varepsilon$ to the model operator \mathcal{G}_ε , and in particular to use Corollary 3.34 to infer properties of the genuine linearised operator.

We begin with a general result. We fix a T -equivariant Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$, not assumed to be cscK, and denote by \mathcal{F}_ε the linearisation of the operator

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

Denote also \mathfrak{t} the space of holomorphy potentials with respect to ω .

Proposition 3.35. *For all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} &\rightarrow L_{k-6}^2, \\ (\psi, h) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \psi - \langle \nabla \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla \psi \rangle + h \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. In addition exists a right inverse $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon$ of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon$ whose operator norm satisfies a bound of the form $\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon\|_{op} \leq C\varepsilon^{-3}$.

The conclusion also holds T -equivariantly, as all operators are T -equivariant, just as with the preceding results. We recall our assumption, which will be used in the proof, that (X, L) is the central fibre of a test configuration for a polarised manifold with discrete automorphism group.

Remark 3.36. To compare Proposition 3.35 to a well-known result in Kähler geometry, recall that the scalar curvature operator $\psi \rightarrow S(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi)$ has linearisation [55, Lemma 4.4]

$$\psi \rightarrow -\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}\psi + \langle \nabla S(\omega), \nabla \psi \rangle,$$

so subtracting $\langle \nabla S(\omega), \nabla \psi \rangle$ leads to an operator whose kernel is precisely given by \mathfrak{t} . Thus adding h leads to a surjective operator, mirroring Proposition 3.35 .

The proof will use the moment map techniques developed in Section 3.3.2. We continue to denote by $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ the space of complex structures biholomorphic to the reference complex structure J , and recall the closed $(1, 1)$ -forms Ω_ε defined on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ through Equation (3.10). Any functions $u, v \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ induce tangent vectors on $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ through the assignment $u \rightarrow Pu$ of Equation (3.6); the same as true for functions in L_k^2 . As in Section 3.3.3, this process can be integrated, associating to ψ a new complex structure $F_\psi(J)$. We will use that the differential of the map $\psi \rightarrow F_\psi(J)$ at $\psi = 0$ is [56, Equation 3]

$$\psi \rightarrow JP(\psi).$$

Proof of Proposition 3.35. We use many of the ideas of Section 3.3 to understand the general properties of the linearised operator. Consider $\omega_t = \omega + ti\partial\bar{\partial}v$, so that the derivative of

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

is given by

$$(3.21) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_X u \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n = \int_X u \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v \omega^n + \int_X u \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v \omega^n.$$

We are interested in the first of these terms, but the advantage of this perspective is that from the proof of Theorem 3.16 we know that for each t

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

so that

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt ds} \right|_{s,t=0} E_Z(tv + su) = \int_X u \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v \omega^n + \int_X u \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v \omega^n.$$

It follows that the integral on the right hand side, considered as a pairing on functions, is actually symmetric.

We need to identify the ε^2 and ε^3 terms in the expansion of \mathcal{F}_ε in order to compare it to the model operator \mathcal{G}_ε . For this we will link with the space $\mathcal{J}_X(M, \omega)$ and the moment map interpretation of the Z -critical equation established in Section 3.3. We first consider the case $\operatorname{Aut}(X, L)$ is discrete, which allows us to use the results of Section 3.3, which were proven under that assumption. Our 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 (3.5) that

$$(3.22) \quad \Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPv) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_X u \operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_t)) \omega^n,$$

where we emphasise that we take the perspective that the complex structure is changing but the symplectic form ω is fixed.

We next compare this to the linearisation with fixed complex structure and varying symplectic structure. Let f_t be the diffeomorphisms of X such that $f_t^* \omega_t = \omega$ and $f_t \cdot J = J$. Then $f_t^* \omega_t^n = \omega^n$, while $f_t^* \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_t)) = \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_t))$. We also need to understand the infinitesimal change in u as we pull-back along f_t , for which we need to understand the construction of f_t in more detail. As we only need to understand the infinitesimal construction of f_t near $t = 0$, it suffices to note that f_t is given by taking the gradient flow along a path of vector fields ν_t on X such that ν_0 is the Hamiltonian vector field associated with the function v . Thus the infinitesimal change in u is simply the Lie derivative

$$\mathcal{L}_{\nu_0} u = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle,$$

where we have used the relationship between the Poisson bracket of functions (that is, the pairing of the induced Hamiltonian vector fields with respect to ω) and the inner products of the Riemannian gradients. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_t)) \omega^n &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_t)) \omega_t^n \\ &\quad - \int_X \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

We now use Equation (3.21), from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_t)) \omega^n &= \int_X u \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v \omega^n \\ &\quad + \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \Delta v \omega^n - \int_X \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) \omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since the final two terms on the right hand side sum to $-\int_X u \langle \nabla \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla v \rangle \omega^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\varepsilon(Pu, JPv) &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_X u \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_t)) \omega^n \\ &= \int_X u \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v \omega^n - \int_X u \langle \nabla \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla v \rangle \omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the operator

$$(3.23) \quad (u, v) \rightarrow \int_X u (\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v - \langle \nabla \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla v \rangle) \omega^n$$

is a self-adjoint operator which only depends on Pu, Pv . As this is true for all ε , it is true for each term in the associated expansion in powers of ε .

When $\text{Aut}(X, L)$ is not discrete, we use the key assumption that (X, L) is a degeneration of a polarised manifold with discrete automorphism group. That is, (X, L) is the central fibre of a test configuration for a polarised manifold with discrete automorphism group (to compare with our previous notation, we are considering (X, L) to be what was previously denoted $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$). Thus we obtain a family J_t of complex structures on the fixed underlying smooth manifold M converging to J_0 , the complex structure inducing X . Since the linearisation satisfies Equation (3.23) for each t , the same equation holds at $t = 0$. In particular self-adjointness, and dependence only on Pu, Pv hold also with respect to J_0 as well.

We use the results of Section 3.4.3 to identify the $\varepsilon, \varepsilon^2$ and ε^3 terms in the expansion of the operator

$$v \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v - \langle \nabla \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla v \rangle,$$

in order to compare them to the model operator. By what we have just proven, this operator must be self-adjoint, and the pairing

$$(u, v) \rightarrow \int_X u(\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon v - \langle \nabla \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)), \nabla v \rangle) \omega^n$$

can only depend on $\mathcal{D}u$ and $\mathcal{D}v$, due to the identification of Equation (3.7).

The leading order ε -term is given by $-\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$, since the leading order ε -term in the expansion of $\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega))$ is simply the scalar curvature. The sixth-order operator in the ε^2 -term arises from linearising $\frac{2\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})}{n(n-1)}\Delta S(\omega)$, meaning that the linearisation inherits a term of the form $-\frac{2\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})}{n(n-1)}\Delta\mathcal{D}^*\mathcal{D}$. As we know the ε^2 -term only depends on $\mathcal{D}u, \mathcal{D}v$, the difference between the ε^2 -term and $-\frac{2\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})}{n(n-1)}(\bar{\partial}^*\mathcal{D})^*\bar{\partial}^*\mathcal{D}$ must be a fourth order operator depending only on $\mathcal{D}u, \mathcal{D}v$ as both are of the form $-\frac{2\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-1})}{n(n-1)}\Delta^3$ plus some fourth order operator. In particular the ε^2 -term must be of the form $c_1\mathcal{D}^*\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}\mathcal{D} + H_1$ where

$$\int_X uH_1v\omega^n = \int_X (\mathcal{D}u, \mathcal{D}v)_{g_1} d\mu_1,$$

and where $d\mu_1$ is a smooth (n, n) -form and

$$g_1 : \Gamma(T^{1,0}X \otimes \Omega^{0,1}(X)) \otimes \Gamma(T^{1,0}X \otimes \Omega^{0,1}(X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a smooth bilinear pairing, but not necessarily a metric. In particular this is of the same form as the ε^2 -term of our model operator of Equation (3.14) computed with respect to ω .

We finally show that the ε^3 -term of our linearisation takes the same form as the model operator, for which we use that $\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{n-3}) = 0$ and $\theta_3 = 0$. From Equation (3.20) it follows that the only sixth order term arises from linearising a multiple of $\operatorname{Im}(\rho_{n-2})\Delta S(\omega)$, which contributes one term which is involved in the ε^3 -term of the model operator. The remaining order terms are fourth-order and so again are given by some H_2 of the same form as H_1 .

What we have demonstrated is that the linearised operator agrees with the model operator to order ε^3 . In particular Corollary 3.31 applies to give the statement of the Proposition. \square

In general we wish to solve the equation

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi)\right) - f - \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla\psi, \nabla f \rangle = 0,$$

for $f \in \mathfrak{t}$ and ψ a Kähler potential. The linearisation of this operator is given by

$$d\mathcal{S}_{0,f}(\psi, h) = \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\psi - \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla\psi, \nabla f \rangle - h.$$

The following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.35.

Corollary 3.37. *For all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, the operator*

$$(\psi, h) \rightarrow d\mathcal{S}_{0,f}(\psi, h) + \frac{1}{2}\left\langle \nabla\psi, \nabla\left(f - 2\operatorname{Im}\left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)\right)\right)\right\rangle$$

is surjective, admits a right inverse, and the operator norm of the inverse is bounded by $C\varepsilon^{-3}$ for some $C > 0$.

Here h and f are holomorphy potentials with respect to ω , which was arbitrary. We apply this to the approximate solutions ω_ε constructed in Lemma 3.33. Rescaling the holomorphy potentials by a factor of two, ω_ε satisfies

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon}(\omega_\varepsilon) \right) - \frac{1}{2}f_\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon^7),$$

where the $f_\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon$, hence the term

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla\psi, \nabla \left(f - 2 \operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega) \right) \right) \right\rangle = O(\varepsilon^7)$$

is of high order in ε . In particular this term does not affect the mapping properties of the linearised operator. The following is then the statement of ultimate interest from the present section.

Corollary 3.38. *The linearisation dS computed at the approximate solution ω_ε is surjective, and right invertible. Moreover its right inverse has operator norm bounded by $C\varepsilon^{-3}$ for some $C > 0$.*

The conclusion also holds T -equivariantly.

3.4.5. *Applying the quantitative inverse function theorem.* We can now construct Z -critical Kähler metrics in the large volume limit, as well as their extremal analogue. We continue with the notation and hypotheses of the previous sections.

Theorem 3.39. *Suppose (X, L) admits a cscK metric ω , and is a degeneration of a polarised manifold with discrete automorphism group. Then (X, L) admits solutions $\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon$ to the equation*

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon)) \in \mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon,$$

where \mathfrak{t}_ε denotes the space of holomorphy potentials with respect to $\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon$.

The statement also holds T -equivariantly, in the sense that the solutions are T -invariant Kähler potentials. This result can be seen as proving the existence of the analogue of extremal Z -critical Kähler metrics. It is a straightforward consequence that (X, L) admits Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics if and only if the analogue of the Futaki invariant described in Corollary 3.23 vanishes for all holomorphic vector fields. In the discrete automorphism group case this produces the following.

Corollary 3.40. *Suppose (X, L) has discrete automorphism group and admits a cscK metric ω . Then (X, L) admits Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics for all $\varepsilon \ll 1$.*

To prove these results we will apply the quantitative implicit function theorem:

Theorem 3.41. [6, Theorem 4.1] *Let $G : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ be a differentiable map between Banach spaces, whose derivative at $0 \in B_1$ is surjective with right 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 $G(x) = y$.

Denote by G_ε the operator

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

Then the linearisation of the map $\tilde{G}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow L_{k-6}^2$ defined by

$$(\psi, h) \rightarrow G_\varepsilon\psi - h - \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle$$

is the map $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon : L_k^2 \times \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow L_{k-6}^2$ defined by

$$(\psi, h) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\psi - h - \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla h, \nabla \gamma_\varepsilon \rangle,$$

since the terms not involving G_ε are actually linear in both factors. Corollary 3.38 then implies that the linearisation of \tilde{G}_ε is surjective and admits a right inverse, and moreover provides a uniform bound on the operator norm of this right inverse in terms of a constant multiple of ε^{-3} .

To apply Theorem 3.41 we thus need to obtain a bound on the operator norm of the operators $\tilde{G}_\varepsilon - d\tilde{G}_\varepsilon$. Denote $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon = \tilde{G}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon$ the non-linear terms of the Z -critical operator, calculated with respect to the approximate solution ω_ε .

Lemma 3.42. *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*

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

Proof. Since the two terms involving the Hamiltonian h in \tilde{G} are actually linear in h and ψ , we may replace $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\psi) - \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\psi')$ with the terms only involving $G_\varepsilon(\psi)$.

The proof is then similar to a situation considered by Fine [26, Lemma 7.1], and is a straightforward consequence of the mean value theorem, which gives a bound

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

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

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

where $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon, \chi_t}$ is the linearisation of the Z_ε -critical operator at $\omega_\varepsilon + i\partial\bar{\partial}\chi$. 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

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

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

Remark 3.43. In fact, as explained by Fine [26, 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 $(J, \psi) - (J', \psi')$ [26, 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 $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon)$.

This is everything needed to apply the quantitative inverse function theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.39. We consider the approximate solution ω_ε which satisfies $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega_\varepsilon)) = O(\varepsilon^7)$. As all of the input is invariant under the maximal compact torus T of $\text{Aut}(X, L)$, the output produced will also be invariant. There are three ingredients which we have established necessary to apply the implicit function theorem:

- (i) Since we are considering the approximate solution, we have $\|G_\varepsilon(0)\| = O(\varepsilon^7)$
- (ii) Next, note that the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\varepsilon$ is an surjective for ε small and the right inverse \tilde{P}_ε satisfies

$$\|\tilde{P}_\varepsilon\|_{op} \leq \varepsilon^{-3} K_1$$

by Corollary 3.38.

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

The second and third of these imply that the radius δ'_ε of the ball around the origin on which $\tilde{G}_\varepsilon - D\tilde{G}_\varepsilon$ is Lipschitz with constant $(2\|\tilde{P}_\varepsilon\|)^{-1}$ is bounded below by a constant. It follows that for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ there is a constant such that if $\|\tilde{G}_\varepsilon(0)\| \leq C$, there is a $z \in B_1$ such that $\tilde{G}_\varepsilon(z) = 0$, 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 3.25.

Finally, while our definition of a Z -critical Kähler metric requires the positivity condition $\text{Re}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon(X, L)} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(\omega)) > 0$, one calculates that this is automatic for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. \square

3.4.6. 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) . In addition we let ω be the symplectic form which is cscK with respect to J_0 . We fix a maximal compact torus T of the automorphism group of (X_0, L_0) as before, and denote by \mathfrak{t} its Lie algebra, identified with Hamiltonian functions on X_0 .

The Kuranishi space used in Section 3.3 is a family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$, with a relatively Kähler metric induced by ω . By construction, the underlying smooth manifold and symplectic form of the family are fixed, while the complex structure varies. There is in addition a T -action on B and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ making $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$ a T -equivariant map. Again as T -equivariance will be automatic for our input and output we only mention T -equivariance occasionally.

As the symplectic structure is fixed and the complex structure varies, it is more convenient to consider the Z -critical operator as an operator on complex structures. On a fixed fibre with complex structure J , we take the following perspective. Recall to a function ψ inducing a Kähler metric $\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi$, by Section 3.3.3 one can instead produce a diffeomorphism F_ψ such that $F_\psi^*(\omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi) = \omega$ is compatible with the induced complex structure $F_\psi \cdot J$. Then

$$(3.24) \quad F_\psi^* \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J, \omega_\psi)) = \text{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(F_\psi \cdot J, \omega)).$$

The main point of the previous Section was to understand the linearisation of the Z -critical operator as the Kähler metric varied, so with this new perspective we need to understand the linearisation under a change instead of complex structure. But the difference between the linearisation of the operator

$$\psi \rightarrow \text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(F_\psi \cdot J, \omega))$$

and the linearisation of the operator

$$\psi \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J, \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi))$$

is given by the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_{v_\psi} \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J, \omega))$, by Equation (3.24) and the definition of F_ψ , and where v_ψ is the Hamiltonian associated to ψ . In particular, at an approximate solution the term $\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J, \omega))$ will be a term of high order in ε , meaning the mapping properties of the linearisation as one varies the complex structure rather than the Kähler structure will be the same. Thus the mapping properties of the linearised operator are the same as those that we have established for the linearisation when we instead vary the Kähler metric.

Denote by J_b the complex structure of the fibre \mathcal{X}_b . A function $\Psi : B \rightarrow L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ can be viewed as a function on \mathcal{X} , whose value at a point $p \in \mathcal{X}_b$ is given by $\Psi(b)[p]$, and hence induces a change in the fibrewise complex structure by

$$J_b \rightarrow F_{\Psi(b)} \cdot J_b.$$

Note that the resulting family $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$, with perturbed complex structures, may no longer be holomorphic.

Proposition 3.44. *Perhaps after shrinking B , there is a $\Psi : B \rightarrow L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ such that for all $b \in B$*

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(F_{\Psi(b)} \cdot J_b, \omega)) \in \mathfrak{t}.$$

Note that the operator $b \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J, \omega))$ is itself T -equivariant as the family $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ is T -equivariant. Then just as before, the function Ψ will automatically be T -equivariant from its construction, where equivariance means with respect to the natural actions on B and $L_k^2(M, \mathbb{R})$.

The result follows directly from the arguments on a fixed complex structure, so we only sketch the differences. On the central fibre $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$, the result is precisely Theorem 3.39. Note that as we are fixing the symplectic structure and varying the complex structure, the space of Hamiltonians for the fixed T -action on $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ is unchanged, so while the space \mathfrak{t} varied with ε in Theorem 3.39, in our new perspective we actually fix \mathfrak{t} .

The three key ingredients in Theorem 3.39 were the construction of approximate solutions, the bound on the operator norm of the right inverse of the linearised operator, and the control of the non-linear operator. The approximate solutions can be constructed for all $b \in B$, since the property used to construct the approximate solutions was that the linearisation was to leading order the Lichnerowicz operator $-\mathcal{D}_0^* \mathcal{D}_0$ on the central fibre $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$. Since the linearisation in general is then a perturbation of $-\mathcal{D}_0^* \mathcal{D}_0$, it is still an isomorphism orthogonal to $\mathfrak{h} = \ker \mathcal{D}_0 \mathcal{D}_0^*$, so the same argument applies. Here we use that the linearisation of the scalar curvature as one varies the complex structure on \mathcal{X}_0 is simply $-\mathcal{D}_0^* \mathcal{D}_0$. Again since the full linearisation is a perturbation of the linearisation at $b = 0$, the mapping properties are inherited from those on $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$. As noted in Remark 3.43, the bounds on the non-linear terms apply also with the complex structure allowed to vary. Thus one can produce the desired $\Psi(b)$ for each $b \in B$, and as a standard consequence of the contraction mapping theorem the $\Psi(b)$ are as regular as possible [54, Proof of Theorem 1] as one varies b . We will only need that they are actually, say, C^8 , to ensure that the Z -critical operator is twice differentiable, which is then guaranteed for sufficiently large k .

The important consequence of Proposition 3.44 is that a zero of the moment map produced by Corollary 3.22 on B is then actually a genuine Z -critical Kähler metric. Thus we have reduced to a finite dimensional moment map problem.

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. The action is automatically effective, as we have assumed that (X, L) has discrete automorphism group. There is a sequence of T -invariant symplectic forms

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

on B for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, such that Ω_0 is itself symplectic from Proposition 3.22. 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. The following, which is simply a combination of Proposition 3.44 and Corollary 3.22, summarises what we have proven so far:

Lemma 3.45. *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) is a Z_ε -critical Kähler metric, where (M, J_b, ω) is the Kähler manifold associated to $b \in B$.

Here we have replaced the initial complex structure over $b \in B$ with the one produced by Proposition 3.44 which satisfies $\text{Im}(e^{-\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(F_{\Psi(b)} \cdot J_b, \omega)) \in \mathfrak{h}$. 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. 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 [25, 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 3.46. *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 3.47. *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 [56, 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 3.23 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 3.23.

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

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} h_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 t_1, \gamma_1 t_2) &= |\lambda_1 t_1|^2 + h_{1,p_1}(0, z_2) \varepsilon^{p_1} + O(\varepsilon t_1^2) + O(\varepsilon^{p_1+1}), \\ h_{2,\varepsilon}(\lambda_1 t_1, \gamma_1 t_2) &= |\gamma_1 t_2|^2 + h_{2,p_2}(z_1, 0) \varepsilon^{p_2} + O(\varepsilon t_2^2) + O(\varepsilon^{p_2+1}). \end{aligned}$$

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 (3.25). 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 3.48. Although our technique is dissimilar to the analogous results in the setting of Z -critical connections on holomorphic vector bundles [14, 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 3.41, 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 3.49. *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 3.50. *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 3.51. *Under the same hypotheses as Proposition 3.47, 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 3.39, 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 3.50.

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 3.25.

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 [19, 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 $x \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. Alternatively, if our solution does not lie in $(\mathbb{C}^*)^k$, we have produced Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics on $(\mathcal{X}_p, \mathcal{L}_p)$, which is the central fibre of a test configuration for (X, L) . As we have assumed (X, L) is Z_ε -stable, $(\mathcal{X}_p, \mathcal{L}_p)$ must be Z_ε -unstable with respect to product test configurations, contradicting Corollary 3.23. \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 $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} \in c_1(\mathcal{L})$ the induced relatively Kähler metric from the construction of the Kuranishi space. Here B is the closure of the $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit of (X, L) in the Kuranishi space of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$. Our hypothesis is that (X, L) admits Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics for all ε sufficiently small, in a way that is compatible with our proof of that “stability implies existence”. That is, we assume that there is a sequence of relative Kähler potentials Ψ_ε producing relatively Kähler metrics $\omega_{\mathcal{X}} + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi$, such that for each ε there is a $b_\varepsilon \in B^\circ$, the open dense orbit of B , such that

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi_\varepsilon} \tilde{Z}_\varepsilon(J_{b_\varepsilon}, (\omega_{\mathcal{X}} + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi)|_{\mathcal{X}_{b_\varepsilon}})) = 0.$$

Recall also that each $\mathbb{C}^* \hookrightarrow T^{\mathbb{C}}$ produces a test configuration for (X, L) .

Theorem 3.52. *In the above situation, for each test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ arising from the action of $T^{\mathbb{C}}$, we have*

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

for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

This of course is equivalent to our definition of asymptotic Z -stability with respect to these test configurations, 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. By Theorem 3.13, each b_ε is actually a zero of a genuine finite dimensional moment map with respect to the Kähler metrics Ω_ε on B . It then follows by convexity of the log norm functional associated to the moment map that for any \mathbb{C}^* -action induced by Jv , with $b_{\varepsilon,0}$ the specialisation of b_ε , the value $\langle \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon, v \rangle(b_{\varepsilon,0})$ is negative. But by Proposition 3.23, 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

Remark 3.53. This is truly a local result. In principle, although it should not be expected to actually happen, (X, L) could admit Z_ε -critical Kähler metrics that are “far” from the cscK metric on $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ to which our result would not apply. Furthermore, there are many other test configurations for (X, L) not arising from the Kuranishi space of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0)$ for which we do not obtain stability with respect to, though these seem geometrically less important.

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 that taking the variation of the Z -energy in this context actually produces a partial differential equation, 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

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

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 [21, Section 1.2] and Tian [59, 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. A Kähler metric $\omega \in c_1(L)$ induces a metric on the holomorphic tangent bundle T_X . This produces representatives of the Segre classes $s_j(T_X)$, 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 $\int_X L^l \cdot s_{m_1}(X) \cdots s_{m_j}(X) \cdot \Theta$ the value

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

given by

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

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 3.4. The curvature property is proven by Tian when $\theta = 0$ [59, Proposition 1.4] for general functionals of this kind, but the proof applies to the general case.

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 [21, 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 3.9 the map $F_{Z,\psi}$ is given by

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

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

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

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

$$F_{Z,\psi} = \int_X L(\psi) \operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\varphi} \hat{Z}(\omega)) \omega^n,$$

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

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

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

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

In general, to check for a given central charge that this even actually produces a partial differential equation seems challenging, so we emphasise that this is a strong hypothesis. We remark however that Pingali has, in a special case, linearised $c_2(\omega)$ and has even established an ellipticity result under hypotheses on the geometry of the manifold in question [47, Lemma 3.1].

Example 4.4. Set

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

The variation of the Deligne functional associated to each term $\int_X L^l .c_{n-l}(X)$ has been calculated by Weinkove [62, 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” [40]) and Futaki (under the name “constant perturbed scalar curvature Kähler metrics” [30]). 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 3.39, 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 3.11, 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 [20, 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 $\mathbb{P}(TX)$ 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 TX 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 $\mathbb{P}(TX)$ 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 now assume that Z is an admissible central charge, in the sense of Section 3, which means that $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-1}) < 0$, $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-2}) > 0$, $\text{Re}(\rho_{n-3}) = 0$ and $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$. These mean that the new terms in the Segre class enter at order ε^4 , meaning the structure of the equation at lower order is the same as in the “rank one” case.

We finally explain how to prove our main result in the higher rank case:

Theorem 4.6. *Let Z be an analytic 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 ??, 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 symplectic geometry, and 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] T. Brönnle, *Extremal Kähler metrics on projectivized vector bundles*. Duke Math. J. 164 (2015), no. 2, 195–233.
- [8] G. Chen, *The J-equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation*. To appear in Invent. Math.
- [9] 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.
- [10] X. X. Chen and G. Tian, *Ricci flow on Kähler-Einstein surfaces*. Invent. Math. 147 (2002), no. 3, 487–544.
- [11] 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.
- [12] T. C. Collins and S. T. Yau, *Moment maps, nonlinear PDE, and stability in mirror symmetry*. arXiv:1811.04824 94pp.
- [13] R. Dervan, *Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2016, no. 15, 4728–4783.
- [14] R. Dervan, J. B. McCarthy and L. M. Sektnan, *Z-critical connections and Bridgeland stability conditions*. 2020, arXiv:2012.10426, 70pp.

- [15] R. Dervan and P. Naumann, *Moduli of polarised manifolds via canonical Kähler metrics*. 2018, arXiv:1810.02576, 28pp
- [16] R. Dervan and J. Ross, *K-stability for Kähler manifolds*. Math. Res. Lett. 24 (2017), no. 3, 689–739.
- [17] R. Dervan and J. Ross, *Stable maps in higher dimensions*. Math. Ann. 374 (2019), no. 3-4, 1033–1073.
- [18] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan, *Extremal metrics on fibrations*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 120 (2020), no. 4, 587–616.
- [19] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan, *Uniqueness of optimal symplectic connections*. To appear in Forum Math. Sigma.
- [20] S. Diverio, *Segre forms and Kobayashi-Lübke inequality*. Math. Z. 283 (2016), no. 3-4, 1033–1047.
- [21] 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.
- [22] 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.
- [23] S. K. Donaldson, *Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties*. J. Differential Geom. 62 (2002), no. 2, 289–349.
- [24] S. K. Donaldson, *Lower bounds on the Calabi functional*. J. Differential Geom. 70 (2005), no. 3, 453–472.
- [25] 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.
- [26] J. Fine, *Constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics on fibred complex surfaces*. J. Differential Geom. 68 (2004), no. 3, 397–432.
- [27] W. Fischer and H. Grauert, *Lokal-triviale Familien kompakter komplexer Mannigfaltigkeiten*. Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math.-Phys. Kl. II 1965 (1965), 89–94.
- [28] A. Fujiki, *Moduli space of polarized algebraic manifolds and Kähler metrics*. Sugaku Expositions Vol. 5 no. 2 (1992) 173–191.
- [29] 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.
- [30] A. Futaki, *Harmonic total Chern forms and stability*. Kodai Math. J. 29 (2006), no. 3, 346–369.
- [31] P. Gauduchon, *Calabi’s extremal Kähler metrics: An elementary introduction*. Book available online.
- [32] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. xiv+517 pp.
- [33] M. Hallam, *Geodesics in the space of relatively Kähler metrics*. arXiv:2012.04416 40pp.
- [34] Y. Hashimoto, *Existence of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics with a large twist*. Math. Z. 292 (2019), no. 3-4, 791–803.
- [35] 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.
- [36] E. Inoue, *The moduli space of Fano manifolds with Kähler-Ricci solitons*. Adv. Math. no. 357 (2019). 1–65.
- [37] A. Jacob and S. T. Yau, *A special Lagrangian type equation for holomorphic line bundles*. Math. Ann. 369 (2017), no. 1-2, 869–898.
- [38] M. Lejmi and G. Székelyhidi, *The J-flow and stability*. Adv. Math. 274 (2015), 404–431.
- [39] N. C. Leung, *Einstein type metrics and stability on vector bundles*. J. Differential Geom. 45 (1997), no. 3, 514–546.
- [40] N. C. Leung, *Bando Futaki invariants and Kähler Einstein metric*. Comm. Anal. Geom. 6 (1998), no. 4, 799–808.
- [41] 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.
- [42] C. Li, *Geodesic rays and stability in the cscK problem*. To appear in Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.
- [43] 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.

- [44] P. E. Newstead, *Introduction to moduli problems and orbit spaces*. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, 51. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; by the Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 1978. vi+183 pp.
- [45] Y. Odaka, *A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory*. Osaka J. Math. 50 (2013), no. 1, 171–185.
- [46] Y. Odaka, *Compact moduli spaces of Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 51 (2015), no. 3, 549–565.
- [47] V. P. Pingali, *A note on higher extremal metrics*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 370 (2018), no. 10, 6995–7010.
- [48] 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.
- [49] C. Scarpa, *The Hitchin-cscK system*. PhD Thesis (2020).
- [50] E. Schlitzer and J. Stoppa, *Deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills connections, extended gauge group and scalar curvature*. To appear in J. Lond. Math. Soc.
- [51] L. M. Sektnan and C. Tipler, *Hermitian Yang-Mills connections on pullback bundles*. 2020, arXiv:2006.06453, 48pp.
- [52] Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, *K-semistability of cscK manifolds with transcendental cohomology class*. J. Geom. Anal. 28 (2018), no. 4, 2927–2960.
- [53] J. Song and B. Weinkove, *Energy functionals and canonical Kähler metrics*. Duke Math. J. (1) 137, 159–184.
- [54] G. Székelyhidi, *On blowing up extremal Kähler manifolds*. Duke Math. J. 161 (2012), no. 8, 1411–1453.
- [55] G. Székelyhidi, *An introduction to extremal Kähler metrics*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 152. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2014). xvi+192 pp.
- [56] G. Székelyhidi, *The Kähler-Ricci flow and K-polystability*. Amer. J. Math. (4) 132 (2014), 1077–1090.
- [57] M. Taylor, *Partial differential equations I. Basic theory*. Second edition. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 115. Springer, New York, 2011. xxii+654 pp.
- [58] G. Tian, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*. Invent. Math. 130 (1997), no. 1, 1–37.
- [59] G. Tian, *Bott-Chern forms and geometric stability*. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems 6 (2000), no. 1, 211–220.
- [60] Y. Toda, *Moduli stacks and invariants of semistable objects on K3 surfaces*. Adv. Math. 217 (2008), no. 6, 2736–2781.
- [61] X. Wang, *Height and GIT weight*. Math. Res. Lett. 19 (2012), no. 4, 909–926.
- [62] B. Weinkove, *Higher K-energy functionals and higher Futaki invariants*. 2002, arXiv:math/0204271, 14pp.
- [63] C. Xu, *K-stability of Fano varieties: an algebro-geometric approach*. 2020, arXiv:2011.10477, 84pp.
- [64] 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.
- [65] 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@dpms.cam.ac.uk