

# Complex plurisubharmonic geodesics via the generalized Legendre transform to the Okounkov body.

REBOULET Rémi

October 6, 2021

## Abstract

Consider a complex projective manifold  $X$  together with an ample line bundle  $L$ . In previous work, Witt Nyström defined a generalized Legendre transform (or Chebyshev transform), sending a continuous psh metric on  $L$  to a convex function on the Okounkov body (a generalized moment polytope). We show that a psh segment on  $L$  is geodesic if and only its associated segment of Chebyshev transforms is affine, hereby generalizing the corresponding statement in toric geometry. We then look into the maximal geodesic rays of Berman-Boucksom-Jonsson, which we characterize completely as having their associated ray of transforms be affine, and their collection of slopes at infinity correspond with the Chebyshev transform (in the sense of Boucksom-Chen-Maclean) of the associated non-Archimedean metric on the Berkovich analytification of  $L$  with respect to the trivial absolute value on  $\mathbb{C}$ . This can be interpreted as saying that along such rays, the non-Archimedean Chebyshev transform is the degenerated (hybrid) limit of the complex Chebyshev transforms.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Plurisubharmonic geodesic segments and the complex concave transform.</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Prerequisites in Kähler geometry. . . . .	5
1.2	The Okounkov body and the Chebyshev transform. . . . .	6
1.3	Linearity of the Chebyshev transform of a segment (proof of Theorem A). . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>The Chebyshev transform of a non-Archimedean metric over a trivially valued field.</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Test configurations and trivially-valued pluripotential theory. . . . .	11
2.2	The Chebyshev transform of a non-Archimedean continuous plurisubharmonic metric. . . . .	12
2.3	Computing the transform of a test configuration. . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>The Chebyshev transform in the non-Archimedean limit.</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Maximal geodesic rays in complex geometry. . . . .	14
3.2	Phong-Sturm's quantization of maximal geodesic rays associated to test configurations. . . . .	15
3.3	Hybrid limit of the concave transforms along a maximal ray, I: the case of a test configuration. . . . .	16

3.4	Hybrid limit of the concave transforms along a maximal ray, II: the general case (proof of Theorem B). . . . .	18
3.5	Toric hybrid limits. . . . .	18

## Introduction.

**Some toric and convex geometry.** Let  $X$  be a compact, complex projective variety of dimension  $d$ . If  $X$  is toric, with dense action of  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ , then work dating back to Atiyah ([2]), Guillemin-Sternberg ([16]) shows that torus-equivariant polarizations  $(X, L)$  are in one-to-one correspondance with lattice polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (see e.g. [5, Section 3.6] and [14] for a more in-depth explanation of the construction).

Via the Legendre transform, one obtains a one-to-one correspondance between locally bounded torus-invariant plurisubharmonic metrics on  $L$  (where a plurisubharmonic metric is a metric with positive curvature current), and bounded convex functions on the associated polytope  $\Delta(X, L)$ . Given such a metric  $\phi$ , let us denote by  $c[\phi]$  this Legendre transform. This correspondance has the fundamental property that it linearizes the Monge-Ampère energy. Recall that the (relative) Monge-Ampère energy between two locally bounded psh metrics  $\phi_0, \phi_1$  is defined as

$$E(\phi_0, \phi_1) = (d+1)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^d \int_X (\phi_0 - \phi_1) (dd^c \phi_0)^i \wedge (dd^c \phi_1)^{d-i},$$

which integrates the Monge-Ampère operator  $\phi \mapsto (dd^c \phi)^d$ . We then have that

$$(\phi_0, \phi_1) = d! \int_{\Delta(X, L)} (c[\phi_1] - c[\phi_0]) d\mu(\Delta(X, L)),$$

where the measure in the right-hand side is the normalized Lebesgue measure on the polytope  $\Delta(X, L)$ .

The Monge-Ampère energy is, even in the non-toric case, affine along a certain type of geodesic in  $\text{PSH}(X, L)$ . Picking an annulus  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{D}^*$  whose image under the map  $z \mapsto -\log |z|$  is  $[0, 1]$ , one can see  $\mathbb{S}^1$ -invariant psh metrics on  $L \times \mathcal{A}$  as convex segments of psh metrics on  $L$ , which we will call a psh segment  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \phi_t$ . One can then define the geodesic joining  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$  as the usc-regularized supremum of all psh segments joining (or below)  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ . The property that the Monge-Ampère energy is affine along this geodesic characterizes the latter among all psh segments. (Note that they can be, at least when the endpoints are smooth and strictly positive, realized as genuine geodesics for a Riemannian structure introduced by Mabuchi ([20]).)

Going back to the toric case, one then has again, via the Legendre transform, a one-to-one correspondance between toric psh geodesics and affine segments connecting convex functions in the polytope  $\Delta(X, L)$ . Our purpose in this article will be to try to generalize this result in the most general non-toric case.

**Generalized Legendre transforms and the Okounkov body.** In [22], Okounkov proposes a generalization of the moment polytope of a toric variety, which would be fully realized in [17], [18]. Roughly, one considers the image of the section ring  $\bigoplus_k H^0(X, kL)$  under a  $\mathbb{N}^d$ -valued valuation with "good" properties, which can be for example obtained as successive orders of vanishing against a flag of subvarieties of  $X$ . Keeping track of the tensor powers, this image becomes a graded semigroup of  $\mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ , and the base of the cone spanned by this semigroup is what one defines to be the Okounkov body  $\Delta(X, L)$  of  $(X, L)$ , a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , i.e. a compact convex subset with nonempty interior. In the toric case, if one picks a torus-invariant flag, [18, Section 6.1] shows that one recovers the usual polytope. In the general case, the correspondance is no longer bijective: there is no certainty that a given convex body gives rise to a unique polarized variety. Nevertheless, Okounkov bodies have been of much help in many different settings, which include constructing toric degenerations ([1]), proving stability results for manifolds with cscK metrics ([25]), and more generally whenever asymptotic valuative techniques arise, as is often the case in the algebraic study of K-stability.

In [21], Witt Nyström generalizes the Legendre transform of toric psh metrics to general continuous psh metrics on polarized varieties  $(X, L)$ . We describe the construction in full detail in Section 1.2. Essentially, one associates to such a metric  $\phi$  a subadditive sequence of functions  $k \mapsto c_k[\phi]$  on each  $\nu(H^0(X, kL))$ , corresponding to the infimum of the Hermitian norm

$$\|s\|_{k\phi}^2 := \int_X |s|^2 e^{-k\phi} d\mu,$$

with respect to a smooth volume form  $d\mu$ , over a certain subspace of sections associated to the semigroup point. One then takes the base of the convex hull of this function, which defines a convex function

$$c[\phi] : \Delta(X, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

One calls  $c[\phi]$  the *Chebyshev transform* of  $\phi$ . Much as the Legendre transform in the toric case, it also linearizes the Monge-Ampère energy ([21, Section 9]).

Our first main result is then the following:

**Theorem A.** Let  $t \mapsto \phi_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a plurisubharmonic segment in  $C^0 \cap \text{PSH}(X, L)$ . The following are equivalent:

1.  $t \mapsto \phi_t$  is a geodesic segment;
2.  $t \mapsto c[\phi_t]$  is affine in  $t$ , i.e. for any  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ ,  $t \mapsto c[\phi_t](p)$  is affine on  $[0, 1]$ .

Remarkably, one obtains an "if and only if" statement. It is natural that the Chebyshev transform is not invertible, i.e. given a convex function on the Okounkov body, there does not necessarily exist an associated psh metric on  $(X, L)$  whose transform is the original convex function, nor does it have to be unique if it exists. However, our result states that one can still characterize geodesic segments via their linearity. We explain ideas of the proof at the end of the Introduction.

**Maximal geodesic rays.** Consider now  $\mathbb{S}^1$ -invariant continuous psh metrics on the product of  $L$  with the punctured unit disc  $\mathbb{D}^*$ , i.e. rays  $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \phi_t$  of continuous psh metrics on  $L$ . To such a ray, Berman-Boucksom-Jonsson associate a function  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  on the Berkovich analytification  $X^{\text{an}}$  of  $X$  with respect to the trivial absolute value on  $\mathbb{C}$ . This space can be described as a compactification of the space  $X^{\text{div}}$  of divisorial valuations lying over  $X$ , via spaces of valuations on function fields of subvarieties  $Y \subset X$ ; in other words,  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  captures certain generalized orders of vanishing of the ray  $\{\phi_t\}_t$ , as we explain in detail in Section 2.1.

One then defines a psh ray to be the *maximal geodesic ray* emanating from  $\phi_0 \in C^0 \cap \text{PSH}(X, L)$  and directed by  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  if it can be realized as the envelope

$$\text{usc sup} \left\{ \{\psi_t\}_t \text{ psh ray with } \psi_0 \leq \phi_0, \psi^{\text{NA}} \leq \phi^{\text{NA}} \right\}.$$

One can think of it as the largest ray with singularity datum prescribed by  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ . By [4], it is equivalently characterized as the unique ray whose Monge-Ampère energy is affine, and such that the slope of the energy corresponds with the non-Archimedean Monge-Ampère energy of  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ , which we define again in Section 2.1. The main philosophy is that such rays best realize many properties of "continuity in the non-Archimedean (or hybrid) limit".

Given a non-Archimedean psh function  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ , Chen-Maclean ([13]), building on Boucksom-Chen ([8]) also define its "non-Archimedean" Chebyshev transform  $c[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$ , whose construction we recall in Section 2.2, and which is again a convex function on the Okounkov body. Our second main result is that the Chebyshev transform is continuous in the non-Archimedean limit, or in other words, that it realizes the non-Archimedean limit as a genuine slope limit of affine functions:

**Theorem B.** Let  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  be a psh ray in  $C^0 \cap \text{PSH}(X, L)$ , whose associated non-Archimedean function we denote by  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ . The following are equivalent:

1.  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  is a maximal geodesic ray;
2.  $\{c[\phi_t]\}_t$  is affine with slope  $c[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$ , i.e. for all  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c[\phi_t](p)}{t} = c[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p).$$

In Section 3.5, we also look at the corresponding statement in the toric case which, although independent of our result, does not seem to have been yet studied in the literature.

As a possible application, our results could be of use in showing convexity of some functionals  $F$  on the space of continuous psh metrics on  $L$ , provided they have a good "Okounkov" version  $c[F]$  which commutes with the Chebyshev transform, much like the Monge-Ampère energy. In that case, proving convexity results regarding  $F$  would amount to checking convexity of  $c[F]$  along genuine affine segments.

**Idea of the proofs.** The trick in both Theorems is to "quantize" the Chebyshev transforms via transforms associated to easier-to-study norms. For Theorem A, we make use of Berndtsson's uniform quantization of geodesics via Bergman kernels ([6]): given two end-point metrics  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ , one has that the associated norms  $\|\cdot\|_{k\phi_0}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{k\phi_1}$  admit a common orthogonal basis,  $(s_{i,k})$ , which we can assume to be orthonormal for the norm at 0. We then define, for all  $t$ , a norm  $\|\cdot\|_{k,t}$  as the unique norm diagonalized by this basis, and with

$$\|s_{i,k}\|_{k,t} = \|s_{i,k}\|_{k\phi_1}^t.$$

We then show that those norms can be used to compute the Chebyshev transform of  $\phi_t$ , via Berndtsson's result. This also allows us to better study the case of rays, because we have a good understanding of the "non-Archimedean limit" of such norms. Coupled with Phong-Sturm's quantization of maximal geodesic rays ([23]), this allows us to almost deduce Theorem B, modulo the non-Archimedean part, for which we proceed similarly, showing that the non-Archimedean Chebyshev transform (in the case where  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  corresponds to a test configuration for  $(X, L)$ ) can be computed with purely algebraic data, which is exactly the "non-Archimedean limit" as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  of norms of the above type.

**Organization of the article.** In Section 1, we first recall some basics of Kähler geometry, and the definition of Witt Nyström's generalized Legendre transform. We then prove Theorem A.

In Section 2, we recall some facts of non-Archimedean pluripotential theory over a trivially-valued field, then define the non-Archimedean Chebyshev transform. We specialize to the case of a test configuration.

In Section 3, we explain the formalism of maximal geodesic rays and their non-Archimedean limits, in the sense of [4]. We then explain Phong-Sturm's quantization result, and prove Theorem B. We finally look at the specialization to the toric case.

**Acknowledgements.** The author thanks his advisors Sébastien Boucksom and Catriona Maclean.

## 1 Plurisubharmonic geodesic segments and the complex concave transform.

### 1.1 Prerequisites in Kähler geometry.

Let  $X$  be a compact complex projective manifold of dimension  $d$ , and  $L$  be an ample line bundle on  $X$ . For lightness of notation, we shall write  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  to be the space of continuous metrics on  $L$  with positive curvature current, i.e. the space of continuous psh metrics on  $L$ . Given  $\phi_0, \phi_1 \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , we define their relative Monge-Ampère energy

$$E(\phi_0, \phi_1) = (d+1)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^d \int_X (\phi_0 - \phi_1) (dd^c \phi_0)^i \wedge (dd^c \phi_1)^{d-i}.$$

We will often make an implicit choice of a reference metric  $\phi_{\text{ref}} \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , and simply write  $E(\phi) := E(\phi, \phi_{\text{ref}})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, e^{-1} \leq |z| \leq 1\}$ . Via the change of variable  $t = -\log|z|$ , psh metrics on  $L \times \mathcal{A}$ , invariant under the action of  $\mathbb{S}^1$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ , are identified with plurisubharmonically-varying segments of psh metrics on  $L$  parameterized by  $t \in [0, 1]$ . We will refer to those as *psh segments*. They are also commonly called *subgeodesics* in the complex geometry literature.

Given  $\phi_0, \phi_1 \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , the regularized supremum

$$\{\phi_t\} := \text{usc sup}\{t \mapsto \psi_t \text{ psh segment with } \psi_0 \leq \phi_0, \psi_1 \leq \phi_1\}$$

is a psh segment which we call the *psh geodesic* joining  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ . It is characterized uniquely among psh segments by the property that  $t \mapsto E(\phi_t)$  is affine.

## 1.2 The Okounkov body and the Chebyshev transform.

Let us denote by  $R(X, L)$  the algebra of sections  $\bigoplus_k H^0(X, kL)$  of  $L$ . We pick a monomial order  $\leq$  on  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , i.e. a total order such that  $0_{\mathbb{N}^d} \leq \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ , and such that if  $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1$ , then  $\alpha + \alpha_0 \leq \alpha + \alpha_1$ . We pick a valuation

$$\nu : R(X, L) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}^d, \leq)$$

defined as follows: pick a point  $x \in X(\mathbb{C})$ , so that by Cohen's structure Theorem,  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$  is isomorphic to a power series algebra  $\mathbb{C}[[x_1, \dots, x_d]]$  with  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  a regular sequence in the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ . Any element in this local ring can then be evaluated against the valuation

$$\nu\left(\sum a_\alpha x^\alpha\right) = \min\{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, a_\alpha \neq 0\}.$$

On taking a local trivialisation,  $\nu$  extends to  $R(X, L)$  (independently of the choice of trivialisation). Let us then define, for all  $k$ , the set

$$\Gamma_k(X, L) = \{(k, \nu(s)) \in \{k\} \times \mathbb{N}^d, s \in H^0(X, kL)\},$$

which is finite and of cardinality  $\dim H^0(X, kL)$ . Then, the set  $\Gamma_\bullet(X, L) = \bigcup_k \Gamma_k(X, L)$  is a semigroup of  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^d$ . By general results on semigroups of points associated to valuations as above ([7]), it in fact generates  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^d$  as a semigroup. Let  $\text{Cone}(\Gamma_\bullet(X, L))$  denote the closure of the cone generated by this semigroup. Its base is the Okounkov body of  $(X, L)$  (with respect to  $\nu$ ):

$$\Delta(X, L) := (\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \text{Cone}(\Gamma_\bullet(X, L)),$$

which is a compact, convex set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with nonempty interior. In other words, it is the convex hull of the set of rescaled semigroup points of  $\Gamma_\bullet(X, L)$ . By [18, Section 6.1], this construction generalizes the usual polytope associated to a toric variety.

Generalizing the toric setting again, Witt Nyström defines in [21] (see also similar ideas, which we will come back to, in [13] and [8]) a generalized Legendre transform, the *Chebyshev transform*, sending a metric in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  to a convex function on  $\Delta(X, L)$ , as follows.

Given a semigroup point  $(k, k\alpha) \in \Gamma_k(X, L)$ , the quotient space  $gr_{k,\alpha}(X, L)$  can be identified as previously explained with the space of sections  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$  with an expansion of the form

$$x^{k\alpha} + (\text{higher order terms with respect to } \leq)$$

about  $x$ . There is, in particular, a subspace of unitary sections

$$\mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha} := \{s \in H^0(X, kL), s \text{ expands near } x \text{ as } x^{k\alpha} + (\text{higher order terms with respect to } \leq)\},$$

which one may also see as a class in the quotient space

$$gr_{k,\alpha} := \{s \in H^0(X, kL), \nu(s) \geq \alpha\} / \bigcup_{\alpha' \geq \alpha} \{s \in H^0(X, kL), \nu(s) \geq \alpha'\}$$

Pick a metric  $\phi \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , and a smooth volume form  $\mu$ . We can identify  $\phi$  with a function  $\phi - \phi_{\text{ref}}$  on  $X$  using the reference metric chosen before. It then induces for all  $k$  a Hermitian norm on  $H^0(X, kL)$  via

$$\|s\|_{k\phi}^2 = \int_X |s|^2 e^{-k\phi(x)} d\mu.$$

We define  $c_k[\phi](k, k\alpha)$  to be the logarithm of the evaluation of  $\mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}$  against the quotient norm on  $gr_{k,\alpha}$  induced by  $\|\cdot\|_{k\phi}$ , i.e.

$$c_k[\phi](k, k\alpha) := \log \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} \|s\|_{k\phi}^2.$$

We then define  $c[\phi] : \Delta(X, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to be the restriction to the Okounkov body of the convex hull of the mapping  $(k, \alpha_k) \in \Gamma_\bullet(X, L) \mapsto c_k[\phi](k, k\alpha_k)$ . By [21, Proposition 7.3], it can be explicitly computed as follows: if  $p$  is a point in the interior of  $\Delta(X, L)$ , such that  $(k, k\alpha_k)$  is a sequence in  $\Gamma_\bullet(X, L)$  with  $\alpha_k \rightarrow_k p$ , then

$$c[\phi](p) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-1} c_k[\phi](k, k\alpha_k). \quad (1)$$

**Remark 1.2.1.** Note that, in [21], the Chebyshev transform is first computed using the supnorm

$$\|s\|_{\text{sup}, \phi}^2 := \sup_{x \in X} |s|^2 e^{-k\phi(x)}$$

associated to  $\phi$ , which is shown in [21, Section 7] to coincide with the Chebyshev transform as defined above.

While the mapping from continuous psh metrics on  $L$  to convex functions on  $\Delta(X, L)$  is no longer invertible (that is not even the case for the Okounkov body construction!), one retains the linearization of the Monge-Ampère energy.

**Theorem 1.2.2** ([21, Theorem 1.4, Equation (21)]). *Given  $\phi_0, \phi_1 \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , we have that*

$$E(\phi_0, \phi_1) = d! \int_{\Delta(X, L)^\circ} (c[\phi_1] - c[\phi_0]) d\mu(\Delta(X, L)),$$

where  $\mu(\Delta(X, L))$  denotes the normalized Lebesgue measure on the Okounkov body.

This result will be essential in the proof of Theorem A.

### 1.3 Linearity of the Chebyshev transform of a segment (proof of Theorem A).

In this Section, we prove Theorem A via quantization. We recall its statement here.

**Theorem 1.3.1** (Theorem A). *Let  $t \mapsto \phi_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , be a plurisubharmonic segment in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$ . The following are equivalent:*

1.  $t \mapsto \phi_t$  is a geodesic segment;
2.  $t \mapsto c[\phi_t]$  is affine in  $t$ , i.e. for any  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ ,  $t \mapsto c[\phi_t](p)$  is affine on  $[0, 1]$ .

Consider  $\phi_0, \phi_1 \in \text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , and the geodesic segment  $\phi_t$  joining them. Let us define for all  $k$ , as in [6], Hermitian norms on each  $H^0(X, kL)$  via

$$\|s\|_{\text{Hilb}_k(\phi_i)}^2 = \int_X |s|^2 e^{-k\phi_i} (dd^c \phi_i)^d,$$

for  $i = 0, 1$ ,  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ . Being Hermitian norms, there exists a basis  $(s_{k,j})_j$  of sections of  $H^0(X, kL)$  which we can choose to be both:

1. orthonormal for  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Hilb}_k(\phi_0)}$ ;
2. orthogonal for  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Hilb}_k(\phi_1)}$ .

Let us denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{k,t}$ , for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the unique Hermitian norm on  $H^0(X, kL)$ , orthogonal with respect to the basis  $(s_{k,j})_j$ , and such that for all  $j$ ,

$$\|s_{k,j}\|_{k,t} = \|s_{k,j}\|_{\text{Hilb}_k(\phi_1)}^t$$

(it is important to note that  $\|\cdot\|_{k,t} \neq \|\cdot\|_{\text{Hilb}_k(\phi_t)}$  in general!) Our claim here is thus that the Chebyshev transform of each  $\phi_t$  can be computed using the sequence of norms  $(\|\cdot\|_{k,t})_k$ . Let us denote by  $\tilde{c}_k[\phi_t]$  the function on  $\Gamma_k(X, L)$  given by

$$\tilde{c}_k[\phi_t](k, k\alpha) := \log \inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \|s\|_{k,t}.$$

Let us also denote the convex hull of the  $\tilde{c}_k$  on the Okounkov body by  $\tilde{c}[\phi_t]$ . We then claim the following:

**Lemma 1.3.2.** For all  $t$ , we have that

$$\tilde{c}[\phi_t] \leq (1-t)c[\phi_0] + tc[\phi_1].$$

*Proof.* Note that, since the Chebyshev transform can be computed against any volume form, we have  $\tilde{c}[\phi_0] = c[\phi_0]$  and  $\tilde{c}[\phi_1] = c[\phi_1]$ . It is then naturally enough to prove that  $\tilde{c}_k[\phi_t] \leq (1-t)\tilde{c}_k[\phi_0] + t\tilde{c}_k[\phi_1]$  for all  $k$ . To that end, we first establish that, for all  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ , the mapping

$$t \mapsto \log \|s\|_{k,t}^2$$

is convex. Using the diagonalizability property, writing  $s = \sum a_j s_{j,k}$ , we have

$$\|s\|_{k,t}^2 = \sum |a_j|^2 \|s_{j,k}\|_{\phi_1}^{2t}.$$



Let us write for simplicity  $\beta_j := \|s_{j,k}\|_{\phi_1}^2$ . A quick computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2(\log \|s\|_{k,t}^2)}{dt^2} &= \frac{\|s\|_{k,t}^2 \left( \sum_j |a_j|^2 \log(\beta_j)^2 \beta_j^t \right) - \left( \sum_j |a_j|^2 \log(\beta_j) \beta_j^t \right)^2}{\|s\|_{k,t}^4} \\ &= \frac{\left( \sum_{j,\ell} |a_j|^2 |a_\ell|^2 \log(\beta_\ell)^2 \beta_j^t \beta_\ell^t \right) - \left( \sum_{j,\ell} |a_j|^2 |a_\ell|^2 \log(\beta_j) \log(\beta_\ell) \beta_j^t \beta_\ell^t \right)}{\|s\|_{k,t}^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Checking positivity of the terms generated by tuples  $(j, \ell)$  is then a matter of checking positivity of  $\log(\beta_j)^2 + \log(\beta_\ell)^2 - 2 \log(\beta_j) \log(\beta_\ell)$  which always holds.

Let  $(k, k\alpha)$  be a semigroup point. We must now verify that

$$\inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|s\|_{k,t} \leq (1-t) \inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|s\|_{k,0} + t \inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|s\|_{k,1}.$$

Note that the function on the left-hand side, although an infimum of convex functions, is not necessarily convex (Kiselman's principle does not apply here). Let  $s_0$  denote a minimizing section for  $\inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|\cdot\|_{k,0}$ . Then

$$\inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|s\|_{k,t} \leq \log \|s_0\|_{k,t},$$

while by convexity,

$$\log \|s_0\|_{k,t} \leq (1-t) \log \|s_0\|_{k,0} + t \log \|s_0\|_{k,1}.$$

Proceeding similarly at  $t = 1$  with a minimizing section  $s_1$ , we find that

$$\inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha}} \log \|s\|_{k,t} \leq \max((1-t) \log \|s_0\|_{k,0} + t \log \|s_0\|_{k,1}, (1-t) \log \|s_1\|_{k,0} + t \log \|s_1\|_{k,1}).$$

The mapping on the right-hand side is a convex function (a maximum of two affine functions), hence is smaller than the affine function joining the endpoints, which is  $(1-t)c_k[\phi_0] + tc_k[\phi_1]$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.3.3.** For all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we have that

$$c[\phi_t] \leq \tilde{c}[\phi_t].$$

*Proof.* Set  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Note first that

$$\begin{aligned} \|s\|_{\sup, \phi_{k,t}}^2 &:= \sup_X |s|^2 e^{-\phi_{k,t}} = \sup_X |s|^2 e^{-\log \sup_{s' \in H^0(X, kL)} \frac{|s'|^2}{\|s'\|_{k,t}^2}} \\ &= \sup_X (|s|^2 \cdot \inf_{s' \in H^0(X, kL)} \frac{\|s'\|_{k,t}^2}{|s'|^2}) \\ &\leq \|s\|_{k,t}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ , and approximate it by a sequence of semigroup points  $(k, k\alpha_k) \in \Gamma_k(X, L)$ , with  $\alpha_k \rightarrow p$ . For all  $k$ , let  $s_{k,t}$  be a minimizing section for  $\inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k,\alpha_k}} \|s\|_{k,t}^2$ . We then have that

$$\log \|s_{k,t}\|_{\sup, \phi_{k,t}} \leq \log \|s_{k,t}\|_{k,t} = \tilde{c}_k[\phi_t](k, \alpha_k). \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, by [6, Theorem 4.2], we have for all  $k$  that

$$|\phi_{t,k} - k\phi_t| \leq c \cdot \log k,$$

for some positive constant  $c$ , i.e. for all  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ ,

$$\log \|s\|_{\text{sup}, k\phi_t} - c \log k \leq \log \|s\|_{\text{sup}, \phi_{k,t}}. \quad (3)$$

Taking infima over  $u_{k, \alpha_k}$  in (3) and combining it with (2) finally yields

$$\inf_{s \in u_{k, \alpha_k}} \log \|s\|_{\text{sup}, k\phi_t} - c \log k \leq \tilde{c}_k[\phi_t](k, k\alpha_k).$$

By Remark 1.2.1,  $c[\phi_t]$  is also computed via the sequence of supnorms  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{sup}, k\phi_t}$ . Dividing by  $k$  and taking the limit then yields our result.  $\square$

We may now prove Theorem A.

*Proof of Theorem A (1.3.1).* Let  $t \mapsto \phi_t$  be a psh segment. Assume first that it is geodesic. We then know that its Monge-Energy is affine with respect to any reference metric  $\phi_{\text{ref}}$ . In particular, we may pick  $\phi_{\text{ref}} = \phi_0$ , which gives

$$E(\phi_t, \phi_0) = (1-t)E(\phi_0, \phi_0) - tE(\phi_1, \phi_0) = tE(\phi_1, \phi_0).$$

Combining this with Theorem 1.2.2, we in fact have that

$$E(\phi_t, \phi_0) = d! \int_{\Delta(X, L)^\circ} (c[\phi_0] - c[\phi_t]) d\mu(\Delta(X, L))$$

on the one hand, and

$$E(\phi_t, \phi_0) = td! \int_{\Delta(X, L)^\circ} (c[\phi_0] - c[\phi_1]) d\mu(\Delta(X, L))$$

on the other hand. This implies that, for all  $t$ , the integral of

$$c[\phi_0] - c[\phi_t] - tc[\phi_0] + tc[\phi_1] = (1-t)c[\phi_0] + tc[\phi_1] - c[\phi_t]$$

is zero. Now, combining Lemmata 1.3.3 and 1.3.2, one finds

$$c[\phi_t] \leq \tilde{c}[\phi_t] \leq (1-t)c[\phi_0] + tc[\phi_1],$$

which together with the zero integral property implies

$$(1-t)c[\phi_0] + tc[\phi_1] = c[\phi_t]. \quad (4)$$

Conversely, assume that the equality (4) above holds. This implies from the same arguments invoking Theorem 1.2.2 that the Monge-Ampère energy is affine along  $\phi_t$ , showing that  $\phi_t$  is then maximal.  $\square$

We have the following consequence:

**Corollary 1.3.4.** *Given a geodesic segment  $t \mapsto \phi_t$ , one has for all  $t$  that*

$$c[\phi_t] = \tilde{c}[\phi_t].$$

*Proof.* This follows from Lemmata 1.3.3 and 1.3.2 together with Theorem 1.3.1.  $\square$

## 2 The Chebyshev transform of a non-Archimedean metric over a trivially valued field.

Throughout this Section, we shall assume  $X$  to be a compact complex projective manifold of dimension  $d$ , endowed with an ample line bundle  $L$ .

### 2.1 Test configurations and trivially-valued pluripotential theory.

In this Section (2.1), we follow [4], [12] and [10].

Via the work of Berkovich ([3]), one can associate to  $X$  its *analytification*  $X^{\text{an}}$  with respect to the trivial (non-Archimedean) absolute value  $|\cdot|_0$  on  $\mathbb{C}$ , defined as  $|z \neq 0| = 1$ . One can describe it as the set of all valuations

$$\nu : \mathbb{C}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

on function fields of subvarieties  $Y$  of  $X$  (which we call *semivaluations* on  $X$ ). We endow it with the topology of pointwise convergence, which one can show makes it compact, connected and Hausdorff. Furthermore,  $X^{\text{an}}$  admits as a dense subset the set  $X^{\text{div}}$  of divisorial valuations lying over  $X$ , i.e. of valuations arising as orders of vanishing along divisors in birational models of  $X$ .

We define a test configuration  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  for  $(X, L)$  to be the data of:

1. a flat, projective morphism  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ;
2. a  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  lifting the canonical  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action on  $\mathbb{C}$ ;
3. an isomorphism  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{L}_1) \simeq (X, L)$ .

Given an ample and normal test configuration  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  for  $(X, L)$ , i.e. a test configuration such that  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\pi$ -ample and  $\mathcal{X}$  is normal, we associate to it a function  $\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$  on  $X^{\text{div}}$  as follows: we pick a test configuration  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{M})$  over both  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  and the trivial test configuration  $(X \times \mathbb{C}, L \times \mathbb{C})$ , via  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -equivariant morphisms respectively  $\pi_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\pi_0$ . There then exists a unique divisor  $E$  supported in the central fibre of  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that

$$\pi_{\mathcal{X}}^* \mathcal{L} - \pi_0^*(L \times \mathbb{C}) = E.$$

Given a point  $\nu \in X^{\text{div}}$ , i.e. a divisorial valuation over  $X$ , one can canonically and equivariantly lift it to a divisorial valuation over  $X \times \mathbb{C}$  via the *Gauss map* sending it to  $\sigma(\nu)$ , defined by

$$\sigma(\nu) \left( \sum p_i T^i \right) := \min_i \{ \nu(p_i) + i \},$$

having identified  $\mathbb{C}(X \times \mathbb{C})$  with  $\mathbb{C}(X)[T, T^{-1}]$ . We finally set

$$\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}(\nu) = \sigma(\nu)(E).$$

We then have that the map

$$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \in \{\text{ample, normal test configurations for } (X, L)\} \rightarrow \phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$$

is injective. Furthermore, one can canonically extend any function in its image to all of  $X^{\text{an}}$ , as in [10], and we write

$$\mathcal{H}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$$

for the image of this map. We will give a more algebraic description of this image in Section 2.3. Finally, we may define the set of continuous  $L^{\text{an}}$ -psh functions on  $X^{\text{an}}$  as

$$\text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}}) := \{\varphi : X^{\text{an}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \varphi \text{ is a uniform limit of functions in } \mathcal{H}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})\}.$$

Note that function  $0 \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$  is given by the trivial test configuration  $(X \times \mathbb{C}, L \times \mathbb{C})$ . We briefly mention that functions in CPSH correspond to continuous *psh metrics on  $L^{\text{an}}$* , in a sense which we will not make precise here, but which is apparent in the literature we cite. Finally, given two functions  $\varphi, \varphi' \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$ , one can construct via intersection theory ([10, Section 3.2]) their *mixed Monge-Ampère measures*

$$\text{MA}(\varphi^k, \varphi'^{(d-k)}) = (L^d)^{-1} (dd^c \varphi)^k \wedge (dd^c \varphi')^{(d-k)},$$

allowing us to define the Monge-Ampère energy of  $\varphi$  as

$$E^{\text{NA}}(\varphi) := (d+1)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^d \int_{X^{\text{an}}} \varphi \text{MA}(\varphi^i, 0^{(d-i)}).$$

It shares much formal properties with the complex Monge-Ampère energy, and is in fact deeply related to it, as we will see in Section 3.1. Note finally that one can define more generally the relative Monge-Ampère energy  $E^{\text{NA}}(\phi, \phi')$  between two functions in CPSH, which occasionally appears in the literature we cite (e.g. [11], [9]). Thus,  $E^{\text{NA}}(\phi) = E^{\text{NA}}(\phi, 0)$ .

## 2.2 The Chebyshev transform of a non-Archimedean continuous plurisubharmonic metric.

Building on the work of Ross-Witt Nyström ([24]) and Boucksom-Chen ([8]), Chen-Maclean define the Chebyshev transform of a continuous  $L^{\text{an}}$ -psh function  $\varphi \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$ , again defined on the Okounkov body, as follows. Let  $(k, k\alpha) \in \Gamma_k(X, L)$  be a semigroup point in the Okounkov body, and consider again as in Section 1.2 the space of unitary sections

$$\mathfrak{u}_{k, k\alpha} = \{s \in H^0(X, kL), s = z^{k\alpha} + \text{higher order terms}\}.$$

The function  $\varphi$  induces a norm  $\|\cdot\|_{k\varphi}$  (with respect to the trivial absolute value) on the space  $H^0(X, kL)$  via

$$\|s\|_{k\varphi} = \sup_{x \in X^{\text{an}}} |s| e^{-k\varphi},$$

where  $|s|$  is the function on  $X^{\text{an}}$  defined by  $\log |s|(\nu) = -\nu(s)$ . We then set

$$c_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi](k, k\alpha) := \log \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k, k\alpha}} \|s\|_{k\varphi},$$

and finally define as in the complex case  $c^{\text{NA}}[\phi]$  to be the convex hull on  $\Delta(X, L)$  of the  $c_k[\phi]$ .

**Remark 2.2.1.** For aesthetic reasons, we ask that our transforms be concave on the Okounkov body, so that we adhere to the conventions of [21] by not putting a minus sign when defining  $c_k^{\text{NA}}$ . This means that our  $c^{\text{NA}}$  equals minus the transform  $G_\phi$  of [13].

Patching together some known results in the literature, we then have that this transform also linearizes the non-Archimedean Monge-Ampère energy:

**Theorem 2.2.2** ([13],[11]). *Given  $\phi \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$ , we have that*

$$E^{\text{NA}}(\phi) = \int_{\Delta(X,L)^\circ} c^{\text{NA}}[\phi] d\mu(\Delta(X,L)).$$

*Proof.* By [13, Theorem 4.3], the sequence of norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\bullet\phi} = (\|\cdot\|_{k\phi})_k$  gives rise to a compactly supported measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , whose first moment, which one calls the "limit volume" of  $\|\cdot\|_{\bullet\phi}$ , equals by [13, Remark 4.4] the quantity

$$\int_{\Delta(X,L)^\circ} -c^{\text{NA}}[\phi] d\mu(\Delta(X,L))$$

(as per the above Remark), and by [11, Theorem 4.13], also equals  $-E^{\text{NA}}(\phi)$ .  $\square$

### 2.3 Computing the transform of a test configuration.

In this Section (2.3), we give a more explicit way to compute the Chebyshev transform of a continuous  $L^{\text{an}}$ -psh function of the form  $\phi_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}$  for some ample, normal test configuration  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  for  $(X, L)$ .

Such a test configuration gives rise to a sequence of norms  $(\|\cdot\|_{k\mathcal{L}})_k$  on each  $H^0(X, kL)$ , with respect to the trivial absolute value on  $\mathbb{C}$ , which is furthermore submultiplicative: given sections  $s_k \in H^0(X, kL)$  and  $s_\ell \in H^0(X, \ell L)$ , we have

$$\|s_k \cdot s_\ell\|_{(k+\ell)\mathcal{L}} \leq \|s_k\|_{k\mathcal{L}} \cdot \|s_\ell\|_{\ell\mathcal{L}}.$$

Given some positive integer  $k$ , and  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ , the norm in question is given by

$$-\log \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}} = \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, t^{-\lambda} \tilde{s} \in H^0(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L})\},$$

where  $\tilde{s}$  is the equivariant section defined by  $s$  under the  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action, and  $t$  is given by the projection on the base  $\mathbb{C}^*$ . Furthermore, using the arguments of [11, Lemma 4.12], one can see that for all  $k$  such that  $k\mathcal{L}$  is very ample, one has

$$\phi_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}} = k^{-1} \phi_{\mathcal{X},k\mathcal{L}} = k^{-1} \log \sup_{s \in H^0(X,kL)} \frac{|s|}{\|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}}.$$

**Lemma 2.3.1.** *If  $k$  is such that  $k\mathcal{L}$  is globally generated, then for all  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ ,*

$$\|s\|_{k\phi_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}} \leq \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s\|_{k\phi_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}} &= \sup_{x \in X^{\text{an}}} |s| e^{-\phi(x)} = \sup_{x \in X^{\text{an}}} \left( |s| - \sup_{s' \in H^0(X,kL)} (|s'| - \|s'\|_{k\mathcal{L}}) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in X^{\text{an}}} (|s| - (|s| - \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}})) = \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We then claim the following:

**Proposition 2.3.2.** *The non-Archimedean Chebyshev transform of  $\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$  can be computed using the sequence of norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\bullet, \mathcal{L}}$ , i.e.  $c^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}]$  is the convex hull of the  $\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}]$  defined as*

$$\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}](k, k\alpha) := \log \inf_{s \in \mathbf{u}_{k, k\alpha}} \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}. \quad (5)$$

*Proof.* We note that the comparison between those two Chebyshev transforms seems to be known as a folklore result, and therefore we provide only a sketch of the proof. Let  $k$  be such that  $k\mathcal{L}$  is globally generated. Then, by Lemma 2.3.1, we have at all semigroup points of the form  $(k, k\alpha)$  that

$$\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}](k, k\alpha) \geq c_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi](k, k\alpha).$$

Let us set  $\tilde{c}^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}]$  for the convex hull of the  $\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}]$ . By submultiplicativity of the sequences of norms in question, and subadditivity of the sequences  $c_k^{\text{NA}}$ , this implies that

$$\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}] \geq c^{\text{NA}}[\phi]. \quad (6)$$

As before, we have  $\int_{\Delta(X, L)^\circ} c^{\text{NA}}[\phi] d\mu(\Delta(X, L)) = E^{\text{NA}}(\phi^{\text{NA}})$ , while, by [13, Equation (29)], the integral of the term on the left-hand side equals a certain quantity, again the limit volume  $\text{vol}(\|\cdot\|_{\bullet, \mathcal{L}})$  of the sequence of norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\bullet, \mathcal{L}}$ . We do not define it here, but the essential result is that by [11, Theorem 4.13] and [11, Lemma 4.12], it equals the non-Archimedean Monge-Ampère energy  $E^{\text{NA}}(\phi^{\text{NA}})$ . Thus, we have two comparable functions on  $\Delta(X, L)^\circ$  whose integrals are equal, hence those functions are equal.  $\square$

### 3 The Chebyshev transform in the non-Archimedean limit.

#### 3.1 Maximal geodesic rays in complex geometry.

We now return to the complex setting. A *plurisubharmonic ray* of metrics in  $\text{PSH}(X, L)$  is defined to be an  $\mathbb{S}^1$ -invariant function in  $\text{PSH}(X \times \mathbb{D}^*, L \times \mathbb{D}^*)$ , where  $\mathbb{D}^*$  denotes the punctured complex unit disc, and we may identify it as before with a mapping  $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \phi_t$  using the change of variable  $t = -\log|z|$ . We furthermore say that it is a *geodesic ray* if it restricts to a geodesic segment on each compact subset of  $[0, \infty)$ ; and that it has *linear growth* if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_X \frac{\phi_t}{t} < \infty.$$

By [4, Section 4.2], one can associate to a psh ray of linear growth  $\Phi = \{\phi_t\}_t$  a natural "non-Archimedean" limit  $\phi^{\text{NA}} \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$ , which is defined generic Lelong numbers along divisors in central fibres of possible test configurations for  $(X, L)$ . This construction has the property that, if  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  extends to a locally bounded metric on some test configuration  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ , then

$$\phi^{\text{NA}} = \phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$$

([4, Lemma 4.4]).

The map  $\{\phi_t\}_t \mapsto \phi^{\text{NA}}$  is not injective, but there is always a canonical element in each fibre, a *maximal geodesic ray*, which is defined by the two following equivalent characterizations ([4, Theorem 6.6, Corollary 6.7]):

1. the Monge-Ampère energy is affine along  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(\phi_t)}{t} = E^{\text{NA}}(\phi^{\text{NA}}); \quad (7)$$

2. the ray  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  is obtained as the regularized upper envelope

$$\text{usc sup}\{\{\psi_t\}_t \text{ psh ray with } \psi_0 \leq \phi_0, \psi^{\text{NA}} \leq \phi^{\text{NA}}\}. \quad (8)$$

We will always assume that our rays emanate from a continuous psh metric  $\phi_0$  on  $L$ .

### 3.2 Phong-Sturm's quantization of maximal geodesic rays associated to test configurations.

By [4, Example 6.9], if  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  is an ample, normal test configuration for  $(X, L)$ , the maximal geodesic ray corresponding to  $\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}} \in \text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$  coincides with a psh ray constructed by Phong-Sturm ([23]), as we describe in this Section.

Consider the Hermitian norm on each  $H^0(X, kL)$  given by

$$\|s\|_{k,0}^2 := \int_X |s|^2 e^{-k\phi_0} (dd^c \phi_0)^d,$$

as well as the ultrametric norm (with respect to the trivial absolute value on  $\mathbb{C}$ )  $\|\cdot\|_{k\mathcal{L}}$  as in Section 2.3. It is a classical result that one can find a basis  $(s_{i,k})_k$  which is both:

1. orthonormal with respect to  $\|s\|_{k,0}$ ;
2. orthogonal with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{k\mathcal{L}}$  in the ultrametric sense, i.e. for all  $s = \sum_i a_i s_{i,k}$ , one has

$$\|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}} = \max_{i, a_i \neq 0} \|s_{i,k}\|_{k\mathcal{L}}.$$

(This is equivalent to the fact stated at the beginning of [24, Section 9], since the data of an ultrametric norm on a  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space  $V$  with respect to the trivial absolute value is equivalent to the data of a filtration of  $V$ , see e.g. [12, Section 1.1].) Let us denote, for all  $k, i$ ,

$$\lambda_{i,k} := -\log \|s_{i,k}\|_{k\mathcal{L}},$$

and consider the ray of Fubini-Study metrics

$$\phi_{k,t} := k^{-1} \log \left( \sum_i e^{t\lambda_{i,k}} |s_{i,k}|^2 \right).$$

We then have that:

**Theorem 3.2.1** ([23, Theorem 1]). *The sequence*

$$k \mapsto \phi_{t,k}$$

*converges pointwise to the maximal ray  $\{\phi_t\}$ ; furthermore, it converges in  $C^0(X \times I)$  for all compact intervals  $I \subset [0, \infty)$ .*

**Remark 3.2.2.** We note that the uniform convergence statement follows from the estimates of Berndtsson ([6]), since we simply restrict to the quantization of psh geodesic segments: on the restriction of  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  to  $I = [K, L]$ , this is simply Berndtsson's quantization of the geodesic segment joining  $\phi_K$  and  $\phi_L$ . Likewise, while the statement of Phong-Sturm invokes regularized *suprema* of the  $\phi_{k,t}$ , the results of Berndtsson allow us to directly consider the limit.

### 3.3 Hybrid limit of the concave transforms along a maximal ray, I: the case of a test configuration.

We will prove here the following special case of the first implication of Theorem B:

**Theorem 3.3.1.** *Let  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  be the maximal geodesic ray corresponding to a function of the form  $\phi^{\text{NA}} = \phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$ , associated to some test configuration  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  of  $(X, L)$ . We then have that the pointwise slope of  $\{c[\phi_t]\}_t$  is  $c[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$ , i.e. for all  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ ,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c[\phi_t](p)}{t} = c[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p).$$

The idea of the proof is to use similar norms as in Section 1.3, whose "non-Archimedean limit" is very-well understood. Namely, we keep the notations of the previous Section, and define for all positive integers  $k$  and all  $t \in [0, \infty)$  a norm  $\|\cdot\|_{k,t}$  by requiring it to be the unique Hermitian norm on  $H^0(X, kL)$ , for which  $(s_{i,k})_k$  is an orthogonal basis, and with for all  $i$

$$\|s_{i,k}\|_{k,t}^2 = e^{-t\lambda_{i,k}}.$$

Let us denote the associated (partial) Chebyshev transforms as  $\tilde{c}_k$ , which coincide with the ones considered in Section 1.3, by Remark 3.2.2. Let us also use the notation from Section 3.2 in writing  $\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}$  for the partial non-Archimedean Chebyshev transforms of  $\phi_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$  computed using the  $\|\cdot\|_{k\mathcal{L}}$ , defined as the unique ultrametric norm with respect to the trivial absolute value on  $\mathbb{C}$ , satisfying the ultrametric orthogonality property with respect to  $(s_{i,k})_k$ , and for which

$$\|s_{i,k}\|_{k\mathcal{L}} = e^{-\lambda_{i,k}}.$$

We then have that:

**Lemma 3.3.2.** For all  $s \in H^0(X, kL)$ ,

$$\lim_t (\|s\|_{k,t}^2)^{\frac{1}{t}} = \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}(s).$$

*Proof.* Decompose  $s$  as  $s = \sum a_i s_{i,k}$ . We have  $\|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}} = \max |a_i|_0 e^{-\lambda_{i,k}}$ , thus

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\|s\|_{k,t}^2)^{\frac{1}{t}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_i |a_i|^2 e^{-t\lambda_{i,k}} \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} = \max_{i, a_i \neq 0} e^{-\lambda_{i,k}} = \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}.$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.3.** For all positive integers  $k$  and all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\tilde{c}_k[\phi_t] \geq \tilde{c}_k[\phi_0] + t\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}].$$



*Proof.* Recall that, for all  $(k, k\alpha) \in \Gamma_k(X, L)$ , and all  $s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}$ ,  $t \mapsto \log \|s\|_{k,t}$  is convex. Therefore, it lies above the line  $t \mapsto \log \|s\|_{k,0} + \lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t}$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_k[\phi_t](k, k\alpha) &\geq \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} \left( \log \|s\|_{k,0} + \lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t} \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} (\log \|s\|_{k,0}) + \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} \lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t} \\ &\geq \tilde{c}_k[\phi_0](k, k\alpha) + \inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} \lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

We must therefore show that

$$\inf_{s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}} \lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t} \geq \tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi_t](k, k\alpha).$$

To that end, by Proposition 2.3.2, it is enough to show that, for all  $s \in \mathfrak{u}_{k,\alpha}$ ,

$$\lim_t \frac{\log \|s\|_{k,t}}{t} \geq \log \|s\|_{k\mathcal{L}}(s).$$

But this is in fact an equality, due to Lemma 3.3.2, proving our claim.  $\square$

We may now prove our Theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.1.* Let  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ , which we approximate with a sequence of semi-group points  $(k, k\alpha_k) \in \Gamma_k(X, L)$ ,  $\alpha(k) \rightarrow p$ . As per Lemma 3.3.3, one finds for all  $k$

$$\tilde{c}_k[\phi_t](k, k\alpha_k) \geq \tilde{c}_k[\phi_0](k, k\alpha_k) + t\tilde{c}_k^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}](k, k\alpha_k).$$

Passing to the limit in  $k$ , we then have

$$\tilde{c}[\phi_t](p) \geq \tilde{c}[\phi_0](p) + t\tilde{c}^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p).$$

By Proposition 2.3.2, the second term on the right-hand side coincides with  $t \cdot c^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p)$ . On the other hand, the argument of Remark 3.2.2 together with Corollary 1.3.4 implies that the term on the left-hand side always equals  $c[\phi_t](p)$ . We thus have

$$c[\phi_t](p) \geq c[\phi_0](p) + t \cdot c^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p).$$

We then use an energy argument again. Since  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  is maximal, its Monge-Ampère energy is affine with slope equal to  $E^{\text{NA}}(\phi^{\text{NA}})$ . Furthermore, since it is a geodesic ray, by Theorem A,  $\{c[\phi_t]\}_t$  is of the form

$$t \mapsto c[\phi_0] + t \lim_t \frac{c[\phi_t]}{t} \geq c[\phi_0] + tc^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}].$$

Since

$$E(\phi_t, \phi_0) = d! \int_{\Delta(X, L)^\circ} -t \lim_t \frac{c[\phi_t]}{t} d\mu(\Delta(X, L)),$$

we get from a similar argument as the proof of Theorem A that  $c[\phi_0] + t \lim_t \frac{c[\phi_t]}{t} = c[\phi_0] + tc^{\text{NA}}[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$  for all  $t$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Hybrid limit of the concave transforms along a maximal ray, II: the general case (proof of Theorem B).

We may now prove Theorem B in full generality.

**Theorem 3.4.1** (Theorem B). *Let  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  be a geodesic ray in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$ , whose non-Archimedean function we denote by  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ . The following are equivalent:*

1.  $\{\phi_t\}_t$  is a maximal geodesic ray;
2. the pointwise slope of  $\{c[\phi_t]\}_t$  is  $c[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$ , i.e. for all  $p \in \Delta(X, L)$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c[\phi_t](p)}{t} = c[\phi^{\text{NA}}](p).$$

*Proof.* Assume (1) to hold. If  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  is associated to a test configuration, then (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is merely the statement of Theorem 3.3.1. In the general case, since any continuous psh metric is a uniform limit of Fubini-Study metrics, we may regularize  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$  by an increasing sequence  $\ell \mapsto \phi_\ell^{\text{NA}}$  of Fubini-Study metrics, with associated increasing sequence maximal geodesic rays  $\{\phi_{\ell,t}\}_t$  (where we know it to be increasing by maximality). We then have  $\lim_\ell c[\phi_\ell^{\text{NA}}] = c[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$  (this can be checked on semigroup points, since infima and increasing uniform limits commute), and for all  $t, \ell$ ,

$$c[\phi_{\ell,t}] = c[\phi_{\ell,0}] + tc[\phi_\ell^{\text{NA}}].$$

By the same argument, the left-hand side converges to  $c[\phi_t]$  while the right-hand side converges to  $c[\phi_0] + tc[\phi^{\text{NA}}]$ , concluding this part of the proof.

Conversely, assume (2) to hold. Let  $\{\psi_t\}_t$  be the unique maximal geodesic ray associated to  $\phi^{\text{NA}}$ . We then have the following information:

1. by maximality,

$$\phi_t \leq \psi_t; \tag{9}$$

2.  $\{c[\phi_t]\}_t$  and  $\{c[\psi_t]\}_t$  are equal, since they define affine segments (by geodesicity) with the same starting point and the same slope (because hypothesis (2) holds).

The latter point implies that  $E(\phi_t) = E(\psi_t)$ , which classically, combined with (9), implies  $\psi_t = \phi_t$  for all  $t$ .  $\square$

### 3.5 Toric hybrid limits.

We briefly show that our results generalize a nice characterization of toric maximal geodesic rays. Note that, while a very similar problem has been studied in [19, Theorem 1.12], the following characterization of toric maximal rays does not seem to appear even implicitly in the current mathematical literature.

Recall from the Introduction (see also [5]) that, if  $X$  is toric and  $L$  is a torus-equivariant line bundle, then the Chebyshev transform of Witt Nyström is simply a Legendre transform, and the Okounkov body is simply the usual lattice polytope associated  $\Delta(X, L)$  associated to this equivariant polarization. Furthermore,  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  is in bijection with the set of continuous convex functions on  $\Delta(X, L)$ ,  $\text{CC}(\Delta(X, L))$ .

On the non-Archimedean side, [15, Section 4] (see also [10, Appendix B]) shows that  $\text{CPSH}(X^{\text{an}}, L^{\text{an}})$  is again in bijection via the Legendre transform with  $\text{CC}(\Delta(X, L))$ . One then has the following:

**Theorem 3.5.1.** *Assume  $X$  to be toric and  $L$  to be an equivariant polarization. Then, one has one-to-one correspondances between:*

1. *toric psh rays in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  and convex rays of functions in  $\text{CC}(\Delta(X, L))$ ;*
2. *toric geodesic rays in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  and affine rays of functions in  $\text{CC}(\Delta(X, L))$ ;*
3. *maximal toric geodesic rays in  $\text{CPSH}(X, L)$  and affine rays of functions in  $\text{CC}(\Delta(X, L))$  whose slope coincides with the Legendre transform of the non-Archimedean function associated to it via the second point.*

*Proof.* The first two points follow from classical results in toric complex geometry, since psh segments and segments of continuous convex functions on the polytope are already in one-to-one correspondance. The third point follows from Theorem 3.4.1 and the fact that, as discussed before, the Legendre construction is also invertible in the non-Archimedean case.  $\square$

## References

- [1] D. Anderson. Okounkov bodies and toric degenerations. *Mathematische Annalen*, 356(3):1183–1202, 2013.
- [2] M. F. Atiyah. Convexity and commuting hamiltonians. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 14(1):1–15, 1982.
- [3] V. G. Berkovich. *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*. Number 33. American Mathematical Soc., 1990.
- [4] R. Berman, S. Boucksom, and M. Jonsson. A variational approach to the yau–tian–donaldson conjecture. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 2021.
- [5] R. J. Berman and B. Berndtsson. Real monge-ampère equations and kähler-ricci solitons on toric log fano varieties. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 22, pages 649–711, 2013.
- [6] B. Berndtsson. Probability measures related to geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0907.1806*, 2009.
- [7] S. Boucksom. Corps d’Okounkov. *Séminaire Bourbaki*, 65:1–38, 2012.
- [8] S. Boucksom and H. Chen. Okounkov bodies of filtered linear series. *Compositio Mathematica*, 147(4):1205–1229, 2011.
- [9] S. Boucksom and D. Eriksson. Spaces of norms, determinant of cohomology and fekete points in non-archimedean geometry. *Advances in Mathematics*, 378:107501, 2021.
- [10] S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson. Global pluripotential theory over a trivially valued field. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.08229*, 2018.

- [11] S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson. A non-Archimedean approach to K-stability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11160*, 2018.
- [12] S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson. A non-archimedean approach to k-stability, i: Metric geometry of spaces of test configurations and valuations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.11221*, 2021.
- [13] H. Chen and C. Maclean. Distribution of logarithmic spectra of the equilibrium energy. *manuscripta mathematica*, 146(3-4):365–394, 2015.
- [14] D. A. Cox, J. B. Little, and H. K. Schenck. *Toric varieties*, volume 124. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [15] J. B. Gil, P. Philippon, and M. Sombra. Arithmetic geometry of toric varieties. *Metrics, measures and heights, e-print*.
- [16] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. Convexity properties of the moment mapping. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 67(3):491–513, 1982.
- [17] K. Kaveh and A. G. Khovanskii. Newton-Okounkov bodies, semigroups of integral points, graded algebras and intersection theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 925–978, 2012.
- [18] R. Lazarsfeld and M. Mustață. Convex bodies associated to linear series. In *Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure*, volume 42, pages 783–835, 2009.
- [19] C. Li. Geodesic rays and stability in the cscK problem. *To appear in Annales Scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure*.
- [20] T. Mabuchi. Some symplectic geometry on compact kähler manifolds. i. *Osaka journal of mathematics*, 24(2):227–252, 1987.
- [21] D. W. Nyström. Transforming metrics on a line bundle to the Okounkov body. *Annales Scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure*.
- [22] A. Okounkov. Why would multiplicities be log-concave? In *The orbit method in geometry and physics*, pages 329–347. Springer, 2003.
- [23] D. H. Phong and J. Sturm. Test configurations for k-stability and geodesic rays. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 5(2):221–247, 2007.
- [24] J. Ross and D. W. Nyström. Analytic test configurations and geodesic rays. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 12(1):125–169, 2014.
- [25] G. Székelyhidi. Filtrations and test-configurations. *Mathematische Annalen*, 362(1):451–484, 2015.