

# MODULI SPACES OF SHEAVES VIA AFFINE GRASSMANNIANS

DANIEL HALPERN-LEISTNER, ANDRES FERNANDEZ HERRERO, AND TREVOR JONES

ABSTRACT. We develop a new method for analyzing moduli problems related to the stack of pure coherent sheaves on a polarized family of projective schemes. It is an infinite-dimensional analogue of geometric invariant theory. We apply this to two familiar moduli problems: the stack of  $\Lambda$ -modules and the stack of pairs. In both examples, we construct a  $\Theta$ -stratification of the stack, defined in terms of a polynomial numerical invariant, and we construct good moduli spaces for the open substacks of semistable points. One of the essential ingredients is the construction of higher dimensional analogues of the affine Grassmannian for the moduli problems considered.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Infinite dimensional GIT	4
1.2. Comparison with the classical approach	6
2. Preliminaries	7
2.1. Notation	7
2.2. Pure sheaves	8
2.3. Hilbert polynomials and Gieseker semistability	8
2.4. Some related moduli problems	9
2.5. $\Theta$ -stratifications and numerical invariants	13
3. Rational maps and affine Grassmannians	16
3.1. Regular principal subschemes and twists	17
3.2. Stacks of rational maps	18
3.3. The affine Grassmannian for pure sheaves	19
3.4. $L_n^\vee$ is asymptotically ample on $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$	23
3.5. Affine Grassmannians for related moduli	26
4. Monotonicity via “infinite dimensional GIT”	27
4.1. The numerical invariant	27
4.2. Rational filling conditions for torsion-free sheaves	29
4.3. Proof of monotonicity via “infinite dimensional GIT”	32
5. Applications to moduli of $\Lambda$ -modules	36
5.1. HN boundedness condition	36
5.2. Canonical filtrations of $\Lambda$ -modules	39
5.3. $\Theta$ -stratification for $\Lambda$ -modules	42

5.4. Boundedness of the semistable locus	45
5.5. Good moduli space for the semistable locus	46
6. Applications to moduli of pairs	47
6.1. Numerical invariants on $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$	47
6.2. Semistable locus and canonical filtrations when $\deg(\delta) \geq d$	48
6.3. HN boundedness for pairs	50
6.4. $\Theta$ -stratifications on $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$	52
6.5. Moduli spaces for pairs	53
References	57

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The moduli stack  $\text{Coh}(X)$  of coherent sheaves on a projective scheme  $X$  is of central interest in moduli theory. It has been used to formulate the non-abelian Hodge correspondence [Sim92], it has been used to define and study algebraic Donaldson invariants of surfaces [Moc09], and several flavors of enumerative invariants for 3-folds [Tho00, PT09]. It has also been used to study the moduli of varieties [Kol09], and has served as a particularly interesting testing ground for the minimal model program [BM14] and hyperkähler geometry [Muk84].

As the examples illustrate, a thorough understanding of the structure of the stack  $\text{Coh}(X)$  is a fundamental building block for many other theories. We will focus on the open substack  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P \subset \text{Coh}(X)$  parameterizing sheaves that are *pure* of dimension  $d$  and have a fixed Hilbert polynomial  $P$ . In this paper, we develop a new method for studying the structure of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P$  and related stacks. We call it *infinite dimensional Geometric Invariant Theory (GIT)*,

Let us recall the main structural results about  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ : Using an ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$  on  $X$ , one defines a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  to be Gieseker  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ -semistable if and only if there is no proper subsheaf  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$  whose reduced Hilbert polynomial is larger than that of  $\mathcal{F}$  (see Subsection 2.3 below). The substack of semistable sheaves  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\text{ss}} \subset \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is open and admits a projective moduli space. Furthermore,  $\text{Coh}^d(X)^{\text{ss}}$  is the open piece of a stratification of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  by locally closed substacks, where the strata parameterize unstable sheaves along with a canonical filtration, called the Harder-Narasimhan filtration [HN75, Sim94, Nit11]. The strata are indexed by the Hilbert polynomials of the associated graded pieces of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, which are themselves semistable.

This moduli problem has been previously studied using geometric invariant theory (GIT) [Ses67, Gie77, Mar78, Sim94], which involves constructing and analyzing explicit families of sheaves over quot-schemes. Over the past few years, a new approach to these structures has developed that is more intrinsic to the moduli problem: the theory of good moduli spaces [Alp13] and the theory of  $\Theta$ -stratifications [HL21]. We will review the key concepts in Subsection 2.5. From the intrinsic perspective, the main structural result is:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $X$  be a projective scheme of finite presentation over a scheme  $S$ . To any relatively ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$  on  $X$ , one can associate a polynomial-valued numerical invariant  $\nu$  (Definition 4.3) that defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P$ . If  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then the  $\nu$ -semistable locus  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a good moduli space that is proper over  $S$ .*

The notion of semistability in Theorem 1.1 agrees with Gieseker semistability. The stratification that we construct can be described in terms of the Harder-Narasimhan stratification in the context of Gieseker stability, but ours is coarser. We call our filtration of an unstable sheaf the *leading term filtration*, see Subsection 5.3. Theorem 1.1 gives an alternative proof of the existence of these filtrations that does not use Harder-Narasimhan theory. The Gieseker-Harder-Narasimhan filtration can be recovered from the leading term filtration by iterating the construction for the associated graded sheaves. This will be explained in the follow up paper [GHZ21].

In the applications mentioned above, one typically considers the moduli problem of a coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  along with some auxiliary data. We will focus on two such variants:

- 1) The moduli stack of pairs  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$  parameterizing a pure coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X$  along with a homomorphism  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  from a fixed coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{A}$  (often with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_X$  or  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_X^{\oplus n}$  for some  $n$  [BD91, Tha94, PT09, Moc09]).
- 2) The moduli stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  of pure coherent modules of dimension  $d$  over a sheaf  $\Lambda$  of rings of differential operators on  $X$ , which we denote  $\Lambda \text{Coh}(X)$ .

See Subsection 2.4 for precise definitions. Both moduli problems admit a morphism to  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  that forgets the additional structure.

**Theorem 1.2** (= Theorems 5.11, 5.19, 6.10, 6.15). *In the context of Theorem 1.1, the restriction of the numerical invariant  $\nu$  from  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  defines a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification of the moduli stack  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  (respectively a  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P$ ). If  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then the  $\nu$ -semistable locus admits a good moduli space that is proper (respectively separated) over  $S$ . In the case of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ , the same holds for a larger family  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  of deformations of the numerical invariant described in Definition 6.3.*

The main contribution of this paper is to develop the method of infinite dimensional GIT to prove these theorems. It is inspired by the theory of infinite dimensional symplectic reduction [AB83, Don85]. In the case of vector bundles on a curve, the differential geometric picture uses the description of the stack as a quotient of an infinite dimensional space of connections by an infinite dimensional gauge group. The analogous uniformization theorem in algebraic geometry describes this stack as the quotient of a Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian, an ind-projective ind-scheme which is a relative version of the affine Grassmannian. We prove the theorems above by constructing a “higher dimensional” analog of the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian and applying “geometric invariant theory” to the action of the infinite-dimensional group of rational maps  $X \dashrightarrow \text{GL}_N$  on these ind-projective ind-schemes.

To our knowledge, the level of generality in which we study  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  is new, and the stratification is new in all instances. One interesting feature is that the canonical filtration of an unstable point in  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  is not “convex” in the way that the usual Harder-Narasimhan filtration of an unstable sheaf or  $\Lambda$ -module is (see Example 6.11). This suggests that the stratification of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  cannot be constructed in the same way as the stratification of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_P$ .

But otherwise these results have been established in previous work, albeit in a more classical language. Our good moduli space for the semistable locus  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  recovers the moduli space of  $p$ -semistable  $\Lambda$ -modules constructed in [Sim94] in the Noetherian case. On the other hand, the good moduli space of the semistable locus  $\text{Pair}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  recovers the moduli spaces of Bradlow pairs considered in [BD91, Tha94] for curves, [PT09] for Calabi-Yau threefolds, [Wan15] in the case of a complex projective variety, and [Kol09] [BLM<sup>+</sup>19, §11] [LWX21] when the stability parameter  $\delta \gg 0$  (see also the related moduli spaces of coherent systems considered in [LP93] for smooth projective varieties, and more recently in [Sch19]).

We believe, however, that the method of infinite dimensional GIT is of intrinsic interest, and is conceptually cleaner than the classical approach. We hope that by developing these methods in the context of familiar moduli problems, this paper lays the foundation for a broad range of applications.

The method of infinite dimensional GIT originated in the forthcoming paper [GHLH21] developing one such application, to the computation of gauged Gromov-Witten invariants. Another application, to the moduli of singular principal  $G$ -bundles on higher dimensional varieties, will appear in [GHZ21].

**1.1. Infinite dimensional GIT.** The theory of  $\Theta$ -stability allows one to formulate notions of semistability and canonical filtrations for points in an algebraic stack  $\mathcal{X}$ . We will give a brief summary here, and refer the reader to Subsection 2.5 for a more detailed discussion of the key ideas and results.

The input of the theory is a structure on  $\mathcal{X}$  called a *numerical invariant* (Definition 2.24). Geometric invariant theory (GIT) is the special case where  $\mathcal{X} = Z/G$  for a reductive group  $G$  acting on a projective scheme  $Z$ . The notion of semistability can be defined using the Hilbert-Mumford criterion with respect to a  $G$ -equivariant ample line bundle  $L$  on  $Z$ . Combined with some additional data (a norm on cocharacters of  $G$ ),  $L$  determines a numerical invariant on  $Z/G$ , which encodes the Hilbert-Mumford criterion and also defines the Hesselink-Kempf-Kirwan-Ness stratification of the unstable locus. In our examples, semistability is defined via an intrinsic version of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion, but instead of a single line bundle  $L$ , we use an infinite sequence of line bundles  $L_n \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{X})$  indexed by  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The resulting numerical invariant is a function in  $n$  (in fact polynomial), and semistability and Harder-Narasimhan filtrations are characterized by the asymptotic behavior of this function as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The main theorem of [HL21] identifies two properties of a numerical invariant  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  that imply that: 1)  $\nu$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\mathcal{X}$ ; and 2) the substack  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{ss}} \subset \mathcal{X}$  of semistable points is open and admits a separated good moduli space [Alp13]. The first condition, *strict monotonicity*, is a condition about extending families over points of codimension 2 (Definition 2.27). Under some mild hypotheses, satisfied in our examples, strict monotonicity implies that the semistable locus admits a separated good moduli space if it is open and bounded [HL21, Thm. 5.5.8]. The second condition is referred to as *HN-boundedness* (Definition 2.28), and combined with strict monotonicity it implies the existence of a  $\Theta$ -stratification, which includes the openness of the semistable locus.<sup>1</sup>

The main technical insight of this paper is that strict monotonicity can be guaranteed by choosing a moduli problem that fits a geometric template that we describe below. In particular, this reduces the construction of moduli spaces to the problem of verifying openness and boundedness of the semistable locus.

Let us explain how this works in the example of GIT. First, we regard the setup as an algebraic stack  $\mathcal{X} = Z/G$  along with a morphism  $Z/G \rightarrow BG$  that is relatively representable by projective schemes. If  $Y$  is a regular 2-dimensional noetherian scheme and  $(0, 0) \in Y$  is a closed point, then any morphism  $Y \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \rightarrow BG$  extends uniquely to a morphism  $\rho : Y \rightarrow BG$ . This filling property for  $BG$  is equivalent to  $G$  being reductive [AHLH19a, Thm. 1.3]. The morphism  $\rho$  does not necessarily lift to  $\mathcal{X}$ , but the lift  $\xi : Y \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  defines a section of the projective morphism  $Y \times_{BG} \mathcal{X} \rightarrow Y$  over  $Y \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ , and we let  $\Sigma$  be the closure of this section. By construction the morphism  $\xi$  extends to a morphism  $\tilde{\xi} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . In other words, given the following diagram of solid arrows, one can always fill

---

<sup>1</sup>Technically, in general you only get a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification if  $S$  does not have characteristic 0.

in the dotted arrows so that the diagram commutes

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} Y \setminus \{(0,0)\} & \dashrightarrow & \Sigma & \dashrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow \xi & \swarrow \tilde{\xi} & & & \downarrow \rho \\ \mathcal{X} & \dashrightarrow & & & BG \end{array} .$$

We postpone the formal definition of monotonicity until after our precise definition of a numerical invariant in Subsection 2.5. But roughly, monotonicity follows from two facts about the filling of the diagram (1): i) if  $Y$  has a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action fixing  $(0,0)$  and the morphism  $\xi$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant, then the dotted arrows can be filled  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariantly as well; and ii) the line bundle  $\tilde{\xi}^*(L)$  will be ample on  $\Sigma$  if  $L$  is relatively ample for the map  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow BG$ .

The stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  is not a quotient stack. For simplicity, we will assume in this introduction that  $X$  is flat and has geometrically integral fibers of dimension  $d$  over the base, and we restrict to the open substack of sheaves of fixed rank  $r$ . To verify monotonicity of the numerical invariant, we construct a morphism  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  to a *non-algebraic* stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  with the following properties analogous to the properties of the morphism  $X/G \rightarrow BG$  in GIT:

- (1) Any equivariant morphism  $Y \setminus \{(0,0)\} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  extends to an equivariant morphism  $Y \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$ .
- (2) The fibers of the morphism  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  are ind-projective ind-schemes, and the duals of the line bundles  $L_n$  are asymptotically positive in the sense that on any quasi-compact closed subscheme  $L_n^\vee$  is ample for  $n \gg 0$ .

The term ‘‘infinite dimensional GIT’’ refers to the infinite dimensional ind-schemes that arise in (2). These conditions imply that any  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\xi : Y \setminus \{(0,0)\} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  can be extended this to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism from a birational cover of  $Y$ ,  $\tilde{\xi} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ , such that  $\tilde{\xi}^*(L_n)$  is ample on  $\Sigma$  for all  $n \gg 0$ . This allows us to imitate the proof of monotonicity in GIT outlined above.

Objects of the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  are pairs  $(\mathcal{E}, D)$  consisting of a torsion-free sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $X$  and an effective Cartier divisor  $D \hookrightarrow X$ . A morphism in  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  from  $(\mathcal{E}_1, D_1)$  to  $(\mathcal{E}_2, D_2)$  can be defined when  $D_2 - D_1$  is effective, in which case it is a morphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_1$  that induces an isomorphism after restriction to  $X \setminus D_2$ . We think of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  as the stack of vector bundles defined on the complement of a divisor in  $X$ , i.e., as the stack of ‘‘rational maps’’  $X \dashrightarrow BGL_r$ . Note that  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  is not a stack in groupoids (although all morphisms are monic). For any field  $k$  over the base, if one formally inverts all morphisms in  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}(k)$ , then the resulting groupoid is canonically equivalent to the groupoid of maps from the generic point of  $X_k$  to  $BGL_r$ .

Let  $T \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  be a morphism corresponding to a flat family of torsion-free sheaves  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $X_T$  along with a family of effective Cartier divisors  $D \hookrightarrow X_T$ . We define the affine Grassmannian  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  to be the fiber product:

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}} := \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}} T.$$

For any  $T'/T$ , a  $T'$ -point of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  is a  $T'$ -flat family of torsion-free sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X_{T'}$  along with a morphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  that becomes an isomorphism after restriction to  $X_{T'} \setminus D_{T'}$ . This is a presheaf of sets on the category of  $T$ -schemes that is representable by an ind-projective ind-scheme over  $T$  (Proposition 3.13). Furthermore, for any quasi-compact closed subscheme  $Y \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$ , the dual of the line bundle  $L_n$  on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ , which we use to define semistability, is  $T$ -ample on  $Y$  for  $n \gg 0$ .

When  $X$  is a smooth curve, the ind-schemes  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  are known as Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannians [BD, §5.3.10.(i)] [MV00, §3] [Zhu17, §3], which are fundamental objects in

geometric representation theory. So we regard  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  as a higher dimensional analogue of the affine Grassmannian.

**1.2. Comparison with the classical approach.** Since the development of GIT, a standard approach to analyzing a moduli problem that is representable by a locally finite type algebraic stack  $\mathcal{X}$  is to attempt to find a projective quotient stack  $Z/G$  with a morphism  $Z/G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . Hopefully, and often with great effort, one can then show that the restriction to the GIT semistable locus  $Z^{\mathrm{ss}}/G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is an open immersion whose image admits a simple intrinsic description.

In the example of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ , the basic idea in [Sim94] is to observe that any sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  admits a surjection  $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)^{\oplus P(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  for  $n$  sufficiently large. The data of  $\mathcal{F}$  along with such a surjection can be regarded as a point in a quot-scheme  $Q_n = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_X(-n)^{\oplus P(n)})$ , which is projective. One then studies the action of  $\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}$  on  $Q_n$ . After a somewhat involved analysis of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion, one finds that the notion of GIT semistability is independent of  $n$ , and it agrees with the intrinsic notion of Gieseker semistability of the underlying sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$ . Finally, one shows that for semistable sheaves the choice of surjection  $\mathcal{O}_X(-n)^{\oplus P(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is unique up to the action of  $\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}$ , and that the GIT quotient  $Q_n^{\mathrm{ss}}//\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}$  is a moduli space for semistable sheaves.

Constructing the stratification of the unstable locus is even more subtle, because unlike in the case of the semistable locus, no single quotient stack will suffice to study all of the strata. In the example of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ , the existence of Harder-Narasimhan filtrations and the constructibility of the stratification of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  by Harder-Narasimhan type has been known for some time [Sha77]. However, the canonical structure of locally closed substacks on the strata is a more recent observation [Nit11, GN14]. As in the case of semistability, one can perform a careful analysis of the Hilbert-Mumford criterion to identify each Harder-Narasimhan stratum of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  with a Hesselink-Kempf-Kirwan-Ness stratum of the quotient stack  $Q_n/\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}$  coming from geometric invariant theory, for  $n$  sufficiently large and depending on the stratum [GSZ15, Hos18].

One advantage of the infinite dimensional GIT approach is that it avoids auxiliary choices, and thus avoids the difficult task of showing that the ultimate result is independent of those choices.

Another advantage is the relationship between the analysis for  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  and the analysis for related moduli stacks such as  $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Pair}^d(X)$  or  $\mathcal{M} = \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . In the GIT approach, one starts with the morphism  $Q_n/\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  described above. The fiber product is then

$$(Q_n/\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}) \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} \mathcal{M} \cong Y/\mathrm{SL}_{P(n)}$$

for some scheme  $Y$  that is *affine* over  $Q_n$ , so one needs a trick in order to apply GIT. For  $\mathcal{M} = \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ , one compactifies  $Y$  in some way and then shows that those new points are unstable. This complicates the story, especially because the new points do not lie over points of  $\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . For  $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Pair}^d(X)$ , one takes the quotient of an open subscheme  $Y^\circ \subset Y$  by a free  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action in order to get a scheme that is projective over  $Q_n$ .

In the infinite dimensional GIT framework, there are analogous stacks of rational objects  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  along with a forgetful morphism  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$ . The fibers of the morphism  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  over a  $T$ -point  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  are closed sub-ind-schemes of the affine Grassmannians  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$ , where the pair  $(D,\mathcal{E})$  corresponds to the composition  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  (see Proposition 3.25). The argument for monotonicity of the numerical invariant on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  implies monotonicity of the restriction of the numerical invariant to  $\mathcal{M}$  with no further effort.

Although we have chosen to focus on  $\mathrm{Pair}^d(X)$  and  $\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  here, there are many more examples of moduli stacks that are affine over  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ , such that the relevant

affine Grassmannian is a closed sub-ind-scheme of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$ . Examples include moduli of holomorphic triples [BGPG04] and more generally moduli spaces related to decorated sheaves [GS03, Sch05, Sch08]. In light of our discussion above, the results of this paper reduce the analysis of all of these moduli problems to verifying two types of boundedness conditions: HN boundedness and boundedness of the semistable locus.

One drawback of the infinite dimensional GIT approach is that does not automatically produce a projective moduli space. It is tempting to relate positivity of the line bundle on the affine Grassmannian to ampleness of the line bundle after descending to the good moduli space of the semistable locus. This is possible in certain classical examples, like the moduli of  $\mathrm{SL}_n$ -bundles on a curve, but at the moment we do not know of any general ampleness results in this framework.

**Remark 1.3.** *The construction of the affine Grassmannians  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$  makes use of quot-schemes, just like the GIT construction of the moduli space for  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)^{\mathrm{ss}}$ . However, the GIT approach uses quot-schemes parameterizing  $d$ -dimensional quotients, whereas  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$  is a colimit of quot-schemes parameterizing  $(d-1)$ -dimensional quotients. Hence despite this superficial resemblance, the approaches are different. The original construction by Seshadri of the moduli of vector bundles on a curve also uses  $(d-1)$ -dimensional quot-schemes [Ses67], but the relationship with the approach in this paper is not clear.*

**Acknowledgements:** The first author acknowledges the support of a Simons Collaboration Grant. The second author acknowledges support by NSF grants DMS-1454893 and DMS-2001071. The first and third authors acknowledge the support of the NSF CAREER grant DMS-1945478. We would like to thank Harold Blum, Tomás L. Gómez, Jochen Heinloth, Yuchen Liu, Chenyang Xu, and Alfonso Zamora for helpful conversations.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation.** We work over a fixed quasicompact base scheme  $S$ . For any  $S$ -scheme  $T$  we let  $\mathrm{Aff}_T$  denote the category of (absolutely) affine schemes over  $T$ . We will write  $\mathrm{Sch}_T$  to denote the category of all schemes over  $T$ . For any map of schemes  $Y \rightarrow T$  we write  $Y_t$  to denote the fiber  $Y \times_T \mathrm{Spec}(k(t))$  over  $t$ . All of the sheaves we consider will be quasicohherent. Whenever we write “ $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module” we mean a quasicohherent  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -sheaf. For any point  $t \in T$ , we sometimes write  $\mathcal{F}_t$  for the restriction of  $\mathcal{F}$  to the fiber  $Y_t$ . This should not be confused with the identical notation employed for the stalk of a sheaf. We will emphasize which use we have in mind whenever it is not clear from context.

In order to simplify notation for pullbacks, we use the following convention. Whenever we have a map of schemes  $f : Y \rightarrow T$  and a sheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $T$ , we will write  $\mathcal{G}|_Y$  to denote the pullback  $f^*\mathcal{G}$  whenever the morphism  $f$  is clear from context.

We fix once and for all a scheme  $X$  that is projective and of finite presentation over  $S$ .  $\pi : X \rightarrow S$  will denote the structure morphism. We also fix an  $S$ -ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  on  $X$ .

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is an algebraic stack, we denote by  $|\mathcal{M}|$  its underlying topological space [Sta20, Tag 04Y8]. We also fix some notation for certain stacks defined in [HL21, AHLH19b]. We will denote by  $\Theta$  the quotient stack  $[\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Z}}^1/\mathbb{G}_m]$ . We use the convention that  $\mathbb{G}_m$  acts linearly on  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Z}}^1 = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t])$  so that  $t$  is given weight  $-1$ .

**Notation 2.1.** *Let  $R$  be a discrete valuation ring with uniformizer  $\varpi$ . We define*

$$Y_{\Theta_R} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[t]) \text{ and } Y_{\overline{\mathrm{ST}}_R} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[s,t]/(st - \varpi)),$$

*equipped with the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action that assigns  $t$  weight  $-1$  and  $s$  weight  $1$ . The isomorphism class of the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -scheme  $Y_{\overline{\mathrm{ST}}_R}$  is independent of the choice of uniformizer  $\varpi$ . We denote*

$\Theta_R = [Y_{\Theta_R}/\mathbb{G}_m]$  and  $\overline{ST}_R = [Y_{\overline{ST}_R}/\mathbb{G}_m]$ . Note that  $Y_{\Theta_R}$  and  $Y_{\overline{ST}_R}$  each contain a unique  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant closed point cut out by the ideals  $(t, \varpi)$  and  $(s, t)$  respectively. We denote this closed point by  $(0, 0)$  in both cases.

**2.2. Pure sheaves.** We are interested in variations of the moduli stack of pure sheaves on  $X$ . Here we state some of the relevant definitions and set up some notation.

**Definition 2.2.** *Let  $Y$  be scheme of finite type over a field. Let  $p \in Y$  be a point. We say that  $p$  has dimension  $d$  if the closure  $\overline{p} \subset Y$  is a variety of dimension  $d$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a coherent  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module. We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  if all the associated points of  $\mathcal{F}$  have dimension  $d$ .*

The definition of pure sheaf above is equivalent to the property that  $\mathcal{F}$  does not contain any nontrivial subsheaves supported on a scheme of dimension smaller than or equal to  $d - 1$ . The latter is the definition of pure sheaf given in [HL97, Def. 1.1.2].

**Definition 2.3.** *Let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow T$  be a morphism of schemes of finite type. We say that a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  is  $T$ -pure of dimension  $d$  if it is  $T$ -flat, finitely presented, and for all  $t \in T$  we have that  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $Y_t$ .*

**Definition 2.4** (Moduli of pure sheaves). *The stack  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  is the pseudofunctor from  $(\text{Sch}/S)^{\text{op}}$  to groupoids defined as follows. For every  $S$ -scheme  $T$ , we set*

$$\text{Coh}^d(X)(T) = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{groupoid of finitely presented } T\text{-flat } \mathcal{O}_{X \times T}\text{-modules} \\ \text{on } X_T \text{ that are } T\text{-pure of dimension } d \end{array} \right]$$

The following proposition is certainly well-known. We include a proof since we are not aware of an explicit reference.

**Proposition 2.5.**  *$\text{Coh}^d(X)$  is an algebraic stack with affine diagonal and locally of finite presentation over  $S$ .*

*Proof.*  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Coh}_{X/S}$  as defined in [Sta20, Tag 08KA]. By [Sta20, Tag 08WC],  $\text{Coh}_{X/S}$  is an algebraic stack with affine diagonal and locally of finite presentation over  $S$ . The proposition follows because the inclusion  $\text{Coh}^d(X) \hookrightarrow \text{Coh}_{X/S}$  is an open immersion by Theorem 12.2.1 (iii) on page 179 of [Gro66].  $\square$

Next, we define some families of line bundles on  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We define  $M_n$  to be the line bundle on  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  determined as follows. Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $f : T \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  be a morphism, represented by a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ . Then, we set  $f^* M_n := \det R\pi_{T*}(\mathcal{F}(n))$ .*

**Remark 2.7.** *The symbol  $\det$  denotes the determinant in the  $K$ -theoretic sense. Note that this makes sense because the derived pushforward is a perfect complex [Sta20, Tag 0A1H].*

**Definition 2.8.** *By [KM76, Thm. 4], the line bundle  $M_n \in \text{Pic}(\text{Coh}^d(X))$  is a polynomial in the variable  $n$  of degree  $d + 1$  with values in  $\text{Pic}(\text{Coh}^d(X))$ . More precisely  $M_n = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{d+1} b_i^{\binom{n}{i}}$  for certain line bundles defined by  $b_i := \bigotimes_{j=0}^i M_j^{(-1)^j \binom{i}{j}}$ .*

**2.3. Hilbert polynomials and Gieseker semistability.** The purpose of this subsection is to recall some notions from [HL97] and set some notation in place. Let  $Y$  be a scheme that is projective over a field. Fix an ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  of  $Y$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $Y$ . We denote by  $P_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  the Hilbert polynomial of  $\mathcal{F}$  [HL97, Lemma 1.2.1]. This is a polynomial of degree  $d$  in the variable  $n$ . It can be written in the form

$$P_{\mathcal{F}}(n) = \sum_{k=0}^d \frac{a_k(\mathcal{F})}{k!} n^k$$



for some sequence of rational numbers  $a_k(\mathcal{F})$ . We set  $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}} := a_d(\mathcal{F})$ . It turns out that  $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is always a positive integer. We define the reduced Hilbert polynomial to be  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} := \frac{1}{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} P_{\mathcal{F}}$ . For every  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ , we set  $\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}) := \frac{a_i(\mathcal{F})}{a_d(\mathcal{F})}$ . We call this the  $i^{\mathrm{th}}$  slope of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The  $(d-1)^{\mathrm{th}}$  slope  $\hat{\mu}_{d-1}(\mathcal{F})$  is the Mumford slope of  $\mathcal{F}$  as in [HL97]; we denote it simply by  $\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{F})$ .

**Definition 2.9.** *A pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $Y$  is called Gieseker semistable if for all non-trivial subsheaves  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  we have  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{E}}(n) \leq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  for  $n \gg 0$ .*

For simplicity of notation, we will use the following convention from now on.

**Definition 2.10.** *For any two polynomials  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}[n]$ , we write  $p_1 \geq p_2$  if  $p_1(n) \geq p_2(n)$  for  $n \gg 0$ .*

In order to check that  $\mathcal{F}$  is Gieseker semistable, it suffices to show that  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  for all nontrivial subsheaves  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}$  is also pure of dimension  $d$ . This is a consequence of [HL97, Prop. 1.2.6].

**Definition 2.11.** *For any rational polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[n]$  of degree  $d$ , let  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  denote the subfunctor of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  consisting of families whose fibers all have Hilbert polynomial  $P$ .*

Since the Hilbert polynomial is locally constant in flat families of sheaves,  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  can be written as a disjoint union of open and closed substacks  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) = \bigsqcup_{P \in \mathbb{Q}[n]} \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ . Using this, we can define a new “normalized” family of line bundles on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ .

**Definition 2.12.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We define  $L_n$  to be the line bundle on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  that is defined on each  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  as follows. Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $f : T \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  be a morphism, represented by a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ . Then, we set*

$$f^* L_n := f^* M_n \otimes (f^* b_d)^{-\otimes \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)}$$

*Note that this formula makes sense because the reduced Hilbert polynomial  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is constant on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$  (it is the unique scalar multiple of  $P$  with leading coefficient  $\frac{1}{d!}$ ).*

## 2.4. Some related moduli problems.

2.4.1. *Moduli of pairs.* Fix a finitely presented sheaf  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $X$ .

**Definition 2.13.** *The moduli stack of pure pairs  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  is the pseudofunctor from  $(\mathrm{Sch}/S)^{\mathrm{op}}$  into groupoids defined as follows. For any  $S$ -scheme  $T$ , we set*

$$\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)(T) = \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{groupoid of tuples } (\mathcal{F}, \alpha), \text{ where } \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)(T) \\ \text{and } \alpha \text{ is a morphism } \alpha : \mathcal{A}|_{X_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \end{array} \right]$$

*We require the isomorphisms in  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  to be compatible with the morphism  $\alpha$ .*

There is a natural morphism  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  that forgets the morphism  $\alpha$ .

**Proposition 2.14.** *The forgetful morphism  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  is schematic, affine and of finite presentation. In particular  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  is an algebraic stack with affine diagonal and locally of finite presentation over  $S$ .*

The following lemma will be used to prove Proposition 2.14.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $Y \rightarrow T$  be a morphism of schemes that is proper and of finite presentation. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be quasicoherent  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules. Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  is finitely presented and  $T$ -flat. Let  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$  denote the functor from  $(\mathrm{Sch}/T)^{\mathrm{op}}$  into sets that sends a  $T$ -scheme  $L$  to*

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})(L) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{Y_L}}(\mathcal{F}|_{Y_L}, \mathcal{G}|_{Y_L})$$

*Then,*

- (a)  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$  is represented by a scheme that is relatively affine over  $T$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is finitely presented, then  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$  is of finite presentation over  $T$ .
- (c) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite type, then the section  $0 : T \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$  induced by the 0 morphism is a closed immersion of finite presentation.

*Proof.* Parts (a) and (b) are a special case of [Sta20, Tag 08K6].

For (c), suppose first that  $\mathcal{F}$  is finitely presented. Then (c) follows because the composition  $T \xrightarrow{0} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow T$  is clearly of finite presentation and the diagonal  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \times_T \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$  is of finite presentation by [Sta20, Tag 0818].

For the general case, since the statement is local on  $T$  we can assume without loss of generality that  $T$  is affine. Therefore  $X$  is quasicompact and separated. By [Sta20, Tag 086M],  $\mathcal{F}$  admits a surjection  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  from a finitely presented sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$ . Observe that the naturally induced diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{0} & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \\ \mathrm{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T & \xrightarrow{0} & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) \end{array}$$

is Cartesian. Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is finitely presented, we already know that  $0 : T \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$  is a closed immersion of finite presentation. Therefore the same holds for  $0 : T \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.14.* Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $T \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  be a morphism represented by a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ . By definition, the fiber product  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X) \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} T$  is the functor  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{A}|_{X_T}, \mathcal{F})$  over the scheme  $T$ . By Lemma 2.15, this is represented by a scheme that is relatively affine and of finite presentation over  $T$ .  $\square$

We will abuse notation and denote by  $M_n, L_n, b_d$  the pullbacks to  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  of the corresponding line bundles on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  under the forgetful morphism defined above.

**2.4.2. Moduli of  $\Lambda$ -modules.** In this section we will work with a sheaf  $\Lambda$  of rings of differential operators for the morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow S$ , as in [Sim94, §2]. We add an extra finite presentation condition in order to work in the non-Noetherian setting.

**Definition 2.16.** *A sheaf of finitely presented rings of differential operators  $\Lambda$  on  $X$  relative to  $S$  is an associative unital  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebra with a filtration  $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda_1 \subset \dots \subset \Lambda$  satisfying the following conditions.*

- (1)  $\Lambda = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} \Lambda_j$ . Furthermore  $\Lambda_i \cdot \Lambda_j \subset \Lambda_{i+j}$  for all  $i, j$ .
- (2) The image of the unit  $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \Lambda$  is equal to  $\Lambda_0$ .
- (3) The image of  $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_S)$  in  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is contained in the center of  $\Lambda$ .
- (4) The left and right  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module structures on  $\Lambda_i/\Lambda_{i-1}$  are equal.
- (5) The sheaves of  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules  $\Lambda_i/\Lambda_{i-1}$  are finitely presented.
- (6) The sheaf of graded  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebras  $\mathrm{Gr}(\Lambda) := \bigoplus_{j \geq 0} \Lambda_j/\Lambda_{j-1}$  is generated by  $\Lambda_1/\Lambda_0$ .
- (7) Let  $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Lambda_1/\Lambda_0)$  denote the free associative tensor  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebra. The kernel of the natural surjective morphism  $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Lambda_1/\Lambda_0) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(\Lambda)$  is locally finitely generated as a two-sided ideal.

**Remark 2.17.** *The definition of sheaf of rings of differential operators in [Sim94, §2] only includes conditions (1) through (6) in the definition above. We include the additional condition (7) to show that the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  of  $\Lambda$ -modules is locally of finite presentation over the base  $S$  in Proposition 2.22. Without assuming (7), the proof of Proposition 2.22*

shows that  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is locally of finite type over  $S$ , and hence locally of finite presentation if  $S$  is Noetherian, which is the context in [Sim94].

If the associated graded algebra  $\text{Gr}(\Lambda)$  is commutative and the base scheme  $S$  is Noetherian, then condition (7) is automatically satisfied by Hilbert's basis theorem. We do not know if (7) is automatic more generally when the base  $S$  is Noetherian.

The proof of [Sim94, Lemma 2.2] implies that each subsheaf  $\Lambda_i$  is finitely presented for both the left and right  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module structures. It follows that  $\Lambda$  is quasicohherent for both the left and right  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module structures.

For the remainder of this article, we fix a sheaf  $\Lambda$  of finitely presented rings of differential operators in Definition 2.16.

Let  $f : T \rightarrow S$  be a morphism of schemes. By [Sim94, Lemma 2.5, 2.6] there is a canonical isomorphism between the pullbacks  $(f_X^*)_l \Lambda_i$  and  $(f_X^*)_r \Lambda_i$  with respect to the left and right  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module structures. There is also a canonical isomorphism between the left and right pullbacks of  $\Lambda$ . We will implicitly use this isomorphism and write  $\Lambda_i|_{X_T}$  and  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  to denote either of these pullbacks. It is shown in [Sim94, Lemma 2.5, 2.6] that  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  is a sheaf of rings of differential operators on  $X_T$  relative to  $T$ . In particular we have a filtration  $(\Lambda|_{X_T})_0 \subset (\Lambda|_{X_T})_1 \subset \dots \subset \Lambda|_{X_T}$ , where  $(\Lambda|_{X_T})_j$  is defined to be the image of the morphism  $\Lambda_j|_{X_T} \rightarrow \Lambda|_{X_T}$ .

**Definition 2.18.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an  $S$ -flat finitely presented  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. A  $\Lambda$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}$  is a module structure on  $\mathcal{E}$  for the sheaf of rings  $\Lambda$  that is compatible with the  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module structure. If  $\mathcal{E}$  is equipped with such structure, then we say that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a  $\Lambda$ -module.*

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\Lambda$ -module on  $X$ . Suppose that we are given a morphism of schemes  $f : T \rightarrow S$ . [Sim94, Lemma 2.7] implies that the pullback  $\mathcal{E}|_{X_T}$  can be naturally equipped with a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure. We can use this fact to define a stack of  $\Lambda$ -modules on  $X$ .

**Definition 2.19.** *The moduli stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  of  $\Lambda$ -modules is the pseudofunctor from  $(\text{Sch}/S)^{\text{op}}$  into groupoids defined as follows. For any  $S$ -scheme  $T$ , we set*

$$\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)(T) = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{groupoid of } T\text{-pure sheaves } \mathcal{E} \text{ of dimension } d \text{ on } X_T \\ \text{equipped with the structure of a } \Lambda|_{X_T}\text{-module} \end{array} \right]$$

*The isomorphisms in the groupoid are required to preserve the  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure.*

For each  $j > 1$ , let  $\mathcal{K}_j$  denote the left and right  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module of finite type fitting into the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_j \rightarrow (\Lambda_1)^{\otimes j} \rightarrow \Lambda_j \rightarrow 0.$$

Here the tensor product is in the sense of  $(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ -bimodules, and the morphism  $(\Lambda_1)^{\otimes j} \rightarrow \Lambda_j$  is given by multiplication.

**Lemma 2.20.** *There exists some  $j_{\text{gen}} \gg 0$  such that for all  $j \geq j_{\text{gen}}$  we have  $\mathcal{K}_j = \sum_{a+b=j-j_{\text{gen}}} \Lambda_1^{\otimes a} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{j_{\text{gen}}} \otimes \Lambda_1^{\otimes b}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that the kernel of the surjection  $\bigcup_j \Lambda_1^{\otimes j} \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda$  is a finitely generated two-sided ideal. The algebra  $\bigcup_j \Lambda_1^{\otimes j}$  is naturally filtered; a standard argument reduces to showing that the corresponding initial ideal in  $\text{Gr}(\bigcup_j \Lambda_1^{\otimes j})$  is finitely generated. Note that  $\text{Gr}(\bigcup_j \Lambda_1^{\otimes j})$  is the free tensor associative  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebra  $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Lambda_1/\Lambda_0)$ .

The initial ideal is the kernel of the associated graded morphism  $T_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\text{Gr}(\Lambda)_1) \rightarrow \text{Gr}(\Lambda)$  obtained from our original morphism  $\bigcup_j \Lambda_1^{\otimes j} \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda$  of filtered algebras. By condition (7) in Definition 2.16, this kernel is a finitely generated two-sided ideal, as desired.  $\square$

Let  $f : T \rightarrow S$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a finitely-presented  $S$ -flat  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -module. Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}$  is given the structure of a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module. Then we get a morphism  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  of left  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -modules given by the composition

$$\Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Lambda|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$$

By [Sim94, Prop 2.8], the image of  $\Lambda_1|_{X_T}$  in  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  locally generates  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  as an algebra. This implies that the morphism  $a$  completely determines the  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}$ . The next proposition characterizes which morphisms  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  arise from such a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -structure. This gives a useful alternative description of  $\Lambda$ -modules.

**Proposition 2.21.** *Let  $f : T \rightarrow S$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a finitely-presented  $S$ -flat  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -module. Let  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  be a morphism of left  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -modules. Then  $a$  arises from a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}$  (as described above) if and only if the following conditions are satisfied*

( $\Lambda 1$ ) *The composition  $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\text{unit}|_{X_T} \otimes \text{id}} \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{E}$  is the identity.*

( $\Lambda 2$ ) *For all  $j > 1$ , the composition  $\mathcal{K}_j|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is 0. Here the last morphism  $(\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is the natural one obtained by applying  $j$ -times the morphism  $a$ , starting with the right-most copy of  $\Lambda_1|_{X_T}$  and ending at the left-most copy.*

*In particular the set of  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structures on  $\mathcal{E}$  is in natural bijection with morphisms  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  satisfying conditions ( $\Lambda 1$ ) and ( $\Lambda 2$ ) above. If  $j_{\text{gen}}$  is as Lemma 2.20, then ( $\Lambda 2$ ) is equivalent to the composition  $\mathcal{K}_{j_{\text{gen}}}|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j_{\text{gen}}} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  being 0.*

*Proof.* If  $a$  comes from a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure, then it follows from construction that it must satisfy conditions ( $\Lambda 1$ ) and ( $\Lambda 2$ ) above. ( $\Lambda 1$ ) follows from the fact that the unit of  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  acts as the identity, and ( $\Lambda 2$ ) follows from the compatibility of the  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure with multiplication.

Conversely, suppose that  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is a morphism of left  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -modules satisfying conditions ( $\Lambda 1$ ) and ( $\Lambda 2$ ). By ( $\Lambda 2$ ), the morphism  $(\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  factors through the quotient  $((\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j} / \mathcal{K}_j) \otimes \mathcal{E} \cong \Lambda_j|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ . Hence we get a sequence of morphisms  $a_j : \Lambda_j|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  compatible with the natural maps  $\Lambda_j|_{X_T} \rightarrow \Lambda_{j+1}|_{X_T}$ . This yields a well-defined morphism  $\text{colim}_{j \geq 0} \Lambda_j|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ . Since tensoring and pulling back commutes with taking colimits, this is equivalent to an action morphism  $\Lambda|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ . By construction this action map is compatible with multiplication on  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ . Moreover, ( $\Lambda 1$ ) implies that the unit in  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$  acts as the identity. We conclude that this is a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}$ . It follows from construction that  $a$  is the composition  $\Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \Lambda|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , as desired. The last statement in the proposition follows because by assumption  $\mathcal{K}_{j_{\text{gen}}}$  generates all  $\mathcal{K}_j$  for  $j \geq j_{\text{gen}}$ .  $\square$

There is a natural forgetful morphism of pseudofunctors  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  that forgets the  $\Lambda$ -module structure. We can use this morphism to show that the stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is algebraic.

**Proposition 2.22.** *The forgetful morphism  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is schematic, affine and of finite presentation. In particular  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is an algebraic stack with affine diagonal and locally of finite presentation over  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $T \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  be represented by a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ . We need to show that  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X) \times_{\text{Coh}^d(X)} T$  is relatively affine and of finite type over  $T$ .

By Proposition 2.21, the fiber product  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} T$  is the subfunctor of  $\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$  that classifies morphisms  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  of left  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -modules satisfying conditions  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$ . By Lemma 2.15, the functor  $\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$  is represented by a scheme that is relatively affine and of finite presentation over  $T$ .

Set  $H := \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$ . Let  $a_{\mathrm{univ}} : \Lambda_1|_{X_H} \otimes \mathcal{F}|_{X_H} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{X_H}$  denote the universal morphism on  $X_H$ . The composition

$$\mathcal{F}|_{X_H} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{X_H} \otimes \mathcal{F}|_{X_H} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{unit}|_{X_H} \otimes \mathrm{id}} \Lambda_1|_{X_H} \otimes \mathcal{F}|_{X_H} \xrightarrow{a_{\mathrm{univ}}} \mathcal{F}|_{X_H}$$

defines a section  $f : H \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) \times_T H$  of the projection  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_{X_T}, \mathcal{F}) \times_T H \rightarrow H$ . The constant identity morphism  $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{F}|_{X_H}}$  induces another section. The subfunctor of  $H$  where  $(\Lambda 1)$  is satisfied is the locus  $Z_0$  where  $f - \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{F}|_{X_H}}$  agrees with the 0 section. Since the 0 section is a closed immersion of finite presentation by Lemma 2.15, it follows that the locus  $Z_0$  is represented by a closed subscheme of finite presentation over  $H$ .

Let  $j_{\mathrm{gen}}$  as in property (8) in Definition 2.20. A similar reasoning shows that the locus  $Z_{j_{\mathrm{gen}}} \hookrightarrow H$  where the following composition vanishes

$$\mathcal{K}_{j_{\mathrm{gen}}}|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (\Lambda_1|_{X_T})^{\otimes j_{\mathrm{gen}}} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$$

is represented by a closed subscheme of finite presentation. We conclude that  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} T$  is represented by the closed subscheme  $Z_0 \cap Z_{j_{\mathrm{gen}}}$  of finite presentation in  $H$ . Since  $H$  is relatively affine and of finite presentation over  $T$ , then so is  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \times_{\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} T$ .  $\square$

**2.5.  $\Theta$ -stratifications and numerical invariants.** In this subsection we recall some of the theory of  $\Theta$ -stratifications and numerical invariants introduced in [HL21]. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an algebraic stack with quasi-affine diagonal and locally of finite presentation over  $S$ .

Let  $K$  be a field. We denote by  $0 \in \mathbb{A}_K$  the fixed point given by the vanishing of the coordinate  $t$  in  $\mathbb{A}_K^1$ . We will abuse notation and also denote by  $0$  the corresponding  $K$ -point of  $\Theta$ . Similarly we let  $1$  be the  $K$ -point of  $\mathbb{A}_K^1$  given by the vanishing of  $t - 1$ , and also denote by  $1$  its image in the quotient  $\Theta$ .

For any field-valued point  $p \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ , a filtration of  $p$  is a morphism  $f : \Theta_K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  along with an isomorphism  $f(1) \simeq p$  [HL21, §1]. The stack of filtrations  $\mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Map}(\Theta, \mathcal{M})$  is represented by an algebraic stack locally of finite presentation over  $S$  [HL21, Prop. 1.1.1]. There is a morphism  $\mathrm{ev}_1 : \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  given by evaluating at  $1 \in \Theta$ .

A graded point of the stack  $\mathcal{M}$  is a morphism  $(BG_m)_K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , where  $K$  is a field. The mapping stack of graded points  $\mathrm{Grad}(\mathcal{M}) := \mathrm{Map}(BG_m, \mathcal{M})$  is also an algebraic stack locally of finite presentation over  $S$  [HL21, Prop. 1.1.1].

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an open substack of  $\mathcal{M}$ . A weak  $\Theta$ -stratum of  $\mathcal{X}$  is a union of connected components of  $\mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$  such that the restriction of  $\mathrm{ev}_1$  is finite and radicial. A  $\Theta$ -stratum is a weak  $\Theta$ -stratum such that  $\mathrm{ev}_1$  is a closed immersion. We can think of a  $\Theta$ -stratum as a closed substack of  $\mathcal{X}$  that is identified with some connected components of  $\mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{X})$ .

**Definition 2.23.** A (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of a collection of open substacks  $(\mathcal{M}_{\leq c})_{c \in \Gamma}$  indexed by a totally ordered set  $\Gamma$ . We require the following conditions to be satisfied

- (1)  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq c} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\leq c'}$  for all  $c < c'$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{c \in \Gamma} \mathcal{M}_{\leq c}$ .
- (3) For all  $c$ , there exists a (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratum  $\mathfrak{S}_c \subset \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{M}_{\leq c})$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq c}$  such that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\leq c} \setminus \mathrm{ev}_1(\mathfrak{S}_c) = \bigcup_{c' < c} \mathcal{M}_{\leq c'}$$

- (4) For every point  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ , the set  $\{c \in \Gamma \mid p \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq c}\}$  has a minimal element.

In order to define  $\Theta$ -stratifications for our stacks of interest, we will need to introduce some numerical invariants in the sense of [HL21, Defn. 0.0.3]. Our numerical invariants will be valued in the ring  $\mathbb{R}[n]$  of polynomials in the variable  $n$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The order described in Definition 2.10 equips  $\mathbb{R}[n]$  with the structure of a totally-ordered  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space.

For  $q \geq 1$ , let  $B\mathbb{G}_m^q := [\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})/\mathbb{G}_m^q]$ . Let  $k$  be a field. We say that a morphism  $g : B(\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is nondegenerate if the induced homomorphism  $(\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(g|_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)})$  has finite kernel. A polynomial numerical invariant is an assignment of a function  $\nu_\gamma : \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[n]$  for each such nondegenerate morphism. We require that this assignment satisfies some extra continuity and compatibility conditions, as stated in the next definition.

**Definition 2.24.** *A polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  on a stack  $\mathcal{M}$  is an assignment defined as follows. Let  $k$  be a field and let  $p \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\gamma : (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(p)$  be a homomorphism of  $k$ -groups with finite kernel. We assign to this data a scale-invariant function  $\nu_\gamma : \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[n]$  such that*

- (1)  $\nu_\gamma$  is unchanged under field extensions  $k \subset k'$ .
- (2)  $\nu$  is locally constant in algebraic families. In other words, let  $T$  be a scheme. Let  $\xi : T \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a morphism and let  $\gamma : (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_T \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(\xi)$  be a homomorphism of  $T$ -group schemes with finite kernel. Then as we vary  $s \in S$ , the function  $\nu_{\gamma_s}$  is locally constant in  $S$ .
- (3) Given a homomorphism  $\phi : (\mathbb{G}_m^w)_k \rightarrow (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k$  with finite kernel, the function  $\nu_{\gamma \circ \phi}$  is the restriction of  $\nu_\gamma$  along the inclusion  $\mathbb{R}^w \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$  induced by  $\phi$ .

Next we explain a useful way to construct polynomial numerical invariants on a stack. Fix a sequence of rational line bundles  $(\mathcal{L}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , where each  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is in the rational Picard group  $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{M}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$  of the stack. For each morphism  $g : (B\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , the pullback line bundle  $g^*(\mathcal{L}_n)$  amounts to a rational character in  $X^*(\mathbb{G}_m^q) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ . Under the natural identification  $X^*(\mathbb{G}_m^q) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Q}^q$ , we can interpret this as a  $q$ -tuple of rational numbers  $(w_n^{(i)})_{i=1}^q$ , which we call the weight of  $g^*(\mathcal{L}_n)$ . It is often the case that one can choose the line bundles  $(\mathcal{L}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  in such a way that for each fixed  $i$  the weight  $w_n^{(i)}$  is a polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}[n]$ . If this is the case, then for every  $g$  we can define a  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear function  $L_g : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[n]$  given by

$$L_g((r_i)_{i=1}^q) = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i \cdot w_n^{(i)}$$

In order to obtain a scale invariant  $\nu$ , we use a rational quadratic norm on graded points as in [HL21, Defn. 4.1.12]. This consists of an assignment of a positive definite quadratic norm  $b_\gamma(-)$  with rational coefficients defined on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  for each choice of  $p \in \mathcal{M}(k)$  and homomorphism  $\gamma : (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(p)$  with finite kernel. Just as in the definition of numerical invariants, we require that this assignment is stable under field extension and locally constant on algebraic families. Also, we require that for any homomorphism  $\phi : (\mathbb{G}_m^w)_k \rightarrow (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k$  with finite kernel the quadratic norms  $b_\gamma$  and  $b_{\gamma \circ \phi}$  are compatible with the corresponding induced inclusion  $\mathbb{R}^w \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ .

Given a sequence of rational line bundles  $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  as above and a rational quadratic norm on graded points  $b$ , we can define a numerical invariant  $\nu$  as follows. For all nondegenerate  $g : (B\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  with corresponding morphism  $\gamma : (\mathbb{G}_m^q)_k \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(g|_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)})$ , we set

$$\nu_\gamma(\vec{r}) = \frac{L_g(\vec{r})}{\sqrt{b_\gamma(\vec{r})}}$$

We next explain how a polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  can define a (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratification on  $\mathcal{M}$  (see [HL21, §4.1] for more details). We say that a filtration  $f : \Theta_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is nondegenerate if the restriction  $f|_0 : [0/(\mathbb{G}_m)_k] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is nondegenerate. We regard  $\nu$

as a function on the set of nondegenerate filtrations by defining  $\nu(f) := \nu(f|_0)(1) \in \mathbb{R}[n]$ . Given a point  $p \in |\mathcal{M}|$ , we say that  $p$  is semistable if all nondegenerate filtrations  $f$  with  $f(1) = p$  satisfy  $\nu(f) \leq 0$ . Otherwise we say that  $p$  is unstable. For such an unstable point, we set  $M^\nu(p)$  to be the supremum of  $\nu(f)$  over all filtrations  $f$  with  $f(1) = p$  (if such supremum exists). If  $p$  is semistable, then by convention we set  $M^\nu(p) = 0$ . We can define a stratification of  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq c}$  indexed by  $c \in \mathbb{R}[n]_{\geq 0}$  as follows. For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}[n]_{\geq 0}$ , we set  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq c}$  to be the open substack of all points  $p$  satisfying  $M^\nu(p) \leq c$ . If this open stratification of the stack comes from a (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratification, then we say that  $\nu$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification.

**Remark 2.25.** *We will only consider nondegenerate filtrations, because these are the ones relevant for stability. For the rest of the article we will sometimes omit the adjective “nondegenerate”.*

For any unstable point  $p$ , a filtration  $f$  of  $p$  is called a Harder-Narasimhan filtration if  $\nu(f) = M^\nu(p)$ . If  $\nu$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification, then every unstable point admits a Harder-Narasimhan filtration that is unique up to pre-composing with a ramified covering  $\Theta_k \rightarrow \Theta_k$ . If  $\nu$  only defines a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification, then the existence and uniqueness of a Harder-Narasimhan filtration holds after passing to a finite purely inseparable extension of the defining field of the point.

A natural question to ask is: when does a numerical invariant  $\nu$  define a (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratification as described above? Another thing we would like to know is whether the locus  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  of  $\nu$ -semistable objects admits a good moduli space in the sense of [Alp13]. A general strategy to address such questions proceeds in three steps:

- (Step 1) Show that the numerical invariant  $\nu$  satisfies some monotonicity conditions (as in Definition 2.27).
- (Step 2) Prove that  $\nu$  satisfies the HN boundedness condition (as in Definition 2.28).
- (Step 3) Check that the semistable locus  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  is a disjoint union of bounded open substacks.<sup>2</sup>

If one can successfully check the previous three steps, then it follows that the invariant  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  defines a (weak)  $\Theta$ -stratification of the stack. Furthermore, the existence criterion of [AHLH19b, Theorem A ] then implies that  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a good moduli space in characteristic 0. We state this as a theorem.

**Theorem 2.26** ([HL21, Theorem B]). *Let  $\nu$  be a polynomial numerical invariant on  $\mathcal{M}$  defined by a sequence of rational line bundles and a norm on graded points, as explained above.*

- (1) *If  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone, then it defines a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\mathcal{M}$  if and only if it satisfies the HN boundedness condition. If moreover  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then  $\nu$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification.*
- (2) *Suppose that all of the conditions in (1) above are satisfied. Furthermore, assume  $\nu$  is strictly  $S$ -monotone and that the semistable locus  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  can be written as a disjoint union of bounded open substacks. Then  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  has a separated good moduli space.*

*If all of the above are satisfied and if  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness for complete discrete valuation rings relative to  $S$  [Sta20, Tag 0CLK], then each quasicompact open and closed substack of  $\mathcal{M}^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a good moduli space that is proper over  $S$ .*

---

<sup>2</sup>The fact that  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is an open substack, hence algebraic, follows from (1) and (2).

We end this subsection by explaining each of the hypotheses that one needs to check in Theorem 2.26. Let  $\kappa$  be a field and let  $a \geq 1$  be an integer. We denote by  $\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1[a]$  the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -scheme  $\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1$  equipped with the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action determined by the equation  $t \cdot [x : y] = [t^{-a}x : y]$ . We set  $0 = [0 : 1]$  and  $\infty = [1 : 0]$ . Recall the schemes  $Y_{\Theta_R}$  and  $Y_{\overline{ST}_R}$  of Notation 2.1.

We will use simplified versions of the monotonicity conditions in [HL21, §5]. We refer the reader there for the general definitions, which allow  $\Sigma$  to be an orbifold.

**Definition 2.27.** *A polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone (resp. strictly  $S$ -monotone) if the following condition holds.*

*Let  $R$  be any complete discrete valuation ring and set  $\mathfrak{X}$  to be  $\Theta_R$  (resp.  $\overline{ST}_R$ ). Choose a map  $\varphi : \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ . Then, after maybe replacing  $R$  with a finite DVR extension, there exists a reduced and irreducible  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant scheme  $\Sigma$  with maps  $f : \Sigma \rightarrow Y_{\mathfrak{X}}$  and  $\tilde{\varphi} : [\Sigma/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that*

- (M1) *The map  $f$  is proper,  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant, and its restriction induces an isomorphism  $f : \Sigma_{Y_{\mathfrak{X}} \setminus (0, 0)} \xrightarrow{\sim} Y_{\mathfrak{X}} \setminus (0, 0)$ .*  
(M2) *The following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [(\Sigma_{Y_{\mathfrak{X}} \setminus (0, 0)}) / \mathbb{G}_m] & & \\ f \downarrow & \searrow \tilde{\varphi} & \\ \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \mathcal{M} \end{array}$$

- (M3) *Let  $\kappa$  denote a finite extension of the residue field of  $R$ . For any  $a \geq 1$  and any finite  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1[a] \rightarrow \Sigma_{(0, 0)}$ , we have  $\nu(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m]}) \geq \nu(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[0/\mathbb{G}_m]})$ .*

Finally, we explain the condition of HN boundedness.

**Definition 2.28** (HN Boundedness). *We say that polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  satisfies the HN boundedness condition if the following is always satisfied:*

*Let  $T$  be an affine Noetherian scheme. Choose a morphism  $g : T \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ . Then there exists a quasicompact open substack  $\mathcal{U}_T \subset \mathcal{M}$  such that the following holds. For all closed points  $t \in T$  with residue field  $k$  and all nondegenerate filtrations  $f : \Theta_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of the point  $g(t)$  with  $\nu(f) > 0$ , there exists another filtration  $f'$  of  $g(t)$  satisfying  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$  and  $f'|_0 \in \mathcal{U}_T$ .*

In plain words, this says that for the purposes of maximizing  $\nu(f)$  among all filtrations of points in a bounded family, it suffices to consider only  $f$  such that the associated graded  $f|_0$  lies in some other (possibly larger) bounded family.

### 3. RATIONAL MAPS AND AFFINE GRASSMANNIANS

In this section we define a stack of rational maps  $\mathcal{M}_{rat}$  for each of the moduli stacks  $\mathcal{M}$  we are considering. There is a natural morphism  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{rat}$  whose fibers are higher dimensional analogues of affine Grassmannians. Just as in the classical case of vector bundles on a curve, our affine Grassmannians are ind-projective strict-ind-schemes over  $S$ .

We will also identify a family of line bundles on the affine Grassmannian that are eventually relatively ample on each projective stratum. The material from this section will be one of the ingredients in the infinite dimensional GIT argument we will use later on to prove monotonicity of the numerical invariant on  $\mathcal{M}$ .



### 3.1. Regular principal subschemes and twists.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $Y$  be a scheme. We say that a closed subscheme  $D \hookrightarrow Y$  is principal if the corresponding ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{I}_D$  is locally a principal ideal.*

**Remark 3.2.** *A subscheme  $D$  is principal if and only if the first Fitting ideal  $\text{Fit}_1(\mathcal{I}_D)$  is the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ . Indeed, if  $\mathcal{I}_D$  is locally generated by one element, then  $\text{Fit}_1(\mathcal{I}_D) = \mathcal{O}_Y$  by [Sta20, Tag 07ZA(1)]. The converse follows by [Sta20, Tag 07ZC]. Since the formation of Fitting ideals commutes with base-change [Sta20, Tag 07ZA(3)], it follows that the property of being a principal subscheme can be checked fpqc locally.*

Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be two principal subschemes cut out by the  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -ideals  $\mathcal{I}_{D_1}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{D_2}$ . We define the sum  $D_1 + D_2$  to be the locally principal scheme cut out by the ideal  $\mathcal{I}_{D_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{D_2}$ .

**Definition 3.3.** *Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $D \hookrightarrow X_T$  be a principal subscheme. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $T$ -flat finitely presented  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ -module. We say that  $D$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular if for all  $t \in T$  the fiber  $D_t$  does not contain any associated point of  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_t}$ .*

The following lemma collects some useful properties of the notion of  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular subscheme.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $C, D \hookrightarrow X$  be two principal subschemes. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $S$ -flat finitely presented  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. Suppose that both  $C, D$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular. Then,*

- (a)  $C + D$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular.
- (b) For any morphism of schemes  $T \rightarrow S$ , the preimage  $(f_X)^{-1}(D)$  is  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_T}$ -regular.
- (c) Let  $\sigma : \mathcal{I}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$  denote the inclusion of the ideal sheaf. Then, the morphism  $\sigma \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{I}_D \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is injective. Moreover, the quotient  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{I}_D \otimes \mathcal{F}$  is  $S$ -flat.
- (d)  $\mathcal{I}_D \otimes \mathcal{F}$  is locally isomorphic to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof.*

- (a) For each  $s \in S$ , the support of  $(C + D)_s$  is the union of the supports of  $C_s$  and  $D_s$ . If  $C_s$  and  $D_s$  do not contain any associated point of  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_s}$ , then neither does the union.
- (b) Let  $t \in T$ . Set  $s = f(t)$ . Since  $f_t : X_t \rightarrow X_s$  is flat, the associated points of  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_t}$  are the preimages of the associated points of  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_s}$ . This implies the claim, because the fiber  $((f_X)^{-1}D)_t$  is the preimage under  $f_t$  of the fiber  $D_s$ .
- (c) Since the question is local, we can assume that  $X$  is affine and the ideal  $\mathcal{I}_D$  is generated by a global section  $\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{O}_X$ . Let  $\text{Ann}(u) \subset \mathcal{O}_X$  denote the ideal annihilating  $u$ . By definition, the sequence  $\text{Ann}(u) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{O}_X$  is exact in the middle, and the cokernel of the first map is identified with  $\mathcal{I}_D$ . Consider the complex  $\text{Ann}(u) \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{F}$  obtained by tensoring with  $\mathcal{F}$ . It suffices to show that the second morphism  $u : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is injective and that  $\mathcal{F}/(u \cdot \mathcal{F})$  is  $S$ -flat.

Since  $D$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular, it follows that for all  $s \in S$  the restriction  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_s} \xrightarrow{u|_{X_s}} \mathcal{F}|_{X_s}$  is injective. Because  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $S$ -flat, the slicing criterion for flatness [Sta20, Tag 00ME] implies that  $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{F}$  is injective and  $\mathcal{F}/(u \cdot \mathcal{F})$  is  $S$ -flat.

- (d) Locally, we can choose  $u$  as in part (c). We have  $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{I}_D \cong \text{coker}[\text{Ann}(u) \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}]$ . It follows from part (c) that  $\text{Ann}(u) \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is the 0 morphism, since the image is contained in the kernel of the injection  $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{I}_D \cong \mathcal{F}$ .

□

Let  $D \hookrightarrow X$  be a  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular principal subscheme. Let  $U = X \setminus D$  be the open complement. The open immersion  $j : U \hookrightarrow X$  is locally given by the localization of a generator of the ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{I}_D$  that cuts out  $D$ . In particular  $j$  is affine. We can use this local interpretation of  $j$  plus Lemma 3.4[(c)] to see that the unit  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow j_*j^*\mathcal{F}$  is injective. Consider the isomorphism  $\mathcal{I}_D \otimes j_*j^*\mathcal{F} \rightarrow j_*j^*\mathcal{F}$  induced by multiplication.

**Definition 3.5** (Twists). *With notation as above, we define  $\mathcal{F}(-D)$  to be the image of  $\mathcal{I}_D \otimes \mathcal{F}$  under the multiplication morphism  $\mathcal{I}_D \otimes j_* j^* \mathcal{F} \rightarrow j_* j^* \mathcal{F}$ .*

*Similarly we define  $\mathcal{F}(D)$  to be the maximal subsheaf  $\mathcal{E} \subset j_* j^* \mathcal{F}$  such that the image of  $\mathcal{I}_D \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow j_* j^* \mathcal{F}$  lands in  $\mathcal{F} \subset j_* j^* \mathcal{F}$ .*

By definition, there are canonical injections  $\mathcal{F}(-D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(D)$ . In fact we have an infinite chain of injections

$$\dots \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-nD) \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-2D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(-D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(D) \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(nD) \hookrightarrow \dots$$

By using the affine local interpretation of  $j$  as a localization, it can be seen that there is a canonical identification  $j_* j^* \mathcal{F} \cong \varinjlim_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}(mD)$ .

Lemma 3.4 (d) implies that  $\mathcal{F}(nD)$  is locally isomorphic to  $\mathcal{F}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular if  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $S$ -pure of dimension  $d$ , then all the twists  $\mathcal{F}(nD)$  are  $S$ -pure of dimension  $d$ .

### 3.2. Stacks of rational maps.

**Definition 3.6.** *We denote by  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  the pseudofunctor from  $\text{Aff}_S^{\text{op}}$  to categories defined as follows. For each affine scheme  $T$  in  $\text{Aff}_S$ , the objects of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)$  consist of pairs  $(D, \mathcal{E})$ , where*

- (1)  $\mathcal{E}$  is a  $T$ -pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ .
- (2)  $D \hookrightarrow X_T$  is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -regular principal subscheme of  $X_T$ .

Let  $A = (D_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $B = (D_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  be two objects in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)$ . The set of morphisms  $\text{Mor}_{\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)}(A, B)$  consists of pairs  $(i, \psi)$ , where

- (1)  $i : D_1 \hookrightarrow D_2$  is an inclusion.
- (2)  $\psi : \mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_1$  is a monomorphism such that the restriction  $\psi|_{X \setminus D_2}$  is an isomorphism.

Note that all morphisms in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)$  are monic.

**Remark 3.7.** *In order to see that this yields a well-defined functor, it is necessary to check that  $\psi$  remains a monomorphism after base-changing  $T$ . This follows because the cokernel of  $\psi$  is  $T$ -flat, by an argument similar to the one for (i) inside the proof of Lemma 3.16 below.*

The pseudofunctor  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  is a stack in the fpqc topology. Indeed, descent data amounts to a cocycle with isomorphisms in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$ . By definition these are the usual naive isomorphisms of triples  $(D, \mathcal{F})$ . Therefore descent follows from the theory of fpqc descent for quasicoherent sheaves and the fact that the property of being a principal subscheme is fpqc local (Remark 3.2).

We conclude that if  $Y$  is an affine scheme in  $\text{Aff}_S$  and  $H$  is an  $S$ -flat algebraic group acting on  $Y$ , then the data of a morphism of pseudofunctors  $[Y/H] \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  amounts to a pair  $(D, \mathcal{F})$ , where

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $H$ -equivariant sheaf on  $X_Y$ .
- (2)  $D \hookrightarrow X_Y$  is an  $H$ -stable  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular principal subscheme.

**Remark 3.8.** *It is possible to develop the theory of infinite dimensional GIT using variants of this definition of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$ . For instance, one could define objects to be those of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ , and morphisms to be equivalence classes consisting of pairs  $(D \subset X, \psi : \mathcal{E}_1|_{X \setminus D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2|_{X \setminus D})$ , where  $D$  is a principal subscheme that is  $\mathcal{E}_1$ -regular and  $\mathcal{E}_2$ -regular, and  $\psi$  is an isomorphism. Two such morphisms are equivalent if they agree on the intersection of the open subsets where they are defined. This is a pseudofunctor valued in groupoids, but it*

does not satisfy smooth descent. The rational filling condition in Definition 4.5 would be more difficult to state without smooth descent.

We can similarly define stacks of rational maps for each of the other stacks introduced in 2.4.

**Definition 3.9.** We denote by  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  the pseudofunctor from  $\text{Aff}_S^{\text{op}}$  to categories defined as follows. For each affine scheme  $T$  in  $\text{Aff}_S$ , the objects of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)$  consist of triples  $(D, \mathcal{E}, \alpha)$ , where

- (1)  $(D, \mathcal{E})$  is an element of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$ .
- (2)  $\alpha$  is a morphism  $\alpha : \mathcal{A}|_{X_T \setminus D} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{X_T \setminus D}$ .

A morphism from  $(D_1, \mathcal{E}_1, \alpha_1)$  to  $(D_2, \mathcal{E}_2, \alpha_2)$  is a morphism  $(i, \psi) : (D_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \rightarrow (D_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  such that  $\psi|_{X_T \setminus D_2}$  is compatible with the sections  $\alpha_1|_{X_T \setminus D_2}$  and  $\alpha_2$ .

**Definition 3.10.** We denote by  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  the pseudofunctor from  $\text{Aff}_S^{\text{op}}$  to categories defined as follows. For each affine scheme  $T$  in  $\text{Aff}_S$ , the objects of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(T)$  consist of triples  $(D, \mathcal{E}, a)$ , where

- (1)  $(D, \mathcal{E})$  is an element of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$ .
- (2)  $a$  is a morphism  $a : \Lambda_1|_{X_T \setminus D} \otimes \mathcal{E}|_{X_T \setminus D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{X_T \setminus D}$  of left  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T \setminus D}$ -modules that endows  $\mathcal{E}|_{X_T \setminus D}$  with the structure of a  $\Lambda|_{X_T \setminus D}$ -module (as in Proposition 2.21).

A morphism from  $(D_1, \mathcal{E}_1, a_1)$  to  $(D_2, \mathcal{E}_2, a_2)$  is a morphism  $(i, \psi) : (D_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \rightarrow (D_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  such that  $\psi|_{X_T \setminus D_2}$  is compatible with the action morphisms  $a_1|_{X_T \setminus D_2}$  and  $a_2$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  or  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . The theory of fpqc descent for quasicoherent sheaves implies that  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}$  satisfies fpqc descent. This shows that the data of a pseudofunctor  $[Y/H] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}$  from a quotient stack  $[Y/H]$  can be concretely described as an  $H$ -equivariant pair  $(D, \mathcal{F}) \in \text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}([Y/H])$  and some extra  $H$ -equivariant structure  $\xi$  defined on  $X_T \setminus D$  in each case.

**3.3. The affine Grassmannian for pure sheaves.** There is a natural morphism  $\text{Coh}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  that takes a pure sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $X_T$  and maps it to the pair  $(\emptyset, \mathcal{E})$ . In this subsection we will describe the “fibers” of this morphism.

Since  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}$  is not a category fibered in groupoids, it is useful to work with the comma category instead of the usual fiber products of categories.

**Definition 3.11.** Suppose that we are given a diagram of pseudofunctors from  $(\text{Aff}_S)^{\text{op}}$  into categories as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathfrak{X} \\ & & \downarrow f_{\mathfrak{X}} \\ \mathfrak{Y} & \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{Y}}} & \mathfrak{Z} \end{array}$$

We define the right comma fiber product  $\mathfrak{X} \overrightarrow{\times}_{\mathfrak{Z}} \mathfrak{Y}$  to be a pseudofunctor from  $(\text{Aff}_S)^{\text{op}}$  into categories. For every  $T \in \text{Aff}_S$ , the objects of  $\mathfrak{X} \overrightarrow{\times}_{\mathfrak{Z}} \mathfrak{Y}(T)$  consist of triples  $(x, y, g)$ , where  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(T)$ ,  $y \in \mathfrak{Y}(T)$  and  $g$  is a morphism  $g : f_{\mathfrak{X}}(x) \rightarrow f_{\mathfrak{Y}}(y)$ .

A morphism  $(x_1, y_1, g_1) \rightarrow (x_2, y_2, g_2)$  consist of a pair  $(\psi_{\mathfrak{X}}, \psi_{\mathfrak{Y}})$  of morphisms  $\psi_{\mathfrak{X}} : x_1 \rightarrow x_2$  and  $\psi_{\mathfrak{Y}} : y_1 \rightarrow y_2$  such that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
f_{\mathfrak{X}}(x_1) & \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{X}}(\psi_{\mathfrak{X}})} & f_{\mathfrak{X}}(x_2) \\
g_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_2 \\
f_{\mathfrak{Y}}(y_1) & \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{Y}}(\psi_{\mathfrak{Y}})} & f_{\mathfrak{Y}}(y_2)
\end{array}$$

The composition of two composable pairs  $(\psi_{\mathfrak{X}}, \psi_{\mathfrak{Y}})$ ,  $(\xi_{\mathfrak{X}}, \xi_{\mathfrak{Y}})$  is given by the pointwise composition  $(\xi_{\mathfrak{X}} \circ \psi_{\mathfrak{X}}, \xi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \circ \psi_{\mathfrak{Y}})$ .

By construction,  $\mathfrak{X} \vec{\times}_3 \mathfrak{Y}$  is equipped with two projection morphisms  $\pi_{\mathfrak{X}} : \mathfrak{X} \vec{\times}_3 \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$  and  $\pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} : \mathfrak{X} \vec{\times}_3 \mathfrak{Y} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$  plus a 2-morphism  $H : f_{\mathfrak{X}} \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{X}} \Rightarrow f_{\mathfrak{Y}} \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{Y}}$  fitting into the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathfrak{X} \vec{\times}_3 \mathfrak{Y} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathfrak{X}}} & \mathfrak{X} \\
\pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow f_{\mathfrak{X}} \\
\mathfrak{Y} & \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{Y}}} & \mathfrak{Z}
\end{array}$$

This data is final for pseudofunctors  $\mathfrak{C}$  equipped with morphisms  $g_{\mathfrak{X}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$  and  $g_{\mathfrak{Y}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$  plus a 2-morphism  $G : f_{\mathfrak{X}} \circ g_{\mathfrak{X}} \Rightarrow f_{\mathfrak{Y}} \circ g_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ .

Fix the choice of an  $S$ -point in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}(S)$  represented by a pair  $(D, \mathcal{E})$ .

**Definition 3.12.** *The affine Grassmannian  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  is defined to be the right comma fiber product  $\text{Coh}^d(X) \vec{\times}_{\text{Coh}^d(X)_{\text{rat}}} S$ .*

For any  $T \in \text{Aff}_S$ , denote  $\mathcal{E}_T := \mathcal{E}|_{X_T}$ . Let  $U := X \setminus D$  and denote the inclusion  $j : U \hookrightarrow X$ . Then  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}(T)$  is the set of equivalence classes of pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$ , where

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $T$ -pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$  such that  $D_T$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular.
- (2)  $\psi$  is monomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that the restriction  $\psi|_{U_T}$  is an isomorphism.

An equivalence between pairs  $(\mathcal{F}_1, \psi_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_2, \psi_2)$  is an isomorphism  $\mathcal{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}_2$  that identifies the morphisms  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$ . Letting  $j_T : U_T \hookrightarrow X_T$  denote the base change of  $j$ , Lemma 3.4 implies that  $\mathcal{F}_i \rightarrow j_{T*} j_T^* \mathcal{F}_i$  is a monomorphism for  $i = 1, 2$ . It follows that an isomorphism between  $(\mathcal{F}_1, \psi_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_2, \psi_2)$  is unique if it exists, so  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  can be regarded as a sheaf of sets.

The main result of this subsection is the following.

**Proposition 3.13.**  *$Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  is represented by a strict-ind scheme that is ind-projective over  $S$ .*

In order to prove Proposition 3.13, we will proceed as in [Zhu17, Thm. 1.1.3]. For any  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi) \in Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}(T)$ , we use the isomorphism  $j_{T*} j_T^* \psi : j_{T*} j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T \rightarrow j_{T*} j_T^* \mathcal{F}$  in order to view  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subsheaf of  $j_{T*} j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T$ . We have  $\mathcal{E}_T \subset \mathcal{F} \subset j_{T*} j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T$ .

**Definition 3.14.** *Let  $N$  be a positive integer. We define  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$  to be the subfunctor of  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$  that sends  $T \in \text{Aff}_S$  to the set*

$$Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}(T) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{pairs } (\mathcal{F}, \psi) \text{ in } Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}(T) \text{ such that} \\ \mathcal{E}_T \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) \end{array} \right\}$$

Note that there is a natural inclusion  $Gr_{\mathcal{E},X/S}^{\leq N} \subset Gr_{\mathcal{E},X/S}^{\leq M}$  whenever  $N \leq M$ . Proposition 3.13 is a direct consequence of the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.15.** *We have  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}} = \operatorname{colim}_{N>0} Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$  (as presheaves on  $\operatorname{Aff}_S$ ).*

*Proof.* Fix  $T$  in  $\operatorname{Aff}_S$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$  be in  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}(T)$ . We would like to show that there exists some  $N > 0$  such that  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$  is in  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$ . The scheme  $X_T$  is quasicompact, because it is of finite type over the affine scheme  $T$ . After passing to a finite affine cover, we can assume that  $X_T$  is affine and  $D_T$  is cut out an element  $x \in \mathcal{O}_{X_T}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_T$  are finitely presented modules without  $x$ -torsion. Let  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  be a finite set of generators for  $\mathcal{F}$ .

By assumption, we have  $\mathcal{F} \left[ \frac{1}{x} \right] = \mathcal{E}_T \left[ \frac{1}{x} \right]$ . This implies that for all  $i \in I$ , there exists a positive integer  $n_i$  such that  $x^{n_i} e_i \in \mathcal{E}_T$ . Set  $N := \max_{i \in I} (n_i)$ . Then  $\mathcal{F} \subset x^{-N} \mathcal{E}_T = \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.16.** *For each  $N > 0$ , the functor  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$  is represented by a disjoint union of schemes that are projective and of finite presentation over  $S$ . Moreover, for all  $N \leq M$  the inclusion  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N} \subset Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq M}$  is a closed immersion.*

*Proof.* We will use an auxiliary functor  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$ . For  $N > 0$ , we set  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$  to be the Quot-scheme  $\operatorname{Quot}_{X/S}(\mathcal{E} / \mathcal{E}(-ND))$  parametrizing  $S$ -flat quotients of  $\mathcal{E}(-ND) / \mathcal{E}$ . A well-know theorem of Grothendieck states that  $\operatorname{Quot}_{X/S}(\mathcal{E}(ND) / \mathcal{E})$  is represented by a disjoint union of projective schemes over  $S$ . See [Nit05] for a detailed treatment.

For all  $N > 0$ , we have a natural inclusion of functors  $t_N : Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N \hookrightarrow Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{N+1}$  given as follows. Let  $T$  in  $\operatorname{Aff}_S$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  a quotient sheaf in  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$ . Let  $q$  be the composition

$$\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) \twoheadrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}{\mathcal{E}_T} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

Let  $\operatorname{Ker}(q)$  denote the kernel. Then, we set  $t_N(T)(\mathcal{F})$  to be the quotient  $\mathcal{E}_T((N+1)D_T) / \operatorname{Ker}(q)$ . We claim that  $t_N(T)(\mathcal{F})$  is a well-defined element of  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{N+1}$ . The only thing to check is that the quotient  $t_N(T)(\mathcal{F})$  is flat over  $T$ . Note that  $t_N(T)(\mathcal{F})$  fits into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow t_N(T)(\mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{E}_T((N+1)D_T)}{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)} \longrightarrow 0$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $T$ -flat, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{E}_T((N+1)D_T) / \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)$  is  $T$ -flat. This is a consequence of Lemma 3.4(c). Therefore we have described a well-defined morphism  $t_N : Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N \hookrightarrow Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{N+1}$ . Since each Quot-scheme  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$  is a disjoint union of proper schemes over  $S$ , it follows from [Sta20, Tag 01W6] that  $t_N$  is proper. By [Sta20, Tag 04XV] the proper monomorphism  $t_N$  is a closed immersion.

To complete the proof of the lemma, we shall show that there is a collection of isomorphisms of functors  $\phi_N : Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$  such that the following diagram commutes for any  $N > 0$ .

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N+1} & \xrightarrow{\phi_{N+1}} & Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{N+1} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N} & \xrightarrow{\phi_N} & Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N \end{array}$$

For any  $T \in \operatorname{Aff}_S$  and  $T$ -point  $\mathcal{E}_T \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)$  of  $Gr_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$ , we set  $\phi_N(T)(\mathcal{F})$  to be the quotient  $\frac{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}{\mathcal{E}_T} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}{\mathcal{F}}$ . On the other hand, suppose that  $\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) / \mathcal{E}_T \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}$  is a  $T$ -point of  $Q_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$ . We set  $\tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G})$  to be the kernel of the composition  $\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) \twoheadrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}{\mathcal{E}_T} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ . We need to check the following:

- (i)  $\phi_N$  gives a well-defined natural transformation  $\phi_N : \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$ .
- (ii)  $\tau_N$  gives a well-defined natural transformation  $\tau_N : \mathbb{Q}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$ .
- (iii)  $\phi_N$  and  $\tau_N$  are inverse of each other.
- (iv) The diagram (2) commutes.

The claims (iii) and (iv) are immediate from construction.

*Proof of (i):*

Let  $T$  in  $\mathrm{Aff}_S$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$  in  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N}$ . We have to show that  $\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) / \mathcal{F}$  is  $T$ -flat. We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow \frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow \frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)} \longrightarrow 0$$

So it suffices to show that both  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}$  are  $T$ -flat.

Let's show that  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $T$ -flat. Note that  $\psi$  induces an isomorphism  $j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E} \cong j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{F}}$  is isomorphic to  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{F}}{\mathcal{F}}$ . Since  $j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{F} = \varinjlim_m \mathcal{F}(mD_T)$ , we have  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{F}}{\mathcal{F}} = \varinjlim_{m>0} \frac{\mathcal{F}(mD_T)}{\mathcal{F}}$ .

Since filtered colimits of  $T$ -flat sheaves are  $T$ -flat, it suffices to show that  $\frac{\mathcal{F}(mD_T)}{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $T$ -flat for all  $m > 0$ . This follows because  $\frac{\mathcal{F}(mD_T)}{\mathcal{F}}$  is an iterated extension of sheaves of the form  $\frac{\mathcal{F}(iD_T)}{\mathcal{F}((i+1)D_T)}$ , which are  $T$ -flat by Lemma 3.4. The proof that  $\frac{j_T^* j_T^* \mathcal{E}_T}{\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)}(ND_T)$  is  $T$ -flat is the same.

*Proof of (ii):*

Let  $T$  in  $\mathrm{Aff}_S$  and  $(\varphi, \mathcal{G})$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^N$ . We need to check that  $\tau_N(\mathcal{G})$  is  $T$ -pure of dimension  $d$ . There is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0$$

Since both  $\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are  $T$ -flat, we conclude that  $\tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G})$  is  $T$ -flat. Let  $t \in T$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $T$ -flat, the short exact sequence above remains exact when we restrict to the fiber  $X_t$

$$0 \longrightarrow \tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G})|_{X_t} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)|_{X_t} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}|_{X_t} \longrightarrow 0$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)|_{X_t}$  is pure of dimension  $d$ , we conclude that its subsheaf  $\tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G})|_{X_t}$  is pure of dimension  $d$  as well. This shows that  $\tau_N(T)(\mathcal{G})$  is  $T$ -pure of dimension  $d$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.17.** *As discussed in Remark 3.8, there are several variants of the definition of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  that one could use to formulate infinite dimensional GIT. For instance, instead of a  $T$ -point being defined by a morphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  whose restriction to  $U_T$  is an isomorphism, one could simply ask for the data of an isomorphism  $\mathcal{E}_T|_{U_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{U_T}$ . The resulting affine Grassmannian is a colimit of the sequence of closed immersions*

$$\cdots \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}(nD)} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}((n-1)D)} \hookrightarrow \cdots$$

*induced by the maps  $\mathcal{E}((n-1)D) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(nD)$ .*

*Another variant is to take the fibers of the canonical morphism  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  for the alternative definition of  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\mathrm{rat}}$  discussed in Remark 3.8. The resulting affine Grassmannian is still an ind-projective ind-scheme, but it is much larger. This construction is closer in spirit to the ‘‘rational affine Grassmannian’’  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathrm{Ran} X}$  studied in [Gai13, §5].*

3.4.  $L_n^\vee$  is asymptotically ample on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$ . There is a natural forgetful morphism  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  that sends a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$  to the sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$ . We will abuse notation and denote by  $M_n, L_n$  and  $b_d$  the line bundles on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$  obtained by pulling back the corresponding line bundles on  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  under the forgetful morphism.

We can consider the open and closed subfunctors of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$  given by the preimages of each component  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P$ .

**Definition 3.18.** Let  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  be an integer valued polynomial. We will denote by  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^P$  the subfunctor of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}$  given as follows. For any  $T$  in  $\mathrm{Aff}_S$ , we set

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{X_S,D,\varepsilon}^P(T) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{pairs } (\mathcal{F}, \psi) \text{ in } \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}(T) \text{ such that} \\ P_{\mathcal{F}|_{X_t}} = P \text{ for all points } t \in T \end{array} \right\}$$

Similarly, we define  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P} := \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^P \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N}$ .

**Proposition 3.19.** Fix  $N > 0$  and  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . The functor  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$  is represented by a projective scheme over  $S$ . Furthermore, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  (depending on  $N$  and  $P$ ) such that for all  $n \geq m$  the line bundle  $L_n^\vee|_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}}$  is  $S$ -ample.

In order to prove this proposition, we will define auxiliary families of line bundles on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$ . For the rest of this subsection we fix  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . We denote by  $\bar{p}$  the reduced Hilbert polynomial corresponding to  $P$  ( $\bar{p}$  is the unique constant multiple of  $P$  with leading coefficient  $\frac{1}{d!}$ ).

**Definition 3.20.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define a line bundle  $\widetilde{M}_n$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$  given as follows. Choose  $T$  in  $\mathrm{Aff}_S$  and let  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$  represent a  $T$ -point  $f : T \rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$ . Then we set

$$f^* \widetilde{M}_n := \det R\pi_{T*} \left( (\mathcal{E}_T(ND_T)/\mathcal{F})(n) \right)$$

Furthermore, we define  $\tilde{b}_d := \bigotimes_{i=0}^d (\widetilde{M}_i)^{(-1)^i \binom{d}{i}}$  and set  $\tilde{L}_n := \widetilde{M}_n \otimes (\tilde{b}_d)^{-\bar{p}(n)}$ .

Proposition 3.19 now follows from Lemmas 3.21 and 3.22 below.

**Lemma 3.21.** Fix  $N > 0$  and  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . The line bundle  $L_n^\vee$  is  $S$ -ample on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$  if and only if  $\tilde{L}_n$  is  $S$ -ample.

*Proof.* We shall show that the line bundles  $L_n^\vee$  and  $\tilde{L}_n$  differ by a line bundle coming from the base  $S$ . This implies the proposition. It suffices to show that  $M_n^\vee$  and  $\widetilde{M}_n$  differ by a line bundle coming from the base  $S$ , which would imply the same for  $\tilde{b}_d$  and  $\tilde{L}_n$ . The additivity of the determinant implies that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have

$$\widetilde{M}_n = M_n^\vee \otimes \det R\pi_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}*} \left( (\mathcal{E}(ND))_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}}(n) \right)$$

Let  $p : \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P} \rightarrow S$  denote the structure morphism of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}$ . We can apply flat base-change to the fiber diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_S \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P} & \longrightarrow & X \\ \pi_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{E},D,X}^{P,\leq N} & \xrightarrow{p} & S \end{array}$$

to conclude that  $\det R\pi_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}*} \left( (\mathcal{E}(ND))_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\varepsilon}^{\leq N,P}}(n) \right) \cong p^* \det R\pi_* (\mathcal{E}(ND)(n))$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.22.** *Fix  $N > 0$  and  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . Then  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$  is a projective scheme over  $S$ . Moreover, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  (depending on  $N$ ) such that for all  $n \geq m$  the line bundle  $\widetilde{L}_n$  is  $S$ -ample on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$ .*

*Proof.* The isomorphism  $\phi_N$  described in Lemma 3.16 identifies  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$  with the component  $\mathrm{Quot}_{X/S}^H(\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}(-ND))$  of the quot-scheme determined by the Hilbert polynomial  $H = P_{\mathcal{E}} - P$ . In particular,  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$  is projective over  $S$ .

It suffices prove the claim when the base is a field, because  $S$  is quasicompact, ampleness is an open condition on the base [Gro66, Corollaire 9.6.4], and ampleness can be checked on fibers [Gro66, Corollaire 9.6.5]. After base-change we can assume that  $k$  is infinite. We will keep these assumptions for the rest of the proof.

We start by showing that  $\widetilde{M}_n$  is ample for  $n$  big enough. Let  $(\mathcal{F}_{univ}, \psi_{univ})$  denote the universal bundle on  $X \times \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$ . By definition

$$\widetilde{M}_n = \det R\pi_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}} \left( \left( (\mathcal{E}(ND))_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}} / \mathcal{F}_{univ} \right) (n) \right)$$

Under the isomorphism  $\phi_N : \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Quot}_X^H(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E})$ , the line bundle  $\widetilde{M}_n$  corresponds to  $\det R\pi_*(\mathcal{Q}_{univ}(n))$  on the quot-scheme. Here

$$\mathcal{Q}_{univ} := \frac{(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E})_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}}}{\mathcal{F}_{univ}/\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}}}$$

denotes the universal quotient. It is known [HL97, Prop. 2.2.5] that  $\det R\pi_*(\mathcal{Q}_{univ}(n))$  is ample for  $n$  big enough. It follows that  $\widetilde{M}_n$  is ample for  $n$  big enough. To conclude the proof, we show that there exists some positive integer  $r$  such that  $\widetilde{b}_d^{\otimes r}$  is trivial, which implies that  $\mathcal{L}_n^{\otimes r} \cong \mathcal{M}_n^{\otimes r}$  is ample.

Notice that the support of  $\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E}$  has dimension  $\leq d-1$ . After replacing  $X$  with this support, we can assume that  $X$  has dimension  $\leq d-1$ . Now [KM76, Theorem 4] shows that the family of line bundles  $\widetilde{M}_n$  is a polynomial of degree  $d$  in the variable  $n$  with coefficients in the Picard group. By definition we see that  $\widetilde{b}_d$  is the leading coefficient of this polynomial. This leading coefficient  $\widetilde{b}_d$  gets replaced by a multiple  $\widetilde{b}_d^{\otimes r^d}$  whenever we replace  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  by a multiple  $\mathcal{O}(r)$ . Hence we can assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  is very ample.

We can use  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  to embed  $X$  into a projective space  $\mathbb{P}_k^m$ . Choose a linear subspace  $L$  of dimension  $m-d$  in  $\mathbb{P}_k^m$  that is disjoint from  $X$ . Then the corresponding projection  $\mathbb{P}^m \setminus L \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{d-1}$  restricts to a finite map  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ . The Quot-scheme  $\mathrm{Quot}_X^H(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E})$  can be identified with the functor parameterizing flat families of quotients of  $f_*(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E})$  as a module over the coherent  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ -algebra  $f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ . Such a quotient is determined by the quotient of underlying  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$ -modules, so the morphism  $\mathrm{Quot}_X^H(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Quot}_{\mathbb{P}^{d-1}}^H(f_*(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E}))$  that forgets the  $f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ -module structure is a proper monomorphism, and hence a closed immersion. Note that the formation of  $\widetilde{M}_n$  is compatible with this closed immersion, because derived pushforward commutes with Tor-independent base change [Sta20, Tag 0A1H]. We have therefore reduced to the case when  $X = \mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ .

Set  $\mathrm{Quot} := \mathrm{Quot}_{\mathbb{P}^{d-1}}^H(f_*(\mathcal{E}(ND)/\mathcal{E}))$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}_{univ}$  denote the universal quotient on  $\mathbb{P}^{d-1} \times \mathrm{Quot}$ . Let  $p$  denote the structure morphism  $p : \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \times \mathrm{Quot} \rightarrow \mathrm{Quot}$ . By definition we have  $\widetilde{M}_n = \det Rp_*(\mathcal{Q}_{univ}(n))$ . By Lemma 3.23 below there is a finite resolution

$$0 \rightarrow p^*\mathcal{V}_l(a_l) \rightarrow p^*\mathcal{V}_{l-1}(a_{l-1}) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow p^*\mathcal{V}_1(a_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{univ} \rightarrow 0$$



where each  $\mathcal{V}_i$  is a vector bundle on Quot. By using additivity of the determinant and the projection formula, we conclude that

$$\widetilde{M}_n = \bigotimes_{i=1}^l \det(\mathcal{V}_i)^{\otimes (-1)^{i+1} \chi(\mathcal{O}(n+a_i))}$$

Here  $\chi(\mathcal{O}(n+a_i))$  denotes the Euler characteristic of  $\mathcal{O}(n+a_i)$  on  $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ . This is a polynomial of degree  $d-1$  in the variable  $n$ . So we see that  $\widetilde{M}_n$  is a polynomial of degree  $d-1$  in the variable  $n$  with coefficients in the Picard group of Quot. By definition  $\widetilde{b}_d$  is the coefficient of  $n^d$ , which is trivial as desired.  $\square$

Here we include a proof the resolution result needed for the proof of the last lemma.

**Lemma 3.23.** *Let  $T$  be a Noetherian scheme and  $k$  a positive integer. Consider the projective space  $p: \mathbb{P}_T^k \rightarrow T$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a  $T$ -flat coherent sheaf on  $\mathbb{P}_T^d$ . Then, there exists an integer  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a tuple of vector bundles  $(\mathcal{V}_i)_{i=0}^k$  on  $T$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}$  admits a resolution of the form*

$$0 \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_k(-n-k) \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_{k-1}(-n-k+1) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_1(-n-1) \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_0(-n) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow 0$$

*Proof.* Consider the diagram given by the first and second projections

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{P}_T^k \times_T \mathbb{P}_T^k & \\ q_1 \swarrow & & \searrow q_2 \\ \mathbb{P}_T^k & & \mathbb{P}_T^k \end{array}$$

Let  $\mathcal{O}_\Delta$  denote the structure sheaf of the diagonal  $\mathbb{P}_T^k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_T^k \times_T \mathbb{P}_T^k$ . By Beilinson's resolution of the diagonal [Bei78] [Huy06, Lemma 8.27],  $\mathcal{O}_\Delta$  admits a locally free resolution

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^k(k) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-k) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^{k-1}(k-1) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-k+1) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^1(1) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \boxtimes \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Delta \rightarrow 0$$

For any integer  $n$ , we can tensor with the pullback  $q_1^* \mathcal{Q}(n)$  to obtain the following acyclic complex in  $\mathbb{P}_T^k \times_T \mathbb{P}_T^k$

$$\mathcal{C}_n^\bullet = \left[ 0 \rightarrow \left( \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^k \otimes \mathcal{Q}(n+k) \right) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-k) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \left( \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}(n+1) \right) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(n) \boxtimes \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Delta \otimes (q_1)^* \mathcal{Q}(n) \rightarrow 0 \right]$$

Choose  $n \gg 0$  so that  $R^j p_* \left( \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^i \otimes \mathcal{Q}(n+i) \right) = 0$  for all  $j \geq 1$  and  $i \geq 0$ . Then by applying [Sta20, Tag 0A1H] and truncation, it follows that

$$\mathcal{V}_i := p_* \left( \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^i \otimes \mathcal{Q}(n+i) \right)$$

is a locally-free  $\mathcal{O}_T$ -module for all  $i \geq 0$ . Also, the projection formula implies that  $R^j (q_2)_* \left( \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_T^k/T}^i \otimes \mathcal{Q}(n+i) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}(-i) \right) = 0$  for all  $i, j \geq 1$ . The first page of the spectral sequence for the derived pushforward  $R(q_2)_* \mathcal{C}_n^\bullet$  of the complex  $\mathcal{C}_n^\bullet$  is concentrated in a single column and shows that the pushforward complex

$$(q_2)_* \mathcal{C}_n^\bullet = \left[ 0 \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_k(-k) \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_{k-1}(-k+1) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_1(-1) \rightarrow p^* \mathcal{V}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(n) \rightarrow 0 \right]$$

is acyclic. We obtain our desired resolution by tensoring with  $\mathcal{O}(-n)$ .  $\square$

**3.5. Affine Grassmannians for related moduli.** Set  $\mathcal{M}$  to be either  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  or  $\Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $(D, \mathcal{E}, \beta)$  be an  $S$ -point of the stack of rational maps  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}$ .

**Definition 3.24.** We define the affine Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta}$  to be the right comma fiber product  $\mathcal{M} \tilde{\times}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}} S$ .

By definition,  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta}(T)$  is the set of triples  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi, \tilde{\beta})$  where  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi) \in \text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}(T)$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$  is a morphism  $\mathcal{A}|_{X_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  (resp. a  $\Lambda|_{X_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{F}$ ) such that  $\tilde{\beta}|_{X_T \setminus D_T}$  is identified with  $\beta|_{X_T \setminus D_T}$  under the isomorphism  $\psi|_{X_T \setminus D_T}$ . There is a forgetful morphism

$$\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta} \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}, \quad (\mathcal{F}, \psi, \tilde{\beta}) \mapsto (\mathcal{F}, \psi)$$

**Proposition 3.25.** The forgetful morphism exhibits  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta}$  as a closed ind-subscheme of  $\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}$ .

*Proof.* We set  $U$  to be the open complement  $X \setminus D$ . Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $T \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}$  be a morphism represented by a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi)$ .

*Proof for  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ :*

Consider the composition  $\gamma = (\psi|_{U_T})^{-1} \circ \beta|_{U_T} : \mathcal{A}|_{U_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{U_T}$ . The fiber product  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta} \times_{\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}} T$  is the functor that takes a  $T$ -scheme  $Y$  to the set of morphisms  $\tilde{\beta} : \mathcal{A}|_{X_Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{X_Y}$  such that  $\tilde{\beta}|_{U_Y} = \beta|_{U_Y}$ . Since  $D_T$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular, if such  $\tilde{\beta}$  exists then it is unique.

There exists some  $m \gg 0$  and a morphism  $\mathcal{A}|_{X_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(mD_T)$  extending  $\gamma$ . Consider the composition

$$\xi : \mathcal{A}|_{X_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(mD_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(mD_T)/\mathcal{F}$$

Then  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta} \times_{\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}} T$  is the subfunctor of  $T$  consisting of morphisms  $Y \rightarrow T$  such that  $\xi|_{X_Y} = 0$ . We know that  $\mathcal{F}(mD_T)/\mathcal{F}$  is  $T$ -flat by Lemma 3.4 (c). Therefore Lemma 2.15 can be applied to show that the functor  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{A}|_{X_T}, \mathcal{F}(mD_T)/\mathcal{F})$  is representable by a separated scheme over  $T$ . The morphisms  $\xi$  and 0 determine two sections of the structure morphism  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{A}|_{X_T}, \mathcal{F}(mD_T)/\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow T$ . We conclude that  $\text{Gr}_{\text{Pair}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta} \times_{\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}} T$  is represented by the closed subscheme of  $T$  where these two sections agree.

*Proof for  $\mathcal{M} = \Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ :*

We can use the  $\Lambda|_{U_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}|_{U_T}$  and the isomorphism  $\psi|_{U_T} : \mathcal{E}|_{U_T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}|_{U_T}$  in order to define a  $\Lambda|_{U_T}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{F}|_{U_T}$ . By Proposition 2.21, this amounts to the data of a morphism  $b : \Lambda_1|_{U_T} \otimes \mathcal{F}|_{U_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_{U_T}$  satisfying conditions  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$  in that proposition.

The fiber product  $\text{Gr}_{\Lambda\text{Coh}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, a} \times_{\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}} T$  is the functor that takes a  $T$ -scheme  $Y$  to the set of morphisms  $\tilde{b} : \Lambda_{X_Y} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  that extend  $b|_{U_Y}$  and satisfy  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$ .

Since  $D_T$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular, it follows that  $\tilde{b}$  is uniquely determined whenever it exists. By the same uniqueness argument, if  $\tilde{b}$  exist then  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$  are automatically satisfied, because they are already satisfied for the restriction  $b|_{U_Y}$ . This shows that  $\text{Gr}_{\Lambda\text{Coh}, X, D, \mathcal{E}, \beta} \times_{\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}} T$  is the subfunctor of  $T$  consisting of morphisms  $Y \rightarrow T$  such that the morphism  $b$  admits an extension to  $X_Y$ . The same argument as in case of pairs shows that this is represented by a closed subscheme of  $T$ , as desired.  $\square$

These affine Grassmannians admit natural morphisms to  $\mathcal{M}$  given by forgetting the isomorphism  $\psi$  defined away from  $D$ . We have just seen that there is a closed immersion into  $\text{Gr}_{X, D, \mathcal{E}}$  such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M},X,D,\mathcal{E},\beta} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Forget} \\
 \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)
 \end{array}$$

We use the forgetful morphism  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M},X,D,\mathcal{E},\beta} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  to restrict the line bundle  $L_n$  to  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . This is the same as the pullback of the line bundle  $L_n$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$ . Therefore we obtain the following corollary as an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.19.

**Corollary 3.26.** *Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . Then, there exists some  $m \gg 0$  such that for all  $n \geq m$ , the line bundle  $L_n^\vee$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M},X,D,\mathcal{E},\beta}^{\leq N,P} := \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M},X,D,\mathcal{E},\beta} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P}$  is  $S$ -ample.  $\square$*

#### 4. MONOTONICITY VIA “INFINITE DIMENSIONAL GIT”

In this section, we define a polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  on the moduli stacks we are considering. Furthermore, we prove that  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone.

**4.1. The numerical invariant.** We refer the reader to Subsection 2.5 for a discussion of filtrations and graded points. In the case of the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ , a  $K$ -valued point is the same thing as morphism  $\mathrm{Spec}(K) \rightarrow S$  and a pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_K$ . A filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\mathbb{A}_K^1$ -flat relative torsion-free sheaf  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  on  $X \times \mathbb{A}_K^1$ . Using the Rees construction [HL21, Prop. 1.0.1] we can view this as a sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of subsheaves of  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfying

- (a)  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  is pure of dimension  $d$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{F}_m = 0$  for  $m \gg 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}$  for  $m \ll 0$ .

The line bundle  $L_n|_{\Theta_K}$  for such a filtration will be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant line bundle on  $\mathbb{A}_K^1$ . All such line bundles come from the base  $[\mathrm{Spec}(K)/\mathbb{G}_m]$ , and so they are classified by the isomorphism class of the fiber  $L_n|_0$  as a one dimensional  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -representation. These isomorphism classes are just characters of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ , which are classified by an integer called the weight. We will denote this integer by  $\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0)$ .

By flat-base change,  $M_n|_0$  is isomorphic to  $\det \left( R\pi_{K*}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_0)(n) \right)$ . As a graded sheaf, we have  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_0 = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1})$ . Here  $\mathbb{G}_m$  acts on  $\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  with weight  $m$ . We can take derived pushforward and determinant in order to conclude that

$$\mathrm{wt}(M_n|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (P_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - P_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}(n)) \cdot m$$

In particular, by additivity of the weight and the definition of  $b_d$ , we see that

$$\mathrm{wt}(b_d|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}) \cdot m$$

We conclude that  $\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0)$  is given by:

$$\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0) = \mathrm{wt}(M_n|_0) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n) \cdot \mathrm{wt}(b_d|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}(n) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)) \cdot \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}$$

One can also give the following alternative formula.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $K$  be a field over  $S$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_K$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . Then, we have*

$$\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)) \cdot \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}$$

*Proof.* We have seen that  $\text{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot \left( P_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}(n) - \frac{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} P_{\mathcal{F}}(n) \right)$ . By condition (c) above, we can express this as a finite sum

$$\text{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{m=-N}^N m \cdot \left( P_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}(n) - \frac{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} P_{\mathcal{F}}(n) \right)$$

Here  $N$  is a big positive integer and we have  $\mathcal{F}_N = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{-N} = \mathcal{F}$ . By summation by parts and additivity of the Hilbert polynomials, we can rewrite the sum above as

$$\text{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{m=-N+1}^N \left( P_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - \frac{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} P_{\mathcal{F}}(n) \right)$$

We can express this in terms of reduced Hilbert polynomials to conclude that

$$\text{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}$$

□

Before defining our numerical invariant, we need to specify a rational quadratic norm on graded points of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $g : (B\mathbb{G}_m)_K^q \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^q$ -graded pure sheaf  $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \bigoplus_{\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^q} \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\vec{m}}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_K$ . We define  $b(g)$  to be the positive definite rational quadratic form on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  given by

$$b(g)(v) := \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^q} \text{rk}_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\vec{m}}} \cdot (\vec{m} \cdot_{\text{std}} v)^2$$

Here  $\cdot_{\text{std}}$  denotes the standard inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^q$ .

If  $q = 1$  above, then the rational quadratic form  $b(g)$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is uniquely determined by its value at 1. From now on, it will be convenient to abuse notation and write  $b(g)$  to denote the value  $b(g)(1)$  for any graded point  $g : (B\mathbb{G}_m)_K \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

Given the sequence of line bundles  $L_n$  on  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  and the norm on graded points  $b$ , we can define a numerical invariant  $\nu$  as explained in Subsection 2.5. For our discussion we only need to understand the corresponding polynomial  $\nu(f)$  assigned to a given nondegenerate filtration  $f$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $f : \Theta_K \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  be a nondegenerate filtration given by  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . We define the numerical invariant  $\nu(f)$  to be the polynomial in  $\mathbb{R}[n]$  given by

$$\nu(f) := \frac{\text{wt}(L_n|_0)}{\sqrt{b(f|_0)}} = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2 \right)}}$$

We use the same formula to define a numerical invariant  $\nu$  for each of the moduli stacks described in 2.4. In each case, the corresponding sequence of line bundles  $L_n$  and the rational quadratic norm  $b$  are pullbacked using the forgetful morphism  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

We end this subsection by recording one simple observation that will be useful in our proof of monotonicity. Namely, we observe that the rational quadratic norm  $b$  is well-defined on the stack of rational maps.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Coh}^d(X)$ ,  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  or  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : (B\mathbb{G}_m)_K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}$  be two graded points. Let  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  denote the underlying graded pure sheaves of dimension  $d$  on  $X_K$  corresponding to  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ . If there exists a 2-morphism  $\varphi_1 \Rightarrow \varphi_2$ , then  $b(g_1) = b(g_2)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $g_1$  (resp.  $g_2$ ) is represented by the graded sheaf  $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  (resp.  $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_m$ ) defined on  $X_K$ . By the definition of  $b$ , it suffices to check that  $\mathrm{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m} = \mathrm{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_m}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The 2-morphism  $\varphi_1 \Rightarrow \varphi_2$  yields a morphism of graded sheaves  $\psi : g_1 \rightarrow g_2$  that restricts to an isomorphism away from a principal subscheme  $D \hookrightarrow X_K$  that is regular for both  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ . This implies that the ranks of corresponding graded terms agree, as desired.  $\square$

**4.2. Rational filling conditions for torsion-free sheaves.** Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring over  $S$ . We refer the reader to Subsection 2.1 for the definitions of  $\Theta_R$ ,  $\overline{ST}_R$ . The following is the main condition we will study in this subsection.

**Definition 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be one of the stacks defined in 2.4. Set  $\mathfrak{X}$  to be either  $\Theta_R$  or  $\overline{ST}_R$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  admits  $\mathfrak{X}$  rational filling if the following is satisfied: For all morphisms  $f : \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , there exists a morphism  $g : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  and a 2-commutative diagram of pseudofunctors*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{M} \\ j \downarrow & \swarrow \cong & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{X} & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}} \end{array}$$

where  $j$  is the open immersion of stacks  $\mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ . Note that the direction of the 2-morphism matters, because  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  is not valued in groupoids.

We start by reducing rational filling conditions to the case of the stack of pure sheaves  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *Suppose that the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  admits  $\Theta_R$  rational filling (resp.  $\overline{ST}_R$  rational filling). Then both of the stacks  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  and  $\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  admit  $\Theta_R$  rational filling (resp.  $\overline{ST}_R$ -rational filling).*

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring over  $S$ . Set  $Y$  to be  $Y_{\Theta_R}$  (resp.  $Y_{\overline{ST}_R}$ ). We denote by  $W$  the open complement of  $(0, 0)$  in  $Y$ .

*Proof for  $\mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ :*

Suppose that we are given a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $Y \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . This consists of a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_W$  and a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_W} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . Assume that  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfies  $\Theta_R$  rational filling (resp.  $\overline{ST}_R$  rational filling). Then we can obtain the following:

- (1) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_Y$ .
- (2) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -stable principal subscheme  $D \hookrightarrow X_Y$  that is  $\mathcal{E}$ -regular.
- (3) A monomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}|_{X_W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\psi|_{X_W \setminus D_W}$  is an isomorphism.

It suffices to show that the morphism  $\alpha$  obtained by the composition

$$\alpha : \mathcal{A}|_{X_W \setminus D_W} \xrightarrow{\beta|_{X_W \setminus D_W}} \mathcal{F}|_{X_W \setminus D_W} \xrightarrow{(\psi|_{X_W \setminus D_W})^{-1}} \mathcal{E}|_{X_W \setminus D_W}$$

extends to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\tilde{\alpha} : \mathcal{A}|_{X_Y \setminus D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{X_Y \setminus D}$ .

Let  $U$  denote the open complement  $X_Y \setminus D$ . Note that the closed fiber  $U_{(0,0)}$  is cut out by a two term regular sequence coming from  $Y$  (either  $(\varpi, t)$  or  $(s, t)$ ). Since  $\mathcal{E}|_U$  is  $Y$ -flat, the sequence is also a regular sequence for the sheaf  $\mathcal{E}|_U$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{E}|_U$  has depth at least 2 at all points of the closed fiber  $U_{(0,0)}$ . [Sta20, Tag 0AV5] implies that  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{A}|_U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$  also has depth at least 2 at all points of  $U_{(0,0)}$ . By [Sta20, Tag 0E9I] applied to the open

subscheme  $U_W$  inside  $U$ , it follows that the morphism  $\alpha$  extends uniquely to a morphism  $\tilde{\alpha} : \mathcal{A}|_U \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_U$ . Moreover this section is automatically  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant. This can be seen by applying [Sta20, Tag 0E9I] again to the pullbacks of  $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{A}|_U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$  to the product  $\mathbb{G}_m \times U$  under the action and projection morphisms.

*Proof for  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ :*

Suppose that we are given a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $Y \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . This consists of a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\Lambda|_{X_W}$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  that is  $W$ -pure of dimension  $d$  on  $X_W$ . If  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfies the appropriate rational filling conditions, then we can find a triple  $(\mathcal{E}, D, \psi)$  as in the previous case of pairs. Set  $U = X_Y \setminus D$ . The isomorphism  $\psi|_{U_W} : \mathcal{F}|_{U_W} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{U_W}$  can be used to equip  $\mathcal{E}|_{U_W}$  with a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\Lambda|_{U_W}$ -module structure. We are left to show that this can be extended to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\Lambda|_U$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}|_U$ .

By Proposition 2.21, a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\Lambda|_{U_W}$ -module structure on  $\mathcal{E}|_{U_W}$  is equivalent to the data of a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $a : \Lambda_1|_{U_W} \otimes \mathcal{E}|_{U_W} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{U_W}$  satisfying conditions  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$ . We just need to check that  $a$  extends to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\tilde{a} : \Lambda_1|_U \otimes \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_U$  satisfying  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$ .

Since  $\mathcal{E}|_U$  has depth at least 2 at all points of  $U_{(0,0)}$ , we can apply [Sta20, Tag 0AV5] to conclude that  $\mathcal{H}om(\Lambda_1|_U \otimes \mathcal{E}|_U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$  also has depth at least 2 at all points of  $U_{(0,0)}$ . Now we can use [Sta20, Tag 0E9I] in the same way as in the case of pairs to conclude that there is a unique  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant extension  $\tilde{a} : \Lambda_1|_U \otimes \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_U$  of the action morphism  $a$ . We are left to check conditions  $(\Lambda 1)$  and  $(\Lambda 2)$ . We showed in the course of the proof of Proposition 2.22 that these are closed conditions on the base  $Y$ . Since they hold over the schematically dense open subset  $W \subset Y$ , they automatically hold over the whole  $Y$ .  $\square$

We now proceed to prove the rational filling conditions in the case when the fibers of  $X \rightarrow S$  are geometrically integral of dimension  $d$ . In this case pure sheaves of dimension  $d$  are the same as torsion-free sheaves.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose that the morphism  $X \rightarrow S$  is flat with geometrically integral fibers of dimension  $d$ . The following stacks admit both  $\Theta_R$  and  $\overline{ST}_R$  rational filling.*

- (i)  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .
- (ii)  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ .
- (iii)  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.6, it suffices to prove (i). Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring over  $S$ . Let  $\kappa$  be the residue field of  $R$  and let  $K$  be the fraction field. Let  $\mathfrak{X}$  denote either  $\Theta_R$  or  $\overline{ST}_R$ . Set  $Y := Y_{\mathfrak{X}}$ . Note that the closed fixed point  $(0, 0)$  is cut out by a regular sequence  $(y_1, y_2)$  in  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ . We write  $W$  for the open complement of  $(0, 0)$  in  $Y$ . Let  $X_R$  denote the pullback under the morphism  $\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow S$ . We can further pullback using the structure morphism  $Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$  to obtain  $X_Y$ .

Suppose that we are given  $f : \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . The morphism  $f$  amounts to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -flat family  $\mathcal{F}$  of torsion-free sheaves on  $X_W$ . Observe that a principal subscheme of  $X_Y$  is regular with respect to a nontrivial torsion-free sheaf if and only if it is a  $Y$ -relative Cartier divisor. Our goal is to find the following.

- (1) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_Y$ .
- (2) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant relative Cartier divisor  $D \hookrightarrow X_Y$ .
- (3) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}|_{X_W} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\psi|_{X_W \setminus D_W}$  is an isomorphism.

Note that this automatically implies that  $\psi|_{X_W}$  is a monomorphism, because  $D_W$  is both  $\mathcal{E}|_{X_W}$ -regular and  $\mathcal{F}$ -regular.

Let  $j$  denote the open immersion  $j : W \hookrightarrow Y$ . Let  $j_X : X_W \hookrightarrow X_Y$  be the base-change. We observe that the pushforward  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := (j_X)_* \mathcal{F}$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant.  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is coherent and  $Y$ -flat by [AHLH19b, §7.2], where we take the base ring  $k = R$  and we set the abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  to be the category  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X_R)$  of quasicoherent sheaves on  $X_R$ .

Since  $X_{(0,0)}$  is integral, there exists some dense open subset  $V_{(0,0)} \subset X_{(0,0)}$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{V_{(0,0)}}$  is a free graded  $\mathcal{O}_{V_{(0,0)}}$ -module. Say  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{V_{(0,0)}} \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{O}_{V_{(0,0)}} \langle m_i \rangle$ , where  $I$  is a finite indexing set and  $\langle m_i \rangle$  denotes a shift in the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -grading. Set  $\mathcal{E} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{O}_{X_Y} \langle m_i \rangle$ . This is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -flat torsion-free sheaf on  $X_Y$ .

There exists  $n \gg 0$  and a non-zero section  $s_0 \in H^0(X_{(0,0)}, \mathcal{O}(n))$  such that  $s_0$  vanishes at all points of the closed complement  $X_{(0,0)} \setminus V_{(0,0)}$ . We can lift  $s_0$  to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant global section  $s \in H^0(X_Y, \mathcal{O}(n))$ . The section  $s$  is non-zero when restricted to the fiber over every point of  $Y$ , because the non-vanishing locus of  $s$  is open,  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -stable, and contains  $(0, 0)$ . Thus the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant principal subscheme  $D \hookrightarrow X_Y$  cut out by  $s$  is a relative Cartier divisor.

We denote by  $U$  the affine open complement  $X_Y \setminus D$ . There is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\varphi : \mathcal{E}|_{U_{(0,0)}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{U_{(0,0)}}$ , because  $U_{(0,0)} \subset V_{(0,0)}$  by construction. Consider the exact sequence of graded sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow (y_1, y_2) \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_U \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_U \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{U_{(0,0)}} \rightarrow 0$$

Applying  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}|_U, -)$  we get an exact sequence

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}|_U, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_U) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}|_{U_{(0,0)}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{U_{(0,0)}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}|_U, (y_1, y_2) \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_U)$$

The third term vanishes, because  $\mathcal{E}|_U$  is locally free and  $U$  is affine, so we can lift  $\varphi$  to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant map  $\tilde{\psi} : \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_U$ . After possibly replacing  $\mathcal{E}$  with a subsheaf  $\mathcal{E}(-nD)$ , we can extend this further to a morphism  $\tilde{\psi} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . We shall prove the following claim.

**Claim.** *There exists a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant relative Cartier divisor  $D' \hookrightarrow X_Y$  such that the restriction  $\tilde{\psi}|_{U \setminus D'} : \mathcal{E}|_{U \setminus D'} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{U \setminus D'}$  is an isomorphism.*

This claim will conclude the proof the the proposition, by replacing  $D$  with the sum  $D + D'$  and setting  $\psi = \tilde{\psi}|_{X_W}$ . In order to show the claim, it suffices to find a  $D'$  such that  $\tilde{\psi}|_{U \setminus D'}$  is surjective. This is because the kernel of  $\tilde{\psi}|_{U \setminus D'}$  will then be a torsion-free sheaf of rank 0, which is therefore 0.

Consider the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant cokernel  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $\tilde{\psi}|_U$ . By definition  $\mathcal{H}$  is a sheaf on  $U$  that is supported at the points where  $\tilde{\psi}|_U$  is not surjective. Let  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$  be the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant closed subset of  $U$  cut out by the 0-Fitting ideal  $\mathrm{Fit}_0(\mathcal{H})$ . It suffices to find a relative Cartier divisor  $D' \hookrightarrow X_Y$  that does not meet  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$ . By construction,  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$  does not contain any point in the fiber  $U_{(0,0)}$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}_U$  denote the graded coordinate ring of the affine scheme  $U$ . The closed subscheme  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$  is cut out by a graded ideal  $J$ . Since  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$  does not meet the fiber  $U_{(0,0)}$ , we know that  $y_1 \mathcal{O}_U + y_2 \mathcal{O}_U + J = \mathcal{O}_U$ . This means that we can find elements  $u, v \in \mathcal{O}_U$  and an element  $i \in J$  such that  $y_1 u + y_2 v + i = 1$ . After passing to graded components, we can assume that  $i \in J$  is homogeneous of degree 0. This gives a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant section  $i : \mathcal{O}_U \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_U$ . Note that  $i$  cuts out a principal subscheme of  $U$  that does not meet  $U_{(0,0)}$  and contains  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$ . There is some  $m \gg 0$  such that we can extend  $i$  to a homogeneous section  $i_Y : \mathcal{O}_{X_Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_Y}(mD)$ . Let  $D'$  be the principal subscheme of  $X_Y$  cut out by  $i_Y$ . The support of  $D'_{(0,0)}$  is contained in  $D_{(0,0)}$ , so  $D'_{(0,0)}$  is a Cartier divisor on  $\mathbb{P}_{(0,0)}^d$ . The same argument as the one for  $D$  above shows that  $D'$  is a relative Cartier divisor. By construction  $D'$  contains  $Z_{\mathcal{H}}$ , so  $\psi|_{U \setminus D'}$  is surjective.  $\square$

**4.3. Proof of monotonicity via “infinite dimensional GIT”.** We prove the main theorems of this section using the affine Grassmannians we have defined. This type of argument is what we refer to as “infinite dimensional GIT.”

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose that the morphism  $X \rightarrow S$  is flat with geometrically integral fibers of dimension  $d$ . Then the invariant  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone on the stacks  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ ,  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ , and  $\Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .*

*Proof.* We set  $\mathcal{M}$  to be one of the stacks  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ ,  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  or  $\Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring with residue field  $\kappa$ . We set  $Y$  to denote either  $Y_{\Theta_R}$  or  $Y_{\overline{ST}_R}$ . Suppose that we are given a morphism  $f : [(Y \setminus (0, 0)) / \mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ . The rational filling properties proved in Lemma 4.7 yield a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & f \\
 & & & & \curvearrowright \\
 Y \setminus (0, 0) & & & & \mathcal{M} \\
 \searrow \tau & & & & \downarrow \\
 & \mathcal{M} \vec{\times}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}} Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} & \\
 \searrow j & \downarrow & & & \downarrow \\
 & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}} & 
 \end{array}$$

Here  $j$  denotes the open immersion  $j : Y \setminus (0, 0) \hookrightarrow Y$ . By definition, the right comma fiber product  $\mathcal{M} \vec{\times}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}} Y$  is an affine Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}$  (as described in Section 3.5). The diagram above can be rewritten as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & f \\
 & & & & \curvearrowright \\
 Y \setminus (0, 0) & & & & \mathcal{M} \\
 \searrow \tau & & & & \downarrow \\
 & \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}} & \xrightarrow{\text{Forget}} & \mathcal{M} & \\
 \searrow j & \downarrow & & & \downarrow \\
 & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}} & 
 \end{array}$$

Since the data used to define  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant, the affine Grassmannian acquires a natural  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action such that the structure morphism  $\text{Gr}_{X_Y, D, \xi} \rightarrow Y$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant. This action can be defined explicitly in each moduli problem by pulling back sheaves and their associated structures under the morphism induced by multiplication by an element of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ . This description shows that each  $Y$ -projective strata  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -stable. By construction, all of the morphisms in the commutative diagram above are  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant.

Since  $Y \setminus (0, 0)$  is quasicompact, the morphism  $\tau$  factors through one of the strata  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$ . Hence we obtain the following  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P} & \xrightarrow{\text{Forget}} \mathcal{M} \\
 \nearrow \tau & \downarrow & \\
 Y \setminus (0, 0) & \hookrightarrow Y & 
 \end{array}$$

Let  $\Sigma \subset \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$  denote the scheme closure of  $Y \setminus (0, 0)$  in  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$ . Note that  $\Sigma$  is a reduced  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -scheme with a natural structure morphism to  $Y$ . The map  $\Sigma \rightarrow Y$  is projective, because  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$  is projective over  $Y$  and  $\Sigma$  is a closed subscheme of  $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}$ .



By construction the morphism  $\Sigma \rightarrow Y$  is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant and restricts to an isomorphism over  $Y \setminus (0, 0)$ . The composition  $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  restricts to  $f : Y \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  over the open subset  $Y \setminus (0, 0) \subset \Sigma$ . Since everything is  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant, we obtain a morphism  $\tilde{\varphi} : [\Sigma/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  satisfying condition (M2) in Definition 2.27.

We are left to check condition (M3) in Definition 2.27. By Corollary 3.26, there exists some  $m \gg 0$  such that  $L_n^\vee|_{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\leq N, P}}$  is  $Y$ -ample for all  $n \geq m$ .

Choose  $a \geq 1$ . Consider  $\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1$  equipped with the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action determined by the equation  $t \cdot [x : y] = [t^{-a}x : y]$ . Suppose that we are given a finite  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1 \rightarrow \Sigma_{(0,0)}$ . For all  $n \geq m$ , the restriction  $L_n^\vee|_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1}$  is ample. This means that  $L_n|_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1}(-N_n)$  for some  $N_n > 0$ . Note that  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1}(-N_n)$  admits a unique  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant structure up to twisting by a character, and we have  $\mathrm{wt} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1}(-N_n)|_\infty \geq \mathrm{wt} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1}(-N_n)|_0$ . By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m]}) &= \frac{\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_\infty)}{\sqrt{b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m]})}} \\ \nu(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[0/\mathbb{G}_m]}) &= \frac{\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0)}{\sqrt{b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[0/\mathbb{G}_m]})}} \end{aligned}$$

We have just shown that  $\mathrm{wt}(L_n|_\infty) \geq \mathrm{wt}(L_n|_0)$  for  $n \gg 0$ . Hence, we will be done if we can prove  $b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m]}) = b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[0/\mathbb{G}_m]})$ . Notice that we have the following commutative diagram, where  $[a]$  is the morphism induced by the  $a^{\mathrm{th}}$  power map on  $\mathbb{G}_m$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} [\mathbb{P}_\kappa^1/\mathbb{G}_m] & \longrightarrow & \Sigma_{(0,0)} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\ (B\mathbb{G}_m)_\kappa & \xrightarrow{[a]} & [(0,0)/\mathbb{G}_m] & \xrightarrow{g_{(0,0)}} & \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}} \end{array}$$

This diagram shows that there exists a 2-morphism between the compositions  $[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m] \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$  and  $[0/\mathbb{G}_m] \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{rat}}$ . By Lemma 4.4, this implies that  $b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[\infty/\mathbb{G}_m]}) = b(\tilde{\varphi}|_{[0/\mathbb{G}_m]})$ .  $\square$

We will use the result for torsion-free sheaves in Theorem 4.8 to bootstrap to the more general case. We will need the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $Y$  be a Noetherian scheme, and let  $p : Z \rightarrow P$  be a finite morphism of  $Y$ -schemes. Suppose that  $Z$  and  $P$  are schemes of finite type over  $Y$  with  $Y$ -fibers of dimension  $d$ . Then, the pushforward  $p_*$  establishes an equivalence between the following two categories:*

- (A) *The category of  $Y$ -pure sheaves of dimension  $d$  on  $Z$ .*
- (B) *The category of  $p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z)$ -modules on  $P$  that are  $Y$ -pure of dimension  $d$ .*

Moreover, if the schemes  $Z, P$  admit compatible  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -actions, then  $p_*$  also induces an equivalence of the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant versions of the categories (A) and (B).

*Proof.* The only thing to check is that a  $Y$ -flat sheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $Z$  has  $Y$ -fibers that are pure of dimension  $d$  if and only if the pushforward  $p_*(\mathcal{G})$  on  $P$  has  $Y$ -fibers that are pure of dimension  $d$ . Since the morphism  $p$  is affine, the formation of the pushforward  $p_*(-)$  commutes with passing to  $Y$ -fibers. Hence we can reduce to the case when  $p_y : Z_y \rightarrow P_y$  is a finite morphism of projective schemes of dimension  $d$  over a field  $k(y)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a coherent sheaf on  $Z$ . Suppose that  $p_*(\mathcal{G})$  has an associated point of dimension  $\leq d - 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset p_*(\mathcal{G})$  be the maximal subsheaf of  $p_*(\mathcal{G})$  that is supported on a closed

subscheme  $H \subset P$  of dimension  $\leq d - 1$ . The  $p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z)$ -module generated by  $\mathcal{T}$  is also supported on  $H$ , and so it must coincide with  $\mathcal{T}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z)$ -submodule of  $p_*(\mathcal{G})$ . The subsheaf of  $\mathcal{G}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{T}$  is also supported on dimension  $\leq d - 1$ , because the morphism  $p$  is finite. We conclude that  $\mathcal{G}$  is not pure of dimension  $d$ .

Conversely, if  $\mathcal{G}$  is not pure of dimension  $d$ , then there exists some nontrivial subsheaf  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{G}$  supported in dimension  $\leq d - 1$ . The pushforward  $p_*(\mathcal{T}) \subset p_*(\mathcal{G})$  is then supported in dimension  $\leq d - 1$ , and so  $p_*(\mathcal{G})$  is not pure of dimension  $d$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.10.** *The invariant  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone on the stacks  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ ,  $\text{Pair}_A^d(X)$ , and  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring over  $S$ . Let  $\kappa$  be the residue field of  $R$  and let  $K$  be the fraction field. Let  $\mathfrak{X}$  denote either  $\Theta_R$  or  $\overline{ST}_R$ . Set  $Y := Y_{\mathfrak{X}}$ . Let  $X_R$  denote the pullback under the morphism  $\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow S$ . We can further pullback  $X_Y$  using the structure morphism  $Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ . Let  $j : W \hookrightarrow Y$  denote the open complement of  $(0, 0)$  in  $Y$ . Let  $j_X : X_W \hookrightarrow X_Y$  be the base-change.

*Proof for  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$ :* Suppose that we are given  $f : \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . The morphism  $f$  amounts to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_W$ . The pushforward  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := (j_X)_* \mathcal{F}$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -flat coherent sheaf by [AHLH19b, §7.2]. Let  $Z \subset X_Y$  denote the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant subscheme of  $X_Y$  cut out by the 0-Fitting ideal of  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . Note that the  $Y$ -fibers of  $Z$  have dimension  $d$ . We can view  $\mathcal{F}$  as a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $Z_W$ .

Embed  $X_R$  into some projective space  $\mathbb{P}_R^N$  by using a multiple  $\mathcal{O}_X(M)$  of the ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ . Consider the  $d$ -dimensional closed subvariety  $Z_{(0,0)} \subset \mathbb{P}_\kappa^N$ . After replacing  $R$  with a finite extension, we can assume that there exists a linear subspace  $L_\kappa \subset \mathbb{P}_\kappa^N$  of dimension  $N - d - 1$  such that  $L_\kappa \cap Z_{(0,0)}$  is empty. We lift  $L_\kappa$  to a linear subspace  $L_R \subset \mathbb{P}_R^N$ , and denote by  $L_Y \subset \mathbb{P}_Y^N$  the base-change. The scheme theoretic intersection  $L_Y \cap Z$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant proper  $Y$ -scheme. The image of the projection  $L_Y \cap Z \rightarrow Y$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -stable closed subset of  $Y$  that does not contain  $(0, 0)$ , since  $Z_{(0,0)} \cap L_Y = \emptyset$  by construction. We conclude that the image is empty, and therefore  $Z$  does not intersect  $L_Y$ .

Consider the affine projection  $\mathbb{P}_R^N \setminus L_R \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_R^d$ . We base-change to  $Y$  and consider the composition

$$p : Z \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_Y^N \setminus L_Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_Y^d$$

The morphism  $p$  is finite, because it is proper and affine. Let  $\Phi$  be the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant sheaf of algebras  $p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z)$  on  $\mathbb{P}_Y^d$ . We regard  $\Phi$  as a ring of differential operators by setting  $\Phi_0 = \text{Im} \left( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d} \rightarrow p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z) \right)$  and  $\Phi_1 = \Phi$ .

By Lemma 4.9,  $(p|_{Z_W})_*(\mathcal{F})$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -pure  $\Phi|_{\mathbb{P}_W^d}$ -module of dimension  $d$  on  $\mathbb{P}_W^d$ . Lemma 4.7 applied to  $X = \mathbb{P}_S^d$  shows that there exists

- (1) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $\mathbb{P}_Y^d$ .
- (2) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant relative Cartier divisor  $D \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_Y^d$ .
- (3) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\beta : \Phi_1|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D} \otimes \mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$  that equips  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$  with the structure of a  $\Phi|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$ -module.
- (4) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\psi : \mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_W^d} \rightarrow (p|_{Z_W})_* \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\psi|_{\mathbb{P}_W^d \setminus D_W}$  is an isomorphism of  $\Phi|_{\mathbb{P}_W^d \setminus D_W}$ -modules.

Observe that the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $\Phi|_{\mathbb{P}_W^d}$ -module  $(p|_{Z_W})_* \mathcal{F}$  can be interpreted as a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\tau : W \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{\Phi \text{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$  over  $Y$ .

By Lemma 4.9, there is a well-defined  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X_Y)$  over  $Y$  that sends a  $T$ -point  $(\mathcal{G}, \varphi, \tilde{\beta})$  in  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}(T)$  to the  $T$ -pure sheaf on  $Z_T \subset X_T$  corresponding to the  $\Phi|_{\mathbb{P}_T^d}$ -module  $(\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\beta})$ . We summarize all of the data we have obtained so far in the following  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & f \\
 & & & & \curvearrowright \\
 Y \setminus (0, 0) & \xrightarrow{\tau} & \mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Coh}^d(X_Y) \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow & & \\
 & & Y & & 
 \end{array}$$

Now we can take the scheme closure  $\Sigma$  of  $Y \setminus (0, 0)$  inside  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$ . Recall that  $M$  denotes the multiple  $\mathcal{O}_X(N)$  that we used to embed  $X$  into a projective space. The rational line bundles  $L_n$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$  coming from  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X_Y)$  agree with the ones pulled-back from  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_S^d)$ , where  $\mathbb{P}_S^d$  is equipped with the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -ample polarization  $\frac{1}{M}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S^d}(1)$ . It follows from Proposition 3.19 that  $L_n^\vee$  is eventually relatively ample on each projective stratum of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$ . We can therefore apply the same argument as in Theorem 4.8 to conclude in this case.

*Proof for either  $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  or  $\mathcal{M} = \Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ :*

A morphism  $f : \mathfrak{X} \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  amounts to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $W$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_W$  and some extra structure  $\alpha$  in the form a morphism of sheaves with target  $\mathcal{F}$ . We can ignore the extra data  $\alpha$  at first and apply the same argument as in the previous case to obtain the data (1)-(4) above.

Let  $C$  denote the principal subscheme of  $Z$  given by the inverse image of  $p^{-1}(D)$ .  $C$  is given by a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant global section  $s$  of  $\mathcal{O}_Z(n)$ . After replacing  $D$  and  $p^{-1}(D)$  with some multiple and scaling  $n$  accordingly, we can lift this to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant global section of  $\mathcal{O}_{X_Y}(n)$ . We denote by  $\tilde{D}$  the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -invariant principal subscheme of  $X_Y$  cut out by  $\tilde{s}$ . By construction the intersection  $\tilde{D} \cap Z$  has dimension  $\leq d - 1$ , and hence  $\tilde{D}$  is regular with respect to any  $Y$ -pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  supported inside  $Z$ . By Lemma 4.9, we can view the  $\Phi_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$ -module  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$  as a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -pure sheaf on  $Z \setminus p^{-1}(D)$ . Since  $Z \setminus p^{-1}(D) = Z \setminus \tilde{D}$  is a closed subscheme of  $X_Y \setminus \tilde{D}$ , we can also view  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{P}_Y^d \setminus D}$  as a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant  $Y$ -pure sheaf on  $X_Y \setminus \tilde{D}$ .

By Lemma 4.9, for any  $T$ -point  $(\mathcal{G}, \varphi, \tilde{\beta})$  in  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$  we can view  $\mathcal{G}$  as a  $T$ -pure sheaf on  $X_T$  supported inside  $Z_T$ . The isomorphism  $\varphi|_{X_T \setminus \tilde{D}_T}$  can then be used to transport the extra structure  $\tilde{\alpha}$  to the restriction  $\mathcal{G}|_{X_T \setminus \tilde{D}_T}$ . Let  $H$  denote the subfunctor of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$  consisting of  $T$ -points such that this extra structure  $\tilde{\alpha}$  on  $\mathcal{G}|_{X_T \setminus \tilde{D}_T}$  extends (uniquely) to  $X_T$ . We claim that  $H$  is a closed strict-ind subscheme of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$ . Indeed, for any such  $T$ -point the structure  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is given by a morphism

$$\tilde{\alpha} : \mathcal{B}|_{X_T \setminus \tilde{D}_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}|_{X_T \setminus \tilde{D}_T}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}$  is a finitely presented coherent sheaf on  $X_T$  (either  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$  or  $\mathcal{B} = \Lambda_1|_{X_T} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ ). There exists some  $N \gg 0$  such that the morphism  $\tilde{\alpha}$  extends uniquely to a morphism  $\xi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(N\tilde{D}_T)$ . Consider the composition

$$\gamma : \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\xi} \mathcal{G}(N\tilde{D}_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(N\tilde{D}_T)/\mathcal{G}$$

The fiber product  $H_T$  represents the locus where this  $T$ -section  $\gamma$  of the Hom functor  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{G}(N\tilde{D}_T)/\mathcal{G})$  is equal to the 0 morphism. By Lemma 2.15, the Hom functor  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{G}(N\tilde{D}_T)/\mathcal{G})$  is represented by a separated scheme over  $T$ . Therefore the locus  $H_T$  where  $\gamma = 0$  is a closed subscheme of  $T$ , as claimed.

By definition,  $H$  admits a morphism to  $\mathcal{M}$ . The triple  $(\mathcal{F}, \psi, \alpha)$  represents a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant morphism  $\tau : Y \setminus (0, 0) \rightarrow H$ . We get a similar  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -equivariant commutative diagram as in the proof for  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  above:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & f & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ Y \setminus (0, 0) & \xrightarrow{\tau} & H & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & & \\ & & Y & & \end{array}$$

By the same reasoning as before, the pullback of  $(L_n)^\vee$  to each projective stratum of the closed ind-subscheme  $H \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{\Phi\mathrm{Coh}^d(\mathbb{P}_Y^d), \mathcal{E}, D, \beta}$  is  $Y$ -ample for  $n \gg 0$ . Therefore we can apply the same argument as in Theorem 4.8 to conclude.  $\square$

## 5. APPLICATIONS TO MODULI OF $\Lambda$ -MODULES

**5.1. HN boundedness condition.** In this subsection we will show that the polynomial numerical invariant  $\nu$  on the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfies HN boundedness. First, we note that there is an explicit description of filtrations in the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  analogous to the one for  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $k$  be a field over  $S$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_k$  equipped with a  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module structure. By the same Rees construction argument, a filtration  $f : \Theta_k \rightarrow \Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  can be described as a sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -submodules of  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfying

- (a)  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  is pure of dimension  $d$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{F}_m = 0$  for  $m \gg 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}$  for  $m \ll 0$ .

In this case, the associated graded  $f|_0$  is the sheaf  $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  equipped with its induced  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module structure.

Using properties (a) and (c) above, we can formulate an alternate description of a filtration. Specifying a filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is equivalent to specifying the data of an unweighted filtration  $0 \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$  and assigning a weight  $w_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  to each  $\mathcal{F}_{(i)}$  such that  $w_i < w_j$  when  $i < j$ . Under this equivalence of data, the weights  $w_i$  correspond to the jump set of the original filtration,

$$\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathcal{F}_i \neq \mathcal{F}_{i+1}\} = \{w_0, \dots, w_N\}.$$

Note that we place parentheses around the indexes to distinguish an unweighted filtration from our other notion of a ( $\mathbb{Z}$ -indexed) filtration.

**Definition 5.1.** *An unweighted filtration is convex if  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}} \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(n)}/\mathcal{F}_{(n+1)}}$  for all  $m > n$ , and it is strictly convex if these inequalities are strict. We say that a filtration is (strictly) convex if its underlying unweighted filtration is (strictly) convex.*

Let  $k$  be a field. Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a filtration of an object  $\mathcal{F} \in \Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . If  $\nu(f) \geq 0$ , we will show that we can replace it by a convex filtration with bigger polynomial numerical invariant. The next lemma is the polynomial-valued equivalent of the insertion and deletion lemma [HL18, Lemma 5.32].

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $f$  be a nondegenerate filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  with underlying unweighted filtration*

$$0 \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{(i)}$  is assigned weight  $w_i$ . Suppose that  $\nu(f) \geq 0$  and that there are consecutive weights  $w_i < w_{i+1}$  such that  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}} \leq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}}$ .

Set  $R_i = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}}$ ,  $R_{i+1} = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}}$ , and  $R = R_i + R_{i+1}$ . Define  $f'$  to be the nondegenerate filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  with underlying unweighted filtration

$$0 \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(i+2)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(i)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$$

and where  $\mathcal{F}_{(l)}$  is assigned weight  $Rw_l$  if  $l \neq i$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{(i)}$  is assigned weight  $R_iw_i + R_{i+1}w_{i+1}$ . Then  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$ .

*Proof.* Set  $L(f) := \nu(f) \cdot \sqrt{b(f|_0)}$  and  $L(f') := \nu(f') \cdot \sqrt{b(f'|_0)}$ . Then, we can write the difference  $\nu(f') - \nu(f)$  as

$$(3) \quad \nu(f') - \nu(f) = \frac{L(f) \left( \sqrt{b(f|_0)} - \sqrt{b(f'|_0)/R^2} \right) + \sqrt{b(f|_0)} (L(f')/R - L(f))}{\sqrt{b(f|_0)} \cdot \sqrt{b(f'|_0)/R^2}}.$$

It suffices to show that all terms appearing in the numerator of Equation (3) are  $\geq 0$ . Observe that we have

$$b(f|_0) := \sum_{k=0}^N w_k^2 \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}/\mathcal{F}_{(k+1)}}$$

$$b(f'|_0) = (w_i R_i + w_{i+1} R_{i+1})^2 \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}} + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq N \\ k \neq i, i+1}} R^2 \cdot w_k^2 \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}/\mathcal{F}_{(k+1)}}$$

The two equations above imply that

$$b(f|_0) - b(f'|_0)/R^2 = (w_i^2 R_i + w_{i+1}^2 R_{i+1}) - \frac{(w_i R_i + w_{i+1} R_{i+1})^2}{R_{i+1} + R_i} = \frac{R_{i+1} R_i (w_{i+1} - w_i)^2}{R_{i+1} + R_i} > 0$$

Hence  $\sqrt{b(f|_0)} - \sqrt{b(f'|_0)/R^2} > 0$ . But we have  $L(f) \geq 0$ , because of the assumption that  $\nu(f) \geq 0$ . We conclude that the first term  $L(f) \left( \sqrt{b(f|_0)} - \sqrt{b(f'|_0)/R^2} \right)$  in the numerator of (3) is nonnegative.

We are left to show  $L(f')/R - L(f) \geq 0$  for the second term. Define  $v_k = w_k - w_{k-1}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq N$  and set  $v_0 = 0$ . Then we can express

$$\begin{aligned} L(f) &:= \text{wt}(L_n|_0) = \sum_{k=0}^N v_k \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}} \\ L(f') &= R_i v_{i+1} \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}} + R_{i+1} v_{i+1} \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq N \\ k \neq i+1}} R \cdot v_k \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}} \end{aligned}$$

Using these equations, we can conclude

$$L(f')/R - L(f) = w_{i+1} R_{i+1} R_i \cdot (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}}) \geq 0$$

□

**Corollary 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \in \Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)(K)$ . Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a nondegenerate filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\nu(f) \geq 0$ . There exists a nondegenerate filtration  $f' = (\mathcal{F}'_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$  and  $f'$  is convex.*

*Proof.* We induct on the length of the underlying unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{(n)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)}$ . If  $n = 0$  then  $f$  is already convex, so we take  $f' = f$ . Now suppose that  $n \geq 1$ . If  $f$  is not convex then there is some  $i$  such that  $\bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+2)}} < \bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)}}$ . By Lemma 5.2, we can construct a filtration  $f'$  such that  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f) \geq 0$  and whose underlying unweighted filtration is shorter. Applying the inductive hypothesis to  $f'$ , there is a convex filtration  $f''$  with  $\nu(f'') \geq \nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$ .  $\square$

Recall that a subset  $B$  of geometric points in a stack  $\mathcal{X}$  is called bounded if it is contained in the image of the map  $|T| \rightarrow |\mathcal{X}|$  for some finite type quasicompact  $S$ -scheme  $T$  and morphism  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *For any bounded subset  $B$  of geometric points in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  and real number  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , the subset*

$$\mathfrak{S}_{B,c} := \left\{ \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \mathcal{F} \in B \text{ such that } (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ is a filtration of } \mathcal{F} \\ \text{and } \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}) \geq c \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{Z} \end{array} \right\}$$

is bounded.

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a quasicompact  $S$ -scheme and morphism  $T \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  such that  $B$  is contained in the image. The morphism  $T \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is represented by a torsion-free sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X_T$ . By base-changing to  $X_T$  and applying Noetherian approximation, we can assume without loss of generality that the base scheme  $T$  is Noetherian. Note that the rank  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_t}$  of the fibers takes only finitely-many values on  $T$ . This provides a uniform bound for the number of nonzero graded pieces in each graded sheaf  $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{B,c}$ . We will induct on the maximum  $N(B)$  of the number of nonzero graded pieces in elements of  $\mathfrak{S}_{B,c}$ . The base case  $N(B) = 1$  is clear, since then  $\mathfrak{S}_{B,c} \subset \{\mathcal{F}_t \mid \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_t) \geq c\}$ .

We proceed with the induction step. For each element  $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{B,c}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}} / \mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}+1}$  the nonzero graded piece with largest weight  $m_{\max}$ . Notice that then  $\mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}+1} = 0$ , and so  $\mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}} / \mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}+1} = \mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}}$  is a subsheaf of a fiber  $\mathcal{F}_t$  satisfying  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}}) \geq c$ . It suffices to show that the set

$$\{\mathcal{G} \mid \exists t \in T \text{ with } \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}_t \text{ and } \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{G}) \geq c\}$$

belongs is bounded, because then we can use the induction hypothesis on the bounded collection  $B'$  consisting of all quotients  $\mathcal{F}_t / \mathcal{F}_{m_{\max}}$  (note that by construction  $N(\mathcal{F}') = N(\mathcal{F}) - 1$ ).

After passing to a (finite) Zariski cover of  $T$ , we can assume without loss of generality that the ample line bundle  $\mathcal{O}_{X_T}(1)$  induces a closed immersion  $i : X_T \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_T^n$ . For any point  $t \in T$  and any pure sheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $X_t$ , the pushforward  $(i_t)_* \mathcal{G}$  will be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $\mathbb{P}_t^n$  with  $\widehat{\mu}((i_t)_* \mathcal{G}) = \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{G})$ . Therefore we can reduce to the case  $X = \mathbb{P}^n$  for the bounded set of sheaves  $\{(i_t)_* \mathcal{F}_t \mid t \in T\}$ . Now we can conclude by [HL97, Lemma 1.7.9], because the set of Castelnuovo-Mumford regularities  $\{\text{reg}((i_t)_* \mathcal{F}_t) \mid t \in T\}$  and the set of Hilbert polynomials  $\{P_{(i_t)_* \mathcal{F}_t} \mid t \in T\}$  are both finite by [HL97, Lemma 1.7.6] (note that the bound on [HL97, Lemma 1.7.9] only depends on the Hilbert polynomial and regularity of the sheaf).  $\square$

We end this section by proving the HN boundedness condition for the numerical invariant  $\nu$  on the stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . For the following proposition, we say that a filtration  $f$  is destabilizing if  $f$  is nondegenerate and  $\nu(f) > 0$ .

**Proposition 5.5** (HN-boundedness). *Let  $T$  be an affine scheme. Let  $g : T \rightarrow \Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . Then there exists a quasicompact open substack  $\mathcal{U}_T$  of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfying the following. For all geometric points  $t \in T$  and all destabilizing filtrations  $f$  of  $g(t)$ , there exists a nondegenerate filtration  $f'$  of  $g(t)$  with  $f'|_0 \in \mathcal{U}_T$  and  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that there is a forgetful map  $\text{Forget} : \Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$ , which is of finite type by Proposition 2.22. We claim that there is a quasicompact open substack  $\mathcal{W}_T$  of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  such that for all destabilizing filtrations  $f$  as in the statement of the proposition we can find a filtration  $f'$  such that  $\text{Forget}(f'|_0) \in \mathcal{W}_T$  and  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$ . Once this claim is proven, then the proposition will follow by taking  $\mathcal{U}_T$  to be the quasicompact preimage  $\text{Forget}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}_T) \subset \Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

By Corollary 5.3, for any destabilizing filtration  $f$  we can always find a convex filtration  $f'$  with  $\nu(f') \geq \nu(f)$ . Therefore, we can restrict to looking at convex filtrations. It suffices to show that the following set of sheaves is bounded

$$\mathfrak{S} := \left\{ \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1} : \exists t \in T \text{ such that } (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ is a convex filtration of } \mathcal{F}_t \right\}$$

In view of Lemma 5.4, it is enough to find a uniform lower bound  $C$  such that for all convex filtrations  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\mathcal{F}_t$  we have  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}) \geq C$ .

Let  $0 = \mathcal{F}_{(q)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(q-1)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}_t$  denote the underlying unweighted filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . By convexity, we have the following inequalities for the associated graded pieces

$$\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(q-1)}} \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(q-2)}/\mathcal{F}_{(q-3)}} \geq \cdots \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(0)}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}}$$

In particular we get inequalities for the slopes

$$\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{(q-1)}) \geq \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{(q-2)}/\mathcal{F}_{(q-3)}) \geq \cdots \geq \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{(0)}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)})$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_{(0)}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}$  is a pure quotient of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ , we have  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{(0)}/\mathcal{F}_{(0)}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}) \geq \widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F}_t)$ , where  $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F}_t)$  denotes the minimal slope among the associated graded pieces of the Gieseker-Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_t$  runs over a bounded family, the minimal slope  $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F}_t)$  admits a uniform lower bound  $C$ . This is our desired lower bound for the slopes  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_{(i)}/\mathcal{F}_{(i+1)})$  of the associated graded pieces.  $\square$

**5.2. Canonical filtrations of  $\Lambda$ -modules.** Simpson defines a canonical unweighted filtration of an unstable  $\Lambda$ -module in the context of Gieseker stability, called the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration in [Sim94]. We will recall this construction and then construct another unweighted filtration, the *leading term filtration*, by deleting steps in the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration. We also record some key properties of the leading term filtration. In the next section, we will show that our numerical invariant on  $\Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification, and the canonical filtration of an unstable point is the leading term filtration (with a canonical choice of weights).

**Definition 5.6** ([Sim94, Lemma 3.1]). *Let  $k$  be a field over  $S$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_k$  equipped with a  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module structure. The p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the unique unweighted filtration of  $\Lambda$ -modules*

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{(n+1)}^{\text{HN}} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(n-1)}^{\text{HN}} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{HN}} = \mathcal{F}$$

such that  $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}$  is semistable and  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} < \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+2)}^{\text{HN}}}$  for all  $m$ .

For the remainder of this subsection, we let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_k$  equipped with a  $\Lambda_{X_k}$ -module structure. Let  $i$  be the smallest integer such that  $\widehat{\mu}_h(\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}) = \widehat{\mu}_h(\mathcal{F}_{(n-1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}) = \cdots = \widehat{\mu}_h(\mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}^{\text{HN}})$  for all  $h > i$ . In other words,  $i$  is the largest integer such that the  $i^{\text{th}}$  slopes of the graded pieces of the filtration are not all equal. Hence we have

$$\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}) \geq \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(n-1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}) \geq \cdots \geq \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}^{\text{HN}})$$

where some of the inequalities above are strict. We let  $h_0 = 0$ , and let

$$\{h_m\}_{m=1}^j = \left\{ 1 \leq l \leq n \mid \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(l-1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(l)}^{\text{HN}}) < \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(l)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(l+1)}^{\text{HN}}) \right\}$$

ordered so that  $h_1 < \dots < h_j$ . In particular, this means that  $\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(l)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(l+1)}^{\text{HN}}) = \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(h_m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(h_m+1)}^{\text{HN}})$  for all  $h_m \leq l < h_{m+1}$ .

**Definition 5.7.** We define the leading term filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  to be the unweighted filtration

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{l-term}} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(j-1)}^{\text{l-term}} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{l-term}} = \mathcal{F}$$

with  $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{l-term}} = \mathcal{F}_{(h_m)}^{\text{HN}}$  for  $m = 0, \dots, j$ . We say that the  $i^{\text{th}}$  slope  $\widehat{\mu}_i$  is the leading slope, and we call  $i$  the leading term index of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

$\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}}$  is coarser than the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration, since we have removed some of the steps. The leading slopes of the graded pieces of  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}}$  are strictly convex in the sense that

$$\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}) > \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(j-1)}^{\text{l-term}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}) > \dots > \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{l-term}}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}^{\text{l-term}}),$$

which implies  $\overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}} > \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j-1)}^{\text{l-term}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}} > \dots > \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(0)}^{\text{l-term}}/\mathcal{F}_{(1)}^{\text{l-term}}}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}$  be an unweighted filtration of  $\Lambda$ -modules  $0 = \mathcal{F}_{(N+1)} \subset \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$ . Choose a degree  $i$ . For  $0 \leq m \leq N$ , set

$$z_m = \left( -a_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

**Definition 5.8.** For any degree  $i$ , we define the  $\widehat{\mu}_i$ -polytope  $\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}$  to be the convex hull of  $\{0, z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ . In other words,

$$\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) := \left\{ \sum_{m=0}^N \lambda_m (z_m - z_{m+1}) \mid 0 \leq \lambda_0 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N \leq 1 \right\}$$

Given a filtration  $f$  with leading term index  $i$ , we define  $\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f)$  to be the  $\widehat{\mu}_i$ -polytope of its underlying unweighted filtration.

**Lemma 5.9.** If  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  is a sub- $\Lambda$ -module such that  $\overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}} \geq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$ , then  $\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{E}) = \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F})$  for all  $l > i$  and  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$ .

*Proof.* The inequalities  $\overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}} \geq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}} \geq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  and the equalities  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(n)}^{\text{HN}}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F})$  for  $l > i$  immediately imply  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{E}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F})$  for these  $l$ .

To show that  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$  we first prove the following claim: for any  $0 \leq m \leq n$ ,

$$(4) \quad P_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \left( \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \right) \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} + P_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}}$$

In order to prove this claim, we set  $\mathcal{E}_{(j)} := \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq n$ . This induces a filtration by sub- $\Lambda$ -modules

$$0 \subset \mathcal{E}_{(n)} \subset \mathcal{E}_{(n-1)} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{E}_{(0)} = \mathcal{E}$$

Set  $r_j := \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}_{(j)}/\mathcal{E}_{(j+1)}}$ . By additivity, we have

$$P(\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{j=n}^0 r_j \cdot \overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}_{(j)}/\mathcal{E}_{(j+1)}}$$

Notice that  $\mathcal{E}_{(j)}/\mathcal{E}_{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}$ , and hence by semistability of  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}$  we have  $\overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}_{(j)}/\mathcal{E}_{(j+1)}} \leq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}}$ . Therefore we get

$$(5) \quad P(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sum_{j=n}^0 r_j \cdot \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}}$$



We can similarly rewrite the right hand side of inequality (4) as

$$(6) \quad \left( \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \right) \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} + P_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} = \sum_{j=n}^0 l_j \cdot \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}}$$

where we define

$$l_j := \begin{cases} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}} & \text{if } j \geq m+1 \\ \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} & \text{if } j = m \\ 0 & \text{if } m > j \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

By equations (5) and (6), it suffices to prove that  $\sum_{j=n}^0 (l_j - r_j) \cdot \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \geq 0$ . Using summation by parts, we can rewrite this sum as

$$\sum_{j=n-1}^0 \left( \sum_{h=n}^{j+1} (l_h - r_h) \right) \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+2)}^{\text{HN}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \right)$$

It follows from the definitions that  $\sum_{h=n}^j (l_h - r_h) \geq 0$  for all  $j$ . On the other hand, the convexity of the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration implies that  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+2)}^{\text{HN}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(j+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \geq 0$ . Therefore all terms in the sum above are  $\geq 0$ , which implies that the sum is nonnegative. This concludes the proof of inequality (4).

The equalities  $\hat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}) = \hat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{E}) = \hat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{HN}})$  for all  $j$  and  $l > i$  imply that both sides of (4) agree in degree greater than  $i$ . Comparing the degree  $i$  terms of both sides of (4), we find that

$$(7) \quad a_i(\mathcal{E}) \leq \left( \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}} \right) \hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}) + a_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}})$$

Let  $\{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  denote the points used to define  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{HN}})$ . For the index  $m$  such that  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}} \leq \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}}$ , inequality (7) shows that  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}})$  lies to the right of the segment joining  $z_m$  and  $z_{m+1}$ . On the other hand,  $\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{E}) \geq \hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F})$  implies that  $-a_i(\mathcal{E}) \leq -\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}) \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}$ , so  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}})$  lies to the left of the segment joining 0 and  $z_0$ . We conclude that  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}})$  lies in the convex hull of  $\{0, z_m, z_{m+1}, z_0\}$ , hence  $(-a_i(\mathcal{E}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}) \in \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{HN}})$ . Note that the construction of the leading term filtration implies that  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}}) = \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{HN}})$ , so we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $0 = \mathcal{F}_{(p+1)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(p)} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$  be a convex unweighted filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  by  $\Lambda$ -modules. Then, we have*

- (i) *For  $0 < m \leq p$  and all  $l > i$ , we have  $\hat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) = \hat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F})$ . Furthermore,  $\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) \geq \hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(n)})$  for  $0 < n < m$ .*
- (ii)  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) \subset \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$ .
- (iii) *If the inequalities of (i) are strict for  $\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet})$  and  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) = \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$ , then  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}$  is the leading term filtration.*

*Proof.* Using convexity of the unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}$  and the additivity of Hilbert polynomials, we get  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(p)}} \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(p-1)}} \geq \dots \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{(0)}} = \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . The equalities for (i) now follow from Lemma 5.9. Also, by Lemma 5.9, all of the points  $(-a_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}), \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}})$  used to define  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet})$  lie inside inside  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$ . This readily implies  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) \subset \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{\text{l-term}})$  as in (ii).

We now show (iii). The strict convexity of the sequence  $(\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}))_{m=0}^p$  (respectively  $(\hat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{l-term}}))_{m=0}^j$ ) implies that the left-most edges of  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet})$  (respectively  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}^{\text{l-term}}(\mathcal{F})$ ) are in bijection with the non-zero  $\Lambda$ -modules in the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}$  (respectively the leading term filtration). This bijective correspondence and the equality  $\text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}) = \text{Pol}_{\hat{\mu}_i}^{\text{l-term}}(\mathcal{F})$

imply that the leading term filtration and the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_\bullet$  have the same length ( $j = p$ ). By induction on the length  $j$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)} = \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$ .

Both  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$  correspond to the first edge of the polytope of their respective filtrations. The equality of polytopes implies that  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}} = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}}$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}) = \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$ . We also know by (ii) that  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$  for all  $l > i$ .

Since both sheaves are saturated and have the same rank, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)} \subset \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$ . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$ . This means that  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}/(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)})$  is a nontrivial subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$ .

We know by construction that every associated graded constituent  $\mathcal{E}$  of the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$  satisfies  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{E}) \leq \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$  for all  $l \geq i$ . This implies that the subsheaf  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)} \subset \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$  satisfies  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)})$  for all  $l \geq i$ . Since  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$ , the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{(j)} \rightarrow \frac{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}}{\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)}} \rightarrow 0$$

shows that  $\widehat{\mu}_l\left(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}/(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)})\right) \geq \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$  for all  $l \geq i$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_{(j)}/(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{(j)})$  is a subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$ , this contradicts the fact that every associated graded constituent  $\mathcal{E}$  of the p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}}$  satisfies  $\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{E}) < \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{E}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(j)}^{\text{l-term}})$  for  $l > i$ .  $\square$

### 5.3. $\Theta$ -stratification for $\Lambda$ -modules.

**Theorem 5.11.** *The numerical invariant  $\nu$  on the stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$  pulled-back from  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  (Definition 4.3) defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification on  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . The optimally destabilizing filtration  $f$  of an unstable  $\Lambda$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $\nu$  has underlying unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^{\text{l-term}}$  and the weight  $w_m$  of each  $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{l-term}}$  is of the form*

$$(8) \quad w_m = L \cdot \left( \widehat{\mu}_i\left(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{l-term}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{l-term}}\right) - \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}) \right),$$

where  $i$  is the leading term index and  $L$  is any rational number such that all  $w_m$  are integers.

With the exception of the explicit description of  $\nu$ -canonical filtrations, Theorem 5.11 is already proved when  $S$  is defined over a field of characteristic 0. Indeed, the conditions in Theorem 2.26 (1) are already established in Theorem 4.10 and Proposition 5.5, so  $\nu$  defines a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . Furthermore, any weak  $\Theta$ -stratification is a  $\Theta$ -stratification in characteristic 0.

We will give the full proof of Theorem 5.11 over an arbitrary base after establishing a necessary rigidity result for  $\nu$ -canonical filtrations.

**Remark 5.12.** *The paper [GN14] constructs a stratification of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P$  in which the strata parameterize a  $\Lambda$ -module along with its full (unweighted) p-Harder-Narasimhan filtration. The explicit description of the  $\nu$ -canonical filtrations in Theorem 5.11 shows that the  $\Theta$ -stratification above is slightly coarser. This is basically forced by the fact that  $\nu$ -canonical filtrations are canonically weighted by integers. If one allows polynomial weights, then one could weight the full HN-filtration analogously to (8) by assigning the polynomial  $w_m = \bar{p}(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\text{HN}}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)}^{\text{HN}}) - \bar{p}(\mathcal{F})$  to the  $m^{\text{th}}$  graded piece. A non-integer weighting of the full HN filtration along these lines is developed in [GHZ21].*

**Lemma 5.13.** *Let  $k$  be a field over  $S$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a pure  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module of dimension  $d$  on  $X_k$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is unstable. The underlying unweighted filtration of the  $\nu$ -canonical*

filtration  $f_{Can}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the leading term filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{l-term}$ , and the weight of each  $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{l-term}$  is given by (8). We call  $f_{Can}$  the weighted leading term filtration.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is unstable, we can restrict to maximizing over filtrations for which the numerical invariant is greater than zero. By Lemma 5.2 it is enough to consider filtrations which are convex. Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a convex filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By Lemma 5.10 (i) we have  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_{(t)}) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F})$  for all  $\mathcal{F}_{(t)} \neq 0$  in the underlying unweighted filtration of  $f$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F}_m) = \widehat{\mu}_l(\mathcal{F})$  for  $l > i$  when  $\mathcal{F}_m \neq 0$ . By Proposition 4.1, the numerator of  $\nu(f)$  can be written as

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(\overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)).$$

Since each of the summands  $\overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n) - \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $i$ , the polynomial  $\nu(f)$  has degree at most  $i$ . Let  $\nu_i(f)/i!$  be the coefficient of degree  $i$  of the invariant  $\nu(f)$ . If a convex filtration  $f$  maximizes  $\nu(f)$ , then it must also maximize  $\nu_i(f)$ . Therefore, the proposition will follow if we show that  $f_{Can}$  as defined above is the unique convex maximizer for  $\nu_i(f)$ .

Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a convex filtration which maximizes  $\nu_i(f)$ . We will show that  $f = f_{Can}$ . Suppose that  $f$  has underlying unweighted filtration

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{(N+1)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$$

and weights  $w_h$ . Set  $d_h = a_i(\mathcal{F}_{(h)}/\mathcal{F}_{(h+1)})$ ,  $r_h = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{(h)}/\mathcal{F}_{(h+1)}}$ ,  $D = a_i(\mathcal{F})$ , and  $R = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$  (see Subsection 2.3). Form a rank-degree sequence  $(r_h, d_h, w_h)_{h=0}^N$  in the sense of [HL18, Notation 5.25].  $\nu_i(f)$  is given by

$$\nu_i(f) = \frac{1}{R} \cdot \frac{\sum_{h=0}^N w_h(Rd_h - r_h D)}{\sqrt{\sum_{h=0}^N w_h^2 r_h}}$$

For any convex polytope  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , set

$$\psi(P) = \max \{ \nu_i(f') \mid f' \text{ is a convex filtration with } \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f') = P \}$$

Formula (39) in the statement of [HL18, Lemma 5.33] gives explicit formulas for  $\psi$  and the choice of maximizing weights given such a polytope  $P$ . The description of the maximizing weights in [HL18, Lemma 5.33] agrees with our choice of weights for  $f_{Can}$ , in other words  $\nu_i(f_{Can}) = \psi(\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f_{Can}))$ . Lemma 5.10 (ii) implies that  $\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f) \subset \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}^{l-term}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f_{Can})$ . If the inclusion is strict  $\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f) \subsetneq \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{l-term})$  then [HL18, Lemma 5.34] shows that  $\psi(\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f)) < \psi(\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{l-term}))$ . This means that

$$\nu_i(f) \leq \psi(\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f)) < \psi(\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{l-term})) = \mu_i(f_{Can})$$

contradicting the maximality of  $\nu_i(f)$ . Hence we must have  $\text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(f) = \text{Pol}_{\widehat{\mu}_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet}^{l-term})$ . The one dimensional insertion-deletion lemma [HL18, Corollary 5.32.1] shows that we can suppose that  $\widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(n)}/\mathcal{F}_{(n+1)}) > \widehat{\mu}_i(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}/\mathcal{F}_{(m+1)})$  for  $n > m$ . Applying Lemma 5.10 (iii), we conclude that the underlying unweighted filtration

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{(N+1)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(N)} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$$

of  $f$  is the unweighted leading term filtration. Moreover, the weight assigned to  $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$  is given by (8), for any rational number  $L$  making all of these expressions integers.  $\square$

We now use the explicit description of the canonical filtrations provided above to show that they are rigid in the sense of deformation theory.

**Lemma 5.14.** *For all indexes  $m$ , the group  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda} \left( \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{HN}, \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{HN} \right)$  of  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module homomorphisms is trivial.*

*Proof.* The  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -modules  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}/\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  satisfy an analogous hypothesis as in the statement of [HL97, Lemma 1.3.3] but in the context of  $\Lambda$ -modules. The same argument as in [HL97, Lemma 1.3.3] applies without change to show that  $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m, \overline{\mathcal{F}}/\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.15.** *Let  $k$  be a field. Suppose that we are given a morphism  $f : \mathrm{Spec}(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $\varphi : \Theta_k \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  be a  $\nu$ -canonical filtration for  $f|_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)}$ . Consider the groupoid  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  of all morphisms  $\tilde{\varphi} : \Theta_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)} \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  along with compatible identifications  $\tilde{\varphi}|_{1_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}} \simeq f$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}|_{\Theta_k} \simeq \varphi$ . Then,  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  is equivalent to either the empty set or the set with one element.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  is nonempty. We want to show that all of the objects in  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  are isomorphic and that each object does not have nontrivial automorphisms.

The morphism  $f$  is represented by a  $\mathrm{Spec}(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2))$ -pure  $\Lambda|_{X_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}}$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}$ . Let us denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$  the restriction  $\mathcal{F}|_{X_k}$ . Up to scaling the weights, the filtration  $\varphi$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$  is the  $\nu$ -canonical filtration  $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$  described in Lemma 5.13. The groupoid  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  is equivalent to the groupoid of decreasing sequences  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\Lambda|_{X_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}}$ -submodules

$$\cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_m \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}$$

such that  $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_m$  is  $k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$ -flat and  $\mathcal{F}_m|_{X_k} = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  for all  $m$ . This description already shows that the objects of  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/f}$  have no automorphisms.

We are left to prove that there is at most one sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  as above. Let  $Q := \mathrm{Quot}_{X_{k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}/k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)}(\mathcal{F})$  denote the quot-scheme of  $k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$ -flat quotients of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By [GN14, Lemma 4.3], there is a closed subscheme  $\Lambda Q \hookrightarrow Q$  classifying  $k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$ -flat quotients where the kernel is a  $\Lambda$ -submodule. Then  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  is a  $k$ -point of  $\Lambda Q$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_m$  is a section  $\sigma : \mathrm{Spec}(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \rightarrow \Lambda Q$  of the structure morphism of  $\Lambda Q$  such that  $\sigma|_k = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$ . The argument in [GN14, Prop. 4.5] shows that the set of such sections  $\sigma$  is a torsor for the group  $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m, \overline{\mathcal{F}}/\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m)$  of homomorphisms of  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -modules.  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$  is a constituent of the p-Harder-Narsimhan filtration of  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ , because the  $\nu$ -canonical filtration is coarser than the p-Harder-Narsimhan filtration (Lemma 5.13). An application of Lemma 5.14 shows that  $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m, \overline{\mathcal{F}}/\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m) = 0$ . Therefore there is at most one first-order deformation  $\mathcal{F}_m$  of the  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -submodule  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_m$ , as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.11.* Theorem 4.10 shows that  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and Proposition 5.5 shows that  $\nu$  satisfies the HN-boundedness condition, so Theorem 2.26 (1) establishes a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification. The  $\nu$ -canonical filtrations have been described in Lemma 5.13. In order to show that we get a  $\Theta$ -stratification and complete the proof, we need to check condition (1) in [HL21, Lemma 2.1.6].

Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  denote the algebraic stack that parametrizes points of  $\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  along with a  $\nu$ -canonical filtration. More formally,  $\mathfrak{S}$  will be a union of components of  $\mathrm{Filt}(\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\leq c})$  for some open substacks  $\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_{\leq c}$  as in Definition 2.23. There is a natural forgetful morphism  $\mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . Let  $k$  be a field. Let  $\varphi : \mathrm{Spec}(k) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$  be a  $k$ -point of  $\mathfrak{S}$ , corresponding to a point  $f : \mathrm{Spec}(k) \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  and a  $\nu$ -canonical filtration  $\varphi$  of  $f$ . We want to show that the derived fiber of the relative cotangent complex  $Lf^* \left( \mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{S}/\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} \right)$  has cohomology concentrated in negative degree.

Let  $\tilde{f} : \mathrm{Spec}(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \rightarrow \Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  denote the trivial first order deformation of  $f$ . By [Ols06, Thm. 1.5], the  $k$ -linear dual  $H^0 \left( Lf^* \left( \mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{S}/\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} \right) \right)^\vee$  classifies isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/\tilde{f}}$  whenever  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/\tilde{f}}$  is not empty. Similarly  $H^1 \left( Lf^* \left( \mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{S}/\Lambda \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)} \right) \right)^\vee$  is the group of automorphisms of any object in  $\mathrm{Def}_{\varphi/\tilde{f}}$ . Lemma 5.15 therefore implies the

desired vanishing

$$H^0 \left( Lf^* \left( \mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{S}/\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)} \right) \right) = H^1 \left( Lf^* \left( \mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{S}/\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)} \right) \right) = 0.$$

□

**5.4. Boundedness of the semistable locus.** We start by showing that our notion of  $\nu$ -semistability (as in Subsection 2.5) recovers p-semistability as in [Sim94, §3].

**Proposition 5.16.** *Let  $k$  be a field. A point  $f \in \Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)(k)$  is  $\nu$ -semistable if and only if the corresponding pure  $\Lambda|_{X_k}$ -module  $p$ -semistable.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is p-semistable. Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . By Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\text{wt} (L_n^\vee|_0) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}(n)) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}$$

By assumption we must have  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m}$  for all  $m$ . This implies that  $\text{wt} (L_n^\vee|_0) \geq 0$ , and therefore  $\nu(f) \leq 0$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is not p-semistable. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a destabilizing sub- $\Lambda$ -module of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We can define a filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_m := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} \\ \mathcal{E} & \text{if } \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}} - \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} \geq m > -\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } m \leq -\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}} \end{cases}$$

Using the formula of Proposition 4.1 again, one can see that  $\text{wt} (L_n^\vee|_0)$  is strictly negative for  $n \gg 0$ . Hence  $\nu(f) > 0$ . □

**Definition 5.17.** *Since the invariant  $\nu$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ , it follows that the set of points that are  $\nu$ -semistable is an open substack of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)$ . We write  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  to denote to this open substack.*

For any rational polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[n]$ , we let  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  be the open and closed substack of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  parametrizing points such that the underlying sheaf has Hilbert polynomial  $P$ .

**Proposition 5.18.** *The stack  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  is bounded.*

*Proof.* Proposition 5.16 shows that every point in  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  is a p-semistable  $\Lambda$ -module in the sense of [Sim94, §3]. Since  $S$  is quasicompact, and both  $X$ ,  $\text{Gr}_1(\Lambda)$  are finitely presented, there exists some  $m \geq 0$  such that  $\text{Gr}_1(\Lambda)(m)|_{X_s}$  is generated by global sections for all  $s \in S$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a field-valued point of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$ . Denote by  $\hat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$  the biggest among the slopes of the associated graded pieces of the Gieseker-Harder-Narsimhan filtration of the underlying sheaf of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By [Sim94, Lemma 3.3], we have that  $\hat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \hat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) + m \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Since the Hilbert polynomial of  $\mathcal{F}$  is fixed to be  $P$ , this gives a uniform upper bound  $C$  on  $\hat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$  for all  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$ .

The forgetful morphism  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}} \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is quasicompact by Proposition 2.22. Therefore, in order to show that  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  is quasicompact, it suffices to show that the image of  $\Lambda \text{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  in  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  is bounded. By the previous paragraph, it is sufficient to prove that the set of sheaves

$$\mathfrak{S} := \{ \mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}^d(X) \mid \hat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \leq C \}$$

is bounded. Since  $S$  is quasicompact and  $X$  is of finite presentation, we can apply Noetherian approximation to reduce to the case when  $S$  is Noetherian. Then the boundedness of the collection  $\mathfrak{S}$  follows from [Lan04, Thm. 4.4]. □

**5.5. Good moduli space for the semistable locus.** We have now all of the necessary ingredients to build a moduli space for  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$ . More precisely, we show that the semistable locus  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a separated good moduli space in the sense of [Alp13].

**Theorem 5.19.** *Assume that the scheme  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Let  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[n]$ . Then the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a separated good moduli space. In particular the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a separated good moduli space.*

*Proof.* We need to check the hypotheses of Theorem 2.26 (2). First,  $\nu$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone by Theorem 4.10. On the other hand, Proposition 5.18 implies that the stack  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  is quasicompact.  $\square$

If  $\Lambda$  is the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_X$ , then  $\Lambda\mathrm{Coh}^d(X) = \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$ . In this case the moduli space in Theorem 5.19 recovers the moduli of Gieseker semistable pure sheaves on  $X$  with Hilbert polynomial  $P$ . It is known that this moduli space is proper (in fact, projective). We can recover the properness of the moduli space by checking that the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness for complete discrete valuation rings relative to  $S$  [Sta20, Tag 0CLK].

**Proposition 5.20.** *Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring with fraction field  $K$ . Suppose that we are given a 2-commutative diagram as follows.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Spec}(K) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Spec}(R) & \longrightarrow & S \end{array}$$

*Then there exist a morphism  $\mathrm{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  such that the following diagram is 2-commutative*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Spec}(K) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Coh}^d(X) \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Spec}(R) & \longrightarrow & S \end{array}$$

*Proof.* The map  $\mathrm{Spec}(K) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  amounts to a pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_K$ . By [Sta20, Tag 01PF] we can extend it to a coherent sheaf  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  on  $X_R$ . Let  $\varpi$  be a uniformizer of  $R$  and let  $\kappa$  denote the residue field. Let  $j : \mathrm{Spec}(K) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(R)$  denote the open immersion. Then we can kill the  $\varpi$ -torsion by taking the image of the unit  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow j_*j^*\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ , so we can assume without loss of generality that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $R$ -flat. Let  $B \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\kappa$  be the maximal subsheaf of dimension  $< d$ , and form  $\mathcal{E} = \ker(\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\kappa/B)$ . We can again replace  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $\ker(\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\kappa/B')$ , where  $B' \subset \mathcal{E}_\kappa$  is the maximal subsheaf of dimension  $< d$ . The proof of [HL97, Theorem 2.B.1]<sup>3</sup> applies verbatim to show that iterating this procedure results in a sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $\mathcal{E}|_{X_\kappa}$  pure and  $\mathcal{E}|_{X_K} \cong \tilde{\mathcal{F}}|_{X_K}$ . This is the morphism  $\mathrm{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  that we were looking for.  $\square$

We now record the stronger result for  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)$  as a separate theorem.

**Theorem 5.21.** *Assume that the scheme  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Let  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[n]$ . Then the stack  $\mathrm{Coh}^d(X)_P^{\nu\text{-ss}}$  admits a proper good moduli space.*

<sup>3</sup>The smoothness hypothesis is unnecessary for the argument. Using the notation in [HL97], a sheaf is semistable in  $\mathrm{Coh}_{d,d-1}$  if and only if it is pure of dimension  $d$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.20,  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness for complete discrete valuation rings. Hence we can conclude by the last sentence in Theorem 2.26.  $\square$

## 6. APPLICATIONS TO MODULI OF PAIRS

In this section we define a family of Laurent polynomial numerical invariants  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  on  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . They are indexed by a choice of rational Laurent polynomial  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$ . We show that each numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  induces a  $\Theta$ -stratification on  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . If  $\delta \geq 0$ , then the corresponding notion of stability agrees with the ones considered in [LP93] [Wan15].

**6.1. Numerical invariants on  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ .** We start by describing filtrations of objects in  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . Let  $k$  be a field over  $S$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  be a pair in  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)(k)$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a pure sheaf of dimension  $d$  on  $X_k$  and  $\beta$  is a morphism  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . A filtration  $f$  of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  consists of a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -indexed filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of the pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  factors through  $\mathcal{F}_m$  for all  $m \leq 0$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{F}_0$  must contain the image of  $\beta$ . For any such filtration, the associated graded point  $f|_0$  is the pair  $(\text{gr}(\mathcal{F}), \text{gr}(\beta))$  on  $X_k$  consisting of the graded sheaf  $\text{gr}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  and the homogeneous morphism  $\text{gr}(\beta) : \mathcal{A}|_{X_k} \rightarrow \text{gr}(\mathcal{F})$  given by the composition

$$\text{gr}(\beta) : \mathcal{A}|_{X_k} \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 / \mathcal{F}_1 \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}$$

In the case of the moduli of pairs, it is useful to have some variations of the line bundle  $L_n$ .

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  be a Laurent polynomial on  $n$  with rational coefficients. For any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define the line bundle  $L_n^{(\delta)}$  on  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  given as follows. Let  $T$  be an  $S$ -scheme. Let  $f : T \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)_P$  be a morphism, represented by a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$ . Then, we set

$$f^* L_n^{(\delta)} := f^* M_n \otimes (f^* b_d)^{\otimes \left(-\frac{\delta(n)}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}(n)\right)}$$

**Remark 6.2.** Note that  $L_n^{(0)} = L_n$  for all  $n$ .

For any fixed  $\delta$ , we denote by  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  the Laurent polynomial numerical invariant on  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  determined by the pullback of the family  $L_n^{(\delta)}$  and the rational quadratic norm  $b$ . This numerical invariant takes values in the group  $\mathbb{R}[n, n^{-1}]$ , which can be equipped with the structure of a totally ordered  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space by defining  $p_1 \geq p_2$  if and only if  $p_1(n) \geq p_2(n)$  for all  $n \gg 0$ .

We record here the value of  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  for filtrations.

**Definition 6.3.** Choose  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$ . Let  $f : \Theta_K \rightarrow \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  be a filtration given by  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . Then  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  is the Laurent polynomial given by

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot \left(\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}\right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}}}{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m / \mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2\right)}}$$

For each fixed  $\delta$ , the arguments in Subsection 3.4 apply without change to the family  $L_n^{(\delta)}$ . Indeed, the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.22 shows that the line bundle  $b_d$  is torsion on each projective stratum  $\text{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}^{\leq N,P} \subset \text{Gr}_{X,D,\mathcal{E}}$  up to a line bundle coming from the base. Therefore, the family  $(L_n^{(\delta)})^{\vee} \cong L_n^{\vee} \otimes b_d^{\otimes (-\delta(n)/\text{rank}_{\mathcal{F}})}$  is eventually relatively ample

on each projective stratum of the affine Grassmannian  $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathrm{Pair}_A^d(X)}$  associated to some data  $\mathcal{E}, D, \beta$ . We can use the same argument as in Theorem 4.10 to conclude the following.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Fix  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$ . The numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone on the stack  $\mathrm{Pair}_A^d(X)$ .  $\square$*

**6.2. Semistable locus and canonical filtrations when  $\deg(\delta) \geq d$ .** In this subsection we work out by hand the case when the degree of Laurent polynomial  $\delta$  is at least  $d$ . We define the degree  $\deg(\delta)$  of a Laurent polynomial  $\delta$  to be the maximum among the integers  $h$  such that  $n^h$  has nonzero coefficient in  $\delta$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *Fix  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\deg(\delta) \geq d$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta) \in \mathrm{Pair}_A^d(X)(k)$  be a field-valued point.*

(i) *If  $\delta < 0$ , then  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is always  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  unstable. There is a unique (up to scaling) canonical filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  that maximizes the numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ . It is given by*

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } m < 1 \end{cases}$$

(ii) *If  $\delta > 0$ , then  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  semistable if and only if the cokernel of  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is supported in dimension  $\leq d - 1$ . If  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is unstable, then up to scaling there is a unique filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  maximizing  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ . It is given by*

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \geq 1 \\ \mathrm{Im}(\beta)^{\mathrm{sat}} & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } 0 > m \end{cases}$$

*Here the saturation  $\mathrm{Im}(\beta)^{\mathrm{sat}}$  denotes the smallest subsheaf  $\mathrm{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathrm{Im}(\beta)^{\mathrm{sat}} \subset \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}/\mathrm{Im}(\beta)^{\mathrm{sat}}$  is pure of dimension  $d$ .*

*Proof.* For this proof we set  $D := \deg(\delta)$ . We first prove (i):

Let  $f$  denote the filtration described in the proposition. If  $\delta_D$  denotes the leading coefficient of  $\delta$ , then the leading coefficient of  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  is given by  $\frac{-\delta_D}{\sqrt{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}}}$ . This is positive by assumption, and hence  $f$  is destabilizing. For any other filtration  $f' = (\mathcal{F}'_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  we have  $\deg(\nu^{(\delta)}(f')) = D$ . The leading coefficient of  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f')$  is given by

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot \frac{-\delta_D}{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}}{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}} \cdot m^2\right)}} = \frac{-\delta_D}{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(m \sqrt{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}}\right) \cdot \left(\sqrt{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}}\right)}{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}} \cdot m^2\right)}}$$

To understand this formula in the case  $D = d$ , we note that the degree  $d$  terms in  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}$  and  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  cancel out.

The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies that  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D \leq \frac{-\delta_D}{\sqrt{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}}}$ , with equality if and only if there is a single jumping point. In this latter case we have that  $f'$  is equal to  $f$  up to scaling. Therefore  $f$  is the unique maximizing filtration for the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ .

*Proof of (ii):*

Suppose that the cokernel of  $\beta$  is supported in dimension  $\leq d - 1$ . Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ . We shall show that  $f$  is not destabilizing. By assumption,  $\mathcal{F}$  itself is the only saturated subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}$  containing  $\mathrm{Im}(\beta)$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}$  for  $m \geq 0$ .



Hence

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{\sum_{m \geq 0} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2 \right)}}$$

Observe that  $m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \leq 0$  for all  $m \geq 0$ , because  $\deg(\delta) \geq d$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , and the degree  $d$  terms of  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}$  cancel. Therefore every summand in the numerator is  $\leq 0$ , and hence  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f) \leq 0$ .

On the other hand, suppose that the cokernel of  $\beta$  is not supported in dimension  $\leq d-1$ . Then  $\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}$  is a proper subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $f$  be the filtration defined in the statement of the proposition. We have

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{\left( \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} + \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}/\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}}}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}}.$$

The leading coefficient  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f)_D = \delta_D \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}}}/\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is positive, so this filtration is destabilizing. We end by showing the following claim: any other filtration  $f' = (\mathcal{F}'_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  must coincide with  $f$  up to scaling. This claim implies that  $f$  is the unique maximizing filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  up to scaling.

For any such filtration  $f'$ , we have seen that the leading term of  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D$  is given by

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D = \frac{\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} m \cdot \frac{-\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}} \cdot m^2 \right)}}$$

If some of the weights are positive, then setting them to 0 increases the numerator and decreases the denominator in the formula above. Hence setting all positive weights to 0 defines another filtration  $f''$  with bigger numerical invariant, and equality  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') = \nu^{(\delta)}(f'')$  holds if and only if all nonzero weights were negative to begin with. Therefore we can reduce to showing the claim in the case when all nonzero weights of  $f'$  are negative. The formula above then reads

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D = \frac{\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{m < 0} \left( (-m) \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}} \right) \cdot \left( \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}}} \right)}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{m < 0} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}'_m/\mathcal{F}'_{m+1}} \cdot (-m)^2 \right)}}$$

An application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality shows that  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D \leq \frac{\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'_0}}$  with equality if and only if there is a single jump point with negative index. Therefore, up to scaling we can reduce to the case when

$$\mathcal{F}'_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{F}'_0 & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } 0 > m \end{cases}$$

and so  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f')_D = \frac{\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'_0}}$ . Since  $\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}$  is the unique saturated subsheaf containing  $\text{Im}(\beta)$ , we have  $\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}} \subset \mathcal{F}'_0$ . It follows that the inequality

$$\frac{\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}}} = \nu^{(\delta)}(f) \leq \nu^{(\delta)}(f') = \frac{\delta_D}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \cdot \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'_0}}$$

implies  $\mathcal{F}'_0 = \text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}$ , and so  $f' = f$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\deg(\delta) \geq d$ . Suppose that  $\delta > 0$ . For any  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ , let  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  denote the open substack of  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable pairs with Hilbert polynomial  $P$ . Then,*

- (1)  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  does not depend on the choice of  $\delta$ .
- (2)  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  is represented by an algebraic space that is proper and of finite presentation over  $S$ .

*Proof.* Proposition 6.5 (ii) shows that  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  does not depend on  $\delta$ . In fact, the explicit description of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  shows that it coincides with the quotient husk functor  $\text{QHusk}_P(\mathcal{A})$  defined by Kollár in [Kol09]. Part (2) follows from [Kol09, Thm. 10].  $\square$

**Remark 6.7.** *When  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_X$  and  $d = 1$ , the space  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^1(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  described above recovers the moduli space of stable pairs in the sense of Pandharipande-Thomas [PT09].*

For the rest of this section we will focus on the case when  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . These cases can yield more interesting  $\Theta$ -stratifications.

**6.3. HN boundedness for pairs.** As preparation for the proof of HN boundedness, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Assume that  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  be a field-valued point of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ , and let  $f$  be a nondegenerate filtration such that  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f) > 0$ . Then there is another nondegenerate filtration  $f'$  with  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  that corresponds to an unweighted filtration  $0 \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(q)} \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(q-1)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$  with associated graded sheaves  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i := \mathcal{G}_{(i)}/\mathcal{G}_{(i+1)}$  such that either*

- (1)  $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) = \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) + \delta_{d-1}/\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$  for all  $i$ , or
- (2)  $\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_q) > \cdots > \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{j+1}) > \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{j-1}) > \cdots > \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_0) \geq \widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$ ,

*In the second case (2),  $j$  denotes the largest index such that  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{G}_{(j)}$ , and  $\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$  (resp.  $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$ ) denotes the maximum (resp. minimum) slope among the graded pieces of the Gieseker-Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Moreover,*

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_j) = \frac{1}{\text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_j}} \cdot \left( \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i \neq j} \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i} \cdot \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) \right).$$

*Proof.* Any filtration  $f_{\vec{w}}$  of the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is given by an unweighted filtration

$$0 \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(q)} \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(q-1)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$$

along with a choice of integer weights  $\vec{w} := (w_i)_{i=0}^q$  satisfying  $w_0 < \cdots < w_q$  and  $w_j \geq 0$ , where  $j$  is the largest index such that  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{G}_{(j)}$ . By the definition of the numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ , we have

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f_{\vec{w}}) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^q w_i \cdot \left( \overline{p}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i}}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{i=0}^q \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i} \cdot w_i^2 \right)}}$$

The Laurent polynomial  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f_{\vec{w}})$  has degree at most  $d - 1$ . Let us denote by  $\nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}})$  and  $\delta_{d-1}$  the coefficient of degree  $d - 1$  in  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f_{\vec{w}})$  and  $\delta_{d-1}$  respectively. By the formula above,

we have

$$(9) \quad \nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}}) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^q w_i \cdot \left( \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) - \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}|X_t}} - \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}|X_t) \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i}}{\sqrt{\left( \sum_{i=0}^q \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i} \cdot w_i^2 \right)}}$$

This formula makes sense if we take  $\vec{w}$  to be a tuple of real numbers, so we regard it as a function  $\nu_{d-1} : \mathbb{R}^{q+1} \setminus 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $\nu_{d-1}$  is continuous and scale invariant. We will use the general fact that for any vector  $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1}$  and positive definite matrix  $B$ , the function  $\nu(\vec{w}) = (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{u}) / \sqrt{\vec{w} \cdot B \vec{w}}$  is strictly quasi-concave on the subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{q+1} \setminus 0$  where  $\nu > 0$  [HL21, Lemma 4.1.15]. By this we mean that for any linearly independent vectors  $\vec{w}_1$  and  $\vec{w}_2$  such that  $\nu(\vec{w}_i) > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , one has  $\nu(t\vec{w}_1 + (1-t)\vec{w}_2) > \min(\nu(\vec{w}_1), \nu(\vec{w}_2))$  for  $t \in (0, 1)$ .

Suppose that the filtration  $f$  given in the statement has underlying unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{G}_\bullet$ . We shall show that one can produce the required filtration  $f'$  satisfying (1) or (2) by a process deleting steps in the underlying unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{G}_\bullet$  and changing the weights  $\vec{w}$ . Because we are only interested in weights up to scaling by a positive integer, and  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  is invariant under scaling, it suffices to construct  $f'$  as an  $\mathbb{R}$ -weighted filtration then observe a posteriori that  $f'$  has rational weights.

If  $\nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}}) \leq 0$  for all choices of  $\vec{w}$  in the cone of weights

$$C_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet} := \{ \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1} \mid w_0 < \dots < w_q \text{ and } w_j \geq 0 \},$$

then  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f_{\vec{w}}) > 0$  implies that  $\nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}}) = 0$ . In this case, you must have the coefficient of each  $w_i$  vanish in (9), or else you could perturb the  $w_i$  so that  $\nu_{d-1}(f) > 0$ . Thus  $f$  itself satisfies condition (1) of the lemma.

Otherwise, assume for the moment that there exists a  $\vec{w}^*$  that maximizes  $\nu_{d-1}$  on  $C_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet}$  and such that  $\nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}^*}) > 0$ . This means that either: (A)  $w_j^* > 0$  and the weights are an unconstrained local max of  $\nu_{d-1}$  on all of  $\mathbb{R}^{q+1} \setminus 0$ ; or (B) the weights are an unconstrained local max of  $\nu_{d-1}$  on the subspace  $\{w_j = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{q+1} \setminus 0$ . Either way, the critical point equations imply that

$$(10) \quad w_i^* = Q \cdot \left( \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) - \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) \right)$$

for some positive rational number  $Q$  and all  $i \neq j$ . The weight  $w_j^*$  is either 0 in case (B) or is given by the same formula (10) in case (A). Therefore this maximizer occurs at a rational point. It is unique because  $\nu_{d-1}$  is strictly quasi-concave. Thus if the original weights of  $f$  are not a multiple of this maximizer  $\vec{w}^*$ , then  $\nu_{d-1}(f) < \nu_{d-1}(f_{\vec{w}^*})$ , so we can set  $f' = f_{\vec{w}^*}$ . The inequalities in condition (2) of the lemma now follow from combining the explicit formula for  $w_i^*$  in terms of  $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i)$  and the hypothesis that  $w_0^* < \dots < w_q^*$ .

In general,  $\nu_{d-1}$  does not achieve a maximum on  $C_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet}$ . However if we denote by  $\overline{C}_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet}$  the closure of  $C_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{q+1}$ , then the continuous function  $\nu_{d-1}$  must achieve a maximum on the compact space  $(\overline{C}_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet} \setminus 0) / \mathbb{R}_{>0}^\times$  but it must achieve a maximum on the compact space  $(\overline{C}_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet} \setminus 0) / \mathbb{R}_{>0}^\times$  because  $\nu_{d-1}$  is continuous. In particular  $\nu_{d-1}$  must attain a global maximum at some point of  $\overline{C}_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet} \setminus 0$ , which is unique up to scaling because of the strict quasi-concavity of  $\nu_{d-1}$ . If this maximizer does not lie in  $C_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet}$ , then it must lie on one of the boundary components where  $w_i = w_{i+1}$ . The restriction of  $\nu_{d-1}$  to this boundary component can be identified with the formula (9) on the cone of weights  $C_{\mathcal{G}'_\bullet}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}'_\bullet$  is the unweighted filtration obtained from  $\mathcal{G}_\bullet$  by deleting the  $i^{\text{th}}$  step. Hence after deleting finitely many steps we get an unweighted filtration  $\mathcal{G}'_\bullet$  such that  $\nu_{d-1}$  does admit a maximum  $\vec{w}^*$  on  $C_{\mathcal{G}'_\bullet}$ . We have already shown that the resulting filtration  $f'_{\vec{w}^*}$  satisfies the condition (2) of the lemma.

Furthermore,  $f'_{\vec{w}^*}$  maximizes  $\nu_{d-1}$  on  $\overline{C}_{\mathcal{G}_\bullet} \setminus 0$  by construction, so  $\nu_{d-1}(f) < \nu_{d-1}(f'_{\vec{w}^*})$ , which in turn implies  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f) \leq \nu^{(\delta)}(f'_{\vec{w}^*})$ .

The inequalities with  $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$  follow from the fact that  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_0$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_q$  are pure quotients and subobjects of  $\mathcal{F}$  respectively. Finally, the formula for  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{G}_j)$  follows from the additivity of Hilbert polynomials.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.9** (HN-boundedness). *Fix  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . Let  $T$  be an affine Noetherian scheme. Let  $g : T \rightarrow \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . Then there exists a quasicompact open substack  $\mathcal{U}_T$  of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  satisfying the following: For all geometric points  $t \in T$  and all  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -destabilizing filtrations  $f$  of  $g(t)$ , there exists a nondegenerate filtration  $f'$  of  $g(t)$  with  $f'|_0 \in \mathcal{U}_T$  and  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$ .*

*Proof.* The natural forgetful map  $\text{Forget} : \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is of finite type by Proposition 2.14. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 5.5, it suffices to show that there is a quasicompact open substack  $\mathcal{W}_T$  of  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  such that for all destabilizing filtrations  $f$  for a pair  $g(t)$  as in the statement of this proposition we can find a filtration  $f'$  such that  $\text{Forget}(f'|_0) \in \mathcal{W}_T$  and  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$ .

The morphism  $T \rightarrow \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  is represented by a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  consisting of a  $T$ -pure sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_T$  and a morphism  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . Lemma 5.4 shows that it is sufficient to find a uniform lower bound  $C$  such that for all  $t \in T$  and all destabilizing filtrations  $f$  of the pair  $(\mathcal{F}_{X_t}, \beta_{X_t})$ , there exists another filtration  $f' = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  satisfying  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}$  and  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}) \leq C$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

By Lemma 6.8, we can always find a filtration  $f'$  with  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f') \geq \nu^{(\delta)}(f)$  and such that for all  $i \neq j$  the associated graded piece  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i$  satisfies either

- (1)  $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) = \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_t) + \delta_{d-1}/\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ , or
- (2)  $\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_t) \geq \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) \geq \widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\mathcal{F}_t)$ .

Since the family  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is bounded, either case yields uniform upper and lower bounds for  $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i)$  if  $i \neq j$ . The slope of the remaining associated graded piece  $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_j$  can be bounded using the formula

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_j) = \frac{1}{\text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_j}} \cdot \left( \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \cdot \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}_t) - \sum_{i \neq j} \text{rk}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i} \cdot \widehat{\mu}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_i) \right)$$

from Lemma 6.8, because we have established that all the terms in the right-hand side admit uniform upper and lower bounds.  $\square$

#### 6.4. $\Theta$ -stratifications on $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ .

**Theorem 6.10.** *Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . The invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  defines a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification of the stack  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . If the scheme  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  defines a  $\Theta$ -stratification.*

*Proof.* We use Theorem 2.26 (1). By Theorem 6.4, the invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone. On the other hand Proposition 6.9 implies that  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  satisfies the HN-boundedness condition.  $\square$

In particular, every unstable pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  defined over a field admits (after maybe passing to a purely inseparable field extension) a canonical filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  that maximizes the numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ . Such canonical filtrations are unique up to scaling the weights.

One interesting feature of the “nonabelian” moduli problem  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  is that the canonical filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  need not be convex with respect to the numerical invariant. This is illustrated by the following example.

**Example 6.11.** Set  $\delta = 0$ . Let  $X = \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}$ . Set  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}(5) \oplus \mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}$ . We define  $\beta : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  to be the inclusion into the last component. Then, the canonical filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  is given up to scaling by

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } m > 3 \\ \mathcal{O}(5) & \text{for } 3 \geq m > 0 \\ \mathcal{O}(5) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \text{for } 0 \geq m > -1 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{for } -1 > m \end{cases}$$

The associated graded pieces are  $\mathcal{O}(5)$  in weight 3,  $\mathcal{O}$  in weight 0, and  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  in weight  $-1$ .

This phenomenon (i.e. nonconvexity of canonical filtrations) does not arise for the moduli stacks  $\text{Coh}^d(X)$  and  $\Lambda\text{Coh}^d(X)$ .

**Remark 6.12.** We note, however, that the canonical filtration of a pair is always “nearly convex”. More precisely, one can modify the proof of Lemma 6.8 (possibly replacing  $\nu_{d-1}$  with a lower order term) to see that the numerical invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  of the graded pieces  $\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}$  will form a convex sequence except possibly at  $\mathcal{F}_0/\mathcal{F}_1$ .

**Remark 6.13.** The canonical filtration coming from the  $\Theta$ -stratification agree with the Harder-Narasimhan filtration for Bradlow pairs in the case of rank 2, as defined in [Tha94].

In higher rank, we find a definition of Harder-Narasimhan filtrations for Bradlow pairs in [Moc09, 3.3.2]. It is interesting to note that our canonical filtration does not necessarily agree with Mochizuki’s Harder-Narasimhan filtration when the rank is bigger than 2. As an example, take Example 6.11 for some constant  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ .

**6.5. Moduli spaces for pairs.** Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\deg(\delta) \leq d-1$ . Since the invariant  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  induces a weak  $\Theta$ -stratification, it follows that the locus of  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable pairs is an open substack of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . We denote this open substack by  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$ . For each rational polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ , we set  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu_P^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  to be the open and closed substack of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  parametrizing  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable points such that the underlying pure sheaf has Hilbert polynomial  $P$ .

**Proposition 6.14.** Assume that  $\deg(\delta) \leq d-1$ . The stack  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu_P^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}$  is quasicompact.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.14, the forgetful morphism  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X) \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is quasicompact. Hence it suffices to show that the image of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu_P^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}} \rightarrow \text{Coh}^d(X)$  is quasicompact. Let  $k$  be a field and let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta) \in \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu_P^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}}(k)$ . We want to show that  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to a fixed bounded family relative to  $S$ . By Noetherian approximation and [Lan04, Thm. 4.4], it suffices to show that there exists a uniform upper bound  $\mu_0$  such that every proper saturated subsheaf  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  satisfies  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mu_0$ .

Let  $\delta_{d-1}$  denote the coefficient of  $n^{d-1}$  in the Laurent polynomial  $\delta$ . Note that the slope  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F})$  and rank  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}$  are fixed, since they only depend on  $P$ . We claim that  $\mu_0 = \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}}$  is a valid upper bound. To see this, let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  be a proper saturated subsheaf. Consider the filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of the pair given by

$$\mathcal{F}_m := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > 1 \\ \mathcal{E} & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } 0 \leq m \end{cases}$$

Then we have  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}} \cdot (\overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}})$ . The leading coefficient in degree  $d-1$  is given by

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f)_{d-1} = \sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}} \cdot \left( \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{E}) - \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) \right)$$

Since  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is semistable, we must have  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f)_{d-1} \leq 0$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}}$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.15.** *Suppose that  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . Choose a Hilbert polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . Suppose that the scheme  $S$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Then the stack  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}$  admits a proper good moduli space over  $S$ .*

*Proof.* We use Theorem 2.26 (2). First,  $\nu^{(\delta)}$  is strictly  $\Theta$ -monotone and strictly  $S$ -monotone by Theorem 6.4. HN boundedness follows from Proposition 6.9. On the other hand, Proposition 6.14 implies that the stack  $\text{Pair}_P^{\nu^{(\delta)\text{-ss}}$  is quasicompact.

We are only left to check that  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$  satisfies the existence part of the valuative criterion for properness. Let  $R$  be a complete discrete valuation ring over  $S$  with fraction field  $K$  and uniformizer  $\varpi \in R$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  be a pair on  $X_K$ . By Proposition 5.20, we can extend  $\mathcal{F}$  to a  $R$ -pure sheaf  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$  of dimension  $d$  on  $X_R$ . Since  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is  $R$ -flat, for any  $n \geq 0$  we have an inclusion  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \varpi^{-n} \cdot \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$  that restricts to an isomorphism on the generic fiber  $X_K$ . The morphism  $\beta : \mathcal{A}|_{X_K} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  extends to a morphism  $\widetilde{\beta} : \mathcal{A}_{X_R} \rightarrow \varpi^{-n} \cdot \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$  for some  $n \gg 0$ . The resulting pair  $(\varpi^{-n} \cdot \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \widetilde{\beta})$  on  $X_R$  extends  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 6.16.** *The same proof as in Proposition 6.5 (i) shows that the  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable locus is empty whenever  $\delta < 0$ . Hence, we can restrict our attention to  $\delta \geq 0$  for the purposes of studying the moduli space.*

**Example 6.17.** *If  $\delta = 0$ , then a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable if and only if the sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is Gieseker semistable. Indeed, given any destabilizing filtration  $f$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  we can obtain a filtration  $f'$  of the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  by shifting the weights so that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  contains the image of  $\beta$ . Since  $\nu^{(0)}$  remains unchanged after shifting weights,  $f'$  is a destabilizing filtration for the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ .*

*Using the scaling action on  $\mathcal{F}$ , one can show that every such semistable pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  contains the semistable pair  $(\mathcal{F}, 0)$  in its closure. This shows that the moduli space of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\delta\text{-ss}}$  agrees with the moduli space of Gieseker semistable pure sheaves on  $X$ .*

We next give an alternative description of  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistability in this case when  $\delta > 0$ . This shows that our stability condition is analogous to the notion of  $\delta$ -stability for coherent systems considered by Le Potier [LP93]. See also [Wan15] for a formulation that is closer to ours.

**Proposition 6.18.** *Suppose that  $\deg(\delta) \leq d - 1$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  be a field-valued point of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)$ . Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}[n, n^{-1}]$  with  $\delta > 0$ . Then  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f)$ -semistable if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied*

- (a)  $\beta \neq 0$ .
- (b) All proper saturated subsheaves  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}} & \text{if } \text{Im}(\beta) \not\subset \mathcal{E} \\ \overline{p}_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \overline{p}_{\mathcal{E}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}} & \text{if } \text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{E} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* [*semistability*  $\Rightarrow$  (a) + (b)]: Suppose that (a) is not satisfied, so  $\beta = 0$ . Then the filtration  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  given by

$$\mathcal{F}_m := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > -1 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } -1 \geq m \end{cases}$$

is a destabilizing filtration for the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ .

On the other hand, suppose that (b) is not satisfied. Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  be a proper saturated sheaf violating condition (b) above. We show that  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is unstable in each case.

(C1) Assume that  $\text{Im}(\beta) \not\subset \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  denote the filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > 1 \\ \mathcal{E} & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } 0 \geq m \end{cases}$$

Then we have  $\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{(\bar{p}_{\mathcal{E}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}}{\sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}}}$ . By assumption this is strictly positive, and hence  $f$  is a destabilizing filtration.

(C2) Assume that  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  denote the filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > 0 \\ \mathcal{E} & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \mathcal{F} & \text{if } 0 > m \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{(-\bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} + \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}}}{\sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}}}}$$

Note that this can be rewritten as follows.

$$\nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}}{\sqrt{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}}}} \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{E}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{E}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right)$$

By assumption this is strictly positive. Therefore  $f$  is a destabilizing filtration. This concludes the “only if” direction.

[(a) + (b)  $\Rightarrow$  semistability]:

Suppose that  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  satisfies conditions (a) and (b) in the statement of the proposition. Let  $f = (\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a filtration of  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$ . We shall show that  $f$  is not destabilizing. By definition, the numerical invariant is given by

$$(11) \quad \nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2)}} \cdot \left( \sum_{m \geq 1} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} + \sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \right)$$

Two applications of summation by parts produce the following two equalities.

$$(12) \quad \sum_{m \geq 1} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} = \sum_{m \geq 1} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}$$

$$\sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} m \cdot \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} = - \sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}$$

We can use (12) to rewrite the summations appearing in formula (11). This yields

$$(13) \quad \nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2)}} \cdot \left( \sum_{m \geq 1} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} + \sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \right)$$

Let us further rewrite the terms in the second summation appearing in (13) above. For each  $m \leq -1$ , we have  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{F}_{m+1}$ . Since  $\beta \neq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq 0$ . If in addition  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}$ , then we have

$$(14) \quad - \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} = \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}$$

Using (14), we rewrite equation (13) as

$$(15) \quad \nu^{(\delta)}(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m/\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \cdot m^2)}} \cdot \left( \sum_{m \geq 1} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} + \sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \right)$$

In order to see that  $f$  is not destabilizing, we shall show that each term in the two summations appearing in (15) is  $\leq 0$ .

1. We show  $\sum_{m \leq -1, \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \leq 0$ . For all  $m \leq -1$  with  $\mathcal{F}_{m+1} \neq \mathcal{F}$ , we know that  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{F}_{m+1} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore, by condition (b), we have

$$\left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_{m+1}} \leq 0$$

for each term in the sum.

2. We show  $\sum_{m \geq 1} \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq 0$ . Let  $m \geq 1$ . If  $\text{Im}(\beta) \not\subset \mathcal{F}_m$ , then condition (b) implies that

$$\left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq 0,$$

On the other hand if  $\text{Im}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{F}_m$ , then we know that  $\mathcal{F}_m \neq 0$  and

$$\left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq 0$$

Using the fact that  $\delta > 0$ , we get the chain of inequalities

$$\left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq \left( \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}_m} + \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m}} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\delta}{\text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}}} \right) \cdot \text{rk}_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq 0$$

thus concluding the proof. □

We proceed to give a few examples of the moduli spaces  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_{\delta}^{ss,P}$ .

**Example 6.19.**

- (1) Suppose that  $\delta > 0$  with  $\deg(\delta) \leq -1$ . In this case Proposition 6.18 implies that a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta)$  is  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -semistable if and only if  $\beta \neq 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is Gieseker semistable. The resulting moduli space of  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)^{\nu^{(\delta)}\text{-ss}}$  is projective over the moduli space of Gieseker semistable pure sheaves on  $X$ .
- (2) Fix the choice of a Hilbert polynomial  $P$ . We restrict to the moduli stack  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  parametrizing pairs with Hilbert polynomial  $P$ . Let  $\delta$  be a positive (constant) rational number. If  $\delta$  is small enough, then Proposition 6.18 implies that a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \beta) \in \text{Pair}_{\mathcal{A}}^d(X)_P$  is semistable if and only if  $\beta \neq 0$ , the sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is Gieseker semistable, and all proper subsheaves  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  with  $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{E}} = \bar{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  satisfy  $\text{Im}(\beta) \not\subset \mathcal{E}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  is Gieseker semistable with the same reduced Hilbert polynomial as  $\mathcal{F}$ , then this last condition is equivalent to requiring that  $\mathcal{F}/\text{Im}(\beta)^{\text{sat}}$  is Gieseker stable.
- (3) Suppose that  $S = \text{Spec}(k)$  for a field  $k$ . Let  $X$  be a smooth projective geometrically connected curve over  $k$ , equipped with the choice of a polarization  $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ . Set  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_X$  and take  $d = 1$ . Then  $\text{Pair}_{\mathcal{O}_X}^1(X)$  is the stack classifying vector bundles on  $X$  along with the choice of a section. We can take  $\delta$  to be a constant in  $\mathbb{Q}$ . If  $\delta > 0$ , then Proposition 6.18 shows that  $\nu^{(\delta)}$ -stability coincides with stability for Bradlow pairs as considered by Thaddeus in his work on the Verlinde formula [Tha94]<sup>4</sup>. Therefore we recover the moduli space of  $\delta$ -semistable Bradlow pairs.

<sup>4</sup>Using the notation in [Tha94], the precise comparison is  $\delta = 2\sigma$ .



## REFERENCES

- [AB83] M. F. Atiyah and R. Bott. The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 308(1505):523–615, 1983.
- [AHLH19a] Jarod Alper, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Jochen Heinloth. Cartan-Iwahori-Matsumoto decompositions for reductive groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.00128>, 2019.
- [AHLH19b] Jarod Alper, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Jochen Heinloth. Existence of moduli spaces for algebraic stacks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01128>, 2019.
- [Alp13] Jarod Alper. Good moduli spaces for Artin stacks. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 63(6):2349–2402, 2013.
- [BD] A. Beilinson and V. Drinfeld. Quantization of Hitchin’s integrable system and Hecke eigensheaves. Available at <http://math.uchicago.edu/~drinfeld/langlands/QuantizationHitchin.pdf>.
- [BD91] Steven B. Bradlow and Georgios D. Daskalopoulos. Moduli of stable pairs for holomorphic bundles over Riemann surfaces. *Internat. J. Math.*, 2(5):477–513, 1991.
- [Bei78] A. A. Beilinson. Coherent sheaves on  $\mathbb{P}^n$  and problems in linear algebra. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 12(3):68–69, 1978.
- [BGPG04] Steven B. Bradlow, Oscar García-Prada, and Peter B. Gothen. Moduli spaces of holomorphic triples over compact Riemann surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 328(1-2):299–351, 2004.
- [BLM<sup>+</sup>19] Arend Bayer, Martí Lahoz, Emanuele Macrì, Howard Nuer, Alexander Perry, and Paolo Stellari. Stability conditions in families. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.08184v3>, 2019.
- [BM14] Arend Bayer and Emanuele Macrì. MMP for moduli of sheaves on K3s via wall-crossing: nef and movable cones, Lagrangian fibrations. *Invent. Math.*, 198(3):505–590, 2014.
- [Don85] S. K. Donaldson. Anti self-dual Yang-Mills connections over complex algebraic surfaces and stable vector bundles. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 50(1):1–26, 1985.
- [Gai13] Dennis Gaitsgory. Contractibility of the space of rational maps. *Invent. Math.*, 191(1):91–196, 2013.
- [GHLH21] Eduardo Gonzalez, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Andres Fernandez Herrero.  $\Theta$ -stratifications of the moduli of gauged maps, 2021. In preparation.
- [GHZ21] Tomás L. Gómez, Andres Fernandez Herrero, and Alfonso Zamora. The moduli stack of  $\rho$ -sheaves, 2021. In preparation.
- [Gie77] D. Gieseker. On the moduli of vector bundles on an algebraic surface. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 106(1):45–60, 1977.
- [GN14] Sudarshan Gurjar and Nitin Nitsure. Schematic Harder-Narasimhan stratification for families of principal bundles and  $\Lambda$ -modules. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 124(3):315–332, 2014.
- [Gro66] A. Grothendieck. Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (28):255, 1966.
- [GS03] T. L. Gómez and I. Sols. Stable tensors and moduli space of orthogonal sheaves. <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0103150>, 2003.
- [GSZ15] T. L. Gómez, Ignacio Sols, and A. Zamora. A GIT interpretation of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 28(1):169–190, 2015.
- [HL97] Daniel Huybrechts and Manfred Lehn. *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves*. Aspects of Mathematics, E31. Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1997.
- [HL18] Daniel Halpern-Leistner. On the structure of instability in moduli theory. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0627>, 2018. ArXiv version.
- [HL21] Daniel Halpern-Leistner. On the structure of instability in moduli theory, 2021. Available at [https://pi.math.cornell.edu/~danielhl/theta\\_stability\\_2019\\_10\\_13.pdf](https://pi.math.cornell.edu/~danielhl/theta_stability_2019_10_13.pdf).
- [HN75] G. Harder and M. S. Narasimhan. On the cohomology groups of moduli spaces of vector bundles on curves. *Math. Ann.*, 212:215–248, 1974/75.
- [Hos18] Victoria Hoskins. Stratifications for moduli of sheaves and moduli of quiver representations. *Algebr. Geom.*, 5(6):650–685, 2018.
- [Huy06] D. Huybrechts. *Fourier-Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
- [KM76] Finn Faye Knudsen and David Mumford. The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. I. Preliminaries on “det” and “Div”. *Math. Scand.*, 39(1):19–55, 1976.
- [Kol09] János Kollár. Hulls and husks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0805.0576>, 2009.
- [Lan04] Adrian Langer. Semistable sheaves in positive characteristic. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 159(1):251–276, 2004.
- [LP93] Joseph Le Potier. Systèmes cohérents et structures de niveau. *Astérisque*, (214):143, 1993.
- [LWX21] Yinbang Lin, Sz-Sheng Wang, and Bingyu Xia. Decorated sheaves and morphisms in tilted hearts. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.12618>, 2021.
- [Mar78] Masaki Maruyama. Moduli of stable sheaves. II. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 18(3):557–614, 1978.

- [Moc09] Takuro Mochizuki. *Donaldson type invariants for algebraic surfaces*, volume 1972 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Transition of moduli stacks.
- [Muk84] Shigeru Mukai. Symplectic structure of the moduli space of sheaves on an abelian or  $K3$  surface. *Invent. Math.*, 77(1):101–116, 1984.
- [MV00] Ivan Mirković and Kari Vilonen. Perverse sheaves on affine Grassmannians and Langlands duality. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 7(1):13–24, 2000.
- [Nit05] Nitin Nitsure. Construction of Hilbert and Quot schemes. In *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, volume 123 of *Math. Surveys Monogr.*, pages 105–137. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [Nit11] Nitin Nitsure. Schematic Harder-Narasimhan stratification. *Internat. J. Math.*, 22(10):1365–1373, 2011.
- [Ols06] Martin C. Olsson. Deformation theory of representable morphisms of algebraic stacks. *Math. Z.*, 253(1):25–62, 2006.
- [PT09] R. Pandharipande and R. P. Thomas. Curve counting via stable pairs in the derived category. *Invent. Math.*, 178(2):407–447, 2009.
- [Sch05] Alexander Schmitt. Moduli for decorated tuples of sheaves and representation spaces for quivers. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 115(1):15–49, 2005.
- [Sch08] Alexander H. W. Schmitt. *Geometric invariant theory and decorated principal bundles*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
- [Sch19] Alexander Schmitt. A general notion of coherent systems. working paper or preprint, December 2019.
- [Ses67] C. S. Seshadri. Space of unitary vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 85:303–336, 1967.
- [Sha77] Stephen S. Shatz. The decomposition and specialization of algebraic families of vector bundles. *Compositio Math.*, 35(2):163–187, 1977.
- [Sim92] Carlos T. Simpson. Higgs bundles and local systems. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (75):5–95, 1992.
- [Sim94] Carlos T. Simpson. Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety. I. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (79):47–129, 1994.
- [Sta20] The Stacks Project Authors. *Stacks Project*. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2020.
- [Tha94] Michael Thaddeus. Stable pairs, linear systems and the Verlinde formula. *Invent. Math.*, 117(2):317–353, 1994.
- [Tho00] R. P. Thomas. A holomorphic Casson invariant for Calabi-Yau 3-folds, and bundles on  $K3$  fibrations. *J. Differential Geom.*, 54(2):367–438, 2000.
- [Wan15] Malte Wandel. Moduli spaces of semistable pairs in Donaldson-Thomas theory. *Manuscripta Math.*, 147(3-4):477–500, 2015.
- [Zhu17] Xinwen Zhu. An introduction to affine Grassmannians and the geometric Satake equivalence. In *Geometry of moduli spaces and representation theory*, volume 24 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 59–154. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 310 MALOTT HALL, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14853, USA.

*Email address:* daniel.hl@cornell.edu

*Email address:* ajf254@cornell.edu

*Email address:* ttj9@cornell.edu