

K-MODULI OF LOG DEL PEZZO PAIRS AND VARIATIONS OF GIT

JESUS MARTINEZ-GARCIA, THEODOROS STYLIANOS PAPAACHARIOU, AND JUNYAN ZHAO

ABSTRACT. We study the K-moduli of log del Pezzo pairs formed by a del Pezzo surface of degree d and an anti-canonical divisor. These moduli spaces naturally depend on one parameter, providing a natural problem in variations of K-moduli spaces. For degrees 2, 3, 4, we establish an isomorphism between the K-moduli spaces and variations of Geometric Invariant Theory compactifications, which generalizes the isomorphisms in the absolute cases established by Odaka–Spotti–Sun and Mabuchi–Mukai.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Isomorphisms of VGIT and K-moduli for degrees 3 and 4	10
4. VGIT and K-moduli spaces of del Pezzo pairs of degree 2	13
5. The walls of K-moduli spaces for degree $d \geq 5$	24
Appendix A. Geometric characterisation of the VGIT quotient for degree 2	30
Appendix B. Explicit description of K-moduli walls for $d \geq 5$	35
References	37

1. INTRODUCTION

K-stability has successfully provided the construction of moduli spaces of Fano varieties and log Fano pairs. The general K-moduli theorem (cf. Theorem 2.16) is a combination of substantial work by a number of people (cf. [Alp+20; Blu+21; BLX22; BX19; CP21b; Jia20; LWX21; LXZ22; OSS16; SSY16; Xu20; XZ20; XZ21]), which establishes that for fixed dimension n and log-anticanonical volume v , the functor of K-semistable log Fano pairs is represented by a separated Artin stack, which admits a projective good moduli space (in the sense of [Alp13]); the closed points of the moduli space are in bijection with isomorphic classes of K-polystable log Fano pairs.

Compact K-moduli spaces $\overline{M}^K(c)$ of K-polystable log Fano pairs (X, cD) with a coefficient c give rise to wall-crossing phenomena as c varies, which is important as it allows us to relate many birational moduli spaces to each other by providing an explicit resolution of the rational maps between them. Perturbations of c result, locally on $\overline{M}^K(c)$, into variations of geometric invariant theory (VGIT) quotients (cf. [ADL24; Zho23]). In some cases, these K-moduli compactifications can be realized globally as VGIT quotients. In recent years, significant efforts have been made to produce specific examples of K-moduli wall crossings (cf. [ADL23a; ADL23b; CM16; GMS21; Mar13; PSW23; Pap22a; Zha23a; Zha23b; Zha24]). However, so far there are no completely understood examples where both the varieties and the boundary divisors have moduli.

The goal of this paper is to study log del Pezzo pair of degree $d > 1$, especially for $d = 2, 3, 4$, where both surfaces and divisors can vary. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_d^K(c)$ the irreducible component of the K-moduli stack of \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothable log pairs (X, cD) , where X is a del Pezzo surface of degree d and $D \in |-K_X|$, and denote by $\overline{M}_d^K(c)$ its good moduli space.

For degrees $d = 3, 4$, since an anticanonical divisor of a smooth degree d del Pezzo surface $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^d$ is a hyperplane section of X , there is a natural way — via VGIT — to construct compactified moduli spaces of smooth log pairs (X, D) (cf. Section 2.4). These moduli spaces, denoted by $\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ depend on a parameter t with a wall-chamber decomposition (cf. [GM19; Pap22a]).

Our first result establishes isomorphisms between the VGIT moduli spaces and the K-moduli spaces for the above log del Pezzo pairs, preserving both wall-crossing structures.

Theorem 1.1 (cf. Theorem 3.8). *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number and $d = 3, 4$. Let $\mathcal{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c))$ be the GIT moduli stack of log del Pezzo pairs of degree d . Let $t(c) = \frac{9c}{8+c}$ if $d = 3$, and $t(c) = \frac{6c}{5+c}$ if $d = 4$. Then there is an isomorphism between Artin stacks*

$$\mathcal{M}_d^K(c) \simeq \mathcal{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c)),$$

which descends to an isomorphism $\overline{M}_d^K(c) \simeq \overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c))$ between the corresponding good moduli spaces. In particular, these isomorphisms commute with the wall-crossing morphisms.

In [GM19; GMS21] and [Pap22a], the authors work out the VGIT moduli spaces for $d = 3, 4$ respectively, and give a geometric description of the singularities of the pairs in different chambers. In fact, the authors prove the above isomorphisms between K-moduli spaces and VGIT moduli spaces when the coefficient c is small (but not beyond the second chamber).

Del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 have a richer geometry than the higher degree analogues. To present our result on their moduli (Theorem 1.2), we first need to introduce some considerations. Let Y be a del Pezzo surface of degree 2 with canonical singularities. Its anti-canonical divisor $-K_Y$ is base-point free and induces a $2 : 1$ morphism to \mathbb{P}^2 branched along a quartic curve C , where curves $D \in |-K_Y|$ are mapped to lines $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Using the double cover, one can relate the K-stability of (Y, cD) to that of $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ [Der16, Example 4.2]. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ the moduli stack of log Fano pairs with a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$, and its good moduli space by $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$. We will establish that $\overline{M}_2^K(c)$ and $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ are isomorphic (cf. Theorem 4.3). We need to caution the reader that even if we denote the moduli space by $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$, there are pairs $(X, \frac{1}{2}D_1 + cD_2)$ in the moduli such that $X \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$.

Natural GIT compactifications can be considered for pairs (C, C') in \mathbb{P}^2 , where C is a quartic curve and C' is a line, and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (cf. [Laz09]):

$$\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\text{GIT}}(t) := (\mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(4)) \times \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1))) //_{\mathcal{O}(a,b)} \text{PGL}(3),$$

where $t = \frac{b}{a}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ be its GIT moduli stack.

It is well known that smooth del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 can degenerate to a double cover Y of $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ branched along an octic hyperelliptic curve $(z^2 - f_8(x, y) = 0)$ (e.g. see [OSS16]). The double cover is induced by the linear system $|-K_Y|$ and anti-canonical curves of Y are mapped to degree 2 curves in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ (in fact, the union of two lines, as there are no irreducible curves of degree 2 in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$). Let $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c)$ be the closure in the K-moduli space of the classes of pairs $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ where C is an octic and C' is a quadric, with reduced scheme structure. Similarly, as for \mathbb{P}^2 , we can obtain natural GIT compactifications of pairs (C, C') in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$:

$$\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^{\text{GIT}}(t) := (\mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8)) \times \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2))) //_{\mathcal{O}(a,b)} \text{PGL}(2)$$

where $t = \frac{b}{a}$. We can now present our second result.

Theorem 1.2 (cf. Corollary 4.2, Theorems 4.9, 4.16, 4.3, 4.22). *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number, and $\overline{M}_2^K(c)$ be the K-moduli space of log del Pezzo pairs (Y, cD) of degree 2, where*

$D \in |-K_Y|$. Then we have a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \simeq \left[\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{t(c)}^{ss} / \mathrm{PGL}(3) \right],$$

where $t(c) = 2c$. The latter quotient stack is obtained by taking the Kirwan blow-up $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{t(c)}^{ss}$ of the VGIT moduli stack $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\mathrm{GIT}}(t(c))$ at the point parameterizing the pair $(2C, L)$, where C is a smooth conic and L is a line intersecting C transversely. This isomorphism descends to a canonical isomorphism of the good moduli spaces:

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c) \simeq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t^{ss} //_{\mathcal{O}(a,b)} \mathrm{PGL}(3),$$

where $t(c) = \frac{a}{b}$. Moreover:

- (1) If $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ is a K -semistable pair in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$, then $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ or $X \cong \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$.
- (2) A pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ is K -(semi/poly)stable if and only if the pair (C, C') is $\mathrm{GIT}_t(c)$ -(semi/poly)stable, where $t(c) = 2c$.
- (3) A pair $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ is K -(semi/poly)stable if and only if (C, C') is $\mathrm{GIT}_t(c)$ -(semi/poly)stable, where $t'(c) = \frac{12c}{1-c}$. Moreover, there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c) \simeq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^{\mathrm{GIT}}(t'(c)).$$

Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 generalize the isomorphisms between the GIT moduli spaces and the K -moduli spaces established in [OSS16] and [MM93] to the log pair case. Moreover, as a consequence, we can determine all the walls for the K -moduli spaces when $d = 2, 3, 4$ by GIT analysis of their VGIT counterparts. We can also determine all the K -polystable elements for each wall c by looking at their VGIT counterparts, since GIT_t -(semi/poly)stability coincides with $c(t)$ (semi/poly)stability.

Theorem 1.3 (cf. Theorem 5.1, 5.2, Wall crossings of K -moduli). *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number, $d \in \{2, \dots, 9\}$ be an integer. Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_d^K(c)$ be the K -moduli spaces of del Pezzo pairs (X, cD) , which admit a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to a pair (Σ_d, cC) , where Σ_d is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d , and $C \in |-K_{\Sigma_d}|$ is a smooth curve.*

- (1) If $d = 9$, then there are no walls and only one chamber. Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_9^K(c)$ is canonically isomorphic to the GIT compactification as cubic curves in \mathbb{P}^2 of the moduli of elliptic curves.
- (2) If $d = 8$ and $\Sigma_8 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, then there is a unique wall $c = \frac{1}{4}$.
- (3) If $d = 8$ and $\Sigma_8 = \mathrm{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$, then there are two walls $c = \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4}$.
- (4) If $d = 7$, then there are three walls $c = \frac{4}{25}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{5}$.
- (5) If $d = 6$, then there are five walls $c = \frac{2}{11}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{5}{14}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}$.
- (6) If $d = 5$, then there are six walls $c = \frac{2}{17}, \frac{4}{19}, \frac{2}{7}, \frac{8}{23}, \frac{4}{9}, \frac{4}{7}$.
- (7) If $d = 4$, then there are five walls $c = \frac{1}{7}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{8}$.
- (8) If $d = 3$, then there are five walls $c = \frac{2}{11}, \frac{4}{13}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{10}{19}, \frac{2}{3}$.
- (9) If $d = 2$, then there are eight walls $c = \frac{1}{13}, \frac{1}{7}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{7}, \frac{7}{10}$.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we recover some of the basic definitions on K -stability and K -moduli, as well as the VGIT construction for log del Pezzo pairs. In Section 3 we study the K -moduli of del Pezzo pairs of degrees 3 and 4, proving Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we study the K -moduli of del Pezzo pairs of degree 2, proving Theorem 1.2. In Section 5 we tackle degrees 5 – 9, proving Theorem 1.3. Some technical results have been relegated to the appendices. In Appendix A, we describe the VGIT quotients of quartic plane curves (and their degenerations) that are used in the proof of Theorem 1.2 and in Appendix B we describe the strictly K -polystable pairs appearing in the walls for degrees 5 and higher.

Acknowledgments. We thank Izzet Coskun, Ruadhaí Dervan, Tiago Duarte Guerreiro, Patricio Gallardo, Yuchen Liu and Cristiano Spotti for advice and useful comments. JMG was partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/V054597/1. TP would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme “New equivariant methods in algebraic and differential geometry” where work on this paper was undertaken. TP was also funded by a postdoctoral fellowship associated to the Royal Society University Research Fellowship held by Ruadhaí Dervan. An important part of this paper was written during a visit by TP and JZ to JMG supported by two University of Essex (UoE) School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Sciences Research and Impact Fund (PI) grants. We thank UoE for their support.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Convention. Throughout this paper, we work over the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} . By a surface, we mean a connected normal projective algebraic surface over \mathbb{C} . For notions and properties of singularities of surface pairs, we refer the reader to [KM98, Chapter 2, Chapter 4].

2.1. K-stability of log Fano pairs. In this section, we follow conventions and notation from [ADL24] and [Ara+23].

Definition 2.1. Let X be a normal projective variety, and D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then the pair (X, D) is called a log Fano pair if $-(K_X + D)$ is an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor and a log del Pezzo pair if in addition $\dim(X) = 2$. A normal projective variety X is called a \mathbb{Q} -Fano variety if $(X, 0)$ is a Kawamata log terminal (klt) log Fano pair. A (\mathbb{Q} -Fano) variety of dimension 2 is a del Pezzo surface.

Definition 2.2. Let (X, D) be an n -dimensional log Fano pair, and L be an ample line bundle on X which is \mathbb{Q} -linear equivalent to $-k(K_X + D)$ for some positive rational number $k \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then a normal test configuration (abbreviated TC) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ of $(X, D; L)$ consists of

- a normal projective variety \mathcal{X} with a flat projective morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$;
- a line bundle \mathcal{L} ample over \mathbb{A}^1 ;
- a \mathbb{G}_m -action on the polarized variety $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ such that π is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant, where \mathbb{A}^1 is equipped with the standard \mathbb{G}_m -action;
- a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant isomorphism between the restriction $(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0; \mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0})$ and $(X; L) \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$;
- an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor \mathcal{D} on \mathcal{X} such that \mathcal{D} is the Zariski closure of $D \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$ in \mathcal{X} , under the identification between $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0$ and $X \times (\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\})$.

A TC is called

- a product test configuration if

$$(2.1) \quad (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) \simeq (X \times \mathbb{A}^1, D \times \mathbb{A}^1; p_1^*L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(l\mathcal{X}_0))$$

for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$;

- a trivial test configuration if it is a product TC and the isomorphism (2.1) is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant, where the \mathbb{G}_m -action on X is trivial;
- a special test configuration if $\mathcal{L} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -k(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{D})$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{X}_0)$ is purely log terminal (plt).

The generalized Futaki invariant of a normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is

$$\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) := \frac{1}{(-K_X - D)^n} \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \cdot \frac{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{n+1}}{k^{n+1}} + \frac{(\overline{\mathcal{L}}^n \cdot (K_{\overline{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}))}{k^n} \right),$$

where $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{D}}; \overline{\mathcal{L}})$ is the natural compactification of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ over \mathbb{P}^1 .

Now we define K-stability for log Fano pairs.

Definition 2.3. A log Fano pair (X, D) is called

- (1) K-semistable if $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ for any normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that L is Cartier;
- (2) K-polystable if it is K-semistable, and $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for some TC $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ if and only if it is a product TC.
- (3) K-stable if it is K-semistable, and $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for some TC $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ if and only if it is a trivial TC.

There is an equivalent formulation of K-(semi)stability in terms of birational geometry, by means of the following invariants:

Definition 2.4. Let (X, D) be an n -dimensional log Fano pair, and E a prime divisor on a normal projective variety Y , where $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ is a birational morphism. Then the log discrepancy of (X, D) with respect to E is

$$A_{(X,D)}(E) := 1 + \text{coeff}_E(K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + D)).$$

The expected vanishing order of (X, D) with respect to E (also referred to as the S -invariant) is

$$S_{(X,D)}(E) := \frac{1}{(-K_X - D)^n} \int_0^\tau \text{vol}(\pi^*(-K_X - D) - xE) dx.$$

The β -invariant of (X, D) with respect to E is then

$$\beta_{(X,D)}(E) := A_{(X,D)}(E) - S_{(X,D)}(E).$$

Theorem 2.5 (cf. [BX19; Fuj19; Li17]). *The following assertions hold:*

- (X, D) is K-stable if and only if $\beta_{(X,D)}(E) > 0$ for every prime divisor E over X ;
- (X, D) is K-semistable if and only if $\beta_{(X,D)}(E) \geq 0$ for every prime divisor E over X .

Theorem 2.6 (cf. [Fuj18; LL19; Liu18]). *Let (X, D) be an n -dimensional K-semistable log Fano pair. Then for any $x \in X$, we have*

$$(-K_X - D)^n \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \widehat{\text{vol}}(x, X, D),$$

where $\widehat{\text{vol}}(x, X, D)$ is the normalized volume of (X, D) at x .

The following two results enable us to deduce the (semi)stability of the central fiber in a test configuration from invariant conditions and (semi)stability of general fibers.

Lemma 2.7 (cf. [Kem78]). *Let (X, L) be a polarized projective variety with an action by a reductive group G . Let $\sigma : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow G$ be a 1-parameter subgroup, and $x \in X$ a GIT semistable point such that its Hilbert-Mumford weight $\mu^L(x, \sigma) = 0$. Then the limit $x_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) \cdot x$ is also GIT semistable.*

Lemma 2.8 (cf. [LWX21]). *Let (X, D) be a log Fano pair, and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is a normal TC. If (X, D) is K-semistable and $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = 0$, then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ is a special TC, and the central fiber $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is also K-semistable.*

Definition 2.9 (cf. [Ara+23, §1.3]). Let (X, D) be a log del Pezzo (surface) pair with klt singularities. If the maximal torus of $\text{Aut}^0(X, D)$ is of codimension 1 (i.e. isomorphic to \mathbb{G}_m),

then we call (X, D) a complexity-one \mathbb{T} -pair. A \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant divisor F over a complexity-one log del Pezzo \mathbb{T} -pair (X, D) is called vertical if a maximal \mathbb{G}_m -orbit in F has dimension 1; otherwise it is called horizontal.

Theorem 2.10 (cf. [Ara+23, Theorem 1.31]). *Let (X, D) be a log del Pezzo \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one, with \mathbb{G}_m -action λ . The pair (X, D) is K -polystable if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\beta_{(X,D)}(F) > 0$ for each vertical \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant prime divisor F on X ,
- (2) $\beta_{(X,D)}(F) = 0$ for each horizontal \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant prime divisor F on X , and
- (3) $\text{Fut}_{(X,D)}(\overline{\lambda \cdot (X, D)}) = 0$ where $\overline{\lambda \cdot (X, D)}$ is the TC induced by taking the closure of the λ -orbit of (X, D) .

Lemma 2.11. *Let (X, D) be a log del Pezzo \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one with \mathbb{G}_m -action λ , with no horizontal divisors such that for each vertical divisor F , $\beta(F) > 0$. Then (X, D) is K -polystable if and only if for any λ -fixed point $p \in F$, where F is any vertical divisor, $\beta_{(X,D)}(E) = 0$ where E is the exceptional divisor of the plt blow-up of (X, D) at p . In fact, it is enough to check this condition for one fixed point of each vertical divisor F .*

Proof. We apply Theorem 2.10. By hypothesis, conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied. By [Xu21, Lemma 3.4] we have that $\text{Fut}_{(X,D)}(\overline{\lambda \cdot (X, D)}) = \beta(E)$. Note that given $q \in F$, a vertical divisor, then the λ -invariant points in F are $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot q = p_1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(t) \cdot q = p_2$. Let E_1, E_2 be the exceptional divisors of their plt-blow ups. By construction, we have $\beta(E_1) + \beta(E_2) = 0$, so it is enough to check $\beta(E_1) = 0$. Note vertical divisors cover the whole set of fixed points (since otherwise we would have a horizontal divisor). \square

2.2. K -moduli spaces and CM line bundles. In this part, we collect some results on the K -moduli spaces of log Fano pairs, following [ADL24] and [GM19].

Definition 2.12. Let $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow B$ be a proper flat morphism with normal geometrically connected fibers of pure dimension n to a reduced scheme B , where \mathcal{D} is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} which does not contain any fiber of f . Then f is a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of log Fano pairs if $-(K_{\mathcal{X}/B} + \mathcal{D})$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample over B .

Definition 2.13. Let $0 < c < \frac{1}{r}$ be a rational number and (X, cD) be a log Fano surface pair such that $D \sim -rK_X$. A \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein flat family of log Fano pairs $f : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow C$ over a pointed smooth curve $(0 \in C)$ is called a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing of (X, D) if

- (1) the divisors \mathcal{D} and $K_{\mathcal{X}/C}$ are both \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, f -ample, and $\mathcal{D} \sim_{\mathbb{Q},f} -rK_{\mathcal{X}/C}$;
- (2) both f and $f|_{\mathcal{D}}$ are smooth over $C \setminus \{0\}$, and
- (3) $(\mathcal{X}_0, c\mathcal{D}_0) \simeq (X, cD)$.

Now let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$ be a proper flat family of connected schemes with S_2 fibers of pure dimension n , and \mathcal{L} be a line bundle on \mathcal{X} which is ample over S . It follows from [KM76] that for sufficiently divisible $k \gg 0$, we have a decomposition

$$\det f_!(\mathcal{L}^k) = \lambda_{n+1}^{\binom{k}{n+1}} \otimes \lambda_n^{\binom{k}{n}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \lambda_0^{\binom{k}{0}}$$

for some line bundles $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ on S . Since f is flat, then each fiber $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$, $t \in S$, has the same Hilbert polynomial for sufficiently divisible $m \gg 0$

$$\chi(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_t^m) = a_0 m^n + a_1 m^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n$$

by Riemann-Roch's Theorem.

Let $\mathcal{D} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathcal{D}_i$ be a relative Mumford \mathbb{Z} -divisor [Kol18, Definition 1] on \mathcal{X} over S . Assume that \mathcal{D}_i is flat over S for each i . Let \tilde{a}_0 be the leading coefficient of the Hilbert polynomial $\chi(\mathcal{D}_t, (\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{D}})_t^m)$ where $m \gg 0$. As above, we have line bundles $\tilde{\lambda}_i = \tilde{\lambda}_i(\mathcal{D}, (\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{D}})^m)$ on S such that

$$\det f_1(\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{D}}^k) = \tilde{\lambda}_n^{\binom{k}{n}} \otimes \tilde{\lambda}_{n-1}^{\binom{k}{n-1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\lambda}_0^{\binom{k}{0}}.$$

Definition 2.14 (cf. [GM19, Definition 2.2], [ADL24, Definition 2.18]). The CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle of a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothable family $f : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ over a reduced base S is defined as

$$\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}} := k^{-n} \left(\lambda_{n+1}^{\otimes \left(n(n+1) + \frac{2a_1 - c\tilde{a}_0}{a_0} \right)} \otimes \lambda_n^{\otimes (-2(n+1))} \otimes \tilde{\lambda}_n^{\otimes c(n+1)} \right)$$

where $\mathcal{L} = -k(K_{\mathcal{X}/S} + c\mathcal{D})$ is a Cartier divisor on \mathcal{X} ample over S , and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is some positive integer.

Theorem 2.15 ([GMS21, Theorem 2.6], cf. [PT08]). *Let $(f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1, \mathcal{L})$ be a test configuration of an n -dimensional $(-k(K_X + cD))$ -polarized pair (X, D) . Then*

$$w(\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}}) = (n+1)! \text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}, -k(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{A}^1} + c\mathcal{D})),$$

where $w(\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}})$ is the total weight of $\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}}$ under the \mathbb{C}^* -action of the test configuration.

Theorem 2.16 (K-moduli Theorem). *Let $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 1}$ and $c \in (0, 1/r)$ be a rational number, and χ be the Hilbert polynomial of an anti-canonically polarized smooth Fano variety. Consider the moduli pseudo-functor sending a reduced base S to*

$$\mathcal{M}_c^K(S) := \left\{ (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})/S \left| \begin{array}{l} (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D})/S \text{ is a } \mathbb{Q}\text{-Gorenstein smoothable log Fano family,} \\ \mathcal{D} \sim_{S, \mathbb{Q}} -rK_{\mathcal{X}/S}, \text{ each fiber } (\mathcal{X}_s, c\mathcal{D}_s) \text{ is } K\text{-semistable,} \\ \text{and } \chi(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_s}(-mK_{\mathcal{X}_s})) = \chi(m) \text{ for } m \text{ sufficiently divisible.} \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Then there is a reduced Artin stack $\mathcal{M}^K(c)$ of finite type over \mathbb{C} representing this moduli pseudo-functor. The \mathbb{C} -points of $\mathcal{M}^K(c)$ parameterize K -semistable \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothable log Fano pairs (X, cD) with Hilbert polynomial $\chi(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-mK_X)) = \chi(m)$ for sufficiently divisible $m \gg 0$ and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -rK_X$. Moreover, the stack $\mathcal{M}^K(c)$ admits a good moduli space $\overline{M}^K(c)$, which is a reduced projective scheme of finite type over \mathbb{C} , whose \mathbb{C} -points parameterize K -polystable log Fano pairs. Moreover, the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $\mathcal{M}^K(c)$ descends to an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $\overline{M}^K(c)$.

The following theorem illustrates how the moduli spaces $\overline{M}^K(c)$ depend on the coefficient c .

Theorem 2.17 (cf. [ADL24, Theorem 1.2]). *There are rational numbers*

$$0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_n = 1,$$

such that for every $0 \leq j < n$, the K -moduli stacks $\mathcal{M}^K(c)$ are independent of the choice of $c \in (c_j, c_{j+1})$. Moreover, for every $0 \leq j < n$ and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, one has open immersions

$$\mathcal{M}^K(c_j - \epsilon) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}^K(c_j) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}^K(c_j + \epsilon),$$

which descend to projective birational morphisms

$$\overline{M}^K(c_j - \epsilon) \rightarrow \overline{M}^K(c_j) \leftarrow \overline{M}^K(c_j + \epsilon).$$

The values c_i are called walls and the intervals (c_i, c_{i+1}) are called chambers. If a pair (X, cD) is K -polystable if and only if $0 < c < c_i$ and at $c = c_i$ we have that its image under the map $\overline{M}^K(c_j - \epsilon) \rightarrow \overline{M}^K(c_j)$ is $(X_0, c_i D_0)$ we say that (X_0, D_0) is the polystable replacement of (X, D) at $c = c_i$.

Theorem 2.18. (cf. [ADL24, Theorem 2.22]) *Let $f : (\mathcal{X}, c\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow S$ be a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothable family of log Fano pairs over a normal projective base S . Let G be a reductive group acting on \mathcal{X} and S such that \mathcal{D} is G -invariant and f is G -equivariant. Moreover, assume the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) *for any $s \in S$, if $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{D}_s)$ is finite, then the stabilizer G_s is also finite;*
- (ii) *if for $s, s' \in S$, we have that $(\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{D}_s) \simeq (\mathcal{X}_{s'}, \mathcal{D}_{s'})$, then $s' \in G \cdot s$;*
- (iii) *$\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}}$ is an ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on S .*

Then $s \in S$ is GIT-(poly/semi)stable with respect to the G -linearized \mathbb{Q} -line bundle $\Lambda_{CM,f,c\mathcal{D}}$ if $(\mathcal{X}_s, c\mathcal{D}_s)$ is a K -(poly/semi)stable pair.

2.3. Variations of GIT quotients. For the general theory on Variations of GIT quotients, we refer the reader to [DH98; Tha96] and the beautiful survey [Laz13]. Here we state only the following structure theorem.

Lemma 2.19. (cf. [Laz13, Lemma 3.10]) *Let (X, L) be a polarized projective variety, and G a reductive group acting on (X, L) . Let L_0 be a G -linearized line bundle on X . For any rational number $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we define $L_{\pm\epsilon} := L \otimes L_0^{\otimes(\pm\epsilon)}$. Let $X^{ss}(0)$ and $X^{ss}(\pm)$ denote the semistable loci with respect to L and $L_{\pm\epsilon}$, respectively. Then*

- (i) *there are open immersions $X^{ss}(\pm) \subseteq X^{ss}(0)$, and*
- (ii) *for any $x \in X^{ss}(0) \setminus X^{ss}(\pm)$, there is a 1-parameter subgroup σ of G such that*

$$\mu^L(x, \sigma) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^{L+\epsilon}(x, \sigma)\mu^{L-\epsilon}(x, \sigma) < 0 \text{ for } 0 < \epsilon \ll 1,$$

where μ is the Hilbert-Mumford weight. Note, the second condition implies that $\mu^{L_t}(x, \sigma)$ changes sign when crossing the ‘wall’ at $t = 0$.

2.4. Overview of VGIT of hypersurfaces and complete intersections in \mathbb{P}^3 and \mathbb{P}^4 . In [GM17; GM18; GMZ18], compactifications of log Fano pairs (X, cD) where X is a Fano hypersurface and D a hyperplane section were introduced using VGIT of pairs (X, H) where H is a hyperplane. This construction was extended in [Pap22a] to the case where X is a complete intersection of hypersurfaces of the same degree and $D = X \cap H$ is still a hyperplane section. Note that in both cases $D \sim -K_X$. Furthermore, [GM19] classified the points for each compactification for the case where $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a cubic surface (a del Pezzo surface of degree 3) and [Pap22a] for the case where $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a complete intersection of two quadrics (a del Pezzo surface of degree 4). Let us briefly recall the constructions and main results for these two specific cases, as we will need them later.

The scheme $S_1 := \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)) \cong \mathbb{P}^{19}$ parameterizes embedded cubic surfaces in \mathbb{P}^3 (including all del Pezzo surfaces of degree 3 with canonical singularities [Kol96, p. III.3]), and the scheme $S_2 := \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)) \cong \mathbb{P}^3$ parameterizes embedded hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^3 . Similarly, let $V = H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2))$ be the vector space of global sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)$. The scheme $S'_1 := \text{Gr}(2, V) \cong \text{Gr}(2, 15)$ parameterizes embedded complete intersections of two quadrics in \mathbb{P}^4 (including all del Pezzo surfaces of degree 4 with canonical singularities [Kol96, p. III.3]), with Plücker embedding $\text{Gr}(2, V) \rightarrow \Lambda^2 \mathbb{P}V$. The scheme $S'_2 := \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^4, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(1)) \cong \mathbb{P}^4$ parameterizes embedded hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^4 .

The groups $\text{PGL}(4)$ and $\text{PGL}(5)$ act naturally on the product spaces $S_1 \times S_2$ and $S'_1 \times S'_2$ parameterizing pairs (X, H) formed by a (possibly non-reduced or reducible) cubic surface and a hyperplane or a (possibly non-reduced or reducible) complete intersection of two quadrics and a hyperplane, respectively. Let π_1, π'_1, π_2 and π'_2 be the projections to S_1, S'_1, S_2, S'_2 , respectively.

For any rational number $t > 0$, we set

$$\mathcal{L}_t := \mathcal{O}(1, t) := \pi_1^* \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(a) \otimes \pi_2^* \mathcal{O}_{S_2}(b)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}'_t := \mathcal{O}(1, t) := (\pi'_1)^* \mathcal{O}_{S'_1}(a) \otimes (\pi'_2)^* \mathcal{O}_{S'_2}(b),$$

where $t = \frac{a}{b}$ and we can define GIT $_t$ -(semi/poly)stability in the obvious way. Note that \mathcal{L}_t and \mathcal{L}'_t are only defined up to scaling. However, since we only use them to define a GIT quotient, the specific choice of (a, b) will be irrelevant (we assume they are both positive and sufficiently large). For each rational $t > 0$, \mathcal{L}_t and \mathcal{L}'_t are ample. For each value $t > 0$, define the GIT moduli stacks

$$\mathcal{M}_3^{\text{GIT}}(t) := [(S_1 \times S_2)^{ss}/_{\mathcal{L}_t} \text{PGL}(4)], \quad \mathcal{M}_4^{\text{GIT}}(t) := [(S'_1 \times S'_2)^{ss}/_{\mathcal{L}'_t} \text{PGL}(5)]$$

and let their moduli spaces be $\overline{M}_3^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ and $\overline{M}_4^{\text{GIT}}(t)$, respectively.

By [GM18, Theorem 1.1] and [Pap22a, Lemma 3.20], there are no GIT $_t$ -semistable pairs (X, H) for $t > 1$. Furthermore, by [GM18, Theorem 1.3] and [Pap22a, Theorem 3.23], if (X, H) is semistable, then $D = X \cap H \sim -K_X$ is a hypersurface in X . In particular, we note $\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ gives a GIT compactification of the moduli of log smooth pairs (X, D) . For $t \in (0, 1)$, there is a wall-chamber decomposition [DH98; Tha96]. A chamber is defined as the largest subinterval in which $\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ does not vary, while a wall is the intersection of the closure of two chambers. If t is a wall, there are contractions:

$$\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t - \epsilon) \longrightarrow \overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t) \longleftarrow \overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t + \epsilon)$$

for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and $d = 3, 4$.

We have a full description of the walls and chambers:

Theorem 2.20 ([GM19, Lemma 1], [Pap22a, §6.3, Theorem 6.20]). *The walls for $\overline{M}_3^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ are:*

$$t_0 = 0, \quad t_1 = \frac{1}{5}, \quad t_2 = \frac{1}{3}, \quad t_3 = \frac{3}{7}, \quad t_4 = \frac{5}{9}, \quad t_5 = \frac{9}{13}, \quad t_6 = 1.$$

The walls for $\overline{M}_4^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ are:

$$t_0 = 0, \quad t_1 = \frac{1}{6}, \quad t_2 = \frac{2}{7}, \quad t_3 = \frac{3}{8}, \quad t_4 = \frac{6}{11}, \quad t_5 = \frac{2}{3}, \quad t_6 = 1.$$

Moreover, in [GM19, Theorems 2 and 3] and [Pap22a, Theorem 6.20, Theorem 6.21] the authors gave a precise description of all pairs (X, D) represented in each $\overline{M}_3^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ and $\overline{M}_4^{\text{GIT}}(t)$, respectively, for each $t \in (0, 1)$. The full statements are rather long, so we will omit them here.

Let $U_3 \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$, $U_4 \subseteq S'_1 \times S'_2$ be the open subsets representing pairs (X, H) such that H is not contained in X and that $X \cap H \neq X \cap H'$ for any hyperplane $H' \neq H$. It follows that the complement of U_d is of codimension ≥ 2 for $d = 3, 4$, and it only contains pairs (X, H) which are GIT-unstable for any $0 < t < 1$ (c.f. [GMS21, Lemmas 3.3, 3.5, 3.6] and [Pap22a, Lemmas 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4]). Let $f : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow U_d$ be the universal family over U_d . For any $0 < c < 1$, let $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c} := \Lambda_{\text{CM},f,c\mathcal{D}}$ be the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle of this family.

Proposition 2.21. (cf. [GMS21, Theorem 3.8]) *For $d = 3$ and any rational number $0 < c < 1$, we have*

$$\Lambda_{\text{CM},c} \simeq \mathcal{O}(8 + c, 9c)$$

as \mathbb{Q} -line bundles. In particular, note that $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c}$ is ample for all $c \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c}$ is proportional to $\mathcal{L}_{t(c)}$ where $t(c) = \frac{9c}{8+c}$.

Proposition 2.22. (cf. [Pap22a, Lemma 7.5]) *For $d = 4$ and any rational number $0 < c < 1$, we have that*

$$\Lambda_{\text{CM},c} \simeq \mathcal{O}(2(5+c), 12c)$$

as \mathbb{Q} -line bundles. In particular, we have that $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c}$ is ample for all $c \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c}$ is proportional to $\mathcal{L}'_{t(c)}$ where $t(c) = \frac{6c}{5+c}$.

For $d = 4$ the author also shows that there is an isomorphism of K-moduli and GIT moduli stacks up until and including the second GIT chamber [Pap22a, Theorem 8.2].

3. ISOMORPHISMS OF VGIT AND K-MODULI FOR DEGREES 3 AND 4

In this section, we will first give a bound of singularities of the surfaces which will appear in the K-moduli spaces. This will be widely used later. Then we prove Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 < c < 1$ be a positive number. Let (X_0, cD_0) be a K-semistable log del Pezzo pair that admits a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to (X, cD) , where X is a smooth del Pezzo surface of degree $l \geq 3$ and $D \in |-K_X|$ is smooth. Then X_0 is Gorenstein.*

Proof. Let $x \in X_0$ be a point, and $n := \text{Ind}(x, K_{X_0}) \geq 1$ be the Gorenstein index at x . If $x \notin D_0$, then the assumption $D_0 + K_{X_0} \sim 0$, in both cases, implies that $n \leq 1$ (since then locally around x , K_{X_0} is trivial and thus Gorenstein). Now let us assume that $x \in D_0$. Since x is a klt surface singularity (as (X_0, cD_0) is K-semistable), then x is a quotient singularity [KM98, Corollary 5.21]. As $x \in X_0$ is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothable and a quotient singularity, then x is an index n point cyclic quotient singularity of type $\frac{1}{dn^2}(1, dna - 1)$ [KS88, Proposition 3.10]. It follows from Theorem 2.6 that for X a del Pezzo surface of degree l

$$l(1-c)^2 = (-K_{X_0} - cD_0)^2 \leq \frac{9}{4} \widehat{\text{vol}}(x, X_0, cD_0).$$

Let $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{X}_0, \tilde{D}_0) \rightarrow (x, X_0, D_0)$ be a smooth covering of degree dn^2 over x . By [LX19, Theorem 2.7 (3)], one has that

$$(3.2) \quad dn^2 \cdot \frac{4}{9} \cdot l(1-c)^2 \leq dn^2 \widehat{\text{vol}}(x, X_0, cD_0) = \widehat{\text{vol}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{X}_0, c\tilde{D}_0) \leq (2 - c \text{ord}_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{D}_0)^2 < 4,$$

where the second inequality follows from computing the discrepancy on the smooth blow-up of \tilde{x} .

Since X_0 is a del Pezzo surface of degree $l \geq 3$, if $\text{ord}_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{D}_0 \geq 2$, then we have

$$dn^2 \cdot \frac{4}{3} (1-c)^2 \leq dn^2 \cdot \frac{4l}{9} (1-c)^2 \leq 4(1-c)^2,$$

and thus $3 \geq dn^2 \geq n^2$. This forces $n = 1$ and X_0 is Gorenstein.

Thus, assume that $\text{ord}_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{D}_0 = 1$. Let u, v be local coordinates near $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}_0$ such that the cyclic group action on \tilde{X} defining the quotient singularity is scaling on each coordinate, and let $u^i v^j$ be a monomial appearing in the local equation of \tilde{D}_0 such that $i + j = \text{ord}_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{D}_0 = 1$. The relation $D_0 + K_{X_0} \sim 0$ implies that

$$i + (dna - 1)j \equiv dna \pmod{dn^2},$$

as around x , the total weights of u, v and K_{X_0} are 1, $dna - 1$ and $-dna$, respectively and $D_0 \sim -K_{X_0}$. Since either $(i, j) = (0, 1)$ or $(i, j) = (1, 0)$, then dn has to divide 1, which implies $d = n = 1$, and hence X_0 is Gorenstein. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let $0 \leq c \leq 1$ be a positive number.*

- (1) Let (X_0, cD_0) be a K -semistable log del Pezzo pair that admits a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to (X, cD) , where X is a cubic surface and $D \in |-K_X|$. Then X_0 can be embedded into \mathbb{P}^3 by $|-K_{X_0}|$ as a cubic surface.
- (2) Let (X_0, cD_0) be a K -semistable log del Pezzo pair that admits a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to (X, cD) , where X is a complete intersection of two quadrics in \mathbb{P}^4 and $D \in |-K_X|$. Then X_0 can be embedded into \mathbb{P}^4 by $|-K_{X_0}|$ as a complete intersection of two quadrics.

Proof. This Corollary is an immediate consequence, in both cases, of Theorem 3.1 and [Fuj90, p. 117 and Corollary 1.7]. \square

Recall that U_d is the open subset parameterizing pairs (X, H) such that H is a hypersurface not contained in X and that $X \cap H \neq X \cap H'$ for any hyperplane $H' \neq H$. Let $U_d^K(c)$ be the open subset of U_d which consists of pairs (X, H) such that (X, cD) is K -semistable, where $D = X \cap H$, and $U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c) \subseteq U_d$ the $\text{GIT}_{t(c)}$ -semistable locus, where $t(c) = \frac{9c}{8+c}$ for $d = 3$ and $t(c) = \frac{6c}{5+c}$ for $d = 4$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let d be 3 or 4. For any $0 < c < 1$, the K -moduli stack $\mathcal{M}_d^K(c)$ is isomorphic to the quotient stack $[U_d^K(c)/\text{PGL}(d+1)]$, via which the open immersions*

$$U_d^K(c - \epsilon) \hookrightarrow U_d^K(c) \hookleftarrow U_d^K(c + \epsilon)$$

descend to wall-crossing morphisms

$$\mathcal{M}_d^K(c - \epsilon) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_d^K(c) \hookleftarrow \mathcal{M}_d^K(c + \epsilon).$$

Proof. Thanks to Corollary 3.2, this can be proven using the same method as in [ADL24, Theorem 5.15]. \square

We denote by

$$0 = c_0 < c_1 < \cdots < c_l = 1$$

a sequence of numbers such that for each c_i , either $c = c_i$ is a wall for K -moduli stacks $\mathcal{M}_d^K(c)$, or $t = t(c_i)$ is a wall for the VGIT moduli stacks $\mathcal{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c))$. The following Proposition summarizes the main results of [GMS21] and [Pap22a].

Proposition 3.4 (cf. [GMS21, Proposition 4.7], [Pap22a, Theorem 8.2]). *Let $d \in \{3, 4\}$. For $c \in (0, c_1)$, the two open subsets $U_d^K(c)$ and $U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$ of U are equal.*

The next two propositions involve an induction process, leading to the results that $U_d^K(c) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$ for any $0 < c < 1$, both for $d = 3$ and $d = 4$. We follow the same proof as in [ADL23a].

Proposition 3.5. *Let $d \in \{3, 4\}$. Suppose that, for any $c \in (0, c_i)$, we have $U_d^K(c) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$. Then $U_d^K(c_i) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$.*

Proof. We first show that $U_d^K(c_i) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$. Let $(X, D) \in U_d^K(c_i)$ be any K -semistable point. Let $(X_0, D_0) \in \overline{M}_d^K(c_i)$ be the K -polystable pair, and σ a 1-parameter subgroup such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) \cdot [(X, D)] = [(X_0, D_0)]$$

in $\overline{M}_d^K(c_i)$. Note that since $-K_X$ is very ample, any special test configuration is naturally embedded into $\mathbb{P}^d \times \mathbb{A}^1$, so that the test configuration is induced by a 1-parameter subgroup. Now, by the surjectivity of the wall-crossing morphism $\overline{M}_d^K(c_i - \epsilon) \rightarrow \overline{M}_d^K(c_i)$, we can choose a K -semistable pair $(X', D') \in U_d^K(c_i - \epsilon)$ and a 1-parameter subgroup σ' such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma'(t) \cdot [(X', D')] = [(X_0, D_0)].$$

Let $(\mathcal{X}, c_i \mathcal{D})$ and $(\mathcal{X}', c_i \mathcal{D}')$ be the two test configurations corresponding to σ and σ' respectively. Since $(X_0, c_i D_0)$ is K-polystable and $(X', c_i D')$ is K-semistable, then the generalized Futaki invariant $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}', c_i \mathcal{D}') = 0$. As $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}', c_i \mathcal{D}')$ is proportional to the GIT weight of the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle Λ_{U, c_i} (Theorem 2.15), then we have $\mu^{\mathcal{L}^{t(c_i)}}([(X', D')], \sigma') = 0$ by Proposition 2.21. By our hypothesis, the pair (X', D') is contained in $U_d^K(c_i - \epsilon) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i - \epsilon) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$. Now it follows from Lemma 2.7 that $[(X_0, D_0)]$ is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i)}$ -semistable. By openness of GIT semistability, we conclude that $[(X, D)] \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$, and hence $U_d^K(c_i) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$.

Conversely, for any $(X, D) \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$, similarly we can find $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i)}$ -polystable pair $(X_0, D_0) \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$, $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i) - \epsilon}$ -semistable pair $(X', D') \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i - \epsilon)$, and two 1-parameter subgroups σ and σ' such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) \cdot [(X, D)] = [(X_0, D_0)], \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma'(t) \cdot [(X', D')] = [(X_0, D_0)],$$

and that

$$\mu^{\mathcal{L}^{t(c_i)}}([(X, D)], \sigma) = \mu^{\mathcal{L}^{t(c_i)}}([(X', D')], \sigma') = 0.$$

Let $(\mathcal{X}', c_i \mathcal{D}'; \mathcal{L})$ be the test configuration of $(X', c_i D')$ corresponding to σ' . Then, $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}', c_i \mathcal{D}'; \mathcal{L}) = 0$ by Proposition 2.21 and Theorem 2.15. Since $(X', (c_i - \epsilon)D')$ is K-semistable by our hypothesis, then \mathcal{X}' is normal ([LX14, Section 8.2], the first paragraph). Now it follows from Lemma 2.8 that $(X_0, c_i D_0)$ is K-semistable, and hence (X, D) is K-semistable by openness of K-semistability. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let $d \in \{3, 4\}$. Suppose that, for any $c \in (0, c_i]$ we have $U_d^K(c) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$. Then $U_d^K(c) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$ for any $c \in (c_i, c_{i+1})$.*

Proof. Notice that it suffices to prove the equality for a fixed $c = c_i + \epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \ll c_{i+1} - c_i$. We first show that $U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon)$. Suppose otherwise, choose a pair $(X, D) \in U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) \setminus U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon)$. By our assumption, (X, D) is GIT_{c_i} -semistable, and hence using Lemma 2.19, we can find a 1-parameter subgroup σ of $\text{PGL}(d+1)$ such that

$$\mu^{\mathcal{L}^{t(c_i)}}([(X, D)], \sigma) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^{\mathcal{L}^{t(c_i + \epsilon)}}([(X, D)], \sigma) < 0.$$

Then the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) \cdot [(X, D)]$ is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i)}$ -semistable by Lemma 2.7, and thus represented by some $(X_0, D_0) \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i)$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ be the test configuration of $(X, D, -K_X)$ corresponding to σ . It follows from Proposition 2.21 and Theorem 2.15 that $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, (c_i + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) < 0$, and hence $(X, (c_i + \epsilon)D)$ is K-unstable, which is a contradiction. Thus $U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon)$. In fact, if $(X, (c_i + \epsilon)D)$ is K-polystable, then it is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -polystable (Lemma 3.7).

Now consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) & \longrightarrow & [U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) / \text{PGL}(d+1)] & \longrightarrow & U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) // \text{PGL}(d+1) = \overline{M}_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) \\ \downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \psi \\ U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon) & \longrightarrow & [U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon) / \text{PGL}(d+1)] & \longrightarrow & U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon) // \text{PGL}(d+1) = \overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c_i + \epsilon)) \end{array}.$$

Note that the existence of maps ϕ , φ and ψ follows from the moduli construction, our proof that $U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon)$ and Lemma 3.7 below. In particular φ and ϕ are natural inclusions.

As ϕ is descended from the open immersion φ , then ϕ is a monomorphism of stacks, and thus it is separated [Sta24, Tag 06MY] and representable (as it is an injection and the stabilisers are the same). By Lemma 3.7 and Proposition 3.3, we see that ϕ sends closed points to closed points, which implies that ψ is quasi-finite, as it is injective. As $\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c_i + \epsilon))$ and $\overline{M}_d^K(c_i + \epsilon)$ are separated, ψ is separated. As $\overline{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c_i + \epsilon))$ and $\overline{M}_d^K(c_i + \epsilon)$ are proper and ψ is separated, then ψ is proper, which together with being quasi-finite means ψ is finite. Consequently ϕ is finite [Alp13, Proposition 6.4]. Note the moduli construction implies that the left and right square

above are fibre products. Since finite maps are preserved by base change ([Gro60, Proposition 6.1.5(iii)]), the map φ is finite, and thus surjective [Sha13, Theorem 1.12]. We conclude that $U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon) = U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon)$. \square

Lemma 3.7. *With the same notation and assumption as in Proposition 3.6, if $(X, (c_i + \epsilon)D) \in U_d^K(c_i + \epsilon)$ is K -polystable, then (X, D) is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -polystable.*

Proof. It is shown in the proof of Lemma 3.6 that (X, D) is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -semistable. Suppose it is not $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -polystable, then there is a 1-parameter subgroup σ of $\text{PGL}(d + 1)$ such that

$$(X_0, D_0) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma(t) \cdot (X, D)$$

is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -polystable. Thus $\mu^{\mathcal{L}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}}([(X, D)], \sigma) = 0$ and $\text{Fut}(\mathcal{X}, (c_i + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L}) = 0$ by Proposition 2.21, where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ is the test configuration of the polarized pair $(X, D, \mathcal{O}_X(1))$ corresponding to σ . Notice that $(X_0, D_0) \in U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i + \epsilon) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c_i) = U_d^K(c_i)$, in particular $(X_0, c_i D_0)$ is klt, and hence $(\mathcal{X}, (c_i + \epsilon)\mathcal{D}; \mathcal{L})$ is a special test configuration (since ϵ is small). Since $(X, (c_i + \epsilon)D)$ is K -polystable, then $(X, D) \simeq (X_0, D_0)$, and hence they are in the same $\text{PGL}(d + 1)$ orbit. As a consequence, (X, D) is $\text{GIT}_{t(c_i + \epsilon)}$ -polystable. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number. Then there is an isomorphism between Artin stacks*

$$\mathcal{M}_d^K(c) \simeq \mathcal{M}_d^{\text{GIT}}(t(c))$$

with $t(c) = \frac{9c}{8+c}$ when $d = 3$ and $t(c) = \frac{6c}{5+c}$ when $d = 4$. Moreover, such isomorphisms commute with wall crossing morphisms.

Proof. This is now an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.4, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.5 using an induction argument. \square

Remark 3.9. It should be noted that Proposition 3.4, and the results of [GMS21; Pap22a] are necessary in order to run the inductive argument which allows us to prove Theorem 3.8. This is due to the fact that we require that $U_d^K(c) \subseteq U_d^{\text{GIT}}(c)$ for $c \in (0, c_1)$, which cannot be proven without the explicit methods of [GMS21] for degree 3 and [Pap22a] for degree 4. In particular, this method is likely to work in many other cases (e.g. Fano complete intersections with hyperplane sections), if one can characterise the first chamber as a global quotient.

4. VGIT AND K-MODULI SPACES OF DEL PEZZO PAIRS OF DEGREE 2

A smooth del Pezzo surface Y of degree 2 admits a natural double cover to \mathbb{P}^2 defined by the linear series $|-K_Y|$, which is branched along a quartic curve $C_4 \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$. A divisor $D \in |-K_Y|$ is mapped to a line L on \mathbb{P}^2 . Thus, we have a crepant double cover

$$(Y, cD) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^2, 1/2C_4 + cL).$$

We will study the K -moduli stack (the K -moduli space, respectively) of pairs $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ which admit a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cL)$ for all rational numbers $c \in (0, 1)$, and prove that these K -moduli spaces are isomorphic to the K -moduli spaces of log del Pezzo pairs (Y, cD) of degree 2, where $D \in |-K_Y|$ (cf. Theorem 4.6). Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ and $\mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$ be the moduli stacks of (limits of) K -semistable pairs on \mathbb{P}^2 and log del Pezzo pairs of degree 2 respectively, and correspondingly let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c)$ be their good moduli spaces.

We first prove an analogue of Theorem 3.1 in this case.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ be a K -semistable pair which admits a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cL)$. Then the Gorenstein index of X is at most 2.*

Proof. As $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ is K-semistable, then X has at worst klt singularities. It follows from [Hac04, Proposition 6.2] that any singularity $x \in X$ is of the form $\frac{1}{n^2}(1, na - 1)$, where $(a, n) = 1$ and $n \neq 3$ is the Gorenstein index of X . Thus, it suffices to show that the Gorenstein index is strictly less than 4. Fix an arbitrary point $x \in X$. If $x \notin C'$, then by the condition that $3C' + K_X \sim 0$, we see that K_X is Cartier near x , and thus $n = 1$. Now, we may assume that $x \in C'$. The same argument in the Proof of Theorem 3.1 shows that $n \leq 3$ as desired. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ be a K-semistable pair in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$, then either $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ or $X \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$.*

Proof. It is known that X is a Manetti surface (cf. [Hac04, Section 8.2]) of Gorenstein index at most 2, hence X is either \mathbb{P}^2 or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. Indeed, if $X \neq \mathbb{P}^2$, then X is a deformation from a Manetti surface $\mathbb{P}(a^2, b^2, c^2)$, where you may assume $c \geq b \geq a$ and the Gorenstein index is at least c by [KS88, Lemma 3.16], which forces $c \leq 2$. Since we may assume $\mathbb{P}(a^2, b^2, c^2)$ is well-formed [Ian00], we conclude $a = b = 1$. Finally, if X is a deformation from $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$, then the only singularity of X is a deformation of a quotient singularity of type $\frac{1}{4}(1, 1)$, which has a one-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein miniversal deformation space, thus it cannot be partially smooth [Akh+16]. Thus either $X = \mathbb{P}^2$ or $X = \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ since there are no local-to-global obstructions. \square

4.1. K-moduli spaces of log del Pezzo pairs of degree 2. In this part, we will prove Theorem 4.3, and then we can reduce our study of log del Pezzo pairs of degree 2 to the study of K-polystable plane curve pairs.

Theorem 4.3. *There is an isomorphism $\phi(c) : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c)$.*

Lemma 4.4. *Let (X, cD) be a degree 2 K-semistable log del Pezzo pair. Then the \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein deformation of (X, cD) is unobstructed. In particular, the moduli stack $\mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$ is irreducible and smooth, and the K-moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c)$ is irreducible and normal.*

Proof. The proof is identical to [Zha24, Proof of Theorem 1.4]. \square

Lemma 4.5. *The K-moduli stack $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ is isomorphic to some quotient stack of a locally closed subscheme of some Hilbert scheme of pairs in \mathbb{P}^5 .*

Proof. Let \mathbb{H} be the locally closed subscheme of the Hilbert scheme parameterizing triples $(X; C, C')$ such that $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^5$ has Hilbert polynomial $\chi(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(2m))$ (i.e. the one embedding \mathbb{P}^2 via Veronese embedding), $3C + 4K_X \sim 0$ and $3C' + K_X \sim 0$. Let \mathcal{H} be the open subscheme of \mathbb{H} parameterizing those such that $(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ is K-semistable. Then we know from Corollary 4.2 that any X in \mathcal{H} is either \mathbb{P}^2 or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. Moreover, the \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein deformations of \mathbb{P}^2 and $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ are unobstructed, and the class groups of them are torsion free. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(1)|_X$ is the unique Weil divisor class which is \mathbb{Q} -linearly equivalent to $-\frac{2}{3}K_X$. Hence, the stack \mathcal{H} is smooth for the same argument as Lemma 4.4, and thus, the quotient stack $[\mathcal{H}/\mathrm{PGL}(6)]$ is smooth. By our construction of \mathcal{H} , there is a morphism $[\mathcal{H}/\mathrm{PGL}(6)] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$, which is separated. Moreover, as the morphism is bijective on \mathbb{C} -points, and the morphism preserves the stabilizers (as $-\frac{2}{3}K_X \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(1)|_X$), we conclude that $[\mathcal{H}/\mathrm{PGL}(6)] \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *There is a natural morphism $\psi(c) : \mathcal{G}(c) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$ from some μ_2 -gerbe $\mathcal{G}(c)$ of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ to $\mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$.*

Proof. Consider the universal family $(\mathcal{X}, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C} + c\mathcal{C}') \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$. Using the isomorphism in Lemma 4.5, one obtains via the pull-back from \mathbb{P}^5 a line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$ on \mathcal{X} . We have that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C}) \otimes$

$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(-2)$ is trivial on each fiber. Thus, it is the pull-back of some line bundle \mathcal{L} on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$. Let $\psi(c) : \mathcal{G}(c) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ be the μ_2 -gerbe obtained by taking the second root stack of \mathcal{L} [AGV08, Appendix B.2]. Then there is a line bundle \mathcal{L}' on $\mathcal{G}(c)$ such that $\mathcal{L}'^{\otimes 2}$ is the pull-back of \mathcal{L} . Let $\pi_{\mathcal{G}(c)} : (\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}; \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}, \mathcal{C}'_{\mathcal{G}(c)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(c)$ be the pull-back of the universal family to $\mathcal{G}(c)$. Then the line bundle $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{G}(c)} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}}(1) \otimes \pi_{\mathcal{G}(c)}^* \mathcal{L}'$ satisfies $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}^{\otimes 2} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}(c)})$.

Now we take the double cover of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}$ branched along $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}$, denoted by

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{G}(c)} := \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}} \left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}} \oplus \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}^* \right).$$

This double cover is also a double cover fiberwise, as $\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}$ is a line bundle. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the pull-back of $\mathcal{C}'_{\mathcal{G}(c)}$ to $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}$. Then, every fiber $(\mathcal{X}_t, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}_t + c\mathcal{C}'_t)$ is the μ_2 -quotient of $(\mathcal{Y}_g, c\mathcal{D}_g)$, where $g \in |\mathcal{G}(c)|$ is the unique point over $t \in |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)|$. Therefore, the morphism

$$(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}, c\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}(c)}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(c)$$

is a family of K-semistable log Fano pairs, where a general fiber is a log del Pezzo pair of degree 2. By the universal property of K-moduli stacks, we obtain a morphism $\mathcal{G}(c) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *The composition morphism*

$$\mathcal{G}(c) \xrightarrow{\psi(c)} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$$

is the good moduli space of $\mathcal{G}(c)$.

Proof. By definition [Alp13, Definition 4.1], we need to prove that $(\psi(c))_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{G}(c)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)}$ and that $\psi(c)$ is cohomologically affine [Alp13, Definition 3.1]. Recall that $\mathcal{G}(c) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$ is the μ_2 -gerbe, so $\mathcal{G}(c) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \times_{B\mathbb{G}_m} B\mathbb{G}_m$, where $f : B\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is given by taking the second power, and the morphism $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \rightarrow B\mathbb{G}_m$ is the classifying morphism of \mathcal{L} introduced in the proof of Lemma 4.6. Thus to show that $\phi(c)$ is cohomologically affine, it suffices to prove f is [Alp, Lemma 6.4.16], which is known to hold true. Indeed, by weight decomposition, a quasi-coherent sheaf V over $B\mathbb{G}_m$ corresponds to a family $(V_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of vector spaces. Moreover, $W := f_* V$ corresponds to $(W_i := V_{2i})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Since the correspondence $V \mapsto V_i$ is exact for every i , then f_* is an exact functor. On the other hand, since $\psi(c)$ is a μ_2 -gerbe, we have that $(\psi(c))_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{G}(c)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)}$. This completes the proof. \square

The morphism $\mathcal{G}(c) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2^K(c)$ constructed in Proposition 4.6 descends to a morphism

$$\phi(c) : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c) \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c).$$

In particular, $\phi(c)(X, \frac{1}{2}C + cC') = (Y, cD)$ where Y is the double cover of X branched at C and $D = \phi(C)^{-1}(C)$.

Proposition 4.8. *The morphism $\phi(c)$ is bijective.*

Proof. Since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^K(c)$ is irreducible and the morphism $\phi(c)$ is dominant (as log smooth pairs are dense in both domain and target), then $\phi(c)$ is surjective by the properness of the K-moduli. Suppose now $(X_1, \frac{1}{2}C_1 + cC'_1)$ and $(X_2, \frac{1}{2}C_2 + cC'_2)$ are two K-polystable pairs such that their double covers (Y_1, cD_1) and (Y_2, cD_2) are isomorphic. Then X_1 and X_2 are isomorphic to either \mathbb{P}^2 or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ by Corollary 4.2. Note $(X_i, \frac{1}{2}C_i)$ is canonical if and only if Y_i is canonical. If X_i is isomorphic to \mathbb{P}^2 , then Y_i is given by $w^2 - f_4(x, y, z) = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)$ and the double cover $\pi_i : Y_i \rightarrow X_i \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ gives us that $K_{Y_i} = \pi_i^*(K_{X_i} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{O}_{X_i}(4))$, so K_{Y_i} is Cartier. Moreover, since Y_i is K-semistable, then it is klt, and hence Y_i has Du Val singularities. If X_i is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$, then C_i does not contain the singularity of X_i since the pair is K-semistable (by Lemma 4.1, and thus Y_i has exactly two non-ADE singularities. By the assumption that $(Y_1, cD_1) \simeq (Y_2, cD_2)$,

we know that $X_1 \simeq X_2$. Now, we assume that $(Y_1, cD_1) = (Y_2, cD_2) = (Y, cD)$ and denote the double covers by $\pi_1 : Y \rightarrow X_1$ and $\pi_2 : Y \rightarrow X_2$.

Assume first that $X_i \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$, and denote by p_i the singularity of X_i . Denote by $L_i := \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(1)$ the class of a line on $X_i \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. Then the local Picard group $\text{Pic}(p_i \in X_i) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ with L_i a generator. Since Y is \mathbb{Q} -Fano, then it is rationally connected by [Zha06] and thus simply connected, so Y has no non-trivial torsion line bundle. As π_i is étale near p_i , then

$$\pi_1^*L_1 - \pi_2^*L_2$$

is torsion, and thus trivial. It follows from [KM98, Definition 2.50] that

$$(\pi_i)_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\pi_i^*(2L_i)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(2L_i) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(-2L_i),$$

and thus

$$H^0(X_1, \mathcal{O}_{X_1}(2L_1)) \simeq H^0(Y, \pi_1^*\mathcal{O}(2L_1)) \simeq H^0(Y, \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}(2L_2)) \simeq H^0(X_2, \mathcal{O}_{X_2}(2L_2)).$$

Similarly, we have that

$$(\pi_i)_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\pi_i^*\mathcal{O}_{X_i}(4L_i)) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(4L_i) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{X_i},$$

and thus

$$H^0(X_1, \mathcal{O}_{X_1}(4L_1)) \oplus \mathbb{C} \simeq H^0(Y, \pi_1^*\mathcal{O}(4L_1)) \simeq H^0(Y, \pi_2^*\mathcal{O}(4L_2)) \simeq H^0(X_2, \mathcal{O}_{X_2}(4L_2)) \oplus \mathbb{C}.$$

Choosing a basis (s_1, s_2, s_3) of $H^0(X_i, 2L_i)$ and an element s_4 in $H^0(Y, \pi_i^*\mathcal{O}(4L_i)) \setminus H^0(X_i, \mathcal{O}_{X_i}(4L_i))$, one obtains a morphism

$$(s_1 : s_2 : s_3 : s_4) : Y \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2),$$

which is isomorphism to π_i once we take the image. It follows that the two double covers π_1 and π_2 differ by an automorphism of $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)$, and hence they are isomorphic. Therefore, we conclude that $(X_1, \frac{1}{2}C_1 + cC'_1) \simeq (X_2, \frac{1}{2}C_2 + cC'_2)$.

Similarly, if $X_i \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$, then the same argument shows that $(X_1, \frac{1}{2}C_1 + cC'_1) \simeq (X_2, \frac{1}{2}C_2 + cC'_2)$. Therefore, the morphism $\phi(c)$ is injective, concluding the proof. \square

Having proven the above statements, we can deduce the main theorem in this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Using Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.8, we can apply Zariski's main theorem to the morphism $\phi(c)$, and conclude that $\phi(c)$ is an isomorphism. \square

4.2. VGIT of plane curves and K-stability of pairs on \mathbb{P}^2 . Consider the $\text{PGL}(3)$ -action on $H_4 \times H_1 := \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(4)) \times \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)) \cong \mathbb{P}^{14} \times \mathbb{P}^2$ induced by the natural action of $\text{PGL}(3)$ on \mathbb{P}^2 . Take a polarization $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$ with $a, b > 0$ and set $t = b/a \in (0, 2)$, where $t = 2$ is the final wall. We call a pair $(C_4, L) \in H_4 \times H_1$ *GIT_t-(semi/poly)stable* if it is a (semi/poly)stable point under the $\text{PGL}(3)$ -action with respect to $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$.

From the algorithm described in [GM18; Pap22a; Pap23] and the computational package [Pap22b] we obtain the following walls and chambers (cf. [Laz06, §4] for an independent solution of the GIT problem):

	t_0	t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5	t_6
walls	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{4}{5}$	1	$\frac{8}{7}$	$\frac{7}{5}$	2
chambers	$(0, \frac{1}{2})$	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$	$(\frac{4}{5}, 1)$	$(1, \frac{8}{7})$	$(\frac{8}{7}, \frac{7}{5})$	$(\frac{7}{5}, 2)$	

We thus obtain 11 non-isomorphic quotients $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\text{GIT}}(t_i)$, which are characterized by Theorems A.3 and A.4.

In the study of the K-moduli of del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 and the GIT of plane quartic curves (cf. [ADL24; OSS16]), we know that the double smooth conic is special, in the sense that it appears in the GIT moduli, but its counterpart does not appear in the K-moduli. Indeed, note

that if it did, then the double cover of \mathbb{P}^2 branched at the double conic should appear on $\overline{M}_2^K(0)$ via $\phi(0)$. However, such double cover is not normal, so it cannot be K-semistable.

We will prove the following result in this section.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number, $t = 2c$, and $(C_4, C_1) \in H_4 \times H_1$ such that C_4 is not a double smooth conic. Then (C_4, C_1) is GIT_t -(semi/poly)stable if and only if $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ is K-(semi/poly)stable.*

Lemma 4.10. *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number, and*

$$\pi : (\mathbb{P}^2 \times H_4 \times H_1, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1) \longrightarrow H_4 \times H_1$$

be the universal family of pairs. Then the CM line bundle $\Lambda_{\text{CM},c}$ is proportional to the polarization $\mathcal{O}_{H_4 \times H_1}(1, t)$ for $t = 2c$ up to a positive constant.

Proof. By [CP21b], the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle with respect to π is given by

$$-\pi_*(-K_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times H_4 \times H_1 / H_4 \times H_1} - \frac{1}{2}C_4 - cC_1)^3 = \frac{3}{2}(1-c)^2 \mathcal{O}_{H_4 \times H_1}(1, 2c).$$

□

We verify that for all GIT_t -polystable pairs (C_4, L) given in Table 2, the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)$ is c -K-polystable for $t = 2c$. We will explicitly demonstrate this only for wall $t = \frac{7}{5}$, as the computations for other walls follow in the same way.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number. Let $(C_0 = \{F = 0\}, L_0 = \{H = 0\})$ be given by the equations of row 8 of Table 2, and $C = \{x_0x_2^3 - x_1^3x_2 + f_4(x_0, x_1) = 0\}$.*

- (1) *The pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)$ is K-polystable if and only if $c = \frac{7}{10}$.*
- (2) *The pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cL_0)$ is K-semistable if $0 \leq c \leq \frac{7}{10}$, and K-unstable for $\frac{7}{10} < c < 1$.*

Proof. (1) Note $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)$ is a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one with the \mathbb{G}_m -action λ with weights $(5, 1, -4)$. Since the horizontal divisors are those whose points have finite orbits, it is easy to deduce that there are no horizontal divisors on (\mathbb{P}^2, C_0) by checking the only fixed points are the intersection of coordinate axis. The vertical divisors must be toric (and thus rational). One checks that $x_0x_2^2 - ax_1^3$ for $a \in \mathbb{P}^1$ covers \mathbb{P}^2 (with $a = 0$ and $a = \infty$ giving the coordinate axes). Then one readily checks that their β -invariant is positive when $c = \frac{7}{10}$.

Testing $\text{Fut}(\lambda \cdot (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)) = 0$ is equivalent to showing $\beta(E) = 0$, where E is the exceptional divisor under the $(3, 1)$ -weighted blow-up $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ at $(0 : 0 : 1)$ (Lemma 2.11). We have

$$K_X - \pi^*(K_{\mathbb{P}^2} + \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL) = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{C}_0 + -c\tilde{L} + \left(\frac{3}{2} - 3c\right)E,$$

hence,

$$A_{(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)}(E) = \frac{5}{2} - 3c.$$

Furthermore, consider $\pi^*(-K_{\mathbb{P}^2} - \frac{1}{2}C_0 - cL) - tE \sim (1-c)\tilde{L} + (3(1-c) - t)E$. This shows that the pseudoeffective threshold is $\tau = 3(1-c)$. Moreover, $\text{vol}(\pi^*(-K_{\mathbb{P}^2} - \frac{1}{2}C_0 - cL)) = (1-c)^2$, and we have

$$P(u) \sim_{\mathbb{R}} \begin{cases} (1-c)\tilde{L} + (3(1-c) - t)E, & 0 \leq t \leq 1-c \\ \left(\frac{3}{2}(1-c) - \frac{1}{2}t\right)\tilde{L} + (3(1-c) - t)E, & 1-c \leq t \leq 3(1-c), \end{cases}$$

where $P(u)$ is the positive part of the Zariski decomposition of the divisor $\pi^*(K_{\mathbb{P}^2 + \frac{1}{2}C_0} + cL) - tE$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)}(E) &= \frac{1}{(1-c)^2} \left(\int_0^\tau \text{vol}(\pi^*(-K_{\mathbb{P}^2} - \frac{1}{2}C_0 - cL) - tE) dt \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-c)^2} \left(\int_0^{1-c} \left((1-c)^2 - \frac{t^3}{3} \right) dt + \int_{1-c}^{3(1-c)} \frac{1}{6} (3(1-c) - t)^2 dt \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-c)^2} \left(\frac{8}{9}(1-c)^2 + \frac{4}{9}(1-c)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{4(1-c)}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\beta_{(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)}(E) = 0$ if and only if $c = \frac{7}{10}$.

(2) The computation in (1) shows that if $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cL_0)$ is K-semistable, then we have that

$$\beta_{\frac{1}{2}C + cL_0}(E) = \frac{7 - 10c}{6} \geq 0,$$

hence $0 \leq c \leq \frac{7}{10}$. By openness of K-semistability we have that $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + \frac{7}{10}L_0)$ is K-semistable. Moreover, $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C)$ is K-semistable [Der16; OSS16] and by interpolation, we have that $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C + cL_0)$ is K-semistable for any $0 \leq c \leq \frac{7}{10}$. \square

By the same computation, we get the following tables on the K-moduli walls, where the equation of the line L is $x_0 = 0$, and the corresponding polystable replacements on the walls.

Wall	Curve C	Line L	Weighted blow-up weights	β -invariant	Row in Table 2
$\frac{1}{4}$	$x_2(x_1^3 - x_2x_0^2)$	x_0	$(3, 2, 0)$	$(1 - 4c)/3$	3
$\frac{1}{4}$	$x_0x_1x_2(x_1 - x_2)$	x_0	$(0, 1, 1)$	$(1 - 4c)/6$	4
$\frac{2}{5}$	$x_1(x_1^3 + x_0x_2^2)$	x_0	$(3, 1, 0)$	$(2 - 5c)/3$	5
$\frac{1}{2}$	$x_0x_1(x_0x_2 - x_1^2)$	x_2	$(0, 1, 2)$	$(1 - 2c)/2$	6
$\frac{4}{7}$	$x_0^3x_2 - x_1^4$	x_2	$(0, 1, 4)$	$(4 - 7c)/3$	7
$\frac{7}{10}$	$x_0x_2^3 - x_2x_1^3$	x_0	$(1, 3, 0)$	$(7 - 10c)/6$	8

TABLE 1. K-moduli walls and polystable replacements obtained for each pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C, L)$ with the method of Proposition 4.11.

Remark 4.12. Notice, that up to projective equivalence, the curves and lines in Table 1 are identical to the corresponding entries in Table 2, except from rows 1 and 2, and the description in Theorem A.4. In particular, this shows that for each of the GIT_t -polystable pairs (C_4, L) of Theorem A.4, the log Fano pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cL)$ are K-semistable, with $t = 2c$.

We next verify that for each of the strictly GIT_t -semistable pairs (C_4, L) of Theorem A.6 the log Fano pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cL)$ are K-semistable, with $t = 2c$. Let $\tilde{C}' = \{f_4(y, z) + xz(f_2(y, z) + xz)\}$ such that the coefficient a of y in f_4 and the coefficient b of y in f_2 satisfy $b = 2a$. The pair (\tilde{C}', \tilde{L}) is strictly GIT_t -semistable for all $0 < t < 2$ by Theorem A.6, and degenerates via one-parameter subgroups to the pair $(2Q, L)$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let (C_4, L) be a strictly GIT_t -semistable pair, where $C \not\cong \tilde{C}'$. Then, the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cL)$ is strictly K-semistable for $t = 2c$.*

Proof. Let (C_4, L) be a strictly GIT_t -semistable pair, with $C \neq \tilde{C}$. Since the pair is strictly GIT semistable, there exists a one-parameter subgroup λ such that the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t) \cdot (C_4, L) = (C_0, L_0)$, where (C_0, L_0) is the strictly GIT_t -polystable pair detailed in Theorem A.4 such that $C_0 \neq 2Q$, from the above discussion. For each such pair, this one-parameter subgroup induces a family $f: (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$, over a curve B , such that the fibers $(\mathcal{C}_t, \mathcal{L}_t)$ are isomorphic to (C_4, L) for all $t \neq 0$, and $(\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{L}_0) \cong (C_0, L_0)$. From this construction, and similarly to Lemma 4.10 we obtain a map $\pi: (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C} + c\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow B$ which is naturally a test configuration of the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ with central fiber $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_0 + cL_0)$. Hence, we have constructed a test configuration $g: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ where the central fiber is a log Fano pair, which is K-polystable by the above discussion and Remark 4.12, and the general fiber $\mathcal{X}_t \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ is not isomorphic to \mathcal{X}_0 . By [Ara+23, Corollary 1.13] and Lemma 4.10 the general fiber $\mathcal{X}_t \cong (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ is strictly c -K-semistable, for $t = 2c$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.9. It follows from Lemma 4.10 and Theorem 2.18 that if the surface pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ is K-(semi/poly)stable, then (C_4, C_1) is GIT_t -(semi/poly)stable. For the converse, we need to compare the explicit stability conditions in Table 2 and Table 1. For the case when $c = 0$, it is known from [ADL24, Section 5] that a pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4)$ with C_4 not a double smooth conic is K-(semi/poly)stable if and only if C_4 is GIT-(semi/poly)stable, i.e. (C_4, C_1) is GIT_0 -(semi/poly)stable. This is covered in the above discussion, Remark 4.12 and Proposition 4.13. \square

4.3. VGIT of binomials on \mathbb{P}^1 and K-stability of pairs on $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. Consider the $\text{SL}(2)$ -action on $H'_8 \times H'_2 := \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8)) \times \mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2))$ induced by the natural action of $\text{SL}(2)$ on \mathbb{P}^1 . Take a polarization $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$ with $a, b > 0$ and set $t = b/a \in (0, +\infty)$. We call a pair $(f_8, f_2) \in H'_8 \times H'_2$ GIT_t -(semi/poly)stable if it is a (semi/poly)stable point under the $\text{SL}(2)$ -action with respect to $\mathcal{O}(a, b)$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{GIT}}(t) := [(H'_8 \times H'_2) //_t \text{PGL}(2)]$$

be the VGIT moduli stack, and $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ be its good moduli space.

Proposition 4.14. *A pair (f_8, f_2) is GIT_t -(semi)stable if and only if*

$$\text{mult}_p(f_8) + t \text{mult}_p(f_2) < (\leq) 4 + t$$

for any point $p \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. This follows from the classical GIT-stability of $\text{SL}(2)$ -action on $\mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(d))$ (cf. [MFK94]) and linearity of Hilbert-Mumford invariant (cf. [Ben14, Proposition 2.15]). \square

Immediately, we can obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.15. *There are six walls $t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, +\infty$, and five chambers for the VGIT moduli spaces.*

Let $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c)$ be the closure in the K-moduli space of the classes of pairs $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}C + cC')$ where C is an octic and C' is a quadric, with reduced scheme structure; and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c)$ be the preimage of the $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c)$ under the good moduli space morphism. We aim to prove the following theorem in the section.

Theorem 4.16. *Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be a rational number, and $t = t(c) = \frac{12c}{1-c}$. Let $F_8 = \{z^2 - f_8(x, y) = 0\}$ and $F_2 = \{f_2(x, y) = 0\}$ be curves on $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ of degree 8 and 2 respectively. Then the*

pair $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is K -(poly/semi)stable if and only if (f_8, f_2) is GIT_t -(poly/semi)stable. Moreover, there is an isomorphism

$$\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c) \simeq \overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{GIT}}(t).$$

We first need to construct the universal family. Let F_8 be a hyperelliptic curve in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ of degree 8 given by the equation $z^2 - f_8(x, y) = 0$. We identify F_8 to a point in the vector space $\mathbb{A} = H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8))$. Since there is a canonical isomorphism $H^0(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \mathcal{O}(2)) \simeq H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(2))$, we will not distinguish $\mathbb{P}H^0(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \mathcal{O}(2))$ with H'_2 . Notice there is a \mathbb{G}_m -action on $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$ by acting on the first factor of weight 8. Then H'_8 is naturally isomorphic to the coarse moduli space of the DM stack $[(\mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{G}_m]$. There is a natural $SL(2)$ -action on \mathbb{A} induced by the usual $SL(2)$ -action on $H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$. Since this $SL(2)$ -action commutes with the \mathbb{G}_m -action, it descends to an $SL(2)$ -action on $(H'_8 \times H'_2, \mathcal{O}(a, b))$.

Let

$$\pi : \left(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4) \times \mathbb{A} \times H'_2, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_8 + c\mathcal{F}_2 \right) \longrightarrow \mathbb{A} \times H'_2$$

be the universal family of pairs over $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$. Here the fiber of π over each point (f_8, f_2) of $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$ is $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$, where $F_8 = \{z^2 - f_8(x, y) = 0\}$ and $F_2 = \{f_2(x, y) = 0\}$. Then the \mathbb{G}_m -action on $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$ naturally lifts to the universal family via

$$\left((x : y : z), \frac{1}{2}(z^2 - f_8 = 0) + c(f_2 = 0) \right) \mapsto \left((x : y : t^4 z), \frac{1}{2}(z^2 - t^8 f_8 = 0) + c(f_2 = 0) \right)$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{G}_m$. After taking the \mathbb{G}_m -quotient, we obtain a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein family of log Fano pairs over $[(\mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{G}_m] \times H'_2$, and the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle $\lambda_{\text{CM}, \pi, c}$ on $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$ also descends to a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on $H'_8 \times H'_2$, denoted by $\Lambda_{\text{CM}, c}$.

Proposition 4.17. *The CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle $\Lambda_{\text{CM}, c}$ for this family over $H'_8 \times H'_2$ is proportional to $\mathcal{O}(1 - c, 12c)$.*

Proof. Write $\Lambda_{\text{CM}, c} = \mathcal{O}(a(c), b(c))$. First, notice that the CM \mathbb{Q} -line bundle with respect to π over $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$ is given by

$$-\pi_*(-K_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4) \times \mathbb{A} \times H'_2 / \mathbb{A} \times H'_2} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_8 - c\mathcal{F}_2)^3 = p_2^* \mathcal{O}_{H'_2}(3(1 - c)^2),$$

where $p_2 : \mathbb{A} \times H'_2 \rightarrow H'_2$ is the second projection. Since \mathbb{G}_m acts trivially on H'_2 , then $b(c) = 3c(1 - c)^2$. Now we compute the degree $a(c)$. As $\text{Pic}(\mathbb{A})$ is trivial, then the degree $a(c)$ equals to the \mathbb{G}_m -weight of the fiber $\lambda_{\text{CM}, \pi, c} \otimes \mathbb{C}((0, f_2))$ for any $f_2 \in H'_2$. It follows from [ADL24, Proposition 2.19] and [Xu21, Lemma 3.4] that

$$a(c) = -3(1 - c)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \beta_{(\mathbb{P}(1,1,4), 1/2(2Q) + cF_2)}(Q) = \frac{3(1 - c)^3}{12},$$

where $Q = \{z = 0\}$ is the conic at infinity. Thus, we conclude that $\Lambda_{\text{CM}, c}$ is proportional to $\mathcal{O}(1 - c, 12c)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.16. By Corollary 4.2, every K -semistable degeneration of $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is a pair on $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. It follows from Proposition 4.17 and Theorem 2.18 that a pair (F_8, F_2) is GIT_t -(semi/poly)stable if $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is K -(semi/poly)stable, where $t = \frac{12c}{1-c}$. Suppose now (F_8, F_2) is a GIT_t -semistable pair. We can take a family of pairs $(F_{8,b}, F_{2,b})_{b \in B}$ over a smooth pointed curve $0 \in B$ such that $(F_{8,0}, F_{2,0}) \simeq (F_8, F_2)$ and that $(F_{8,b}, F_{2,b})$ is a smooth octic $F_{8,b}$ together with a union of two distinct lines $F_{2,b}$ intersection $F_{8,b}$ transversely. By the properness of K -moduli spaces, one can find a limit $(F'_{8,0}, F'_{2,0})$ as $b \rightarrow 0$ such that

$(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F'_{8,0} + cF'_{2,0})$ is K-polystable, after a finite base change. Then $(F'_{8,0}, F'_{2,0})$ is GIT_t -polystable, and by the separatedness of GIT moduli spaces, we deduce that (F_8, F_2) specially degenerates to $g \cdot (F'_{8,0}, F'_{2,0})$ for some $g \in \text{PGL}(2)$. By openness of K-semistability, one has that $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is K-semistable. If moreover (F_8, F_2) is a GIT_t -polystable, then we must have that $(F_8, F_2) = g \cdot (F'_{8,0}, F'_{2,0})$ for some $g \in \text{PGL}(2)$, and hence $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is K-polystable.

From the equivalence of K-stability and VGIT stability, we obtain a morphism

$$\psi(c) : \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{GIT}}(t) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c),$$

which descends to an isomorphism $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)}^K(c) \simeq \overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{GIT}}(t)$ between moduli spaces by Zariski's main theorem. \square

Corollary 4.18. *For the K-moduli spaces of degree 2 log del Pezzo pairs (X, cD) with $D \in |-K_X|$, the walls are given by*

$$c \in \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{13}, \frac{1}{7}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{7}, \frac{7}{10}, 1 \right\}.$$

4.4. VGIT on the Kirwan blow-ups.

Theorem 4.19. *Let $(X, \frac{1}{2}D_1 + cD_2)$ be a K-polystable pair in $\overline{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c)$. Then*

- (1) *either $(X, \frac{1}{2}D_1 + cD_2) \simeq (\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ where (C_4, C_1) is a GIT_{2c} -polystable plane curve pair of degree 4 and 1 respectively, where C_4 is not projectively isomorphic to $[2Q]$;*
- (2) *or $(X, \frac{1}{2}D_1 + cD_2) \simeq (\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ where (f_8, f_2) is $\text{GIT}_{\frac{12c}{1-c}}$ -polystable.*

Conversely, any such pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ or $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is K-polystable.

Proof. We start with c -K-polystability implies GIT_t -polystability. Let $(X, \frac{1}{2}D_1 + cD_2)$ be a K-polystable pair. Then, by Corollary 4.2, we have that $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ or $X \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$. If $X = \mathbb{P}^2$, then D_1 and D_2 are plane curves of degree 4 and 1 respectively. Notice that D_1 is not projectively isomorphic to $2Q$ since otherwise the β -invariant of the pair with respect to the divisor Q is negative. It follows from Theorem 4.9 that (D_1, D_2) is GIT_{2c} -polystable. If $X \simeq \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$, then the $\text{GIT}_{\frac{12c}{1-c}}$ -polystability follows from Theorem 4.16.

For the converse, let (C_4, C_1) be a GIT_t -polystable pair. From Theorem A.4, C_4 cannot be projectively isomorphic to $2Q$. Then by Theorem 4.9 we conclude that the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}C_4 + cC_1)$ is $t/2$ -K-polystable. Similarly, let (F_8, F_2) be a GIT_t -polystable pair. Then, we conclude from Theorem 4.16 that the pair $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), \frac{1}{2}F_8 + cF_2)$ is c -K-polystable, where $c = \frac{t}{t+12}$, as required. \square

Now fix a plane conic Q , and let $[2Q]$ represent a non-reduced plane quartic curve.

Proposition 4.20. *Let $H = H_4 \times H_1$ and $G = \text{SL}(3)$ as before. Let $Q = \{q = zx - y^2 = 0\} \in H_2$, $2Q = \{q^2 = 0\} \in H_4$,*

$$Z = \{(2Q, L) \in H : |Q \cap L| = 2\}.$$

Let $G \cdot [Z]$ be the G -orbit of Z , and $\mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}$ be its normal bundle in H . Then the followings hold:

- (i) $T_H|_Z \cong T_{G \cdot [Z]}|_Z \oplus \mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z$ with $\iota : \mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \rightarrow T_H|_Z$ being the natural inclusion,
- (ii) $\mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \cong H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z$,
- (iii) *a Luna slice to the $\text{SL}(3)$ -orbit of $Z \subset H$ is given by the locally closed subset*

$$W := \{(\{q^2 + f_4 = 0\}, \{l = 0\}) \in H : (f_4, l) \in \iota(\mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z)\}$$

for all $t \in (0, 2)$.

Proof. Note that Theorem A.4 implies that, for all $t \in (0, 2)$ and all $x \in Z$, x is GIT_t polystable. In particular, $G \cdot [Z]$ is closed in H^{ss} and thus G_Z is reductive. In fact, we have $G_Z \simeq \text{SL}(2)$.

We first prove (ii); we have an inclusion $Z \subset G \cdot [Z] \subset H^{ss}$, which after taking closures in H gives $\overline{Z} \subset \overline{G \cdot [Z]} \subset H$. (Caution: $\overline{G \cdot [Z]} \neq G \cdot [\overline{Z}]$ but $\overline{G \cdot [Z]} = \overline{G \cdot [\overline{Z}]}$.) The chain of inclusions induces a short exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/\overline{G \cdot [Z]}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\overline{G \cdot [Z]}/H}|_{\overline{Z}} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $i: H_2 \hookrightarrow H_4$ be given by $i(f_2) = f_2^2$ and note that

$$\overline{Z} = \{[2Q]\} \times H_1 \subseteq i(H_2) \times H_1 = \overline{G \cdot [Z]}.$$

Let p_1, p_2 be the natural projections from \overline{Z} to $H_2 \cong i(H_2)$ and H_1 , respectively, induced naturally by the inclusion. Since $H_2 \cong \mathbb{P}^5$, we naturally have that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/\overline{G \cdot [Z]}} = p_1^* T_{H_2}|_{[2Q]} \otimes p_2^* \mathcal{O}_{H_1} \cong T_{\mathbb{P}^5}|_{[Q]} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Z}}.$$

Similarly, by restricting the projections p_1, p_2 from the product $H_4 \times H_2$ to the natural inclusion of \overline{Z} in H , we get:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/H} = p_1^* T_{H_4}|_{[2Q]} \otimes p_2^* \mathcal{O}_{H_1} \cong T_{\mathbb{P}^{14}}|_{[2Q]} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Z}}.$$

From the short exact sequence we obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_{\overline{G \cdot [Z]}/H}|_{\overline{Z}} \cong \left(\mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/H} / \mathcal{N}_{\overline{Z}/\overline{G \cdot [Z]}} \right) \Big|_{\{[2Q]\} \times H_1} \cong (p_1^* T_{H_4} / p_1^* T_{H_2})|_{[2Q]} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Z}} \cong H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\overline{Z}},$$

where the last isomorphism follows from [ADL24, eq. (5.5)]. Finally, note that $\mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \cong \mathcal{N}_{\overline{G \cdot [Z]}/H}|_Z$, completing the proof of (ii).

Now we prove (i), that is, $T_H|_Z \cong \mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \oplus T_{G \cdot [Z]}|_Z$. To see this, let $p_1: G \cdot [Z] \rightarrow G \cdot [2Q] \subset H_4$ and $p_2: G \cdot [Z] \rightarrow H_1$ induced by restricting the natural projections $H \rightarrow H_4, H \rightarrow H_1$ respectively. Then we have that $T_{G \cdot [Z]}|_Z \cong p_1^* T_{G \cdot [2Q]}|_Z \oplus p_2^* T_{H_1}|_Z$. By restricting to H^{ss} we similarly obtain

$$T_{H^{ss}}|_Z \simeq p_1^* T_{H_4}|_Z \oplus p_2^* T_{H_1}|_Z \simeq p_1^* (T_{H_4}|_{[2Q]})|_Z \oplus p_2^* T_{H_1}|_Z \simeq N_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \oplus p_1^* T_{G \cdot [2Q]}|_Z \oplus p_2^* T_{H_1}|_Z,$$

where the last isomorphism follows from [ADL24, Proof of Lemma 5.12] and (ii). Therefore, the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_{G \cdot [Z]}|_Z \longrightarrow T_H|_Z \longrightarrow N_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z \longrightarrow 0$$

naturally splits and (i) holds. The natural projection $T_H|_Z \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/H}|_Z$ defined as $(z, w_z, m_z) \mapsto (z, m_z)$ has a zero-section ι . By composing ι with the exponential map $T_H \rightarrow H$, which is étale, we obtain the Luna slice W . As $Z \subset H^{ss}$ and $(q^2 + f_4, l)$ degenerates to $(q, l) \in H^{ss}$, so by openness of the semistable locus, $W \subset H^{ss}$, completing the proof of (iii). \square

4.5. K-moduli spaces as global VGIT quotients. In the end of this section, we will prove that the K-moduli can be realized as a global GIT quotient; see Theorem 4.22.

Proposition 4.21. *Let $U_t \subseteq H_4 \times H_1$ be the GIT_t -semistable locus under the $\text{PGL}(3)$ -action, and $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}_4 + c\mathcal{C}_1) \rightarrow U_t$ be the universal family. Then by taking the stacky weighted blow-up of weight 2 (see [ADL24, Definition 5.10]) $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \rightarrow U_t$ along the orbit of $([2Q], [L])$ with exceptional divisor \mathcal{E} and a contraction morphism, one has a universal family $(\mathcal{Z}, 1/2\mathcal{C}_{Z,4} + c\mathcal{C}_{Z,1}) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$ satisfying that*

- (1) *it is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{P}^2, \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}_4 + c\mathcal{C}_1)|_{U_t \setminus G \cdot ([2Q], [L])} \rightarrow U_t \setminus G \cdot ([2Q], [L])$ over the open locus $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \setminus \mathcal{E}$, and*
- (2) *the fibers over \mathcal{E} are of the form $(\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4), 1/2F_8 + cF_2)$, where $F_8 = \{z^2 - f_8(x, y) = 0\}$ and $F_2 = \{f_2(x, y) = 0\}$ for some $f_i \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(i))$.*

(3) Consider the exceptional divisor \mathcal{E}_W of the stacky blow-up $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_t := \widetilde{U}_t \times_{U_t} W \rightarrow W$. Then the family $(\mathcal{Z}, 1/2\mathcal{C}_{Z,4} + c\mathcal{C}_{Z,1}) \times_{\widetilde{U}_t} \mathcal{E}_W \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_W$ is isomorphic to the universal family over $[(\mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{G}_m] \times H'_2$.

Proof. Recall that by Proposition 4.20(ii) the restriction of the normal bundle of $G \cdot Z$ in U on $Z = \{(2Q, L) \in H : |Q \cap L| = 2\}$ is naturally isomorphic to

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(8)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z,$$

with an induced $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ -action. Let $\widetilde{U}_t \rightarrow U_t$ be the stacky blow-up along the G -orbit of $([2Q], [L])$, and $\widetilde{U}_t \rightarrow U_t$ the scheme-theoretic blow-up, which are both $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -equivariant. Let \mathcal{E} and E be the stacky and scheme-theoretic exceptional divisors, respectively. Let

$$(\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{U}_t}^2, 1/2\mathcal{C}_4 + c\mathcal{C}_1) \longrightarrow \widetilde{U}_t \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{U}_t}^2, 1/2\mathcal{C}_4 + c\mathcal{C}_1) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$$

be the pull-back of the universal family.

Take the blow-up $\psi : (\mathcal{X}, 1/2\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X},4} + c\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X},1}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t}^2, 1/2\mathcal{C}_4 + c\mathcal{C}_1)$ of the universal family along the conic component of the fiber over \mathcal{E} , and let \mathcal{G} be the exceptional divisor. Notice that this blow-up is $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -equivariant and also gives a flat family over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$, whose fibers over points in \mathcal{E} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \setminus \mathcal{E}$ are $\mathbb{P}^2 \cup \mathbb{F}_4$ and \mathbb{P}^2 respectively, where \mathbb{F}_4 is the 4-Hirzebruch surface. In fact, the fibers over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \setminus \mathcal{E}$ are not changed.

Let \mathcal{H} be the proper transform of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t}^2$ in \mathcal{X} and note that the pre-images of any point in \mathcal{E} (respectively \mathcal{G}) in \mathcal{H} is \mathbb{P}^2 (respectively \mathbb{F}_4). Now we prove that \mathcal{H} is contractible over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$. Let \mathcal{Q}_0 be a divisor class on \mathcal{X} obtained by pulling back some conic curve Q_0 in \mathbb{P}^2 . Then $\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}$ is positive over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \setminus \mathcal{E}$ and trivial over \mathcal{E} . Moreover, the restriction of $\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}$ on the \mathbb{F}_4 component of any fiber over \mathcal{E} is $4f + e$, where f and e are the fiber and negative section class on \mathbb{F}_4 respectively. In particular, we have that $(\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}.f) = 1$ and $(\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}.e) = 0$. As $\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}$ is relatively nef over \mathcal{E} and trivial on \mathcal{H} , then $a(\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}) - K_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^2}$ is relatively ample over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$ for some $a > 0$. It follows from the base point free theorem that the divisor $\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}$ gives a desired contraction over $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$. Denote by $(\mathcal{Z}, 1/2\mathcal{C}_{Z,4} + c\mathcal{C}_{Z,1})$ the image of the contraction. By our construction, the fibers in \mathcal{Z} over points in $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \setminus \mathcal{E}$ and in \mathcal{E} are \mathbb{P}^2 and $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ respectively. Moreover, as the line bundle $\mathcal{Q}_0 - \mathcal{G}$ is naturally $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -polarized, the construction is $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -equivariant, and hence the construction descends to the quotient. This proves (1).

Now let us focus on the degeneration of boundary divisors. We can base change to the Luna slice W by functoriality. We can reduce the problem to finding the limit of boundary divisors on \mathbb{P}^2 when \mathbb{P}^2 degenerates to $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ as in [ADL24, Theorem 5.14]. Here the difference is that our boundary divisors consist of two parts, the quartic curve and the line.

Take the standard degeneration of \mathbb{P}^2 to $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$ in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 2)_{x,y,z,w}$, given by the family $\mathcal{X} = \{xz - y^2 = tw\} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_t^1$. The fiber over $t \neq 0$ is $\mathcal{X}_t \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ and the fiber over 0 is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)_{u,v,s}$. Taking the pull-back of the equations on the Luna slice, one deduces that an equation over $t \neq 0$ is of the form

$$(w^2 + f_4(x, y, z) = 0, l(x, y, z) = 0)$$

and the equation over $t = 0$ is

$$(s^2 + \overline{f}_8(u, v) := s^2 + f_4(u^2, uv, v^2) = 0, \overline{l}_2(u, v) := l(u^2, uv, v^2) = 0),$$

proving (2).

As the assigned weight on $\mathcal{N}_{G \cdot [Z]/U_t}$ is the same as that of the \mathbb{G}_m -action σ on $\mathbb{A} \times H'_2$, we deduce (3) as desired. \square

Let $\mathcal{I}_t \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{U_t}$ be the ideal sheaf such that $\tilde{U}_t = \text{Bl}_{\mathcal{I}_t} U_t$, and $\overline{\mathcal{I}}_t \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{H_4 \times H_1}$ be the $\text{SL}(3)$ -equivariantly extended ideal sheaf of \mathcal{I}_t whose cosupport is the closure of $G \cdot ([2Q], [L])$ in $H_4 \times H_1$. In fact, $\overline{\mathcal{I}}_t$ is the ideal sheaf of the smooth locus $(G \cdot [2Q]) \times H_1$. Let $\pi_H : \tilde{H} = \text{Bl}_{\overline{\mathcal{I}}_t}(H_4 \times H_1) \rightarrow H_4 \times H_1$ be the blow-up and \overline{E} the exceptional divisor. Then the line bundle $L_{k,t} := \pi_H^* \mathcal{O}(k, kt) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-E)$ is an $\text{SL}(3)$ -linearized polarization on \tilde{H} for any sufficiently divisible and large integer k . It follows from [Kir85] that the GIT_t -stability of $(\tilde{H}, \mathcal{L}_{k,t})$ is independent of the choice of $k \gg 1$, and the GIT_t -semistable locus \tilde{H}_t^{ss} is contained in $\tilde{U}_t = \pi_H^{-1}(U_t)$. Let U_t^{ps} and \tilde{H}_t^{ps} be the GIT_t -polystable loci in $H_4 \times H_1$ and \tilde{H} respectively. Set $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t^{ss} := \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \times_{\tilde{U}_t} \tilde{H}_t^{ss}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t^{ps} := \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t \times_{\tilde{U}_t} \tilde{H}_t^{ps}$.

Theorem 4.22. *For any rational number $t \in (0, 2)$ and $c = 2t$, there is an isomorphism*

$$\psi_t : \left[\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t^{ss} / \text{PGL}(3) \right] \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^K(c).$$

Proof. Let $E_{V,t}^{ps}$ be the GIT_t -polystable locus in the exceptional divisor E_V of the blow-up $\tilde{V} \rightarrow V$. Then by [Kir85], we have that

$$\tilde{U}_t^{ps} = \pi_H^{-1}(U_t^{ps} \setminus G \cdot ([2Q], [L])) \cup G \cdot E_{V,t}^{ps}.$$

By Theorem 4.19, the fibers of $(\mathcal{Z}, 1/2\mathcal{C}_{Z,4} + c\mathcal{C}_{Z,1}) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t$ over \tilde{U}_t^{ps} are all c -K-polystable. By openness, we deduce that each fiber over $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t^{ss}$ is K-semistable. The existence of morphism ψ_t follows from the universal property of the K-moduli stacks.

The proof of isomorphism between stacks is the same as that of [ADL24, Theorem 5.15], which makes use of Alper's criterion (cf. [Alp13, Proposition 6.4]). \square

5. THE WALLS OF K-MODULI SPACES FOR DEGREE $d \geq 5$

For the purpose of completeness, we will determine all the K-moduli walls for $d = 5, 6, 7, 8, 9$ in this section, in spite of the lack of VGIT set-up.

Let (X, cC) be a log del Pezzo pair admitting a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein smoothing to (Σ_d, cD_d) , where Σ_d is the smooth del Pezzo surface of degree d (for $d = 8$ we have $\Sigma_8 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\Sigma_8' = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$), and $D_d \in |-K_{\Sigma_d}|$ is a smooth divisor. Then the pair (X, cC) is K-(poly/semi)stable if and only if $(X, \frac{1}{2}c(2C))$ is K-(poly/semi)stable. In particular, the walls for the K-moduli of pairs (X, cC) with $C \in |-K_X|$ and $c \in (0, 1)$ are exactly those for the K-moduli of pairs (X, cD) with $D \in |-2K_X|$ and $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, which correspond to the destabilization of pairs where $D = 2C$ for some $C \in |-K_X|$. Thus, for $d = 5, 8, 9$, we obtain all the K-moduli walls by applying [ADL23a; ADL24; PSW23; Zha24] directly, and noting that by Theorem 3.1 the variety X is Gorenstein.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number, and $\overline{M}_{d,c}^K$ be the K-moduli of pairs (X, cD) as above.*

- (1) *If $d = 9$, then there are no walls.*
- (2) *If $d = 8$ and $\Sigma_8 = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, then there is a unique wall $c = \frac{1}{4}$.*
- (3) *If $d = 8$ and $\Sigma_8 = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$, then there are two walls $c_1 = \frac{1}{5}$ and $c_2 = \frac{1}{4}$.*
- (4) *If $d = 5$, then there are six walls $c = \frac{2}{17}, \frac{4}{19}, \frac{2}{7}, \frac{8}{23}, \frac{4}{9}, \frac{4}{7}$.*

For the cases when $d = 6$ and $d = 7$, the K-moduli of log pairs with boundary in $|-2K_X|$ is not available in the literature, so extra computations are needed. In the rest of this section, we will prove the following result.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number, and $\overline{M}_{d,c}^K$ be the K-moduli of pairs (X, cD) as above.*

- (1) If $d = 7$, then there are three walls $c = \frac{4}{25}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{5}$.
(2) If $d = 6$, then there are five walls $c = \frac{2}{11}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{5}{14}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}$.

See also Appendix B for an explicit description.

5.1. The case for $d = 7$. Before starting the proof, we give an explanation of the idea of the proof. The easy observation is that every K-wall $c = c_i$ is contributed by some pair, meaning that there is a pair (X, D) such that $(X, c_i D)$ is K-semistable, but (X, cD) is K-unstable for any $0 < c < c_i$. By volume comparison, we know that X has at worst Du Val singularities, then for each possible surface X with Du Val singularities, we can analyze the stability region for divisors in $|-K_X|$. Equivalently, we give a stratification of the linear series $|-K_X|$ for any possible X .

There are only two different del Pezzo surfaces of degree $d = 7$ with Du Val singularities. The first one, which we will denote by X , is smooth, and it is classically obtained by blowing up \mathbb{P}^2 along two points $p = (0 : 0 : 1)$ and $q = (0 : 1 : 0)$. Let $l \subseteq X$ be the proper transform of the line $\{x = 0\}$ through p and q . The second surface, which we denote by X' , has precisely one A_1 -singularity. X can be realised by blowing a point in the only (-1) -curve of \mathbb{F}_1 and contracting the proper transform of such curve to the singularity (cf. [HW81, Theorem 3.4]). We will denote this curve by E .

Proposition 5.3. *If a pair (X, cD) is K-semistable, then $c \geq \frac{4}{25}$; if a pair (X', cD') is K-semistable, then $c \geq \frac{2}{9}$.*

Proof. Suppose that (X, cD) is K-semistable. Then we have that $\beta_{(X, cD)}(l) \geq 0$. Since $A_{(X, cD)}(l) \leq 1$, and $S_{(X, cD)}(l) = \frac{25}{21}(1 - c)$, then we must have $c \geq \frac{4}{25}$. Similarly, one can show that

$$\beta_{(X', cD')}(E) = A_{(X', cD')}(E) - \frac{9}{7}(1 - c) \leq 1 - \frac{9}{7}(1 - c) \leq 0$$

if $c \leq \frac{2}{9}$. □

In fact, by the same computation as in the proof, one can obtain the following results.

Corollary 5.4. *If $D \in |-K_X|$ has l as a component, then (X, cD) is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$; If $D' \in |-K_{X'}|$ passes through the A_1 -singularity, then (X', cD') is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

Let us first deal with the smooth surface X . A member $C \in |-K_X|$ is the proper transform of a plane cubic curve \overline{C} with $p, q \in \overline{C}$. Thus, we can identify \overline{C} with a cubic polynomial

$$yz(ay + bz) + xf_2(y, z) + x^2 f_1(y, z) + x^3.$$

Note that $a = b = 0$ if and only if l is in the support of C .

Proposition 5.5. *Let $C \in |-K_X|$ be a curve as above. If $ab \neq 0$, then (X, cC) is K-semistable for $c = \frac{4}{25}$; if either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ (but not both), then (X, cC) is K-semistable for $c = \frac{4}{25}$, but K-unstable for $c < \frac{4}{25}$.*

Proof. If $ab \neq 0$, then the \mathbb{G}_m -action defined by $t \cdot (x : y : z) = (tx : y : z)$ induces an isotrivial degeneration from (X, cC) to (X, cC_0) , where C_0 is the proper transform of the plane cubic $yz(ay + bz) = 0$, consisting of three lines through $(1 : 0 : 0)$. These lines are distinct if and only if $ab \neq 0$. The pair (X, cC_0) is a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one, so one can apply Theorem 2.10. Indeed, note that C_0 is not a toric divisor and the \mathbb{G}_m -action above is in $\text{Aut}^0(X, C_0)$. It follows that the only \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant divisors are the lines through $(1 : 0 : 0)$. Of these, the only horizontal divisor for (X, cC_0) on X is l , and one has that $\beta_{(X, cC_0)}(l) = 0$ if and only if $c = \frac{4}{25}$. One can easily check

that when $c = \frac{4}{25}$, the β -invariant with respect to any vertical divisor is positive. Thus $(X, \frac{4}{25}C_0)$ is K-semistable, and so is $(X, \frac{4}{25}C)$ by openness of K-semistability.

If $ab = 0$, then we may assume that $b = 0$ and $a = 1$. In this case, we claim that the coefficient of y^2 in $f_2(y, z)$ is non-zero. In fact, if otherwise, then the β -invariant of (X, cC) with respect to the exceptional divisor over $q = (0 : 1 : 0)$ is at most $1 - c - \frac{25}{21}(1 - c) < 0$ for any $0 < c < 1$. Applying the same argument and using the \mathbb{G}_m -action $t \cdot (x, y, z) = (t^2x : y : tz)$, one concludes that (X, cC) is K-semistable for $c = \frac{4}{25}$, but K-unstable for $c < \frac{4}{25}$. \square

To show that $c = \frac{4}{25}$ is the first wall, we need to show that any other (Y, D) (which in this case we know it can only be $Y = X'$) does not induce a wall before $c = \frac{4}{25}$. Since by Corollary 5.4, when the pair (X, cC) is K-semistable for some c , the curve \overline{C} must not have $a = b = 0$, then Proposition 5.5 provides the explicit description of the walls when Y is smooth. Furthermore, if (Y, cD) is K-semistable where Y is a del Pezzo surface of degree 7 and $D \in |-K_Y|$, for a point $x \in Y$, by [LL19, Proposition 4.6], we have

$$7(1 - c)^2 = (-K_Y - cD)^2 \leq \frac{9}{4}\widehat{\text{vol}}(x, Y, D) \leq \frac{9}{4}\widehat{\text{vol}}(x, Y).$$

Furthermore, if x is singular, locally $(x \in Y) \sim \mathbb{C}^2/G$ for some non-trivial finite group G and by [LX19, Theorem 2.7] we have that

$$|G| \leq 4 \cdot \frac{9}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{7(1 - c)^2} < 2$$

for all $c < \frac{14-3\sqrt{14}}{14}$, where we use the fact that $\widehat{\text{vol}}(x, Y) = \frac{4}{|G|}$. Hence, for all $c < \frac{14-3\sqrt{14}}{14}$ we have that $Y \cong X$ is smooth, and the first wall is given by $c = \frac{4}{25}$.

Now let us focus on the surface X' with an A_1 -singularity P . Similar as before, a divisor $C' \in |-K_{X'}|$ comes from a plane cubic curve \overline{C}' passing through the tangent vector supported at $(0 : 0 : 1)$ along the direction of $\{x = 0\}$ to blow up. Thus, we can identify C' with a cubic polynomial

$$z^2g_1(x, y) + zg_2(x, y) + g_3(x, y) = 0.$$

If $g_1(x, y) \neq 0$, then $g_1(x, y)$ is a multiple of x .

Lemma 5.6. *If $g_1(x, y) = 0$, then (X', cC') is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

Proof. Let E be the exceptional divisor of the blow-up of X' at P , which is a (-2) -curve. Since $g_1(x, y) = 0$, then, we have that $A_{(X', cC')}(E) \leq 1 - c$. On the other hand, we have that $S_{(X', cC')}(E) = \frac{9}{7}(1 - c)$, and thus

$$\beta_{(X', cC')}(E) \leq -\frac{2}{7}(1 - c) < 0$$

for any $0 < c < 1$. Therefore, (X', cC') is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$. \square

Now we may assume that $g_1(x, y) = x$. Another observation is the following.

Lemma 5.7. *If the coefficient of y^2 in $g_2(x, y)$ and the coefficient of y^3 in $g_3(x, y)$ are both zero, then (X', cC') is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

Proof. Under the assumption, the strict transform of $\{x = 0\}$, denoted by l' , is a component of C' . Computing the β -invariant of (X', cC') with respect to l' similarly as in Lemma 5.6, one concludes that (X', cC') is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$. \square

Proposition 5.8. *Let $C' \in |-K_{X'}|$ be a curve such that $g_1(x, y) = x$.*

- (1) *If the coefficient of y^2 in $g_2(x, y)$ is non-zero, then (X', cC') is K-semistable when $c = \frac{2}{9}$, and K-unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{9}$.*

- (2) If the coefficient of y^2 in $g_2(x, y)$ is zero, but the coefficient of y^3 in $g_3(x, y)$ is non-zero, then (X', cC') is K -semistable when $c = \frac{2}{5}$, and K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{5}$.

Proof. The proof strategy is the same as in proof of Proposition 5.5.

- (1) Notice that the \mathbb{G}_m -action of weight $(0, 1, 2)$ yields an isotrivial degeneration of (X', cC') to (X', cC'_0) , where C'_0 comes from the cubic curve $z(zx + ay^2) = 0$. Since (X', cC') is a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one, one can apply Theorem 2.10 to prove that it is K -polystable when $c = \frac{2}{9}$. By openness of K -semistability, one proves that $(X', \frac{2}{9}C')$ is K -semistable. The second statement follows from Lemma 5.3.
- (2) This is similar to the proof of (1), but here we use the \mathbb{G}_m -action of weight $(0, 2, 3)$. □

Corollary 5.9. *There are three walls $c = \frac{4}{25}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{5}$ for the K -moduli $\overline{M}_{7,c}^K$.*

5.2. The case for $d = 6$. Recall that we have a classification of del Pezzo surfaces of degree 6 with at worst Du Val singularities (cf. [CP21a, Big Table, Section 8]). We will describe the geometry of these surfaces when using them. The notation we use is the following: we will denote for instance the surface with exactly one A_2 -singularity by X_2 , and the one with exactly one A_1 -singularity and one A_2 -singularity by $X_{1,2}$.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ be a rational number, then $\overline{M}_{6,\epsilon}$ is isomorphic to the GIT quotient $| -K_{\Sigma_6} | // \text{Aut}(\Sigma_6)$, where Σ_6 is the smooth sextic del Pezzo surface.*

Proof. The proof follows from a similar argument as in [Zha24, Proof of Theorem 3.2]. □

Recall that X_1 is anti-canonical model of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at $p_1 = (1 : 0 : 0)$, $p_2 = (0 : 1 : 0)$ and $p_3 = (1 : 1 : 0)$. A curve $C \in | -K_{X_1} |$ comes from a plane cubic \overline{C} passing through p_1, p_2, p_3 . Thus, we can identify C with the defining polynomial of \overline{C} :

$$f_3(x, y) + zf_2(x, y) + z^2f_1(x, y) + z^3 = 0.$$

Notice that if $f_3(x, y) \neq 0$, then it is a constant multiple of $xy(x - y)$.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $C \in | -K_{X_1} |$ be a curve.*

- (1) If C satisfies that $f_3(x, y) = 0$, then (X_1, cC) is K -unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.
- (2) If $f_3(x, y) \neq 0$, then $(X_1, \frac{1}{4}C)$ is K -semistable, and (X_1, cC) is K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{1}{4}$.

Proof. Denote by \widetilde{X}_1 the surface obtained by blowing up \mathbb{P}^2 at p_1, p_2, p_3 , and by l the strict transform of the line containing p_1, p_2, p_3 on \widetilde{X} . We will compute the β -invariant with respect to l . We have that

$$S_{(X_1, cC)}(l) = \frac{1-c}{6} \left(\int_0^1 6 - 2t^2 dt + \int_1^3 (3-t)^2 dt \right) = \frac{4}{3}(1-c).$$

If $f_3(x, y) = 0$, then $A_{(X_1, cC)}(l) \leq 1 - c$, and hence $\beta_{(X_1, cC)}(l) < 0$ for any $0 < c < 1$. Thus (X_1, cC) is K -unstable. If $f_3(x, y) \neq 0$, then $A_{(X_1, cC)}(l) = 1$. Thus, if (X_1, cC) is K -semistable, one has to have $1 - \frac{4}{3}(1 - c) \geq 0$, and hence $c \geq \frac{1}{4}$. On the other hand, consider the pair (X', cC_0) , where C_0 comes from the cubic $\{xy(x - y) = 0\}$. Notice that (X', cC_0) is a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one, and that (X', cC) admits an isotrivial degeneration to (X', cC_0) , induced by the \mathbb{G}_m -action $t \cdot (x : y : z) = (x : y : tz)$. One can apply Theorem 2.10 to prove that (X', cC_0) is K -polystable for $c = \frac{1}{4}$. Therefore, by openness of K -semistability, one deduces that $(X', \frac{1}{4}C)$ is K -semistable. □

The surface X'_1 is anti-canonical model of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 along $p = (1 : 0 : 0)$ and along the tangent direction of $\{x = 0\}$ at $q = (0 : 0 : 1)$. A curve $C \in |-K_{X'_1}|$ comes from a plane cubic \overline{C} passing through the point p and the tangent vector v to blow up. Thus, we can identify C with the defining polynomial of \overline{C} :

$$z^2 f_1(x, y) + z f_2(x, y) + f_3(x, y) = 0.$$

If $f_1(x, y) \neq 0$, then we may assume that $f_1(x, y) = x$.

Proposition 5.12. *Let $C \in |-K_{X'_1}|$ be a curve and $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number.*

- (1) *If $f_1(x, y) = 0$, then (X'_1, cC) is K -unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*
- (2) *Assume that $f_1(x, y) = x$ and f_2 has a non-zero x^2 term. Then (X'_1, cC) is K -semistable when $c = \frac{2}{11}$, and is K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{11}$.*
- (3) *Assume that $f_1(x, y) = x$, f_2 has no x^2 term, and f_3 has a non-zero $x^2 y$ term. Then (X'_1, cC) is K -semistable when $c = \frac{2}{11}$, and is K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{11}$.*
- (4) *If $f_1(x, y) = x$, f_2 has no x^2 term, and f_3 has no $x^2 y$ term, then (X'_1, cC) is K -unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

Proof. Identify C with the cubic equation as above.

- (1) The proof of (1) is the same as that of Proposition 5.11(1).
- (2) The \mathbb{G}_m -action of weight $(1, 0, 1)$ yields an isotrivial degeneration of (X'_1, cC) to a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one (X'_1, cC_0) , where C_0 comes from the plane cubic $\{xz(z+x) = 0\}$. One can apply Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 to check that $(X'_1, \frac{2}{11}C_0)$ is K -polystable. Indeed, the horizontal divisor on X'_1 is the strict transform l of the line $\{y = 0\}$. One has that $A_{(X_{1,1}, cC_0)}(E) = 1$ and that $S_{(X_{1,1}, cC_0)}(E) = \frac{11}{9}(1-c)$, so $\beta_{(X'_1, cC_0)}(E) = 0$ if and only if $c = \frac{2}{11}$. One also checks that the β -invariants of all vertical divisors are positive when $c = \frac{2}{11}$. Thus $(X'_1, \frac{2}{11}C_0)$ is K -polystable and $(X'_1, \frac{2}{11}C)$ is K -semistable by openness. The same computation also shows that (X'_1, cC) is K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{11}$.
- (3) We apply the same method of proof as in (2), but we use the \mathbb{G}_m -action of weight $(2, 0, 1)$ to obtain an isotrivial degeneration to the pair (X'_1, cC_1) , where C_1 comes from the plane cubic $\{x(z^2 + xy) = 0\}$.
- (4) In this case, one can check that the β -invariant with respect to the exceptional divisor over $p = (0 : 0 : 1)$ is negative for any $0 < c < 1$.

□

The surface $X_{1,1}$ is anti-canonical model of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 along $p = (0 : 1 : 0)$ and along the tangent direction of $\{z = 0\}$ at $q = (1 : 0 : 0)$. A curve $C \in |-K_{X_{1,1}}|$ comes from a plane cubic \overline{C} passing through the point p and the tangent vector v to blow up. Thus, we can identify C with the defining polynomial of \overline{C} :

$$x^2 f_1(y, z) + x f_2(y, z) + f_3(y, z) = 0.$$

If $f_1(y, z) \neq 0$, then we may assume that $f_1(y, z) = z$.

Proposition 5.13. *Let $C \in |-K_{X_{1,1}}|$ be a curve and $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number.*

- (1) *If $f_1(y, z) = 0$, then $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ is K -unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*
- (2) *Assume that $f_1(y, z) = z$ and f_2 has a non-zero y^2 term. Then $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ is K -semistable when $c = \frac{5}{14}$, and is K -unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{5}{14}$.*
- (3) *Assume that $f_1(y, z) = z$. If f_2 has no y^2 term, then $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ is K -unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

Proof. The proof of (1) is the same as in Proposition 5.11(1). For (2), first notice that the \mathbb{G}_m -action of weight $(2, 1, 0)$ yields an isotrivial degeneration of $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ to a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one $(X_{1,1}, cC_0)$, where C_0 comes from the plane cubic $\{x(xz + ay^2) = 0\}$ for some $a \neq 0$. We can apply Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 to check that $(X_{1,1}, \frac{5}{14}C_0)$ is K-polystable. Indeed, the horizontal divisor on $X_{1,1}$ is the exceptional divisor F over $(1 : 0 : 0)$ which passes through one of the A_1 -singularities. One has that $A_{(X_{1,1}, cC_0)}(F) = 1$ and $S_{(X_{1,1}, cC_0)}(F) = \frac{14}{9}(1 - c)$, so $\beta_{(X_{1,1}, cC_0)}(F) = 0$ if and only if $c = \frac{5}{14}$. One also checks that the β -invariants of all vertical divisors are positive when $c = \frac{5}{14}$. Thus $(X_{1,1}, \frac{5}{14}C_0)$ is K-polystable and $(X_{1,1}, \frac{5}{14}C)$ is K-semistable by openness. The same computation also shows that $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ is K-unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{5}{14}$.

For (3), one computes the β invariant with respect to the exceptional divisor E over $X_{1,1}$ coming from the line $\{z = 0\}$, and prove that $\beta_{(X_{1,1}, cC)}(E) < 0$ for any $0 < c < 1$. \square

The surface X_2 with exactly one A_2 -singularity is obtained by blowing up \mathbb{P}^2 along a 0-dimensional subscheme of length 3 which is supported at $(1 : 0 : 0)$ and curvilinear with respect to a conic $\{xz - y^2 = 0\}$. A curve $C \in |-K_{X_2}|$ comes from a plane cubic \overline{C} passing through the 0-dimensional scheme to blow up. Thus, we can identify C with the defining polynomial of \overline{C} :

$$x^2 f_1(y, z) + x f_2(y, z) + f_3(y, z) = 0.$$

If $f_1(y, z) \neq 0$, then we may assume that $f_1(x, y) = z$.

Proposition 5.14. *Let $C \in |-K_{X_2}|$ be a curve and $0 < c < 1$ be a rational number.*

- (1) *If $f_1(y, z) = 0$, then (X_2, cC) is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*
- (2) *Assume that $f_1(y, z) = z$, then $f_2(y, z)$ has non-zero y^2 term, and the pair $(X_2, \frac{2}{5}C)$ is K-semistable, but (X_2, cC) is K-unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{5}$.*

Proof. The proof of (1) is the same as in Proposition 5.11(1). For (2), if $f_1(y, z) = z$, then the assumption that \overline{C} passes through the length 3 subscheme to blow up implies that $f_2(y, z) = -y^2 + ayz + bz^2$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, the \mathbb{G}_m -action λ of weight $(2, 1, 0)$ yields an isotrivial degeneration of $(X_{1,1}, cC)$ to a \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one (X_2, cC_0) , where C_0 comes from the plane cubic $\{x(xz - y^2) = 0\}$ for some $a \neq 0$. We can apply Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 to check that $(X_2, \frac{2}{5}C_0)$ is K-polystable. In this case, there are no horizontal divisors on $X_{1,1}$, and one can check that the β -invariants of all vertical divisors are positive when $c = \frac{2}{5}$. The condition that $\text{Fut}(\lambda) = 0$ is equivalent to saying that $\beta_{((X_2, cC_0))}(G) = 0$, where G is the exceptional divisor of the $(2, 1, 0)$ weighted blow-up at $(0 : 0 : 1)$. We have that

$$A_{(X_2, cC_0)}(G) = 3 - 4c, \quad \text{and} \quad S_{((X_2, cC_0))}(G) = \frac{7}{3}(1 - c),$$

and hence $\beta_{((X_2, cC_0))}(G) = 0$ if and only if $c = \frac{2}{5}$. Thus $(X_2, \frac{2}{5}C_0)$ is K-polystable and $(X_2, \frac{2}{5}C)$ is K-semistable by openness. The same computation also shows that (X_2, cC) is K-unstable for any $0 < c < \frac{2}{5}$. \square

Observe that the surface $X_{1,2}$ is a toric surface with Picard rank 1, and hence a weighted projective plane. It is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3)_{u,v,w}$. The same proof to Proposition 5.11(1) shows the following lemma.

Lemma 5.15. *If a curve $C \in |-K_{X_{1,2}}|$ passes through any singularity of $X_{1,2}$, then $(X_{1,2}, cC)$ is K-unstable for any $0 < c < 1$.*

We now assume that $C \in |-K_{X_{1,2}}|$ is a curve avoiding both of the two singularities of $X_{1,2}$. Using the coordinates of the weighted projective plane $\mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3)_{u,v,w}$, we may assume that C is given by the polynomial $y^3 + z^2 + x f_5(x, y, z)$.

Proposition 5.16. *The pair $(X_{1,2}, cC)$ admits an isotrivial degeneration to the \mathbb{T} -pair of complexity-one $(X_{1,2}, cC_0)$, where $C_0 = \{y^3 - z^2 = 0\}$. Moreover, the pair $(X_{1,2}, cC)$ is K -semistable for $c = \frac{1}{2}$, but K -unstable for $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. The degeneration is induced by the \mathbb{G}_m action of weight $(0, 3, 2)$ on (u, v, w) . Let us only verify that $(X_{1,2}, cC_0)$ is K -polystable when $c = \frac{1}{2}$. In fact, the horizontal divisor on $X_{1,2}$ is $E = \{u = 0\}$, and hence $\beta_{(X_{1,2}, cC_0)}(E) = 1 - 2(1 - c) = 1 - 2c$, which is zero if and only if $c = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, by Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 $(X_{1,2}, cC_0)$ is K -polystable \square

Corollary 5.17. *There are five walls $c = \frac{2}{11}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{5}{14}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{2}$ for the K -moduli $\overline{M}_{6,c}^K$.*

APPENDIX A. GEOMETRIC CHARACTERISATION OF THE VGIT QUOTIENT FOR DEGREE 2

In this section we will describe explicitly the GIT quotient $(H_4 \times H_1) //_t \text{PGL}(3)$, which was detailed in Section 4.2 using the algorithm in [GM18; Pap22a] and the computational code [Pap22b]. The description of the GIT quotient gives an explicit description of the eight walls of $\overline{M}_2^K(c)$ which are discussed in Theorem 4.16. We should note, that partial results on the explicit description of strictly polystable and strictly semistable orbits of this quotient, for each wall and chamber, were achieved in [Laz06, §4]. However, a full classification of stable and semistable orbits for each wall and chamber is missing, which we present here, using the computational methods of [GM18; Pap22a].

The computational method produces the values of the 8 GIT walls, and the finite set $S_{1,4}$ (Lemma A.1) of one-parameter subgroups [GM18, Definition 3.1] that determine the t -stability of all pairs (C, L) for all t . For convenience, given a one-parameter subgroup $\lambda = \text{Diag}(r_0, \dots, r_2)$, we define its dual one as $\overline{\lambda} = \text{Diag}(-r_2, \dots, -r_0)$.

Lemma A.1. *The elements of $S_{1,4}$ are λ_k and $\overline{\lambda}_k$, where λ_k is one of the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \text{Diag}(5, 2, -7) & \lambda_2 &= \text{Diag}(4, 1, -5) \\ \lambda_3 &= \text{Diag}(1, 0, -1) & \lambda_4 &= \text{Diag}(2, -1, -1). \end{aligned}$$

We will give some brief preliminaries on singularity theory, which will be used throughout this appendix.

Definition A.2 ([Arn76, p.88]). A class of singularities T_2 is *adjacent* to a class T_1 , and one writes $T_1 \leftarrow T_2$ if every germ of $f \in T_2$ can be locally deformed into a germ in T_1 by an arbitrary small deformation. We say that the singularity T_2 is *worse* than T_1 , or that T_2 is a degeneration of T_1 .

The degenerations of the isolated singularities that appear in a quartic curve in \mathbb{P}^2 are described in Figure 1 (for details, see [Arn76, p.88] and [Arn75, §13] and [Dur79, Table 3]). The above theory considers only local deformations of singularities. When we study degenerations in the GIT quotient, we are interested in global deformations. In the particular cases of quartic curves in \mathbb{P}^2 , since by [Tak13] the sum of the Milnor numbers of all ADE singularities satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^r \mu(T_r) \leq 7$, by [HP10, Proposition 3.1] any local deformation of isolated singularities is induced by a global deformation. We are now in a position to classify all stable, polystable and semistable orbits for each wall t .

Theorem A.3. *Let (C_4, L) be a pair where C_4 is a quartic curve in \mathbb{P}^2 and L is a line.*

- (1) $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$: *The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{A}_4 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 . In particular, C_4 can be non-reduced.*




FIGURE 1. Degeneration of germs of isolated singularities appearing in quartic curves in \mathbb{P}^2

- (2) $t = \frac{1}{2}$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{A}_4 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 , or if C_4 is non-reduced and L is not contained in C_4 , or if C_4 has one \mathbf{A}_2 singularity and L is not contained in C_4 .
- (3) $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{A}_4 or \mathbf{D}_4 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 .
- (4) $t = \frac{4}{5}$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 is as in the chamber $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$, or if C_4 has one \mathbf{A}_1 singularity and L is not contained in C_4 .
- (5) $t \in (\frac{4}{5}, 1)$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{A}_5 or \mathbf{D}_5 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 .
- (6) $t = 1$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 is as in the chamber $t \in (\frac{4}{5}, 1)$, or if C_4 has one \mathbf{A}_1 singularity and L is not contained in C_4 .
- (7) $t \in (1, \frac{8}{7})$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{D}_6 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 .
- (8) $t = \frac{8}{7}$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 is as in the chamber $t \in (1, \frac{8}{7})$, or if C_4 is smooth and L is not contained in C_4 .
- (9) $t \in (\frac{8}{7}, \frac{7}{5})$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{A}_6 , \mathbf{D}_6 or \mathbf{E}_6 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 .
- (10) $t = \frac{7}{5}$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 is as in the chamber $t \in (\frac{8}{7}, \frac{7}{5})$, or if C_4 is smooth and L is not contained in C_4 .
- (11) $t \in (\frac{7}{5}, 2)$: The pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if C_4 has at worst finitely many \mathbf{E}_7 singularities and L does not pass through the singular point of C_4 .

Proof. Let $C_4 = \{f_4 = 0\}$, $L = \{h = 0\}$, where f_4 is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 4 and h is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 1. By [GM18, Theorem 1.4] and [Pap22a, Theorem 3.26, Lemma 3.25] the pair (C_4, L) is not t -stable if and only if for any $g \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$ the monomials with non-zero coefficients of $(g \cdot f_4, g \cdot L)$ are contained in a tuple of sets $N_t^\ominus(\lambda, x_p)$ which is maximal for every given t . These maximal sets can be found algorithmically using computational packages [GM17; Pap22b]. This is equivalent to the conditions in the statement. We verify the conditions for each $t \in (0, 2)$.

Let $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and let $(\lambda, x_p) = (\lambda_4, x_0)$. Then the maximal set $N_t^\ominus(\lambda, x_p)$ gives a pair (C, L) defined by $C = \{f_4(x_1, x_2) + x_0 f_3(x_1, x_2) = 0\}$, $L = \{l(x_0, x_1, x_2)\}$. C has a \mathbf{D}_4 singularity by [Tak13]. Hence, a t -stable pair cannot have C with at worst a \mathbf{D}_4 singularity. Similarly, if we consider $(\lambda, x_p) = (\lambda_2, x_0)$, the maximal set $N_t^\ominus(\lambda, x_p)$ gives a pair (C, L) defined by $C = \{x_2(f_3(x_1, x_2) + x_2 f_2(x_1, x_2)) = 0\}$, $L = \{l(x_0, x_1, x_2)\}$. C has a \mathbf{A}_5 singularity by [Tak13]. Hence, a t -stable pair cannot have C with at worst a \mathbf{A}_5 singularity. If we consider $(\lambda, x_p) = (\lambda_3, x_1)$, we deduce that the pair given by $C = \{f_4(x_1, x_2) + x_2 x_0 (f_2(x_1, x_2) + x_0 x_2) = 0\}$, $L = \{l(x_1, x_2)\}$, such that C has a \mathbf{A}_3 singularity and L passes through the singular point of C is t -unstable. Hence, the pair given by $C = \{f_4(x_1, x_2) + x_2 x_0 (f_2(x_1, x_2) + x_0 x_2) = 0\}$, $L = \{l(x_0, x_1, x_2)\}$ is t -stable. This completes the proof of (1).

For $t = \frac{1}{2}$, the maximal sets $N_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\ominus}(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as those for $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ but replacing the set $N_{t \in (0, 1/2)}^{\ominus}((2, -1, -1), x_0)$ with the sets $N_{1/2}^{\ominus}((5, -1, -4), x_2)$, $N_{1/2}^{\ominus}((2, -1, -1), x_0)$ and $N_{1/2}^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_0)$, which represent the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is irreducible and has one \mathbf{A}_2 singularity and L' is contained in C' , or C' is irreducible and has one \mathbf{D}_4 singularity and L' does not pass through the singular point of C' , or C' is non-reduced and L' is contained in C' . Hence, (2) follows.

Let $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as for $t = \frac{1}{2}$ but replacing the set $N_{1/2}^{\ominus}((4, 1, -5), x_0)$, with the sets $N_t^{\ominus}((5, 2, -7), x_0)$, $N_t^{\ominus}((5, -1, -4), x_0)$. A pair (C', L') whose defining equations have coefficients in the set $N_t^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_0)$ require that C' has (a degeneration of) a \mathbf{D}_5 singularity. Hence, a t -stable pair (C_4, L) may now have \mathbf{D}_4 singularities but not \mathbf{D}_5 singularities. In particular, the pair (C, L) defined by $C = \{f_4(x_1, x_2) + x_0 f_3(x_1, x_2) = 0\}$, $L = \{l(x_0, x_1, x_2)\}$, where C has a \mathbf{D}_4 singularity and L does not intersect the singular point of C is t -stable. Therefore, (3) follows.

Let $t = \frac{4}{5}$. The t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as for $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$ with the addition of the set $N_t^{\ominus}((4, 1, -5), x_2)$, which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is irreducible with an \mathbf{A}_1 singularity and L' is contained in C' . Therefore, (C_4, L) is $\frac{4}{5}$ -stable if and only if in addition to the conditions for t -stability when $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{5})$, L is not contained in C_4 when C_4 is irreducible and has (a degeneration of) a \mathbf{A}_1 singularity. Hence, (4) follows.

Let $t \in (\frac{4}{5}, 1)$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as for $t = \frac{4}{5}$, replacing set $N_{1/2}^{\ominus}((4, 1, -5), x_2)$ with the sets $N_t^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_0)$ and $N_t^{\ominus}((7, -2, -5), x_0)$. The set $N_t^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_0)$ represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' has at worst a \mathbf{D}_6 singularity and L' is a line not passing through the singular point of C' . Also, the set $N_t^{\ominus}((7, -2, -5), x_0)$ represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' has at worst a \mathbf{E}_6 singularity and L' is a line not passing through the singular point of C' . Therefore, (C, L) is t -stable if and only if in addition to the conditions for t -stability when $t = \frac{4}{5}$, C has at worst a \mathbf{D}_5 or \mathbf{A}_5 singular point and L does not pass through the singular point of C . Hence, (5) follows.

Let $t = 1$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x^J, x_p)$ are the same as for $t \in (\frac{4}{5}, 1)$, replacing the sets $N_{t \in (4/5, 1)}^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_1)$ and $N_{t \in (4/5, 1)}^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_2)$ with the set $N_t^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_2)$ which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that L' is not contained at C' , and C' has a (degeneration of) a \mathbf{A}_1 singularity. Furthermore, the restrictions for $t \in (\frac{4}{5}, 1)$ still apply. Therefore, a pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if satisfies the conditions in (6).

Let $t \in (1, \frac{8}{7})$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as for $t = 1$, but replacing sets $N_1^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_2)$ and $N_1^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_0)$ with the set $N_t^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_2)$, which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' has at worst (a degeneration of) an \mathbf{E}_6 singularity and L' is a line not passing through this singular point. In addition, the replaced set $N_1^{\ominus}((1, 0, -1), x_0)$, represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' has a (degeneration of) a \mathbf{D}_6 singularity, and L' does not pass through this singular point of C' . In particular, such a pair is t -stable and hence, (7) follows.

Let $t = \frac{8}{7}$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x^J, x_p)$ are the same as for $t \in (1, \frac{8}{7})$, replacing the set $N_{t \in (1, 8/7)}^{\ominus}((1, 1, -2), x_0)$ with the set $N_t^{\ominus}((5, 2, -7), x_2)$, which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is smooth and L' is contained in C' . Hence, a pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if satisfies the conditions in (8).

Let $t \in (\frac{8}{7}, \frac{7}{5})$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^{\ominus}(\lambda, x^J, x_p)$ are the same as for $t = \frac{8}{7}$, replacing the set $N_{8/7}^{\ominus}((7, -2, -5), x_0)$ with the sets $N_t^{\ominus}((5, -1, -4), x_0)$ and $N_t^{\ominus}((2, -1, -1), x_0)$, which

represent the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is irreducible and has at worst (a degeneration of) a \mathbf{E}_7 singularity and L' is a line not passing through the singular point of C' , or C' has non ADE singularities and L' does not pass through the singular points. Therefore, (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if in addition to the conditions for t -stability when $t = \frac{8}{7}$, C has at worst a \mathbf{A}_6 , \mathbf{D}_6 or \mathbf{E}_6 singular point and L is a line not passing through this singular point. Hence, (9) follows.

Let $t = \frac{7}{5}$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^\ominus(\lambda, x_p)$ are the same as for $t \in (\frac{8}{7}, \frac{7}{5})$, replacing the sets $N_{t \in (8/7, 7/5)}^\ominus((5, -2, -7), x_2)$ and $N_{t \in (8/7, 7/5)}^\ominus((1, 0, -1), x_2)$ with the set $N_t^\ominus((4, 1, -5), x_2)$, which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is smooth and L' is not contained in C' . Hence, a pair (C_4, L) is t -stable if and only if satisfies the conditions in (10).

Let $t \in (\frac{7}{5}, 2)$. The maximal t -non-stable sets $N_t^\ominus(\lambda, x^J, x_p)$ are the same as for $t = \frac{7}{5}$, removing the set $N_{7/5}^\ominus((5, -1, -4), x_0)$, which represents the monomials of the equations of any pair (C', L') such that C' is irreducible with \mathbf{E}_7 singularities and L' does not pass through the singular point of C' . Hence, a t -stable pair (C_4, L) can have C_4 with at worst \mathbf{E}_7 singularities, with L not passing through the singular point, proving (11). \square

Theorem A.4. *Let $t \in (0, 2)$. If t is a chamber, then $\overline{M(t)}$ is the compactification of the stable loci $M(t)$ by the closed $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -orbit in $\overline{M(t)} \setminus M(t)$ represented by the pair (\tilde{C}_4, \tilde{L}) , where \tilde{C}_4 is the unique \mathbb{G}_m -invariant double conic, and \tilde{L} is a line intersecting \tilde{C}_4 at two distinct points, or by the closed $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -orbit in $\overline{M(t)} \setminus M(t)$ represented by the pair $(\overline{C}_4, \overline{L})$, where \overline{C}_4 is the unique \mathbb{G}_m -invariant intersection of two conics on general position with \mathbf{A}_3 singularities, and \overline{L} is a line intersecting \overline{C}_4 at two distinct points. If $t = t_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, then $\overline{M(t_i)}$ is the compactification of the stable loci $M(t_i)$ by the three closed $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ -orbits in $\overline{M(t)} \setminus M(t)$ represented by the uniquely defined pairs (\tilde{C}_4, \tilde{L}) and $(\overline{C}_4, \overline{L})$ described above, and the \mathbb{G}_m -invariant pairs (C_i, L_i) , (C'_i, L'_i) uniquely defined as follows:*

- (1) the reducible quartic C_1 with 1 \mathbf{A}_5 and 1 \mathbf{A}_2 singularities, and the line L_1 not passing through these singularities, and the reducible quartic curve C'_1 with 1 \mathbf{D}_4 singularity, and the line L'_1 not passing through the singular point;
- (2) the reducible quartic curve C_2 with 1 \mathbf{D}_5 singularity, and the line L_2 not passing through the singular point;
- (3) the reducible quartic curve C_3 with 1 \mathbf{D}_6 singularity and 1 \mathbf{A}_1 singularity, and the line L_3 passing through the \mathbf{D}_6 singular point;
- (4) the irreducible quartic curve C_4 with 1 \mathbf{E}_6 singularity, and the line L_4 not passing through the singular point;
- (5) the reducible quartic curve C_5 with 1 \mathbf{E}_7 singularity, and the line L_5 not passing through the singular point.

Proposition A.5. *Let (C, L) be a pair that is invariant under a non-trivial \mathbb{C}^* -action. Suppose the singularities of C and the intersections with L are given as in the first and third entries in one of the rows of Table 2, respectively. Then (C, L) is projectively equivalent to $(\{F = 0\}, \{H = 0\})$ for F and H as in the fourth and fifth entries in the same row of Table 2, respectively. In particular, any such pair (C, L) is unique. Conversely, if (C, L) is given by equations as in the fourth and fifth entries in a given row of Table 2, then (C, L) has singularities and intersections as in the first and third entries in the same row of Table and (C, L) is \mathbb{C}^* -invariant. Furthermore, the element $\lambda \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C}^*)$, as defined in Lemma A.1, given in the entry of the corresponding row of Table 2 is a generator of the \mathbb{C}^* -action.*

Sing(C)	C reducible?	Intersection $C \cap L$	F	H	λ
Double conic	No	Two double points	$(x_1^2 + x_0x_2)^2$	x_1	λ_3
\mathbf{A}_3 at P_1 , \mathbf{A}_3 at P_2	Yes	non-singular	$f_2(x_1^2, x_0x_2)$	x_1	λ_3
\mathbf{A}_5 at P_1 , \mathbf{A}_2 at P_2	Yes	$P_2 + P_3$	$x_2(x_1^3 + x_0^2x_2)$	x_0	λ_2
\mathbf{D}_4 at P_1 , \mathbf{A}_1 at P_2	Yes	$L = \{x_0\}$	$x_0f_3(x_1, x_2)$	x_0	λ_3
\mathbf{D}_5 at P_1 , \mathbf{A}_1 at P_2	Yes	P_2	$x_1(x_1^3 + x_0x_2^2)$	x_0	λ_2
\mathbf{D}_6 at P_1 , \mathbf{A}_1 at P_2	Yes	$P_2 + P_3$	$x_0x_1(x_1^2 + x_0x_2)$	x_2	λ_3
\mathbf{E}_6 at P_1	No	P_3	$x_1^4 + x_0^3x_2$	x_2	λ_1
\mathbf{E}_7 at P_1	Yes	not P_1	$x_2(x_1^3 + x_0x_2^2)$	x_0	λ_2

TABLE 2. Some degree (4, 1) pairs $(C, L) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ invariant under \mathbb{C}^* -action λ .

Proof. The double conic is unique, given up to projective equivalence by F as in row 1 of the Table. Similarly, the curve with 2 \mathbf{A}_3 singularities is uniquely given by F as in row 2. These are the 2 polystable orbits for the classical GIT of quartic curves, and hence are \mathbb{C}^* -invariant.

Assume that a quartic curve C is reducible with an \mathbf{A}_2 singularity in one component and an \mathbf{A}_5 singularity in the other component. Since C is reducible, $C = L + T$, where L is a line and T is a cubic. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $L = \{x_2 = 0\}$. Then T must be a singular cubic with an \mathbf{A}_2 singularity. Hence, T is given, up to projective equivalence, by $T = \{x_1^3 + x_0^2x_2\}$ and C is given by $x_2(x_1^3 + x_0^2x_2)$, with an \mathbf{A}_5 singularity as required.

Similarly, let C be a quartic curve which is reducible with an \mathbf{D}_4 singularity at the point $(1 : 0 : 0)$. Since C is reducible, $C = L + T$, where L is a line and T is a singular cubic. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $L = \{x_0 = 0\}$. Then T must be a singular cubic with an \mathbf{D}_4 singularity, such that $L \cap T = \emptyset$. Hence, T is given, up to projective equivalence, by $T = \{f_3(x_1, x_2)\}$, i.e. three lines intersecting at one point, and C is given by $x_0f_3(x_1, x_2)$, with a \mathbf{D}_4 singularity at $(1 : 0 : 0)$ as required.

A similar analysis shows that a curve C with singularities \mathbf{D}_5 , \mathbf{D}_6 and \mathbf{E}_7 is generated by the equations F of rows 5, 6, 8 of Table 2. Irreducible quartics with an \mathbf{E}_6 singularity have equation $F = x_1^4 + x_0^3x_2 + \alpha x_1^2x_0^2$; it is not hard to see that this is \mathbb{C}^* -invariant if and only if $\alpha = 0$, as in row 7 in Table 2. Furthermore, it is trivial to check that each one-parameter subgroup λ in the corresponding row of Table 2 leaves C invariant, and therefore λ is a generator of the \mathbb{C}^* -action. Furthermore, it is straightforward to verify that the corresponding intersections $C \cap L$ are as above, and we omit the analysis. \square

Proof of Theorem A.4. Suppose (C, L) —defined by polynomials F and H —belongs to a closed strictly t -semistable orbit. By [GM18, Theorem ref], they are generated by monomials in $N_t^0(\lambda, x_i)$ for some (λ, x_i) such that $N_t^\oplus(\lambda, x_i)$ is maximal with respect to the containment order of sets. Since there is a finite number of λ to consider (those in Lemma A.1), this is a finite computation which can be carried out by software [GM18; GM19; Pap22b]. For each pair (λ, x_i) , there is a change of coordinates that gives a natural bijection between $N_t^0(\lambda, x_i)$ and $N_t^0(\lambda, x_{2-i})$. Therefore, about half of the values are redundant, and we have two possible choices for each F and H if $t = t_2, \dots, t_5$ and three choices if $t = t_1$.

By [GM18, Lemma 3.2] we can check that the pairs (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) and $(\overline{C}, \overline{L})$ corresponding to $\tilde{F} = (x_1^2 + x_0x_2)^2$, $\tilde{H} = x_1$ and $\tilde{F} = f_2(x_1, x_0x_2)$, $\tilde{H} = x_1$ are both strictly t -semistable. Suppose that $(\lambda, x_i) = (\lambda_3, x_1)$. Then $F = f_4(x_1, x_0) + x_2x_0(f_2(x_1, x_0) + x_0x_2)$ and $H = g_1(x_1, x_2)$. We will show that the closure of (C, L) contains (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) and $(\overline{C}, \overline{L})$. Let $\gamma = \text{Diag}(1, 0, -1)$ be a one-parameter subgroup. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \gamma(t) \cdot F = a_1x_1^4 + a_2x_1^2x_0x_2 + a_3x_0^2x_2^2 \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \gamma(t) \cdot H = x_1.$$

This implies, that for specific values of a_1 , a_2 and a_3 $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \gamma(t) \cdot (C, L) = (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L})$. For general values of the a_i , $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \gamma(t) \cdot (C, L) = (\bar{C}, \bar{L})$. Hence, the closure of the orbit of (C, L) contains both (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) and (\bar{C}, \bar{L}) . We can do similar analysis for the rest of the cases and end up with F and H not depending on any parameters. Observe that since (C, L) is strictly t -semistable, the stabilizer subgroup of (C, L) , namely, $G_{(C,L)} \subset \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$ is infinite (c.f. [Dol03, Remark 8.1 (5)]). In particular, there is a \mathbb{C}^* -action on (C, L) . Proposition A.5 classifies the singularities of (C, L) uniquely according to their equations. For each $t \in (0, 2)$, the proof of Theorem A.4 follows. \square

We also provide a description of strictly semistable orbits.

Theorem A.6. *Let (C_4, L) be a pair where C_4 is a quartic curve in \mathbb{P}^2 and L is a line. Let (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) be the pair given by equations $\tilde{C} = \{f_4(x_1, x_2) + x_0x_2(f_2(x_1, x_2) + x_0x_2) = 0\}$ and $\tilde{L} = \{f_1(x_1, x_2) = 0\}$. If t is a chamber, then the unique strictly t -semistable pair is the pair (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) , such that \tilde{C} has a \mathbf{D}_4 singularity, and L is passing through the singularity. If t is a wall, then the pair (C_4, L) is strictly t -semistable if and only if it is the pair (\tilde{C}, \tilde{L}) or one of the following:*

- (1) $t = \frac{1}{2}$: *The pair (C_4, L) where C_4 is the unique reducible quartic curve with one singular point which is an \mathbf{A}_5 singularity, with L not intersecting the \mathbf{A}_5 singularity, or where C_4 is non-reduced given by equation $C_4 = \{x_2f_3(x_0, x_1, x_2)\}$ and $C_4 \cap L = C_4$.*
- (2) $t = \frac{4}{5}$: *The pair (C_4, L) where C_4 is the irreducible quartic curve with an \mathbf{A}_1 singularity (type I) and $C_4 \cap L = 4P$, where P is the singular point, or where C_4 is the unique irreducible quartic curve with one singular point which is a \mathbf{D}_5 singularity, with L not intersecting the \mathbf{D}_5 singularity.*
- (3) $t = 1$: *The pair (C_4, L) where C_4 is the irreducible quartic curve with an \mathbf{A}_1 singularity (type II) and $C_4 \cap L = 3P + Q$, where P is the singular point and Q is a different point, or where C_4 is the unique reducible quartic curve with one singular point which is a \mathbf{D}_6 singularity, with L not intersecting the \mathbf{D}_6 singularity.*
- (4) $t = \frac{8}{7}$: *The pair (C_4, L) where C_4 is smooth (type I) and $C_4 \cap L = 4P$ or where C_4 is the unique irreducible quartic curve with one singular point which is a \mathbf{E}_6 singularity, with L not intersecting the \mathbf{E}_6 singularity.*
- (5) $t = \frac{7}{5}$: *The pair (C_4, L) where C_4 is smooth (type II) and $C_4 \cap L = 3P + Q$ or where C_4 is the unique irreducible quartic curve with one singular point which is a \mathbf{E}_7 singularity, with L not intersecting the \mathbf{E}_7 singularity.*

Proof. Let $C_4 = \{f_4 = 0\}$, $L = \{h = 0\}$, where f_4 is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 4 and h is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 1. By [Pap22a, Theorem 3.26, Lemma 3.25] the pair (C_4, L) is not t -stable if and only if for any $g \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$ the monomials with non-zero coefficients of $(g \cdot f_4, g \cdot L)$ are not contained in a tuple of sets $N_t^\circ(\lambda, x_p)$ which is maximal for every given t . In particular, the pair is strictly t -semistable if and only if it satisfies the Centroid Criterion (c.f. [GM18] or [Pap22a]).

These maximal sets can be found algorithmically using the computational package [Pap22b] as in the proof of Theorem A.3. The strictly t -semistable pairs are obtained from verifying via the Centroid Criterion which of these families provide strictly t -semistable pairs. We verify this computationally. The above classification then follows directly from [Tak13] (where type I and type II refers to the specific cases in this classification). \square

APPENDIX B. EXPLICIT DESCRIPTION OF K-MODULI WALLS FOR $d \geq 5$

For the reader's convenience, in this section we provide an explicit classification of the divisors for each K-moduli wall for degrees $d \geq 5$. The classification follows from Theorems 5.1, 5.2 and

[ADL23a; ADL24; PSW23; Zha24]. For $d = 9$, there are no walls. For $d = 8$ and $\Sigma_8 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, there is one wall at $c = \frac{1}{4}$, where the divisor $D = 2H$, where H is a smooth $(1, 1)$ -curve. The rest cases are summed up in the following tables.

Let $P = [1 : 0 : 0]$, and $\Sigma_8 \cong \text{Bl}_P \mathbb{P}^2$.

wall	curve C in \mathbb{P}^2	sing. of replaced surfaces
$\frac{1}{5}$	$x(xz + cy^2)$, $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$	smooth
$\frac{1}{4}$	$x^2z + cy^3$, $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$	smooth

TABLE 3. K-moduli walls for pairs (Σ_8, cD)

Let $P = [0 : 0 : 1]$, $Q = [0 : 1 : 0]$, and $\Sigma_7 \cong \text{Bl}_{P,Q} \mathbb{P}^2$. Let also X' be the del Pezzo surface of degree 7 with an A_1 -singularity, obtained by taking weighted blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 at P of weight $(2, 1, 0)$. The K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surface of degree 7 are summed below:

wall	curve C in \mathbb{P}^2	sing. of replaced surfaces
$\frac{4}{25}$	$yz(ay + bz) + xf_2(y, z) + x^2f_1(y, z) + x^3$	smooth
$\frac{4}{25}$	$y^2z + xf_2(y, z) + x^2f_1(y, z) + x^3$	smooth
$\frac{2}{9}$	$z^2x + zy^2 + z(ax^2 + bxy) + g_3(x, y)$	\mathbf{A}_1
$\frac{2}{5}$	$z^2x + z(ax^2 + bxy) + g_3(x, y)$	\mathbf{A}_1

TABLE 4. K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surfaces of degree 7

Let $P_1 = (1 : 0 : 0)$, $P_2 = (0 : 1 : 0)$ and $P_3 = (1 : 1 : 0)$. Let $\Sigma_6 \cong \text{Bl}_{P_1, P_2, P_3} \mathbb{P}^2$. The surface X'_1 is the anti-canonical model of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 along $P = (1 : 0 : 0)$ and along the tangent direction of $\{x = 0\}$ at $Q = (0 : 0 : 1)$. The surface $X_{1,1}$ is the anti-canonical model of the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 along $P = (0 : 1 : 0)$ and along the tangent direction of $\{z = 0\}$ at $Q = (1 : 0 : 0)$. The surface X_2 with one \mathbf{A}_2 singularity is obtained by blowing up \mathbb{P}^2 along a 0-dimensional subscheme of length 3 which is supported at $P = (1 : 0 : 0)$ and curvilinear with respect to a conic $\{xz - y^2 = 0\}$. Finally, the surface $X_{1,2}$ is a toric surface with Picard rank 1, and hence a weighted projective plane. It is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1, 2, 3)_{u,v,w}$. Below, we summarize the description of K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surfaces of degree 6.

wall	curve C in \mathbb{P}^2 or $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 4)$	sing. of replaced surfaces
$\frac{1}{4}$	$xy(x - y) + zf_2(x, y) + z^2f_1(x, y) + z^3 = 0$	\mathbf{A}_1
$\frac{2}{11}$	$z^2x + zx^2 + zx(ax + by) + f_3(x, y) = 0$	\mathbf{A}_1
$\frac{5}{14}$	$x^2z + xy^2 + x(ayz + bz^2) + f_3(y, z) = 0$	$2\mathbf{A}_1$
$\frac{2}{5}$	$x^2z + xy^2 + x(ayz + bz^2) + f_3(y, z) = 0$	\mathbf{A}_2
$\frac{1}{2}$	$y^3 + z^2 + xf_5(x, y, z) = 0$	$\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2$

TABLE 5. K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surfaces of degree 6

Below, we summarize the description of K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surfaces of degree 5.

wall	corresponding cubic curves	sing. of replaced surfaces
$\frac{2}{17}$	double line + different line	\mathbf{A}_1
$\frac{4}{19}$	three concurrent distinct lines	$2\mathbf{A}_1$
$\frac{2}{7}$	three concurrent distinct lines	\mathbf{A}_2
$\frac{8}{23}$	conic + tangent line	$\mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2$
$\frac{4}{9}$	conic + tangent line	\mathbf{A}_3
$\frac{4}{7}$	cuspidal cubic	\mathbf{A}_4

TABLE 6. K-moduli walls for Gorenstein del Pezzo surface of degree 5

REFERENCES

- [AGV08] D. Abramovich, T. Graber, and A. Vistoli. “Gromov-Witten theory of Deligne-Mumford stacks”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 130.5 (2008), pp. 1337–1398.
- [Akh+16] M. Akhtar, T. Coates, A. Corti, L. Heuberger, A. Kasprzyk, A. Oneto, A. Petracci, T. Prince, and K. Tveiten. “Mirror symmetry and the classification of orbifold del Pezzo surfaces”. In: *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 144.2 (2016), pp. 513–527.
- [Alp13] J. Alper. “Good moduli spaces for Artin stacks”. In: *Annales de l’Institut Fourier* 63.6 (2013), pp. 2349–2402.
- [Alp] J. Alper. *Stacks and moduli*. <https://sites.math.washington.edu/~jarod/moduli.pdf>, accessed 25/06/2024.
- [Alp+20] J. Alper, H. Blum, D. Halpern-Leistner, and C. Xu. “Reductivity of the automorphism group of K-polystable Fano varieties”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 222.3 (2020), pp. 995–1032.
- [Ara+23] C. Araujo, A.-M. Castravet, I. Cheltsov, K. Fujita, A.-S. Kaloghiros, J. Martinez-Garcia, C. Shramov, H. Süß, and N. Viswanathan. *The Calabi problem for Fano threefolds*. Vol. 485. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023, pp. vii+441.
- [Arn75] V. I. Arnol’d. “Critical points of smooth functions and their normal forms”. In: *Russian Mathematical Surveys* 30.5 (Oct. 1975), pp. 1–75.
- [Arn76] V. Arnold. “Local Normal Forms of Functions.” In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 35 (1976), pp. 87–110.
- [ADL23a] K. Ascher, K. DeVleming, and Y. Liu. “K-moduli of curves on a quadric surface and K3 surfaces”. In: *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 22.3 (2023), pp. 1251–1291.
- [ADL23b] K. Ascher, K. DeVleming, and Y. Liu. “K-stability and birational models of moduli of quartic K3 surfaces”. In: *Invent. Math.* 232.2 (2023), pp. 471–552.
- [ADL24] K. Ascher, K. DeVleming, and Y. Liu. “Wall crossing for K-moduli spaces of plane curves”. In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 128.6 (2024), e12615.
- [Ben14] O. Benoist. “Quelques espaces de modules d’intersections complètes lisses qui sont quasi-projectifs”. In: *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 16.8 (2014), pp. 1749–1774.
- [Blu+21] H. Blum, D. Halpern-Leistner, Y. Liu, and C. Xu. “On properness of K-moduli spaces and optimal degenerations of Fano varieties”. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 27.4 (2021), p. 73.
- [BLX22] H. Blum, Y. Liu, and C. Xu. “Openness of K-semistability for Fano varieties”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 171.13 (2022), pp. 2753–2797.

- [BX19] H. Blum and C. Xu. “Uniqueness of K-polystable degenerations of Fano varieties”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 190.2 (2019), pp. 609–656.
- [CM16] I. Cheltsov and J. Martinez-Garcia. “Dynamic alpha-invariants of del Pezzo surfaces”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 10 (2016), pp. 2994–3028.
- [CP21a] I. Cheltsov and Y. Prokhorov. “Del Pezzo surfaces with infinite automorphism groups”. In: *Algebr. Geom.* 8.3 (2021), pp. 319–357.
- [CP21b] G. Codogni and Z. Patakfalvi. “Positivity of the CM line bundle for families of K-stable klt Fano varieties”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 223.3 (2021), pp. 811–894.
- [Der16] R. Dervan. “On K-stability of finite covers”. In: *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 48.4 (2016), pp. 717–728.
- [Dol03] I. Dolgachev. *Lectures on invariant theory*. Vol. 296. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, pp. xvi+220.
- [DH98] I. V. Dolgachev and Y. Hu. “Variation of geometric invariant theory quotients”. In: *Publications Mathématiques de l’Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques* 87 (1998), pp. 5–51.
- [Dur79] A. H. Durfee. “Fifteen characterizations of rational double points and simple critical points”. In: *Enseign. Math. (2)* 25.1-2 (1979), pp. 131–163.
- [Fuj18] K. Fujita. “Optimal bounds for the volumes of Kähler-Einstein Fano manifolds”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 140.2 (2018), pp. 391–414.
- [Fuj19] K. Fujita. “A valuative criterion for uniform K-stability of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties”. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 751 (2019), pp. 309–338.
- [Fuj90] T. Fujita. “On singular del Pezzo varieties”. In: *Algebraic geometry*. Springer, 1990, pp. 117–128.
- [GM17] P. Gallardo and J. Martinez-Garcia. “Variations of GIT quotients package v0. 6.13”. In: (2017).
- [GM18] P. Gallardo and J. Martinez-Garcia. “Variations of geometric invariant quotients for pairs, a computational approach”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 146.6 (2018), pp. 2395–2408.
- [GM19] P. Gallardo and J. Martinez-Garcia. “Moduli of cubic surfaces and their anticanonical divisors”. In: *Revista Matemática Complutense* 32 (2019), pp. 853–873.
- [GMS21] P. Gallardo, J. Martinez-Garcia, and C. Spotti. “Applications of the moduli continuity method to log K-stable pairs”. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 103.2 (2021), pp. 729–759.
- [GMZ18] P. Gallardo, J. Martinez-Garcia, and Z. Zhang. “Compactifications of the moduli space of plane quartics and two lines”. In: *Eur. J. Math.* 4.3 (2018), pp. 1000–1034.
- [Gro60] A. Grothendieck. “Éléments de géométrie algébrique. I. Le langage des schémas.” In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 4 (1960), p. 228.
- [Hac04] P. Hacking. “Compact moduli of plane curves”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 124.2 (2004), pp. 213–257.
- [HP10] P. Hacking and Y. Prokhorov. “Smoothable del Pezzo surfaces with quotient singularities”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 146.1 (2010), pp. 169–192.
- [HW81] F. Hidaka and K. Watanabe. “Normal Gorenstein surfaces with ample anti-canonical divisor”. In: *Tokyo J. Math.* 4.2 (1981), pp. 319–330.
- [Ian00] A. R. Iano-Fletcher. “Working with weighted complete intersections”. In: *Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds*. Vol. 281. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 101–173.

- [Jia20] C. Jiang. “Boundedness of \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties with degrees and alpha-invariants bounded from below”. In: *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér (4)* 53.5 (2020), pp. 1235–1248.
- [Kem78] G. R. Kempf. “Instability in invariant theory”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 108.2 (1978), pp. 299–316.
- [Kir85] F. C. Kirwan. “Partial desingularisations of quotients of nonsingular varieties and their Betti numbers”. In: *Annals of mathematics* 122.1 (1985), pp. 41–85.
- [KM76] F. Knudsen and D. Mumford. “The Projectivity Of The MODULI SPACE OF STABLE CURVES I: PRELIMINARIES ON "det" AND "Div"”. In: *Mathematica Scandinavica* 39.1 (1976), pp. 19–55.
- [Kol96] J. Kollár. *Rational curves on algebraic varieties*. Vol. 32. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996, pp. viii+320.
- [Kol18] J. Kollár. “Mumford divisors”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07596* (2018).
- [KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori. *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*. Vol. 134. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, pp. viii+254.
- [KS88] J. Kollár and N. I. Shepherd-Barron. “Threefolds and deformations of surface singularities”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 91.2 (1988), pp. 299–338.
- [Laz09] R. Laza. “Deformations of singularities and variation of GIT quotients”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 361.4 (2009), pp. 2109–2161.
- [Laz13] R. Laza. “GIT and moduli with a twist”. In: *Handbook of moduli. Vol. II, Adv. Lect. Math.* 25 (2013), pp. 259–297.
- [Laz06] R.-M. Laza. *Deformations of singularities and variations of GIT quotients*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Columbia University. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2006, p. 286.
- [Li17] C. Li. “K-semistability is equivariant volume minimization”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 166.16 (2017), pp. 3147–3218.
- [LL19] C. Li and Y. Liu. “Kähler–Einstein metrics and volume minimization”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 341 (2019), pp. 440–492.
- [LWX21] C. Li, X. Wang, and C. Xu. “Algebraicity of the metric tangent cones and equivariant K-stability”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 34.4 (2021), pp. 1175–1214.
- [LX14] C. Li and C. Xu. “Special test configuration and K-stability of Fano varieties”. In: *Annals of mathematics* (2014), pp. 197–232.
- [Liu18] Y. Liu. “The volume of singular Kähler–Einstein Fano varieties”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 154.6 (2018), pp. 1131–1158.
- [LX19] Y. Liu and C. Xu. “K-stability of cubic threefolds”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 168.11 (2019), pp. 2029–2073.
- [LXZ22] Y. Liu, C. Xu, and Z. Zhuang. “Finite generation for valuations computing stability thresholds and applications to K-stability”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 196.2 (2022), pp. 507–566.
- [MM93] T. Mabuchi and S. Mukai. “Stability and Einstein–Kähler metric of a quartic del Pezzo surface”. In: *Einstein metrics and Yang–Mills connections*. CRC Press, 1993, pp. 133–160.

- [Mar13] J. Martinez Garcia. *Dynamic alpha-invariants of del Pezzo surfaces with boundary*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2013, p. 1.
- [MFK94] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan. *Geometric invariant theory*. Third. Vol. 34. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994, pp. xiv+292.
- [OSS16] Y. Odaka, C. Spotti, and S. Sun. “Compact moduli spaces of del Pezzo surfaces and Kähler–Einstein metrics”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 102.1 (2016), pp. 127–172.
- [PSW23] L. Pan, F. Si, and H. Wu. “K moduli of log del Pezzo pairs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05651* (2023).
- [Pap22a] T. S. Papazachariou. “K-moduli of log Fano complete intersections”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09332* (2022).
- [Pap22b] T. S. Papazachariou. *Variations of GIT quotients for complete intersections package*. <https://doi.org/10.5526/ERDR-00000155>. 2022.
- [Pap23] T.-S. Papazachariou. “K-moduli of log Fano complete intersections”. Apr. 2023.
- [PT08] S. T. Paul and G. Tian. *CM Stability and the Generalized Futaki Invariant I*. 2008. arXiv: [math/0605278](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605278).
- [Sha13] I. R. Shafarevich. *Basic algebraic geometry. 1*. Russian. Varieties in projective space. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. xviii+310.
- [SSY16] C. Spotti, S. Sun, and C. Yao. “Existence and deformations of Kähler–Einstein metrics on smoothable \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 165.16 (2016), pp. 3043–3083.
- [Sta24] T. Stacks project authors. *The Stacks project*. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>. 2024.
- [Tak13] T. Takahashi. “Geometric Properties of Plane Quartics (Computer Algebra : The Algorithms, Implementations and the Next Generation)”. In: *RIMS Kokyuroku*. 1843. 2013, pp. 163–165.
- [Tha96] M. Thaddeus. “Geometric invariant theory and flips”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 9.3 (1996), pp. 691–723.
- [Xu20] C. Xu. “A minimizing valuation is quasi-monomial”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 191.3 (2020), pp. 1003–1030.
- [Xu21] C. Xu. “K-stability of Fano varieties: an algebro-geometric approach”. In: *EMS Surv. Math. Sci.* 8.1 (2021), pp. 265–354.
- [XZ20] C. Xu and Z. Zhuang. “On positivity of the CM line bundle on K-moduli spaces”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 192.3 (2020), pp. 1005–1068.
- [XZ21] C. Xu and Z. Zhuang. “Uniqueness of the minimizer of the normalized volume function”. In: *Camb. J. Math.* 9.1 (2021), pp. 149–176.
- [Zha06] Q. Zhang. “Rational connectedness of log \mathbb{Q} -Fano varieties”. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 590 (2006), pp. 131–142.
- [Zha23a] J. Zhao. “Compactifications of moduli of del Pezzo surfaces via line arrangement and K-stability”. In: *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* To appear (2023).
- [Zha23b] J. Zhao. “The Moduli Space of Genus Six Curves and K-stability: VGIT and the Hassett-Keel Program”. In: *arXiv preprint:2304.13259* (2023).
- [Zha24] J. Zhao. “Moduli of genus six curves and K-stability”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Series B* 11.26 (2024), pp. 863–900.
- [Zho23] C. Zhou. “On wall-crossing for K-stability”. In: *Adv. Math.* 413 (2023), Paper No. 108857, 26.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX, COLCHESTER, CO4 3SQ, UK

Email address: `jesus.martinez-garcia@essex.ac.uk`

ISAAC NEWTON INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0EH, UK

Email address: `tsp35@cam.ac.uk`

851 S MORGAN ST, 60607, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, USA

Email address: `jzhao81@uic.edu`