

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	10
4. f -stable pairs	17
5. C -framed f -stable pairs	22
6. C -framed wallcrossing identity	31
7. C -framed flop identity	32
8. Examples and explicit results	35
Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 2.6	44
Appendix B. Openness of orthogonality	56
Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 6.2	57
References	66

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 transformations¹ in enumerative geometry.

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 connected 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 . In particular, the curves are rigid² and hence there exist unique chains of scheme-theoretic thickenings

$$\Sigma^\pm = \Sigma_1^\pm \subset \Sigma_2^\pm \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_{n^\pm}^\pm$$

of Σ^\pm , with $n^\pm \geq 2$, whose structure sheaves fit into exact sequences of the form

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

for $1 \leq i \leq n^\pm - 1$.

Consider a smooth connected Weil divisor $W \subset X$ 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. We shall assume that the canonical projection $f_{S^+}: S^+ \rightarrow W$ is an isomorphism and S^+ intersects Σ^+ transversely at a single point p . Furthermore, we shall assume that S^- is reduced and irreducible, with a zero-dimensional singular locus.

Consider a reduced irreducible plane curve $C \subset W$ 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 Σ^+ . On the other hand, $C^- \subset S^-$ is a reduced irreducible closed subscheme which intersects Σ^- 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 $m_\Sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ be the *multiplicity* of Z_Σ along Σ at the generic point.

Let $\text{Hilb}^k(C^+)$ denote the *Hilbert scheme of k points on C^+* : it parametrizes length k zero-dimensional subschemes of C^+ . Let $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m) \subset \text{Hilb}^k(C^+) \times \text{Hilb}^{k+m}(C^+)$ be the *Flag Hilbert scheme*³ parametrizing flags of ideal sheaves $\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_{C^+}$ so that the ideal \mathcal{I}_2 has colength k and $\mathcal{I}_2/\mathcal{I}_1$ is the pushforward of a length m zero-dimensional sheaf on T_n , where T_n is the scheme-theoretic intersection of Σ_n and S^+ in Y^+ . Let $\text{FHilb}_{T_n, p}^k(C^+; m)$ be the *punctual Flag Hilbert scheme*, i.e., the inverse image of the punctual Hilbert scheme $\text{Hilb}_p^{k+m}(C^+) \subset \text{Hilb}^{k+m}(C^+)$ via the forgetful morphism $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m) \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^{k+m}(C^+)$ sending $(\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{I}_2)$ to \mathcal{I}_1 .

On the other hand, let $\mathcal{SP}_{C^-}(Y^-)$ be the moduli space of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on Y^- scheme-theoretic supported on C^- , as introduced in [PT09], i.e, the moduli space of pairs

¹A 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.

²in the sense of Definition 2.4.

³Following, the usual notation used in the literature for the Flag Hilbert scheme, we should have denoted it as $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^{[k, m]}(C^+)$: since in the following k and m will play different roles, we preferred to differentiate them in our notation.

(\mathcal{F}, s) with \mathcal{F} a pure one-dimensional 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:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_{T_{n,p}}^k(C^+; m_\Sigma)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathcal{SP}_{C^-, q_i}(Y^-; k)) q^k. \quad (1.2)$$

Remark. By analogy to [OS12, Proposition 12 and Theorem 13], note that [PT10, Theorem 3] implies that the right hand side of the main identity in Theorem A is the expansion of a rational function of the form $P_-(q)/(1-q)$, where $P_-(q)$ is a polynomial with integer coefficients. \triangle

Furthermore, let $\text{Hilb}_{q_i}^k(C^-)$ 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:*

$$q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+})} \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{FHilb}_{T_{n,p}}^k(C^+; m_\Sigma)) q^k = q^{\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^-})} \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\text{Hilb}_{q_i}^k(C^-)) q^k. \quad (1.3)$$

Remark. Although formally setting $n = 1$ does not make sense in our setting, since it would contradict the hypothesis that Σ is a $(0, -2)$ -curve, it is worth noticing that the $n = 1$ analog of $\text{FHilb}_{T_{n,p}}^k(C^+; m_\Sigma)$ is the punctual Flag Hilbert scheme considered in [OS12]. Thus, the LHS of (1.2) and (1.3) for $n = 1$ would correspond to the coefficient of q -degree $2m_\Sigma - \mu + 1$ of the HOMFLY polynomial of the corresponding link (up to some constant factor), where μ is the Milnor number of the singularity. Following this analogy, the computation of the LHS of (1.2) and (1.3) for arbitrary $n \geq 2$ can be seen as a first step into a generalization of [OS12]. \triangle

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 $\text{Perf}(X)$. 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 $\text{Coker}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_f$.

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

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C^+] + m[\Sigma^+] \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\mathcal{F}) = n, \quad (1.4)$$

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

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

where $\text{DT}(Y^+)$ is the generating function of Donaldson-Thomas invariants of Y^+ , while $\text{DT}_{\text{ex}}(Y^+)$ 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 [Pä21].⁴

⁴Note that in [Pä21], 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.

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}_Σ is set theoretically supported on Σ^+ 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 §5.2, for fixed topological invariants (1.4), 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

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

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, which is carried out in Theorem 5.12 and Proposition 5.14. Here, $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}(C^+; m)$ is the disjoint union of all $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$'s by varying of k .

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 6.2). *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 C.

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

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

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

1.3. Explicit examples. Fix $r, s, n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $r > s > n \geq 2$ and r, s coprime. Consider the planar curve singularity $C_{r,s}$ given by the equation $x^r = w^s$ and corresponding to the (s, r) torus knot. Denote by p the origin of \mathbb{C}^2 . Let T_n be the closed subscheme given by the equations $x = 0$ and $w^n = 0$. 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 $Z_{t,m}(q, x)$. Set

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

In §8.2 we prove the following:

Theorem D. Let $\mathrm{FHilb}_{T_n,p}^k(C_{r,s};s)$ be the punctual Flag Hilbert scheme parametrizing flags of ideal sheaves $\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_{C_{r,s}}$ so that $\mathcal{O}_{C_{r,s}}/\mathcal{I}_1$ is set-theoretic supported at p , the ideal \mathcal{I}_2 has colength k , and $\mathcal{I}_2/\mathcal{I}_1$ is the pushforward of a length s zero-dimensional sheaf on T_n . Then

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{FHilb}_{T_n,p}^k(C_{r,s};s))q^k = Z_{r,s,n}(q).$$

Now, consider the 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. Thanks to Theorems B and D, we can derive:

Theorem E (Theorem 8.17). For any $\ell \geq 0$, let $\mathrm{Hilb}_o^\ell(C_{n,p,q})$ be punctual Hilbert scheme parametrizing length ℓ zero-dimensional subschemes of $C_{n,p,q}$ with support at the origin. Then

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \chi(\mathrm{Hilb}_o^\ell(C_{n,p,q}))q^\ell = q^{-nq(q-1)/2} Z_{p+q,qn,n}(q). \quad (1.5)$$

Remark. In principle one could try to compute the left-hand-side of identity (1.5) in Theorem E 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. \triangle

1.4. 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 develop 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 – see [AB13, Appendix A]). §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, B, and C. §8 is devoted to explicit examples in the toric framework and the proofs of Theorems D and E. Finally the paper has three appendices. Appendix A contains the proof of Theorem 2.6, while Appendix B provides a criterion to prove the openness of the torsion-free part of a torsion pair. In Appendix C we provide the detailed proof of Theorem 6.2, 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. He thanks the institution for providing an exceptional research environment. We would like to thank Yan Soibelman for very helpful discussions and Michael Wemyss for very stimulating discussions about contraction algebras and Reid’s width, and for bringing to our attention the paper [Tod07]: it was our starting point to prove Theorem 2.6.

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. **(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 $(0, -2)$ -curve⁵ 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 ω_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^{an} has a cDV singular point at ν . 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 Σ . Since Σ has codimension two, this implies that $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{O}_Y$. \square

2.2. **Numerical classes.** Let $N_1(Y)$ be the group of *numerical equivalence classes* of one-cycles of Y (cf. [Ful98, Chapter 19]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $Z \subset Y$ be a purely⁶ 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, $H \cap \Xi \neq \emptyset$. 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 2.3. *There is a splitting*

$$N_1(Y) \simeq \mathbb{N}[\Sigma] \oplus N_1(Y/X).$$

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 $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$.
- (2) $\Sigma \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in N_1(Y/X)$.

⁵i.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 $\Sigma \subset Y$.

⁶i.e., all irreducible components of Z are one-dimensional.

Proof. This statement from Lemma 2.2 and the exact sequence

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

□

2.3. Rigidity and filtrations. Let \mathcal{H} be the connected component of the Hilbert scheme of curves on Y which contains Σ .

Definition 2.4. We say that Σ is *rigid* if \mathcal{H} is zero-dimensional, i.e., it is isomorphic to $\text{Spec}(R)$, with R a local Artin ring over \mathbb{C} . ◊

Proposition 2.5. *Under the conditions stated in Assumption I, the curve Σ is rigid.*

Proof. Suppose Σ is not rigid. Then $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 1$. Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset Y \times \mathcal{H}$ be the universal curve and let $o \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the closed point corresponding to $\Sigma \subset Y$. Since \mathcal{H} is projective and at least one-dimensional, it contains at least one closed point $p \in \mathcal{H}$, such that $p \neq o$. Then $\mathcal{Z}_p \subset Y$ is a closed subscheme of Y which does not coincide with $\Sigma \subset Y$.

Let $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_p}$ and let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{E}$ be the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf. Since \mathcal{Z} is a flat family, note that

$$\text{ch}_i(\mathcal{E}) = \text{ch}_i(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \quad (2.2)$$

for $2 \leq i \leq 3$. Then, Lemma 2.2 implies that \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{T} is a purely one-dimensional sheaf on Y with scheme-theoretic support on Σ . Hence it is isomorphic to the pushforward of a line bundle \mathcal{L} on Σ . Moreover, the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}$$

is surjective, where $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is the canonical epimorphism. The relations (2.2) imply that $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ and $\chi(\mathcal{T}) = 0$, i.e., $\mathcal{T} = 0$. Then, $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$. Furthermore, since $\text{End}_Y(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, there exists an isomorphism $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ so that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \end{array},$$

where the vertical maps are surjective. This implies that \mathcal{Z}_p coincides with Σ as subschemes of Y , hence it leads to a contradiction. □

The following result will be proved in Appendix A.

Theorem 2.6. *Under the conditions stated in Assumption I, there exists a unique chain of subschemes*

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_n,$$

with $n \geq 2$, which determines a filtration of the form

$$0 = \mathcal{J}_{n+1} \subset \mathcal{J}_n \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \quad (2.3)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i &\subset \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \subset \mathcal{J}_i, \quad \mathcal{J}_i/\mathcal{J}_{i+1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \\ \mathcal{J}_i/\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i &\simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2), \quad \mathcal{J}_{i+1}/\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

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

$$\mathcal{J}_n/\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_n \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(1)^{\oplus 2}. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, the structure sheaves of the subschemes $\Sigma_k \subset Y$, with $1 \leq k \leq n$, fit into nontrivial extensions

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0 \quad (2.7)$$

where the morphisms $i_{\Sigma_k, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k-1}, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}$ and $i_{\Sigma_k, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ are the canonical surjections.

Furthermore, one more condition will be assumed to hold:

Assumption II. There exists a smooth connected Weil divisor $W \subset X$ so that its strict transform $S \subset Y$ is a smooth connected surface intersecting Σ 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 and II hold.

Proposition 2.7. *One has*

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

for $i \geq 1$,

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

for $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{R}^1 f_* (i_{\Sigma, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-S)) = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_* \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} = 0 \quad (2.11)$$

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 v for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $U \subset X$ be an affine open neighborhood of v , let $Y_U := f^{-1}(U)$ and let $f_U := Y_U \rightarrow U$ be the restriction of f to Y_U . Note that $\Sigma \subset Y_U$. Then it suffices to show that relations (2.8), (2.9), and (2.10) hold for f_U . This follows from [Har77, Proposition III.8.5]. Thus, the relations (2.8), (2.9) and (2.10) hold.

Let us prove the vanishing result (2.11). 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 $f_* i_{\Sigma, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \simeq \mathcal{O}_v$, the pushforward is surjective as well. Therefore $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} = 0$. \square

Corollary 2.8. *For any $1 \leq k \leq n$ one has*

$$\mathbb{R}^i f_* i_{\Sigma_k, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

for $i \geq 1$, and

$$\mathrm{Tor}_i(i_{S, *} \mathcal{O}_S, i_{\Sigma_k, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

for $i \geq 1$.

Proof. By construction, one has the exact sequences (2.6):

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k+1}, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k+1}} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k, *} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (2.14)$$

for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. We prove the vanishing results (2.12) and (2.13) 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 (2.14). Therefore, the first claim holds.

Since \mathcal{O}_Σ 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 (2.14). \square

For each $1 \leq k \leq n$, let T_k be the scheme-theoretic intersection of Σ_k and S in Y and let $i_{T_k}: T_k \rightarrow Y$ denote the canonical closed immersion. By Assumption II, this is a zero-dimensional subscheme of S with set-theoretic support p . Let also $\mathcal{Q}_k := f_*i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then the following holds:

Corollary 2.9. *Each morphism*

$$\phi_k: \mathcal{Q}_k \longrightarrow f_*i_{T_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{T_k}$$

is determined by the canonical epimorphism $i_{\Sigma_k,}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \rightarrow i_{T_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{T_k}$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, one has exact sequences*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (2.15)$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_1 \longrightarrow 0, \quad (2.16)$$

induced by the exact sequences (2.6) and (2.7) respectively.

Proof. Note the canonical isomorphism

$$i_{T_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{T_k} \simeq i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes i_{S,*}\mathcal{O}_S.$$

As a consequence of Equation (2.13), 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

$$\mathbb{R}^1 f_*(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(-S)) = 0$$

for $i \geq 0$. Given the exact sequence (2.14), this follows by induction from Equation (2.10).

The second claim follows by pushforward from the exact sequences (2.6) and (2.7) using the vanishing result (2.12). \square

For each $1 \leq k \leq n$, let $Z_k \subset W$ be the closed subscheme identified with $T_k \subset S$ by the isomorphism $f|_S: S \rightarrow W$. Let $i_{Z_k}: Z_k \rightarrow X$ denote the canonical closed immersion. Moreover, since $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_X$, note that the canonical epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ induces a morphism $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then one further has:

Corollary 2.10. *For each $1 \leq k \leq n$ there is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_X & \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_k & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & i_{Z_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \end{array} \quad (2.17)$$

where the arrow $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow i_{Z_k,}\mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$ is the canonical epimorphism and the bottom arrow is an isomorphism. Moreover, the morphisms $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k$, for $2 \leq k \leq n$, fit into commutative diagrams*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_X & \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_k & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_X & \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_k & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{Q}_1 \end{array},$$

where the bottom arrows are the right epimorphisms in the exact sequences (2.15) and (2.16).

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

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

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

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & i_{W,*}\mathcal{O}_W \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{Q}_k & \xrightarrow{\phi_k} & f_*i_{T_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{T_k} \end{array},$$

where the top horizontal arrow is the natural epimorphism and bottom horizontal arrow is the isomorphism obtained in Corollary 2.9. Moreover, by construction, there is a canonical isomorphism $f_*i_{T_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{T_k} \simeq i_{Z_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$. This yields diagram (2.17).

The second statement follows by applying f_* to the natural commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \\ & \swarrow & \searrow \\ i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma_1,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_1} \end{array},$$

respectively. □

2.4. Euler pairing. We shall now prove a result which will help us to readapt part of the arguments in [BS16, Mau16] to our setting.

Lemma 2.11. *For any thickening $\Sigma \subset \Sigma' \subset Y$, one has $\omega_Y|_{\Sigma'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma'}$.*

Proof. We observe that the scheme-theoretic image $Z = f(\Sigma')$ is a zero-dimensional subscheme with set-theoretic support ν since f is proper. Moreover, by Lemma 2.1, ω_X is locally free and $\omega_Y = f^*\omega_X$, where ω_X . Since $f|_{\Sigma'}: \Sigma' \rightarrow X$ factors through the closed immersion $Z \rightarrow X$, we get $\omega_Y|_{\Sigma'} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma'}$. □

Lemma 2.11 implies:

Corollary 2.12. *Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be coherent sheaves on Y so that \mathcal{G} is one-dimensional, with $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}) \in \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$. 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 2.2 shows that \mathcal{G}' is set-theoretically supported on Σ . 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 Σ .

Now, the claim follows by Lemma 2.11 and Serre duality. □

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, Assumption I holds.

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 Σ by Corollary 2.3. 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 μ_Y -slope *(semi)stable*. 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 Σ .

The first goal of this section is to prove that any stable sheaf in $\text{Coh}_\Sigma^{\text{pure}}(Y)$ is isomorphic to the pushforward of a line bundle on Σ .⁷ We start with some preliminary results.

Lemma 3.1. *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 3.2. *Let \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 be line bundles on Σ so that $\chi(\mathcal{L}_1) < \chi(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Suppose that \mathcal{E} is an extension of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2 \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.1}$$

on Y . Then \mathcal{E} is isomorphic to the pushforward of a locally free sheaf on Σ .

Proof. Let $e \in \text{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1)$ be the extension class associated to the exact sequence (3.1). Let $p \in \Sigma$ be an arbitrary closed point. Recall that the standard local to global spectral sequence yields an exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1) & & \\ & & \xrightarrow{f} & & & & \\ & & H^0(\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1)) & \longrightarrow & 0 & & \end{array}$$

where the germ of $f(e)$ at p is the extension class associated to the extension of stalks

$$0 \longrightarrow (i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1)_p \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_p \longrightarrow (i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2)_p \longrightarrow 0. \tag{3.2}$$

In particular if $f(e) = 0$, it follows that the extension (3.2) is trivial at all $p \in \Sigma$, which implies that \mathcal{E} is scheme-theoretically supported on Σ . This implies the claim.

In conclusion, it suffices to prove that

$$H^0(Y, \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1)) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

⁷Similar results were proven in [Kat08] for sheaves on complex analytic spaces and in [Dav19] for sheaves of Euler characteristic zero.

Since $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$, using Assumption II, one has $\mathcal{L}_i \simeq \mathcal{O}_Y(d_i S) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ for some $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that $d_1 < d_2$. Then one has

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y((d_1 - d_2)S).$$

Moreover, the exact sequence

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

yields isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{I}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-2)),$$

since Σ is a $(0, -2)$ curve on Y . Therefore

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_2, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_1) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d_1 - d_2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d_1 - d_2 - 2)).$$

Since $d_1 < d_2$, this implies the vanishing result (3.3). \square

We have the following result.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} is a nonzero stable purely one-dimensional sheaf on Y with set-theoretic support on Σ . Then \mathcal{F} is isomorphic to the pushforward of a line bundle on Σ .*

Proof. Since $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$, it suffices to prove that \mathcal{F} is scheme-theoretically supported on Σ . Let $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma]$, with $r > 0$. If $r = 1$ there is nothing to prove.

By induction, suppose the claim holds for all stable sheaves \mathcal{F}' with $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{F}') = r'[\Sigma]$, with $1 \leq r' \leq r - 1$. Using Lemma 3.1, one can assume that

$$0 \leq \chi(\mathcal{F}) \leq r - 1$$

without loss of generality.

Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ be the maximal zero-dimensional subsheaf and let $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma / \mathcal{T}$. Then there is an exact sequence

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

with \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{G} purely one-dimensional sheaves on Y supported on Σ . Moreover, by construction, \mathcal{G} is the pushforward of a nonzero locally free sheaf on Σ . Hence $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{E}) = s[\Sigma]$ for some $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$. Let

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

be the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of \mathcal{E} . Using the inductive hypothesis, each successive quotient $\mathcal{H}_{i+1}/\mathcal{H}_i$ is S -equivalent to a sheaf of the form $i_{\Sigma,*}(\mathbb{C}^{s_i} \otimes \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(d_i))$ with $s_i \geq 1$. Furthermore, since \mathcal{F} is stable of slope

$$0 \leq \mu(\mathcal{F}) \leq \frac{r-1}{r},$$

one has

$$d_k < \cdots < d_1 \leq -1.$$

Therefore the Harder-Narasimhan filtration admits a refinement

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

so that each quotient $\mathcal{E}_i/\mathcal{E}_{i-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_i$ for some line bundles \mathcal{L}_i on Σ so that

$$\chi(\mathcal{L}_s) \leq \chi(\mathcal{L}_{s-1}) \leq \cdots \leq \chi(\mathcal{L}_1) \leq 0.$$

Moreover, \mathcal{G} is the pushforward of a direct sum of line bundles

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{M}_j$$

so that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_j) \geq 1$.

Note the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}_{s-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}_{s-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}_{s-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L}_s$ and $\chi(\mathcal{L}_s) < \chi(\mathcal{M}_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \ell$. Then Lemma 3.2 shows that $\mathcal{G}_1 := \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}_{s-1}$ is the pushforward of a locally free sheaf on Σ .

Proceeding by induction, suppose that $\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}_{s-i}$ is the pushforward of a locally free sheaf on Σ for some $1 \leq i \leq s-1$. Then one has the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{s-i}/\mathcal{E}_{s-i-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}_{s-i-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_i \longrightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{s-i}/\mathcal{E}_{s-i-1} \simeq \mathcal{L}_{s-i}$$

with $\chi(\mathcal{L}_{s-i}) \leq 0$. At the same time, \mathcal{G}_i is again isomorphic to the pushforward of a direct sum of line bundles

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \mathcal{M}_{i,j}$$

with $\chi(\mathcal{M}_{i,j}) \geq 1$. Then Lemma 3.2 shows that the central term in extension 3.1 is the pushforward of a locally free \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -module. This proves the inductive step.

In conclusion, \mathcal{F} is scheme-theoretically supported on Σ , as claimed. \square

Corollary 3.4. *A nonzero sheaf $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Coh}_{\Sigma}^{\text{pure}}(Y)$ is semistable if and only if it admits a filtration*

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

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 Σ so that $\chi(\mathcal{L}) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{E})$.

Corollary 3.5. *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 Σ 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 μ_Y -slope stability. Then each subquotient $\mathcal{G}_k/\mathcal{G}_{k-1}$ has a filtration as in Corollary 3.4. Then the Harder-Narasimhan filtration admits a non-unique refinement, so the claim follows. \square

Recall that Σ_n denotes the closed subscheme of Y defined by the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{J}_n \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ from Formula (2.3) in Theorem 2.6. The next result shows that the scheme-theoretic support of any semistable sheaf in $\text{Coh}_{\Sigma}^{\text{pure}}(Y)$ is contained in Σ_n .

Lemma 3.6. *Any nonzero semistable sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_{\Sigma}^{\text{pure}}(Y)$ is scheme-theoretically supported on Σ_n .*

Proof. By Corollary 3.4, the sheaf \mathcal{F} admits a Jordan-Hölder filtration

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

so that each successive quotient is isomorphic to

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

for a line bundle \mathcal{L} on Σ , with

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

If $j = 1$, i.e., if \mathcal{F} is stable, the claim follows from Proposition 3.3. 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 Σ_n . For any coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} on Y , the morphism corresponding to the multiplication by σ_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 $\mu_{\mathcal{G}} = 0$. 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 (2.5) in Theorem 2.6, 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 $\text{Im}(\mu_{\mathcal{F}}) = 0$, which proves the inductive step. \square

Finally, recall that the direct image $\mathcal{Q}_k = f_* \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ is isomorphic to the structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_{Z_k} of a zero-dimensional subscheme $Z_k \subset W$ by Corollary 2.10. Furthermore, the exact sequences (2.16) yield exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_v \longrightarrow 0,$$

for all $2 \leq k \leq n$, where the epimorphisms $\mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_v$ are canonical. Conversely, the following holds:

Proposition 3.7. *The evaluation map $\text{ev}_k: f^* \mathcal{Q}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ is an isomorphism for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Moreover, one has a commutative diagram with exact rows*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f^* \mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} & \longrightarrow & f^* \mathcal{O}_{Z_k} & \longrightarrow & f^* \mathcal{O}_V \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{k-1} & & \downarrow \text{ev}_k & & \downarrow \text{ev}_1 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} . \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ denote the image of the evaluation map, which is a purely one-dimensional sheaf with set-theoretic support on Σ . The induced morphism $f_* \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k$ is a tautological isomorphism, while Corollary 2.9 implies that

$$\chi(\mathcal{Q}_k) = r_k$$

where $\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) = r_k[\Sigma]$. In conclusion,

$$\chi(f_* \mathcal{E}_k) = r_k . \quad (3.5)$$

Let

$$0 \subset \mathcal{E}_{k,1} \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{E}_{k,s_k} = \mathcal{E}_k \quad (3.6)$$

be the filtration constructed in Corollary 3.5, where

$$\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{E}_k) = s_k[\Sigma] .$$

Each successive quotient $\mathcal{E}_{k,i}/\mathcal{E}_{k,i-1}$ is isomorphic to the pushforward of a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{k,i}$ on Σ so that

$$\chi(\mathcal{L}_{k,s_k}) \leq \cdots \leq \chi(\mathcal{L}_{k,1}) .$$

Moreover, the exact sequences (2.6) and (2.7) imply that \mathcal{O}_{Σ_k} admits a filtration so that all subquotients are isomorphic to $i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$. Therefore \mathcal{O}_{Σ_k} is semistable of slope 1 by Corollary 3.4. This implies that

$$\chi(\mathcal{L}_{k,s_k}) \leq \cdots \leq \chi(\mathcal{L}_{k,1}) \leq 1 .$$

Filtration 3.6 yields a second filtration

$$0 \subset f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,1} \subset \cdots \subset f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,s_k} = f_* \mathcal{E}_k$$

so that for each $1 \leq i \leq s_k$ there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,i-1} \longrightarrow f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,i} \longrightarrow f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{L}_{k,i} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Moreover, Proposition 2.7 shows that

$$f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{L}_{k,i} \simeq \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_V & \text{if } \chi(\mathcal{L}_{k,i}) = 1 , \\ 0 & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

In particular $f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{L}_{k,i}$ is zero dimensional, which implies

$$\chi(f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,i} / f_* \mathcal{E}_{k,i-1}) \leq \chi(f_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{L}_{k,i}) \leq 1$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq s_k$. Then one obtains

$$\chi(f_* \mathcal{E}_k) \leq \ell_k$$

where $0 \leq \ell_k \leq s_k$ is the number of subquotients of the filtration (3.6) of Euler characteristic 1. Since $\ell_k \leq s_k \leq r_k$ by construction, Equation (3.5) implies $\ell_k = s_k = r_k$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{k,i} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s_k$. Therefore \mathcal{E}_k has the same topological invariants as \mathcal{O}_{Σ_k} , which implies that $\mathcal{E}_k = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$. This proves the first claim.

In order to prove the second claim, note that diagram (3.4) is naturally commutative and the bottom row is exact. Since the vertical arrows are isomorphisms, the top row is also exact. \square

Corollary 3.8. *For each $1 \leq k \leq n$ one has a cartesian diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_k & \xrightarrow{i_{\Sigma_k}} & Y \\ \phi_k \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Z_k & \xrightarrow{i_{Z_k}} & X \end{array}, \quad (3.7)$$

where ϕ_k is flat.

Proof. As shown in Corollary 2.10, the pushforward of the canonical morphism $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ coincides with the canonical morphism $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$. Then one obtains a tautological commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^*\mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ f^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_k} & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_k} & \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \end{array}.$$

By Proposition 3.7, the evaluation map in the above diagram is an isomorphism. Hence $\Sigma_k \subset Y$ coincides with the scheme theoretic inverse image $f^{-1}(Z_k)$.

In order to prove that ϕ_k is flat, note that Z_k is isomorphic to the spectrum of a local artinian ring over \mathbb{C} , since it is zero dimensional and it has a unique closed point ν . Using the local criterion of flatness, it suffices to prove that the natural morphism

$$\phi_k^*\mathcal{I}_\nu \longrightarrow \phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$$

is injective, where $\mathcal{I}_\nu \subset \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$ is the defining ideal sheaf of ν in Z_k .

Since the diagram (3.7) is cartesian, the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow f^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \longrightarrow f^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \longrightarrow f^*\mathcal{O}_\nu \longrightarrow 0$$

in diagram (3.4) is the pushforward of the exact sequence

$$\phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \longrightarrow \phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \longrightarrow \phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_\nu \longrightarrow 0$$

obtained by pulling back the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \xrightarrow{\xi_k} \mathcal{O}_{Z_k} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\nu \longrightarrow 0$$

to Σ_n . Therefore the natural morphism

$$\phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \longrightarrow \phi_k^*\mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$$

is injective. Since the morphism $\xi_k: \mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$ maps $\mathcal{O}_{Z_{k-1}}$ isomorphically onto $\mathcal{I}_\nu \subset \mathcal{O}_{Z_k}$, this proves the claim. \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 Corollary 3.4 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 (2.3) of \mathcal{I}_Σ . As in Corollary 2.9, 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

$$\mathcal{F} \longmapsto i_{\zeta}^*\mathcal{F}$$

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 3.1, 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. Then one has:

Proposition 3.9. *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 $f^*\mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, any semistable sheaf \mathcal{F} on Y as in Proposition 3.9 admits a length r filtration so that all subquotients are isomorphic to $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$. Moreover, the scheme-theoretic support of \mathcal{F} is also contained in Σ_n by Lemma 3.6. Using Proposition 2.7, this implies that $f_*\mathcal{F}$ is scheme-theoretically supported on Z_n and has length r .

Conversely, any length r sheaf \mathcal{Q} on X on Z_n admits a length r filtration so that all subquotients are isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_v . Since diagram (3.7) is cartesian, one has

$$f^*i_{Z_n,*}\mathcal{Q} \simeq i_{\Sigma_n,*}\phi_n^*\mathcal{Q}.$$

Since ϕ_n is flat, $\phi_n^*\mathcal{Q}_n$ has a length r filtration so that each subquotient is isomorphic to $\phi_n^*\mathcal{O}_v \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$. Therefore $f^*\mathcal{Q}_n$ is a semistable sheaf on Y satisfying the conditions of Proposition 3.9. \square

Now recall that the restriction $f|_S: S \rightarrow W$ maps $T_n \subset S$ isomorphically onto $Z_n \subset W$. Then Proposition 3.9 yields:

Corollary 3.10. *The assignment $\mathcal{F} \mapsto i_S^*\mathcal{F}$ 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 $f^*i_{Z_n,*}t_n^*\mathcal{Q}$.*

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 using the definition of [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. We define similarly $\text{Coh}_0(X)$. Following [BS16, §2], we introduce the following torsion pair. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_f &:= \{\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(Y) \mid \mathbb{R}^\bullet f_*\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_0(X) \subset \text{Perf}(X)\} \\ \mathcal{F}_f &:= \{\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(Y) \mid \text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) = 0 \text{ for any } \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{T}_f\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *One has $\mathcal{T}_f \subseteq \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f$. Since f is birational, we see that \mathcal{F} is 0-dimensional away from the exceptional locus of f . Since the latter is 1-dimensional, we immediately conclude that $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$. \square

Lemma 4.2 ([BS16, Lemma 13]). *The pair $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$ is a torsion pair in $\text{Coh}(Y)$.*

Remark 4.3. 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^{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 $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$.

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 4.4. *Any one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ fits into 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}_Σ 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}_Σ is set-theoretically supported on Σ .

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 2.3 and Lemma 4.4 yields the following.

Corollary 4.5. *Let \mathcal{F} be a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on Y with $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = r[\Sigma] + \beta$, for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta \in N_1(Y/X)$. Then, $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) = r[\Sigma]$ and $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) = \beta$.*

Lemma 4.6.

- (1) *Let \mathcal{F} be a nonzero one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on Y so that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in N_1(Y/X)$. Then $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{F} = 0$, for all $k \geq 1$, and $\mathbb{R}^0 f_* \mathcal{F}|_{X^{\text{reg}}}$ is a nonzero one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf, where $X^{\text{reg}} := X \setminus \{v\}$.*
- (2) *Let \mathcal{F} be a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf so that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}[\Sigma]$. 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 2.3, under the current assumptions, $Z_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a purely one-dimensional closed subscheme of Y so that $(Z_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$ 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 $\pi^{-1}(X^{\text{reg}}) = Y \setminus \Sigma$ isomorphically onto X^{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 2.3, any one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf \mathcal{F} with $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\Sigma]$ 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 3.5 using [Har77, Proposition III.8.5]. \square

Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6 further imply the following.

Proposition 4.7. *Let \mathcal{F} be a coherent sheaf on Y , with one-dimensional support so that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \neq 0$, 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 4.4. Then, we have the following:

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

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 4.6, all direct images are $\mathbb{R}^k f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma$, for $k \geq 1$, are zero-dimensional sheaves supported at the singular point ν . 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 4.6-(1). This further implies that $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G}_\Sigma = 0$ since $\mathbb{R}^1 f_* \mathcal{G} = 0$. Then $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) \geq 0$ by Lemma 4.6-(2).

Conversely, by Lemma 4.6-(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}_Σ , i.e., the maximal destabilizing subsheaf of \mathcal{G}_Σ . By (1), one has $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{T}_f$ if and only if $\mu_Y(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$. Hence one must have $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = \mu_Y(\mathcal{E}) < 0$ 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 Σ 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 $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{G}_\Sigma) < 0$. By (1) any pure coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{T}_f$ has $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$. Hence, $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = 0$. Since \mathcal{G}_Σ is pure, it follows that $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{G}_\Sigma) = 0$. Therefore, the assertion follows. \square

Using Corollary 3.5, one obtains the following consequences of Proposition 4.7.

Corollary 4.8.

- Assume that $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f$. 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 Σ 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 sheaves.

Proposition 4.9. 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 Σ , as in Lemma 4.4. 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 4.7-(1), it suffices to prove that $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) < 0$ since this implies $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\Sigma) = 0$ for all $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{T}_f$.

Suppose $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma) \geq 0$ and let $\mathcal{F}'_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ be the semistable sheaf of maximal slope. Then by Corollary 3.4, there is a line bundle \mathcal{L} on Σ such that $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{F}'_\Sigma$ of degree ≥ -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 4.10. *The subcategory \mathcal{T}_f satisfies the openness condition in flat families.*

Proof. Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 4.7-(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 $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq 0$. 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 4.11. *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 4.9 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 B.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 4.12. *The torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{F}_f)$ is open.*

Now, let \mathcal{A}_{tor} be the smallest full abelian subcategory of \mathcal{A} closed under extensions and containing $\mathcal{F}[1]$ for coherent sheaves $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 2}(Y) \cap \mathcal{F}_f$.

Lemma 4.13. *For $E \in \mathcal{A}$ the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $E \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{tor}}$;
- (2) $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(E) \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 2}(Y) \cap \mathcal{F}_f$.
- (3) $\text{rk}(E) = 0$.

Proof. First notice that for $E \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $\mathcal{H}^0(E) \in \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ by Lemma 4.1. From here, the equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows automatically. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (3) follows from the additivity of the rank. Finally, let us prove that (3) \Rightarrow (1). Now, all the terms of the fiber sequence

$$\mathcal{H}^{-1}(E)[1] \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^0(E)$$

belong to \mathcal{A} , and therefore that the above can be interpreted as a short exact sequence in \mathcal{A} . Moreover, $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(E)[1]$ and $\mathcal{H}^0(E)$ belong to \mathcal{A}_{tor} , hence also E since \mathcal{A}_{tor} is closed under extensions. \square

4.4. Definition of f -stable pairs. Let us recall the notion of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs.

Definition 4.14. A Pandharipande-Thomas stable pair on Y is a pair (\mathcal{F}, s) , where \mathcal{F} is a pure one-dimensional sheaf on Y and $s: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a section so that $\text{Coker}(s)$ is zero-dimensional.

⊙

Now, mimicking [BS16, Definition 14], we introduce the following.

Definition 4.15. 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 . ⊙

Proposition 4.7 yields the following:

Corollary 4.16.

- Let (\mathcal{F}, s) be an f -stable pair on Y . Then, \mathcal{F} is a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf.
- 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.

Proposition 4.17. For a fiber sequence

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow E \quad (4.6)$$

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}_{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

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

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 $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}[1])$. 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, $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F})$. 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 $E \in \mathcal{A}$. □

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

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

$\mathbf{Perf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y)$ 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 4.12, $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$ is an open substack of $\mathbf{Perf}(Y)$, hence it is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over \mathbb{C} . Thanks to Lemma 4.13, we define the derived substack $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$ of $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})$ parametrizing objects in \mathcal{A}_{tor} as the open substack $\mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_{\mathcal{A}})_{rk=0}$

consisting of those objects having vanishing rank. Thus, also $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)$ is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over \mathbb{C} .

Motivated by Proposition 4.17, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 4.18. The *derived moduli stack $f\text{-SP}(Y)$ of f -stable pairs on Y* is the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f\text{-SP}(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Perf}^\dagger(Y; \mathcal{O}_Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow_{\partial_1[1] \times \partial_0} \\ \mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)_{\text{ch}_1=0} \times \mathbf{Coh}(Y, \tau_A) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Perf}(Y) \times \mathbf{Perf}(Y) \end{array}, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)_{\text{ch}_1=0}$ is the open and closed substack of $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)$ 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 4.19. $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$ 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 4.20. $f\text{-SP}(Y; \beta, n)$ 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 4.4. Assume that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = m[\Sigma] + [C]$. Then, by Corollary 4.5, 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.

\circlearrowright

5.2. Moduli stacks of C -framed f -stable pairs. From now on, let C be a reduced irreducible curve in a smooth irreducible effective divisor $S \subset Y$, which intersects Σ transversely at a single point $p \in C^{\text{sing}}$. The goal of this section is to construct a geometric derived stack parametrizing C -framed f -stable pairs on Y , which we introduced in Definition 5.1. This will require a detailed structural analysis for these objects.

5.2.1. *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 Σ 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 purely one-dimensional 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 ζ 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}_{δ} be defined by the exact sequence

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

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 Σ . Then, one has a canonical commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & 0 & & 0 & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 & & & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{F}'_1 & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}'_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 & & & 0 & & 0 &
 \end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

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

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 Σ since \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{Q} are supported on Σ . 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

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

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 Σ , 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

5.2.2. 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 Σ 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 is S -equivalent to $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$, 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

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

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 $\text{Coker}(s)$ must belong to \mathcal{T}_f .

Since \mathcal{F} is C -framed and an object in \mathcal{F}_f , by Proposition 4.7-(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}_{Σ} is either a one-dimensional pure coherent sheaf on Y set-theoretically supported on Σ , 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, $(\text{Supp}(\mathcal{F}_{Y/X}) \cap \Sigma)_{\text{red}}$ 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 2.3 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 4.8 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 $\text{Im}(s_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_C$ (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

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

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 Σ transversely exactly once, Corollary 4.8 shows that $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y(-S), \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$. Furthermore, since \mathcal{F}_0 is purely one dimensional, set-theoretically supported on Σ , one also has $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_S(-C), \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$. Then the above exact sequence implies that $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_C, \mathcal{F}_0) = 0$ as well. In particular, δ in (5.6) vanishes. This implies that the induced map $\text{Im}(s) \rightarrow \text{Im}(s_1)$ is an isomorphism, hence $\text{Im}(s) \cap \mathcal{F}_0 = 0$ as subsheaves of \mathcal{F} . This yields the diagram (5.5).

Now, the epimorphism $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1$ restricts to an isomorphism $\text{Im}(s) \rightarrow \text{Im}(s_1)$. Since $\text{Im}(s)$ 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 $\text{Im}(s_1) \subset \mathcal{F}_1$ admits a splitting. Hence the associated extension class is trivial, and Lemma 5.3 implies that $\text{Im}(s_1) \subset \ker(\delta_{\mathcal{F}})$. 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 Σ .

Lemma 5.7. *The following hold:*

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

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

(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 4.7-(1) shows that \mathcal{G}' is set theoretically supported on Σ and $\mu_{Y\text{-min}}(\mathcal{G}) \geq 0$. Furthermore, diagram (5.5) in Lemma 5.6 yields an exact sequence

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

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

$$\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}'$$

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 Σ , 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 Corollary 3.4, 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 4.7-(2) shows that $\mu_{Y\text{-max}}(\mathcal{F}_0) < 0$. Again, Corollary 3.4 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 $\mathcal{F}_0 \simeq \mathbf{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$. Therefore s is unique.

Now, we need to show that $\mathcal{G} := \text{Coker}(s)$ belongs to \mathcal{F}_f . We shall make use of Proposition 4.7-(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

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

is injective and one obtains the exact sequence

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

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

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 Σ and $\mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{G}') = m'[\Sigma]$, 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

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

where the rows are exact and the vertical maps are surjective. This shows that $\mathcal{G}'/\mathcal{F}'_0$ is zero dimensional since $\mathrm{Coker}(s_1)/\mathcal{T}$ 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 Corollary 3.4, \mathcal{G}' is S -equivalent to $\mathbf{C}^{m'} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(a)$. 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 $\mathbf{C}^m \otimes i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$. 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

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

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

5.2.3. Moduli spaces. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{Coh}^{\mathrm{pure}}(C;1)$ be the open substack of $\mathbf{Coh}(C)$ parametrizing pure coherent sheaves on C of rank one and let $\mathbf{Coh}_{\mu=-1}^{\mathrm{ss}}(Y; m[\Sigma])$ is the moduli stack of semistable sheaves on Y of slope -1 and second Chern class $m[\Sigma]$. Consider the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{\mathbf{Coh}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(Y; m) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Coh}^{\mathrm{ext}}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow p_3 \times p_1 \\ \mathbf{Coh}^{\mathrm{pure}}(C;1) \times \mathbf{Coh}_{\mu=-1}^{\mathrm{ss}}(Y; m[\Sigma]) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Coh}(Y) \times \mathbf{Coh}(Y) \end{array},$$

where the map $\mathbf{Coh}^{\mathrm{pure}}(C;1) \rightarrow \mathbf{Coh}(Y)$ is induced by the pushforward with respect to the canonical closed embedding of C into Y ; while $p_3 \times p_1$ corresponds to the map sending an extension to the extreme factors in the reversed order. Now, we introduce $f\text{-SP}_C(Y; m)$ as the fiber

product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y; m) & \longrightarrow & f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \widehat{\mathbf{Coh}}^{\text{ext}}(Y; m) & \xrightarrow{p_2[1]} & \mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)_{\text{ch}_1=0} \end{array} ,$$

where the right vertical map is induced by the fiber product (4.8), while p_2 corresponds to the map sending an extension to the middle term. Moreover, the target of $p_2[1]$ is exactly $\mathbf{Coh}_{\text{tor}}(Y, \tau_A)_{\text{ch}_1=0}$ because of Proposition 4.7–(2).

By construction, $f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y; m)$ is a geometric derived stack locally of finite presentation over \mathbb{C} . Moreover, by Theorem 5.5, it is the stack parameterizing C -framed f -stable pairs (\mathcal{F}, s) on Y such that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$. It decomposes into

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

with respect to the Euler characteristic. We denote the truncation of $f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y; m)$ by $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m)$.

Definition 5.8. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The derived moduli stack 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 $f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$. We denote by $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$ its truncation.

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

$$f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y) := \bigsqcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} f\text{-}\mathbf{SP}_C(Y; m) .$$

We denote by $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$ its truncation. ◊

Proposition 5.9. $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$ 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} .

Proof. Note that the map $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n) \rightarrow f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y; m, n)$ induced by $p_2[1]$ is represented by algebraic spaces since p_2 is represented by Quot schemes. Since $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y; m, n)$ is an algebraic space by Proposition 4.20, the claim follows. ◻

5.3. Relation to Flag Hilbert schemes of C . In this section, we shall show that $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$ can be interpreted as a Flag Hilbert scheme of C . Now, we shall assume that also Assumption II holds.

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

Lemma 5.10. *The sheaf \mathcal{Q} is flat over \mathcal{SP}_C .*

Proof. By construction, one has the universal exact sequence

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

where σ_1 restricts to an injection on fibers. This implies that \mathcal{Q} is \mathcal{SP}_C -flat. ◻

Now recall that C is contained as closed subscheme in the smooth surface $S \subset Y$ and T_n is the scheme theoretic intersection of Σ_n and S in Y . Let $i_{C,S}: \mathcal{SP}_C \times C \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_C \times S$ be the canonical closed immersion. Let $q: \text{Quot}_{T_n}(\mathcal{Q}/\mathcal{SP}_C; m) \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_C$ be the relative Quot scheme whose functor of points assigns to any map $\phi: Z \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_C$ the set of quotients

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

so that $i_{C,S,*} \mathcal{G}$ is a \mathbb{Z} -flat family of length m sheaves on T_n .

The next goal is to construct an equivalence $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m) \rightarrow \text{Quot}_{T_n}(\mathcal{Q}/\mathcal{SP}_C; m)$. 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 5.11. *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 is Z -flat family of pushforwards of rank one pure coherent sheaves on C and \mathcal{F}_0 is a flat family of slope (-1) semistable sheaves on Y with second Chern class $m[\Sigma]$. Then, multiplication by π^ζ 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

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{O}_{Z \times Y} & & & & \\ & & \downarrow s & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

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 5.11, the main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 5.12. *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

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

Proof. First, by Lemma 3.1, 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 3.10 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 5.11 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 5.12 yields the following.

Corollary 5.13. *For any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $m \geq 0$, the motivic classes of $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m)$ and $\text{Quot}_{T_n}(\mathcal{Q}/\mathcal{SP}_C; m)$ in the Grothendieck ring of algebraic spaces coincide.*

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

Proposition 5.14. *Let $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}(C; m)$ be the Flag 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 $\text{Quot}_{T_n}(\mathcal{Q}/\mathcal{SP}_C; m) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{FHilb}_{T_n}(C; m)$ mapping the data $(s_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1, g: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{G})$ to*

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

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

6. C-FRAMED WALLCROSSING IDENTITY

In this section $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a threefold contraction satisfying Assumptions I and II. As in §5.2, let $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$ 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 construction completely analogous to the one in §5 yields a moduli space $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; m, n)$ 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]).

Remark 6.1. Note that $\mathcal{SP}_C(Y; 0, n)$ coincides with the moduli space of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs (\mathcal{F}, s) on Y with \mathcal{F} scheme-theoretically supported on C and $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = n$. \triangle

Let

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

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

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

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 6.2. *The following identity holds:*

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

We postpone the proof of the theorem to Appendix C. We shall proceed by analogy to [Bri11, §4] and [BS16, §6]. In §C.1 and §C.2 will derive the relevant identities in the infinite type motivic Hall algebra of stack functions. As explained in §C.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 Assumption I and ϕ is a canonical isomorphism $\phi: Y^+ \setminus \Sigma^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} Y^- \setminus \Sigma^-$. Recall that ν denotes the singular point of X .

Remark 7.1. Note that given a morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ as in Assumption I, 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 II. In particular, there exists a Weil divisor $W \subset X$ for which 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 $\nu \in C^{\mathrm{sing}}$. 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 III. The strict transform S^- of W 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. \circledast

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 $NS(Y^\pm)$ be the *Neron-Severi group* of Y^\pm , i.e., the image of $\mathrm{ch}_1: \mathrm{Pic}(Y^\pm) \rightarrow A_2(Y^\pm)$, and let $N^1(Y^\pm)$ be the group of *numerical equivalence classes* of Cartier divisors on Y^\pm , i.e., the quotient of $NS(Y^\pm)$ by its torsion subgroup. $N^1(Y^\pm)$ is a finitely generated free abelian group. One has an isomorphism

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

determined by the chain of isomorphisms

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

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 III 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 II, one has $S^- \cdot \Sigma^- = -1$. Therefore Σ^- 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 $m_\Sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ be the multiplicity of Z_Σ along Σ at the generic point.

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

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

Proof. By construction, ϕ 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 γ^- 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 Σ^- 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 Σ^+ 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 Σ^- 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

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

where $(\Delta)_{\text{red}}$ is contained in the exceptional locus of σ . Since Γ^- 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 Γ^- . Furthermore it is also disjoint from the exceptional locus of σ .

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

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

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

$$\Gamma \cdot C = m_{\Sigma} D^- \cdot \Sigma^- + D^- \cdot C^-,$$

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 Γ^+ is canonically isomorphic to Γ . The same holds for the $C^+ \subset S^+$. Then one obtains

$$D^+ \cdot C^+ = \Gamma^+ \cdot C^+ = \Gamma \cdot C = D^- \cdot (m_{\Sigma} \Sigma^- + C^-).$$

In conclusion, one obtains an identity

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

for any ample divisor class γ^- 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:*

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

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]⁸, and it uses also Lemma 7.2. Although in the present case Y^{\pm} are not Calabi-Yau threefolds, the result proven in Corollary 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 $\Phi: D^b(Y^+) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(Y^-)$ required in [Cal16, §3.9] is a special case of [VdB04, Theorem C]. \square

As shown in Theorem 6.2, one also has the identity

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

Therefore Theorem 6.2 and Proposition 7.3 yield:

Corollary 7.4. *One has*

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

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

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 5.14, the left-hand-side of identity (7.2) can be rewritten as a generating function of Euler numbers for the Flag Hilbert schemes $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$ considered in §5.3. 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 $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+}/\mathcal{I}') = k$

⁸An equivalent proof of this result is provided also in [Tod13].

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 Σ_n^+ in Y^+ . Then, Proposition 5.14 immediately yields the identity

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

Therefore, we have the following:

Corollary 7.5. *One has*

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

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 $\text{Hilb}_p^{k+m_\Sigma}(C^+)$ be the punctual Hilbert scheme of C^+ parametrizing length $k + m_\Sigma$ zero-dimensional subschemes with set-theoretic support at p . Let $\text{FHilb}_{T_n, p}^k(C^+; m) \subset \text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m)$ be the inverse image of $\text{Hilb}_p^{k+m_\Sigma}(C^+)$ via the canonical forgetful morphism $\text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; m) \rightarrow \text{Hilb}^{k+m_\Sigma}(C^+)$ 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*

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

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:*

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

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, and III. 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

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

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° . 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 Σ^\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.*

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

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

$$Y^-: \begin{cases} 2z_1 w_1 - (z_3 + z_4^n z_5) w_2 = 0, \\ z_2 w_2 - (z_3 - z_4^n z_5) w_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8.3)$$

This implies that the exceptional loci Σ^\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° , as observed in [Rei83, Remark 5.13]. Hence Y^\pm is smooth and f^\pm satisfies Assumption I. \square

Remark 8.3. 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 Σ_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 (2.3), where \mathcal{I}_Σ is the ideal sheaf of Σ . Moreover, conditions (2.4) and (2.5) are easily verified by local computations using the affine coordinates (8.1).

The above filtration coincides with that of Theorem 2.6 because of the uniqueness result proved in Theorem 2.6. \triangle

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 8.4.

- 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 intersects Σ^+ 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

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = 0, \\ z_3 - z_4^n z_5 = 0, \\ z_1 w_1 - z_4^n z_5 w_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

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 Kleinian 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

$$z_1^r - z_4^s = 0, \tag{8.4}$$

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 8.5.

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

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

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 $S^+ \cap V^+$ is the affine plane $v = 0$ and the strict transform $C^+ \subset S^+$ is locally given by

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

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

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

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

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 $\text{Quot}_{T_n, p}^k(C^+; s)$ be the relative Quot scheme over $\text{Hilb}_p^k(C^+)$ parametrizing quotients $\mathcal{I} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, with \mathcal{Q} a coherent \mathcal{O}_{T_n} -module of length s . Then,

$$\text{Quot}_{T_n, p}^k(C^+; s) \simeq \text{FHilb}_{T_n}^k(C^+; s). \quad (8.5)$$

Set

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

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

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


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 $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the conditions

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

and

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

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 μ and the size $|\mu|$ of μ 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 μ . Proceeding by analogy to [OS12, Lemma 17], the following holds.

Lemma 8.6. *The set of fixed points in $\text{Quot}_{T_n, p}^k(C^+; s)$ 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 $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\mu)$,
- (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 μ 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 μ 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 $H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu}) \xrightarrow{\cdot x} H^0(C^+, \mathcal{O}_{Z_\mu})$ is given by


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

The monomials spanning K_μ are in one-to-one correspondence to the set of boxes of μ marked with \bullet below.




The fixed points in the relative Quot scheme $\text{Quot}_{T_{n,p}}^k(C^+; s)$ 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_μ annihilated by w^n . Such pairs are in one-to-one correspondence to Young diagrams μ satisfying conditions (1) – (3) in the statement. \square

Example 8.7. For illustration, some examples of partitions satisfying conditions (1) – (3) in Lemma 8.6 are shown below for $(r, s, n) = (7, 5, 2)$.




(8.6)




(8.7)

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 (8.7) 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 (8.6), where $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 = 4 < 7$. \triangle

Example 8.8. Consider



(8.8)



(8.9)

Cases (8.8) and (8.9) do not satisfy all required conditions in Lemma 8.6 for $(r, s, n) = (7, 5, 2)$. For case (8.8), one has $m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = 3 > 2$, in contradiction to condition (2). For case (8.9), one has $\mu'_1 - \mu'_5 = 7$ while $m_1 + m_7 = 3 > 2$, in contradiction with condition (8.9). \triangle

For future reference note the following.

Lemma 8.9. *Under the current assumptions, let $d(r, s, n) = \min\{|\mu| : \mu \in P(r, s, n)\}$. 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 $\mu \in P(r, s, n)$ has s rows, i.e., $\mu_s \geq 1$. Then the partition of minimal size in $P(r, n, n)$ is indeed given by

$$\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_n = 1.$$

Suppose that the claim is true for all $1 \leq k \leq m$, for some $1 \leq m \leq r-1$. Let $\mu \in P(r, n(m+1), n)$ 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 8.6, 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 8.6 implies that the first n rows, must have at least $m+1$ boxes. Hence the minimal configuration is achieved for

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

Note that condition (3) in Lemma 8.6 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 ν is at most m .

Set

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

Lemma 8.10. *One has*

$$Z_{t,m}(q, x) = \prod_{i=1}^t (1 + xq^i + \dots + (xq^i)^m). \quad (8.10)$$

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 (8.10). \square

Theorem 8.11. For any $k \geq 0$, let $Z_{t,n}^{(k)}(q)$ denote the coefficient of x^k in $Z_{t,n}(q, x)$. Then

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


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 λ consisting of the empty boxes, and a second Yang diagram ρ consisting of the boxes marked with \bullet .



The resulting partitions (λ, ρ) must satisfy the conditions below, which follow from properties (1) – (3) in Lemma 8.6:


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

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

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

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

Similarly, any Yang diagram $\mu \in P_r(r, s, n)$ decomposes uniquely into three Yang diagrams (λ, ν, ρ) as shown below,



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

- λ is nonempty rectangular partition with $\ell(\lambda) = s$,
- ν 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 ρ have multiplicity at most n .

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

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

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

□

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, Γ^- has two irreducible components, C^- and Γ_{Σ^-} . By definition, the strict transform C^- is also reduced, while Γ_{Σ^-} is set-theoretically supported on Σ^- . Recall the multiplicity $m_\Sigma \in \mathbb{Z}$ defined by

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

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

Lemma 8.12. *For any coprime pair $r, s \geq 2$, one has $m_\Sigma = s$. 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, $m_\Sigma = s$.

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 Σ^- . 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 Σ^- . \square

8.4. Euler numbers of Hilbert schemes of points of curves with local complete intersections singularities. Corollary 7.5, Formula (8.5), and Theorem 8.11 yield the following:

Corollary 8.13. *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 8.14. *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 8.15. *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 Γ^- 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, Γ_{V^-} is the scheme-theoretic union of the closed subschemes Γ^0 and Γ^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 8.14 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_{Σ^-} and C^- in V^- , respectively. \square

The previous two lemmas imply the following.

Proposition 8.16. *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*

$$\begin{cases} xv - w^n = 0, \\ x^{r-t} - v^t = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8.11)$$

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 Y^- 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 punctual Hilbert schemes of points of $C_{r,t,n}$.

Theorem 8.17. *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 (8.11). 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 8.11 yield the identity

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

where $s = nt$. Note that the lowest degree term in the right hand side of the above identity is 1. By Lemma 8.9, the lowest degree term of $Z_{r,tn,n}(q)$ is $q^{d(r,s,n)-s}$, where $d(r,s,n) := \min\{|\mu| : \mu \in \mathbb{P}(r,s,n)\}$. Therefore it follows that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{C^+}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_{r,t,n}}) + d(r,s,n) - s = 0$ and the identity claimed in Theorem 8.17 holds. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.6

In this section, we will prove the following:

Theorem A.1. *Under the conditions stated in Assumption I, there exists a unique chain of subschemes*

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_n,$$

with $n \geq 2$, which determines a filtration of the form

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

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i &\subset \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \subset \mathcal{J}_i, \quad \mathcal{J}_i / \mathcal{J}_{i+1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \\ \mathcal{J}_i / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i &\simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2), \quad \mathcal{J}_{i+1} / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_i \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

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

$$\mathcal{J}_n / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \mathcal{J}_n \simeq i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(1)^{\oplus 2}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

To prove the theorem, we need several preliminary results.

Lemma A.2. *Let R be a local Artinian ring over \mathbb{C} so that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(m/m^2) = 1$, where $m \subset R$ is the maximal ideal. Then $R \simeq \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^n)$ for some $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Nakayama's lemma, m has a single generator t as an R -module. Since R is Artinian, there exists an integer $n \geq 1$ so that $t^{n-1} \neq 0$ and $t^n = 0$. \square

Thanks to Proposition 2.5, Assumption I yields that the curve Σ is rigid. From now on, we shall analyze the implications of this property.

Lemma A.3. *We have $\mathcal{H} \simeq \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^n)$ for some $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since Σ is rigid, $\mathcal{H} \simeq \text{Spec}(R)$, with R a local Artinian ring over \mathbb{C} . The Zariski tangent space to \mathcal{H} at $[\mathcal{O}_\Sigma]$ is isomorphic to $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma)$, where $\mathcal{I}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ is the defining ideal of Σ . Moreover,

$$\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_\Sigma / \mathcal{I}_\Sigma^2, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \text{Hom}_\Sigma(\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma/Y}^\vee, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma/Y} \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(-2)$ is the normal bundle to Σ in Y . Therefore

$$\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{I}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathbb{C}.$$

Then the claim follows from Lemma A.2. \square

Let $n \geq 1$ be the positive integer appearing in Lemma A.3. By analogy to [Tod07, Theorem 3.1], for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $k \geq 1$, let $R_k := \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^k)$ and note the canonical exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow R_1 \longrightarrow R_k \longrightarrow R_{k-1} \longrightarrow 0, \\ 0 &\longrightarrow R_{k-1} \longrightarrow R_k \longrightarrow R_1 \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the closed subscheme defined by the projection $R_n \rightarrow R_k$. Let $Y_k := Y \times \mathcal{H}_k$ and let $\pi_k: Y_k \rightarrow Y$ be the canonical projection. We have $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}$ and $Y = Y_1 \subset Y_2 \subset \dots \subset Y_n$. We denote the corresponding closed embeddings by $i_{k-1,k}$ and $j_{k-1,k}$, for $k = 2, \dots, n$, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{Z}_k \subset Y_k = Y \times \mathcal{H}_k$ be the universal closed subscheme, let κ_k be the corresponding closed embedding, and let $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{Y_k}$ be its defining ideal. Note that $\kappa_{k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_k}$ and \mathcal{J}_k are flat over \mathcal{H}_k . Set $\mathcal{E}_k := \kappa_{k,*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_k}$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_n|_{Y_1} = i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$.

For any $1 \leq k \leq n$, set $\mathcal{E}_k := \pi_{k,*} \mathcal{E}_k$. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_1 = i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$. Then one has the exact sequences of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{k-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_1 \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{k-1} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

As in the proof of [Tod07, Theorem 3.1], the infinitesimal deformation theory of the family of sheaves \mathcal{E}_k over \mathcal{H}_k is encoded in the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{E}_1) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_1) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \\ &\longrightarrow \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{E}_1) \xrightarrow{\xi_k} \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_1) \xrightarrow{\delta_k} \text{Ext}_Y^2(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \longrightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

derived from (A.4). Let $e_k \in \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{E}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_1)$, for $2 \leq k \leq n$, be the extension class associated to the sequence (A.5). Then the following holds by [Tho00, Proposition 3.13]:

Lemma A.4. For any $2 \leq k \leq n-1$, one has $e_k = \xi_k(e_{k+1})$, hence also $\delta_k(e_k) = 0$.

Now, we shall show that $e_k \neq 0$ for all $2 \leq k \leq n$.

Lemma A.5. The extension class in $e_2 \in \text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma)$ associated to the short exact sequence (A.4) for $k=2$ is nonzero.

Proof. Note the commutative diagram of \mathcal{O}_{Y_2} -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,2})_*\mathcal{O}_{Y_1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{Y_2} & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,2})_*\mathcal{O}_{Y_1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,2})_*\kappa_{1,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_1} & \longrightarrow & \kappa_{2,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_2} & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,2})_*\kappa_{1,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_1} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the rows are exact and the vertical arrows are the canonical epimorphisms. Applying π_{2*} , i.e., forgetting the R_2 -module structure, one obtains an analogous diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \overset{p}{\curvearrowright} & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma & \xrightarrow{j} & \mathcal{E}_2 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

in $\text{Coh}(Y)$, where the maps ι, q are canonical, i.e.,

$$\iota := \begin{pmatrix} \text{id} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad q := (\text{id} \ 0).$$

Moreover, one has the canonical splitting

$$p := (\text{id} \ 0).$$

Note that the R_2 -module structure is encoded in the endomorphisms $\phi: \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y$,

$$\phi_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{id} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\psi_2: \mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2 \circ g &= g \circ \phi_2, & \psi_2^2 &= 0, \\ \phi_2 \circ \iota &= 0, & \psi_2 \circ j &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose the bottom row of the commutative diagram (A.6) is a trivial extension, i.e., there exists an isomorphism $\xi: \mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$. Note that

$$\text{End}_Y(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^2), \quad \text{Aut}_Y(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

since $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Then there exists an isomorphism $\eta: i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \rightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ so that

$$\eta \circ (\xi \circ \psi_2 \circ \xi^{-1}) \circ \eta^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{id} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, since $\psi_2 \circ j = 0$, one also has

$$\eta \circ (\xi \circ \psi_2 \circ \xi^{-1}) \circ \eta^{-1} \circ (\eta \circ \xi \circ j) = \eta \circ \xi \circ \psi_2 \circ j = 0.$$

Hence

$$\eta \circ \xi \circ j = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, with $\lambda \neq 0$. Then one obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & p & & \\
 & & & & \swarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{t} & \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow f' & \searrow s & \downarrow g' & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} & \xrightarrow{j'} & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

where

$$j' = \lambda^{-1}(\eta \circ \xi \circ j), \quad g' = \eta \circ \xi \circ g, \quad f' = \lambda f,$$

and

$$s = (\text{id} \ 0).$$

In particular, $s \circ g' = f' \circ p$. At the same time the R_2 -module structure on $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ is given by the Jordan block $\psi'_2 := \eta \circ (\xi \circ \psi_2 \circ \xi^{-1}) \circ \eta^{-1}$. This implies that the canonical quotient

$$\mathcal{O}_{Z_2} \twoheadrightarrow (\kappa_{1,2})_*\mathcal{O}_{Z_1},$$

where $\kappa_{1,2}$ denotes the inclusion of Z_1 in Z_2 , is isomorphic to the pull-back of the canonical quotient

$$\mathcal{O}_Y \twoheadrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$$

via the canonical projection $Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1$. Then, the universality property of the Hilbert scheme implies that the canonical closed immersion $\mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_n$ factors through the closed immersion $\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_n$. Hence it leads to a contradiction. \square

Lemmas A.4 and A.5 imply the following result.

Corollary A.6. *For any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, one has $e_k \neq 0$.*

Next, we shall show that $\delta_n(e_n) \neq 0$, i.e., the \mathcal{H}_n -flat deformation \mathcal{E}_n does not admit any further extensions.

Lemma A.7. *Let $R_{n+1} := \mathbb{C}[t]/(t^{n+1})$, $\mathcal{H}_{n+1} := \text{Spec } R_{n+1}$ and $Y_{n+1} := Y \times \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$. Assume that there exists a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} on Y_{n+1} , flat over \mathcal{H}_{n+1} , which fits in an exact sequence of $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}}$ -modules*

$$0 \longrightarrow (j_{1,n+1})_*i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow (j_{n,n+1})_*\kappa_{n,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_n} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then, there exists a surjective morphism $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ which fits in a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,n+1})_*\mathcal{O}_Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} & \longrightarrow & (j_{n,n+1})_*\mathcal{O}_{Y_n} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,n+1})_*i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & (j_{n,n+1})_*\kappa_{n,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_n} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

where the left and right vertical maps are the canonical surjections. In particular, \mathcal{E} is isomorphic to the structure sheaf of an \mathcal{H}_{n+1} -flat closed subscheme $Z_{n+1} \subset Y_{n+1}$.

Proof. First, note that $Z_n \subset Y_n$ is a closed subscheme of Y_{n+1} through the canonical closed immersion $Y_n \rightarrow Y_{n+1}$. Hence one has a natural surjective morphism $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} \rightarrow (j_{n,n+1})_*\kappa_{n,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_n}$ which factors through $\mathcal{O}_{Y_n} \rightarrow \kappa_{n,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_n}$.

The exact sequence (A.7) yields the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow H^0(Y_{n+1}, \mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow H^0(Z_n, \mathcal{O}_{Z_n}) \longrightarrow H^1(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $H^1(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0$. Hence, the map $H^0(Y_{n+1}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow H^0(Z_n, \mathcal{O}_{Z_n})$ is surjective. Therefore, pick a lift $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} \rightarrow (j_{n,n+1})_*\kappa_{n,*}\mathcal{O}_{Z_n}$.

One obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,n+1})_* \mathcal{O}_Y & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{Y_{n+1}} & \longrightarrow & (j_{n,n+1})_* \mathcal{O}_{Y_n} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow & , \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (j_{1,n+1})_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & (j_{n,n+1})_* \kappa_{n,*} \mathcal{O}_{Z_n} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the right vertical map is the canonical surjection. Let $\mathcal{Q} := \text{Coker}(g)$. The snake lemma yields an exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \xrightarrow{p} \text{Coker}(g) \longrightarrow 0 . \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Since $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, the left vertical arrow f can be either surjective or identically zero. If it is surjective, the exact sequence (A.9) shows that $\text{Coker}(g) = 0$, hence the claim follows.

Suppose that f is identically zero. Then $\text{Coker}(f) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, and the map p in (A.9) is either identically zero or an isomorphism. If it is identically zero, one obtains again $\text{Coker}(g) = 0$ and the claim follows.

Suppose that p is an isomorphism. Then the composition

$$\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \xrightarrow{p^{-1}} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$$

is a splitting of the bottom row in diagram (A.8). Hence $\mathcal{E} \simeq (j_{n,n+1})_* \kappa_{n,*} \mathcal{O}_{Z_n} \oplus (j_{1,n+1})_* i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$. This leads to a contradiction since \mathcal{E} is flat over \mathcal{H}_{n+1} by assumption, while the direct summands violate the local criterion of flatness. \square

Using the universality property of the Hilbert scheme, Lemma A.7 yields:

Corollary A.8. *One has $\delta_n(e_n) \neq 0$.*

Using Lemma 2.11, the same arguments as in the proof of [Tod07, Theorem 3.1] yield the following:

Corollary A.9. *One has*

$$\text{Ext}_Y^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_n) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ext}_Y^2(\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{E}) = 0 .$$

It will be shown next by induction that each \mathcal{E}_k is isomorphic to the structure sheaf of a scheme theoretic thickening $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_k \subset Y$. The starting point is the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_2 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 ,$$

which yields a long exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y, \mathcal{E}_2) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_Y, i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow 0$$

since $H^1(\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0$. Pick a lift $f_2: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$ of the canonical morphism $f_1: \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$.

Proposition A.10. *The morphism f_2 is surjective, hence $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_2}$ for a closed subscheme $\Sigma_2 \subset Y$. Moreover, its defining ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ fits into an exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 . \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Proof. One has a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{O}_Y & & & & \\ & & \downarrow f_2 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_2 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*} \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} . \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Note that \mathcal{E}_2 is purely one-dimensional, set-theoretically supported on Σ . Hence $\text{Im}(f_2)$ is the structure sheaf of a purely one-dimensional closed subscheme $\Sigma_2 \subset Y$ with set theoretic support

on Σ . Let $\mathcal{J}_2 \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ be its defining ideal. Applying the snake lemma to the diagram (A.11), one obtains a long exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_\Sigma \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \xrightarrow{c} \mathcal{E}_2/i_{\Sigma_2,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_2} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Suppose that the morphism c is nonzero. Then c is an isomorphism and the composition

$$\mathcal{E}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_2/i_{\Sigma_2,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_2} \xrightarrow{c^{-1}} i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$$

determines a splitting of the bottom row of diagram (A.11). This implies $e_2 = 0$, leading to a contradiction (cf. Corollary A.6). Hence $c = 0$, which implies $\mathcal{E}/i_{\Sigma_2,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_2} = 0$, as claimed. The exact sequence (A.10) follows from the bottom row of diagram (A.12). \square

Proceeding by induction, the same arguments of the previous proposition shows:

Proposition A.11. *Assume that the sheaf \mathcal{E}_{k-1} , is isomorphic to the structure sheaf of a purely one-dimensional scheme-theoretic thickening $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_{k-1} \subset Y$ for some $3 \leq k \leq n$. Then there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathcal{O}_Y & & \\ & & \downarrow f_k & & \downarrow f_{k-1} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where the right vertical arrow is the canonical epimorphism and the left vertical arrow is surjective. In particular $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}$ for a closed subscheme $\Sigma_k \subset Y$ and its defining ideal sheaf $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ fits in an exact sequence

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

In conclusion, Propositions A.10 and A.11 provide a canonical chain of scheme-theoretic thickenings

$$\Sigma_n \subset \cdots \subset \Sigma_1 = \Sigma$$

whose structure sheaves fit simultaneously in the exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k} \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \longrightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By construction, the extension class associated to (A.13) is nontrivial. As shown below, the same holds for the second sequence.

Lemma A.12. *The extension class associated to (A.14) is nontrivial.*

Proof. Suppose that the extension class associated to (A.14) is trivial. This yields a surjective morphism $\mathcal{O}_Y \twoheadrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma \oplus i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}$. By restriction to any closed point $p \in \Sigma$ one obtains a surjective morphism $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus V$, where V is a nonzero vector space. Hence, we get a contradiction. \square

Moreover, one has the following result.

Lemma A.13. *One has $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

Proof. The exact sequence (A.14) yields the long exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}) & \longrightarrow & \\ & & & & \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, \mathcal{O}_\Sigma) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \text{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_\Sigma, i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

where $\delta(1)$ is the associated extension class. Lemma A.12 shows that $\delta(1) \neq 0$. Hence

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k})$$

and the claim follows by induction. \square

Recall the following basic result:

Lemma A.14. *Let $Z \subset Y$ be a purely one-dimensional closed subscheme and let i be the corresponding closed embedding. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^3(i_*\mathcal{O}_Z, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0.$$

Furthermore one has isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^i(\mathcal{I}_Z, \mathcal{O}_Y) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^{i+1}(i_*\mathcal{O}_Z, \mathcal{O}_Y), \quad (\text{A.15})$$

for $i \geq 0$, where $\mathcal{I}_Z \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ is the ideal sheaf of Z . In particular, \mathcal{I}_Z has homological dimension one, i.e., it admits a locally free resolution of amplitude $[-1, 0]$.

Proof. The first part follows from [HL10, Proposition 1.1.10]. The isomorphisms (A.15) follow from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow i_*\mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow 0.$$

Hence one has $\mathcal{E}xt^i(\mathcal{I}_Z, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$ which implies that \mathcal{I}_Z has homological dimension one. \square

Lemma A.15. *Let $(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee} := \mathbb{R}\mathcal{H}om_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ be the derived dual of \mathcal{O}_{Σ} . Then*

$$(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)[-2].$$

Proof. Since $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ is a purely one-dimensional sheaf, Lemma A.14 implies that $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^i(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$ and $i \neq 2$. Therefore, we have

$$(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee} \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y)[-2],$$

where $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is reflexive, by [HL10, Proposition 1.1.10]. Hence it is in particular purely one-dimensional. Moreover, $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is also set-theoretically supported on Σ . Since

$$\mathrm{ch}_2((i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee}) = \mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = [\Sigma] \quad \text{and} \quad \chi((i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee}) = -\chi(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = -1,$$

one gets $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_Y) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$. \square

Lemma A.16. *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2), \\ \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2), \\ \mathcal{E}xt_Y^3(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

Proof. By Lemma A.14, one has isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^{i-1}(\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}xt_Y^i(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. For $i = 0$, one has

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{H}om_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{H}om_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma/Y}, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

This proves the first identity. In order to prove the second identity, note the isomorphism

$$\mathbb{R}\mathcal{H}om_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq (i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^{\vee} \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$$

in $D^b(Y)$. Using Lemma A.15 this yields an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

The third identity follows from Lemma A.14. The fourth identity follows from the second using the isomorphism (A.16) with $k = 2$. \square

Lemma A.17. *One has $H^1(Y, \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})) = 0$ for any $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

Proof. The exact sequence (A.14) yields the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) & \longrightarrow & \\ & & & & \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) & \longrightarrow \dots \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ by Lemma A.16.

It will be shown by induction that $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq V_k \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$, which implies the claim. This clearly holds for $k = 1$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_{k-1},*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{k-1}}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq V_{k-1} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, with V_{k-1} a vector space. Since $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)) = 0$, this implies that $\text{Im}(\delta) \subset i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$. Hence $\text{Im}(\delta)$ is either identically zero or isomorphic to $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$. At the same time, there is a surjective morphism

$$V_{k-1} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \twoheadrightarrow \text{Im}(\delta).$$

Since $\text{Im}(\delta)$ is either identically zero or isomorphic to $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, the kernel of this epimorphism is isomorphic to $V'_{k-1} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$, with $V'_{k-1} \subset V_{k-1}$ a vector subspace. Then one is left with a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow V'_{k-1} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma_k,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ is a \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -module, and $\text{Ext}_{\Sigma}^1(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0$, the inductive step follows. \square

As shown in Corollary A.9, recall that

$$\text{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ext}_Y^2(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Using these vanishing results, and Lemmas A.13 and A.17, one obtains:

Lemma A.18. *One has isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq V_1 \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1), \\ \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \oplus (V_2 \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)) \end{aligned}$$

for some vector spaces V_1, V_2 .

Proof. The second term of the standard local to global spectral sequence for $\text{Ext}_Y^\bullet(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ reads

$$E_2^{p,q} = H^q(Y, \mathcal{E}xt_Y^p(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})),$$

for any $p, q \geq 0$. Since all local Ext sheaves are set-theoretically supported on Σ , all terms with $q \geq 2$ vanish identically. Since Y is a smooth threefold, all terms with $p \geq 4$ also vanish identically. Furthermore Lemmas A.16 and A.17 show that $E_2^{0,1} = 0 = E_2^{3,0}$.

Hence one has a first quadrant spectral sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & E_2^{1,1} & & E_2^{2,1} & & E^{3,1} \\
& & & \searrow & & \searrow & & \\
0 & & & & & & & \\
& & & d_2^{0,1} & & d_2^{1,1} & & \\
& & & \searrow & & \searrow & & \\
& & E_2^{0,0} & & E_2^{1,0} & & E_2^{2,0} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

where all other terms are zero. In particular, all differentials $d_r^{p,q}$, with $r \geq 2$, are identically zero. Then the first vanishing condition in (A.17) implies that $E_2^{1,0} = 0$, i.e., one has

$$H^0(Y, \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})) = 0.$$

This further implies that $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ must be purely one-dimensional. Since it is also a \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -module, it must be the pushforward of a locally free sheaf \mathcal{F} on Σ so that $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{F}) = 0$. Hence \mathcal{F} is either zero or

$$\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 0.$$

Here, the slope of a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} on Σ is defined by $\mu(\mathcal{E}) = \chi(\mathcal{E})/\text{rk}(\mathcal{E})$ provided that $\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) > 0$.

Similarly, the second vanishing condition in (A.17) implies that $H^1(\Sigma, \mathcal{F}) = 0$. If \mathcal{F} is nonzero, this yields $\mu_{\min}(\mathcal{F}) \geq 0$. In conclusion, $\mathcal{F} \simeq V_1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)$ for some vector space V_1 .

Moreover, the second vanishing condition in (A.17) also implies that

$$H^0(Y, \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})) = 0.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ is the pushforward of a locally free sheaf \mathcal{G} on Σ . If $\mathcal{G} \neq 0$, it must satisfy

$$\mu_{\max}(\mathcal{G}) \leq 0.$$

Finally, by Serre duality, Lemma A.13 yields

$$\text{Ext}_Y^3(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbb{C}.$$

Since $E_2^{1,1} = 0 = E_2^{p,0}$, with $p \geq 3$, one obtains an isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}_Y^3(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq H^1(\Sigma, \mathcal{G}).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{G} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \oplus (V_2 \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1))$ for some vector space V_2 . □

Lemma A.19. *One has*

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ and

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \begin{cases} i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1) \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1) & \text{for } k = n, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_Y$ is the ideal sheaf of Σ_k for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Proof. The exact sequence

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

yields the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_{k-1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \\
&\xrightarrow{\delta_0} \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_{k-1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \quad (\text{A.18}) \\
&\xrightarrow{\delta_1} \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. Lemma A.16 shows that there are isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

Next, it will be shown by induction that

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. For $k = 1$, the claim is proven in Lemma A.16. Suppose

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_{k-1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$$

for some $2 \leq k \leq n$. The the exact sequence (A.18) yields an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
\cdots &\longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \xrightarrow{f} i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \\
&\longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{\delta} i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \longrightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)) = 0$, it follows that $\text{Im}(f)$ is either 0 or $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$. Hence $\text{Coker}(f)$ is either $i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$ or 0 respectively. Since $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ is a \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -module, this implies that

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq W_k \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \quad (\text{A.19})$$

with W_k a vector space. Lemma A.13 shows that there isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^{i-1}(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^i(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_k}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \quad (\text{A.20})$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ and all $i \geq 1$. By Lemma A.18, one has

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma_n,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_n}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \oplus (V_2 \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1)).$$

Therefore $W_n \simeq \mathbb{C}$ and $V_2 = 0$, hence

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_n, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

By Lemma A.16, also $\mathcal{E}xt_Y^2(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$, hence returning to the sequence (A.18) with $k = n$, and using Lemma A.16 and equation (A.19), one then obtains a surjective morphism

$$i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \longrightarrow W_{n-1} \otimes i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where W_{n-1} is a nonzero vector space. Since $\text{Hom}_Y(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)) = 0$, this implies that $W_{n-1} \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Proceeding by descending induction on ℓ , a completely analogous argument shows that $W_{\ell} \simeq \mathbb{C}$ for all $k \leq \ell \leq n$. In particular this proves the inductive step. In conclusion,

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$$

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

To prove the second part, note that the exact sequence (A.18) reduces to an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_{k-1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A.21})$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. By induction, this implies

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_n, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})) = \text{ch}_2(\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})) = 2[\Sigma].$$

Using equation (A.20) and Lemma A.18, this implies that

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_n, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1) \oplus i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-1).$$

Then the exact sequence (A.21) yields an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_{n-1}, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \longrightarrow i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since the central term is by definition the pushforward of a \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -module, it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_{n-1}, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2).$$

Then by descending induction on k , the same exact sequence yields

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(-2)$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. □

Proposition A.20. *One has*

$$\mathcal{J}_k \otimes i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \simeq \begin{cases} i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2) & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1) \oplus i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(1) & \text{for } k = n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma A.14, the ideal sheaf \mathcal{J}_k has a locally free resolution

$$\mathcal{V}_{-1} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{V}_0$$

of amplitude $[-1, 0]$. Then $\mathcal{J}_k \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}$ is isomorphic to the pushforward of the locally free complex

$$\mathcal{V}_{-1}|_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{d|_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{V}_0|_{\Sigma} \tag{A.22}$$

on Σ . Moreover, $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{H}om_Y(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$ is isomorphic to the pushforward of the locally free complex of amplitude $[0, 1]$

$$\mathcal{V}_0^{\vee}|_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{d^{\vee}|_{\Sigma}} \mathcal{V}_{-1}^{\vee}|_{\Sigma}$$

on Σ . This complex is isomorphic to the dual of (A.22), i.e.,

$$(\mathcal{V}_0|_{\Sigma})^* \xrightarrow{(d|_{\Sigma})^*} (\mathcal{V}_{-1}|_{\Sigma})^* \tag{A.23}$$

where $(-)^*$ denotes the dual on Σ . By Lemma A.19, the cohomology groups of the complex (A.23)

$$\mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})$$

are locally free as \mathcal{O}_{Σ} -modules. This implies that the cohomology groups of the complex (A.22) are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_k \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} &\simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^0(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^*, \\ \mathcal{T}or_1^Y(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) &\simeq \mathcal{E}xt_Y^1(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma})^*. \end{aligned}$$

Then the claim follows from Lemma A.19. □

We are ready to prove:

Proof of the existence part of Theorem A.1. The existence of the chain of subschemes is proved in Propositions A.10 and A.11.

The second isomorphism in the first row of (A.2) is clear by construction. The first isomorphism in the second row of (A.2) and (A.3) follow from Proposition A.20 via the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}\mathcal{J}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_k \otimes i_{\Sigma, *}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0.$$

In particular, these isomorphisms imply

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

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

It remains to show that the first isomorphism of the first row and the second isomorphism of the second row of (A.2) hold. One has a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}\mathcal{J}_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \oplus i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow p \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}_k & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J}_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

where p is surjective and $\ker(p) \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2)$. This implies that $\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}\mathcal{J}_{k-1} \subset \mathcal{J}_k$ and $\mathcal{J}_k/\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma}\mathcal{J}_{k-1} \simeq i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(2)$ by the snake lemma. \square

We prove now the uniqueness part of the statement in Theorem A.1. We need first the following lemma.

Lemma A.21. *We have*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_k, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbf{C}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

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

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_n, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) = 0, \quad (\text{A.25})$$

for a filtration of the form (A.1) satisfying conditions (A.2) and (A.3).

Proof. We shall prove Formula (A.24) 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

$$\mathrm{Ext}_Y^1(i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbf{C}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

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 (A.26), 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 $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{J}_{k+1}, i_{\Sigma,*}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}) \simeq \mathbf{C}$, 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 (A.25), note that $i_{\Sigma}^*(J_n/I_{\Sigma}J_n) \simeq i_{\Sigma}^*J_n$, hence the claim follows from condition (A.3). \square

Proof of the uniqueness part of Theorem A.1. The proof is inductive. Let $\{\mathcal{J}_n\}$ and $\{\mathcal{J}'_n\}$ be two filtrations satisfying the conditions (A.2) and (A.3). By construction, \mathcal{J}_1 and \mathcal{J}'_1 coincide with \mathcal{I}_{Σ} as ideal sheaves in \mathcal{O}_Y . Using Formula (A.24) one obtains a commutative diagram

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

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

APPENDIX B. 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 B.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 $f^*: \text{QCoh}(T) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(S)$ be the *derived* pullback functor, and we let $f_*: \text{QCoh}(S) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(T)$ be the *derived* pushforward.⁹ Similarly, all fiber products and tensor products considered in this appendix will be understood in the derived sense. \triangle

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

Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism of qcqs derived schemes. For every $S \in \text{dAff}/_Y$, 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 B.3. Let $F \in \text{Perf}(X)$ be a perfect complex and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be two integers. The functor $\Phi_F: \text{dAff}/_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is given by

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

\circlearrowright

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

Proposition B.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 id_Y and F by $f_*(F)$. Besides, by definition of tor-amplitude, we see that $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(S) = \Phi_F^{[a,b]}(\text{cl}S)$. So we can also replace Y by $\text{cl}Y$ or, equivalently, assume from the very beginning that Y is underived.

⁹Here and in what follows, we consider ∞ -categories the $\text{QCoh}(-)$, $\text{Perf}(-)$, \mathcal{S} , etc – see e.g. [PS23, §1.6].

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 $s: \text{Spec}(\kappa(s)) \rightarrow S$ one has $\Phi_F^{[a,b]}(\text{Spec}(\kappa(s))) = *$. Besides, [Lur18, Corollary 6.1.4.6] shows as well that the subset U of Y given by those geometric points $s: \text{Spec}(\kappa(s)) \rightarrow Y$ 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

Corollary B.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 B.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 C. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 6.2. 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 $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$.

C.1. Infinite type 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 ≤ 1 . We introduce below the C -framed stack functions to be used in the proof of Theorem 6.2. We do not recall here the construction of $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$, rather we refer to [Bri12].

C.1.1. Subcategories, pairs, and moduli stacks.

Definition C.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 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 $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$. 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 4.12.

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

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

where the vertical arrows are the natural forgetful morphisms. The stack $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\circlearrowleft}(Y)$ is algebraic, locally of finite type over \mathbb{C} , and the projection to $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ is representable, of finite type¹⁰. Then, the same holds for $\text{Coh}^{\circlearrowleft}(\mathcal{B})$ and the projection to $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{B})$. The associated stack functions will be denoted by

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

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

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

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

C.1.2. C -framed stack functions.

Definition C.2. Given an algebraic subcategory $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ as in Definition C.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 §5.2.

Recall that $\text{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y)$ 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

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

denote the three natural projections. Moreover, $\text{Coh}_C(Y) \subset \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$ 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 $\text{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y)$ is defined by the fiber product

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

¹⁰All these statements can be proved as in [Bri11, Lemma 2.4] or by using our derived approach via the derived stack $\text{Perf}(Y)$ of perfect complexes on Y . Both approaches work also to prove similar geometric properties of all the other stacks introduced in this section.

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

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

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

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

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 4.4.

Lemma C.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}_{Σ} 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 C.3, one defines a notion of C -framed section of a C -framed sheaf as follows.

Definition C.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 ${}^\circ\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B})$ be the open substack consisting of pairs (\mathcal{F}, s) so that s is C -framed. The associated stack function will be denoted by

$${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_C} := \left[{}^\circ\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right] \in H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Remark C.5. Note that in general $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}_C$ does not imply that \mathcal{F}_C and \mathcal{F}_Σ 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 $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{F}_f, \mathcal{F}_C) = 0$ by support conditions. \triangle

C.1.3. C -framed Hilbert schemes. For any $m \geq 0$, let $\text{Hilb}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma])$ denote the Hilbert scheme of closed one-dimensional subschemes $W \subset Y$ with $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_W) = [C] + m[\Sigma]$. Then, let $\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m)$ be the stack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}_C(Y; m) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hilb}(Y; [C] + m[\Sigma]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y; m) & \xrightarrow{\pi_C} & \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where the bottom horizontal arrow is induced by the central projection $\pi: \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}^{\text{ext}}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y)$. The resulting stack function will be denoted by

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} := \sum_{m \geq 0} \left[\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m) \longrightarrow \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right],$$

the structural morphisms being again induced by the central projection.

Remark C.6. Note that $\mathcal{H}_C(Y; m)$ is an algebraic space of locally finite type. Moreover, by Lemma C.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

C.1.4. C -framed stable pairs. Let ${}^{\text{sp}}\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(Y)$ be the stack defined by the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\text{sp}}\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{SP}(Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow q \\ \text{Coh}_C^{\text{ext}}(Y) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \end{array},$$

where $\mathcal{SP}(Y)$ denotes the moduli space of Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs on Y . ${}^{\text{sp}}\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(Y)$ is an algebraic space, locally of finite type over \mathbb{C} .

We introduce the stack functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{SP}_C} &:= \left[{}^{\text{sp}}\text{Coh}_C^{\text{O}, \text{ext}}(Y) \longrightarrow \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right], \\ \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C} &:= \left[f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}(Y) \longrightarrow \text{Coh}_{\leq 1}(Y) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the moduli stack $f\text{-}\mathcal{SP}_C(Y)$ has been introduced in §5.2.

C.1.5. Exceptional Hilbert scheme. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}(Y)$ denote the Hilbert scheme parametrizing closed subschemes $W \subset Y$ so that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_W) \in \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$. By Corollary 2.3, 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 Σ . The associated stack function will be also denoted by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}(Y)}$.

C.2. Motivic Hall algebra identities.

Lemma C.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}_Σ . 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 $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{F}) \in [C] + \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$, Corollary 2.3 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

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(t) \longrightarrow \ker(f) \longrightarrow \ker(g) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(t) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \longrightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

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 (C.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 $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{K}_1) \in \mathbb{N}[\Sigma]$, 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 C.3. \square

Lemma C.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 C.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}_Σ .

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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{K} & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s) & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(s_C) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C \longrightarrow 0 \end{array},$$

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 C.7 and C.8, the next result is the C -framed analogue of [Bri11, Lemma 4.3].

Lemma C.9. *The following identity holds in the stack function algebra $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$:*

$$\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Next note that any sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 1}$ fits into a unique exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

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 C.10. *The following identity holds in $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Furthermore, given the exact sequence (C.5), one also has:

Lemma C.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 C.3. At the same time, By Proposition 4.7-(1), the set-theoretic support of the subsheaf $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{F}$ in (C.5) is either zero-dimensional or the union of Σ 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

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow i & & \downarrow \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow j & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_\Sigma & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} .$$

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}_Σ , and \mathcal{F}_C is purely one-dimensional, scheme-theoretically supported on C , Lemma C.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 C.3. Again, by Proposition 4.7-(1) one has $\mathrm{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}_C) = 0$. Hence one obtains a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & \mathcal{Q}_C & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}} & \mathcal{Q}_C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} ,$$

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}_Σ . Therefore, \mathcal{F} is C -framed by Lemma C.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 4.7-(2). \square

Consider the stack functions $\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}$ and ${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}$ as introduced in (C.1) and (C.2), respectively, with $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{F}_C$. Lemma C.11-(1) yields the following result, which is the C -framed variant of [BS16, Lemma 55].

Corollary C.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}_Σ is a flat family of objects of \mathcal{A}_Σ ,
- \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 4.7 and Lemma C.11, we obtain the next result, which is the C -framed variant of [Bri11, Lemma 4.2], [BS16, Lemma 57].

Lemma C.13. *The following identity holds in $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}_f}^\circ * {}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}^\circ. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Lemma C.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 C.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 C.11 and C.14, one can prove the following C -framed variant of [BS16, Lemma 60].

Lemma C.15. *The following identity holds in $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$*

$${}^\circ\mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_C}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Finally, by analogy to [BS16, Lemma 59], one also has the following.

Lemma C.16. *The following identity holds in $H_\infty(\mathcal{A}_{\leq 1})$:*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}^\circ = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f}. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

C.3. Proof of Theorem 6.2. First, using the DT/PT correspondence proven in [ST11], it suffices to prove the identity

$$f\text{-PT}_C(Y) = \frac{\text{DT}_C(Y)}{\text{DT}_{\text{ex}}(Y)}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

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 §C.1.3 and §C.1.5, respectively.

Now, identity (C.6) yields

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

On the other hand, recall the identity (C.4):

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = {}^\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_C}.$$

Using identity (C.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 (C.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 (C.8) in the right-hand-side one obtains

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{T}_f} * \mathbf{1}_{f\text{-SP}_C} * \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{F}_f)_\Sigma}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

By comparing (C.11) and (C.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 Corollary 2.12, this leads to identity (C.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 Corollary 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, 20
- [Bri11] T. Bridgeland, *Hall algebras and curve-counting invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **24** (2011), no. 4, 969–998. 32, 57, 58, 62, 64
- [Bri12] ———, *An introduction to motivic Hall algebras*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 1, 102–138. 57
- [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, 10, 17, 21, 22, 32, 62, 63, 64, 65
- [Cal16] J. Calabrese, *Donaldson-Thomas invariants and flops*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **716** (2016), 103–145. 34
- [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*, Duke Math. J. **117** (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. 4
- [DPS22] D.-E. Diaconescu, M. Porta, and F. Sala, *Cohomological Hall algebras and their representations via torsion pairs*, arXiv:2207.08926, 2022. 5, 21, 58
- [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. 6
- [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. 8, 18
- [HL10] D. Huybrechts and M. Lehn, *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves*, second ed., Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. 50
- [Kat08] S. Katz, *Genus zero Gopakumar-Vafa invariants of contractible curves*, J. Diff. Geom. **79** (2008), no. 2, 185–195. 11
- [Kaw88] Y. Kawamata, *Crepanant blowing-up of 3-dimensional canonical singularities and its application to degenerations of surfaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 93–163. 32
- [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. 6
- [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. 6, 32
- [Kol89] J. Kollár, *Flops*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 15–36. 32
- [Lur18] J. Lurie, *Spectral algebraic geometry*, available at his webpage, 2018. 57
- [Mau16] D. Maulik, *Stable pairs and the HOMFLY polynomial*, Invent. Math. **204** (2016), no. 3, 787–831. 1, 2, 4, 10, 31, 34
- [Mor88] S. Mori, *Flip theorem and the existence of minimal models for 3-folds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 1, 117–253. 32
- [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, 3, 38, 39, 43
- [PS23] M. Porta and F. Sala, *Two-dimensional categorified Hall algebras*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **25** (2023), no. 3, 1113–1205. 56
- [PT09] R. Pandharipande and R. P. Thomas, *Curve counting via stable pairs in the derived category*, Invent. Math. **178** (2009), no. 2, 407–447. 2, 4, 26
- [PT10] ———, *Stable pairs and BPS invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 1, 267–297. 3, 31, 35
- [Pă21] T. Pădurariu, *Relative stable pairs and a non-Calabi-Yau wall crossing*, arXiv:2110.14561, 2021. 3, 22
- [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. 6
- [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. 6, 36
- [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. 65
- [Sta23] The Stacks project authors, *The stacks project*, 2023. 22
- [Tho00] R. P. Thomas, *A holomorphic Casson invariant for Calabi-Yau 3-folds, and bundles on $K3$ fibrations*, J. Differential Geom. **54** (2000), no. 2, 367–438. 45
- [Tod07] Y. Toda, *On a certain generalization of spherical twists*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **135** (2007), no. 1, 119–134. 5, 45, 48
- [Tod09] ———, *Limit stable objects on Calabi-Yau 3-folds*, Duke Math. J. **149** (2009), no. 1, 157–208.

- [Tod13] ———, *Curve counting theories via stable objects II: DT/ncDT flop formula*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **675** (2013), 1–51. 34
- [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.
- [Vak22] R. Vakil, *The rising sea: Foundations of algebraic geometry*, 2022. 18
- [VdB04] M. Van den Bergh, *Three-dimensional flops and noncommutative rings*, Duke Math. J. **122** (2004), no. 3, 423–455. 34

(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

Email address: `arianvwr@gmail.com`