

# FLOPS AND HILBERT SCHEMES OF SPACE CURVE SINGULARITIES

DUILIU-EMANUEL DIACONESCU, MAURO PORTA, FRANCESCO SALA, AND ARIAN VOSOUGHINIA

ABSTRACT. Using pagoda flop transitions between smooth projective threefolds, a relation is derived between the Euler numbers of moduli spaces of stable pairs which are scheme-theoretically supported on a fixed singular space curve and Euler numbers of Flag Hilbert schemes associated to a plane curve singularity. When the space curve singularity is locally complete intersection, one obtains a relation between the latter and Euler numbers of Hilbert schemes of the space curve singularity. It is also shown that this relation yields explicit results for a class of torus-invariant locally complete intersection singularities.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Geometric setup	5
3. Semistable sheaves on the exceptional locus	11
4. $f$ -stable pairs	14
5. $C$ -framed $f$ -stable pairs	19
6. $C$ -framed wallcrossing identity	28
7. $C$ -framed flop identity	28
8. Examples and explicit results	32
Appendix A. Openness of orthogonality	41
Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 6.1	42
References	51

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The topology of punctual Hilbert schemes of plane curve singularities has been studied very intensively in the mathematical literature due to its connections with knot polynomials [CDGZ03, OS12, ORS18, Mau16] and representation theory [GORS14, Ren18, GK22]. In particular, the Oblomkov-Shende conjecture [OS12], proven by Maulik [Mau16], provides a remarkable formula relating the generating function of Euler numbers of punctual Hilbert schemes of a plane curve singularity to the HOMFLY polynomial of its link. In contrast, punctual Hilbert schemes of space curve singularities have been studied to a much lesser degree in the literature. The main result known to date is due to [BRV20], which proves that the motivic zeta function of the Hilbert of a reduced curve is rational.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 14N35; Secondary: 14D23, 14E99, 14F99.

*Key words and phrases*. Hilbert schemes, Stable pairs, Flops, Motivic Hall algebras.

The work of F. S. was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21K03197, while the work of D.-E. D. and A. V. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1802410.

The present paper aims to derive explicit results for Euler numbers of punctual Hilbert schemes of space curve singularities through flop transformations in enumerative geometry. A similar approach was employed in [Mau16] in the proof of the Oblomkov-Shende conjecture, as well as in [Tod15] for punctual Hilbert schemes of Kleinian surface singularities of type A.

### 1.1. Main results. Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^+ & \overset{\phi}{\dashrightarrow} & Y^- \\ & \searrow f^+ & \swarrow f^- \\ & X & \end{array}, \quad (1.1)$$

be a flop transition between smooth projective complex threefolds, where  $X$  has a unique singular point  $\nu \in X$  so that the scheme-theoretic exceptional loci  $\Sigma^\pm := (f^\pm)^{-1}(\nu)$  are smooth connected  $(0, -2)$ -curves on  $Y^\pm$ . Motivated by [Rei83, Proposition 5.10], in the present framework it will be assumed that  $\Sigma^+ \subset Y^+$  satisfies the conditions stated in Assumption II. In particular, this implies that there exists a unique chain of scheme-theoretic thickenings

$$\Sigma^+ = \Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma_2 \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_n$$

whose structure sheaves fit in exact sequences of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_i} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{i+1}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma^+} \longrightarrow 0,$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . In addition, let  $W \subset X$  be a smooth connected Weil divisor containing the singular point, and let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^+ & \overset{\phi_S}{\dashrightarrow} & S^- \\ & \searrow f_{S^+} & \swarrow f_{S^-} \\ & W & \end{array}$$

be its strict transforms under the two contractions. Suppose the canonical projection  $f_{S^+}: S^+ \rightarrow W$  is an isomorphism and  $S^+$  intersects  $\Sigma^+$  transversely at a single point  $p$ . Furthermore, suppose  $S^-$  is reduced irreducible, with a zero-dimensional singular locus.

Let  $C \subset W$  be a reduced irreducible plane curve so that  $\nu \in C^{\text{sing}}$  and let  $C^\pm \subset S^\pm$  be its strict transforms. Under the current assumptions the natural projection  $C^+ \rightarrow C$  is an isomorphism and  $p \in (C^+)^{\text{sing}}$  is the only point of intersection of  $C^+$  and  $\Sigma^+$ . On the other hand,  $C^- \subset S^-$  is a reduced irreducible closed subscheme which intersects  $\Sigma^-$  at finitely many points  $q_1, \dots, q_d$ . Note that  $(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C)$  is the scheme-theoretic union of two irreducible components:

$$(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C) = C^- \cup Z_\Sigma,$$

where  $(Z_\Sigma)_{\text{red}} = \Sigma$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  be the multiplicity of  $Z_\Sigma$  along  $\Sigma$  at the generic point.

Now, let  $T_n$  be the scheme-theoretic intersection of  $\Sigma_n$  and  $S^+$  in  $Y^+$ . Let  $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$  be the nested Hilbert scheme parametrizing flags of ideal sheaves  $\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_{C^+}$  so that the ideal  $\mathcal{I}_1$  has colength  $k$  and  $\mathcal{I}_2/\mathcal{I}_1$  is the pushforward of a length  $m$  zero-dimensional sheaf on  $T_n$ . Let also  $\text{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; m)$  be the inverse image of the punctual Hilbert scheme  $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+) \subset \text{Hilb}^k(C^+)$  via the forgetful morphisms  $(\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{I}_2) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_1$ .

On the other hand, let  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-)$  be the moduli space of  $C^-$ -framed Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on  $Y$  as introduced in [Mau16], i.e, the moduli space of pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  with  $\mathcal{F}$  a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $Y^-$ , which is scheme-theoretically supported on  $C^-$ , and  $s: \mathcal{O}_{Y^-} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  a generically surjective section. Let  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k)$  denote its open and closed component defined by  $\chi(\text{Coker}(s)) = k$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq d$ , let  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-, q_i}(Y^-; k) \subset \mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k)$  be the reduced closed subscheme defined by the condition that  $\text{Coker}(s)$  is set-theoretically supported at  $q_i$ . Then, the first main result of this paper is:

**Theorem A.** *The following identity for generating functions of Euler numbers holds:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; c)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_{C^-, q_i}(Y^-; k)) q^k.$$

Furthermore, let  $\mathrm{Hilb}_{q_i}^k(C^-)$  be the punctual Hilbert scheme parametrizing length  $k$  zero-dimensional subschemes of  $C^-$ , set-theoretically supported at  $q_i$ . Then Theorem A yields the following result via [PT10, Proposition B.5].

**Theorem B.** *Assume that  $C^-$  has locally complete intersection singularities. Then, the following identity for generating functions of Euler numbers holds:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; c)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{Hilb}_{q_i}^k(C^-)) q^k.$$

**1.2. Strategy of the proof.** The proof of Theorem A uses in an essential way the notion of  $f$ -stable pairs introduced by Bryan and Steinberg [BS16] for a smooth crepant resolution of threefold singularities  $f: Y \rightarrow X$ . This datum determines a torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  on the abelian category of coherent sheaves on  $Y$ , where the torsion part  $\mathcal{T}_f$  is the full subcategory of sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  so that  $\mathbb{R}f_* \mathcal{F}$  is isomorphic to a zero-dimensional sheaf in  $D^b(X)$ . An  $f$ -stable pair is then a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$ , with  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  a section, so that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a one dimensional sheaf in  $\mathcal{F}_f$  and  $\mathrm{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_f$ .

In the present case, the construction of [BS16] is applied to the contraction  $f^+: Y^+ \rightarrow X$  in diagram (1.1). As shown in §4.4, flat families of  $f^+$ -stable pairs with fixed topological invariants

$$\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C^+] + m[\Sigma^+] \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\mathcal{F}) = n, \quad (1.2)$$

form an algebraic space of finite type  $f^+ \text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y^+; m, n)$ . As in [BS16], let  $f\text{-PT}(Y^+)$  denote the associated generating function of topological Euler numbers. Then [BS16, Theorem 6] yields the identity

$$f\text{-PT}(Y^+) = \frac{\mathrm{DT}(Y^+)}{\mathrm{DT}_{\mathrm{ex}}(Y^+)},$$

where  $\mathrm{DT}(Y^+)$  is the generating function of Donaldson-Thomas invariants of  $Y^+$ , while  $\mathrm{DT}_{\mathrm{ex}}(Y^+)$  denotes its truncation to curve classes supported on the exceptional locus. Although this is proven in *loc. cit.* for Behrend function invariants, assuming  $Y^+$  to be  $K$ -trivial, the proof applies verbatim to topological Euler number invariants as long as the morphism  $Y^+ \rightarrow X$  is crepant. The study of enumerative invariants in this setting has been investigated also in [Pă21].<sup>1</sup>

By analogy to [DHS12, Mau16], an arbitrary pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$  will be said to be  $C^+$  framed if  $\mathcal{F}$  fits into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{C^+} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$  is set theoretically supported on  $\Sigma^+$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{C^+}$  is the pushforward of a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $C^+$ . This notion applies both to Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs [PT09], as well as  $f^+$ -stable pairs. As shown in [Mau16] and §5.4, for fixed topological invariants (1.2), the resulting moduli spaces,  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^+}(Y^+; m, n)$  and  $f^+ \text{-}\mathcal{SP}_{C^+}(Y^+; m, n)$ , are algebraic spaces of finite type. Furthermore, an analogous construction yields a moduli space  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; m, n)$  of  $C^-$ -framed Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on  $Y^-$ .

The first step in the proof of Theorem A is the construction of an equivalence

$$f^+ \text{-}\mathcal{SP}_{C^+}(Y^+; m) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{FHilb}_{T_n}(C^+; m),$$

for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , which is carried out in Theorem 5.11 and Proposition 5.13.

<sup>1</sup>Note that in [Pă21], the author constructs a virtual fundamental class associated to the moduli stack of  $f$ -stable pairs. In §4.4, we construct a derived enhancement of the moduli stack in a canonical way.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} f\text{-PT}_C(Y) &= f\text{-PT}_C(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m, \\ \text{PT}_C(Y) &= \text{PT}_C(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m, \\ \text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y) &= \text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(\mathcal{SP}(Y; m[\Sigma], n)) q^n Q^m. \end{aligned}$$

The second step is the following:

**Theorem C** (Theorem 6.1). *The following identity holds:*

$$f\text{-PT}_C(Y) = \frac{\text{PT}_C(Y)}{\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y)}.$$

The proof of above result follows the same lines as the proof of [BS16, Theorem 6], although some intermediate arguments have to be modified in the  $C^+$ -framed setup. For completeness the details are included in Appendix B.

The final step in the proof of Theorem A is a flop identity relating  $C^\pm$ -framed topological stable pair invariants:

$$Q^c \frac{\text{PT}_{C^+}(Y^+; q, Q^{-1})}{\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y^+; q, Q^{-1})} = \frac{\text{PT}_{C^-}(Y^-; q, Q)}{\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y^-; q, Q)},$$

as stated in Proposition 7.3. The proof of this identity is completely analogous to the proof of [Mau16, Proposition 2.4].

The paper concludes with some explicit results derived in §8 for complete intersection curves of the form

$$C_{n,p,q}: \begin{cases} xv - w^n = 0 \\ x^p - v^q = 0 \end{cases},$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ , with  $n, p, q \geq 2$ , and the pairs  $(p, q)$  and  $(n, p + q)$  coprime. For any  $t, m \geq 1$ , let

$$Z_{t,m}(q, x) := \prod_{i=1}^t (1 + xq^i + \cdots + (xq^i)^m)$$

and let  $Z_{t,m}^{(k)}(q)$  denote the coefficient of  $x^k$  in  $Z_{t,m}(q, x)$ . Then for any  $r, s, n$ , with  $r > s > n \geq 2$ , let

$$Z_{r,s,n}(q) = \frac{q^s}{1 - q^s} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=s-n}^{s-m-1} q^{mr} Z_{r-1,n}^{(k)}(q).$$

**Theorem D.** *For any  $\ell \geq 0$ , let  $\text{Hilb}_o^\ell(C_{n,p,q})$  be punctual Hilbert scheme parametrizing length  $\ell$  zero-dimensional subschemes of  $C_{n,p,q}$  with support at the origin. Then*

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \chi(\text{Hilb}_o^\ell(C_{n,p,q})) q^\ell = q^{-nq(q+1)/2} Z_{p+q,qn,n}(q). \quad (1.3)$$

**Remark.** *In principle one could try to compute the left-hand-side of identity (1.3) in Theorem D directly by localization with respect to the given torus action. This approach leads to a very difficult counting problem for constrained three dimensional partitions. The above result shows that this counting problem is equivalent in a nontrivial way to a tractable counting problem for constrained two dimensional partitions.*

**1.3. Outline.** In §2, we study the general framework in which we develop the theory of ( $C$ -framed)  $f$ -stable pairs. In particular, we introduce the assumptions on a map  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  between projective threefolds and characterize the geometric implications of them. In §3, we study semistable sheaves supported on the exceptional locus and provide an explicit equivalence between their moduli stacks and the moduli stacks of certain zero-dimensional sheaves. §4 we developed the theory of  $f$ -stable pairs in our framework and the construction of their moduli stacks: since we follow an approach developed in [DPS22], we introduce a suitable torsion pair on the abelian category of coherent sheaves on the smooth threefold and we prove its openness (in the sense of Lieblich [AB13]). §5 is devoted to the introduction of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs and their moduli stacks. In addition, we provide an relation to Hilbert schemes on the curve  $C$ . In §6 and §7 we prove the main identities between generating functions of Euler numbers of moduli stacks of ( $C$ -framed)  $f$ -stable pairs, which will allow us to prove Theorems A and B. §8 is devoted to explicit examples in the toric framework. Finally the paper has two appendices. Appendix A provides a criterion to prove the openness of the torsion-free part of a torsion pair. In Appendix B we provide the detailed proof of Theorem 6.1, which is a  $C$ -framed version of the main result of [BS16].

**Acknowledgments.** The paper was finalized during a research visit of the third-named author at Kavli IPMU, the University of Tokyo. We thank the institution for providing an exceptional research environment. The first-named author would like to thank Yan Soibelman for very helpful discussions.

## 2. GEOMETRIC SETUP

In this section, we shall introduce the geometric framework over which we shall study ( $C$ -framed)  $f$ -stable pairs. In particular, we state the Assumptions we shall impose and describe the geometric consequences of them.

**2.1. Rigid  $(0, -2)$  curves on threefolds.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be irreducible projective complex threefolds and let  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  be a morphism. We shall impose the following assumptions.

### Assumption I.

- (1)  $Y$  is smooth, while  $X$  reduced and normal, and it has a unique singular point  $\nu \in X$ .
- (2) The scheme-theoretic inverse image  $\Sigma := f^{-1}(\nu)$  is a smooth connected  $(0, -2)$ -curve<sup>2</sup> on  $Y$  and  $f$  maps the complement  $Y \setminus \Sigma$  isomorphically onto  $X \setminus \{\nu\}$ .

◊

Let us denote by  $i_\Sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow Y$  the corresponding closed embedding and by  $\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$  the corresponding defining ideal.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Under the conditions stated in Assumption I, the threefold  $X$  is Gorenstein with rational singularities. Therefore the dualizing sheaf  $\omega_X$  is locally free and*

$$\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_X \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = 0 \quad \text{for } k \geq 1. \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover,  $f$  is crepant, i.e.,  $f^* \omega_X \simeq \omega_Y$ .

*Proof.* As shown in [Rei83, Remark 5.13] (see also [KM92]), the underlying complex analytic space  $X^{\text{an}}$  has a cDV singular point at  $\nu$ . Then [KM98, Theorem 5.42] shows that the singular point  $\nu \in X$  is rational. This further implies via [KM98, Theorem 5.11 and Corollary 5.11] that  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  is a rational resolution of singularities. Moreover, by [Rei80, Theorem 2.6.II],  $X$  is also Gorenstein and one has  $\omega_X \simeq f_* \omega_Y$ . Set  $\mathcal{L} := \omega_Y \otimes f^* \omega_X$ . Since  $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_X$  this implies that  $f_* \mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_Y$  are isomorphic on the complement of  $\Sigma$ . Since  $\Sigma$  has codimension two, this implies that  $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{O}_Y$ .  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>i.e.,  $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{Y/\Sigma} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2)$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_{Y/\Sigma}$  is the normal bundle of the inclusion  $\Sigma \subset Y$ .

Motivated by [Rei83, Proposition 5.10], the following conditions will be further assumed in the following.

**Assumption II.** The ideal  $\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$  associated to  $\Sigma$  admits a filtration of the form

$$0 = \mathcal{J}_{n+1} \subset \mathcal{J}_n \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \quad (2.2)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i \subset \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \subset \mathcal{J}_i, \quad \mathcal{J}_i / \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \quad \mathcal{J}_{i+1} / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2), \quad (2.3)$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and

$$\mathcal{J}_n / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_n \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(1)^{\oplus 2}. \quad (2.4)$$

◊

First, let us note that if the defining ideal of  $\Sigma$  satisfies Assumption II, the filtration is unique.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $Y$  be a smooth projective threefold and let  $\Sigma \subset Y$  be a smooth irreducible  $(0, -2)$ -curve on  $Y$ . If the defining ideal  $\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$  of  $\Sigma$  admits a filtration of the form (2.2) satisfying conditions (2.3) and (2.4), then the filtration is unique.*

To prove the proposition, we need first the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.2, we have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathbf{C}, \quad (2.5)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ , and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_n, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

*Proof.* We shall prove Formula (2.5) by using induction on  $k$ . Since  $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{J}_1 \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2)$  by assumption, the claim clearly holds for  $k=1$ . By applying  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(-, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma)$  to the canonical exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0,$$

we obtain the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_\Sigma(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_1, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{O}_Y, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ , this exact sequence yields an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_1, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma),$$

hence

$$\mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathbf{C}. \quad (2.7)$$

In order to prove the inductive step, we apply the functor  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(-, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma)$  to the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{k+1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_k \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0,$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ , yielding the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_\Sigma(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_{k+1}, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Using the inductive hypothesis and Equation (2.7), this exact sequence reduces to

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_{k+1}, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

If  $k \leq n - 2$ , one must have  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_{k+1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$ , since, by assumption, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{k+2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_{k+1} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0,$$

hence a nontrivial morphism  $\mathcal{J}_{k+1} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ . This proves the inductive step.

In order to prove (2.6), note that  $i_{\Sigma}^*(J_n/I_{\Sigma}J_n) \simeq i_{\Sigma}^*J_n$ , hence the claim follows from condition (2.4).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* The proof is inductive. Let  $\{\mathcal{J}_n\}$  and  $\{\mathcal{J}'_n\}$  be two filtrations satisfying the conditions stated by hypothesis. By construction,  $\mathcal{J}_1$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_1$  coincide with  $\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}$  as ideal sheaves in  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ . Using Formula (2.5) one obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}_2 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow \lambda \mathrm{id} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}'_2 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{\times}$ . Then the snake lemma implies that the induced morphism  $\mathcal{J}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}'_2$  is the identity. By reasoning in an analogous way, one can prove the inductive step.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* In the analytic setting, Assumption II is equivalent to the requirement that  $\Sigma$  has Reid's width equals to  $n$  – cf. [Rei83, Definition 5.3 and Proposition 5.10]. In the algebraic setting, one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\nu} \simeq \mathbb{C}[[x, y, z, w]] / (x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^{2n}),$$

where  $n$  is the Reid's width.  $\triangle$

Furthermore, one more condition will be assumed to hold, as follows.

**Assumption III.** There exists a smooth connected Weil divisor  $W \subset X$  so that its strict transform  $S \subset Y$  is a smooth connected surface intersecting  $\Sigma$  transversely at a single closed point  $p \in \Sigma$ . Moreover, the restriction  $f_S := f|_S: S \rightarrow W$  is an isomorphism.  $\otimes$

From now on, we assume that Assumptions I, II, and III hold.

**Proposition 2.5.** *One has*

$$\mathbb{R}^0 f_* i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\nu \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}^i f_* i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

for  $i \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_*(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-S)) = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

for  $i \geq 0$ , and

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_* \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

for  $i \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $f|_{Y \setminus \Sigma}: Y \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow X \setminus \{v\}$  is an isomorphism, all direct images  $\mathbb{R}^i f_*(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(aS))$  are set-theoretically supported at  $\nu$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $U \subset X$  be an affine open neighborhood of  $\nu$ , let  $Y_U := f^{-1}(U)$  and let  $f_U := f|_{Y_U}: Y_U \rightarrow U$  be the restriction of  $f$  to  $Y_U$ . Note that  $\Sigma \subset Y_U$ . Then it suffices to show that relations (2.8) and (2.9) hold for  $f_U$ . This follows from [Har77, Proposition III.8.5]. Thus, the relations (2.8) and (2.9) hold.

Let us prove the vanishing result (2.10). We have a long exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow f_* \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow f_* \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow f_* i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \dots$$

associated to the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Relations (2.1) and (2.8) imply

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_* \mathcal{I}_\Sigma = 0,$$

for  $i \geq 2$ . Moreover,  $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_X$  and the morphism  $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  is the pushforward of the canonical surjection  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ . Since  $f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \simeq \mathcal{O}_X$ , the pushforward is surjective as well. Therefore  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{I}_\Sigma = 0$ .  $\square$

For each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , let  $\Sigma_k \subset Y$  be the closed subscheme defined by the ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{I}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$  from Formula (2.2) in Assumption II. Let  $i_{\Sigma_k} : \Sigma_k \rightarrow Y$  denote the corresponding closed embedding.

**Corollary 2.6.** *For any  $1 \leq k \leq n$  one has*

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_* i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

for  $i \geq 1$ , and

$$\mathrm{Tor}_i(i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S, i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S) = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

for  $i \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* By construction, one has the exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k+1},*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k+1}} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (2.13)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ . We prove the vanishing results (2.11) and (2.12) inductively. For  $k=1$ , we have  $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma$ . Hence, we observe that it holds for  $k=1$ . Then, the inductive step follows from the exact sequence (2.13). Therefore, the first claim holds.

Since  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  is purely one-dimensional and the set theoretic intersection  $S \cap \Sigma = \{p\}$ , the second vanishing result follows immediately from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow 0.$$

The inductive step follows straightforwardly by using the short exact sequence (2.13).  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Set  $\mathcal{Q}_k := f_* i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then, each morphism*

$$\phi_k : \mathcal{Q}_k \longrightarrow f_*(i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S),$$

*determined by the canonical epimorphism  $i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \rightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S$ , is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* As a consequence of Equation (2.12), the canonical exact sequence

$$i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-S) \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*} \mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact to the left. Therefore, it suffices to prove the vanishing result

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_*(i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-S)) = 0$$

for  $i \geq 0$ . Given the exact sequence (2.13), this follows by induction from Equation (2.9).  $\square$

Since  $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_X$ , the natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ i_{\Sigma_{k+1},*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k+1}} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma_k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \end{array}$$

determines by pushforward a second commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_X & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{q_k} & \mathcal{Q}_k \end{array} \quad (2.14)$$

for all  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ .



**Corollary 2.8.** *The sheaf  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $W$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Moreover, all morphisms  $q_k$  in diagram (2.14) are surjective and  $\ker(q_k) \simeq \mathcal{O}_\nu$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $1 \leq k \leq n$  one has a natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_Y & \longrightarrow & i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \end{array},$$

where all arrows are surjective. Since the restriction  $f_S: S \rightarrow W$  is an isomorphism by assumption, this yields by pushforward a second commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_W \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_k & \xrightarrow{\phi_k} & f_*(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S) \end{array},$$

where the top horizontal arrow is the natural epimorphism. The bottom horizontal arrow in the above diagram is an isomorphism by Corollary 2.7, while the right vertical arrow is surjective since  $f_S$  is an isomorphism. Therefore the left vertical arrow is surjective as well. This shows that the morphism  $\mathcal{O}_W \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k$  is surjective for any  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

The second statement follows from applying  $f_*$  to the short exact sequence (2.13) and using the vanishing result (2.11).  $\square$

Note that, for each  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ , the exact sequence (2.13) also shows that there exists the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_k & \longrightarrow & \Sigma_{k+1} \\ & \searrow g_k & \swarrow g_{k+1} \\ & \Sigma & \end{array}.$$

By Corollary 2.8,  $\mathcal{Q}_k = i_{Z_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$ , where  $Z_k$  is a zero-dimensional subscheme  $Z_k$  of  $W$  such that its underlying reduced subscheme is exactly  $\nu$ . Here,  $i_{Z_k}: Z_k \rightarrow X$  is the corresponding closed embedding.

**Proposition 2.9.** *For all  $1 \leq k \leq n$  one has  $g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \simeq H^0(Z_k, \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  as sheaves of algebras over  $\Sigma$ . In particular,  $\Sigma_k \simeq Z_k \times \Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Since each  $g_k$  is a finite morphism,  $\mathbb{R}^1 g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} = 0$ . By varying of  $k$ , the exact sequences (2.13) yield a cofiltration

$$g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \rightarrow g_{(k-1),*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$$

so that each successive kernel is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ . Since  $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ . By using induction, one can show that  $g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma^{\oplus k}$ . Thus, all successive extensions are trivial. Therefore, the evaluation map

$$H^0(\Sigma, g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$$

is an isomorphism. Since the evaluation map is compatible with the algebra structure, this is an isomorphism of sheaves of algebras over  $\Sigma$ . Furthermore, by Corollary 2.7, one has an isomorphism

$$H^0(\phi_k): H^0(\Sigma, g_k*\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(Z_k, \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}).$$

$\square$

**2.2. Numerical classes.** Let  $NS(Y)$  be the *Neron-Severi group* of  $Y$ , i.e., the image of  $\text{ch}_1: \text{Pic}(Y) \rightarrow A_2(Y)$ , and let  $N^1(Y)$  be the group of *numerical equivalence classes* of Cartier divisors on  $Y$ , i.e., the quotient of  $NS(Y)$  by its torsion subgroup.  $N^1(Y)$  is a finitely generated free abelian group. Let  $N_1(Y)$  be the group of *numerical equivalence classes* of one-cycles of  $Y$  (cf. [Ful98, Chapter 19]).

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $Z \subset Y$  be a purely<sup>3</sup> one-dimensional closed subscheme so that  $[Z] = n[\Sigma]$  in  $N_1(Y)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Then  $Z_{\text{red}} = \Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Z' \subseteq Z$  be the maximal closed subscheme of  $Z$  such that  $Z'_{\text{red}} = \Sigma$ . Let  $Z''$  be the closure of the complement  $Z \setminus Z'$ . Then, by assumption, one has  $[Z''] = n''[\Sigma]$  for some  $n'' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Furthermore,  $(Z'' \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$  is zero dimensional. We shall show that  $n'' = 0$ .

Assume that  $n'' > 0$ . Then the scheme-theoretic image of  $Z''$  through the morphism  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  is a non-empty one-dimensional closed subscheme  $\Xi \subset X$ . Let  $H \subset X$  be an ample Cartier divisor which does not contain the singular point  $\nu \in X$ . Then,  $H \cap \Xi \neq 0$ . On the other hand, the projection formula yields

$$H \cap \Xi = H \cap f_*([Z'']) = f_*(f^*(H) \cap [Z'']) = n'' f_*(f^*(H) \cap \Sigma) = 0,$$

which leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $N_1(Y/X) \subset N_1(Y)$  be the subgroup spanned by closures of one-cycles in  $Y \setminus \Sigma$ .

**Corollary 2.11.** *There is a splitting*

$$N_1(Y) \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma] \oplus N_1(Y/X).$$

Moreover, given a purely one-dimensional sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$ , one has

- (1)  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{F})_{\text{red}} = \Sigma$  if and only if  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ .
- (2)  $\Sigma \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{F})$  if and only if  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in N_1(Y/X)$ .

*Proof.* This statement from Lemma 2.10 and the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A_1(\Sigma) \longrightarrow A_1(Y) \longrightarrow A_1(Y \setminus \Sigma) \longrightarrow 0.$$

$\square$

We conclude this section with a result about the Euler pairing for numerical classes of sheaves on  $Y$ .

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be coherent sheaves on  $Y$  so that  $\mathcal{G}$  is one-dimensional, with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ . Let  $[\mathcal{F}]$  and  $[\mathcal{G}]$  denote the numerical equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  in  $K_0^{\text{num}}(Y)$ , respectively, and let  $\chi: K^{\text{num}}(Y) \times K^{\text{num}}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  denote the Euler pairing. Then*

$$\chi([\mathcal{F}], [\mathcal{G}]) + \chi([\mathcal{G}], [\mathcal{F}]) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G}_0 \subset \mathcal{G}$  be the maximal zero dimensional subsheaf and let  $\mathcal{G}' := \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}_0$ . Since  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}') \in \mathbb{Z}[\Sigma]$ , Lemma 2.10 shows that  $\mathcal{G}'$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ . Therefore it has a finite filtration so that each successive quotient  $\mathcal{G}'_i$  is a pure one-dimensional sheaf and scheme-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ .

Now, we shall show that  $\omega_Y|_{\Sigma'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma'}$  for any thickening  $\Sigma \subset \Sigma' \subset Y$ . We observe that the scheme-theoretic image  $Z = f(\Sigma')$  is a zero-dimensional subscheme with set-theoretic support  $\nu$  since  $f$  is proper. Moreover, by Lemma 2.1,  $\omega_X$  is locally free and  $\omega_Y = f^*\omega_X$ , where  $\omega_X$ . Since  $f|_{\Sigma'}: \Sigma' \rightarrow X$  factors through the closed immersion  $Z \rightarrow X$ , we get  $\omega_Y|_{\Sigma'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma'}$ . Then, the claim follows by Serre duality.  $\square$

<sup>3</sup>i.e., all irreducible components of  $Z$  are one-dimensional.

## 3. SEMISTABLE SHEAVES ON THE EXCEPTIONAL LOCUS

The goal of this section is to prove some structure results for the moduli stack of semistable one-dimensional sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}[\Sigma]$ . In this section, Assumptions I and II hold.

**3.1. Semistable sheaves and filtrations.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a nonzero purely one-dimensional sheaf on  $Y$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma]$ , with  $r > 0$ . First, note that  $\mathcal{F}$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$  by Corollary 2.11. We define the *slope* of  $\mathcal{F}$  as

$$\mu_Y(\mathcal{F}) := \frac{\chi(\mathcal{F})}{r}.$$

Note that the slope does not depend on a specific choice of a polarization. We consider the corresponding slope-semistability, which does not depend on a specific polarization either. The sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  will be simply called *(semi)stable* if it is  $\mu_Y$ -slope *(semi)stable*.

*Remark 3.1.* Note that, given an arbitrary polarization  $H$ , it is straightforward to check that  $\mathcal{F}$  is *(semi)stable* if and only if it is Gieseker *(semi)stable* with respect to  $H$ .  $\triangle$

For ease of exposition, let  $\text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y) \subset \text{Coh}(Y)$  denote the full subcategory of purely one-dimensional sheaves on  $Y$  set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any nonzero sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$  one has*

$$\mu_Y(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S)) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{F}) + 1.$$

*Therefore  $\mathcal{F}$  is (semi)stable if and only if  $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S)$  is (semi)stable.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is purely one-dimensional and  $S \cap \Sigma = \{p\}$ , one has

$$\text{Tor}_i(i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S, \mathcal{F}) = 0$$

for  $i \geq 1$ . By tensoring by  $\mathcal{F}$  the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \longrightarrow 0$$

and using the Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch theorem, one gets

$$\chi(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S)) = \chi(\mathcal{F}) + \chi(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \otimes i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S) = \chi(\mathcal{F}) + S \cdot \text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}).$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.** *A nonzero sheaf  $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$  is semistable if and only if it admits a filtration*

$$0 = \mathcal{E}_0 \subset \mathcal{E}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{E}_n = \mathcal{E}$$

*so that  $\mathcal{E}_j/\mathcal{E}_{j-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}$ , with  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , for some line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* The claim is proved in [Dav19, Proposition 4.3] for sheaves of slope zero. The general case follows from this by using Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a nonzero sheaf in  $\text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  has a filtration*

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}$$

*so that*

$$\mathcal{F}_i/\mathcal{F}_{i-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_i$$

*for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , with  $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_m$  line bundles on  $\Sigma$  satisfying*

$$\chi(\mathcal{L}_1) \geq \cdots \geq \chi(\mathcal{L}_m).$$

*Moreover,*

$$\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}) = \chi(\mathcal{L}_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{F}) = \chi(\mathcal{L}_m).$$

*Proof.* Let

$$0 \subset \mathcal{G}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{G}_h = \mathcal{F}$$

be the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $\mu_Y$ -slope stability. Then each subquotient  $\mathcal{G}_k/\mathcal{G}_{k-1}$  has a filtration as in Lemma 3.3. Then the Harder-Narasimhan filtration admits a non-unique refinement, so the claim follows.  $\square$

Recall that  $\Sigma_n$  denotes the closed subscheme of  $Y$  defined by the ideal sheaf  $\mathcal{J}_n \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$  from Formula (2.2) in Assumption II. The next result shows that the scheme-theoretic support of any semistable sheaf in  $\text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$  is contained in  $\Sigma_n$ .

*Remark 3.5.* For any line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\Sigma$  and any positive integer  $r$ , the sheaf  $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}^{\oplus r}$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma_n$ .

$\triangle$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$  be a nonzero semistable sheaf and let*

$$0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F} \tag{3.1}$$

*be a Jordan-Hölder filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then, there exists a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\Sigma$ , with*

$$\chi(\mathcal{L}) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{F}),$$

*so that each successive quotient is isomorphic to*

$$\mathcal{F}_i/\mathcal{F}_{i-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}.$$

*Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma_n$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.3.

Let us prove that  $\mathcal{F}$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma_n$ . Consider a Jordan-Hölder filtration of  $\mathcal{F}$  of the form (3.1). If  $j = 1$ , i.e., if  $\mathcal{F}$  is stable, the claim follows from Remark 3.5.

Assume that  $j > 1$ . The proof will proceed by induction on  $j$ , keeping  $\mathcal{L}$  fixed. Suppose that the claim holds for all semistable sheaves  $\mathcal{F}'$  with slope

$$\mu_Y(\mathcal{F}') = \chi(\mathcal{L}),$$

which have  $j' \leq j - 1$  factors in their Jordan-Hölder filtrations. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a semistable sheaf with

$$\mu_Y(\mathcal{F}) = \chi(\mathcal{L}),$$

which has a Jordan-Hölder filtration of length  $j$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  fits into an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{G} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  is semistable, with a Jordan-Hölder filtration of length  $j - 1$ .

Let  $\sigma_n: \mathcal{J}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y$  be the defining section of  $\Sigma_n$ . For any coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $Y$ , the morphism corresponding to the multiplication by  $\sigma_n$  will be denoted by  $\mu_{\mathcal{E}} := \text{id}_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \sigma_n: \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ . We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{F}' \otimes \mathcal{J}_n & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow \mu_{\mathcal{F}'} & & \downarrow \mu_{\mathcal{F}} & & \downarrow \mu_{\mathcal{G}} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the rows are exact. Since  $\mathcal{G} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}$ , we get  $\mu_{\mathcal{G}} = 0$  by Remark 3.5. Moreover,  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}'} = 0$  by the inductive hypothesis. Then the snake lemma yields the exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{F}' \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(\mu_{\mathcal{F}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Now, we claim that  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n$  is semistable of slope  $\mu_Y(\mathcal{F}') + 1$ . Indeed, this follows from condition (2.4) in Assumption II, which implies that

$$i_{\Sigma}^* \mathcal{J}_n \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1)^{\oplus 2}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{G} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}$ , one obtains

$$\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}(\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1)^{\oplus 2}),$$

which implies the claim.

Since  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  are semistable, with  $\mu_Y(\mathcal{G}) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{F}') + 1$ , one has again  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J}_n, \mathcal{F}') = 0$ . Therefore  $\delta = 0$ , which implies that  $\text{Coker}(\mu_{\mathcal{F}})$  has the same topological invariants as  $\mathcal{F}$ . This implies that  $\text{lm}(\mu_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0$ , which proves the inductive step.  $\square$

**3.2. Moduli stacks.** For any  $r, c \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $m \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], c)$  denote the moduli stack of semistable one-dimensional sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = c$ . By Lemma 3.3 this stack is empty unless  $c = rd$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ . From now on, we assume that  $c$  is of this form. For  $d = 1$  the moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], r)$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r)$  for simplicity.

Let  $n$  be the integer appearing in the filtration (2.2) of  $\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}$  and let  $T_n \subset S$  be the scheme-theoretic intersection  $\Sigma_n \cap S$  in  $Y$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}(T_n; r)$  be the moduli stack of coherent  $\mathcal{O}_{T_n}$ -modules of length  $r$ . The goal of this section is to prove that the assignment

$$\mathcal{F} \mapsto i_{\Sigma}^* \mathcal{F}$$

yields an equivalence of stacks  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], dr) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}(T_n; r)$  for any  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

First note that, by Lemma 3.2, one has  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], r) \simeq \mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], dr)$ . Hence, we can set  $d = 1$  without loss of generality. From Corollary 2.7 and Proposition 2.9, one obtains the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} S & \longleftarrow & T_n & \longrightarrow & \Sigma_n \\ \downarrow f|_S & & \downarrow t_n & & \downarrow f|_{\Sigma_n} \\ W & \longleftarrow & Z_n & \longrightarrow & X \end{array} \quad (3.2)$$

where all horizontal arrows are canonical closed immersions, while  $f|_S$  and  $t_n$  are isomorphisms. Moreover, one also has an isomorphism  $\varphi_n: \Sigma_n \simeq Z_n \times \Sigma$  which is compatible with the projection  $f|_{\Sigma_n}$ , i.e., the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_n & \xrightarrow{\varphi_n} & Z_n \times \Sigma \\ \downarrow f|_{\Sigma_n} & & \downarrow \text{pr}_1 \\ X & \longleftarrow & Z_n \end{array} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\text{pr}_1$  is the canonical projection.

**Proposition 3.7.** *The assignment  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto f_* \mathcal{F}$  yields an equivalence between the category of semistable sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$ , with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = r$ , and the category of  $\mathcal{O}_{Z_n}$ -modules of length  $r$ . The inverse functor maps  $\mathcal{Q}$  to  $i_{\Sigma_n,*}\text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{Q}$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $Z_n \subset W$  is a length  $n$  thickening of the closed point  $\nu \in W$ . In particular,  $Z_n \simeq \text{Spec}(R)$  for some Artin ring  $R$ , hence  $\Sigma \times Z_n \simeq \mathbb{P}_R^1$ , where  $\mathbb{P}_R^1$  is the projective line over  $R$ . Recall Beilinson's derived equivalence:

$$D^b(\text{Coh}(\mathbb{P}_R^1)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Mod}_R(\text{Kr})), \quad E \longmapsto \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_R^1}(1), E),$$

where  $\text{Kr}$  denotes the Kronecker quiver and  $\text{Mod}_R(\text{Kr})$  the abelian category of representations of  $\text{Kr}$  over  $R$ .

By Lemma 3.6, Any semistable sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  of slope one is an iterated extension of  $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ . Under Beilinson's derived equivalence,  $\mathcal{F}$  is an iterated extension of the simple module of the Kronecker quiver supported at the first vertex. Now, note that the category of  $\mathcal{O}_{Z_n}$ -modules is equivalent to the category of representations of the one-loop quiver over  $R$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}$  corresponds to an iterated extension of the simple module of the one-loop quiver, via the diagram (3.3).  $\square$

Now, the above proposition together with the use of diagram (3.2) yield the following.

**Corollary 3.8.** *The assignment  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto i_{\Sigma}^* \mathcal{F}$  yields an equivalence between the category of semistable sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$ , with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = r$ , and the category of  $\mathcal{O}_{T_n}$ -modules of length  $r$ . The inverse functor maps  $\mathcal{Q}$  to  $f^* \iota_* t_{n,*} \mathcal{Q}$ , where  $\iota: Z_n \rightarrow X$  is the canonical closed embedding.*

*In particular, we obtain an equivalence of stacks  $\tau: \mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; r[\Sigma], rd) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}(T_n; r)$  for any  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

#### 4. $f$ -STABLE PAIRS

In this section, we introduce  $f$ -stable pairs in our framework mimicking [BS16]. We shall assume that only Assumption I holds in this section.

**4.1. Torsion pairs.** Let  $\text{Coh}_{\leq i}(Y)$  and  $\text{Coh}_0(Y)$  be the subcategories of the abelian category  $\text{Coh}(Y)$  of coherent sheaves on  $Y$  formed by those sheaves of dimension  $\leq i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , and zero, respectively. Following [BS16, §2], we introduce the following torsion pair. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_f := \{ \mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(Y) \mid \mathbb{R}^* f_* \mathcal{F} \text{ is isomorphic to a zero-dimensional sheaf on } X \\ \text{as objects of } \text{Perf}(Y) \},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_f := \{ \mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(Y) \mid \text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) = 0 \text{ for any } \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{T}_f \}.$$

**Lemma 4.1** ([BS16, Lemma 13]). *The pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  is a torsion pair in  $\text{Coh}(Y)$ .*

*Remark 4.2.* Note that  $\mathcal{T}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  correspond to the categories  $\mathcal{P}_f, \mathcal{Q}_f$  introduced in [BS16]. Moreover, in *loc.cit.*, the authors proved that these categories form a torsion pair in  $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ . We are able to remove the extra condition of the dimension of the support because in our case  $X^{\text{sing}}$  is zero-dimensional and the exceptional locus of  $f$  is one dimensional, and we can apply verbatim the arguments in the proof of [BS16, Lemma 13].  $\triangle$

We denote by  $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$  the  $t$ -structure on  $\text{Perf}(Y)$  obtained by tilting the standard  $t$ -structure with respect to the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  and we denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the heart of  $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Following [Tod09, §2.3], let  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$  be the smallest full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  closed under extensions and containing both  $\mathcal{F}[1]$  for coherent sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  of dimension  $\leq 2$  such that  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f$ , and  $\mathcal{O}_x$  for  $x \in Y$ ; we also set:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}} := \{ E \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(F, E) = 0 \text{ for any } F \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}} \} \subset \mathcal{A}.$$

*Remark 4.3.* Note that the subcategory  $\text{Coh}_{\text{t.f.}}(Y)[1]$  is contained in  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}}$ , where  $\text{Coh}_{\text{t.f.}}(Y)$  is the category of torsion-free sheaves on  $Y$ .  $\triangle$

The following lemma can be proven by an argument parallel to the one given in [Tod09, Lemma 2.16].

**Lemma 4.4.** *The pair  $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}})$  is a torsion pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

**Definition 4.5.** We call the objects of  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$  *torsion perverse sheaves* on  $Y$ , while the objects of  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}}$  *torsion-free perverse sheaves* on  $Y$ .  $\circlearrowright$

**4.2. Characterization of  $f$ -torsion and  $f$ -torsion-free objects.** Some specific results on the structure of  $\mathcal{T}_f$  and  $\mathcal{F}_f$  in the present context are recorded in the following.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Any one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  fits in a unique exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (4.1)$$

*with  $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}$  pure one-dimensional coherent sheaves so that*

- (1)  $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional, and
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ .

*Proof.* Let  $Z_{\mathcal{F}}$  be the scheme-theoretic support of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $Z \subset Z_{\mathcal{F}}$  be the maximal closed subscheme so that  $\Sigma \not\subseteq Z$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}' := i_{Z,*} i_Z^* \mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}$  be the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}'$  by its maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf. Then, one obtains an exact sequence of the form (4.1).  $\square$

Corollary 2.11 and Lemma 4.6 yields the following.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$  with  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma] + \beta$ , for some  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\beta \in N_1(Y/X)$ . Then,  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) = r[\Sigma]$  and  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) = \beta$ .*

**Lemma 4.8.**

- (1) *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a nonzero one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$  so that  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in N_1(Y/X)$ . Then  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$ , for all  $k \geq 1$ , and  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F}|_{X^{\mathrm{reg}}}$  is a nonzero one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf, where  $X^{\mathrm{reg}} := X \setminus \{v\}$ .*
- (2) *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf so that  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}[\Sigma]$ . Then  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$ , for all  $k \geq 2$ , and  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F}$  is a zero-dimensional sheaf with support on the singular locus  $\{v\}$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$  if and only if  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 0$  and  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$  if and only if  $\mu_{Y-\min}(\mathcal{F}) \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). Let  $Z_{\mathcal{F}}$  be the scheme-theoretic support of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By Corollary 2.11, under the current assumptions,  $Z_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a purely one-dimensional closed subscheme of  $Y$  so that  $(Z_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \Sigma)_{\mathrm{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. Let  $\iota: Z_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow Y$  denote the canonical closed embedding. Then  $\mathcal{F} = \iota_* \mathcal{G}$  for a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $Z_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{R}^j \iota_* \mathcal{G} = 0$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . This implies that

$$\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = \mathbb{R}^k (f \circ \iota)_* \mathcal{G}$$

for all  $k \geq 0$ . Under the current assumptions, all fibers of  $f \circ \iota: Z_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow X$  are zero-dimensional. Therefore [Vak22, Theorem 19.8.5 (relative dimensional cohomology vanishing)] shows that  $\mathbb{R}^k (f \circ \iota)_* \mathcal{G} = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . The second statement follows by flat base change since  $f$  maps  $\pi^{-1}(X^{\mathrm{reg}}) = Y \setminus \Sigma$  isomorphically onto  $X^{\mathrm{reg}}$ .

Now we prove (2). The first part follows again from [Vak22, Theorem 19.8.5 (relative dimensional cohomology vanishing)] by analogy to (1). In order to prove the second part, let  $U \subset X$  be an affine open subscheme containing  $v$  and let  $f_U: Y_U \rightarrow U$  denote the restriction of  $f$  to  $Y_U := f^{-1}(U)$ . By Corollary 2.11, any one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\Sigma]$  is supported on  $\Sigma \subset Y_U$ . By flat base change, this implies that all direct images  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F}$  are set-theoretically supported at  $v$ . Hence it suffices to prove the statement (2) for  $f_U$ . This follows from Corollary 3.4 using [Har77, Proposition III.8.5].  $\square$

Lemmas 4.6 and 4.8 further imply the following.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a coherent sheaf on  $Y$ , with one-dimensional support so that  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \neq 0$ , let  $\mathcal{T}$  be its torsion subsheaf, and let*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.2)$$

*be the corresponding short exact sequence, where  $\mathcal{G}$  is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$ . Let also*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.3)$$

*be the short exact sequence obtained in Lemma 4.6. Then, we have the following:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}_{Y/X} = 0$  and  $\mu_{Y-\min}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) \geq 0$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f$  if and only if  $\mathcal{T} = 0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_\Sigma$  is either zero or  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) < 0$ .

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). Recall that  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f$  if and only if  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F}$  is zero-dimensional and  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$  for  $k \geq 1$ .

We prove the “only if” direction. The exact sequences (4.2) and (4.3) yield the long exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.4)$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.5)$$

Since  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F}$  is zero-dimensional and  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$ , for  $k \geq 1$ , the first of the above sequences implies that  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G}$  is also zero-dimensional and  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} = 0$ . By Lemma 4.8, all direct images are  $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma$ , for  $k \geq 1$ , are zero-dimensional sheaves supported at the singular point  $\nu$ . Then the second of the above sequences implies that  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G}_{Y/X}$  is zero-dimensional as well, hence  $\mathcal{G}_{Y/X} = 0$  by Lemma 4.8-(1). This further implies that  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma = 0$  since  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} = 0$ . Then  $\mu_{Y-\min}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) \geq 0$  by Lemma 4.8-(2).

Conversely, by Lemma 4.8-(2), one has  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma = 0$  and  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma$  zero-dimensional. Since  $\mathcal{G}_{Y/X} = 0$ , the exact sequence (4.5) implies  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} = 0$ . Then the exact sequence (4.4) shows that  $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$  and  $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F}$  is zero-dimensional.

Now, we prove (2). Recall that  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_f$  if and only if  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ .

First, we deal with the “only if” direction. Clearly,  $\mathcal{T} = 0$  since  $\text{Coh}_0(Y) \subset \mathcal{T}_f$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G}_\Sigma$  be the first step in the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of  $\mathcal{G}_\Sigma$ , i.e., the maximal destabilizing subsheaf of  $\mathcal{G}_\Sigma$ . By (1), one has  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{T}_f$  if and only if  $\mu_Y(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ . Hence one must have  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{E}) < 0$  in order to avoid a contradiction.

Conversely, since  $\mathcal{T} = 0$ , one has  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ . Note that (1) implies that any coherent sheaf in  $\mathcal{T}_f$  is set-theoretically supported on the union of  $\Sigma$  with a zero-dimensional closed subscheme. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{G}_{Y/X}$  is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf and  $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{G}_{Y/X}) \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. Hence,  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{G}_{Y/X}) = 0$ . Thus,  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{G}_\Sigma) \simeq \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F})$ .

Now, if  $\mathcal{G}_\Sigma = 0$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}_{Y/X} \in \mathcal{F}_f$ . Otherwise, assume that  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) < 0$ . By (1) any pure coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{T}_f$  has  $\mu_{Y-\min}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ . Hence,  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}_\Sigma$  is pure, it follows that  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = 0$ . Therefore, the assertion follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.10.** *Let  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$  be a Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair on  $Y$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma = 0$ . Then  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  is a  $f$ -stable pair.*

Using Corollary 3.4, one obtains the following consequences of Proposition 4.9.

**Corollary 4.11.**

- Assume that  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f$ . Then,  $H^i(Y, \mathcal{F}) = 0$  for  $i \geq 1$ .
- Assume that  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}[\Sigma]$ . Let  $D \subset Y$  be a smooth effective Cartier divisor which intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely at a single point. Then  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y(-kD), \mathcal{F}) = 0$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ .

We conclude this section with another characterization of  $f$ -torsion-free objects.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a coherent sheaf on  $Y$ . Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{E}$  be the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{F}_f$  if and only if  $\mathcal{T} = 0$  and  $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-1), \mathcal{E}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The “only if” direction is obvious since  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-1)$  belong to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ .

In order to prove the “if” direction, first note that  $\mathcal{E}$  does not admit any zero-dimensional subsheaves. Let  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$  be the maximal purely one-dimensional subsheaf of  $\mathcal{E}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{F}$  be the maximal subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}$  with set theoretic support on  $\Sigma$ , as in Lemma 4.6. Given a pure one-dimensional coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{T}_f$ , any nonzero morphism  $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  factors through the inclusion  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{E}$ . Because of Proposition 4.9-(1), it suffices to prove that  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) < 0$  since this implies  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\Sigma) = 0$  for all  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{T}_f$ .

Suppose  $\mu_{Y-\max}(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) \geq 0$  and let  $\mathcal{F}'_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{F}_\Sigma$  be the semistable sheaf of maximal slope. Then by Lemma 3.3, there is a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\Sigma$  such that  $i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{F}'_\Sigma$  of degree  $\geq -1$ . This implies  $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-1), \mathcal{F}'_\Sigma) \neq 0$ , which further implies  $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-1), \mathcal{E}) \neq 0$ . Hence contradiction.  $\square$

**4.3. Openness of the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$ .** The next goal is to show that the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  is open in the sense of [AB13, Definition A.2].

**Proposition 4.13.** *The subcategory  $\mathcal{T}_f$  satisfies the openness condition in flat families.*



*Proof.* Lemma 2.10 and Proposition 4.9-(1) imply that a coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_f$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is of dimension at most one, with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\Sigma]$ , and  $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(F) \geq 0$ . The first condition is open and closed. The second condition is open by the basic properties of Harder-Narasimhan filtrations in flat families.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.14.** *The subcategory  $\mathcal{F}_f$  satisfies the openness condition in flat families.*

*Proof.* Let  $Z$  be a parameter scheme and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $Z$ -flat family of coherent sheaves on  $Y$ . Given a point  $z \in Z$ , Proposition 4.12 shows that  $\mathcal{E}_z \in (\mathcal{F}_f)_z$  if and only if the following conditions hold simultaneously

- (1)  $\mathcal{E}_z$  has no zero-dimensional subsheaves on  $Y_z$ , and
- (2)  $\text{Hom}_{Y_z}(i_{\Sigma_z,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_z}(-1), \mathcal{E}_z) = 0$ .

The same arguments as in the proof of [AB13, Example A.4-(1)] shows that the set of points  $z \in Z$  satisfying condition (1) is open. Let us denote it by  $U_1 \subset Z$ . As for (2), it is enough to apply Corollary A.5 (with  $N = 0$ ,  $F := p_Y^*i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$ , where  $p_Y: Z \times Y \rightarrow Y$  is the projection, and  $G := \mathcal{E}$ ) to deduce that it is an open condition. The conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.15.** *The torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  is open.*

Now, by mimicking the arguments in the proof of [AB13, Theorem A.8], one can also show the following.

**Corollary 4.16.** *The subcategory  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$  satisfies the openness condition in families.*

**4.4. Definition of  $f$ -stable pairs.** Mimicking [BS16, Definition 14], we introduce the following.

**Definition 4.17.** An  $f$ -stable pair on  $Y$  is a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  where  $\mathcal{F}$  is an object of  $\mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  and  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is a section so that  $\text{Coker}(s)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ .  $\otimes$

*Remark 4.18.* Let  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  be an  $f$ -stable pair on  $Y$ . Proposition 4.9 shows in particular that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf.  $\triangle$

**Proposition 4.19.** *For a fiber sequence*

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow E \tag{4.6}$$

in  $\text{Perf}(Y)$ , the following statements are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  and the morphism  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is such that  $\text{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_f$ , i.e., the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  is a  $f$ -stable pair;
- (2)  $E$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}[1]$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$ , and  $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We first prove that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Since  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ , we have  $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}[1] \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  by definition. We need only to show that  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ . Taking the long exact sequence of cohomology sheaves associated to (4.6) we obtain

$$0 = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{-1}(E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(E) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{4.7}$$

The central terms are canonically identified with  $\mathcal{O}_Y$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ , respectively. Thus, our assumption guarantees that  $\mathcal{H}^0(E) \simeq \text{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_f$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{O}_Y \in \mathcal{F}_f$ , hence  $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(E) \in \mathcal{F}_f$  because of the defining properties of a torsion pair (cf. [DPS22, Lemma 3.2]). Therefore,  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ .

We now prove that (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Since  $\mathcal{F}[1] \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$ , the sheaf  $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{F}[1])$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 2}(Y)$ , while  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}[1])$  is zero-dimensional. Passing to the long exact sequence of cohomology sheaves associated to (4.6), we obtain

$$0 = \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(E) = 0.$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}[1])$ . Since  $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ , we get that  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to  $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ . Finally, the sequence (4.7) canonically identifies the cokernel of  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathcal{H}^0(E)$ , which is an object of  $\mathcal{T}_f$  because  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.20.* Note that for any fiber sequence  $\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow E$  such that  $\mathcal{F}[1]$  and  $E$  belong to  $\mathcal{A}$ , one gets  $E \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}}$ . Indeed, rotating the sequence above we obtain the fiber sequence

$$E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y[1] \xrightarrow{s[1]} \mathcal{F}[1] ,$$

where the three terms belong to  $\mathcal{A}$ . It follows that this is in fact a short exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$  and therefore that the map  $E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y[1]$  is injective. Since  $\mathcal{O}_Y[1] \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}}$ , also  $E \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{t.f.}}$ .  $\triangle$

Now, we introduce the derived stack of  $f$ -stable pairs, following [DPS22, §6.3]. First, let  $\mathbf{Perf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y)$  be the derived stack parametrizing fiber sequences of the form

$$E := (\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow E) .$$

$\mathbf{Perf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y)$  is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbb{C}$ . We set

$$\partial_0(E) := E \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_1(E) := \mathcal{F} .$$

Let  $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$  be the derived moduli stack of  $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ -flat objects of  $\text{Perf}(Y)$ . Thanks to Corollary 4.15,  $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$  is an open substack of  $\mathbf{Perf}(Y)$ , hence it is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, following [DPS22, Construction 3.17], let us introduce the substack  $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$  of  $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$  parametrizing objects in  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$ , which is open thanks to Corollary 4.16. Thus, also  $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$  is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Motivated by Proposition 4.19, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 4.21.** The *derived moduli stack  $f$ -SP( $Y$ )* of  $f$ -stable pairs on  $Y$  is the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f\text{-SP}(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Perf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_1[1] \times \partial_0 \\ \mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})_{\text{ch}_1=0} \times \mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Perf}(Y) \times \mathbf{Perf}(Y) \end{array} ,$$

where  $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})_{\text{ch}_1=0}$  is the open and closed substack of  $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})_{\text{ch}_1=0}$  consisting of those objects having vanishing first Chern class.  $\circlearrowright$

By construction,  $f\text{-SP}(Y)$  is a geometric derived stack, locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $f\text{-SP}(Y) := {}^{\text{cl}}(f\text{-SP}(Y))$  be the classical truncation. It is an algebraic stack, locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbb{C}$ . From now on, we shall focus on  $f\text{-SP}(Y)$  since the derived structure will not play any role in our main results.

Note that

$$f\text{-SP}(Y) = \bigsqcup_{\beta \in N_1(Y), n \in \mathbb{Z}} f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n) ,$$

where  $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$  parametrizes those  $f$ -stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  for which  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = \beta$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = n$ . Now, we can argue as in [BS16, Lemma 46] to show that flat families of  $f$ -stable pairs with fixed Chern classes are bounded. Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Lemma 4.22.**  $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$  is a finite type algebraic stack over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Now, the same arguments as in the proof of [BS16, Lemma 23] shows that the automorphism group of a  $f$ -stable pair is trivial (cf. [Pă21, Proposition 3.3]). Hence, the canonical morphism from the inertia stack of  $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$  to  $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$  is an equivalence. Thus, [Sta23, Tag 04SZ] yields the following.

**Proposition 4.23.**  $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$  is a finite type algebraic space over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

5.  $C$ -FRAMED  $f$ -STABLE PAIRS

In this section, we will study  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs on  $Y$  and their moduli stacks. We shall assume that only Assumption I holds in this section.

**5.1. Definition.** Let  $C \subset Y$  be a reduced, irreducible, purely one-dimensional, closed subscheme so that  $(C \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$  and let

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow 0$$

be the canonical support sequence constructed in Lemma 4.6. Assume that  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = m[\Sigma] + [C]$ . Then, by Corollary 4.7, one has  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) = m[\Sigma]$  and  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) = [C]$ .

**Definition 5.1.** We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed if  $\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ .

Moreover, a pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$ , with  $s$  an arbitrary section, is called  $C$ -framed if  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed.

◊

**5.2. Some results on extensions of sheaves.** In the following assume that  $S \subset Y$  is a smooth irreducible effective divisor  $S \subset Y$  which intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely exactly at one point. Let  $\zeta \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(S))$  be a defining section. Let  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be one-dimensional pure coherent sheaves on  $Y$ , so that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $S$  and  $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_0) \cap S)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. First note the following vanishing result.

**Lemma 5.2.** Under the present assumptions, we get

$$\text{Tor}_k(i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S), \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$$

for all  $k \geq 1$ . Moreover

$$\chi(\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S)) = S \cdot \text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_0).$$

*Proof.* The first part follows immediately from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \longrightarrow i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \longrightarrow 0,$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf and  $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_0) \cap S)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. The second part follows from Grothendieck-Riemann-Roch theorem.  $\square$

Now assume that

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

is an extension of coherent sheaves on  $Y$ . Then multiplication by  $\zeta$  yields the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \zeta_{\mathcal{F}_0} & & \downarrow \zeta_{\mathcal{F}} & & \downarrow 0 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (5.1)$$

Lemma 5.2 shows that  $\zeta_{\mathcal{F}_0}$  is injective, hence  $\text{Coker}(\zeta_{\mathcal{F}_0}) = \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_S(S) := i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S)$ . Therefore the snake lemma yields a morphism

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S).$$

Conversely, given a morphism  $\delta: \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_\delta$  be defined by the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_\delta \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \oplus \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \delta \\ g \end{pmatrix}} \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $g: \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$  is the canonical epimorphism. The next result follows from the functorial properties of the snake lemma. The detailed proof will be omitted.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Under the above assumptions, the assignments  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \delta_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\delta \mapsto \mathcal{E}_{\delta}$  determine an isomorphism*

$$\varepsilon: \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_0) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_S(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)).$$

Furthermore, one also has:

- (1) *Given a subsheaf  $\mathcal{F}'_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_1$ , the pull-back of an extension class  $e \in \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_0)$  to  $\text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{F}'_1, \mathcal{F}_0)$  is trivial if and only if  $\mathcal{F}'_1 \subset \ker(\varepsilon(e))$ .*
- (2) *Given a purely one-dimensional quotient  $\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_0$ , the pushforward of an extension class  $e \in \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_0)$  to  $\text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}'_0)$  is trivial if and only if the composition*

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon(e)} \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}'_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$$

*is identically zero.*

Using the notation from diagram (5.1), set  $\mathcal{F}'_1 := \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{F}})$  and  $\mathcal{Q} := \text{Im}(\delta_{\mathcal{F}}) \subset \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *Under the above assumptions, suppose  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ . Then, one has a canonical commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{F}'_1 & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array} \quad (5.2)$$

with exact rows and columns, where  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is a one dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$ , set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ .

*Proof.* Using the snake lemma in diagram (5.1), one obtains an isomorphism  $\ker(\zeta_{\mathcal{F}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{E}})$  since  $\zeta_{\mathcal{F}_0}$  is injective. This yields the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{F}'_1 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the vertical arrows are injective. Applying the snake lemma to the above diagram, one further obtains a diagram as in Equation (5.2), where  $\mathcal{F}'_0 := \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'_1$ .

Clearly,  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$  since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  are supported on  $\Sigma$ . Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{Q}$  is set-theoretically supported on the intersection  $S \cap \Sigma$ , it follows that the restriction of  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  to  $Y \setminus S$  is purely one dimensional. Hence the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{F}'_0$  is set-theoretically supported on  $S \cap \Sigma$ .

Assume that  $\mathcal{T} \neq 0$  and set  $\mathcal{F}''_0 := \mathcal{F}'_0/\mathcal{T}$ . Then one obtains a second commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_0 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}''_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}''_0 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

with exact rows, where the right vertical arrow is the canonical surjection. Then the snake lemma shows that the left vertical arrow is injective, and it also yields an isomorphism  $\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}_1''/\mathcal{F}_1'$ . Since  $\text{Supp}(\mathcal{T}) \subset S \cap \Sigma$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1'$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $S$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{F}_1''$  is set-theoretically supported on  $S$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is purely one-dimensional, set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ , we have that  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}_1'', \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$ . Therefore the composition

$$\mathcal{F}_1'' \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1$$

is injective, leading to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \mathcal{F}_1'' & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{F}_1'' & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} .$$

Then Lemma 5.3 implies that  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{F}_1'') = 0$ , while by construction

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{F}_1'') \simeq \mathcal{F}_1''/\mathcal{F}_1' \simeq \mathcal{T},$$

since  $\mathcal{F}_1' = \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{F}})$ . This leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

**5.3. Structural result for  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs.** From now on, let us assume that  $C$  is a reduced irreducible curve in a smooth irreducible effective divisor  $S \subset Y$  which intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely at a single point  $p \in C^{\text{sing}}$ .

The goal of this section is to prove the following structural result for  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$  be a  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pair with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$ , with  $m \geq 0$ . Then, there exists a unique commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \\ & & & \downarrow s & & \downarrow s_1 & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (5.3)$$

such that  $(\mathcal{F}_1, s_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1)$  is a Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair with  $\mathcal{F}$  scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ , the associated morphism  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$ , via Lemma 5.3, is surjective, and

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}} \circ s_1 = 0.$$

Conversely, let  $(\mathcal{F}_1, s_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1)$  be a Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair with  $\mathcal{F}$  scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$  where  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $m \geq 0$ . Let

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{f_1} \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5.4)$$

a short exact sequence such that the associated morphism  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$ , via Lemma 5.3, is surjective, and

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}} \circ s_1 = 0.$$

Then there exists a unique section  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  so that  $f_1 \circ s = s_1$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  is a  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pair.

We start by proving the “only if” direction.

**Lemma 5.6.** *There exists a unique commutative diagram of the form (5.3) such that*

- (1)  $(\mathcal{F}_1, s_1)$  is a Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair on  $Y$ ; and

(2) one has a second commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & \mathrm{Im}(s) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{Im}(s_1) & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array} \tag{5.5}$$

where the top horizontal arrow is an isomorphism. In particular  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}} \circ s_1 = 0$ .

*Proof.* First note that  $s \neq 0$  since  $\mathrm{Coker}(s)$  must belong to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ .

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed and an object in  $\mathcal{F}_f$ , by Proposition 4.9-(2),  $\mathcal{F}$  is a pure coherent sheaf, which fits in a unique exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{Y/X} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}$  is either a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$  set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ , with  $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}) < 0$  or zero, and  $\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}$  is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on  $Y$  scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$  (in particular,  $(\mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) \cap \Sigma)_{\mathrm{red}}$  is zero-dimensional). Set  $\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1 := \mathcal{F}_{Y/X}$ .

Since the fundamental cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C + m\Sigma$ , Corollary 2.11 shows that the fundamental cycle of  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is  $C$ . Since  $C$  is reduced irreducible and  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is purely one dimensional, this implies that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is the pushforward to  $Y$  of a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $C$ . This further shows that the composition  $s_1 := f_1 \circ s$  is either zero or generically surjective. Moreover, Corollary 4.11 shows that  $H^0(Y, \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$ . Since  $s \neq 0$ , this rules out the case  $s_1 = 0$ , hence  $s_1$  is generically surjective. This means that  $(\mathcal{F}_1, s_1)$  is a Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair on  $Y$ , which further implies that  $\mathrm{Im}(s_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_C$  (cf. [PT09, Lemma 1.6]).

Assume that  $\mathcal{F}_0 \neq 0$ . Applying the snake lemma to diagram (5.3), one obtains the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(s) \longrightarrow \ker(s_1) \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \dots \tag{5.6}$$

where  $\ker(s_1) \simeq \mathcal{I}_C$ , where  $\mathcal{I}_C$  is the ideal sheaf of  $C$  (cf. [PT09, Formula (1.7)]). Since  $C$  is a divisor in the smooth surface  $S$ , one has an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_C \longrightarrow i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S(-C) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since  $S$  intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely exactly once, Corollary 4.11 shows that  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y(-S), \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$ . Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is purely one dimensional, set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ , one also has  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_S(-C), \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$ . Then the above exact sequence implies that  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_C, \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$  as well. In particular,  $\delta$  in (5.6) vanishes. This implies that the induced map  $\mathrm{Im}(s) \rightarrow \mathrm{Im}(s_1)$  is an isomorphism, hence  $\mathrm{Im}(s) \cap \mathcal{F}_0 = 0$  as subsheaves of  $\mathcal{F}$ . This yields the diagram (5.5).

Now, the epimorphism  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1$  restricts to an isomorphism  $\mathrm{Im}(s) \rightarrow \mathrm{Im}(s_1)$ . Since  $\mathrm{Im}(s)$  is a subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}$ , this implies that the restriction of the extension

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

to  $\mathrm{Im}(s_1) \subset \mathcal{F}_1$  admits a splitting. Hence the associated extension class is trivial, and Lemma 5.3 implies that  $\mathrm{Im}(s_1) \subset \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Thus, the relation  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}} \circ s_1 = 0$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{F}'_1 := \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{F}})$ . By Lemma 5.4, the quotient  $\mathcal{F}'_0 := \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'_1$  is a pure one-dimensional coherent sheaf on  $Y$  set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *The following hold:*

(1)  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  are slope-semistable,  $S$ -equivalent to

$$\mathcal{F}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}'_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1).$$

(2) The morphism  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)$  is surjective.

(3) The section  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  factors through a section  $s'_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G} := \text{Coker}(s)$  and let  $\mathcal{G}' := \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T}$  be the quotient by the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ , Proposition 4.9-(1) shows that  $\mathcal{G}'$  is set theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$  and  $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{G}) \geq 0$ . Furthermore, diagram (5.5) in Lemma 5.6 yields an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_1 := \text{Coker}(s_1)$ . Under the current assumptions,  $\mathcal{G}_1$  is a zero-dimensional sheaf supported at  $p \in C$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is purely one-dimensional, the composition

$$\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$$

is injective.

Let  $\mathcal{K} := \ker(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G})$ , which is isomorphic to  $\text{Im}(s_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_C$  by Lemma 5.6. Since  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is purely one-dimensional, supported on  $\Sigma$ , we get  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{F}'_0) = 0$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{K}$  is a subsheaf of  $\mathcal{F}'_1 \subset \mathcal{F}$ . This yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{K} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_0 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the left vertical arrow is injective and the right vertical arrow is surjective. Since  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is purely one-dimensional by Lemma 5.4, the resulting surjective morphism  $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_0$  factors through a surjective morphism  $\mathcal{G}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_0$ . Since  $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{G}') \geq 0$ , this implies

$$\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{F}'_0) \geq 0.$$

By Lemma 3.3, each Harder-Narasimhan subsequent quotient of  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is  $S$ -equivalent to

$$\mathbf{C}^r \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)$$

for some  $r, a \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $r \geq 1$ . The above inequality implies that  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)) \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $a \geq -1$ . Therefore one finds  $\chi(\mathcal{F}'_0) \geq 0$ . Moreover, equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is semistable,  $S$ -equivalent to  $\mathbf{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$ .

On the other hand, since  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ , Proposition 4.9-(2) shows that  $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}_0) < 0$ . Again, Lemma 3.3 shows that each Harder-Narasimhan subsequent quotient of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is  $S$ -equivalent to  $\mathbf{C}^r \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)$  for some  $r, a \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $r \geq 1$ . The above inequality implies that  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)) \leq -1$ , i.e.,  $a \leq -2$ . Therefore one finds  $\chi(\mathcal{F}_0) \leq -m$ . Moreover, equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is slope-semistable in the  $S$ -equivalence class of  $\mathbf{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ . However, the bottom row of diagram (5.2) shows that

$$0 \leq \chi(\mathcal{F}'_0) = \chi(\mathcal{F}_0) + \chi(\mathcal{Q}) \leq \chi(\mathcal{F}_0) + \chi(\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S)) = \chi(\mathcal{F}_0) + m. \quad (5.7)$$

Then one obtains the simultaneous inequalities

$$\chi(\mathcal{F}_0) \leq -m \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\mathcal{F}_0) \geq -m,$$

hence  $\chi(\mathcal{F}_0) = -m$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is slope-semistable in the  $S$ -equivalence class of  $\mathbf{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ . Furthermore, inequality (5.7) implies that

$$\chi(\mathcal{F}'_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S).$$

This further implies that  $\mathcal{F}'_0$  is semistable,  $S$ -equivalent to  $\mathbf{C}^m \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$ . Then  $H^0(Y, \mathcal{F}'_0) = 0$ , hence  $s$  factors through  $s'_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.5.* The “only if” direction follows from Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7.

We prove now the “if” direction. Since  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}} \circ s_1 = 0$ , Lemma 5.3-(1) shows that the restriction of the extension (5.4) to  $\text{Im}(s_1) \subset \mathcal{F}_1$  is trivial, which means that there exists an injective morphism

$\text{Im}(s_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  which fits in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \text{Im}(s_1) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Im}(s_1) & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} .$$

Then let  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  be defined by the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow \text{Im}(s_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} .$$

Given any section  $s': \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  so that  $f_1 \circ s' = s_1$ , one has  $s' - s \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{F}_0)$ , which is zero since  $\mathcal{F}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ . Therefore  $s$  is unique.

Now, we need to show that  $\mathcal{G} := \text{Coker}(s)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ . We shall make use of Proposition 4.9-(1). Snake lemma yields the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(s_1) \longrightarrow 0 .$$

Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{G}$  be the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is purely one dimensional, the composition

$$\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(s_1)$$

is injective and one obtains the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(s_1)/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow 0 .$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T}$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$  and  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T}) = m[\Sigma]$ .

Let  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}' \neq 0$  be the minimal slope-semistable quotient provided by the Harder-Narasimhan filtration. Note that  $\mathcal{G}'$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$  and  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}') = m'[\Sigma]$ , with  $m' > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}'_0 \subset \mathcal{G}'$  be the image of the composition  $\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ . Then, note the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{T} & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker}(s_1)/\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G}' & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} ,$$

where the rows are exact and the vertical maps are surjective. This shows that  $\mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0$  is zero dimensional since  $\text{Coker}(s_1)/\mathcal{T}$  is zero-dimensional. In particular,  $\mathcal{F}'_0 \neq 0$ .

In order to finish the proof, one has to show that  $\mu_Y(\mathcal{G}') \geq 0$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $\mathcal{G}'$  is  $S$ -equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}^{m'} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)$ . Suppose  $\mu_Y(\mathcal{G}') < 0$ , i.e.,  $a \leq -2$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}'_0 \neq 0$ , the case  $a \leq -3$  is ruled out since  $\mathcal{G}'$  is semistable and receives a nonzero morphism from  $\mathcal{F}_0$  which is  $S$ -equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ . Hence  $a = -2$ . Since both  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}'$  are semistable sheaves of equal slope, it follows that  $\mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0$  is either a nonzero semistable sheaf of the same slope or zero. Since  $\mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0$  was already shown to be zero-dimensional, it follows that  $\mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0 = 0$ . This yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \mathcal{G}' & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{G}' & & \end{array} ,$$

where the vertical arrows are surjective. Then Lemma 5.3-(2) shows that composition

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_{\mathcal{F}}} \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}' \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S) \tag{5.8}$$

is identically zero. However, since  $\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$  is surjective, and  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}$  is also surjective, the composition (5.8) has to be surjective. This leads to a contradiction since  $\mathcal{G}' \neq 0$ . Therefore  $\mu_{Y-\min}(\mathcal{G}') \geq 0$ , hence  $G \in \mathcal{T}_f$ .  $\square$



**5.4. Moduli stacks of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs.** As in the previous section, from now on, let  $C$  be a reduced irreducible curve in a smooth irreducible effective divisor  $S \subset Y$ , which intersects  $\Sigma$  transversely at a single point  $p \in C^{\text{sing}}$ .

Mimicking the construction in [DPS22, §6.4], let  $\mathbf{FlagPerf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1])$  be the derived stack parametrizing commutative diagrams  $\mathbb{E}$  in  $\mathbf{Perf}(Y)$  of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & E \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 & \longrightarrow & E_1 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Y[1] \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & & & 0
 \end{array} . \tag{5.9}$$

$\mathbf{FlagPerf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1])$  is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbf{C}$ . We set

$$\partial_0(\mathbb{E}) := (\mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y[1]) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_1(\mathbb{E}) := (\mathcal{F} \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y[1]).$$

We equally set

$$u_1(\mathbb{E}) := \mathcal{G}.$$

Consider the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{FlagPerf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1]) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow u_1 \times \partial_0 \\
 \mathbf{Coh}(Y; 0, 0, m[\Sigma]) \times \mathbf{SP}_C(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Perf}(Y) \times \mathbf{Perf}(Y)
 \end{array} ,$$

where  $\mathbf{SP}_C(Y)$  is the derived moduli stack<sup>4</sup> of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on  $Y$  which are scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ , while  $\mathbf{Coh}(Y; 0, 0, m[\Sigma])$  is the derived moduli stack of coherent sheaves  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $Y$  of vanishing rank and first Chern class, and  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}) = m[\Sigma]$ , for some  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $m \geq 0$ . The derived stack  $\mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m)$  is geometric and locally of finite presentation over  $\mathbf{C}$ . It decomposes into

$$\mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m) := \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m, n)$$

with respect to the Euler characteristic.

Thanks to Theorem 5.5, the map  $\partial_1$  induce a map

$$\partial_1 : \mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m, n) \longrightarrow f\text{-SP}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma], n),$$

sending a commutative diagram  $\mathbb{E}$  (5.9) to  $(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y[1])$ , and a map at the level of the corresponding classical stacks:

$$\partial_1 : {}^{\text{cl}}\mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m, n) \longrightarrow f\text{-SP}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma], n).$$

**Definition 5.8.** Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  be with  $m \geq 0$ . The moduli stack  $f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m, n)$  of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  on  $Y$ , of second Chern class  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = n$ , is

$$f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m, n) := {}^{\text{cl}}\mathbf{FlagCoh}_C^{\dagger, \text{sp}}(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y[1], m, n).$$

The moduli stack  $f\text{-SP}_C(Y)$  of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  on  $Y$  is

$$f\text{-SP}_C(Y) := \bigsqcup_{m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m, n).$$

<sup>4</sup>Whose construction can be given as e.g. in [Tod20, §4.5].

Similarly, we introduce  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m)$ . ◊

Note that by construction,  $\partial_1$  induces a map  $\iota: f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n) \rightarrow f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma], n)$ . By Proposition 4.23,  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma], n)$  is an algebraic space of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, also  $\iota$  is representable by algebraic spaces. Thus,  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$  is an algebraic space of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ , while  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m)$  and  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$  are algebraic spaces locally of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**5.5. Relation to the Hilbert scheme of  $C$ .** In this section, we shall assume that also Assumptions II and III hold.

Let  $T_n$  be the scheme-theoretic intersection  $S \cap \Sigma_n$ . Let  $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$  denote the moduli space of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on  $Y$  scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ . Let  $(\mathcal{F}_1, \sigma_1)$  denote the universal stable pair on  $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y) \times Y$  and let  $\mathcal{Q} := \text{Coker}(\sigma_1)$ .

**Lemma 5.9.** *The sheaf  $\mathcal{Q}$  is flat over  $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$ .*

*Proof.* By construction, one has the universal exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{SP}_C(Y) \times Y} \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\sigma_1$  restricts to an injection on fibers. This implies that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$ -flat. □

Now let  $q: \text{Quot}_{T_n}(C; m) \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$  be the relative Quot scheme whose functor of points assigns to any map  $\phi: Z \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$  the set of quotients

$$g: (\phi \times \iota_C)^* \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G},$$

so that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $Z$ -flat family of length  $m$  sheaves on  $T_n$ .

The next goal is to construct an equivalence  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m) \rightarrow \text{Quot}_{T_n}(C; m)$ . First, we need the following *family variant* of Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.5, which we shall prove now.

Let  $Z$  be an arbitrary parameter scheme and let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Z \times Y & \\ \pi \swarrow & & \searrow p \\ Z & & Y \end{array}$$

denote the canonical projections. Let also  $\zeta \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(S))$  be a defining section of  $S$ .

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

*be an exact sequence of  $Z$ -flat families of one-dimensional pure coherent sheaves on  $Y$ , such that  $(\mathcal{F}_1, \sigma_1)$  is  $Z$ -flat family of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs on  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is a flat family of slope  $(-1)$  semistable sheaves on  $Y$  with second Chern class  $m[\Sigma]$ . Then, multiplication by  $\pi^* \zeta$  determines a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & & & \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \zeta_{\mathcal{F}_0} & & \downarrow \zeta_{\mathcal{F}} & & \downarrow 0 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_Y(S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_Y(S) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_Y(S) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_S(S) & & & & \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & & \end{array}$$

where the rows and the left column are exact. In particular one has a connecting morphism

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_S(S),$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_S(S)$  is  $Z$ -flat. Moreover, for any  $z \in Z$ , the restriction of  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}$  to  $\{z\} \times Y$  coincides with the analogous morphism constructed in Lemma 5.3.

*Proof.* The first part is clear since the pull-back  $\pi^*: \text{Coh}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(Z \times Y)$  is exact and  $\pi^* \mathcal{G}$  is  $Z$ -flat for any coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $Y$ . By construction, the restriction  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}|_{\{z\} \times Y}$  coincides to connecting morphism  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}_z}$  constructed in Lemma 5.3 for any point  $z \in Z$ . The latter is surjective by Theorem 5.5, hence  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}}$  is also surjective. Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_S(S)$  is  $Z$ -flat since both factors are  $Z$ -flat.  $\square$

Thanks to Theorem 5.5, the stack  $f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m)$  assigns to an arbitrary parameter scheme  $Z$  the groupoid of  $Z$ -flat families of diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & E \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 & \longrightarrow & E_1 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & & & 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y}[1] \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & & & 0 \end{array},$$

satisfying the following conditions:

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is a flat family of purely one-dimensional slope  $(-1)$  semistable sheaves on  $Y$  with second Chern class  $m[\Sigma]$ ,
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is a flat family of purely one dimensional sheaves on  $Y$  with second Chern class  $[C]$ , which has scheme theoretic support  $Z \times C$  as a sheaf on  $Z \times Y$ .
- (3) For any point  $z \in Z$ , the restriction of the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$  to  $z \times Y$  is a  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pair.

Using the same notation as in Lemma 5.10, the main result of this section is the following.

**Theorem 5.11.** *Using the isomorphism  $\zeta: \mathcal{O}_{T_n} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S(S) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{T_n}$  induced by the defining section  $\zeta \in H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(S))$ , the assignment*

$$(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}, s) \longmapsto (\mathcal{F}_1, \pi^* \zeta \circ \delta_{\mathcal{F}})$$

determines an equivalence of algebraic spaces

$$f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Quot}_{T_n}(C; m).$$

*Proof.* First, by Lemma 3.2, one has  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; m) \simeq \mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; m[\Sigma], -m)$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}(T_n; m)$  be the moduli stack of length  $m$  sheaves on  $T_n$ . Then Corollary 3.8 proves that one has an equivalence

$$\tau: \mathcal{M}^{\text{ss}}(Y; m[\Sigma], -m) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}(T_n; m)$$

which acts as  $\mathcal{F}_0 \mapsto \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{O}_S$  on flat families. Then the existence of a functor as claimed in the assertion follows from Lemma 5.10 and the “only if” direction of Theorem 5.5. In particular, the latter shows that the restriction  $\delta_{\mathcal{F}_z}$  is surjective for any point  $z \in Z$ . The fact that this is an equivalence follows from the “if” direction of Theorem 5.5.  $\square$

Theorem 5.11 yields the following.

**Corollary 5.12.** *For any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $m \geq 0$ , the motivic classes of  $f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m)$  and  $\text{Quot}_{T_n}(C; m)$  in the Grothendieck ring of algebraic spaces coincide.*

Furthermore, [PT10, Proposition B.8] yields:

**Proposition 5.13.** *Let  $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}(C; m)$  be the nested Hilbert scheme parametrizing flags of ideal sheaves  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}' \subset \mathcal{O}_C$  so that  $\mathcal{I}'/\mathcal{I}$  is the pushforward of a length  $m$  zero-dimensional sheaf on  $T_n$ . Then, there is an isomorphism  $\text{Quot}_{T_n}(C, m) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{FHilb}_{T_n}(C; m)$  mapping the data  $(s_1: \mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1, g: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{G})$  to*

$$\mathcal{I} := \text{Hom}_C(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{O}_C) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}' := \text{Hom}_C(\mathcal{F}'_1, \mathcal{O}_C),$$

where  $\mathcal{F}'_1$  is the kernel of the composition  $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{G}$ .

## 6. C-FRAMED WALLCROSSING IDENTITY

In this section  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  is a threefold contraction satisfying Assumptions I, II, and III. As in §5.4, let  $f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m, n)$  denote the moduli space of  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  on  $Y$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = m[\Sigma] + [C]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = n$ , where  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $m \geq 0$ . A completely analogous construction yields a moduli space  $\text{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$  of  $C$ -framed Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  on  $Y$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = m[\Sigma] + [C]$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = n$ , where  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $m \geq 0$  (cf. [Mau16, §2.1]). Let

$$\begin{aligned} f\text{-PT}_C(Y) &= f\text{-PT}_C(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m, \\ \text{PT}_C(Y) &= \text{PT}_C(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(\text{SP}_C(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

be the associated generating functions for topological Euler characteristics. Furthermore, set

$$\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y) = \text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y; q, Q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0} \chi(\text{SP}(Y; m[\Sigma], n)) q^n Q^m. \quad (6.2)$$

The main result of this section is the following.

**Theorem 6.1.** *The following identity holds:*

$$f\text{-PT}_C(Y) = \frac{\text{PT}_C(Y)}{\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y)}. \quad (6.3)$$

We postpone the proof of the theorem to Appendix B. We shall proceed by analogy to [Bri11, §4] and [BS16, §6]. In §B.1 and §B.2 will derive the relevant identities in the infinite type motivic Hall algebra of stack functions. As explained in §B.3, these identities result in a fake proof of identity (6.3). The actual proof is then obtained using Laurent truncations in complete analogy to [BS16, §7].

## 7. C-FRAMED FLOP IDENTITY

Consider a threefold flop diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^+ & \overset{\phi}{\dashrightarrow} & Y^- \\ & \searrow f^+ & \swarrow f^- \\ & X & \end{array}, \quad (7.1)$$

where  $f^\pm: Y^\pm \rightarrow X$  are contractions satisfying the conditions of Assumptions I and II and  $\phi$  is a canonical isomorphism  $\phi: Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} Y^- \setminus \Sigma^-$ . Recall that  $\nu$  denotes the singular point of  $X$ .

*Remark 7.1.* Note that given a morphism  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  as in Assumptions I and II, results of [Kaw88, Mor88, Kol89] imply that a flop of the form (7.1), with e.g.  $f = f^+$ , always exists and it is moreover unique by [KM98, Corollary 6.4].  $\triangle$

Let us assume that  $f^+ : Y^+ \rightarrow X$  satisfies Assumption III. Hence, there exists a Weil divisor  $W \subset X$ , which satisfies the conditions of Assumption III. In particular, the strict transform of  $W$  is a smooth divisor  $S^+ \subset Y^+$  so that the restriction  $f^+|_{S^+}$  is an isomorphism onto  $W$ .

Let  $C \subset W$  be a reduced irreducible curve on  $W$  so that  $\nu \in C^{\text{sing}}$ . The strict transform of  $C$  with respect to  $f^+$  is a reduced irreducible curve  $C^+ \subset S^+$ , also mapped isomorphically to  $C$  by  $f^+$ . Let  $S^-, C^-$  be the strict transforms of  $W, C$  respectively under the contraction  $f^- : Y^- \rightarrow X$ . Then  $C^-$  is a reduced irreducible curve on  $Y^-$ . An extra assumption will be made in the following, namely:

**Assumption IV.** The strict transform  $S^-$  is a reduced irreducible divisor on  $Y$  which coincides with the scheme-theoretic inverse image  $S^- = (f^-)^{-1}(W)$ . Moreover, the singular locus of  $S^-$  is zero-dimensional.  $\circlearrowright$

The goal of this section is to prove an identity relating the Euler character invariants of the moduli space of stable pairs on  $C^-$  to those of the moduli space of  $C^+$ -framed  $f^+$ -stable pairs on  $Y^+$ .

**7.1. Transformation of numerical classes.** Let  $N^1(Y^\pm)$  denote the quotient of the Neron-Severi group  $NS(Y)$  of  $Y$  by its torsion subgroup. Then one has an isomorphism

$$\phi_*^1 : N^1(Y^+) \xrightarrow{\sim} N^1(Y^-),$$

determined by the chain of isomorphisms

$$A_2(Y^+) \xrightarrow{\sim} A_2(Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+) \simeq A_2(Y^- \setminus \Sigma^-) \xrightarrow{\sim} A_2(Y^-).$$

More explicitly, this isomorphism is determined by the assignment

$$D^+ \mapsto D^+ \cap Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+ \mapsto \overline{D^+ \cap Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+},$$

where  $\overline{D^+ \cap Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+}$  denotes the scheme-theoretic closure of  $D^+ \cap Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+$  in  $Y^-$ .

Using the non-degenerate bilinear form  $N^1(Y^\pm) \times N_1(Y^\pm) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , one obtains an isomorphism  $\phi_{1,*} : N_1(Y^+) \xrightarrow{\sim} N_1(Y^-)$ , where  $\phi_{1,*} = ((\phi_*^1)^\vee)^{-1}$ . More explicitly, given any class  $\beta \in N_1(Y^+)$ , the image  $\phi_{1,*}(\beta) \in N_1(Y^-)$  is uniquely determined by the relations

$$[D^+] \cdot \beta = \phi_*^1([D^+]) \cdot \phi_{1,*}(\beta),$$

with  $[D^+] \in N^1(Y^+)$  arbitrary. Recall also that  $\phi_*([\Sigma^+]) = -[\Sigma^-]$ .

Let  $f_{S^-} : S^- \rightarrow W$  be natural projection. Assumption IV implies that the scheme-theoretic inverse image  $(f^-)^{-1}(C)$  coincides with the inverse image  $f_{S^-}^{-1}(C)$ , regarded as a closed subscheme of  $Y$  contained in  $S^- \subset Y$ . Moreover, since  $S^-$  is the strict transform of  $S^+$ , and  $S^+ \cdot \Sigma^+ = 1$  by Assumption III, one has  $S^- \cdot \Sigma^- = -1$ . Therefore  $\Sigma^-$  is contained in  $S^-$  as a closed subscheme. This implies that  $(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C)$  is the scheme-theoretic union of two irreducible components:

$$(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C) = C^- \cup Z_\Sigma,$$

where  $(Z_\Sigma)_{\text{red}} = \Sigma$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  be the multiplicity of  $Z_\Sigma$  along  $\Sigma$  at the generic point.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Under the above assumptions, the following identity holds*

$$\phi_{1,*}([C^+]) = [C^-] + c[\Sigma^-].$$

*Proof.* By construction,  $\phi$  identifies the open curves  $C^{+,\circ} := C^+ \cap (Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+)$  and  $C^{-,\circ} := C^- \cap (Y^- \setminus \Sigma^-)$ . Furthermore,  $C^\pm$  is the scheme-theoretic closure of  $C^{\pm,\circ}$  and  $(C^\pm \cap \Sigma^\pm)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. The image  $\phi_{1,*}([C^+])$  is uniquely determined by the intersection numbers

$$\gamma^- \cdot \phi_{1,*}([C^+]) = (\phi_*^1)^{-1}(\gamma^-) \cdot C^+,$$

with  $\gamma^- \in N^1(Y^-)$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\gamma^-$  is sufficiently ample so that the following conditions hold for any sufficiently generic divisor  $D^- \in \gamma^-$ :

- (1) the scheme-theoretic intersection of  $D^-$  and  $S^-$  is a smooth projective curve  $\Gamma^- \subset (S^-)^{\text{reg}}$  which intersects  $\Sigma^-$  transversely at finitely many closed points  $p_1, \dots, p_d$  contained in  $(S^-)^{\text{reg}} \setminus C^-$ , and
- (2)  $(\Gamma^- \cap C^-)_{\text{red}}$  is a zero-dimensional set contained in  $(C^-)^{\text{reg}} \setminus \Sigma^-$ .

Let  $D \subset X$  be the scheme theoretic image of  $D^-$  through  $f^- : Y^- \rightarrow X$  and let  $D^+ \subset Y^+$  be the strict transform of  $D$ . Then  $(\phi_*^1)^{-1}(\gamma^-) = [D^+]$ . Note also that

$$D^+ \cdot \Sigma^+ = -D^- \cdot \Sigma^- < 0,$$

hence  $\Sigma^+$  is contained in  $D^+$  as a closed subscheme.

Let  $\sigma: \tilde{S}^- \rightarrow S^-$  be a minimal resolution of singularities, and let  $\tilde{\Sigma}^-, \tilde{C}^-$  be the strict transforms of  $\Sigma^-$  and  $C^-$ , which are divisors on  $\tilde{S}^-$ . Then the inverse image  $\sigma^{-1}(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C)$  is a scheme-theoretic union of effective divisors

$$\sigma^{-1}(f_{S^-})^{-1}(C) = \tilde{C}^- \cup c\tilde{\Sigma}^- \cup \Delta,$$

where  $(\Delta)_{\text{red}}$  is contained in the exceptional locus of  $\sigma$ . Since  $\Gamma^-$  is entirely contained in the smooth locus of  $S^-$ , its strict transform  $\tilde{\Gamma}^-$  coincides with the inverse image  $\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma^-)$  and it is canonically isomorphic to  $\Gamma^-$ . Furthermore it is also disjoint from the exceptional locus of  $\sigma$ .

Let  $\Gamma \subset W$  be the scheme theoretic image of  $\Gamma^-$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma$  coincides with the scheme theoretic image of  $\tilde{\Gamma}^-$  via the the proper morphism  $f_{S^-} \circ \sigma: \tilde{S}^- \rightarrow W$ . Applying the projection formula for  $f_{S^-} \circ \sigma$ , one finds

$$\Gamma \cdot C = c\tilde{\Gamma}^- \cdot \tilde{\Sigma} + \tilde{\Gamma}^- \cdot \tilde{C}^-.$$

Given assumptions (1) and (2) above, since  $\Sigma^-$  and  $C^-$  are subschemes of  $S^-$ , this further yields

$$\Gamma \cdot C = cD^- \cdot \Sigma^- + D^- \cdot C^-,$$

where the right-hand-side is a sum of intersection products in  $Y^-$ . In order to finish the proof, recall that the induced projection  $f_{S^+}: S^+ \rightarrow S$  is an isomorphism under the current assumptions. Set  $\Gamma^+ := (f_{S^+})^{-1}(\Gamma)$  and note that  $\Gamma^+$  is canonically isomorphic to  $\Gamma$ . The same holds for the  $C^+ \subset S^+$ . Then one obtains

$$D^+ \cdot C^+ = \Gamma^+ \cdot C^+ = \Gamma \cdot C = D^- \cdot (c\Sigma^- + C^-).$$

In conclusion, one obtains an identity

$$\gamma^- \cdot \phi_{1,*}([C^+]) = D^- \cdot (c\Sigma^- + C^-),$$

for any ample divisor class  $\gamma^-$  satisfying conditions (1) and (2) above. This proves the claim.  $\square$

**7.2. Flop identity.** Let  $\text{PT}_{C^\pm}(Y^\pm)$  and  $\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y^\pm)$  be the generating functions (6.1) and (6.2), respectively, associated to  $f^\pm: Y^\pm \rightarrow X$ . Set

$$\text{PT}'_{C^\pm}(Y^\pm) = \frac{\text{PT}_{C^\pm}(Y^\pm)}{\text{PT}_{\text{ex}}(Y^\pm)}.$$

**Proposition 7.3.** *The following identity holds:*

$$Q^c \text{PT}'_{C^+}(Y^+; q, Q^{-1}) = \text{PT}'_{C^-}(Y^-; q, Q).$$

*Proof.* The proof is completely analogous to the proof of [Mau16, Proposition 2.4], which is a  $C$ -framed variant of [Cal16, Theorem 3.26 and Corollary 3.27]<sup>5</sup>, and it uses also Lemma 7.2. Although in the present case  $Y^\pm$  are not Calabi-Yau threefolds, the result proven in Lemma 2.12 suffices in order for the arguments of *loc.cit.* to go through. One should also keep in mind that in the present context the derived equivalence  $\Phi: \text{D}^b(Y^+) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{D}^b(Y^-)$  required in [Cal16, §3.9] is a special case of [VdB04, Theorem C].  $\square$

<sup>5</sup>An equivalent proof of this result is provided also in [Tod13].

As shown in Theorem 6.1, one also has the identity

$$f^+ \text{-PT}_{C^+}(Y^+) = \text{PT}'_{C^+}(Y^+).$$

Therefore Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 7.3 yield:

**Corollary 7.4.** *One has*

$$\left[ f^+ \text{-PT}_{C^+}(Y^+; q, Q^{-1}) \right] \Big|_{Q^{-c}} = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k)) q^k, \quad (7.2)$$

where the right-hand-side is the coefficient of  $f^+ \text{-PT}_{C^+}$  of degree  $Q^{-c}$ .

Here,  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k) := \mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; 0, k + \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-}))$ , i.e., it is the moduli space of stable pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  on  $Y^-$  such that  $\mathcal{F}$  is scheme-theoretically supported on  $C^-$ ,  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C]$ , and  $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = k + \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})$ .

Using Proposition 5.13, the left-hand-side of identity (7.2) can be rewritten as a generating function of Euler numbers for the nested Hilbert schemes  $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$  considered in §5.5. Recall that  $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$  parametrizes flags  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}' \subset \mathcal{O}_{C^+}$  of ideal sheaves such that  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+}/\mathcal{I}) = k$  and  $\mathcal{I}'/\mathcal{I}$  is a length  $m$  zero-dimensional sheaf of  $T_n$ , where  $T_n$  is the scheme-theoretic intersection of  $S^+$  and  $\Sigma_n^+$  in  $Y^+$ . Then, Proposition 5.13 immediately yields the identity

$$\left[ f^+ \text{-PT}_{C^+}(Y^+; q, Q^{-1}) \right] \Big|_{Q^{-c}} = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; c)) q^k.$$

Therefore, we have the following:

**Corollary 7.5.** *One has*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; c)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k)) q^k. \quad (7.3)$$

We can also provide a punctual version of identity (7.3) as follows. Let  $(C^- \cap \Sigma^-)_{\text{red}} = \{q_1, \dots, q_d\}$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq d$ , let  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-, q_i}(Y^-; k) \subset \mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k)$  be the reduced closed subscheme defined by the condition that  $\text{Coker}(s)$  is set-theoretically supported at  $q_i$ .

Recall that  $(C^+ \cap \Sigma^+)_{\text{red}}$  consists of a single point  $p \in (C^+)_{\text{sing}}$ . Let  $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+)$  be the punctual Hilbert scheme of  $C^+$  parametrizing length  $k$  zero-dimensional subschemes with set-theoretic support at  $p$ . Let  $\text{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; m) \subset \text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$  be the inverse image of  $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+)$  via the canonical forgetful morphism  $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m) \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^k(C^+)$  sending the flag  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}' \subset \mathcal{O}_{C^+}$  to  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_{C^+}$ . Then, by an inductive stratification argument, Corollary 7.5 further yields:

**Corollary 7.6.** *The following identity holds*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; c)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_{C^-, q_i}(Y^-; k)) q^k. \quad (7.4)$$

Finally, we can also derive the following identity when  $C^-$  has locally complete intersection singularities.

**Corollary 7.7.** *Assume in addition that  $C^-$  has locally complete intersection singularities. Then, the following identity holds:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_p^k(C^+; c)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{Hilb}_{q_i}^k(C^-)) q^k. \quad (7.5)$$

*Proof.* By assumption, the dualizing sheaf of  $C^-$  is a line bundle. Then [PT10, Proposition B.5] yields an isomorphism  $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-; k) \simeq \text{Hilb}^k(C^-)$ . Then identity (7.5) follows from identity (7.4).  $\square$

## 8. EXAMPLES AND EXPLICIT RESULTS

This section presents a concrete construction of a flop transition between projective threefolds satisfying Assumptions I, II, III, and IV. Explicit results are then obtained for torus-invariant space curves.

**8.1. Pagoda flop transition for complete intersection threefolds.** Let  $P$  be the toric fourfold  $(\mathbb{C}^5 \setminus \Delta) / \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C}^\times$  where the torus action has weights

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} z_0 & z_1 & z_2 & z_3 & z_4 & z_5 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -n \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

and

$$\Delta := \{z_0 = z_4 = 0\} \cup \{z_1 = z_2 = z_3 = z_5 = 0\}.$$

Let  $X \subset P$  be the hypersurface given by

$$2z_1z_2 - z_3^2 + z_4^n z_5^2 = 0.$$

**Lemma 8.1.**  *$X$  has a unique singular point at  $z_i = 0$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P^\circ \subset P$  denote the open subscheme  $\{z_0 \neq 0, z_5 \neq 0\}$ . Note that  $P^\circ \simeq \mathbb{C}^4$  with toric affine coordinates

$$\begin{cases} x = z_0 z_5^{-1} z_1, \\ y = z_0 z_5^{-1} z_2, \\ z = z_0 z_5^{-1} z_3, \\ w = z_0^{-1} z_4. \end{cases} \quad (8.1)$$

Then the intersection  $X^\circ := X \cap P^\circ$  is the hypersurface given by

$$2xy - z^2 + w^{2n} = 0.$$

This is precisely the threefold singularity studied in [Rei83, §5, Remark 5.13]. In particular, it has a unique singular point at the origin which is furthermore a cDV singularity. In order to finish the proof, one has to check that  $X$  is smooth at all points in the complement of  $X^\circ$ . This follows by straightforward computations in toric affine charts.  $\square$

Let  $Z_\pm \subset P$  be the closed subschemes given by

$$\begin{cases} z_1 = 0, \\ z_3 - z_4^n z_5 = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} z_1 = 0, \\ z_3 + z_4^n z_5 = 0. \end{cases}$$

respectively. Let  $P^\pm \rightarrow P$  be the blow-up of  $P$  along  $Z_\pm$ , which is again smooth. Let  $Y^\pm \subset P^\pm$  denote the strict transform of  $X$  in  $P^\pm$  and let  $f^\pm: Y^\pm \rightarrow X$  denote the canonical projections. Let  $\Sigma^\pm := (f^\pm)^{-1}(\nu)$  be the scheme-theoretic inverse images of the singular point  $\nu \in X$ . Note that both  $\Sigma^\pm$  coincide with the rational curve given by

$$z_i = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 4$$

as subschemes of  $P \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . Then the following holds.

**Proposition 8.2.**  *$Y^\pm$  is smooth, the projection  $f^\pm: Y^\pm \rightarrow X$  satisfies Assumption I and  $\Sigma^\pm$  satisfies Assumption II.*

*Proof.* Note that  $Y^\pm$  are given by the following equations in  $P \times \mathbb{P}^1$

$$Y^+: \begin{cases} z_1 w_1 - (z_3 - z_4^n z_5) w_2 = 0, \\ 2z_2 w_2 - (z_3 + z_4^n z_5) w_1 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8.2)$$



$$Y^- : \begin{cases} 2z_1w_1 - (z_3 + z_4^n z_5)w_2 = 0, \\ z_2w_2 - (z_3 - z_4^n z_5)w_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8.3)$$

This implies that the exceptional loci  $\Sigma^\pm$  of the projections  $f^\pm$  coincide simultaneously with the projective line

$$z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_3 = 0, z_4 = 0,$$

as subschemes of  $P \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . Since  $X \setminus \{\nu\}$  is smooth,  $Y^\pm \setminus \Sigma_\pm$  is also smooth. Moreover, let  $Y_\pm^\circ := (f^\pm)^{-1}(P^\circ)$ , where  $P^\circ \subset P$  is the open subscheme  $\{z_0 \neq 0, z_5 \neq 0\}$  used in the proof of Lemma 8.1. Then the resulting projections  $(Y^\pm)^\circ \rightarrow X^\circ$  coincide with the two canonical Atiyah-Brieskorn resolutions of  $X^\circ$ , as observed in [Rei83, Remark 5.13]. Hence  $Y^\pm$  is smooth and  $f^\pm$  satisfies Assumption I.

In order to prove the second part, let  $\Sigma_k \subset P \times \mathbb{P}^1$ , with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , be the closed subschemes

$$z_i = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 3, \quad z_4^k = 0.$$

Equations (8.2) and (8.3) show that  $\Sigma_k$  is contained as a closed subscheme in both  $Y^\pm$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{Y^\pm}$  be the associated ideal sheaves. Clearly, one has a filtration

$$\mathcal{J}_n \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{I}_\Sigma$$

as (2.2), where  $\mathcal{I}_\Sigma$  is the ideal sheaf of  $\Sigma$ . Moreover, conditions (2.3) and (2.4) are easily verified by local computations using the affine coordinates (8.1).  $\square$

Furthermore, let  $W \subset X$  be the Weil divisor defined by the equations

$$z_2 = 0, \quad z_3 - z_4^n z_5 = 0.$$

Let  $S^\pm \subset Y^\pm$  denote its strict transforms. Then the following holds by straightforward computations.

**Proposition 8.3.**

- The strict transform  $S^+$  of  $W$  under  $f^+ : Y^+ \rightarrow X$  is determined by the equations

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = 0, \\ w_1 = 0, \\ z_3 - z_4^n z_5 = 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular it is smooth irreducible and has intersects  $\Sigma^+$  transversely at the unique point  $p \in Y^+$  determined by

$$z_i = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 4, \quad w_1 = 0.$$

- The strict transform  $S^-$  coincides with the scheme-theoretic inverse image  $(f^-)^{-1}(W)$  and it is determined by the equations

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = 0, \\ z_3 - z_4^n z_5 = 0, \\ z_1w_1 - z_4^n z_5 w_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, it has a unique singular point  $q$  determined by

$$z_i = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 4, \quad w_1 = 0,$$

which is Keinian singularity of type  $A_{n-1}$ .

In conclusion, Assumptions II and III are satisfied.

8.2. **Torus invariant plane curves in  $Y^+$ .** Now let  $C \subset W$  be the curve

$$z_1^r - z_4^s = 0, \quad (8.4)$$

where  $r, s \geq 2$  are coprime integers. As in the proof of Lemma 8.1, let  $P^\circ \subset P$  the affine toric chart  $z_0 \neq 0$  and  $z_5 \neq 0$ , with coordinates  $(x, y, z, w)$  defined in (8.1). Recall that the defining equation of  $X^\circ = X \cap P^\circ$  is

$$2xy - z^2 + w^{2n} = 0.$$

Let  $(Y^+)^\circ := (f^+)^{-1}(X^\circ)$  and note that it has the natural open cover  $U^+ := (Y^+)^\circ \cap \{w_1 \neq 0\}$  and  $V^+ := (Y^+)^\circ \cap \{w_2 \neq 0\}$ , where  $[w_1 : w_2]$  are homogeneous coordinates on  $\mathbb{P}^1$  as in equations (8.2) and (8.3). Let  $u = w_1^{-1}w_2$  and  $v = w_2^{-1}w_1$  be the natural affine coordinates on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Then

$$U^+ := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[u, y, w] \quad \text{and} \quad V^+ := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x, w]$$

and  $U^+ \setminus \{u = 0\}$  is identified with  $V^+ \setminus \{v = 0\}$  via the transition functions

$$uv = 1, \quad xv = w^n - yu.$$

Moreover, the following holds by local computations.

**Lemma 8.4.**

- Let  $W^\circ$  and  $C^\circ$  be the scheme-theoretic intersection of  $W$  and  $C$ , respectively, with the open subscheme  $P^\circ \subset P$ . Then  $W^\circ$  is given by

$$y = 0, \quad z - w^n = 0,$$

hence it is isomorphic to the affine plane  $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, w]$ . The affine curve  $C^\circ \subset W^\circ$  is defined by

$$x^r - w^s = 0.$$

- The scheme-theoretic intersection of the strict transform  $S^+ \cap V^+$  is the affine plane  $v = 0$  and the strict transform  $C^+ \subset S^+$  is locally given by

$$v = 0, \quad x^r - w^s = 0$$

in  $V^+$ . In particular,  $C^+$  has a unique intersection point  $p$  with  $\Sigma^+$ , which coincides with the origin in  $V^+$ . Furthermore, the subscheme  $T_n \subset S^+$  coincides with the closed subscheme

$$x = 0, \quad w^n = 0$$

in  $S^+ \cap V^+$ .

As in Corollary 7.6, let  $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+)$  be the punctual Hilbert scheme parametrizing length  $k$  zero-dimensional subschemes of  $C^+$  with set theoretic support  $\{p\}$ . Let  $\text{Quot}_p(C^+, T_n; m, k)$  be the relative Quot scheme over  $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+)$  parametrizing quotients  $\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , with  $\mathcal{Q}$  a coherent  $\mathcal{O}_{T_n}$ -module of length  $m$ . Set

$$Z_{r,s,n}(q) := \sum_{k \geq 1} \chi(\text{Quot}_p(C^+, T_n; m, k)) q^k.$$

An explicit formula for this generating function will be derived below by localization with respect to the torus action  $\mathbb{C}^\times \times C^+ \rightarrow C^+$ , given by

$$\lambda \times (x, w) \mapsto (\lambda^s x, \lambda^r w).$$


By analogy to [OS12, Lemma 17], the fixed points will be in one-to-one correspondence to partitions, or Young diagrams, satisfying certain conditions. In order to fix conventions, Young diagrams will be identified with finite subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying the conditions

$$(i, j) \in \mu, \quad i \geq 1 \Rightarrow (i-1, j) \in \mu$$

and

$$(i, j) \in \mu, \quad j \geq 1 \Rightarrow (i, j-1) \in \mu,$$

as shown below



By convention, the partition associated to such a diagram is defined by lengths  $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_\ell(\mu)$  of its rows. The number of rows,  $\ell(\mu)$ , will be called the length of  $\mu$  and the size  $|\mu|$  of  $\mu$  will be defined as its total number of boxes. For each  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\mu)$ , let  $m_i$  denote the multiplicity of the  $i$ -th row of  $\mu$ . Proceeding by analogy to [OS12, Lemma 17], the following holds.

**Lemma 8.5.** *The set of fixed points in  $\text{Quot}_p(C^+, T_n; m, k)$  is isomorphic to the set  $P(r, s, n)$  of partitions satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1)  $\ell(\mu) = s$  and  $m_i \leq n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ ,
- (2)  $\mu_1 - \mu_{\ell(\mu)} \leq r$ , and
- (3) if  $\mu_1 - \mu_{\ell(\mu)} = r$ , then  $m_1 + m_{\ell(\mu)} \leq n$ .

*Proof.* As shown in [OS12, Lemma 17], the set of fixed points is in one-to-one correspondence to Young diagrams  $\mu$  satisfying conditions

- $\ell(\mu) \leq s$ , and
- if  $\ell(\mu) = s$ , then  $\mu_1 - \mu_{\ell(\mu)} \leq r$ .

The zero dimensional subscheme  $Z_\mu \subset C_+$  associated to the partition  $\mu$  is determined by

$$H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu}) \simeq \mathbb{C}\langle x^{i-1}w^{j-1}, (i, j) \in \mu \rangle,$$


equipped with ring structure induced by the natural surjection

$$\mathbb{C}[x, w]/(x^r - w^s) \rightarrow H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu}).$$

In particular the kernel of the multiplication map  $H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu}) \xrightarrow{\cdot} H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu})$  is given by


$$K_\mu \simeq \mathbb{C}\langle x^{\mu_j-1}w^j, (i, j) \in \mu \rangle.$$

The monomials spanning  $K_\mu$  are in one-to-one correspondence to the set of boxes of  $\mu$  marked with  $\bullet$  below.




The fixed points in the relative Quot scheme  $\text{Quot}_p(C^+, T_n; m, k)$  are in one-to-one correspondence to pairs  $Z_\nu \subset Z_\mu$ , so that the kernel of the natural epimorphism  $H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu}) \rightarrow H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\nu})$  is a length  $s$  submodule of  $K_\mu$  annihilated by  $w^n$ . Such pairs are in one-to-one correspondence to Young diagrams  $\mu$  satisfying conditions (1) – (3) in the statement.  $\square$

*Example 8.6.* For illustration, some examples of partitions satisfying conditions (1) – (3) in Lemma 8.5 are shown below for  $(r, s, n) = (7, 5, 2)$ .




(8.5)




(8.6)

Note that in both cases one has  $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 \leq 7$  and all rows have multiplicity at most 2, as required by conditions (1) and (2). Moreover, for case (8.6) one also has  $m_1 + m_5 \leq 2$  as required by condition (3), since  $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 = 7$ . This condition is not required in case (8.5), where  $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 = 4 < 7$ .  $\triangle$

*Example 8.7.* Consider



(8.7)



(8.8)

Cases (8.7) and (8.8) do not satisfy all required conditions in Lemma 8.5 for  $(r, s, n) = (7, 5, 2)$ . For case (8.7), one has  $m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = 3 > 2$ , in contradiction to condition (2). For case (8.8), one has  $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 = 7$  while  $m_1 + m_7 = 3 > 2$ , in contradiction with condition (8.8).  $\triangle$

For future reference note the following.

**Lemma 8.8.** *Under the current assumptions, let  $d(r, s, n) = \min\{|\mu| : \mu \in \mathcal{P}(r, s, n)\}$ . Assume that  $s = nk$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $1 \leq k < r$ . Then  $d(r, s, n) = nk(k+1)/2$ .*

*Proof.* It will be shown inductively, that under the current assumptions, the partition of minimal size is given by

$$\mu_{ni+j}^{(k)} = k - i$$

for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . In other words  $\mu^{(k)}$  has  $n$  rows of length  $i$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Indeed, in this case,  $|\mu^{(k)}| = nk(k+1)/2$ , which implies the claim.

Assume that  $k = 1$ . By definition, any partition  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(r, s, n)$  has  $s$  rows, i.e.,  $\mu_s \geq 1$ . Then the partition of minimal size in  $\mathcal{P}(r, n, n)$  is indeed given by

$$\mu_1 = \cdots = \mu_n = 1.$$

Suppose that the claim is true for all  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , for some  $1 \leq m \leq r-1$ . Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(r, n(m+1), n)$  be the partition of minimal size. By the induction hypothesis, in order for  $\mu^{(m+1)}$  to have minimal size allowed by conditions (1) – (3) in Lemma 8.5, the subpartition of  $\mu^{(m+1)}$  determined by the rows  $n+1$  through  $n(m+1)$  coincides with  $\mu^{(m)}$ . Therefore one must have

$$\mu_{i+n}^{(m+1)} = \mu_i^{(m)},$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq nm$ . Furthermore, condition (2) in Lemma 8.5 implies that the first  $n$  rows, must have at least  $m+1$  boxes. Hence the minimal configuration is achieved for

$$\mu_1^{(\ell+1)} = \cdots = \mu_n^{(\ell+1)} = m+1.$$

Note that condition (3) in Lemma 8.5 is trivially satisfied since  $\mu_1^{(m+1)} - \mu_{n(m+1)}^{(m+1)} = m \leq r-1$ .  $\square$

The main goal of this section is to derive an explicit formula for the generating function

$$Z_{r,s,n} = \sum_{\mu \in P(r,s,n)} q^{|\mu|}.$$

As a first step, for any  $t, m \geq 1$  let  $P(t, m)$  denote the set of partitions  $\nu = (\nu_1 \geq \dots \geq \nu_{\ell(\nu)} > 0)$  satisfying the following conditions

- $\nu_1 \leq t$ ,
- the multiplicity any part of  $\nu$  is at most  $m$ .

Set

$$Z_{t,m}(q, x) := \sum_{\nu \in P(t,m)} x^{\ell(\nu)} q^{|\nu|}.$$

**Lemma 8.9.** *One has*

$$Z_{t,m}(q, x) = \prod_{i=1}^t (1 + xq^i + \dots + (xq^i)^m). \quad (8.9)$$

*Proof.* It is straightforward to check that there is a one-to-one correspondence between partitions in  $P(t, m)$  and monomials in the expansion of the right hand side of equation (8.9).  $\square$

**Theorem 8.10.** *For any  $k \geq 0$ , let  $Z_{t,n}^{(k)}(q)$  denote the coefficient of  $x^k$  in  $Z_{t,n}(q, x)$ . Then*

$$Z_{r,s,n}(q) = \frac{q^s}{1 - q^s} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=s-n}^{s-m-1} q^{mr} Z_{r-1,n}^{(k)}(q).$$


*Proof.* Note the decomposition

$$P(r, s, n) = P_{\leq r-1}(r, s, n) \cup P_r(r, s, n),$$

where  $P_{\leq r-1}(r, s, n)$  consists of partitions  $\mu \in P_r(r, s, n)$  with  $0 \leq \mu_1 - \mu_s \leq r - 1$ , while  $P_r(r, s, n)$  consists of partitions  $\mu \in P(r, s, n)$  with  $\mu_1 - \mu_s = r$ . This yields a decomposition

$$Z_{r,s,n}(q) = Z_{\leq r-1}(q) + Z_r(q).$$

Moreover, as shown below, any partition  $\mu \in P_{\leq r-1}(r, s, n)$  decomposes uniquely as a union of a rectangular Yang diagram  $\lambda$  consisting of the empty boxes, and a second Yang diagram  $\rho$  consisting of the boxes marked with  $\bullet$ .



The resulting partitions  $(\lambda, \rho)$  must satisfy the conditions below, which follow from properties (1) – (3) in Lemma 8.5:


- $\lambda$  is nonempty and  $\ell(\lambda) = s$ ,
- $s - n \leq \ell(\rho) \leq s - 1$  and  $\rho_1 \leq r - 1$ , and
- all rows of  $\rho$  have multiplicity at most  $n$ .

In particular,  $\rho \in P(r - 1, n)$ .

Conversely, any pair  $(\lambda, \rho)$  satisfying the three conditions listed above determines a unique partition  $\mu \in P_{\leq r-1}(r, s, n)$ . This yields

$$Z_{\leq r-1}(q) = \frac{q^s}{1 - q^s} \sum_{k=s-n}^{s-1} Z_{r-1,n}^{(k)}(q).$$

Similarly, any Yang diagram  $\mu \in P_r(r, s, n)$  decomposes uniquely into three Yang diagrams  $(\lambda, \nu, \rho)$  as shown below,



where the boxes belonging to  $\lambda$  are empty, the boxes belonging to  $\rho$  are marked with  $\bullet$ , and those belonging to  $\nu$  are marked with  $*$ . Since  $\mu \in P_r(r, s, n)$ , the following conditions must hold:

- $\lambda$  is nonempty rectangular partition with  $\ell(\lambda) = s$ ,
- $\nu$  is a nonempty rectangular partition with  $m$  rows of length  $r$  for some  $1 \leq m \leq s$ ,
- $s - n \leq \ell(\rho) \leq s - m - 1$  and  $\rho_1 \leq r - 1$ , and
- all rows of  $\rho$  have multiplicity at most  $n$ .

In particular, again,  $\rho \in P(r - 1, n)$ .

Conversely, any triple  $(\lambda, \nu, \rho)$  satisfying all the above conditions determines a unique diagram  $\mu \in P_r(r, s, n)$ . This yields

$$Z_r(q) = \frac{q^s}{1 - q^s} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=s-n}^{s-m-1} q^{mr} Z_{r-1,n}^{(k)}(q).$$

□

**8.3. The strict transforms in  $Y^-$ .** The goal of this section is to determine the strict transform  $C^- \subset Y^-$  of the plane curve  $C \subset W$  in equation (8.4).

Let  $(Y^-)^\circ := (f^-)^{-1}(X^\circ)$  and note that it has an open cover  $U^- := (Y^-)^\circ \cap \{w_1 \neq 0\}$  and  $V^- := (Y^-)^\circ \cap \{w_2 \neq 0\}$ , where  $[w_1 : w_2]$  are homogeneous coordinates on  $\mathbb{P}^1$  as in equations (8.2) and (8.3). Let  $u = w_1^{-1}w_2$  and  $v = w_2^{-1}w_1$  be the canonical affine coordinates on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Then a simple computation shows that

$$U^- := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[u, y, w] \quad \text{and} \quad V^- := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x, w],$$

and  $U^- \setminus \{u = 0\}$  is identified with  $V^- \setminus \{v = 0\}$  via the transition functions

$$uv = 1, \quad xv = w^n - yu.$$

Let  $\Gamma^- := (f^-)^{-1}(C)$  be the scheme-theoretic image of  $C$ , and let  $(C^-)^\circ := C^- \cap (Y^-)^\circ$  be its strict transform. Since  $C$  is irreducible,  $\Gamma^-$  has two irreducible components,  $C^-$  and  $\Gamma_{\Sigma^-}$ . By definition, the strict transform  $C^-$  is also reduced, while  $\Gamma_{\Sigma^-}$  is set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma^-$ . Recall the multiplicity  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$  defined by

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\Sigma^-}}) = c \text{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma^-})$$

as sheaves on  $Y^-$ . Then, the following holds by local computations.

**Lemma 8.11.** *For any coprime pair  $r, s \geq 2$ , one has  $c = s$ . Furthermore,  $(C^- \cap \Sigma^-)_{\text{red}}$  consists of a single point  $q$ , which coincides with the origin in  $V^-$ .*

*Proof.* The scheme-theoretic intersection  $\Gamma^- \cap U^-$  is given by

$$y = 0, \quad w^s(4^r u^r w^{nr-s} - 1) = 0.$$

This is a plane curve consisting of two irreducible components,

$$y = 0, \quad w^s = 0,$$

and

$$y = 0, \quad 4^r u^{r-s} w^{nr-s} - 1 = 0.$$

Moreover,  $\Sigma^- \cap U^-$  is determined by

$$y = 0, \quad w = 0.$$

Hence the first component of  $\Gamma^- \cap V^-$  is a length  $s$  thickening of  $\Sigma^- \cap U^-$ , while the second is a smooth plane curve disjoint from  $\Sigma^- \cap U^-$ . This identifies the first component as  $\Gamma_{\Sigma^-} \cap U^-$  and the second as  $C^- \cap U^-$ . In particular,  $c = s$ .

In order to prove the second claim, note that the defining equations of  $\Gamma^- \cap V^-$  in  $V^-$  are

$$xv - w^n = 0, \quad x^r - w^s = 0.$$

By restriction to the open subscheme  $v \neq 0$ , these equations are equivalent to

$$x - v^{-1}w^n = 0, \quad w^s(v^r - w^{nr-s}) = 0.$$

This is a plane curve with two irreducible components

$$x - v^{-1}w^n = 0, \quad w^s = 0,$$

and

$$x - v^{-1}w^n = 0, \quad v^r - w^{nr-s} = 0.$$

The first is a length  $s$  thickening of  $\Sigma^- \cap \{v \neq 0\}$ , while the second is a smooth plane curve disjoint from  $\Sigma^-$ . Therefore  $C^- \cap V^-$  is the scheme theoretic closure of the latter in  $V^-$ , i.e., the smallest closed subscheme of  $V^-$  containing the second component as an open subscheme. Given the above equations, it is clear that  $C^-$  contains the origin, which is the unique common point of  $C^-$  and  $\Sigma^-$ .  $\square$

**8.4. Euler numbers of Hilbert schemes of points of curves with local complete intersections singularities.** Corollary 7.5 and Theorem 8.10 yield the following:

**Corollary 8.12.** *The following identity holds:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{Hilb}_q^k(C_-)) = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} Z_{r,s,n}(q).$$

It is technically difficult to find an explicit presentation for the defining ideal of  $C^-$  in  $Y^-$  for general values of  $(r, s, n)$ . An explicit presentation will be determined in the following, subject to the assumption that  $s$  is a multiple  $n$ . Moreover, in this case  $C^-$  will be shown to be a local complete intersection in  $Y^-$ .

**Lemma 8.13.** *Let  $a > b \geq 2$  be coprime integers so that  $a + b, n$  are also coprime. Let  $I = (xv - w^n, x^a - v^b) \subset \mathbb{C}[v, x, w]$ . Then  $I$  is a prime ideal.*

*Proof.* Let  $f: \mathbb{C}[v, x, w] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[t, w]$  be the ring homomorphism

$$f(v) = t^b, \quad f(x) = t^a, \quad f(w) = w.$$

Let  $J \subset \mathbb{C}[t, w]$  be the principal ideal  $(t^{a+b} - w^n)$ , which is prime under the current assumptions. Moreover,  $I \subset f^{-1}(J)$ . Hence it suffices to prove that  $I = f^{-1}(J)$ .

Suppose a polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{C}[v, x, w]$  belongs to  $f^{-1}(J)$ , i.e.,  $P(t^b, t^a, w) = (t^{a+b} - w^n)Q(t, w)$  for some  $Q(t, w) \in \mathbb{C}[t, w]$ . Note that  $P$  can be uniquely written as

$$P(v, x, w) = P_1(v, x, w) + (xv - w^n)P_2(x, v, w)$$

with

$$P_1(v, x, w) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} P_{1,k}(v, x)w^k.$$

Therefore,  $P_1(t^b, t^a, w)$  is a multiple of  $t^{a+b} - w^n$ , which holds if and only if it vanishes identically. Hence  $P_{1,k}(t^b, t^a)$  vanishes identically for all  $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ . Since  $a, b$  are assumed coprime, the chinese remainder theorem implies that  $P_1(x, v)$  is a multiple of  $v^b - x^a$  as in the proof of [OS12, Lemma 17]. In conclusion,  $P \in I$  as claimed above.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.14.** *Assume that  $s = ns'$ , where  $s' \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $s' \geq 1$ . Then the defining equations of the strict transform  $C^-$  in the affine chart  $V^-$  are*

$$xv - w^n = 0, \quad x^{r-s'} - v^{s'} = 0.$$

*Proof.* The defining ideal of  $\Gamma^-$  in  $V^- := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x, w]$  is  $I := (vx - w^n, x^r - w^{ns'})$  or, equivalently,  $I = (vx - w^n, x^{s'}(x^{r-s'} - v^{s'}))$ . We shall show that  $I = I_0 \cap I_1$ , where

$$I_0 := (vx - w^n, x^{s'}), \quad I_1 := (vx - w^n, x^{r-s'} - v^{s'}).$$

Clearly,  $I \subset I_0 \cap I_1$ , hence it suffices to prove the inverse inclusion. An element

$$(vx - w^n)A + x^{s'}B \in I_0$$

belongs to  $I_1$  if and only if it can be written as

$$(vx - w^n)A + x^{s'}B = (vx - w^n)A' + (x^{r-s'} - v^{s'})B'.$$

Note that  $B, B'$  can be uniquely written as

$$B := B_1 + (xv - w^n)B_2, \quad B' := B'_1 + (xv - w^n)B'_2$$

with  $\deg_w B_1, \deg_w B'_1 \leq n-1$ . Then it follows that

$$x^{s'}B_1 - (x^{r-s'} - v^{s'})B'_1$$

is a multiple of  $(vx - w^n)$ . Therefore it must vanish identically, which proves the claim.

In conclusion,  $\Gamma_{V^-}$  is the scheme-theoretic union of the closed subschemes  $\Gamma^0$  and  $\Gamma^1$ . Note that the first is set-theoretically supported on the closed subscheme given by  $x = 0, w = 0$ , i.e.,  $\Sigma^- \cap V^-$ . Moreover, the second is reduced irreducible by Lemma 8.13 and the only point in  $(\Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_0)_{\text{red}}$  is the origin. This identifies  $I_0, I_1$  as the defining ideals of  $Z_{\Sigma^-}$  and  $C^-$  in  $V^-$ , respectively.  $\square$

The previous two lemmas imply the following.

**Proposition 8.15.** *For any integers  $r, t, n \geq 2$  with  $r > t$  and  $(r, nt)$  coprime, let  $C_{r,t,n}$  be the curve defined by*

$$\begin{cases} xv - w^n = 0, \\ x^{r-t} - v^t = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8.10)$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^3 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[v, x, w]$ . Then  $C_{r,t,n}$  is local complete intersection in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . Its scheme theoretic closure in  $V^-$  is also a local complete intersection, and coincides with the strict transform  $C^-$ .

In order to conclude this section, we the following explicit formula for the generating function of Euler numbers of puntual Hilbert schemes of points of  $C_{r,t,n}$ .

**Corollary 8.16.** *For any integers  $r, t, n \geq 2$  with  $r > t$  and  $(r, nt)$  coprime, let  $C_{r,t,n} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$  be the curve defined by the equations (8.10). Let  $o$  be the origin in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ . Then*

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{Hilb}_o^k(C_{r,t,n}))q^k = q^{-nt(t+1)/2} Z_{r,tn,n}(q).$$



*Proof.* Corollary 7.5 and Theorem 8.10 yield the identity

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{Hilb}_q^k(C_{r,t,n})) = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{r,t,n}})} Z_{r,s,n}(q).$$

Now,  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{r,t,n}}) + d(r,s,n) = 0$ , where  $s = nt$ . Here,  $d(r,s,n) := \min\{|\mu| : \mu \in P(r,s,n)\}$ . Then, the claim follows from Lemma 8.8.  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. OPENNESS OF ORTHOGONALITY

In proving that a torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  satisfies openness of flatness, it is often useful to consider a mild variation of the classical semicontinuity theorem.

*Warning A.1.* Contrary to the main body of the paper, we use the *implicitly derived convention*: given a morphism of derived schemes  $f: S \rightarrow T$ , we let  $f^*: \mathrm{QCoh}(T) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(S)$  be the *derived* pullback functor, and we let  $f_*: \mathrm{QCoh}(S) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(T)$  be the *derived* pushforward.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, all fiber products and tensor products considered in this appendix will be understood in the derived sense.  $\triangle$

**Definition A.2.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of qcqs derived schemes. We say that  $F \in \mathrm{Perf}(X)$  is *f-properly supported* if for every  $E \in \mathrm{Perf}(X)$ ,  $f_*(E^\vee \otimes F)$  is a perfect complex on  $Y$ .  $\otimes$

Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of qcqs derived schemes. For every  $S \in \mathrm{dAff}/_Y$ , let  $X_S := S \times_Y X$  and let  $f_S: X_S \rightarrow S$  and  $p_S: X_S \rightarrow X$  be the natural projections.

**Definition A.3.** Let  $F \in \mathrm{Perf}(X)$  be a perfect complex and let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  be two integers. The functor  $\Phi_F: \mathrm{dAff}/_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is given by

$$\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) := \begin{cases} * & \text{if } f_{S,*} p_S^*(F) \text{ has tor-amplitude contained in } [a,b], \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$\otimes$

Using the natural identification  $\mathrm{dSt}/_Y \simeq \mathrm{Sh}(\mathrm{dAff}/_Y, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}})$ , we can see  $\Phi_F$  as a derived stack equipped with a natural map  $\phi: \Phi_F \rightarrow Y$ . We have the following.

**Proposition A.4.** *Assume that  $F$  is f-properly supported. Then, the morphism  $\phi: \Phi_F^{[a,b]} \rightarrow Y$  is representable by open immersions.*

*Proof.* Let  $g: S \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism. Derived base change yields a canonical identification

$$f_{S,*} p_S^*(F) \simeq g^* f_*(F).$$

Therefore,  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $g^* f_*(F)$  has tor-amplitude contained in  $[a,b]$ . Thus, we can replace  $f$  by  $\mathrm{id}_Y$  and  $F$  by  $f_*(F)$ . Besides, by definition of tor-amplitude, we see that  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) = \Phi_F^{[a,b]}(\mathrm{cl}S)$ . So we can also replace  $Y$  by  $\mathrm{cl}Y$  or, equivalently, assume from the very beginning that  $Y$  is underived.

Applying [Lur18, Propositions 6.1.4.4 & 6.1.4.5], we see that  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) = *$  if and only if for every geometric point  $s: \mathrm{Spec}(\kappa(s)) \rightarrow S$  one has  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(\mathrm{Spec}(\kappa(s))) = *$ . Besides, [Lur18, Corollary 6.1.4.6] shows as well that the subset  $U$  of  $Y$  given by those geometric points  $s: \mathrm{Spec}(\kappa(s)) \rightarrow Y$  such that  $s^*(F)$  has tor-amplitude contained in  $[a,b]$  is an open subset. Unraveling the definitions, we see that  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) = *$  if and only if the morphism  $S \rightarrow Y$  factors through  $U$ . Therefore,  $\Phi_F^{[a,b]} = U$ , whence the conclusion.  $\square$

<sup>6</sup>Here and in what follows, we consider  $\infty$ -categories the  $\mathrm{QCoh}(-)$ ,  $\mathrm{Perf}(-)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$ , etc – see e.g. [PS23, §1.6].

**Corollary A.5.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of qcqs derived schemes. Let  $F \in \text{Perf}(X)$  be a perfect complex and let  $N \in \mathbb{Z}$  be an integer. For every  $S \in \text{dAff}/Y$  and every  $f_S$ -properly supported  $G \in \text{Perf}(X_S)$ , the set  $U$  of geometric points  $t: \text{Spec}(\kappa) \rightarrow S$  such that*

$$H^i(\text{Hom}_{X_t}(j_t^* p_S^*(F), j_t^*(G))) \simeq 0$$

for every  $i \leq N$  is an open subset of  $S$ . Here,  $j_t: X_t \rightarrow X$  is the canonical map from the fiber.

*Proof.* Consider the perfect complex  $E := \mathcal{H}om_{X_S}(p_S^*(F), G)$ . Inspection reveals that it is  $f_S$ -properly supported. For every  $g: T \rightarrow S$ , let  $j_g: X_T := T \times_S X_S \rightarrow X_S$  be the induced morphism. Then since  $p_S^*(F)$  is perfect, we have a canonical equivalence

$$j_g^* \mathcal{H}om_{X_S}(p_S^*(F), G) \simeq \mathcal{H}om_{X_T}(j_g^* p_S^*(F), j_g^*(G)).$$

Combining this equivalence with [Lur18, Propositions 6.1.4.4 & 6.1.4.5], we deduce that for  $g: T \rightarrow S$  the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) for every geometric point  $t: \text{Spec}(\kappa) \rightarrow T \rightarrow S$ ,  $H^i(\text{Hom}_{X_t}(j_t^* p_S^*(F), j_t^*(G))) \simeq 0$  for every  $i \leq N$ ;
- (2)  $f_{T,*} j_g^*(E)$  has tor-amplitude concentrated in cohomological degrees  $\geq N$ .

Observe now that since  $E$  is  $f_S$ -properly supported,  $f_{S,*}(E)$  has tor-amplitude contained in  $[n, m]$  for some integers  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Set  $a := \max\{n, N\}$  and  $b := \max\{m, N\}$ . Then the above two conditions are further equivalent to  $\Phi_E^{[a,b]}(T) = *$ . Applying Proposition A.4 to the morphism  $f_S: X_S \rightarrow S$  and to the perfect complex  $E$ , we deduce that  $\Phi_E^{[a,b]}$  is representable by an open subscheme of  $S$ , which, in virtue of the above discussion, coincides exactly with the subset  $U$  of the statement. The conclusion follows.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.1

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 6.1. We shall refer to [Bri12, Bri11] for the relevant background on motivic Hall algebras. Moreover, we shall use the notation  $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  for the category  $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ .

**B.1. Infinite type  $\mathcal{C}$ -framed stack functions.** Following [Bri11, §4], let  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$  denote the infinite-type motivic Hall algebra generated by algebraic stack functions of locally finite type with target the algebraic stack  $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  of coherent sheaves on  $Y$  of dimension  $\leq 1$ . We introduce below the  $\mathcal{C}$ -framed stack functions to be used in the proof of Theorem 6.1. We do not recall here the construction of  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$ , rather we refer to [Bri12].

**B.1.1. Subcategories, pairs, and moduli stacks.**

**Definition B.1.** We say that a full subcategory  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  is *algebraic* if flat families of objects of  $\mathcal{B}$  form an algebraic substack  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ , locally of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ .  $\circlearrowright$

Examples include

$$\mathcal{A}_\Sigma, \quad \mathcal{T}_f, \quad \mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y),$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  is the full abelian subcategory consisting of coherent sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  defined by the condition  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ . Note that  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{T}_f)$  and  $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(\mathcal{F}_f)$  are defined as in [DPS22, Construction 3.17] and they are algebraic since the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$  is open by Corollary 4.15.

Fixing topological invariants  $\alpha \in N_{\geq 1}(Y)$ , one obtains an open and closed substack  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{B}; \alpha) \subset \text{Coh}(\mathcal{B})$ . Similarly, fixing a curve class  $\beta \in N_1(Y)$ , one obtains an open and closed substack  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{B}; \beta) \subset \text{Coh}(\mathcal{B})$  consisting of flat families of objects  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = \beta$ .

Furthermore, let  $\mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\mathcal{O}}(Y)$  be the moduli stack of pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$ , with  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  an arbitrary section. Let  $\mathcal{Coh}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{B})$  be the substack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Coh}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{B}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\mathcal{O}}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{B}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where the vertical arrows are the natural forgetful morphisms. The stack  $\mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\mathcal{O}}(Y)$  is algebraic, locally of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ , and the projection to  $\mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  is representable, of finite type<sup>7</sup>. Then, the same holds for  $\mathcal{Coh}^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{B})$  and the projection to  $\mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{B})$ . The associated stack functions will be denoted by

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{O}} \in H_{\infty}(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}),$$

respectively. Furthermore, for any full subcategory  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  as in the first paragraph, let  $\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma} := \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\Sigma}$  and set

$$\mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma}) := \mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{B}) \times_{\mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)} \mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{\Sigma}).$$

The associated stack functions will be denoted by  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma}}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{\Sigma}}^{\mathcal{O}}$ , respectively.

### B.1.2. $C$ -framed stack functions.

**Definition B.2.** Given an algebraic subcategory  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  as in Definition B.1, the subcategory  $\mathcal{B}_C$  of  $C$ -framed objects is the full subcategory of all sheaves  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}$  so that

- $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$  for some  $m \geq 0$ , and
- the fundamental cycle  $[\mathcal{F}]$  in the Chow variety coincides with  $C + m\Sigma$ .

◊

The goal of this section is to construct stack functions associated to  $C$ -framed subcategories by analogy to §5.4.

Recall that  $\mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y)$  denotes the moduli stack of three term exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ , and

$$\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi: \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$$

denote the three natural projections. Moreover,  $\mathcal{Coh}_C(Y) \subset \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  is the closed substack of pure one-dimensional sheaves  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  with scheme-theoretic support on  $C$ , so that  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C]$ .

Finally, the stack  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y)$  is defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (\pi_1, \pi_2) \\ \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}_{\Sigma}} \times \mathcal{Coh}_C(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \times \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array}.$$

The stack function  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C}$  is then defined as

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C} := \left[ \pi_C: \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right].$$

<sup>7</sup>All these statements can be proved as in [Bri11, Lemma 2.4] or by using our derived approach via the derived stack  $\mathbf{Perf}(Y)$  of perfect complexes on  $Y$ . Both approaches work also to prove similar geometric properties of all the other stacks introduced in this section.

More generally, given any algebraic subcategory  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ , let  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$  be defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_C \\ \mathcal{Coh}(\mathcal{B}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array} .$$

Let also  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$  be the stack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\circ}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow q \\ \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_C} & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array} .$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y)$  is algebraic, of locally finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$  and the same holds for  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(Y)$ . Similarly results hold for  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$  and  $\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$ . Then, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_C} &:= \left[ \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right], \\ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_C}^{\circ} &:= \left[ \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

denote the associated stack functions, where the structural maps are induced by the central projection  $\pi: \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ .

For future reference, note the following variant of Lemma 4.6.

**Lemma B.3.**

- (1) Let  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_C$  be a  $C$ -framed one-dimensional coherent sheaf on  $Y$ . Then, there is a unique exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Sigma}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_C$  is the pushforward of a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $C$ .

- (2) Moreover, if  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_C$  is the structure sheaf of a closed one-dimensional subscheme, then  $\mathcal{F}_C = \mathcal{O}_C$  and the composition  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  coincides with the natural epimorphism  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C$ .

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). Let  $\mathcal{F}_C := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{O}_C / \mathcal{T}$  be the quotient by the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf, and let  $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma}$  be the kernel of the natural surjection  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed, the claim is obvious.

Now, we consider (2). Since  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is surjective, the composition  $\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  must be also surjective. Since  $\mathcal{F}_C$  is the pushforward of a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $C$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

Using the notation in Lemma B.3, one defines a notion of  $C$ -framed section of a  $C$ -framed sheaf as follows.

**Definition B.4.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $C$ -framed object of  $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ . We say that a section  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed if the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$$

is not identically zero.  $\circlearrowright$

For any algebraic subcategory  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ , let  ${}^{\circ}\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$  be the open substack consisting of pairs  $(\mathcal{F}, s)$  so that  $s$  is  $C$ -framed. The associated stack function will be denoted by

$${}^{\circ}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_C} := \left[ {}^{\circ}\mathcal{Coh}_C^{\circ, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right] \in H_{\infty}(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

*Remark B.5.* Note that in general  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}_C$  does not imply that  $\mathcal{F}_C$  and  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$  belong to  $\mathcal{B}$ . However, this holds for  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{F}_f$  since  $\mathcal{F}_f$  is closed under subobjects, and  $\mathcal{F}_C \in \mathcal{F}_f$  for any sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_C$  since  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}_f, \mathcal{F}_C) = 0$  by support conditions.  $\triangle$

**B.1.3.  $C$ -framed Hilbert schemes.** For any  $m \geq 0$ , let  $\mathrm{Hilb}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma])$  denote the Hilbert scheme of closed one-dimensional subschemes  $W \subset Y$  with  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_W) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$ . Then, let  $\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m)$  be the stack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}_C(Y; m) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hilb}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathrm{ext}}(Y; m) & \xrightarrow{\pi_C} & \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where the bottom horizontal arrow is induced by the central projection  $\pi: \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\mathrm{ext}}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ . The resulting stack function will be denoted by

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} := \sum_{m \geq 0} \left[ \mathcal{H}_C(Y; m) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right],$$

the structural morphisms being again induced by the central projection.

*Remark B.6.* Note that  $\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m)$  is an algebraic space of locally finite type. Moreover, by Lemma B.3-(2), the groupoid associated to a parameter scheme  $Z$  consists of  $Z$ -flat commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} & & & & \\ & & \downarrow & \searrow & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{Z \times C} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the row is exact, the morphism  $\mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is surjective, and the morphism  $\mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z \times C}$  is the canonical epimorphism.  $\triangle$

**B.1.4.  $C$ -framed stable pairs.** Let  ${}^{\mathrm{sp}}\mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{ext}}(Y)$  be the stack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\mathrm{sp}}\mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{ext}}(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{SP}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow q \\ \mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathrm{ext}}(Y) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where  $\mathcal{SP}(Y)$  denotes the moduli space of Pandaripande-Thomas stable pairs on  $Y$ .  ${}^{\mathrm{sp}}\mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{ext}}(Y)$  is an algebraic space, locally of finite type over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

We introduce the stack functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{SP}_C} &:= \left[ {}^{\mathrm{sp}}\mathrm{Coh}_C^{\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{ext}}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right], \\ \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C} &:= \left[ f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the moduli stack  $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$  has been introduced in §5.4.

**B.1.5. Exceptional Hilbert scheme.** Let  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ex}}(Y)$  denote the Hilbert scheme parametrizing closed subschemes  $W \subset Y$  so that  $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_W) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ . By Corollary 2.11, this implies that the quotient  $\mathcal{O}_W/\mathcal{T}$  by the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_W$  is either zero or set-theoretically supported on  $\Sigma$ . The associated stack function will be also denoted by  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ex}}(Y)}$ .

## B.2. Motivic Hall algebra identities.

**Lemma B.7.** *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_2 \longrightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  where  $\mathcal{F}_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C$  be the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaves, respectively. Set  $\mathcal{F}_{1,C} := \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C / \mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_C := \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C / \mathcal{T}$ .

- (1) *Assume that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is  $C$ -framed. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed as well, and the injection  $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  yields an injection  $\mathcal{F}_{1,C} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$ . Moreover, suppose  $s_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1$  is a  $C$ -framed section. Then the composition*

$$s: \mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s_1} \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

*is also  $C$ -framed.*

- (2) *Conversely, assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed. Then  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is also  $C$ -framed and the injection  $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  yields an injection  $\mathcal{F}_{1,C} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$ .*

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). The canonical morphism  $f: \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C$  yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_{1,C} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow t & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} .$$

Since  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in [C] + \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ , Corollary 2.11 shows that its fundamental cycle must be of the form  $C' + m\Sigma$  with  $[C'] = [C]$ . By construction, this implies that  $\mathcal{F}_C$  is either a purely one-dimensional sheaf with scheme-theoretic support on  $C$  or identically zero. In order to rule out  $\mathcal{F}_C = 0$  it suffices to show that  $g$  is injective.

By assumption,  $\mathcal{F}_{1,C}$  is the pushforward of a rank one torsion-free sheaf on  $C$ . At the same time, the snake lemma yields the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(t) \longrightarrow \ker(f) \longrightarrow \ker(g) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(t) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $\ker(t)$  and  $\text{Coker}(t)$  are zero dimensional. Moreover, one also has the long exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \text{Tor}_1(\mathcal{F}_2, i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_2 \otimes i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ ,  $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_2) \cap C)_{\text{red}}$  is zero-dimensional. Hence  $\text{Tor}_1(\mathcal{F}_2, i_{C,*}\mathcal{O}_C)$  is zero-dimensional, which implies that  $\ker(f)$  is also zero-dimensional. In conclusion, the exact sequence (B.3) shows that  $\ker(g)$  must be zero-dimensional. Since  $\mathcal{F}_{1,C}$  is purely one-dimensional, this implies that  $\ker(g) = 0$ , i.e.,  $g$  is injective as claimed.

The second part follows from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{s_1} & \mathcal{F}_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_{1,C} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{s} & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} ,$$

where the vertical arrows are injective.

Now, we prove (2). Note that  $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_C) = 0$  since  $\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_2) \cap C$  is zero-dimensional. Hence, one obtains an injection

$$\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_C) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_C)$$

which implies that the composition  $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  is not identically zero. Therefore its image  $\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_C$  is purely one-dimensional, scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ , while  $\mathcal{F}_C/\mathcal{I}_1$  is zero-dimensional. This further implies that the kernel  $\mathcal{K}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_1$  of the map  $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  has  $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{K}_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\Sigma]$ , hence  $\mathcal{K}_1 \in \mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is also  $C$ -framed, and  $\mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{F}_{1,C}$  by Lemma B.3.  $\square$

**Lemma B.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_C$  and let*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

*be the exact sequence in Lemma B.3. Let  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  be a  $C$ -framed section and let  $s_C: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  denote the composition  $\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$ . Then  $\text{Im}(s) \subset \mathcal{F}$  is isomorphic to the structure sheaf of a unique  $C$ -framed one-dimensional closed subscheme  $Z \subset Y$ , and  $\text{Coker}(s)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{Im}(s)$  is a one dimensional quotient of  $\mathcal{O}_Y$  it is clearly isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_Z$  for a unique one-dimensional closed subscheme  $Z \subset Y$ . Moreover, under the current assumptions,  $(\mathcal{F}_C, s_C)$  is a stable pair, in particular,  $\text{Im}(s_C) = \mathcal{O}_C$ . One also has a commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{K} & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s) & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s_C) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array},$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the kernel of the canonical epimorphism  $\text{Im}(s) \rightarrow \text{Im}(s_C)$ . Then, the snake lemma shows that

- the morphism  $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma$  is injective, hence  $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ , and
- $\text{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{A}_\Sigma$  since  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \in \mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ , and  $\text{Coker}(s_C)$  is zero-dimensional.

This proves the claim.  $\square$

By using Lemmas B.7 and B.8, the next result is the  $C$ -framed analogue of [Bri11, Lemma 4.3].

**Lemma B.9.** *The following identity holds in the stack function algebra  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$ :*

$$\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Next note that any sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$  fits into a unique exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

with  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{T}_f$  and  $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{F}_f \cap \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ . By analogy to [Bri11, Lemma 4.1] and [BS16, Lemma 55], this yields:

**Lemma B.10.** *The following identity holds in  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Furthermore, given the exact sequence (B.5), one also has:

**Lemma B.11.**

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed if and only if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $C$ -framed. Moreover, if this is the case, the surjection  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  yields an isomorphism  $\mathcal{F}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_C$ .
- (2) Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed and let  $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  be a section. Then  $s$  is  $C$ -framed if and only if the composition  $\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  is nonzero.

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed and let

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

be the exact sequence in Lemma B.3. At the same time, By Proposition 4.9-(1), the set-theoretic support of the subsheaf  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{F}$  in (B.5) is either zero-dimensional or the union of  $\Sigma$  and a zero-dimensional set. Therefore  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}_C) = 0$ , which implies that the inclusion  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{F}$  factors through  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Hence one obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow i & & \downarrow \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow j \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} .$$

Then the snake lemma shows that  $j$  is surjective and the connecting homomorphism

$$\delta: \ker(j) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Coker}(i)$$

is an isomorphism. Since  $\mathrm{Coker}(i)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_C$  is purely one-dimensional, scheme-theoretically supported on  $C$ , Lemma B.3 shows that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $C$ -framed and the induced morphism  $j_C: \mathcal{Q}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  is an isomorphism.

Conversely, suppose  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $C$ -framed and let

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

be the exact sequence in Lemma B.3. Again, by Proposition 4.9-(1) one has  $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}_C) = 0$ . Hence one obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \\ & & & & \mathcal{Q}_C & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}} & \mathcal{Q}_C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} ,$$

where the vertical arrows are surjective. This yields the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \ker(f) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0 ,$$

which shows that the central term belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $C$ -framed by Lemma B.3, and the surjection  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_C$  coincides with the canonical surjection  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$ .

Now, we prove (2). The first part shows that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is also  $C$ -framed and there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{F}_C & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}_C \end{array} ,$$

where the bottom horizontal arrow is an isomorphism. Then it is clear that  $s$  is  $C$ -framed if and only if the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}$$

is also  $C$ -framed. In order to finish the proof, note that any nonzero section  $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  must be  $C$ -framed since  $H^0(Y, \mathcal{Q}_\Sigma) = 0$  by Proposition 4.9-(2).  $\square$

Consider the stack functions  $\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}$  and  ${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}$  as introduced in (B.1) and (B.2), respectively, with  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{F}_C$ . Lemma B.11-(1) yields the following result, which the  $C$ -framed variant of [BS16, Lemma 55].

**Corollary B.12.** *The following identities hold in  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A})$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C} &= \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C} , \\ {}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C} &= \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_f} * {}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C} . \end{aligned}$$



Next recall that  $\mathcal{Coh}^\circ((\mathcal{F}_f)_C)$  is the stack defined by the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Coh}^\circ((\mathcal{F}_f)_C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}^\circ(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{Coh}((\mathcal{F}_f)_C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where the bottom horizontal arrow is again determined by the central projection. Therefore, given a parameter scheme  $Z$ , the groupoid  $\mathcal{Coh}^\circ((\mathcal{F}_f)_C)(Z)$  consists of  $Z$ -flat diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} & & & & \\ & & \downarrow s & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}_C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where

- $\mathcal{Q}$  is a flat family of objects of  $\mathcal{F}_f$ ,
- $\mathcal{Q}_\Sigma$  is a flat family of objects of  $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma$ ,
- $\mathcal{Q}_C$  is the pushforward of a flat family of rank one torsion-free sheaves on  $C$ , and
- $s$  is an arbitrary section.

Let  ${}^\circ\mathcal{Coh}^\circ((\mathcal{F}_f)_C)$  denote the open substack defined by  $s \neq 0$ . Let  ${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}^\circ$  be the associated stack function. By using Proposition 4.9 and Lemma B.11, we obtain the next result, which is the  $C$ -framed variant of [Bri11, Lemma 4.2], [BS16, Lemma 57].

**Lemma B.13.** *The following identity holds in  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_f}^\circ * {}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}^\circ. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

**Lemma B.14.** *Let  $(\mathcal{F}, s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F})$  be a  $C$ -framed  $f$ -stable pair. Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

*be the canonical sequence in Lemma B.3. Then  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \in (\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma$  and  $s$  is  $C$ -framed.*

*Proof.* By assumption,  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}_f \cap \mathcal{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$  is  $C$ -framed and  $\text{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_f$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_f$  is closed under subobjects,  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \in \mathcal{F}_f$ , hence  $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \in (\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma$ .

Next, let  $s_C: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$  denote the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_C$$

and note the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker}(s) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s_C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker}(s_C) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}.$$

The snake lemma shows that the left vertical arrow is surjective. Since  $\text{Coker}(s)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_f$ , so does  $\text{Coker}(s_C)$  since  $\mathcal{T}_f$  is closed under quotients. At the same time  $\text{Coker}(s_C)$  is set-theoretically supported on  $C$ . This implies it must be zero-dimensional, hence  $s_C \neq 0$ .  $\square$

By using Lemmas B.11 and B.14, one can prove the following  $C$ -framed variant of [BS16, Lemma 60].

**Lemma B.15.** *The following identity holds in  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Finally, by analogy to [BS16, Lemma 59], one also has the following.

**Lemma B.16.** *The following identity holds in  $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$ :*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

**B.3. Proof of Theorem 6.1.** First, using the DT/PT correspondence proven in [ST11], it suffices to prove the identity

$$f\text{-PT}_C(Y) = \frac{\text{DT}_C(Y)}{\text{DT}_{\text{ex}}(Y)}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DT}_C(Y) &:= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi(\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m, \\ \text{DT}_{\text{ex}}(Y) &:= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}(Y; m, n)) q^n Q^m, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m, n)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}(Y; m, n)$  are introduced in §B.1.3 and §B.1.5, respectively.

Now, identity (B.6) yields

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

On the other hand, recall the identity (B.4):

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = {}^\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C}.$$

Using identity (B.7) in the right-hand-side, one further obtains

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}^\circ * {}^\circ \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}.$$

Now, by identity (B.9), this yields

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * {}^\circ \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}.$$

Finally, using identity (B.8) in the right-hand-side one obtains

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

By comparing (B.11) and (B.12), we obtain

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}.$$

Assuming  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}$  to be invertible, this yields

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, suppose one has an integration map  $I: H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\Delta]$ , where  $\Delta \subset N_{\leq 1}(Y)$  is the cone of effective numerical equivalence classes. Then, using Lemma 2.12, this leads to identity (B.10). As shown in [BS16, §7], the actual proof makes each step of the above heuristic derivation rigorous using Laurent truncations of stack functions of infinite type. The details will be omitted since they are completely analogous to *loc.cit.*, although  $Y$  is not assumed to be a Calabi-Yau threefold in the present case, the local Calabi-Yau property proven in Lemma 2.12 suffices in order for the arguments in *loc.cit.* to go through.

## REFERENCES

- [AB13] D. Arcara and A. Bertram, *Bridgeland-stable moduli spaces for  $K$ -trivial surfaces*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **15** (2013), no. 1, 1–38, With an appendix by M. Lieblich. 5, 16, 17
- [Bri11] T. Bridgeland, *Hall algebras and curve-counting invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **24** (2011), no. 4, 969–998. 28, 42, 43, 47, 49
- [Bri12] ———, *An introduction to motivic Hall algebras*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 1, 102–138. 42
- [BRV20] D. Bejleri, D. Ranganathan, and R. Vakil, *Motivic Hilbert zeta functions of curves are rational*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **19** (2020), no. 3, 947–964. 1
- [BS16] J. Bryan and D. Steinberg, *Curve counting invariants for crepant resolutions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **368** (2016), no. 3, 1583–1619. 3, 4, 5, 14, 17, 18, 28, 47, 48, 49, 50
- [Cal16] J. Calabrese, *Donaldson-Thomas invariants and flops*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **716** (2016), 103–145. 30
- [CDGZ03] A. Campillo, F. Delgado, and S. M. Gusein-Zade, *The Alexander polynomial of a plane curve singularity via the ring of functions on it*, (2003), no. 1, 125–156. 1
- [Dav19] B. Davison, *Refined invariants of finite-dimensional Jacobi algebras*, arXiv:1903.00659, 2019. 11
- [DHS12] D.-E. Diaconescu, Z. Hua, and Y. Soibelman, *HOMFLY polynomials, stable pairs and motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants*, Commun. Number Theory Phys. **6** (2012), no. 3, 517–600. 3
- [DPS22] D.-E. Diaconescu, M. Porta, and F. Sala, *Cohomological Hall algebras and their representations via torsion pairs*, arXiv:2207.08926, 2022. 5, 17, 18, 25, 42
- [Ful98] W. Fulton, *Intersection theory*, second ed., Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. 10
- [GK22] N. Garner and O. Kivinen, *Generalized Affine Springer Theory and Hilbert Schemes on Planar Curves*, International Mathematics Research Notices (2022). 1
- [GORS14] E. Gorsky, A. Oblomkov, J. Rasmussen, and V. Shende, *Torus knots and the rational DAHA*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), no. 14, 2709–2794. 1
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. 7, 15
- [KM92] S. Katz and D. R. Morrison, *Gorenstein threefold singularities with small resolutions via invariant theory for Weyl groups*, J. Algebraic Geom. **1** (1992), no. 3, 449–530. 5
- [Kaw88] Y. Kawamata, *Crepant blowing-up of 3-dimensional canonical singularities and its application to degenerations of surfaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 93–163. 28
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. 5, 28
- [Kol89] J. Kollár, *Flops*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 15–36. 28
- [Lur18] J. Lurie, *Spectral algebraic geometry*, available at his webpage, 2018. 41, 42
- [Mau16] D. Maulik, *Stable pairs and the HOMFLY polynomial*, Invent. Math. **204** (2016), no. 3, 787–831. 1, 2, 3, 4, 28, 30
- [Mor88] S. Mori, *Flip theorem and the existence of minimal models for 3-folds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 1, 117–253. 28
- [ORS18] A. Oblomkov, J. Rasmussen, and V. Shende, *The Hilbert scheme of a plane curve singularity and the HOMFLY homology of its link*, Geom. Topol. **22** (2018), no. 2, 645–691, With an appendix by E. Gorsky. 1
- [OS12] A. Oblomkov and V. Shende, *The Hilbert scheme of a plane curve singularity and the HOMFLY polynomial of its link*, Duke Math. J. **161** (2012), no. 7, 1277–1303. 1, 34, 35, 40
- [PT09] R. Pandharipande and R. P. Thomas, *Curve counting via stable pairs in the derived category*, Invent. Math. **178** (2009), no. 2, 407–447. 3, 22
- [PT10] ———, *Stable pairs and BPS invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 1, 267–297. 3, 28, 31
- [Pä21] T. Pădurariu, *Relative stable pairs and a non-Calabi-Yau wall crossing*, arXiv:2110.14561, 2021. 3, 18
- [PS23] M. Porta and F. Sala, *Two-dimensional categorified Hall algebras*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **25** (2023), no. 3. 41
- [Rei80] M. Reid, *Canonical 3-folds*, Journées de Géométrie Algébrique d’Angers, Juillet 1979/Algebraic Geometry, Angers, 1979, Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn—Germantown, Md., 1980, pp. 273–310. 5
- [Rei83] ———, *Minimal models of canonical 3-folds*, Algebraic varieties and analytic varieties (Tokyo, 1981), Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 1, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983, pp. 131–180. 2, 5, 6, 7, 32, 33
- [Ren18] J. V. Rennemo, *Homology of Hilbert schemes of points on a locally planar curve*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **20** (2018), no. 7, 1629–1654. 1
- [ST11] J. Stoppa and R. P. Thomas, *Hilbert schemes and stable pairs: GIT and derived category wall crossings*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **139** (2011), no. 3, 297–339. 50
- [Sta23] The Stacks project authors, *The stacks project*, 2023. 18
- [Tod09] Y. Toda, *Limit stable objects on Calabi-Yau 3-folds*, Duke Math. J. **149** (2009), no. 1, 157–208. 14
- [Tod13] ———, *Curve counting theories via stable objects II: DT/ncDT flop formula*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **675** (2013), 1–51. 30
- [Tod15] ———, *S-duality for surfaces with  $A_n$ -type singularities*, Math. Ann. **363** (2015), no. 1-2, 679–699. 2
- [Tod20] ———, *Hall-type algebras for categorical Donaldson-Thomas theories on local surfaces*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **26** (2020), no. 4, Paper No. 62, 72. 25
- [Vak22] R. Vakil, *The rising sea: Foundations of algebraic geometry*, 2022. 15

[VdB04] M. Van den Bergh, *Three-dimensional flops and noncommutative rings*, Duke Math. J. **122** (2004), no. 3, 423–455.  
30

(Duiliu-Emanuel Diaconescu) NEW HIGH ENERGY THEORY CENTER - SERRIN BUILDING, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, 126 FRELINGHUYSEN RD., PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019, USA

*Email address:* `duiliu@physics.rutgers.edu`

(Mauro Porta) INSTITUT DE RECHERCHE MATHÉMATIQUE AVANCÉE (IRMA), UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG, FRANCE

*Email address:* `porta@math.unistra.fr`

(Francesco Sala) UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, LARGO BRUNO PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA (PI), ITALY

KAVLI IPMU (WPI), UTIAS, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, KASHIWA, CHIBA 277-8583, JAPAN

*Email address:* `francesco.sala@unipi.it`

(Arian Vosoughinia) NEW HIGH ENERGY THEORY CENTER - SERRIN BUILDING, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, 126 FRELINGHUYSEN RD., PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019, USA