

ON WALL-CROSSING FOR K-STABILITY

CHUYU ZHOU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we explore the wall crossing phenomenon for K-stability, and apply it to explain the wall crossing for K-moduli stacks and K-moduli spaces.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Acknowledgement	3
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. K-stability via test configurations	4
2.2. Valuative criterion	4
2.3. Log Calabi-Yau pair	6
3. Constructibility of delta invariants for family of log Fano pairs	7
4. Two thresholds $l(t)$ and $u(t)$	9
5. Application to K-moduli	14
5.1. Wall crossing for K-moduli stacks	14
5.2. Wall crossing for K-moduli spaces	16
References	18

1. INTRODUCTION

By the works [Jia20, BLX19, Xu20, BX19, ABHLX20, BHLLX20, CP18, XZ20, LXZ21], a compactified moduli space is constructed for Fano varieties via the concept of K-stability. Then it is natural to study the relations between different compactifications. For example, the work [ADL19] establishes a wall crossing result for K-moduli of smoothable log Fano varieties, which indicates that K-moduli is likely to play a role of bridge connecting GIT-moduli and KSBA-moduli. One reason for the smoothable condition being posed there is caused by the lack of properness for K-moduli at that time, and they heavily depend on the analytic tools developed in [CDS15a, CDS15b, CDS15c, Tia15, TW19, LWX19] to overcome this difficulty. Along with the establishment of properness by the work [LXZ21] recently, we can clarify the wall crossing phenomenon for K-moduli by a purely algebraic way, and this is the motivation of the current paper.

Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ be a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties of dimension d such that the anti-canonical divisor $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} , where B is a normal base. Suppose \mathcal{D} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} such that every component is flat over B and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. For a rational number $0 < c < 1$, we denote $p_c : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$

and consider the following subset of B :

$$B_c := \{t \in B \mid (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable}\}.$$

Let's write $B^{ss} \subset B$ to be the subset parametrizing K-semistable fibers of π , then $B_0 = B^{ss}$, which is an open subset of B (see [BLX19, Xu20]). For the family $p_1 : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$, let $U \subset B$ be the subset parametrizing log canonical fibers, then by inversion of adjunction, U is an open subset of B . By interpolation property of K-stability we see $B^{ss} \cap U \subset B_c$ for any rational $0 < c < 1$. Therefore, B_c are mutually birational as c varies for rational $c \in [0, 1]$ when B^{ss} and U are both non-empty. Note here that when $c = 1$, the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{D}_t)$ being K-semistable just means it's log canonical (e.g. [BHJ17, Section 9] or [Oda13, Theorem 1.5]). Then our goal is to explain the following wall-crossing phenomena for K-stability.

- (1) Find finite rational numbers $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1$ such that B_c does not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) , $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$.
- (2) Figure out the relationship among $B_{c_j - \epsilon}$, B_{c_j} and $B_{c_j + \epsilon}$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

This goal is achieved in Theorem 4.5, and we also apply it to explain wall crossing phenomenon for K-moduli, which culminates in Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.8. We just summarize them in this section.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ be a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties of dim d such that $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} , where B is a normal base. Suppose \mathcal{D} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} such that every component is flat over B and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. For a rational number $0 \leq c \leq 1$, denote $p_c : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$ and*

$$B_c := \{t \in B \mid (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable}\}.$$

Then there exist finite rational numbers $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1$ such that B_c does not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$.

The above theorem is contained in Theorem 4.5, where we also characterize there the relationships among $B_{c_j - \epsilon}$, B_{c_j} and $B_{c_j + \epsilon}$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$. The strategy is to study the following two thresholds and prove their constructible property (see Section 4):

$$l(t) := \inf\{0 \leq c \leq 1 \mid \text{the pair } (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable}\}, \quad (1)$$

$$u(t) := \sup\{0 \leq c \leq 1 \mid \text{the pair } (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable}\}. \quad (2)$$

Note that such kind of thresholds have been defined for family of smoothable Fano varieties in the works [LWX19, Definition 7.4] and [ADL19, Definition 3.14], and some constructible properties are also proved therein to get openness property for K-stability. In this paper, we will study their constructibility by a different method, which fits to the recently developed algebraic K-stability theory.

In order to apply it to the wall crossing for K-moduli, we first set the notation. Fix a rational number $r > 0$, we consider a set \mathcal{F} of pairs satisfying that $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if it's of the following form:

- (1) X is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and volume v ,
- (2) $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_X$ is a Weil divisor on X such that $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K-semistable for some rational $c \in [0, 1)$.

In Theorem 5.4, we will see that \mathcal{F} lies in a log bounded family. Then for sufficiently large m , we define the following subset of \mathcal{F} , denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{m, \mathbb{P}^{N_m}}^{\mathcal{X}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}}$ and abbreviated by \mathcal{F}_m , such that $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_m$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) (X, D) can be embedded into $\mathbb{P}^{N_m} \times \mathbb{P}^{N_m}$ such that

$$\mathcal{O}_X(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)|_X \sim -mK_X \quad \text{and} \quad H^0(\mathbb{P}^{N_m}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)) \cong H^0(X, -mK_X),$$

(2) X (resp. D) admits Hilbert polynomial χ (resp. $\tilde{\chi}$) with respect to $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_D(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)|_D$).

Write $P := (\chi, \tilde{\chi})$. We define the subset $\mathcal{F}_{m,c} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ for a rational $c \in [0, 1)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,c} := \{(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_m \mid \text{the pair } (X, \frac{c}{r}D) \text{ is K-semistable}\}.$$

The set \mathcal{F}_m admits an algebraic structure to become a Hilbert scheme, and $\mathcal{F}_{m,c} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ is an open sub-scheme by [BLX19, Xu20], then we write $\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$ to be the corresponding reduced schemes. Denote $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K := [\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}/\text{PGL}(N_m + 1)]$, which is a reduced Artin stack of finite type representing the moduli pseudo-functor over reduced bases (by the works [Jia20, BLX19, Xu20]). Here one can also define the moduli functor over any base due to [Kol19], see Remark 5.5. We denote $M_{P,r,c}^K$ the descent of $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$, which is a separated projective good moduli space parametrizing K-polystable elements, whose existence is due to the works [ABHLX20, BHLLX20, XZ20, LXZ21]. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *There exist finite rational numbers $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1$ such that*

(1) *the Hilbert schemes $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$, and we have open immersions*

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,c_j-\epsilon}^{\text{red}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{m,c_j}^{\text{red}} \hookleftarrow \mathcal{F}_{m,c_j+\epsilon}^{\text{red}}$$

for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

(2) *the Artin stacks $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$, and we have the following open immersions*

$$\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j-\epsilon}^K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j}^K \hookleftarrow \mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j+\epsilon}^K$$

for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

(3) *the good moduli spaces $M_{P,r,c}^K$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$, and we have the following projective morphisms among good moduli spaces*

$$M_{P,r,c_j-\epsilon}^K \xrightarrow{\phi_j^-} M_{P,r,c_j}^K \xleftarrow{\phi_j^+} M_{P,r,c_j+\epsilon}^K$$

for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, which behave like flips.

The above theorem is contained in Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.8.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Yuchen Liu and Ziquan Zhuang for helpful discussions and good suggestions, and Zsolt Patakfalvi for beneficial comments. The author is supported by grant European Research Council (ERC-804334).

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review the concepts of K-stability of Fano varieties via test configurations and valuative criterion. We work over complex number field \mathbb{C} through the paper. We say (X, Δ) is a log pair if X is a projective normal variety and Δ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. We say a log pair (X, Δ) is log Fano if it admits klt singularities and $-K_X - \Delta$ is ample. If a log Fano pair (X, Δ) has vanishing boundary, i.e. $\Delta = 0$, we just say X is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety. For various concepts of singularities in birational geometry, such as klt and lc, we refer to [KM98, Kol13].

2.1. K-stability via test configurations. The definition of K-stability via test configurations originates to [Tia97] and was later algebraically reformulated by [Don02].

Definition 2.1. Let (X, Δ) be a log pair of dimension d and L is an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on X . A test configuration $\pi : (\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a degenerating family over \mathbb{A}^1 consisting of the following data:

- (1) $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a projective flat morphism from a normal variety \mathcal{X} , Δ_{tc} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{L} is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} ,
- (2) the family π admits a \mathbb{C}^* -action induced by the natural multiplication on \mathbb{A}^1 such that $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L}) \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{C}^*$ is \mathbb{C}^* -equivariantly isomorphic to $(X, \Delta; L) \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{C}^*$.

We denote $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\Delta}_{\text{tc}}; \bar{\mathcal{L}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ to be the natural compactification of the original test configuration, which is obtained by glueing $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L})$ and $(X, \Delta; L) \times (\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus 0)$ along their common open subset $(X, \Delta; L) \times \mathbb{C}^*$.

Suppose (X, Δ) is a log Fano pair of dimension d and $L = -K_X - \Delta$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L})$ be a test configuration such that $\mathcal{L} = -K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} - \Delta_{\text{tc}}$. We call it a special (resp. weakly special) test configuration if the central fiber $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\text{tc},0})$ admits klt (resp. lc) singularities.

Definition 2.2. The generalized Futaki invariant of a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L})$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L}) := \frac{(K_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \bar{\Delta}_{\text{tc}})\bar{\mathcal{L}}^d}{L^d} - \frac{d}{d+1} \frac{\{(K_X + \Delta)L^{d-1}\}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{d+1}}{(L^d)^2}.$$

In particular, if (X, Δ) is a log Fano pair and $L = -K_X - \Delta$, we have

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L}) = \frac{d\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{d+1}}{(d+1)(-K_X - \Delta)^d} + \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^d \cdot (K_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \bar{\Delta}_{\text{tc}})}{(-K_X - \Delta)^d}.$$

Definition 2.3. Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair of dimension d and $L = -K_X - \Delta$. We say (X, Δ) is K-semistable if the generalized Futaki invariants is non-negative for all test configurations. We say (X, Δ) is K-polystable if it's K-semistable and any test configuration with K-semistable central fiber is induced by a one parameter subgroup of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, which is also called a test configuration of product type.

2.2. Valuative criterion. Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair of dimension d , we say E is a prime divisor over X if there is a proper birational morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ between normal varieties such that E appears as a prime divisor on Y . We say E is a special (resp. weakly special) divisor over X if ord_E is induced by some non-trivial special (resp. weakly special) test configuration of $(X, \Delta; L := -K_X - \Delta)$. In other words, if $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L})$ is a non-trivial special (resp. weakly special) test configuration of $(X, \Delta; L)$, by [BHJ17], the central fiber

induces a divisorial valuation on $K(X)$, i.e. $\text{ord}_{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}|_{K(X)}} = c \cdot \text{ord}_E$, for some rational number $c > 0$ and some prime divisor E over X , and such a prime divisor E is called a special (resp. weakly special) divisor over X .

Definition 2.4. Let E be a prime divisor over X , we have the following invariants:

$$A_{X,\Delta}(E) = \text{ord}_E(K_Y - f^*(K_X + \Delta)) + 1,$$

$$S_{X,\Delta}(E) = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(-K_X - \Delta)} \int_0^\infty \text{vol}(-f^*(K_X + \Delta) - tE) dt.$$

Then beta invariant is defined to be

$$\beta_{X,\Delta}(E) = A_{X,\Delta}(E) - S_{X,\Delta}(E);$$

and delta invariant is defined to be

$$\delta(X, \Delta) = \inf_F \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(F)}{S_{X,\Delta}(F)},$$

where F runs through all prime divisors over X .

Remark 2.5. Notation as in above definition, we give a few remarks here,

- (1) The invariant $S_{X,\Delta}(E)$ can also be defined as the limit of $S_m(E) := \max_{D_m} \text{ord}_E(D_m)$, where D_m runs through all m -basis type divisors. Note that, if we denote $N_m := \dim H^0(X, -m(K_X + \Delta))$, then the divisor of the form

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_m} \text{div}(s_j = 0)}{mN_m} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -(K_X + \Delta)$$

is called an m -basis type divisor, where $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^{N_m}$ is a complete basis of the vector space $H^0(X, -m(K_X + \Delta))$.

- (2) Define $T_{X,\Delta}(E) := \sup_{D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta} \text{ord}_E(D)$, then we have $\frac{d+1}{d} \leq \frac{T_{X,\Delta}(E)}{S_{X,\Delta}(E)} \leq d+1$, see [BJ20].
- (3) For a weakly special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L})$ of $(X, \Delta; L)$, denote $v_{\mathcal{X}_0} := \text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}|_{K(X)} = c \cdot \text{ord}_E$ for some rational number $c > 0$ and prime divisor E over X , then we have $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}}; \mathcal{L}) = c \cdot \beta_{X,\Delta}(E)$, see [Fuj19, Theorem 6.13].
- (4) If $\delta(X, \Delta) < \frac{d+1}{d}$, the inf in the definition of $\delta(X, \Delta)$ can be replaced by min due to the recent work [LXZ21].

The following theorem is now a cornerstone in the recently developed algebraic K-stability theory.

Theorem 2.6. ([Fuj19, Li17, BJ20, FO18]) *Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair of dimension d , then we have the following equivalences:*

- (1) (X, Δ) is K-semistable if and only if $\beta_{X,\Delta}(E) \geq 0$ for any prime divisor E over X (or equivalently for any special divisor E over X).
- (2) (X, Δ) is K-semistable if and only if $\delta(X, \Delta) \geq 1$ for any prime divisor E over X (or equivalently for any special divisor E over X).

2.3. Log Calabi-Yau pair. We say a log pair (Y, G) is log Calabi-Yau if it admits log canonical singularities and $K_Y + G \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. In this subsection, we only focus on log Calabi-Yau pairs of the form (X, D) , where X is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$. Suppose $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a test configuration of $(X, D; L := -K_X)$, by Definition 2.2, we have the following formula:

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = \frac{(K_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \bar{\mathcal{D}})\bar{\mathcal{L}}^n}{L^n}.$$

Let $c \in [0, 1]$, we also have the following easy computation by Definition 2.2:

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = c \cdot \text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) + (1 - c) \cdot \text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{L}).$$

We will need the the following widely known lemma later.

Lemma 2.7. *Notation as above, we have the following two statements:*

- (1) *Suppose E is an lc place of (X, D) , then one can produce a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L} = -K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1})$ of $(X, D; -K_X)$ such that the central fiber $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is log canonical and*

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}|_{K(X)} = \text{ord}_E \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = 0.$$

- (2) *Suppose $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L} = -K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1})$ is a test configuration of $(X, D; -K_X)$ such that $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is log canonical, then $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}|_{K(X)}$ is an lc place of (X, D) .*

Proof. We first prove (1). By [BCHM10], there exists an extraction morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ which only extracts E . If E is a divisor on X we just take $f = \text{id}$. Then we have the following:

$$K_Y + f_*^{-1}D + E = f^*(K_X + D).$$

It's not hard to see that Y is of Fano type, so E is a dreamy divisor. We put the morphism f into a trivial family $F : Y_{\mathbb{A}^1} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, then we have

$$K_{Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + F_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E_{\mathbb{A}^1} + Y_0 = F^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X_0),$$

where X_0 (resp. Y_0) is the central fiber of the family $X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ (resp. $Y_{\mathbb{A}^1} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$). Let v be a divisorial valuation over $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ with weights $(1, 1)$ along divisors $E_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and Y_0 , then

$$A_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X_0}(v) = A_{Y_{\mathbb{A}^1}, F_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + E_{\mathbb{A}^1} + Y_0}(v) = 0.$$

By [BCHM10], one can extract v to be a divisor on a birational model $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ as follows:

$$K_{\mathcal{Y}} + g_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + g_*^{-1}X_0 + \mathcal{E} = g^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + X_0),$$

where $v = \text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}}$. The pair $(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + g_*^{-1}X_0 + \mathcal{E})$ is log canonical and being log Calabi-Yau over \mathbb{A}^1 , and \mathcal{Y} is of Fano type. Then we run $g_*^{-1}X_0$ -MMP over \mathbb{A}^1 to get a minimal model $\mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{Y}'/\mathbb{A}^1$. Denote $D_{\mathcal{Y}'}$ (resp. X'_0 and \mathcal{E}') to be the pushforward of $g_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ (resp. $g_*^{-1}X_0$ and \mathcal{E}). By Zariski lemma $g_*^{-1}X_0$ is contracted, that is, $X'_0 = 0$. Thus we get

$$(\mathcal{Y}, g_*^{-1}D_{\mathbb{A}^1} + g_*^{-1}X_0 + \mathcal{E}) \dashrightarrow (\mathcal{Y}', D_{\mathcal{Y}'} + \mathcal{E}'),$$

and the pair $(\mathcal{Y}', D_{\mathcal{Y}'} + \mathcal{E}')$ is still being lc log Calabi-Yau over \mathbb{A}^1 and \mathcal{Y}' is of Fano type. We focus on the pair $(\mathcal{Y}', D_{\mathcal{Y}'} + \mathcal{E}') \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$. Run $-K_{\mathcal{Y}'}$ ($\sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{A}^1} D_{\mathcal{Y}'} + \mathcal{E}'$)-MMP over \mathbb{A}^1 to get an ample model $\mathcal{Y}' \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Let \mathcal{D} (resp. \mathcal{E}'') be the pushforward of $D_{\mathcal{Y}'}$ (resp. \mathcal{E}'), then we see that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a test configuration of (X, D) , and the central fiber is exactly \mathcal{E}'' . By our construction of \mathcal{E} we know that the restriction of $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{E}''}$ to $K(X)$ is exactly ord_E .

Let $p : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{D}})$ and $q : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow (X_{\mathbb{P}^1}, D_{\mathbb{P}^1})$ be a common log resolution, by above construction we see that $p^*(K_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \bar{\mathcal{D}}) = q^*(K_{X_{\mathbb{P}^1}/\mathbb{P}^1} + D_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$, which deduces the vanishing of $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$.

Now we turn to (2). Denote $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{X}_0}|_{K(X)} = c \cdot \text{ord}_E$ for some rational $c > 0$ and prime divisor E over X . Then we see $(\mathcal{X}, a\mathcal{D})$ is a weakly special test configuration of (X, aD) for any rational $a \in [0, 1)$. By [BLX19, Appendix], for any rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, one can find a $D_\epsilon \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$ such that E is an lc place of $(X, (1 - \epsilon)D + \epsilon D_\epsilon)$. Suppose E is not an lc place of (X, D) , then $A_{X,D}(E) > t$ for some $t > 0$. On the other hand,

$$A_{X,(1-\epsilon)D+\epsilon D_\epsilon}(E) = A_{X,(1-\epsilon)D}(E) - \epsilon \cdot \text{ord}_E(D_\epsilon) \geq t - \epsilon \cdot T_X(E).$$

For sufficiently small ϵ we have $A_{X,(1-\epsilon)D+\epsilon D_\epsilon}(E) > 0$, a contradiction. \square

3. CONSTRUCTIBILITY OF DELTA INVARIANTS FOR FAMILY OF LOG FANO PAIRS

Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair of dimension d and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta$ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Given a real number $0 < c < 1$. If $(X, \Delta + cD)$ is log Fano, we define

$$\delta(X, \Delta + cD) := \inf_E \frac{A_{X,\Delta+cD}(E)}{(1-c)S_{X,\Delta}(E)},$$

where E runs through all prime divisors over X . Note here that $\delta(X, \Delta + cD)$ is exactly the delta invariant of the log Fano pair $(X, \Delta + cD)$ when c is rational.

Definition 3.1. For a given real number $0 < c < 1$, we say the pair $(X, \Delta + cD)$ is K-semistable if it's klt and $\delta(X, \Delta + cD) \geq 1$.

Note that this definition is now standard if c is rational due to the work [FO18, BJ20]. However, if c is irrational, it may not be standard to talk about the concepts of K-stability for the pair in the literature, as one should start with test configurations and prove the valuative criterion as in [Li17, Fuj19]. Here we don't need the equivalence between the two definitions of K-stability, respectively via test configurations and via valuative criterion, for real coefficients, so we just define K-stability in a way as the above definition. Denote $\tilde{\delta}(X, \Delta + cD) := \min\{\delta(X, \Delta + cD), 1\}$, we have the following generalization of openness property for K-stability in [BLX19, Xu20].

Theorem 3.2. ([BLX19, Xu20]) *Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ be a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties of dim d such that $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} , where B is a normal base. Suppose \mathcal{D} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} such that every component is flat over B and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. For any given real number $0 < c < 1$, the set $\{\tilde{\delta}(\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) | t \in B\}$ is finite.*

Note that the result is a direct consequence of [BLX19, Xu20] for rational c . For irrational c , it's enough to show that $\delta(X, cD)$ can be approximated by lc places of bounded complements of $(X, -K_X)$ if it's no more greater than 1 (see next lemma), and the rest follows from [BLX19, Proposition 4.3].

Lemma 3.3. *Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair of dimension d and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta$ an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Fix an irrational number $0 < c < 1$ such that the log Fano pair $(X, \Delta + cD)$*

satisfies that $\delta(X, \Delta + cD) \leq 1$. Then there exists an integer N depending only on d and the coefficients of Δ such that

$$\delta(X, cD) = \inf_E \frac{A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E)}{(1-c)S_{X, \Delta}(E)},$$

where E runs through lc places of some N -complements of (X, Δ) .

Proof. We define

$$\delta_m := \delta_m(X, \Delta + cD) := \inf_E \frac{A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E)}{\max_{D_m} (1-c) \text{ord}_E(D_m)},$$

where E runs through all prime divisors over X and D_m runs through all m -basis type divisors of (X, Δ) . It's clear that $\lim_m \delta_m(X, \Delta + cD) = \delta(X, \Delta + cD)$.

We first assume $\delta(X, \Delta + cD) < 1$, then $\delta_m(X, \Delta + cD) < 1$ for sufficiently large m . In this case one can find an m -basis type divisor D_m such that $(X, \Delta + cD + \delta_m(1-c)D_m)$ is strictly log canonical and admits an lc place E_m over X . We choose a general $H \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta$ such that $(X, \Delta + cD + \delta_m(1-c)D_m + (1-c - \delta_m(1-c))H)$ is an lc log Calabi-Yau pair. By [BCHM10], there is an extraction $g_m : Y_m \rightarrow X$ which only extracts E_m , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & K_{Y_m} + \tilde{\Delta} + c\tilde{D} + \delta_m(1-c)\tilde{D}_m + (1-c - \delta_m(1-c))\tilde{H} + E_m \\ &= g_m^*(K_X + \Delta + cD + \delta_m(1-c)D_m + (1-c - \delta_m(1-c))H), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\bullet}$ is the birational transformation of \bullet and Y_m is of Fano type. We run $-(K_{Y_m} + \tilde{\Delta} + E_m)$ -MMP to get a minimal model $f_m : Y_m \dashrightarrow Y'_m$ such that $-(K_{Y_m} + f_{m*}\tilde{\Delta} + f_{m*}E_m)$ is nef and Y'_m is also of Fano type. By [Bir19, Theorem 1.7], there exists a positive integer N depending only on d and the coefficients of Δ such that E_m is an lc place of some N -complement of (X, Δ) . It's not hard to see that

$$\delta(X, \Delta + cD) = \lim_m \frac{A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E_m)}{(1-c)S_{X, \Delta}(E_m)},$$

where E_m are a sequence of lc places of some N -complements of (X, Δ) .

Next we turn to the case $\delta(X, \Delta + cD) = 1$. By the same proof as [ZZ19, Theorem 1.1], for any rational $0 < \epsilon_i < 1$, one can find a $D_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta$ such that $\delta(X, \Delta + cD + \epsilon_i D_i) < 1$. We assume ϵ_i is a decreasing sequence of rational numbers tending to 0. For each ϵ_i , by the proof of the previous case, there exists a sequence of prime divisors $\{E_{i,m}\}_m$ which are lc places of some N -complements of (X, Δ) such that

$$\delta(X, \Delta + cD + \epsilon_i D_i) = \lim_m \frac{A_{X, \Delta + (c+\epsilon_i)D}(E_{i,m})}{(1-c-\epsilon_i)S_{X, \Delta}(E_{i,m})},$$

and N depends only on d and the coefficients of Δ . It's not hard to see that

$$\delta(X, \Delta + cD) = \inf_{i,m} \frac{A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E_{i,m})}{(1-c)S_{X, \Delta}(E_{i,m})}.$$

The proof is finished. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The proof is just a combination of above lemma and [BLX19, Proposition 4.3]. □

We also need the following lemma in the next section.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (X, Δ) be a log Fano pair and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X - \Delta$ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Suppose $0 < c < 1$ is a given real number such that $(X, \Delta + cD)$ is a K-semistable log Fano pair, and E is a prime divisor over X such that it induces a special test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}} + c\mathcal{D})$ of $(X, \Delta + cD)$. If $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\text{tc},0} + c\mathcal{D}_0)$ is K-semistable, then*

$$A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E) - (1 - c)S_{X, \Delta}(E) = 0.$$

Note that it is well known if c is rational.

Proof. As $(X, \Delta + cD)$ is K-semistable, we have $A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E) - (1 - c)S_{X, \Delta}(E) \geq 0$. By the same proof as [Fuj19, Theorem 5.1], the generalized Futaki invariant of the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc}} + c\mathcal{D})$ is equal to $A_{X, \Delta + cD}(E) - (1 - c)S_{X, \Delta}(E)$. Suppose it's strictly positive, then there exists a product type test configuration of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\text{tc},0} + c\mathcal{D}_0)$ with negative generalized Futaki invariant. This will produce a prime divisor F over \mathcal{X}_0 such that

$$A_{\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\text{tc},0} + c\mathcal{D}_0}(F) - (1 - c)S_{\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\text{tc},0}}(F) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction to the K-semistability of $(\mathcal{X}_0, \Delta_{\text{tc},0} + c\mathcal{D}_0)$. \square

4. TWO THRESHOLDS $l(t)$ AND $u(t)$

Our strategy for the goal in the first section is to study the following two thresholds:

$$l(t) := \inf\{0 \leq c \leq 1 \mid \text{the pair } (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is K-semistable}\}, \quad (3)$$

$$u(t) := \sup\{0 \leq c \leq 1 \mid \text{the pair } (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is K-semistable}\}. \quad (4)$$

In this section, we will study the constructibility of these two thresholds by an approach different from [LWX19, Definition 7.4] and [ADL19, Definition 3.14], which fits to the recently developed algebraic K-stability theory. It's clear that these two functions are defined on the base B , where $t \in B$ varies through closed points. It may appear for some $t \in B$ such that the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t)$ is not K-semistable for any rational $c \in [0, 1]$, in this case we just define $l(t) = u(t) = -\infty$. We first have the following lemma on semi-continuity of $l(t)$ and $u(t)$.

Lemma 4.1. *The function $l(t)$ is upper semi-continuous and $u(t)$ is lower semi-continuous. Therefore, the set $\{l(t) \mid t \in B\}$ (resp. $\{u(t) \mid t \in B\}$) satisfies ACC (resp. DCC) condition.*

Proof. To show $l(t)$ is upper semi-continuous, it suffices to show that the set $l_a := \{t \in B \mid l(t) < a\}$ is an open subset for any $0 < a < 1$. Suppose $t_0 \in l_a$, then the pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_0}, a_0\mathcal{D}_{t_0})$ is K-semistable for some rational $a_0 < a$. By openness property for K-semistable locus (see [BLX19, Xu20]), we know there exists an open subset $U_{t_0} \subset B$ such that the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, a_0\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K-semistable for any $t \in U_{t_0}$. Thus $l(t) \leq a_0 < a$ for any $t \in U_{t_0}$, which concludes the upper semi-continuity of $l(t)$. The same analysis applies to the lower semi-continuity of $u(t)$. The ACC (resp. DCC) property follows immediately. \square

The ACC (resp. DCC) property of $l(t)$ (resp. $u(t)$) is not enough for our purpose, and we will prove that they even satisfy constructible property. Before that, we will first list the following properties of the two functions.

Lemma 4.2. *Notation as above, we have the following properties for $u(t)$ and $l(t)$:*

- (1) the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -semistable for every rational $c \in [l(t), u(t)]$,
- (2) $l(t) = 0$ and $u(t) = 1$ for $t \in B^{ss} \cap U$,
- (3) The inf (resp. sup) in the definition of $l(t)$ (resp. $u(t)$) can be replaced by min (resp. max),
- (4) $l(t)$ and $u(t)$ are both rational for any $t \in B$ if they are not $-\infty$,
- (5) $B_c \subset B$ is an open subset for any rational $0 \leq c \leq 1$,
- (6) $\{t \in B \mid l(t) = u(t) = -\infty\}$ is a closed subset of B .

Proof. For (1) and (2), they are direct consequences by applying interpolation property of K -stability. (3) and (4) are corollaries of the next lemma, and (5) is a corollary of openness property of K -semistability by [BLX19, Xu20]. For (6), it's clear that the set $\{t \in B \mid l(t) = u(t) = -\infty\}$ is the complement in B of the following set:

$$\{t \in B \mid (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable for some rational } c \in [0, 1]\},$$

which is an open subset of B by [BLX19, Xu20], thus (6) is concluded. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let X be a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Suppose $0 < c < 1$ is a real number, then we have the following results:*

- (1) *If (X, aD) is K -semistable for any $a \in [c - \epsilon, c]$ (resp. $a \in [c, c + \epsilon]$) and some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, but K -unstable for any $a \in (c, 1)$ (resp. $a \in (0, c)$), then the number c must be rational.*
- (2) *Suppose the pair (X, aD) is K -semistable for any $a \in [c - \epsilon, c]$ or $a \in (c, c + \epsilon]$ for some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, then (X, cD) is K -semistable.*

Proof. For (1), we only assume (X, aD) is K -semistable for any $a \in [c - \epsilon, c]$ and some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ but K -unstable for any $a \in (c, 1)$, as the other case can be obtained by the same way. We choose a sequence of decreasing rational numbers $c < c_i < 1$ tending to c . After subtracting those c_i which are not close to c we may assume that $(X, c_i D)$ is a K -unstable log Fano pair for every i . By [BLZ19, LXZ21], there is a prime divisor E_i over X such that

$$A_{X, c_i D}(E) - \delta(X, c_i D) S_{X, c_i D}(E) = 0,$$

and E_i induces a special test configuration of $(X, c_i D)$, denoted by $(\mathcal{X}_i, c_i \mathcal{D}_i)$ such that $\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i \mathcal{D}_{i,0}) = \delta(X, c_i D)$. We first show that the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, \mathcal{D}_{i,0})\}$ lies in a log bounded family. It's clear that $\text{vol}(-K_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}) = \text{vol}(-K_X)$ and

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}(E)} \geq (1 - c_i) \cdot \frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i \mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(E)}{(1 - c_i) S_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}(E)}$$

for every prime divisor E over $\mathcal{X}_{i,0}$. In other words,

$$\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}) \geq (1 - c_i) \delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i \mathcal{D}_{i,0}) = (1 - c_i) \delta(X, c_i D).$$

By the following estimate on $\delta(X, c_i D)$,

$$\delta(X, c_i D) = \inf_F \frac{A_{X, c_i D}(F)}{S_{X, c_i D}(F)} = \inf_F \frac{A_{X, cD}(F) - (c_i - c) \text{ord}_F(D)}{\frac{1 - c_i}{1 - c} (1 - c) S_X(F)} \geq \frac{1 - c}{1 - c_i} - \frac{(d + 1)(c_i - c)}{1 - c_i},$$

where F runs through all prime divisors over X , we see that $\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0})$ admits a positive lower bound which doesn't depend on i . Thus the set $\{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}\}$ lies in a bounded family by [Jia20], which implies that the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, \mathcal{D}_{i,0})\}$ lies in a log bounded family as $\mathcal{D}_{i,0} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}$ and

the Weil index of $\mathcal{D}_{i,0}$ is upper bounded. We now consider the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c\mathcal{D}_{i,0})\}$, which lies in a log bounded family. We have the following estimate on $\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c\mathcal{D}_{i,0})$:

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c\mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(F)}{(1-c)S_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}}(F)} = \frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i\mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(F) + (c_i - c)\text{ord}_F(\mathcal{D}_{i,0})}{\frac{1-c}{1-c_i}S_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i\mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(F)} \geq \frac{1-c_i}{1-c} \frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i\mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(F)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i\mathcal{D}_{i,0}}(F)},$$

where F runs through all prime divisors over $\mathcal{X}_{i,0}$. Combine the estimate of $\delta(X, c_iD) = \delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c_i\mathcal{D}_{i,0})$ above, we see that

$$\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c\mathcal{D}_{i,0}) \geq 1 - \frac{(d+1)(c_i - c)}{1-c}.$$

By Theorem 3.2 we see that $\delta(\mathcal{X}_{i,0}, c\mathcal{D}_{i,0}) \geq 1$ for $i \gg 1$. By Lemma 3.4, this implies

$$A_{X, cD}(E_i) - (1-c)S_X(E_i) = 0.$$

By the proof of [BLZ19, Theorem 4.7] we see that $S_X(E_i)$ is a rational number. Combine the inequality

$$A_{X, c_iD}(E_i) - (1-c_i)S_X(E_i) < 0$$

one concludes that c is a rational number.

For (2), we only assume (X, aD) is K-semistable for any $a \in [c - \epsilon, c)$ for some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, as the other case can be done by the same way. Suppose (X, cD) is K-unstable, then there exists a prime divisor E over X such that $A_{X, cD}(E) - (1-c)S_X(E) < 0$. Replace c by another rational $0 < c^- < c$ such that $0 < c - c^- \ll 1$, one still has $A_{X, c^-D}(E) - S_{X, c^-D}(E) < 0$, which is a contradiction since (X, aD) is K-semistable for any rational $a \in [c - \epsilon, c)$ for some $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. \square

We are ready to prove the following constructible property.

Theorem 4.4. *Both $\{l(t)|t \in B\}$ and $\{u(t)|t \in B\}$ are finite rational sets.*

Proof. We first show $l(t)$ satisfies DCC property. Suppose not, one can find a strictly decreasing sequence $\{0 \leq a_i < 1\}_{i=1}^\infty$ which tends to a rational limit $a \in [0, 1)$, such that there is a corresponding sequence of closed points on B , denoted by $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) The pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable for every i ,
- (2) The pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, c\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is not K-semistable for each rational $0 \leq c < a_i$ and every i .

We consider the family $p_a : (\mathcal{X}, aD) \rightarrow B$. By finiteness of the set (see [BLX19, Xu20])

$$\{\min\{1, \delta(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t)\}|t \in B\},$$

we see there exists a positive rational number $0 < \eta_a < 1$ such that, the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K-semistable if and only if $\delta(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t) > \eta_a$. Since $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable, by valuative criterion,

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)} \geq 1$$

for any prime divisor E over \mathcal{X}_{t_i} . Note that $S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E) = \frac{1-a}{1-a_i}S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)$, thus we have

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)} \geq \frac{1-a_i}{1-a}$$

for any prime divisor E over \mathcal{X}_{t_i} . As a_i strictly decreases to a , we have $\frac{1-a_i}{1-a} > \eta_a$ for sufficiently large i . Thus $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable for sufficiently large i . This is a contradiction since $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, c\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is not K-semistable for any rational $0 \leq c < a_i$ and any i . The contradiction implies that $l(t)$ satisfies DCC condition, which implies that $\{l(t)|t \in B\}$ is indeed a finite set.

Next we show $u(t)$ satisfies ACC property. Suppose not, one can find a strictly increasing sequence $\{0 < a_i < 1\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ which tends to a rational limit $a \in (0, 1]$, such that there is a corresponding sequence of closed points on B , denoted by $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) The pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable for every i ,
- (2) The pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, c\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is not K-semistable for each rational $a_i < c \leq 1$ and every i .

As $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is klt for every i , by ACC of log canonical thresholds (see [HMX14]), we may assume $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is log canonical for every i after subtracting those a_i that are not sufficiently close to a .

We first assume $a = 1$, then there is a positive rational number $0 < \xi < 1$ such that $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, (1 - \xi)\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is log canonical if and only if $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, \mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is log canonical for every i . Since $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable, the pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, \mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is log canonical for sufficiently large i , thus being K-semistable by [Oda13, Theorem 1.5]. By interpolation property of K-stability, we see $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, c\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable for any rational $a_i < c \leq 1$, which is a contradiction.

We next assume $0 < a < 1$ and consider the family $p_a : (\mathcal{X}, a\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$. As we have seen, the set

$$\{\min\{1, \delta(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t)\}|t \in B\}$$

is finite, thus there exists a positive rational number $0 < \xi_a < 1$ such that, the pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K-semistable if and only if $\delta(\mathcal{X}_t, a\mathcal{D}_t) > \xi_a$. Since $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable, by valuative criterion,

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)} \geq 1$$

for any prime divisor E over \mathcal{X}_{t_i} . Again by the relation $S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E) = \frac{1-a}{1-a_i} S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)$, we have

$$\frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)} = \frac{A_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E) - (a - a_i)\text{ord}_E(\mathcal{D}_{t_i})}{\frac{1-a}{1-a_i} S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, a_i\mathcal{D}_{t_i}}(E)} \geq \frac{1 - a_i}{1 - a} - \frac{a - a_i}{1 - a} \frac{T_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}}(E)}{S_{\mathcal{X}_{t_i}}(E)} > \xi_a$$

for sufficiently large i . Thus the pair $(\mathcal{X}_{t_i}, c\mathcal{D}_{t_i})$ is K-semistable for each rational $a_i < c \leq a$, which is a contradiction and implies that $\{u(t)|t \in B\}$ is a finite set. The proof is finished. \square

As $\{l(t)|t \in B\}$ and $\{u(t)|t \in B\}$ are both finite rational sets, we assume $l(t)$ takes values in $\{0 \leq l_i \leq 1| i = 0, 1, \dots, r, r+1\}$ with $0 = l_0 < l_1 < l_2 < \dots < l_r < l_{r+1} = 1$, and $u(t)$ takes values in $\{0 \leq u_j \leq 1| j = 0, 1, \dots, s, s+1\}$ with $0 = u_0 < u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_s < u_{s+1} = 1$. We put these rational numbers together and reorder them by identifying the repeating numbers as the following sequence:

$$0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1.$$

It's not hard to see that this sequence is exactly what we need in Section 1. Above all, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ be a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties of dim d such that $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} , where B is a normal base. Suppose \mathcal{D} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} such that every component is flat over B and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. For a rational number $0 \leq c \leq 1$, denote $p_c : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$ and*

$$B_c := \{t \in B \mid (\mathcal{X}_t, c\mathcal{D}_t) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable}\}.$$

Then there exist finite rational numbers $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1$ such that B_c does not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$. Moreover, we give the following description of the relationships among $B_{c_j-\epsilon}, B_{c_j}$ and $B_{c_j+\epsilon}$ for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$:

- (1) $B_0 = B^{ss}$ and $B_\epsilon = B^{ss} \setminus \{t \in B \mid u(t) = 0\}$,
- (2) if $c_j = l_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $c_j \neq u_q$ for any $1 \leq q \leq s$, we have

$$B_{c_j-\epsilon} \subset B_{c_j} = B_{c_j+\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{c_j} \setminus B_{c_j-\epsilon} = \{t \in B \mid l(t) = c_j\},$$

- (3) if $c_j = u_q$ for some $1 \leq q \leq s$ and $c_j \neq l_p$ for any $1 \leq p \leq r$, we have

$$B_{c_j-\epsilon} = B_{c_j} \supset B_{c_j+\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{c_j} \setminus B_{c_j+\epsilon} = \{t \in B \mid u(t) = c_j\},$$

- (4) if $c_j = l_p = u_q$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $1 \leq q \leq s$, we have

$$B_{c_j-\epsilon} \subset B_{c_j} \supset B_{c_j+\epsilon},$$

$$B_{c_j} \setminus B_{c_j-\epsilon} = \{t \in B \mid l(t) = c_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{c_j} \setminus B_{c_j+\epsilon} = \{t \in B \mid u(t) = c_j\}.$$

We end this section by the following lemma, which will be used in the next section.

Lemma 4.6. *Notation as in Theorem 4.5, we have the following results:*

- (1) if $c_j = l_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $c_j \neq u_q$ for any $1 \leq q \leq s$, then the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t) \mid l(t) = c_j\}$ contains no K -polystable point,
- (2) if $c_j = u_q$ for some $1 \leq q \leq s$ and $c_j \neq l_p$ for any $1 \leq p \leq r$, then the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t) \mid l(t) = c_j\}$ contains no K -polystable point,
- (3) for $1 \leq j \leq k$ and rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, it cannot happen that $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$ (resp. $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$) is strictly K -semistable (i.e. K -semistable but not K -polystable) but $(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable.

Proof. We only prove (1) and (3), as the (2) can be proved by the same way as (1). For (1), suppose $t \in B$ satisfies that $l(t) = c_j = l_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $c_j \neq u_q$ for any $1 \leq q \leq s$, and $(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable. We first see that $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable for all rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, and $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -unstable for all rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. By [BLZ19, LXZ21], there is a special test configuration of $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$, denoted by $(\mathcal{Y}_\epsilon, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, such that $\delta(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t) = \delta(\mathcal{Y}_\epsilon, (c_j - \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) < 1$. Thus the generalized Futaki invariant of this test configuration is negative, which implies that it's not of product type. By the same method as the proof of Lemma 4.3, we know that $(\mathcal{Y}_\epsilon, c_j\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ is K -semistable when ϵ is sufficiently small, then one sees that the test configuration is of product type, since the K -polystable pair $(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t)$ degenerates to a K -semistable pair $(\mathcal{Y}_\epsilon, c_j\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, contradiction.

For (3), we only assume $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$ is strictly K -semistable for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ but $(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable, and the other case can be proved similarly. For any special test configuration of $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_t)$, denoted by $(\mathcal{W}_\epsilon, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, such that the central fiber $(\mathcal{W}_{\epsilon,0}, (c_j + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,0})$ is K -semistable, by the same method as the proof of Lemma 4.3, we know $(\mathcal{W}_{\epsilon,0}, c_j\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,0})$ is also K -semistable for sufficiently small ϵ . Thus the test configuration

is of product type, since $(\mathcal{X}_t, c_j \mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable. This implies that $(\mathcal{X}_t, (c_j + \epsilon) \mathcal{D}_t)$ is K -polystable, contradiction. \square

5. APPLICATION TO K -MODULI

In this section we study the wall crossing phenomenon for K -moduli. Through the section, we fix a rational number $r > 0$.

5.1. Wall crossing for K -moduli stacks. In this subsection, we prove the wall crossing phenomenon as in Theorem 4.5 for K -moduli stacks. We first have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $r \geq 1$, then there exists a positive rational number $0 < t_0 < 1$ depending only on d and r such that if X is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_X$ is a Weil divisor satisfying that $(X, \frac{1-t_0}{r}D)$ is log canonical, then the pair $(X, \frac{1}{r}D)$ is log canonical.*

Proof. The existence of t_0 is just an application of ACC of log canonical thresholds by [HMX14]. \square

We also need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Notation as in the previous lemma, there exists a rational number $0 < t'_0 < 1$ depending only on d and r , such that the pair $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K -semistable for some rational $c \in [1 - t'_0, 1)$ if and only if $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K -semistable for any rational $c \in [1 - t'_0, 1]$.*

Proof. It follows from the next lemma by taking $t'_0 = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let (Y, G) be an lc log Calabi-Yau pair where Y is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and $G \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X$ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on Y . Then there exists a rational $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$ depending only on d and the coefficients of G such that the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *the pair (Y, cG) for some rational $c \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1)$ is K -semistable,*
- (2) *the pair (Y, cG) for any rational $c \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1]$ is K -semistable,*
- (3) *$\beta_Y(E) = A_Y(E) - S_Y(E) \geq 0$ for every lc place E of (Y, G) .*

Proof. The direction (2) \Rightarrow (1) is clear. We first prove (1) \Rightarrow (3). Let E be an lc place of (Y, G) , then by Lemma 2.7 one can construct a test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1})$ of $(Y, G; -K_Y)$ such that $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1}) = 0$. By the interpolation property of generalized Futaki invariants, we have

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}, c\mathcal{G}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1}) = c \cdot \text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1}) + (1 - c) \cdot \text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1}) \geq 0.$$

Thus we see the following

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}; -K_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathbb{A}^1}) \stackrel{\text{up to a positive multiple}}{=} A_Y(E) - S_Y(E) \geq 0.$$

It remains to prove (3) \Rightarrow (2). Suppose it's not true, then there exists a sequence of increasing rational numbers $0 < a_i < 1$ tending to one and a corresponding sequence of lc Calabi-Yau pairs (Y_i, G_i) such that

- (1) $A_{Y_i}(F) - S_{Y_i}(F) \geq 0$ for any lc place F of (Y_i, G_i) ,

- (2) $(Y_i, a_i G_i)$ is K-unstable for each i , where Y_i is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and $G_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_{Y_i}$ with its coefficients contained in the set of coefficients of G .

By [LX14], there exists a special divisor E_i over Y_i which corresponds to a special test configuration of $(Y_i, a_i G_i)$, denoted by $(\mathcal{Y}_i, a_i \mathcal{G}_i)$, such that

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{Y}_i, a_i \mathcal{G}_i; -K_{\mathcal{Y}_i}) \stackrel{\text{up to a positive multiple}}{=} A_{Y_i, a_i G_i}(E_i) - S_{Y_i, a_i G_i}(E_i) < 0.$$

After subtracting those a_i which are not close to one, we may assume $(\mathcal{Y}_{i,0}, \mathcal{G}_{i,0})$ is log canonical by [HMX14]. That is to say, the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}_i, \mathcal{G}_i)$ degenerates an lc pair (Y_i, G_i) to another lc pair $(\mathcal{Y}_{i,0}, \mathcal{G}_{i,0})$, which implies that E_i is an lc place of (Y_i, G_i) by Lemma 2.7. This is a contradiction, since $A_{Y_i}(F) - S_{Y_i}(F) \geq 0$ for any lc place F of (Y_i, G_i) , however,

$$A_{Y_i, a_i G_i}(E_i) - S_{Y_i, a_i G_i}(E_i) = (1 - a_i)(A_{Y_i}(E_i) - S_{Y_i}(E_i)) < 0.$$

The proof is finished. □

If $r \geq 1$, we choose t'_0 as above; if $0 < r < 1$, we just choose $t'_0 = 1 - r$. From now on, we consider a set \mathcal{F} of pairs satisfying that $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if it's of the following form:

- (1) X is a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety of dimension d and volume v ,
- (2) $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_X$ is a Weil divisor on X such that $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K-semistable for some rational $c \in [0, 1)$.

Theorem 5.4. *Notation as above, the set \mathcal{F} is contained in a log bounded family.*

Proof. Suppose $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\text{vol}(-K_X) = v$. By Lemma 5.2, (X, cD) is K-semistable for some rational $c \in [0, 1 - t'_0]$. By valuative criterion one has $\delta(X) \geq t'_0$. By [Jia20] we know X lies in a bounded family. As $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_X$ is a Weil divisor, the degree of D is also bounded. Thus \mathcal{F} is contained in a log bounded family. □

Note that the varieties in \mathcal{F} admit dimension d and volume v . We choose a sufficiently divisible m depending only on (d, v, t'_0) such that $-mK_X$ is very ample for every \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety X with $\dim(X) = d$, $\text{vol}(-K_X) = v$, and $\delta(X) \geq \frac{t'_0}{2}$. Then we consider the following subset of \mathcal{F} , denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{m, \mathbb{P}^{N_m}}^{\chi, \tilde{\chi}}$, such that $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_{m, \mathbb{P}^{N_m}}^{\chi, \tilde{\chi}}$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) (X, D) can be embedded into $\mathbb{P}^{N_m} \times \mathbb{P}^{N_m}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_X(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)|_X \sim -mK_X$ and $H^0(\mathbb{P}^{N_m}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)) \cong H^0(X, -mK_X)$,
- (2) X (resp. D) admits the Hilbert polynomial χ (resp. $\tilde{\chi}$) with respect to $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_D(1) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)|_D$).

We just use \mathcal{F}_m to denote $\mathcal{F}_{m, \mathbb{P}^{N_m}}^{\chi, \tilde{\chi}}$ for simplicity, since we from now on fix $P := (\chi, \tilde{\chi})$. We define the subset $\mathcal{F}_{m,c} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ for a rational $c \in [0, 1)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,c} := \{(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_m \mid \text{the pair } (X, \frac{c}{r}D) \text{ is K-semistable}\}.$$

It's not hard to see that \mathcal{F}_m admits an algebraic structure to become a Hilbert scheme, and $\mathcal{F}_{m,c} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ is an open sub-scheme by [BLX19, Xu20], then we write $\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$ to be the corresponding reduced schemes. By [ADL19, Theorem 3.24], the reduced Artin stacks $[\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}/\text{PGL}(N_m + 1)]$ stabilize for sufficiently divisible m , thus we just denote it by $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$.

By the works [Jia20, BLX19, Xu20], we currently know that $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$ is a reduced Artin stack of finite type representing the moduli pseudo-functor over reduced bases, where $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K(S)$ for a reduced scheme $S \in Sch_{\mathbb{C}}$ consists of all families $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ is a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein family with each fiber contained in $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}$,
- (2) $-K_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ is a relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_{\mathcal{X}/S}$.

Remark 5.5. We only consider the above moduli pseudo-functor for convenience, but it also defines for any base (including non-reduced ones) due to the work [Kol19]. Fix a rational number $c \in [0, 1)$, to define the moduli functor for an arbitrary base scheme $S \in Sch_{\mathbb{C}}$, one just consider all the families $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$ is proper and flat,
- (2) \mathcal{D} is a K-flat family of divisors on \mathcal{X} (see [Kol19]),
- (3) $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - c\mathcal{D}$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier with each geometric fiber contained in $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}$.

By the works [ABHLX20, BHLLX20, XZ20, LXZ21], $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$ admits a separated projective good moduli space $M_{P,r,c}^K$ parametrizing K-polystable elements. Combine Theorem 4.5 and Lemma 5.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 5.6. *There exist finite rational numbers $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k < c_{k+1} = 1$ such that*

- (1) *the Hilbert schemes $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$, and we have open immersions*

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,c_j-\epsilon}^{\text{red}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{m,c_j}^{\text{red}} \hookleftarrow \mathcal{F}_{m,c_j+\epsilon}^{\text{red}}$$

for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

- (2) *the Artin stacks $\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c}^K$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for $0 \leq j \leq k$, and we have open immersions*

$$\mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j-\epsilon}^K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j}^K \hookleftarrow \mathcal{M}_{P,r,c_j+\epsilon}^K$$

for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

5.2. Wall crossing for K-moduli spaces. We denote $(\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{D}_m) \subset (\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}} \times \mathbb{P}^{N_m}, \mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}} \times \mathbb{P}^{N_m})$ to be the universal family corresponding to $\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$, and write $p : (\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{D}_m; \mathcal{L}_m) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$, where \mathcal{L}_m is an ample line bundle on \mathcal{X}_m obtained by pulling back $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{N_m}}(1)$.

Definition 5.7. Let $\lambda_{d+1} := p_*\mathcal{L}_m^{d+1}$, $\lambda_d := \frac{d}{2}p_*\mathcal{L}_m^{d+1} + \frac{1}{2}p_*(-\mathcal{L}_m^d K_{\mathcal{X}_m/\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}})$, and $\tilde{\lambda}_d := p_*(\mathcal{L}_m^d \mathcal{D}_m)$, then we define

$$M_1 := \lambda_{d+1}^{\mu+n(n+1)} \otimes \lambda_d^{-2(d+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 := \lambda_{d+1}^{\mu'} \otimes \tilde{\lambda}_d^{-(d+1)},$$

where $\mu = \frac{-dK_{\mathcal{X}_m,t}\mathcal{L}_{m,t}^{d-1}}{\mathcal{L}_{m,t}^d}$ and $\mu' = \frac{d\mathcal{D}_{m,t}\mathcal{L}_{m,t}^{d-1}}{\mathcal{L}_{m,t}^d}$, which do not depend on the choice of closed points $t \in \mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$. For the family $p_c : (\mathcal{X}_m, \frac{c}{r}\mathcal{D}_m) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$, we define $\lambda_{CM,c} := M_1 - \frac{c}{r}M_2$, which is a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $\mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$.

By [CP18, XZ20, LXZ21], we know that $\lambda_{CM,c}|_{\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}}$ is a nef \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$, and it admits an ample descent on the good moduli space $M_{P,r,c}^K$, denoted by $\Lambda_{CM,c}$. Let $(\mathcal{X}_m, \frac{1}{r}\mathcal{D}_m) =: (\mathcal{X}, \frac{1}{r}\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_m^{\text{red}}$ be the universal family, and we take $0 = l_0 < l_1 < \dots < l_r <$

$l_{r+1} = 1$ and $0 = u_0 < u_1 < \dots < u_s < u_{s+1} = 1$ as in Section 4. Combine Lemma 4.6, we have the following possibilities.

- (1) For $1 \leq j \leq k$, if $c_j = l_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ but $c_j \neq u_q$ for any $1 \leq q \leq s$. Then the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j}{r}\mathcal{D}_t) | l(t) = c_j\}$ contains no K-polystable points, and the K-(poly/strictly semi)stability won't change as we go from $\mathcal{F}_{m, c_j - \epsilon}^{\text{red}}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{m, c_j}^{\text{red}}$, which implies that $\phi_j^- : M_{P, r, c_j - \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$ is an isomorphism. On the other hand, it cannot happen that $(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j + \epsilon}{r}\mathcal{D}_t)$ is strictly K-semistable but $(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j}{r}\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K-polystable. However, it may appear that $(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j + \epsilon}{r}\mathcal{D}_t)$ is K-polystable but $(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j}{r}\mathcal{D}_t)$ is strictly K-semistable. Thus there is a projective contraction morphism $\phi_j^+ : M_{P, r, c_j + \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$.
- (2) For $1 \leq j \leq k$, if $c_j = u_q$ for some $1 \leq q \leq s$ but $c_j \neq l_p$ for any $1 \leq p \leq r$, the same analysis as in the previous case tells us that there is a projective contraction morphism $\phi_j^- : M_{P, r, c_j - \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$ and an isomorphism $\phi_j^+ : M_{P, r, c_j + \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$.
- (3) For $1 \leq j \leq k$, if $c_j = l_p = u_q$ for some $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $1 \leq q \leq s$. Then just combine (2) and (3), we get two projective morphisms $\phi_j^- : M_{P, r, c_j - \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$ and $\phi_j^+ : M_{P, r, c_j + \epsilon}^K \rightarrow M_{P, r, c_j}^K$. The difference in this case is that there may appear some new K-polystable points in the set $\{(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{c_j}{r}\mathcal{D}_t) | l(t) = u(t) = c_j\}$.

Let $M_{2, c}$ be the descent of M_2 on $M_{P, r, c}^K$, we have the following result on the wall crossing of good moduli spaces.

Theorem 5.8. *The good moduli spaces $M_{P, r, c}^K$ do not change as c varies in (c_j, c_{j+1}) for rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, and we have the following projective morphisms among good moduli spaces*

$$M_{P, r, c_j - \epsilon}^K \xrightarrow{\phi_j^-} M_{P, r, c_j}^K \xleftarrow{\phi_j^+} M_{P, r, c_j + \epsilon}^K.$$

Moreover,

$$\Lambda_{CM, c_j - \epsilon} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \phi_j^-} -\epsilon M_{2, c_j - \epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{CM, c_j + \epsilon} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \phi_j^+} \epsilon M_{2, c_j + \epsilon}$$

are relatively ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles.

One sees from the result that ϕ_j^- and ϕ_j^+ behave like a flip in birational geometry (e.g [KM98, Section 3.7]) and the wall crossing phenomenon in GIT (e.g. [DH98, Tha96]).

Proof. The projective morphisms follow from the analysis (1)-(3) above, and the \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalence relations follow from the definition of CM line bundles, see Definition 5.7. \square

We end this section by the following theorem for independent interest. Choose a rational $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ satisfying the condition $t'_0 - (d+1)\epsilon \geq \frac{t'_0}{2}$, then we have the following result.

Theorem 5.9. *Choose a sufficiently small rational number $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ as above, then it's enough to check all one parameter subgroups of $\text{SL}(N_m + 1)$ to detect K-(semi/poly)stability of $(X, \frac{\epsilon}{r}D)$ for any $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and rational $c \in [0, \epsilon)$.*

Proof. Suppose $(X, D) \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and the log Fano pair $(X, \frac{\epsilon}{r}D)$ is K-unstable for some rational $c \in [0, \epsilon)$, then there is a special test configuration of $(X, \frac{\epsilon}{r}D)$ whose central fiber admits the same delta invariant as $(X, \frac{\epsilon}{r}D)$ (see [BLZ19, LXZ21]). If we denote $(X_0, \frac{\epsilon}{r}D_0)$ for the

central fiber, then we have $\text{vol}(-K_{X_0}) = \text{vol}(-K_X)$ and $\delta(X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0) = \delta(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$. By the proof of Theorem 5.4, for any prime divisor E over X , we have

$$\frac{A_{X, \frac{c}{r}D}(E)}{S_{X, \frac{c}{r}D}(E)} = \frac{A_X(E) - \frac{c}{r}\text{ord}_E D}{(1-c)S_X(E)} \geq \frac{t'_0}{1-c} - \frac{(d+1)c}{1-c}.$$

Thus for any prime divisor F over X_0 , we have

$$\frac{A_{X_0}(F)}{S_{X_0}(F)} \geq (1-c) \frac{A_{X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0}(F)}{S_{X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0}(F)} \geq t'_0 - (d+1)c \geq \frac{t'_0}{2}.$$

Therefore we see $(X_0, D_0) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_m$ by the choice of m (see the paragraph below Theorem 5.4), and the test configuration is induced by a one parameter subgroup of $\text{SL}(N_m + 1)$ with negative generalized Futaki invariant.

Next we assume $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K -semistable for some rational $c \in [0, \epsilon)$, and any one parameter subgroup of $\text{SL}(N_m + 1)$ with vanishing generalized Futaki invariant degenerates $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ to a pair isomorphic to itself. We prove $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ is K -polystable. If it's not K -polystable, then one can find a special test configuration with vanishing generalized Futaki invariant which degenerates $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$ to $(X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0)$, and $(X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0)$ is not isomorphic to $(X, \frac{c}{r}D)$. As $(X_0, \frac{c}{r}D_0)$ is K -semistable, we see $(X_0, D_0) \in \mathcal{F}_m$. Thus the test configuration is induced by a one parameter subgroup of $\text{SL}(N_m + 1)$, contradiction. \square

Remark 5.10. If $\lambda_{CM,c}$ is an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $\mathcal{F}_{m,c}^{\text{red}}$ for $c \in [0, \epsilon)$, one sees by the above theorem that, the GIT-(semi/poly)stability with respect to the $\text{SL}(N_m + 1)$ -linearization of $\lambda_{CM,c}$ coincides with K -(semi/poly)stability, as the generalized Futaki invariant of a one parameter subgroup coincides with the GIT weight of this one parameter subgroup up to a positive multiple, e.g. [ADL19, Proposition 2.19]. Therefore, for sufficiently small rational number $0 \leq c < \epsilon$, K -moduli coincides with GIT moduli if $\lambda_{CM,c}$ is ample.

REFERENCES

- [ABHLX20] Jarod Alper, Harold Blum, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Chenyang Xu, *Reductivity of the automorphism group of K -polystable Fano varieties*, Invent. Math. **222** (2020), no. 3, 995–1032. MR4169054 \uparrow 1, 3, 16
- [ADL19] Kenneth Ascher, Kristin DeVleming, and Yuchen Liu, *Wall crossing for K -moduli spaces of plane curves* (2019). in preparation. \uparrow 1, 2, 9, 15, 18
- [BCHM10] Caucher Birkar, Paolo Cascini, Christopher D. Hacon, and James McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468. MR2601039 \uparrow 6, 8
- [BHJ17] Sébastien Boucksom, Tomoyuki Hisamoto, and Mattias Jonsson, *Uniform K -stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **67** (2017), no. 2, 743–841. MR3669511 \uparrow 2, 4
- [BHLLX20] Harold Blum, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, Yuchen Liu, and Chenyang Xu, *On properness of k -moduli spaces and optimal degenerations of fano varieties*, 2020. \uparrow 1, 3, 16
- [Bir19] Caucher Birkar, *Anti-pluricanonical systems on Fano varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **190** (2019), no. 2, 345–463. MR3997127 \uparrow 8
- [BJ20] Harold Blum and Mattias Jonsson, *Thresholds, valuations, and K -stability*, Adv. Math. **365** (2020), 107062, 57. MR4067358 \uparrow 5, 7

- [BLX19] Harold Blum, Yuchen Liu, and Chenyang Xu, *Openness of K -semistability for Fano varieties*, arXiv e-prints (2019Jul), arXiv:1907.02408, available at 1907.02408. ↑1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16
- [BLZ19] Harold Blum, Yuchen Liu, and Chuyu Zhou, *Optimal destabilization of K -unstable Fano varieties via stability thresholds*, arXiv e-prints (2019Jul), arXiv:1907.05399, available at 1907.05399. ↑10, 11, 13, 17
- [BX19] Harold Blum and Chenyang Xu, *Uniqueness of K -polystable degenerations of Fano varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **190** (2019), no. 2, 609–656. MR3997130 ↑1
- [CDS15a] Xiuxiong Chen, Simon Donaldson, and Song Sun, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. I: Approximation of metrics with cone singularities*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 183–197. MR3264766 ↑1
- [CDS15b] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. II: Limits with cone angle less than 2π* , J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 199–234. MR3264767 ↑1
- [CDS15c] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. III: Limits as cone angle approaches 2π and completion of the main proof*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 235–278. MR3264768 ↑1
- [CP18] Giulio Codogni and Zolt Patakfalvi, *Positivity of the cm line bundle for families of k -stable klt fanos*, 2018. ↑1, 16
- [DH98] Igor V. Dolgachev and Yi Hu, *Variation of geometric invariant theory quotients*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **87** (1998), 5–56. With an appendix by Nicolas Ressayre. MR1659282 ↑17
- [Don02] S. K. Donaldson, *Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties*, J. Differential Geom. **62** (2002), no. 2, 289–349. MR1988506 ↑4
- [FO18] Kento Fujita and Yuji Odaka, *On the K -stability of Fano varieties and anticanonical divisors*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **70** (2018), no. 4, 511–521. MR3896135 ↑5, 7
- [Fuj19] Kento Fujita, *A valuative criterion for uniform K -stability of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **751** (2019), 309–338. ↑5, 7, 9
- [HMX14] Christopher D. Hacon, James McKernan, and Chenyang Xu, *ACC for log canonical thresholds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **180** (2014), no. 2, 523–571. MR3224718 ↑12, 14, 15
- [Jia20] Chen Jiang, *Boundedness of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties with degrees and alpha-invariants bounded from below*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **53** (2020), no. 5, 1235–1248. MR4174851 ↑1, 3, 10, 15, 16
- [KM98] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. MR1658959 ↑4, 17
- [Kol13] János Kollár, *Singularities of the minimal model program*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 200, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. With a collaboration of Sándor Kovács. MR3057950 ↑4
- [Kol19] János Kollár, *Families of divisors*, 2019. ↑3, 16
- [Li17] Chi Li, *K -semistability is equivariant volume minimization*, Duke Math. J. **166** (2017), no. 16, 3147–3218. MR3715806 ↑5, 7
- [LWX19] Chi Li, Xiaowei Wang, and Chenyang Xu, *On the proper moduli spaces of smoothable Kähler-Einstein Fano varieties*, Duke Math. J. **168** (2019), no. 8, 1387–1459. MR3959862 ↑1, 2, 9
- [LX14] Chi Li and Chenyang Xu, *Special test configuration and K -stability of Fano varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **180** (2014), no. 1, 197–232. MR3194814 ↑15
- [LXZ21] Yuchen Liu, Chenyang Xu, and Ziquan Zhuang, *Finite generation for valuations computing stability thresholds and applications to k -stability*, 2021. ↑1, 3, 5, 10, 13, 16, 17
- [Oda13] Yuji Odaka, *The GIT stability of polarized varieties via discrepancy*, Ann. of Math. (2) **177** (2013), no. 2, 645–661. MR3010808 ↑2, 12
- [Tha96] Michael Thaddeus, *Geometric invariant theory and flips*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 3, 691–723. MR1333296 ↑17
- [Tia15] Gang Tian, *K -stability and Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **68** (2015), no. 7, 1085–1156. MR3352459 ↑1
- [Tia97] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*, Invent. Math. **130** (1997), no. 1, 1–37. MR1471884 ↑4

- [TW19] Gang Tian and Feng Wang, *On the existence of conic kahler-einstein metrics*, 2019. ↑1
- [Xu20] Chenyang Xu, *A minimizing valuation is quasi-monomial*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **191** (2020), no. 3, 1003–1030. MR4088355 ↑1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16
- [XZ20] Chenyang Xu and Ziquan Zhuang, *On positivity of the CM line bundle on K-moduli spaces*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **192** (2020), no. 3, 1005–1068. MR4172625 ↑1, 3, 16
- [ZZ19] Chuyu Zhou and Ziquan Zhuang, *Some criteria for uniform K-stability*, arXiv e-prints (2019Jul), arXiv:1907.05293, available at 1907.05293. ↑8

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE (EPFL), MA C3 615, STATION 8, 1015 LAUSANNE,
SWITZERLAND

Email address: `chuyu.zhou@epfl.ch`