

Asymptotics of quantized barycenters of lattice polytopes with applications to algebraic geometry

Chenzi Jin, Yanir A. Rubinstein

with an appendix by Yaxiong Liu

June 2024

Abstract

This article addresses a combinatorial problem with applications to algebraic geometry. To a convex lattice polytope P and each of its integer dilations kP one may associate the barycenter of its lattice points. This sequence of k -quantized barycenters converge to the (classical) barycenter of the polytope considered as a convex body. A basic question arises: is there a complete asymptotic expansion for this sequence? If so, what are its terms? This article initiates the study of this question. First, we establish the existence of such an expansion as well as determine the first two terms. Second, for Delzant lattice polytopes we use toric algebra to determine all terms using mixed volumes of virtual rooftop polytopes, or alternatively in terms of higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants. Third, for reflexive polytopes we show the quantized barycenters are colinear to first order, and actually colinear in the case of polygons. The proofs use Ehrhart theory, convexity arguments, and toric algebra. As applications we derive the complete asymptotic expansion of the Fujita–Odaka stability thresholds δ_k on arbitrary polarizations on (possibly singular) toric varieties. In fact, we show they are rational functions of k for sufficiently large k . This gives the first general result on Tian’s stabilization problem for δ_k -invariants for (possibly singular) toric Fanos: δ_k stabilize in k if and only if they are all equal to 1, and when smooth if and only if asymptotically Chow semistable. We also relate the asymptotic expansions to higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants of test configurations motivated by Ehrhart theory, and unify in passing previous results of Donaldson, Ono, Futaki, and Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	A combinatorial problem	2
1.2	Relation to algebraic-geometry and stability thresholds	3
2	Results	5
2.1	Results for general lattice polytopes	5
2.2	Results for Delzant lattice polytopes	7
2.3	Results for reflexive polytopes	11

2.4	Applications to asymptotics of δ_k -invariants	11
2.5	Test configurations, higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants, and Tian’s stabilization problem	12
2.6	Organization	13
3	First order expansion of quantized barycenters of lattice polytopes	14
4	Asymptotics of quantized barycenters of Delzant lattice polytopes	17
5	First order expansion of quantized barycenters of reflexive polytopes	22
6	Quantized barycenters of reflexive polygons	24
7	Asymptotics of δ_k-invariants	30
8	Relation to test configurations	32
8.1	Construction of the rooftop test configuration	33
8.2	Quantized barycenters and higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants	34
9	Examples	34
9.1	Two simple polygon examples	34
9.2	A 3-dimensional reflexive example with non-collinear quantized barycenters	35
9.3	Virtual rooftop polytopes and verification of the terms in the expansion	36
9.4	Three non-stabilizing quantized barycenter examples	37
A	On a result of Blum–Jonsson and Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang	38

1 Introduction

1.1 A combinatorial problem

This article initiates the study of a combinatorial problem: *what is the asymptotic behavior of the quantized barycenters of lattice polytopes?*

To state this more precisely, let

$$M \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$$

denote a lattice and $P \subset M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ denote a convex lattice polytope, i.e., the vertex set satisfies $\text{Ver } P \subset M$. The k -quantized barycenter of P is defined as the average of the lattice points in kP divided by k :

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) := \frac{1}{k|kP \cap M|} \sum_{u \in kP \cap M} u, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The barycenter of P is the first moment of the uniform probability measure on P , considered as a convex body in $M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, or

$$\text{Bc}(P) := \frac{1}{|P|} \int_P x dx \in M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

The empirical measures $\frac{1}{|kP \cap M|} \sum_{u \in P \cap k^{-1}M} \delta_u$ converge weakly to $1_P dx / |P|$ so

$$\text{Bc}(P) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Bc}_k(P) \in M_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Does the sequence $\{\text{Bc}_k(P)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ encode other canonical quantities associated to P beside $\text{Bc}(P)$? We pose the following:

Problem 1.1. *Is there an asymptotic expansion*

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i(P) k^{-i}?$$

If so, what are the coefficients $a_i(P)$?

Problem 1.1 is of purely combinatorial interest within Ehrhart theory. Thus, the bulk of this article (Sections 3, 5, and 6) can be read as a purely enumerative combinatorics paper, and to some extent also Section 4 that is concerned with algebraic combinatorics. Sections 7–8 and the Appendix are concerned with the algebraic geometric applications and can be read independently by the reader interested only in those (or skipped by the combinatorics-oriented reader).

1.2 Relation to algebraic-geometry and stability thresholds

At the same time, this article can be considered as the second in a series where we initiate the study of asymptotics of algebro-geometric invariants arising from Kodaira embeddings using vector spaces of holomorphic sections of powers of a line bundle $H^0(X, L^k)$. The asymptotic parameter is the power k of the line bundle, where $1/k$ can be thought of as Planck’s constant in geometric quantization. The over-arching geometric motivation for the series initiated in [27] is to obtain complete asymptotic expansions for these invariants. This is of course motivated by the foundational result of Catlin and Zelditch on the complete asymptotics of the Bergman kernel [10, 52], but the setting is quite different: the invariants we are interested in are Tian’s α_k - and Fujita–Odaka’s δ_k -invariants [45, 18] and they are not directly defined in terms of the Bergman kernel. Rather, they are more related to singularities of divisors in the linear series $|kL|$ on X . These invariants play a fundamental role in both the minimal model program in algebraic geometry and in the study of canonical Kähler metrics in differential geometry.

Problem 1.2. *Is there an asymptotic expansion*

$$\delta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i(X, L) k^{-i}?$$

If so, what are the coefficients $a_i(X, L)$?

By a theorem of Blum–Jonsson $\lim_k \delta_k = \delta$ [5, Theorem 4.4], with δ the basis log canonical threshold of Fujita–Odaka [18]. Thus, if such an expansion exists then $a_0(X, L) = \delta$.

Another motivation is *Tian’s stabilization problem* which asks whether such invariants “stabilize”, i.e., become eventually constant in k . Tian asked this for his α_k -invariants in the smooth Fano setting [45, Question 1], and later for all polarizations on possibly singular varieties [47, Conjecture 5.3], and one can extend his problem to the δ_k -invariants.

Problem 1.3. *Is $\delta_k = \delta$ for all sufficiently large k ?*

One can consider our Problem 1.2 as a refinement of Problem 1.3.

We completely solve Problem 1.3 in the (possibly singular) toric Fano setting (Corollary 2.15). This shows there is a remarkable dichotomy between the α_k -invariants and the δ_k -invariants. The first paper in the series resolved Tian’s stabilization problem for α_k -invariants by showing that in the toric Fano setting $\alpha_k = \alpha$ for all k . Here we show that δ_k -invariants behave very differently and *rarely stabilize*, but that if they do stabilize then they also satisfy $\delta_k = \delta$ for *all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and when Fano also $\delta_k = \delta = 1$. This precisely suggests that most likely there is a complete asymptotic expansion as conjectured in Problem 1.2, and indeed we prove that is the case.

Problems 1.2 and 1.3 are intimately related to Problem 1.1 as we explain next.

The relation between stability thresholds and barycenters has a rich and long history. Let $\Omega \in H^2(M, \mathbb{R})$ be a Kähler class. In 1983 Futaki introduced the eponymous invariant $F_\Omega(v)$ that associates to each holomorphic vector field v on X a number; he proved that F_Ω must vanish on all holomorphic vector fields in order for a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric to exist in Ω [19]. In the case X is toric it suffices to consider the n vector fields t_1, \dots, t_n generated by the complex torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ acting on X . A beautiful theorem of Mabuchi states that (when suitably normalized) $(F(t_1), \dots, F(t_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the barycenter $\text{Bc}(P_{X,\Omega})$ of the Delzant polytope $P_{X,\Omega}$ associated to (X, Ω) [34, Theorem 5.3]. Thus, Futaki’s obstruction can be rephrased geometrically as $\text{Bc}(P_{X,\Omega}) = 0$. Some thirty years later, Blum–Jonsson showed that Mabuchi’s theorem can be rephrased in terms of the Fujita–Odaka δ invariant [5, Corollary 7.16]:

$$\delta^{-1} = \max_{i=1, \dots, d} [\langle \text{Bc}(P_{X,\Omega}), v_i \rangle + b_i],$$

where $\{v_1, \dots, v_d\}$ are the primitive generators of the one-dimensional cones of the fan determining X and $(b_1, \dots, b_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ determine the class Ω , so that $P_{X,\Omega} = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle u, v_i \rangle + b_i \geq 0\}$. In particular, in the Fano case $\Omega = -K_X$, $b_1 = \dots = b_d = 1$, so $\delta \leq 1$ with equality if and only if $\text{Bc}(P) = 0$. It was then realized by Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang that Blum–Jonsson’s formula in the Fano case extends also to quantized barycenters [42, Corollary 7.1],

$$\delta_k^{-1} = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} [\langle \text{Bc}_k(P_{X, -K_X}), v_i \rangle + 1], \tag{1}$$

and that similarly $\text{Bc}_k(P_{X, -K_X})$ is essentially a quantized Futaki character that obstructs the existence of k -th balanced metrics [42, Theorem 2.3]. The formula (1) is the link, at the heart of the present article, between quantized barycenters and stability thresholds. In an appendix it is shown that (1) extends to all polarizations (36).

Thus, the study of asymptotics of $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ for lattice polytopes is essentially equivalent to the study of the asymptotics of δ_k for (possibly singular) toric varieties. We employ this link in both directions in this article. For general P we derive a formula for $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ which answers the first part of Problem 1.1 as well as determines $a_1(P)$; we then use this to obtain corresponding formula and asymptotics for δ_k for general (possibly very singular) toric varieties. Restricting to toric manifolds we then use (as well as add some entries to) the well-developed dictionary between Riemann–Roch theory and Ehrhart theory to answer Problem 1.1 completely for *Delzant lattice polytopes* P , determining all $a_i(P)$ in terms of mixed volumes of virtual polytopes. Thirdly, restricting to Gorenstein Fano varieties amounts to working with the sub-class of reflexive polytopes for which we refine the general expansion and show that $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ are colinear, to first order, with $\text{Bc}(P)$.

This is not true for general P . Finally, for toric del Pezzos we show how the combinatorial and algebraic approach give two completely different proofs of the same formula for $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ or δ_k . In this dimension $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ are actually colinear with $\text{Bc}(P)$. The beauty of this special case is that either convexity arguments or Ehrhart theory allows to replace the otherwise mysterious Ehrhart polynomial expressions by completely explicit formulas involving the lattice-normalized measure or intersection numbers.

In a forthcoming article, the third in the series, we unify the study of Tian’s and Fujita–Odaka’s invariants [28].

2 Results

Our overarching goal is to make this article accessible to both combinatorists and algebraic geometers. As part of that, we carefully separate the sections dealing with each. Sections 3–6 detail our combinatorial results on Problem 1.1. Section 7 describes our results on Problems 1.2 and 1.3. Section 8 revisits Section 4 in terms of test configurations and is relevant to both audiences.

2.1 Results for general lattice polytopes

To state our most general result on Problem 1.1 we set-up some basic terminology from Ehrhart theory.

A real Euclidean space V of dimension n and an \mathbb{R} -basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of V define a lattice

$$\mathbb{Z}^n \cong M \equiv M(v_1, \dots, v_n) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i : a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \right\} \subset V \cong \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is called a basis of M , and $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} = V \cong \mathbb{R}^n$. Any other basis of M differs by an n -by- n matrix with integer entries and determinant ± 1 [24, Theorem 21.1]. The determinant of M is the Euclidean volume of the unit (or fundamental) parallelotope $\{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i : a \in [0, 1]^n\} \subset M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, denoted

$$\det M = |\det[v_1 \dots v_n]|,$$

independent of the choice of basis.

A convex lattice polytope $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the convex hull of a finite collection of lattice points, assumed to be n -dimensional.

Definition 2.1. Let L be a n -dimensional lattice and L_H an affine sublattice obtained by intersecting L with a hyperplane H .

- Let Vol denote the standard Lebesgue $(n - 1)$ -dimensional measure on H . Define the *lattice-normalized measure on H* as the measure with respect to the affine sublattice L_H , i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\text{Vol}} := \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(C)} \text{Vol},$$

where C is a fundamental parallelotope of the affine sublattice L_H . That is, C is the parallelotope spanned by a basis of L_H . Note that while fundamental parallelotopes are not unique, their volumes are the same [24, p. 358].

- Let P be a lattice polytope. The *lattice-normalized measure on ∂P* is defined to be the measure whose restriction to any facet of P is the normalized volume on that facet. Let $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P)$ denote the barycenter of ∂P with respect to this measure, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) = \frac{1}{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)} \int_{\partial P} u \cdot d\widetilde{\text{Vol}}$$

See Examples 9.1 and 9.2 for some explicit calculation of the lattice-normalized measure. This measure is important in Ehrhart theory, as it governs the first non-trivial coefficient of the *Ehrhart polynomial*, a classical object recalled in the next result:

Theorem 2.2. [14, 15], [24, Theorem 19.1],[36, Theorem 12.2, Exercise 12.5],[3, Corollary 5.5] *Let M be a lattice of dimension n . For any lattice polytope P , there is a polynomial*

$$E_P(k) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i k^i$$

such that

$$E_P(k) = \#(kP \cap M)$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$a_n = \text{Vol}(P), \quad a_{n-1} = \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P), \quad a_0 = 1.$$

Next, embed M as a sublattice $M \times \{0\}$ of $M \times \mathbb{Z}$. For $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in M$ such that

$$P + c \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \{0\},$$

and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define the convex lattice polytope of one dimension higher (“roof-top polytope”),

$$P(c; i) := \left\{ (u, h) : u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in P + c, h \in [0, u_i] \right\} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Denote

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = (\text{Bc}_{k,1}(P), \dots, \text{Bc}_{k,n}(P)) \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2)$$

Our first main result answers the first part of Problem 1.1, as well as determines the first non-trivial coefficient.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $M \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a lattice and $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ be an n -dimensional convex lattice polytope. For $c \in M$ such that $P + c \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$,*

$$\text{Bc}_{k,i} = \frac{E_{P(c;i)}(k) - E_P(k)}{kE_P(k)} - c = \frac{E_{P(c;i)}(k) - E_{P \times [0, c_i]}(k)}{kE_P(k)}. \quad (3)$$

In particular, $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i(P) k^{-i}$ for some a_i that depend only on P . Moreover,

$$a_0(P) = \text{Bc}(P), \quad a_1(P) = \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} (\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P)),$$

where $\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)$ is the mass of the lattice-normalized measure of ∂P , and $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P)$ is its barycenter (see Definition 2.1). Finally, if $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ is constant for $n + 1$ values of k then $a_i(P) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 2.3 implies that if $\text{Bc}(P) \neq \text{Bc}_k(P)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then the same is true for all sufficiently large k . In this context, it raises the following interesting problem:

Problem 2.4. Assume that P is a lattice polytope satisfying $\text{Bc}(P) \neq \text{Bc}_k(P)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Does there exist such a P for which $\{\text{Bc}_i(P)\}_{i \in I}$ is a singleton for some subset $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|I| \geq 2$?

Theorem 2.3 says that if such a P exists then $|I| \leq n$. In Remark 6.3 we resolve Problem 2.4 in dimension $n = 2$.

2.2 Results for Delzant lattice polytopes

In this part, we assume that P belongs to the sub-class of Delzant polytopes.

Definition 2.5. A convex lattice polytope P in \mathbb{R}^n is *Delzant* if:

1. there are exactly n edges meeting at each vertex p (i.e., P is *simple*);
2. the edges meeting at a vertex p satisfy that each edge is of the form $p + tu_i$ with $u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, n$;
3. the u_1, \dots, u_n in (2) can be chosen to be a basis of \mathbb{Z}^n .

Such polytopes are an important sub-class of lattice polytopes since there is a one-to-one correspondence between Delzant lattice polytopes and polarized toric manifolds. We collect in one statement that correspondence and in fact a more general one including the singular and reflexive cases.

Theorem 2.6. [9, Theorem 28.2], [12], [17, §1.5], [1, Proposition 2.2.23] *There is a one-to-one correspondence between lattice polytopes and polarized toric varieties. Specifically, let*

$$P = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle u, v_i \rangle \geq -b_i\}$$

be a lattice polytope, where each $v_i \in N := \text{Hom}(M, \mathbb{Z})$ is chosen to be primitive, i.e., not a multiple of another lattice point, and $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. It determines a fan where $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is the set of primitive generators of the one-dimensional cones. This fan then determines a toric variety X , on which the irreducible toric divisors $\{D_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are in one-to-one correspondence with $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$. The divisor

$$D := \sum_{i=1}^d b_i D_i$$

is ample and Cartier. Let L be the corresponding line bundle. Then the polarized variety (X, L) is the one in correspondence with P .

The variety X is smooth if and only if P is Delzant (Definition 2.5).

The variety X is Gorenstein Fano (i.e., $-K_X$ is Cartier and ample) with $L = -K_X$ if and only if P is reflexive.

To generalize this correspondence for divisors that are not necessarily ample, we use the notion of virtual polytopes [40, Corollary 2].

Definition 2.7. • Let \mathcal{P} denote the monoid of (possibly degenerate, i.e., of lower dimension) polytopes in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Recall that a monoid is a set equipped with an associative multiplication with identity. Let \mathcal{P}^* denote the Grothendieck group of \mathcal{P} , i.e., the group of equivalent classes of formal differences $P_1 - P_2$ where $P_1 - P_2 \sim P'_1 - P'_2$ if and only if $P_1 + P'_2 = P'_1 + P_2$. The elements in \mathcal{P}^* are called *virtual polytopes*.

• The notion of *mixed volumes* (including volumes) can be extended by multi-linearity to virtual polytopes. For $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathcal{P}^*$ and $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_1 + \dots + m_k = n$, set

$$V(P_1, m_1; \dots; P_k, m_k) := V(P_1, \dots, P_1, \dots, P_k, \dots, P_k),$$

where each P_i appears m_i times.

• Let X be a smooth toric variety (toric manifold). Let

$$\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$$

denote the primitive generators of the rays in the associated fan. Let

$$D_i$$

denote the toric divisor corresponding to v_i [17, §3.3]. For any ample toric divisor

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i D_i$$

where $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the *polytope associated to* (X, D) ,

$$P_D := \bigcap_{i=1}^d \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle u, v_i \rangle \geq -b_i\}.$$

In general, since any divisor can be written as the difference of two ample divisors [30, Example 1.2.10], for any divisor D there is an associated virtual polytope $P_D \in \mathcal{P}^*$.

Let P be a Delzant lattice polytope, and let (X, L) be the associated polarized toric manifold given by Theorem 2.6, where

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i D_i.$$

Fix $v \in N$. Pick

$$q \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } \langle \cdot, v \rangle + q > 0 \text{ on } P \text{ (possible as } P \text{ is compact)}. \quad (4)$$

Consider the lattice polytope of one dimension higher,

$$P_{v,q} := \{(u, h) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : u \in P, 0 \leq h \leq \langle u, v \rangle + q\} \quad (5)$$

$$= \{(u, h) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : \langle u, v_i \rangle \geq -b_i, i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, 0 \leq h \leq \langle u, v \rangle + q\}. \quad (6)$$




Figure 1: The fan of the new toric manifold $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$. Note that X corresponds to the subfan consisting of the cones in $M_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}$. The cones above $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ are spanned by the cones in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the ray generated by $(0, 1)$, while the cones below $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ are spanned by the cones in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the ray generated by $(v, -1)$.

It corresponds to a polarized toric manifold of dimension $n + 1$

$$(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{L}}) \quad (7)$$

(see Figures 1 and 2). This polytope has $d + 2$ facets. Under the correspondence of Theorem 2.6, the associated primitive generators of the rays in the fan are

$$(v_1, 0), \dots, (v_d, 0), (0, 1), (v, -1) \in N \times \mathbb{Z},$$

and we denote

$$\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d, \mathcal{D}_{d+1}, \mathcal{D}_{d+2} \quad (8)$$

the corresponding torus-invariant divisors. Rewrite (5),

$$P_{v,q} = \{(u, h) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : \langle (u, h), (v_i, 0) \rangle \geq -b_i, \langle (u, h), (0, 1) \rangle \geq 0, \langle (u, h), (v, -1) \rangle \geq -q\},$$

By Definition 2.7,

$$P_{v,q} = P_{\mathcal{D}},$$

where

$$\mathcal{D} := \sum_{i=1}^d b_i \mathcal{D}_i + q \mathcal{D}_{d+2},$$

and

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}} \sim \mathcal{D}.$$

Define a virtual polytope

$$P'_v := P_{\sum_{i=1}^d b_i \mathcal{D}_i} = P_{v,q} - q P_{\mathcal{D}_{d+2}}.$$

Our second main result is the complete resolution of Problem 1.1 when P is Delzant:




Figure 2: The projection $\pi : \overline{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $P \subseteq M \otimes \mathbb{R}$ be a Delzant lattice polytope. Then for any $v \in N$,*

$$\langle \text{BC}_k(P), v \rangle = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^n c'_{j+1} k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} k^{-j} \sum_{i=0}^j c'_{n+1-j+i} \left(\frac{\delta_{i0}}{a_n} + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \frac{(-1)^\ell}{a_n^{\ell+1}} \sum_{\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} i_m = i - \ell} \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} a_{n-i_m-1} \right),$$

where

$$a_j = \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n-j} \frac{n! B_{\ell_1} \cdots B_{\ell_d}}{j! \ell_1! \cdots \ell_d!} V(P, j; P_{D_1}, \ell_1; \dots; P_{D_d}, \ell_d),$$

$$c'_j = \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n+1-j} \frac{(n+1)! B_{\ell_1} \cdots B_{\ell_d}}{j! \ell_1! \cdots \ell_d!} V(P'_v, j; P_{D_1}, \ell_i; \dots; P_{D_d}, \ell_d).$$

In particular,

$$a_n = \text{Vol}(P),$$

$$a_{n-1} = \frac{n}{2} V(P, n-1; P_{-K_X}, 1),$$

$$a_{n-2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{12} \left(V(P, n-2; P_{-K_X}, 2) + \sum_{i < j} V(P, n-2; D_i, 1; D_j, 1) \right),$$

$$c'_{n+1} = \text{Vol}(P'_v),$$

$$c'_n = \frac{n+1}{2} V(P'_v, n; P_{-K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1}}, 1),$$

$$c'_{n-1} = \frac{(n+1)n}{12} \left(V(P'_v, n-1; P_{-K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1}}, 2) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} V(P'_v, n-1; P_{D_i}, 1; P_{D_j}, 1) \right),$$

where

$$P_{-K_X} = P_{\sum_{i=1}^d D_i}, \quad P_{-K_{\mathbb{A}^1/\mathbb{P}^1}} = P_{\sum_{i=1}^d \mathcal{D}_i},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle &= \frac{c'_{n+1}}{a_n} + \left(\frac{c'_n}{a_n} - \frac{c'_{n+1} a_{n-1}}{a_n^2} \right) \frac{1}{k} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{c'_{n-1}}{a_n} - \frac{c'_n a_{n-1} + c'_{n+1} a_{n-2}}{a_n^2} + \frac{c'_{n+1} a_{n-1}^2}{a_n^3} \right) \frac{1}{k^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{k^3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

2.3 Results for reflexive polytopes

Another subclass of lattice polytopes is that of reflexive polytopes.

Definition 2.9. [11, Definition 2.3.12] A lattice polytope is called *reflexive* if it contains the origin, and each of its facet is given by $\langle u, v \rangle = 1$ where $v \in N$ is some primitive vector.

Remark 2.10. We are not aware of a relationship between being reflexive and being Delzant. For instance, the square with vertices $(\pm 1, 0)$ and $(0, \pm 1)$ is reflexive but not Delzant, and the square with vertices $(\pm 2, \pm 2)$ and $(\pm 2, \mp 2)$ is Delzant but not reflexive.

Our third main result is the specialization of Theorem 2.3 to the reflexive setting. It is quite remarkable that in this setting the *quantized barycenters are, to first order, colinear*. Furthermore, in the planar case, they are in fact *colinear*, and have a completely explicit expression.

Theorem 2.11. *Let P be a reflexive polytope. Then $a_1(P) = \text{Bc}(P)/2$ (recall Problem 1.1), i.e.,*

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \right) + O(k^{-2}).$$

Moreover, if $\dim P = 2$, then

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{4+2k(k+1)\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)} \text{Bc}(P).$$

We give two completely different proofs of the two-dimensional part of Theorem 2.11.

2.4 Applications to asymptotics of δ_k -invariants

Theorem 2.3 together with Corollary A.8 answer the first part of Problem 1.2 as well as determine the first non-trivial coefficient for a general polarized (possibly singular) toric variety.

Corollary 2.12. *Let X be a (possibly singular) toric variety given by a fan Δ in a lattice $N \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$. Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in N$ denote the primitive generators of rays in Δ . Let L be an ample toric line bundle with the associated convex polytope (recall Theorem 2.6)*

$$P = \{x \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle x, v_i \rangle \geq -b_i, i = 1, \dots, d\}$$

for some $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, where $M_{\mathbb{R}} := \text{Hom}(N, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Let I be the set of indices i such that v_i and b_i compute δ (see (34)). Then there is a complete asymptotic expansion for δ_k as in Problem 1.2, with

$$a_0(X, L) = \delta = \frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle + b_i}, \quad i \in I, \quad a_1(X, L) = -\frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \max_{i \in I} \langle \widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle \delta^2.$$

In particular,

$$\delta_k = \delta - \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \max_{i \in I} \langle \widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle \delta^2 k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}), \quad (9)$$

where $\widetilde{\text{Vol}}$ is the normalized volume of the boundary ∂P and $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}$ is the barycenter of ∂P with respect to $\widetilde{\text{Vol}}$ (see Definition 2.1).

In fact, for sufficiently large k , (9) is a complete asymptotic expansion of a rational function of k with both numerator and denominator polynomial of degree n in k .

In the case of most interest, namely when X is Fano polarized by $-K_X$, Theorem 2.11 and (1) give a more explicit result.

Corollary 2.13. *For a toric Fano (possibly singular) variety X and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\delta_k(-K_X) = \delta(-K_X) - \frac{1}{2k} \delta(-K_X)(1 - \delta(-K_X)) + O(k^{-2}).$$

Moreover, if $\dim X = 2$,

$$\delta_k(-K_X) = \left(1 + \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)K_X^2}{4+2k(k+1)K_X^2} ((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} - 1) \right)^{-1}.$$

2.5 Test configurations, higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants, and Tian’s stabilization problem

Finally, we make contact with the much-studied notion of test configurations [46, 13]. We show that in the case P is Delzant, the coefficients $a_i(P)$ conjectured by Problem 1.1 and established by Theorem 2.8 are closely related to the higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants of certain test configurations.

Theorem 2.14. *Let $P \subset M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ be a lattice polytope. Let (X, L) be the associated (possibly singular) toric variety given by Theorem 2.6. Let $v \in N$ be arbitrary. Then*

$$\langle a_i(P), v \rangle = DF_i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\},$$

where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)})$ denotes a product test configuration (30) constructed in §8.1.

In particular, if (X, L) is K -semistable then DF_1 vanishes for all product test configurations [4, Remark 2.13(2)], thus $a_1(P) = 0$ by Theorem 2.14, i.e., $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ by Theorem 2.3, recovering a well-known result of Donaldson [13, Proposition 4.2.1]. In the reflexive case the additional relation $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) = (1 + \frac{1}{n})\text{Bc}(P)$ (by Theorems 2.3 and 5.5) forces $\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) = \text{Bc}(P) = 0$, generalizing one direction of a result of Ono [38, Corollary 1.7] to the non-smooth setting (notice Ono assumes P is reflexive and Delzant), that is, asymptotic Chow semistability implies $\text{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ for all k . By

(1), $\text{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ if and only if $\delta_k = 1$. Conversely, if δ_k stabilizes then by Corollary 2.13 $\delta = 1$, and hence $\delta_k = 1$ for large k , that by the previous sentence means $\text{Bc}_k = 0$ for large k . In this case we also know by Theorem 2.3 that $\text{Bc}_k = 0$ for all k , that in turn by the other direction of Ono’s result (only valid if P is also Delzant) implies asymptotic Chow semistability. In sum we have the following solution of Problem 1.3 for toric Fanos:

Corollary 2.15. • *For a toric Fano manifold X , δ_k stabilizes in k if and only if $(X, -K_X)$ is asymptotically Chow semistable. In this case $\delta_k = \delta = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

• *For (possibly singular) toric Fano variety X , δ_k stabilizes in k if and only if $\delta_k = \delta = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Corollary 2.15 is in interesting contrast to the situation for the $\alpha_{k,G}$ -invariant, that was shown to stabilize always [27, Theorem 1.4]. Thus \mathbb{P}^2 blown-up at one or two points are examples for which $\delta_k(-K_X)$ does not stabilize, while for the three remaining smooth toric del Pezzos stabilization occurs. This might give the impression that the existence of the Kähler–Einstein metric dictates stabilization; this is true precisely when $n \leq 6$ (Example 9.6).

Remark 2.16. The first part of Corollary 2.15 generalizes to non-toric smooth Fano X using difficult results from algebraic and differential geometry, e.g., the Yau–Tian–Donaldson correspondence, and finite generation. Indeed, when $\delta > 1$ this follows from [54, Corollary 1.11]. When $\delta < 1$, here is a sketch: there exists a “dreamy” divisor E over X that computes δ [31, Theorem 1.2], and corresponds to a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ with $S_k(E) = \sum_i DF_i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})k^{-i}$ and $2 \text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = A(E) - S(E) < 0$. In particular, $DF_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = -\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) > 0$. Therefore, for sufficiently large k , $S_k(E) > S(E)$. Hence $\delta_k < \delta$. We emphasize that these results do not seem to give any information concerning the more refined Problem 1.2 nor an alternative approach to our Corollary 2.12.

Remark 2.17. Let (X, L) be a polarized toric manifold with associated Delzant lattice polytope P . A result of Ono can be interpreted as (he does not implicitly consider the quantized barycenters) $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ (for a fixed k) is a necessary condition for (X, kL) to be Chow semistable [38, Theorem 1.2] (for Fano, and not necessarily toric manifolds see [42, Theorem 2.3] and [42, Corollary 7.1]). In particular, if (X, L) is asymptotically Chow semistable, i.e., (X, kL) is Chow semistable for sufficiently large k , then Ono’s result can be interpreted as implying $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ for all k [38, Theorem 1.4] (by using the existence of the generalized Ehrhart polynomial for homogeneous polynomials (cf. Remark 3.2)). These results are of course special cases of Theorems 2.3 and 2.14, together with the fact that $DF_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)}) = 0$ for all product test configurations whenever (X, L) is K-semistable [13, Definition 2.1.2], a condition that is implied by asymptotic Chow semistability [44, §5]. Resolving a conjecture of Ono, Futaki [21] showed Ono’s result can be interpreted in terms of integral invariants related to Hilbert series as in the work of Futaki [20] and Futaki–Ono–Sano [22]. See also [50, 51, 43] for more on relations between Chow stability, combinatorics and δ_k -invariants.

Problem 2.18. *Does the stabilization of $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ imply asymptotic Chow stability?*

2.6 Organization

In Section 3, we derive a formula for the first order expansion of the quantized barycenters for any lattice polytope (Theorem 2.3). In Section 4, we express the asymptotic expansion of the quantized

barycenters for Delzant lattice polytopes in terms of mixed volumes using Hirzebruch–Riemann–Roch (Theorem 2.8). Section 5 simplifies the results in Section 3 under the additional assumption that the lattice polytope is reflexive (Theorem 5.5). We record in Section 6 an explicit computation of the quantized barycenters of reflexive polygons without the use of Ehrhart theory (Theorem 6.1). These results are then used to derive the asymptotic behavior of δ_k -invariants in Section 7 (Corollaries 2.12 and 2.13). In Section 8 we remark on how the coefficients of the asymptotic expansion are related to higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants (Theorem 2.14). Finally, we provide some examples in Section 9. In an Appendix it is shown that (1) extends to all polarizations (36), generalizing a formula of Blum–Jonsson and Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang.

Acknowledgments. Thanks to F. Liu for pointing out the case $n = 3$ of Proposition 5.4 and to her and to A. Futaki, K. Mészáros, and Y. Odaka for helpful references, and to H. Blum, M. Jonsson, and K. Zhang for Remark 2.16. Research supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1906370, 2204347, BSF grant 2020329, and an Ann G. Wylie Dissertation Fellowship.

3 First order expansion of quantized barycenters of lattice polytopes

In this section we study the first order expansion of $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ for any lattice polytope P .

Proposition 3.1. *Let P be a lattice polytope. Then*

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P) + \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)}(\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P))k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}).$$

Proof. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. Pick an integer $C_i \geq -\min\{u_i : (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in P\}$. Then for any $u \in P$, the function $h_i(u) := u_i + C_i$ is non-negative. Consider the lattice polytope (see Figure 3)

$$P_i := \{(u, h) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : u \in P, 0 \leq h \leq h_i(u)\}. \quad (10)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{P_i}(k) &= \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} \#\left\{ \left(u, 0\right), \left(u, \frac{1}{k}\right), \dots, \left(u, h_i(u)\right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} (k(u_i + C_i) + 1) \\ &= (kC_i + 1)E_P(k) + k \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} u_i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{E_P(k)} \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} u_i = \frac{E_{P_i}(k)}{kE_P(k)} - C_i - \frac{1}{k}. \quad (11)$$

Now,

$$\text{Vol}(P_i) = \int_P h_i(u) d\text{Vol} = \int_P u_i d\text{Vol} + C_i \text{Vol}(P). \quad (12)$$




Figure 3: The lattice polytope P_i : $u_i + C_i$ lattice points above each lattice point in P with i -th coordinate equal to u_i . The dotted lines are fibers of $\pi : M \times \mathbb{R} \ni (u, h) \mapsto u \in M$.

Notice that the projection to $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ from the upper boundary of P_i , denoted by

$$H_i := \{(u, h) \in P_i : h = h_i(u)\},$$

preserves normalized volumes, since this projection restricted to the lattice points on the hyperplanes is an isomorphism of lattices. In particular, $\text{Vol}(P) = \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(H_i)$. It follows that

$$\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P_i) = \int_{\partial P} h_i(u) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + 2\text{Vol}(P) = \int_{\partial P} u_i d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + C_i \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) + 2\text{Vol}(P). \quad (13)$$

Combining (11), (12), (13), and Theorem 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{E_P(k)} \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} u_i &= \frac{\text{Vol}(P_i) k^{n+1} + \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P_i) k^n + O(k^{n-1})}{\text{Vol}(P) k^{n+1} + \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) k^n + O(k^{n-1})} - C_i - \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \frac{\text{Vol}(P_i)}{\text{Vol}(P)} - C_i + \left(\frac{\text{Vol}(P) \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P_i) - \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) \text{Vol}(P_i)}{2\text{Vol}(P)^2} - 1 \right) k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}) \\ &= \frac{\int_P u_i d\text{Vol}}{\text{Vol}(P)} + \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \left(\frac{\int_{\partial P} u_i d\widetilde{\text{Vol}}}{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)} - \frac{\int_P u_i d\text{Vol}}{\text{Vol}(P)} \right) k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

Remark 3.2. An alternative proof of Proposition 3.1 can be obtained from the first-order expansion of the *sum* of the function $\phi(u) = u$ over the integral lattice points (as opposed to Bc_k that is its *average*), see, e.g., [51, (5)], [32, (7)]. Such a formula follows directly from the existence of the generalized Ehrhart polynomial for homogeneous polynomials and from Ehrhart–MacDonald reciprocity for such polynomials that generalizes Proposition 5.2 [8, Proposition 4.1]. While such a proof would be perhaps more standard for experts in Ehrhart theory, the proof we give is certainly more elementary and allows us to make the connection to the *rooftop polytope* (that, in the toric geometry literature, goes back to Donaldson [13, §4.2]) that then leads to the connection to Donaldson–Futaki invariants in Theorem 2.14.

Corollary 3.3. *Each coordinate of the quantized barycenter $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ is a rational function of k . More precisely, it is the quotient of two polynomials of degree at most n . In particular, if $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ is constant for $n+1$ values of k , then $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ for all k . Consequently, if $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ is constant for sufficiently large k , then $\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P)$ for all k .*

Proof. Let $\text{Bc}_{k,i}$ denote the i -th coordinate of the quantized barycenter $\text{Bc}_k(P) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, by (11), we have

$$\text{Bc}_{k,i} = \frac{1}{E_P(k)} \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} u_i = \frac{E_{P_i}(k) - (C_i k + 1)E_P(k)}{kE_P(k)}. \quad (14)$$

Notice that the numerator

$$Q_i(k) := E_{P_i}(k) - (C_i k + 1)E_P(k) = E_{P_i}(k) - E_{P \times [0, C_i]}(k),$$

is a polynomial with respect to k of degree at most $n + 1$ and with constant term 0 by Theorem 2.2. Hence $Q_i(k) = k\tilde{Q}_i(k)$ for some polynomial \tilde{Q}_i of degree at most n . Now,

$$\text{Bc}_{k,i} = \frac{\tilde{Q}_i(k)}{E_P(k)}.$$

Since there are $n + 1$ values of k such that $\text{Bc}_{k,i}$ is equal to a constant, say, λ_i , the polynomial

$$\tilde{Q}_i(k) - \lambda_i E_P(k)$$

has degree at most n and has at least $n+1$ zeros. It follows that this polynomial vanishes everywhere, i.e., $\text{Bc}_{k,i}$ is constant for all k . \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The second half of the theorem is proved by Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.3. It remains to show (3). Notice that for any i ,

$$P(c; i) - c = \{(u, h) : u \in P + c, h \in [0, u_i]\} - c = \{(u, h) : u \in P, h \in [0, u_i + c_i]\} = P_i$$

(Recall (10)). In particular, their Ehrhart polynomials coincide. This reduces (3) to (14). \square

4 Asymptotics of quantized barycenters of Delzant lattice polytopes

In this section, we express the asymptotic expansion of the quantized barycenters in terms of mixed volumes of virtual polytopes using toric geometry. Here we restrict ourselves to Delzant lattice polytopes, namely the lattice polytopes that determines a smooth fan, i.e., the primitive generators of any n -dimensional cone form a \mathbb{Z} -basis. Recall Definition 2.7.

Lemma 4.1. *For divisors D_1, \dots, D_n with associated virtual polytopes P_1, \dots, P_n ,*

$$V(P_1, \dots, P_n) = \frac{1}{n!} D_1 \cdots D_n.$$

Proof. Since any divisor can be written as the difference of two ample divisors, by multi-linearity we may assume D_1, \dots, D_n are ample. In that case the corresponding virtual polytopes P_1, \dots, P_n are polytopes. For $k_1, \dots, k_n > 0$, the divisor $k_1 D_1 + \cdots + k_n D_n$ is ample with associated polytope $k_1 P_1 + \cdots + k_n P_n$. Therefore

$$\text{Vol}(k_1 P_1 + \cdots + k_n P_n) = \frac{1}{n!} (k_1 D_1 + \cdots + k_n D_n)^n.$$

Both sides are polynomials in k_1, \dots, k_n . In particular, the coefficients of $k_1 \cdots k_n$ in both sides of the equation should be equal, i.e., $n!V(P_1, \dots, P_n) = D_1 \cdots D_n$. \square

Definition 4.2. Define the Todd class

$$\text{Td}(X) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\xi_i}{1 - e^{-\xi_i}},$$

where the ξ_i 's are the Chern roots of the tangent bundle T_X , i.e., they are symbolic objects such that

$$c(T_X) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \xi_i),$$

or more explicitly,

$$c_i(T_X) = \sigma_i(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n),$$

where σ_i is the i -th elementary symmetric polynomial.

$\text{Td}(X)$ can be expressed in terms of the cohomology classes of the torus invariant divisors.

Definition 4.3. Define

$$\text{Td}(x) := \frac{x}{1 - e^{-x}} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_j}{j!} x^j = 1 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{12}x^2 - \frac{1}{720}x^4 + \dots,$$

where B_j is called the j -th Bernoulli number.

Lemma 4.4. [11, Theorem 13.1.6] *Let D_i denote the divisor corresponding to v_i . Then*

$$\text{Td}(X) = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{Td}([D_i]).$$

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose L is ample. Then*

$$h^0(X, kL) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j,$$

where

$$a_j = \frac{L^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n-j} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} D_i^{\ell_i}.$$

In particular,

$$a_n = \frac{L^n}{n!}, \quad a_{n-1} = \frac{L^{n-1} \cdot (-K_X)}{2(n-1)!}, \quad a_{n-2} = \frac{L^{n-2} \cdot \left((-K_X)^2 + \sum_{i < j} D_i \cdot D_j \right)}{12(n-2)!}.$$

Proof. By the Kodaira vanishing theorem, $h^0(X, kL) = \chi(X, kL)$ for sufficiently large k . Since both are polynomials, they are equal for all k . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(X, kL) &= \chi(X, kL) \\ &= \int_X \text{ch}(kL) \cdot \text{Td}(X) \\ &= \int_X e^{k[L]} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^d \text{Td}([D_i]) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_X \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{k^j}{j!} [L]^j \cdot \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_{\ell}}{\ell!} [D_i]^{\ell} \\
&= k^j \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{L^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n-j}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} D_i^{\ell_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.6. Recall the average scalar curvature

$$\bar{S} := \frac{\int_X S_{\omega} \cdot \omega^n}{\int_X \omega^n} = \frac{\int_X n \operatorname{Ric} \omega \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\int_X \omega^n} = \frac{n(-K_X) \cdot L^{n-1}}{L^n} = \frac{2a_{n-1}}{a_n}.$$

By Theorem 2.2,

$$\bar{S} = \frac{\widetilde{\operatorname{Vol}}(\partial P)}{\operatorname{Vol}(P)},$$

as observed by Donaldson [13, p. 309].

Next, using the construction of Proposition 3.1, we relate $\operatorname{Bc}_k(P)$ to this expansion.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $P \subseteq M \otimes \mathbb{R}$ be a Delzant lattice polytope. Fix $v \in N$. Let (X, L) denote the corresponding polarized toric manifold as in Theorem 2.6, where*

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i D_i.$$

Also recall (8). Then

$$\langle \operatorname{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^n c'_{j+1} k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} k^{-j} \sum_{i=0}^j c'_{n+1-j+i} \left(\frac{\delta_{i0}}{a_n} + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \frac{(-1)^{\ell}}{a_n^{\ell+1}} \sum_{\substack{\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} i_m = i-\ell}} \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} a_{n-i_m-1} \right),$$

where

$$a_j = \frac{L^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n-j}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} D_i^{\ell_i}, \quad c'_j = \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n+1-j}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} \mathcal{D}_i^{\ell_i},$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i \mathcal{D}_i.$$

In particular,

$$a_n = \frac{L^n}{n!},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{n-1} &= \frac{L^{n-1} \cdot (-K_X)}{2(n-1)!}, \\
a_{n-2} &= \frac{L^{n-2} \cdot \left((-K_X)^2 + \sum_{i<j} D_i \cdot D_j \right)}{12(n-2)!}, \\
c'_{n+1} &= \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}, \\
c'_n &= \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^n \cdot (-K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}})}{2n!}, \\
c'_{n-1} &= \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{n-1} \cdot \left((-K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}})^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} \mathcal{D}_i \cdot \mathcal{D}_j \right)}{12(n-1)!},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$-K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}} := -K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} + \pi^* K_{\mathbb{P}^1} = -K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}} - \mathcal{D}_{d+1} - \mathcal{D}_{d+2} = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathcal{D}_i,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle &= \frac{c'_{n+1}}{a_n} + \left(\frac{c'_n}{a_n} - \frac{c'_{n+1} a_{n-1}}{a_n^2} \right) \frac{1}{k} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{c'_{n-1}}{a_n} - \frac{c'_n a_{n-1} + c'_{n+1} a_{n-2}}{a_n^2} + \frac{c'_{n+1} a_{n-1}^2}{a_n^3} \right) \frac{1}{k^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{k^3}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We use the setup in Section 2.2. By (11),

$$\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle = \frac{E_{P_{v,q}}(k)}{kE_P(k)} - q - \frac{1}{k}.$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned}
E_P(k) &= \sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j, \\
E_{P_{v,q}}(k) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} c_j k^j.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_j &= \frac{L^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n-j} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} D_i^{\ell_i}, \\
c_j &= \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{d+2} \ell_i = n+1-j} \prod_{i=1}^{d+2} \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} \mathcal{D}_i^{\ell_i} = qa_{j-1} + a_j + \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n+1-j} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} \mathcal{D}_i^{\ell_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we define

$$a_j := 0$$

for $j < 0$ or $j > n$, and

$$c_j := 0$$

for $j < 0$ or $j > n + 1$. We also define

$$c'_j := c_j - qa_{j-1} - a_j = \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^j}{j!} \cdot \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i = n+1-j} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{B_{\ell_i}}{\ell_i!} \mathcal{D}_i^{\ell_i}.$$

Note c_j depends on the choice of q while c'_j is canonical. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle &= \frac{E_{P_{v,q}}(k)}{kE_P(k)} - q - \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \frac{E_{P_{v,q}}(k) - qkE_P(k) - E_P(k)}{kE_P(k)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} (c_j - qa_{j-1} - a_j) k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^{j+1}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} c'_j k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^{j+1}} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} k^{-j} \sum_{i=0}^j c'_{n+1-j+i} \left(\frac{\delta_{i0}}{a_n} + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \frac{(-1)^\ell}{a_n^{\ell+1}} \sum_{\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} i_m = i-\ell} \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} a_{n-i_m-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall that $a_0 = c_0 = 1$. Therefore $c'_0 = c_0 - a_0 = 0$, and

$$\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} c'_j k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^{j+1}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^n c'_{j+1} k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.8 is a reformulation of Corollary 4.7 in terms of mixed volumes of virtual polytopes.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. This follows from Corollary 4.7 and Lemma 4.1. \square

5 First order expansion of quantized barycenters of reflexive polytopes

In this section, we study the special case that the lattice polytope is reflexive.

Definition 5.1. [11, Definition 2.3.12] A lattice polytope in $M \otimes \mathbb{R}$ is called *reflexive* if it contains the origin, and each of its facet is given by $\langle u, v \rangle = 1$ where v is some primitive vector of N .

Proposition 5.2. [35], [24, Theorem 19.1] For $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_P(-k) = (-1)^n \#((\text{int } kP) \cap M).$$

Corollary 5.3. Let $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ be an n -dimensional reflexive polytope. Then

$$E_P(-k) = (-1)^n E_P(k-1).$$

Proof. By Definition 2.9, there exist $v_1, \dots, v_d \in N$ so that P can be written

$$P = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle u, v_i \rangle \geq -1\}. \quad (15)$$

Then for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{int } kP) \cap M &= \bigcap_i \{u \in M : \langle u, v_i \rangle > -k\} \\ &= \bigcap_i \{u \in M : \langle u, v_i \rangle \geq -k+1\} \\ &= (k-1)P \cap M. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 5.2,

$$E_P(-k) = (-1)^n \#((\text{int } kP) \cap M) = (-1)^n \#((k-1)P \cap M) = (-1)^n E_P(k-1),$$

as claimed. \square

Proposition 5.4 ([14]). Let P be an n -dimensional reflexive polytope. Then $\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) = n\text{Vol}(P)$. In other words,

$$E_P(k) = \text{Vol}(P)k^n + \frac{n}{2}\text{Vol}(P)k^{n-1} + \dots + 1.$$

In particular,

$$E_P(k) = \begin{cases} \text{Vol}(P)k^2 + \text{Vol}(P)k + 1, & n = 2; \\ \text{Vol}(P)k^3 + \frac{3}{2}\text{Vol}(P)k^2 + (\frac{1}{2}\text{Vol}(P) + 2)k + 1, & n = 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Corollary 5.3, since

$$E_P(-k) = (-1)^n \text{Vol}(P)k^n + (-1)^{n-1} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)k^{n-1} + \dots + 1,$$

and

$$(-1)^n E_P(k-1) = (-1)^n \text{Vol}(P)(k-1)^n + (-1)^n \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)(k-1)^{n-1} + \cdots + (-1)^n,$$

comparing the coefficients we get

$$(-1)^{n-1} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) = (-1)^{n-1} n \text{Vol}(P) + (-1)^n \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P),$$

i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) = \frac{n}{2} \text{Vol}(P).$$

It follows that when $n = 2$,

$$E_P(k) = \text{Vol}(P)k^2 + \text{Vol}(P)k + 1.$$

When $n = 3$,

$$E_P(k) = \text{Vol}(P)k^3 + \frac{3}{2} \text{Vol}(P)k^2 + a_1 k + 1 \tag{16}$$

for some coefficient a_1 . To determine a_1 , we may simply plug in special values for k . By Corollary 5.3,

$$E_P(-1) = -E_P(0) = -1.$$

Letting $k = -1$ in (16) gives

$$-1 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(P) - a_1 + 1,$$

i.e.,

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(P) + 2,$$

as claimed. □

Theorem 5.5. *Let P be reflexive. Then*

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \text{Bc}(P) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \right) + O(k^{-2}).$$

Proof. Recall (15). Fix $1 \leq i \leq d$. Consider the reflexive polytope

$$P_i := \{(u, h) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : u \in P, -1 \leq h \leq \langle u, v_i \rangle + 1\}.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{P_i}(k) &= \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} \# \left\{ (u, -1), \left(u, -1 + \frac{1}{k} \right), \dots, (u, \langle u, v_i \rangle + 1) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} (k \langle u, v_i \rangle + 2k + 1) \\ &= (2k + 1) E_P(k) + k \sum_{u \in P \cap \frac{1}{k}L} \langle u, v_i \rangle \\ &= (2k + 1) E_P(k) + k E_P(k) \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 4: The polytope P_1 corresponding to \mathbb{P}^2 with $v_1 = (1, 0)$, $v_2 = (0, 1)$, $v_3 = (-1, -1)$.

Therefore,

$$\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle = \frac{E_{P_i}(k)}{kE_P(k)} - 2 - \frac{1}{k}. \quad (17)$$

Now,

$$\text{Vol}(P_i) = \int_P (\langle u, v_i \rangle + 2) d\text{Vol} = (\langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle + 2) \text{Vol}(P). \quad (18)$$

By Theorem 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle &= \frac{\text{Vol}(P_i) k^{n+1} + \frac{n+1}{2} \text{Vol}(P_i) k^n + O(k^{n-1})}{\text{Vol}(P) k^{n+1} + \frac{n}{2} \text{Vol}(P) k^n + O(k^{n-1})} - 2 - \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \frac{\text{Vol}(P_i)}{\text{Vol}(P)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \right) - 2 - \frac{1}{k} + O(k^{-2}) \\ &= \langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \right) + O(k^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since P is bounded, $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ spans $N \otimes \mathbb{R}$. This completes the proof. \square

6 Quantized barycenters of reflexive polygons

In this section, we give an explicit formula for the quantized barycenters of reflexive polygons without using Ehrhart theory.




Figure 5: The indexing of the edges and the lattice points of the polygon corresponding to the blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let P be a reflexive polygon, i.e., $P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a lattice polytope given by*

$$P = \bigcap_{j=1}^d \{x \in M_{\mathbb{R}} : \langle x, v_j \rangle \geq -1\} \quad (19)$$

for some primitive vectors $v_j \in N$. Then

$$\text{Bc}_k(P) = \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{4+2k(k+1)\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)} \text{Bc}(P). \quad (20)$$

Proof. Since $\dim P = 2$, each facet of P is a line segment on the line $\langle x, v_j \rangle = -1$. Let

$$F_j^{(1)}$$

denote this facet. We may index the lattice points $F_j^{(1)} \cap M$ on the polygon ∂P counterclockwise as $u_{j,0}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{j,N_j}^{(1)}$. Note that $u_{j,0}^{(1)}$ and $u_{j,N_j}^{(1)}$ are vertices of P and will be indexed twice as they belong to two facets. Define $w_j := u_{j,1}^{(1)} - u_{j,0}^{(1)}$, i.e., w_j characterizes the distance between two neighboring lattice points on a line perpendicular to v_j . For any $0 \leq l \leq N_j$,

$$u_{j,l}^{(1)} = u_{j,0}^{(1)} + lw_j. \quad (21)$$

We repeat this construction for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Each facet of kP is a line segment on the line $\langle x, v_j \rangle = -k$ and are denoted by

$$F_j^{(k)}.$$

Since kP is a dilation of P ,

$$F_j^{(k)} = k \cdot F_j^{(1)},$$

and in particular, the end points are $k \cdot u_{j,0}^{(1)}$ and $k \cdot u_{j,N_j}^{(1)} = k \cdot u_{j,0}^{(1)} + kN_j \cdot w_j$ (recall (21)). We may also index the lattice points $F_j^{(k)} \cap M$ counterclockwise as $u_{j,0}^{(k)}, \dots, u_{j,kN_j}^{(k)}$, where for any $0 \leq l \leq kN_j$,

$$u_{j,l}^{(k)} = u_{j,0}^{(k)} + lw_j = k \cdot u_{j,0}^{(1)} + lw_j. \quad (22)$$




Figure 6: The relationship between $F_j^{(1)}$ and a general $F_j^{(k)}$.

Notice that the lattice points of kP are

$$kP \cap M = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k (\partial(iP) \cap M) \quad (23)$$

$$= \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{j=1}^d \{u_{j,0}^{(i)}, \dots, u_{j,iN_j}^{(i)}\}. \quad (24)$$

Indeed, $0 \in kP \cap M$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\partial(iP) \subseteq kP$. Hence

$$kP \cap M \supseteq \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k (\partial(iP) \cap M).$$

On the other hand, suppose there exists $x \in kP \cap M$ other than the origin that does not belong to any $\partial(iP)$. Then there is a unique integer $0 \leq k_x < k$ such that $x \notin k_x P$ and $x \in \text{int}(k_x + 1)P$. Recall (19). Since $x \notin k_x P$, there is some j such that $\langle x, v_j \rangle < -k_x$. On the other hand, since $x \in \text{int}(k_x + 1)P$, we know $\langle x, v_j \rangle > -k_x - 1$. However, $\langle x, v_j \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$, which is a contradiction.

We are now ready to compute the barycenters using (24). Recall that in the expression (24) every vertex of iP shows up twice.

Let $m_j^{(k)}$ denote the midpoint of $F_j^{(k)}$, i.e.,

$$m_j^{(k)} := u_{j,0}^{(k)} + \frac{kN_j}{2} w_j. \quad (25)$$

Since $F_j^{(k)} = k \cdot F_j^{(1)}$, we also have

$$m_j^{(k)} = k \cdot m_j^{(1)}. \quad (26)$$

Recall the indexed lattice points

$$F_j^{(k)} \cap M = \{u_{j,0}^{(k)}, \dots, u_{j,kN_j}^{(k)}\}.$$

Since each vertex is indexed twice,

$$\#(\partial(kP) \cap M) = \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\#(F_j^{(k)} \cap M) - 1 \right) = k \sum_{j=1}^d N_j. \quad (27)$$

Also, by (22), (25), and (26),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u \in \partial(kP) \cap M} u &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{2} u_{j,0}^{(k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{kN_j-1} u_{j,l}^{(k)} + \frac{1}{2} u_{j,kN_j}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{2} u_{j,0}^{(k)} + \sum_{l=1}^{kN_j-1} (u_{j,0}^{(k)} + l \cdot w_j) + \frac{1}{2} (u_{j,0}^{(k)} + kN_j \cdot w_j) \right) \\ &= k \sum_{j=1}^d N_j \left(u_{j,0}^{(k)} + \frac{kN_j}{2} w_j \right) \\ &= k \sum_{j=1}^d N_j m_j^{(k)} \\ &= k^2 \sum_{j=1}^d N_j m_j^{(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two equations and (23), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bc}_k(P) &= \frac{1}{k} \text{Bc}(kP \cap M) \\ &= \frac{1}{k \#(kP \cap M)} \sum_{u \in kP \cap M} u \\ &= \frac{1}{k \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \#(\partial(iP) \cap M) \right)} \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{u \in \partial(iP) \cap M} u \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)}{6 \left(1 + \frac{k(k+1)}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d N_j \right)} \sum_{j=1}^d N_j m_j^{(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{Bc}(P) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Bc}_k(P) = \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^d N_j m_j^{(1)}}{3 \sum_{j=1}^d N_j}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathrm{Bc}_k(P) = \frac{(k+1)(2k+1) \sum_{j=1}^d N_j}{4 + 2k(k+1) \sum_{j=1}^d N_j} \mathrm{Bc}(P).$$

Finally, by Definition 2.1, $N_j = \widetilde{\mathrm{Vol}}(F_j^{(1)})$ (The line segment $F_j^{(1)}$ has N_j fundamental parallelograms). Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^d N_j = \widetilde{\mathrm{Vol}}(\partial P). \quad (28)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 6.2. We record here also the proof of Theorem 6.1 using Ehrhart theory. Recall the proof of Theorem 7.3. By Theorem 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{P_i}(k) &= \mathrm{Vol}(P_i)k^3 + \frac{3}{2}\mathrm{Vol}(P_i)k^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Vol}(P_i) + 2\right)k + 1, \\ E_P(k) &= \mathrm{Vol}(P)k^2 + \mathrm{Vol}(P)k + 1. \end{aligned}$$

By (17) and (18),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathrm{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle &= \frac{E_{P_i}(k) - (2k+1)E_P(k)}{kE_P(k)} \\ &= \frac{(\mathrm{Vol}(P_i) - 2\mathrm{Vol}(P))k^3 + (\frac{3}{2}\mathrm{Vol}(P_i) - 3\mathrm{Vol}(P))k^2 + (\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Vol}(P_i) - \mathrm{Vol}(P))k}{k(\mathrm{Vol}(P)k^2 + \mathrm{Vol}(P)k + 1)} \\ &= \frac{k^2 + \frac{3}{2}k + \frac{1}{2}}{\mathrm{Vol}(P)k^2 + \mathrm{Vol}(P)k + 1} (\mathrm{Vol}(P_i) - 2\mathrm{Vol}(P)) \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)\mathrm{Vol}(P)}{2 + 2k(k+1)\mathrm{Vol}(P)} \langle \mathrm{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows since by Proposition 5.4, $\mathrm{Vol}(P) = \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\mathrm{Vol}}(\partial P)$.

Remark 6.3. As a consequence of Theorem 6.1, we see that the following are equivalent for toric del Pezzo surfaces:

- 1) $\mathrm{Bc}(P) = 0$;
- 2) $\mathrm{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ for some k ;
- 3) $\mathrm{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ for all k .

This strengthens Corollary 3.3 that holds in all dimensions. Moreover, this resolves Problem 2.4 in dimension $n = 2$ showing the answer is ‘no’. In addition, formula (20) tells us that the quantized barycenter $\mathrm{Bc}_k(P)$ lies on a certain line.

Remark 6.4. For higher dimensions, it is harder to derive such a formula this way, and in general Bc_k and Bc are not collinear. See Example 9.3. In fact, for a polytope of dimension 3 or higher, it has faces of dimension 2 or higher, whose shapes and lattice points are more difficult to characterize.




Figure 7: The barycenter and quantized barycenters of the polygon corresponding to \mathbb{F}_1 . In particular, $Bc_1 = (\frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{9})$, $Bc_2 = (\frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{10})$, $Bc_3 = (\frac{2}{21}, \frac{2}{21})$, and $Bc = (\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12})$.




Figure 8: The barycenter and quantized barycenters of the polygon corresponding to the blow-up of $\mathbb{P}_1 \times \mathbb{P}_1$. In particular, $\text{Bc}_1 = (-\frac{1}{8}, -\frac{1}{8})$, $\text{Bc}_2 = (-\frac{5}{44}, -\frac{5}{44})$, $\text{Bc}_3 = (-\frac{14}{129}, -\frac{14}{129})$, and $\text{Bc} = (-\frac{2}{21}, -\frac{2}{21})$.

7 Asymptotics of δ_k -invariants

In this section we study the asymptotics of δ_k -invariant using the results of the previous sections.

Theorem 7.1. *If $\delta_k(-K_X) = 1$ for sufficiently large k , then $\delta_k(-K_X) = 1$ for all k .*

Proof. By (36), $\delta_k(-K_X) = 1$ if and only if $\text{Bc}_k(P) = 0$, where P is the polytope associated to X . By Corollary 3.3, $\text{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ for all k . \square

Proof of Corollary 2.12. By Proposition 3.1, (34) and (36),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_k^{-1} &= \max_{i=1, \dots, d} (\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i) \\
 &= \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \left(\langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle + b_i + \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \langle (\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P)), v_i \rangle k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}) \right) \\
 &= \delta^{-1} + \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \max_{i \in I} \langle \widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\delta_k - \delta = \frac{\delta^2(\delta^{-1} - \delta_k^{-1})}{\delta \delta_k^{-1}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\delta^2(\delta^{-1} - \delta_k^{-1})}{1 - \delta(\delta^{-1} - \delta_k^{-1})} \\
&= \delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{1}{\delta_k} \right) + O(k^{-2}) \\
&= -\delta^2 \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{2\text{Vol}(P)} \max_{i \in I} (\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) - \text{Bc}(P), v_i) k^{-1} + O(k^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since δ_k is the minimum of finitely many rational functions, for sufficiently large k , there is a rational function that dominates the rest. Indeed, consider the asymptotic expansion and take the one whose coefficient dominates in the lexicographic order. Therefore δ_k is a rational function of k when k is sufficiently large. \square

Remark 7.2. Recall

$$\delta_k = \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i}.$$

Since $\text{Bc}_k(P)$ has an asymptotic expansion by Corollary 3.3, for each $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i}$$

has an asymptotic expansion. However, $\arg\min_{i=1, \dots, d} (\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i)^{-1}$ is not necessarily constant for all k . Therefore we can only deduce that there is an expansion that works for sufficiently large k , but not necessarily all k .

Theorem 7.3. *Let X be Fano. Then*

$$\delta_k(-K_X) = \delta(-K_X) - \frac{1}{2k} \delta(-K_X)(1 - \delta(-K_X)) + O(k^{-2}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_k^{-1} &= \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + 1 \\
&= \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \right) + 1 + O(k^{-2}) \\
&= \delta^{-1} + \frac{1}{2k} (\delta^{-1} - 1) + O(k^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_k &= \frac{\delta}{1 + \frac{1}{2k}(1 - \delta) + O(k^{-2})} \\
&= \delta - \frac{1}{2k} \delta(1 - \delta) + O(k^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 7.4. *For a smooth del Pezzo surface X ,*

$$h^0(X, -K_X) = 1 + K_X^2.$$

In particular, if X is toric with associated polytope P , then

$$\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) = K_X^2.$$

Proof. Since $-K_X$ is ample, by Kodaira Vanishing Theorem $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)) = h^0(X, -K_X)$ and by Riemann–Roch [23, p. 472] $\chi(\mathcal{O}_X(-K_X)) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_X) + K_X^2 = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) - h^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X) + h^2(X, \mathcal{O}_X) + K_X^2 = 1 - h_{\bar{\delta}}^{0,1} + h_{\bar{\delta}}^{0,2} + K_X^2 = 1 + K_X^2$.

By (23), (27) and (28), $h^0(X, -K_X) = \#(P \cap M) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^d N_j = 1 + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)$. \square

Theorem 7.5. *Let X be a smooth toric del Pezzo surface. Then*

$$\delta_k(-K_X) = \left(1 + \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)K_X^2}{4+2k(k+1)K_X^2} ((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} - 1) \right)^{-1}, \quad (29)$$

In particular,

$$\frac{\delta_k(-K_X)}{\delta(-K_X)} = 1 - \frac{1}{2k}(1 - \delta(-K_X)) + O(k^{-2}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_k(-K_X)^{-1} - 1 &= \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)K_X^2}{4+2k(k+1)K_X^2} \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle \\ &= \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)K_X^2}{4+2k(k+1)K_X^2} (\delta(-K_X)^{-1} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_k(-K_X) &= \left(1 + \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)K_X^2}{4+2k(k+1)K_X^2} ((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} - 1) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1 + \frac{3}{2k} + O(k^{-2})}{1 + \frac{1}{k} + O(k^{-2})} ((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} - 1) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} + \frac{1}{2k} ((\delta(-K_X))^{-1} - 1) O(k^{-2}) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k}(1 - \delta(-K_X)) + O(k^{-2}) \right) \delta(-K_X), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

8 Relation to test configurations

In this section, we explain how the coefficients of the asymptotic expansion relate to the higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants.

Definition 8.1. • A test configuration for (X, L) is a triple $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma)$, where σ is a \mathbb{C}^* -action on the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$, with a \mathbb{C}^* -equivariant projective morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that \mathcal{L} is π -relatively very ample, i.e., π lifts to $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r = \text{Proj } \mathbb{C}[t][Z_0, \dots, Z_r]$ which pulls $\mathcal{O}(1)$ back to \mathcal{L} , and each fiber over $t \in \mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, denoted by $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$, is isomorphic to (X, L) .

- We say that a test configuration is a product configuration if $\mathcal{X} \cong X \times \mathbb{C}$, and a trivial configuration if the \mathbb{C}^* action on $\mathcal{X} \cong X \times \mathbb{C}$ is trivial on the first factor.
- The \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathcal{L} induces a \mathbb{C}^* -action on $H^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0^k)$. Let w_k denote the sum of the weights of this action.
- Define the Donaldson–Futaki coefficients to be the coefficients of the expansion

$$\frac{w_k}{kH^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0^k)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} DF_i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma) k^{-i}.$$

8.1 Construction of the rooftop test configuration

We construct a product test configuration

$$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)}) \tag{30}$$

as follows. Recall the pair $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{L}})$ constructed in (7). The projection $M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to an equivariant map $\pi : \overline{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ (see Figure 2). The subfan consisting of cones generated by $(v_1, 0), \dots, (v_d, 0), (0, 1)$ (i.e., the cones on or above the hyperplane $M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \{0\}$) is the product of the fan of X and the fan of \mathbb{C} , and hence corresponds to the toric manifold $\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{C}) \cong X \times \mathbb{C}$. Similarly, the subfan consisting of cones generated by $(v_1, 0), \dots, (v_d, 0), (v, -1)$ (i.e., the cones on or below the hyperplane $M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \{0\}$) corresponds to $\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0\}) \cong X \times \mathbb{C}$. Let \mathcal{X} denote the latter open submanifold and \mathcal{L} the restriction of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ over \mathcal{X} . Note that this product structure implies that each fiber of π is a copy of (X, L) .

The lattice point $(0, -1) \in N \times \mathbb{Z} = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^*, (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1})$ induces a \mathbb{C}^* -action expressed on the torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \times \mathbb{C}^*$ (the first factor is the open-orbit in X considered as a toric variety) as

$$\sigma(t) : z \mapsto \sigma(t).z := (z_1, \dots, z_n, t^{-1}z_{n+1}), \quad t \in \mathbb{C}^*.$$

By definition of a toric variety (both X and $X \times \mathbb{C}$ are such) it is enough to specify the action on the open orbit and it will extend uniquely to $X \times \mathbb{C}$. Of course, it is not obvious what the action does at $t = 0$ as $1/t$ blows up; this shows in passing that what we construct is not a trivial, but rather a product, test configuration (this test configuration is trivial if and only if $\overline{\mathcal{X}} = X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, which is precisely when $v = 0$). We can lift it to a \mathbb{C}^* -action on the line bundle $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ by (recall $q = q(v)$ defined in (4))

$$\sigma_{q(v)}(t) : (z, f) \mapsto (\sigma(t).z, t^{-q}f).$$

More precisely, for a section $s_{u'} \in H^0(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{L}})$ given by $z \mapsto z^{u'}$ under the standard local trivialization over $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$, where $u' \in M \times \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{q(v)}(t) \left(z, z^{u'} \right) &= \left((z_1, \dots, z_n, t^{-1}z_{n+1}), t^{-q}z_1^{u'_1} \dots z_n^{u'_n} z_{n+1}^{u'_{n+1}} \right) \\ &= \left((z_1, \dots, z_n, t^{-1}z_{n+1}), t^{u'_{n+1}-q}z_1^{u'_1} \dots z_n^{u'_n} (t^{-1}z_{n+1})^{u'_{n+1}} \right) \\ &= \left(\sigma_t(z), t^{u'_{n+1}-q}\sigma_t(z)^{u'} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sigma_{q(v)}(t) (s_{u'}) = t^{u'_{n+1}-q} s_{u'} \circ \sigma_t,$$

i.e., a section $s_{u'}$ has weight $u'_{n+1} - q$.

We define this triple $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)})$ to be the product test configuration (30).

8.2 Quantized barycenters and higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants

Theorem 8.2. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_v)$ be the product test configuration (30) constructed in §8.1. Then*

$$\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} DF_i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)}) k^{-i}.$$

Proof. Consider the lattice points on the facet

$$\{(u, \langle u, v \rangle + q) \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R} : u \in P \cap k^{-1}M\}.$$

They correspond to the torus invariant sections of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^k$ that do not vanish along $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{D}_{d+2}$ [17, p. 61]. For $u \in P \cap k^{-1}M$, let s_u denote the section of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^k$ corresponding to $(u, \langle u, v \rangle + q)$, which has weight $k\langle u, v \rangle$. It follows that the section $s_u|_{\mathcal{L}_0^k}$ on \mathcal{L}_0^k also has weight $k\langle u, v \rangle$. Since $\{s_u|_{\mathcal{L}_0^k}\}_{u \in P \cap k^{-1}M}$ spans $H^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0^k)$, taking the sum of all their weights, we get

$$\frac{w_k}{kH^0(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}_0^k)} = \frac{1}{kE_P(k)} \sum_{u \in P \cap k^{-1}M} k\langle u, v \rangle = \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Combining this with Corollary 4.7, we obtain an expression for the higher Donaldson–Futaki invariants of this test configuration.

Corollary 8.3. *Assume X is smooth. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_v)$ be the product test configuration (30) constructed in §8.1. Then*

$$DF_j(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \sigma_{q(v)}) = \sum_{i=0}^j c'_{n+1-j+i} \left(\frac{\delta_{i0}}{a_n} + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \frac{(-1)^\ell}{a_n^{\ell+1}} \sum_{\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} i_m = i-\ell} \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} a_{n-i_m-1} \right),$$

where a_j and c'_j are defined in Corollary 4.7.

9 Examples

9.1 Two simple polygon examples

Example 9.1. Let P be the associated polytope of \mathbb{P}^2 . Specifically, the three edges of ∂P are $F_1 := \{(-1, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1 \leq y \leq 2\}$, $F_2 := \{(x, -1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1 \leq x \leq 2\}$, and $F_3 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x+y-1=0, -1 \leq x \leq 2\}$. Let C_1, C_2 , and C_3 denote the standard cubes of the induced affine sublattices on F_1, F_2 , and F_3 , respectively. Precisely, we may choose $C_1 := \{(-1, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1 \leq y \leq 0\}$, $C_2 := \{(x, -1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1 \leq x \leq 0\}$ and $C_3 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x+y-1=0, -1 \leq x \leq 0\}$. Then $\text{Vol}(C_1) = \text{Vol}(C_2) = 1$ and $\text{Vol}(C_3) = \sqrt{2}$. Thus one has

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P) &= \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F_1) + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F_2) + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F_3) \\ &= \frac{\text{Vol}(F_1)}{\text{Vol}(C_1)} + \frac{\text{Vol}(F_2)}{\text{Vol}(C_2)} + \frac{\text{Vol}(F_3)}{\text{Vol}(C_3)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 3 + 3 + \frac{3\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\
&= 9, \\
\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P) &= \frac{1}{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)} \left(\int_{F_1} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + \int_{F_2} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + \int_{F_3} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{9} \left(\left(-3, \frac{3}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{3}{2}, -3 \right) + \left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right) \right) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 4.6, the average scalar curvature $\overline{S} = \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P)}{\text{Vol}(P)} = 2$.

Example 9.2. Let P' be the associated polytope of blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at one point. Specifically, the four edges of $\partial P'$ by $F'_1 := \{(-1, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq y \leq 2\}$, $F'_2 := \{(x, -1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq 2\}$, $F'_3 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x + y = 1, -1 \leq x \leq 2\}$, and $F'_4 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x + y = -1, -1 \leq x \leq 0\}$. Let C'_1, C'_2, C'_3 , and C'_4 denote the standard cube of the induced lattice on F'_1, F'_2, F'_3 , and F'_4 , respectively. Then $\text{Vol}(C'_1) = \text{Vol}(C'_2) = 1$ and $\text{Vol}(C'_3) = \text{Vol}(C'_4) = \sqrt{2}$. Thus one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P') &= \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F'_1) + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F'_2) + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F'_3) + \widetilde{\text{Vol}}(F'_4) \\
&= \frac{\text{Vol}(F'_1)}{\text{Vol}(C'_1)} + \frac{\text{Vol}(F'_2)}{\text{Vol}(C'_2)} + \frac{\text{Vol}(F'_3)}{\text{Vol}(C'_3)} + \frac{\text{Vol}(F'_4)}{\text{Vol}(C'_4)} \\
&= 2 + 2 + \frac{3\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\
&= 8, \\
\widetilde{\text{Bc}}(\partial P') &= \frac{1}{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P')} \left(\int_{F'_1} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + \int_{F'_2} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + \int_{F'_3} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} + \int_{F'_4} (x, y) d\widetilde{\text{Vol}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{8} \left((-2, 2) + (2, -2) + \left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right) + \left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 4.6, the average scalar curvature $\overline{S} = \frac{\widetilde{\text{Vol}}(\partial P')}{\text{Vol}(P')} = 2$.

9.2 A 3-dimensional reflexive example with non-collinear quantized barycenters

Example 9.3. The Fano 3-fold *No.3.29* has a toric structure with the primitive elements of the rays of its fan being the columns of the matrix [49, p. 43]

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$




Figure 9: The fan and the polytope $P_{v,q}$ of the pair (\bar{X}, \bar{L}) .

Then a computer calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bc}_1(P) &= \left(\frac{6}{28}, \frac{-12}{28}, \frac{3}{28} \right), \\ \text{Bc}_2(P) &= \left(\frac{51}{260}, \frac{-99}{260}, \frac{24}{260} \right) \\ \text{Bc}_3(P) &= \left(\frac{201}{1071}, \frac{-387}{1071}, \frac{93}{1071} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that Bc_k are not on a line. This means that $a_i(P) \neq 0$ for some $i > 1$.

9.3 Virtual rooftop polytopes and verification of the terms in the expansion

Example 9.4. Consider $X = \mathbb{P}^1$ with $L = -K_X \sim \{0\} + \{\infty\}$. Then $P = [-1, 1]$. For $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $q = |v| + 1$. Then

$$P_{v,q} = \{(u, h) \in [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_+ : h \leq v \cdot u + q\}.$$

This corresponds to $\bar{X} = \mathbb{F}_{|v|}$ with $\bar{L} = E + H + qF_\infty$, where E is the $-|v|$ -curve, H the torus invariant $|v|$ -curve, and F_∞ the fiber over $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$. See Figure 9.

Example 9.5. Let $X = \mathbb{P}^2$ with $L = -K_X$. We have $v_1 = (1, 0)$, $v_2 = (0, 1)$, $v_3 = (-1, -1)$. Let us verify Corollary 4.7 with $v = (1, 0)$.

Let D_1, D_2, D_3 be the corresponding toric divisors. Geometrically, they correspond to virtual polytopes $P_{D_i} = P_{-K_X + D_i} - P_{-K_X}$. We have $L = -K_X = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$. By Corollary 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= \frac{L^2}{2} = \frac{9}{2}, \\ a_1 &= \frac{L^2}{2} = \frac{9}{2}, \\ a_0 &= \frac{L^2 + \sum_{i < j} D_i \cdot D_j}{12} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For divisors in (8), we have $\bar{L}' = -K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$, and

$$\mathcal{D}_2 \sim \mathcal{D}_3, \quad \mathcal{D}_1^3 = -2, \quad \mathcal{D}_1^2 \cdot \mathcal{D}_2 = -1, \quad \mathcal{D}_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}_2^2 = 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_2^3 = 1.$$

By Corollary 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned} c'_3 &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}'^3}{6} = 0, \\ c'_2 &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}'^3}{4} = 0, \\ c'_1 &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{L}}' \cdot \left(\bar{\mathcal{L}}'^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} \mathcal{D}_i \cdot \mathcal{D}_j \right)}{12} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^n c'_{j+1} k^j}{\sum_{j=0}^n a_j k^j} = 0.$$

9.4 Three non-stabilizing quantized barycenter examples

Example 9.6. Batyrev–Selivanova symmetry of P [2] implies $\text{Bc}_k(P) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and is furthermore equivalent to it when $n \leq 6$ [26]. This relies on Nill–Paffenholz’s exhaustive computer search showing there are exactly three toric Fano manifolds X_1, X_2, X_3 of dimension up to 8 whose associated polytopes have $\text{Bc} = 0$ but are not symmetric in the sense of Batyrev–Selivanova [37, Proposition 2.1].

X_1 is 7-dimensional. Let P_1 be the associated polytope. Then a computer calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bc}_1(P_1) &= \frac{16}{2257}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 2), \\ \text{Bc}_2(P_1) &= \frac{60}{27121}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 2), \\ \text{Bc}_3(P_1) &= \frac{2744}{2579721}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 2). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

It is interesting to note that our results give a refinement of a theorem of Ono–Sano–Yotsutani [39, Theorem 1.6], who showed that $(X_1, -kK_{X_1})$ is not Chow semistable for k large enough. Chow stability of $(X_1, -kK_{X_1})$ is equivalent to existence of k -anticanonical balanced metrics (see [41, Theorem 4], [55, Theorem 3.2], [33, Theorem 0.1]), so this means Ono–Sano–Yotsutani showed that X_1 does not admit k -anticanonical balanced metrics for k large enough. But in fact from the above computation and Corollary 3.3, $\delta_k(-K_{X_1}) < 1$ for all k except at most 7 values of k . Thus, by [42, Theorem 2.3], $(X_1, -kK_{X_1})$ is actually not Chow semistable for all but at most 7 values of k .

Next, $X_2 = X_1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. So $P_2 = P_1 \times [-1, 1]$. Then $\text{Bc}_k(P_2) = (\text{Bc}_k(P_1), 0)$ (see (31)).

Finally, X_3 is 8-dimensional. Let P_3 be the associated polytope. Then a computer calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bc}_1(P_3) &= \frac{32}{5459}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2), \\ \text{Bc}_2(P_3) &= \frac{580}{321787}(-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that in these three examples, the $\text{Bc}_k(P_i)$ we computed are colinear. This is actually true for all k and is because while P_i is not Batyrev–Selivanova symmetric, there is a 1-dimensional subspace that is invariant under $\text{Aut } P$. We explain this in more detail in [26].

A On a result of Blum–Jonsson and Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang

Yaxiong Liu¹

Blum–Jonsson computed explicitly the δ -invariant of toric varieties [5, Corollary 7.16] using a valuative approach. In the Fano case, Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang gave an alternative proof of their result and also extended it to the δ_k -invariants by using an analytic approach with balanced metrics and coercivity arguments [42, Corollary 7.1]. The goal of this appendix is to give an alternative proof of the Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang result and simultaneously extend it to any polarization, by showing that (as expected) the original valuative proof of Blum–Jonsson for δ adapts to handle also δ_k .

We follow the valuative reformulation of the δ -invariant due to Blum–Jonsson. Let (X, L) be a polarized variety. A *valuation* on X means a real valuation $w : \mathbb{C}(X)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is trivial on \mathbb{C} . We denote Val_X the space of all valuations on X . A *prime divisor* E over X , meaning that E is a prime divisor on some birational model Y of X , defines a valuation $\text{ord}_E : \mathbb{C}(X)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in Val_X as vanishing order at the generic point of E . For any prime divisor E over X , the *log discrepancy* of ord_E is defined by $A_X(\text{ord}_E) := 1 + \text{ord}_E(K_{Y/X})$. We assume that X has klt singularities. As showed in [7], the log discrepancy can be extended to a lower semicontinuous function $A_X : \text{Val}_X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ that is homogeneous of order 1, i.e., $A_X(tw) = tA_X(w)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Definition A.1. A *filtration* $\mathcal{F}R_\bullet$ of the graded \mathbb{C} -algebra $R = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} R_k = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} H^0(X, kL)$ consists of a family of subspace $\{\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k\}_\lambda$ of R_k , for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, satisfying:

- (i) (decreasing) $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \subset \mathcal{F}^{\lambda'} R_k$ if $\lambda \geq \lambda'$;
- (ii) (left-continuous) $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k = \bigcap_{\lambda' < \lambda} \mathcal{F}^{\lambda'} R_k$;
- (iii) (multiplicative) $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \cdot \mathcal{F}^{\lambda'} R_{k'} \subset \mathcal{F}^{\lambda+\lambda'} R_{k+k'}$ for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$;
- (iv) (linearly bounded) $\mathcal{F}^0 R_k = R_k$ and $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k = 0$ for $\lambda \gg 0$.

Any valuation $w \in \text{Val}_X$ induces a filtration \mathcal{F}_w on the section ring $R(X, L)$ via

$$\mathcal{F}_w^\lambda R_k := \{s \in R_k : v(s) \geq \lambda\}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $R_k = H^0(X, kL)$. The jumping numbers of the filtration \mathcal{F}_w are

$$a_{k,j} := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \text{codim} \mathcal{F}^t R_k \geq j\}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N_k. \quad (32)$$

Their average is

$$S_k(w) := \frac{1}{kN_k} \sum_j a_{k,j} \quad (33)$$

¹University of Maryland, yxliu238@umd.edu

where $N_k := h^0(X, kL)$. The *expected vanishing order* is

$$S(w) := \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(L)} \int_0^\infty \text{Vol}(L; w \geq \lambda) d\lambda$$

where $\text{Vol}(L; w \geq \lambda) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!}{k^n} \dim \mathcal{F}_w^{\lambda k} R_k$, and $S(w) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_k(w)$ [6, Theorem 2.11].

The δ_k - and δ -invariants can be expressed using valuations:

$$\delta_k(L) = \inf_w \frac{A_X(w)}{S_k(w)}, \quad \delta(L) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \delta_k(L) = \inf_w \frac{A_X(w)}{S(w)},$$

where w ranges over nontrivial valuations on X with $A_X(w) < \infty$ [5, Proposition 4.2, Theorem 4.4].

Blum–Jonsson’s proved that for polarized toric variety (X, L) [5, Corollary 7.16],

$$\delta(L) = \inf_{w \in \text{Val}_X} \frac{A_X(w)}{S(w)} = \inf_{v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{S(v)} = \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}(P), v_i \rangle + b_i}. \quad (34)$$

They used the following proposition, reducing the above formula to the toric valuation $v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$:

Proposition A.2. *If $w \in \text{Val}_X$ with $A_X(w) < \infty$, then there exists $v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $A(v) \leq A(w)$ and $S(v) \geq S(w)$.*

We now explain how to modify Blum–Jonsson’s argument to derive a similar conclusion for S_k (Proposition A.7). For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda, k}(\mathcal{F}) := \mathfrak{b}(|\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k|),$$

where $\mathfrak{b}(|\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k|) \subset \mathcal{O}_X$ is the *base ideal* of the linear series $|\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k|$ [30, Definition 1.1.8] defined as the image of the map $|\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k| \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} L^* \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ determined by the evaluation of sections in $|\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k|$

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow L.$$

The sequence $\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda, k}(\mathcal{F})$ is stationary, i.e., $\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda, k}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda, k+1}(\mathcal{F})$ for k large enough [5, Lemma 3.17], thus one set $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}) := \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda, k}(\mathcal{F})$ for large k . One has [5, Corollary 3.18],

$$\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}) \cdot \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda'}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda+\lambda'}(\mathcal{F}),$$

so $w(\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda+\lambda'}(\mathcal{F})) \leq w(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F})) + w(\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda'}(\mathcal{F}))$ for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and any $w \in \text{Val}_X$.

Recall the classical Fekete Lemma:

Lemma A.3. [16, Section 2], [25, Theorem 7.6.1] *For any measurable subadditive function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the limit $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda)/\lambda$ exists and is equal to $\inf_{\lambda > 0} f(\lambda)/\lambda$ (This limit may be $-\infty$).*

Definition A.4. The valuation of the graded sequence of base ideals $\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ of a filtration is defined as

$$w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})) := \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{w(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}))}{\lambda} = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \frac{w(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}))}{\lambda}, \quad (35)$$

where $w \in \text{Val}_X$. Due to Lemma A.3, it is well-defined.

Lemma A.5. *If $w \in \text{Val}_X$ with $w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \subset \mathcal{F}_w^\lambda R_k$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In [5, Lemma 3.20], the authors showed the inclusion for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$. By modifying the definition of the valuation of the graded base ideals, we also obtain the same conclusion for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Proof. By definition (35), we have $1 \leq w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \leq w(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}))/\lambda$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Then $w(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F})) \geq \lambda$, so that $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{a}_\lambda(w)$ where $\mathfrak{a}_\lambda(w) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X \mid w(f) \geq \lambda\}$. Since we have $\mathfrak{b}_{\lambda,k}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{b}_\lambda(\mathcal{F})$ [5, Lemma 3.17], $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \subset H^0(X, kL \otimes \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda,k}(\mathcal{F})) \subset H^0(X, kL \otimes \mathfrak{a}_\lambda(w)) = \mathcal{F}_w^\lambda R_k$. \square

Next, we adapt [5, Corollary 3.21]:

Corollary A.6. *Let \mathcal{F} be a linearly bounded filtration of $R(X, L)$. Then, for all $w \in \text{Val}_X, k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$S_k(w) \geq w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F}))S_k(\mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. If $w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})) = 0$, there is nothing to show. If not, we may assume $w(\mathfrak{b}_\bullet(\mathcal{F})) = 1$ by scaling w . By Lemma A.5, we have $\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_k \subset \mathcal{F}_w^\lambda R_k$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Thus, the jumping numbers of the filtration $\mathcal{F}_w^\bullet R_k$ is greater than equal to the jumping numbers of the filtration $\mathcal{F}^\bullet R_k$ (see (32)). Since $S_k(\mathcal{F})$ is the sum of jumping numbers of the filtration \mathcal{F} , we obtain $S_k(\mathcal{F}) \leq S_k(\mathcal{F}_w) = S_k(w)$. \square

Once we have Corollary A.6, then we can run the proof of [5, Proposition 7.14] and obtain:

Proposition A.7. *For a nontrivial $w \in \text{Val}_X$ with $A_X(w) < \infty$, then there exists $v \in \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$ with $A(v) \leq A(w)$ and $S_k(v) \geq S_k(w)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Thus, we obtain the following extension of the result of Rubinstein–Tian–Zhang (that assumed $L = -K_X$ so $b_i = 1$ for all i):

Corollary A.8. *For a polarized toric variety (X, L) and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\delta_k(L) = \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i}. \quad (36)$$

Zhang [53] deduced an explicit formula of δ -invariant in the rational Fano T -varieties of complexity 1, generalizing Blum–Jonsson’s result. By the same ideas as above, we can also modify Zhang’s argument to obtain a similar formula, involving the weighted quantized barycenter of its associated polytope, of δ_k -invariant for T -varieties of complexity 1.

Proof. By Proposition A.7,

$$\delta_k(L) = \inf_{v \in \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{S_k(v)}. \quad (37)$$

Recall the following facts due to Blum–Jonsson [5]:

- (i) $S_k(v) = \langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle - \psi_L(v)$, where ψ_L is the support function of P [5, Proposition 7.6].
- (ii) Write $L = \mathcal{O}_X(D)$ and $D_u := D + \sum_{i=1}^d \langle u, v_i \rangle D_i$ for $u \in P \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then $v(D_u) = \langle u, v \rangle - \psi_L(v)$ for $v \in \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$ [5, Lemma 7.1].
- (iii) For $u \in P \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\text{lct}(D_u) = \inf_{v \in \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{v(D_u)} = \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{\langle u, v_i \rangle + b_i}$ [5, Corollary 7.3].

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_k(L) &= \inf_{v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{S_k(v)} \quad (\text{by (37)}) \\
&= \inf_{v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v \rangle - \psi_L(v)} \quad (\text{by (i)}) \\
&= \inf_{v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{A_X(v)}{v(D_{\text{Bc}_k(P)})} \quad (\text{by (ii)}) \\
&= \text{lct}(D_{\text{Bc}_k(P)}) \quad (\text{by (iii)}) \\
&= \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{\langle \text{Bc}_k(P), v_i \rangle + b_i} \quad (\text{by (iii)})
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

References

- [1] V. BATYREV, Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi–Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties, *J. Algebraic Geom.* 3 (1994), 493–535. 2.6
- [2] V. V. BATYREV, E. N. SELIVANOVA, Einstein–Kähler metrics on symmetric toric Fano manifolds, *J. reine angew. Math.*, 519 (1999), 225–236. 9.6
- [3] M. BECK, S. ROBINS, *Computing the continuous discretely: Integer-point enumeration in polyhedra*, Springer, 2007. 2.2
- [4] H. BLUM, Math 7800: K-stability, 2022, <https://www.math.utah.edu/~blum/KstabilityNotes.pdf> 2.5
- [5] H. BLUM, M. JONSSON, Thresholds, valuations, and K-stability, *Adv. Math.* 365 (2020). 1.2, 1.2, A, A, A, A, A, A, i, ii, iii
- [6] S. BOUCKSOM, H. CHEN, Okounkov bodies of filtered linear series, *Compos. Math.* 147 (2011), 1205–1229. A
- [7] S. BOUCKSOM, T. DE FERNEX, C. FARVE, S. URBINATI, Valuation spaces and multiplier ideals on singular varieties, in: *Recent Advances in Algebraic Geometry*, 2015, pp. 29–51. A
- [8] M. BRION AND M. VERGNE, Lattice points in simple polytopes, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 10(2) (1997) 371–392. 3.2
- [9] A. CANNAS DA SILVA, *Lectures on symplectic geometry*, Springer, 2001. 2.6
- [10] D. CATLIN, The Bergman kernel and a theorem of Tian, *Analysis and geometry in several complex variables* (Katata, 1997), Birkhäuser, 1999, pp. 1–23. 1.2
- [11] D. A. COX, J. B. LITTLE, H. K. SCHENCK, *Toric varieties*, Amer. Math. Soc., 2011. 2.9, 4.4, 5.1

- [12] T. DELZANT, Hamiltoniens périodiques et images convexes de l'application moment, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 116 (1988), 315–339. 2.6
- [13] S. K. DONALDSON, Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties, *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 62 (2002), 289–349. 2.5, 2.5, 2.17, 3.2, 4.6
- [14] E. EHRHART, Sur un problème de géométrie diophantienne linéaire I. Polyèdres et réseaux, *J. reine angew. Math.* 226 (1967) 1–29. 2.2, 5.4
- [15] E. EHRHART, Démonstration de la loi de réciprocité pour un polyèdre entier, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* 265 (1967) A5–A7. 2.2
- [16] M. FEKETE, Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten, *Math. Z.*, 17 (1923), 228–249. A.3
- [17] W. FULTON, Introduction to toric varieties, Princeton University Press, 1993. 2.6, 2.7, 8.2
- [18] K. FUJITA, Y. ODAKA, On the K-stability of Fano varieties and anticanonical divisors, *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 70 (2018), 511–521. 1.2, 1.2
- [19] A. FUTAKI, An obstruction to the existence of Einstein Kähler metrics, *Invent. math.* 73 (1983), 437–443. 1.2
- [20] A. FUTAKI, Asymptotic Chow semi-stability and integral invariants, *Intern. J. Math.* 15 (2004), 967–979. 2.17
- [21] A. FUTAKI, Asymptotic Chow polystability in Kähler geometry, in: Fifth International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians Part 1, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, (2012), 139–153. 2.17
- [22] A. FUTAKI, H. ONO, Y. SANO, Hilbert series and obstructions to asymptotic semistability, *Adv. Math.* 226 (2011), 254–284. 2.17
- [23] P. GRIFFITHS, J. HARRIS. Principles of algebraic geometry, John Wiley & Sons, 2014. 7
- [24] P. M. GRUBER, Convex and Discrete Geometry, Springer, 2007. 2.1, 2.1, 2.2, 5.2
- [25] E. HILLE, R. S. PHILLIPS, Functional analysis and semi-groups, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1948. A.3
- [26] C. JIN, Y. LIU, Y. A. RUBINSTEIN, Symmetry notions for toric Fanos, preprint, 2024. 9.6, 9.6
- [27] C. JIN, Y. A. RUBINSTEIN, Tian's stabilization problem for toric Fanos, preprint, 2024, arxiv:2403.17262. 1.2, 2.5
- [28] C. JIN, Y. A. RUBINSTEIN, Grassmannian stability thresholds, preprint, 2024. 1.2
- [29] J. M. KANTOR, A. KHOVANSKII, Une application du théorème de Riemann-Roch combinatoire au polyèdre d'Ehrhart des polyèdres entiers de \mathbb{R}^d , *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 317 (1993), no. 5, 501–507.
- [30] R. LAZARSFELD, Positivity in algebraic geometry, I, Springer, 2004. 2.7, A

- [31] Y. LIU, C. XU, Z. ZHUANG, Finite generation for valuations computing stability thresholds and applications to K-stability, *Ann. of Math.*, 196(2) (2022), 507–566. 2.16
- [32] A. LOI, F. ZUDDAS, Some characterizations of the complex projective space via Ehrhart polynomials, *Internat. J. Math.*, 35 (2024). 3.2
- [33] H. LUO, Geometric criterion for Gieseker-Mumford stability of polarized manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.* 49 (1998), 577–599. 9.6
- [34] T. MABUCHI, Einstein–Kähler forms, Futaki invariants and convex geometry on toric Fano varieties, *Osaka J. Math.* 24(4) (1987), 705–737. 1.2
- [35] I. G. MACDONALD, Polynomials Associated with Finite Cell-Complexes, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-4 (1971), 181–192. 5.2
- [36] E. MILLER, B. STURMFELS, *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra*, Springer, 2005. 2.2
- [37] B. NILL, A. PAFFENHOLZ, Examples of Kähler–Einstein toric Fano manifolds associated to non-symmetric reflexive polytopes, *Beitr. Algebra Geom.*, 52 (2011), 297–304. 9.6
- [38] H. ONO, A necessary condition for Chow semistability of polarized toric manifolds, *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 63(4) (2011), 1377–1389. 2.5, 2.17
- [39] H. ONO, Y. SANO, N. YOTSUTANI, An example of an asymptotically Chow unstable manifold with constant scalar curvature, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 62 (2012), 1265–1287. 9.6
- [40] A. V. PUKHLIKOV, A. G. KHOVANSKII, Finitely additive measures of virtual polytopes, *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 4.2 (1993), 337–356. 2.2
- [41] D. H. PHONG AND J. STURM, Stability, Energy Functionals, and Kähler–Einstein Metrics, *Commun. Anal. Geom.*, 11 (2003), 565–597. 9.6
- [42] Y.A. RUBINSTEIN, G. TIAN, K. ZHANG, Basis divisors and balanced metrics, *J. reine angew. Math.* 778 (2021), 171–218. 1.2, 1.2, 2.17, 9.6, A
- [43] S. SAITO, R. TAKAHASHI, Stability of anti-canonically balanced metrics, *Asian J. Math.* 23(6) (2019), 1041–1058. 2.17
- [44] R. P. THOMAS, Notes on GIT and symplectic reduction for bundles and varieties, *Surveys in Differential Geometry* 10.1 (2005), 221–273. 2.17
- [45] G. TIAN, On a set of polarized Kähler metrics on algebraic manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* 32 (1990), 99–130. 1.2, 1.2
- [46] G. TIAN, Kähler–Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature, *Invent. Math.* 130 (1997), 1–37. 2.5
- [47] G. TIAN, Existence of Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, in: *Metric and Differential Geometry*, Springer, 2012. 1.2
- [48] X. WANG, X. ZHU, Kähler–Ricci solitons on toric manifolds with positive first Chern class, *Adv. Math.*, 188, (2004), 87–103.

- [49] K. WATANABE, M. WATANABE, The classification of Fano 3-folds with torus embeddings, Tokyo J. Math., 5 (1982), 37–48. 9.3
- [50] N. YOTSUTANI, Facets of secondary polytopes and Chow stability of toric varieties, Osaka J. Math., 53(3) (2016), 751–765. 2.17
- [51] N. YOTSUTANI, Asymptotic Chow semistability implies Ding polystability for Gorenstein toric Fano varieties, Mathematics, 2023, 11(19), 4114. 2.17, 3.2
- [52] S. ZELDITCH, Szegő kernels and a theorem of Tian, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, 6 (1998), 317–331. 1.2
- [53] K. ZHANG, Stability thresholds of Fano T-varieties of complexity one, 2018, https://kweizhang666.github.io/kwzhang.github.io/Stability_thresholds_on_Fano_T_varieties-2.pdf
A
- [54] K. ZHANG, A note on filtrations and Chow stability, 2021, https://kweizhang666.github.io/kwzhang.github.io/S_S_m.pdf 2.16
- [55] S. ZHANG, Heights and reductions of semi-stable varieties, Compositio Math. 104 (1996), 77–105. 9.6

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

cjin123@terpmail.umd.edu, yanir@alum.mit.edu