

Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals on direct images

Siarhei Finski

Abstract. For a polarized family of complex projective manifolds, we study the Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals on the sequence of vector bundles over the base of the family associated with direct image sheaves of the tensor powers of the polarization. We make a connection between the asymptotic minimization of these functionals, for big tensor powers of the polarization, and the minimization of the so-called Wess-Zumino-Witten functional defined on the space of all relatively Kähler $(1, 1)$ -forms on the fibration. We establish the sharp lower bounds on the latter functional in terms of the limiting Harder-Narasimhan measure, which is a certain algebraic invariant of the family. As an application, in a fibered setting, we prove an asymptotic converse to the Andreotti-Grauert theorem conjectured by Demailly.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
2	A minimizing sequence for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional	6
3	Dequantization of approximate critical Hermitian structures	11
4	Curvature of direct images and semiclassical extension theorem	18
5	Submultiplicative nature of the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations	23
6	Restriction of the weight operator over the geodesic ray	24
7	Symmetric powers of geodesic rays and holomorphic extension theorem	26
8	Geodesic rays of symmetric powers and fibration degenerations	28
9	Approximate critical Hermitian structures and geodesic rays	31
10	Mehta-Ramanathan type formula for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional	35
11	Asymptotic cohomology and the absolute Monge-Ampère functional	36
12	Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence and Hessian quotient equations	39

1 Introduction

This paper grew out from the following basic question: for a given compact complex manifold Y , and a cohomology class $[\alpha] \in H^{1,1}(Y)$, what is the infimum of $\int_Y |P(\alpha)|$, where α is an arbitrary smooth closed differential $(1, 1)$ -form in the class $[\alpha]$, P is an arbitrary fixed polynomial with differential form coefficients, and $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value of the top degree component of a differential form (calculated with respect to the orientation given by the complex structure)?

While for some specific polynomials P , as $P(\alpha) = \alpha \wedge \omega^{\dim Y - 1}$, where ω is a Kähler form from the class $[\omega] \in H^{1,1}(Y)$, one can easily show that the infimum of $\int_Y |P(\alpha)|$ coincides with the trivial lower bound $|\int_Y [\alpha] \cdot [\omega]^{\dim Y - 1}|$, for general polynomials the problem is widely open.

The main goal of this article is to give a sharp lower bound for the polynomial relevant for the Wess-Zumino-Witten equation. More precisely, consider a holomorphic submersion $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ between compact Kähler manifolds X and B of dimensions $n + m$ and m respectively. We fix a Kähler form ω_B on B . We say that a smooth closed differential $(1, 1)$ -form α on X , positive along

the fibers of π , satisfies the Wess-Zumino-Witten equation if

$$\alpha^{n+1} \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^{m-1} = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

This terminology was introduced by Donaldson in [26] in the special case when B is an annuli in \mathbb{C} , due to its similarity with some equations from mathematical physics [70].

We define the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional as follows

$$\text{WZW}(\alpha, \omega_B) := \int_X |\alpha^{n+1} \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^{m-1}|, \quad \text{WZW}([\alpha], \omega_B) = \inf \text{WZW}(\alpha, \omega_B), \quad (1.2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -forms α in the class $[\alpha]$, which are positive along the fibers of π . Remark that for a relatively Kähler class $[\alpha]$, there is a unique $t \in \mathbb{R}$, such that the identity (1.1) holds on the cohomological level for $\alpha := \alpha - t\pi^* \omega_B$. Clearly, the positivity of $\text{WZW}([\alpha] - t\pi^*[\omega_B], \omega_B)$ measures the obstructions for finding approximate solutions to (1.1), where $[\omega_B]$ denotes the De Rham class of ω_B . In this article, we give a precise formula for $|\text{WZW}([\alpha] - t\pi^*[\omega_B], \omega_B)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for classes $[\alpha] \in H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$.

In order to state our results, recall that a *slope* (or $[\omega_B]$ -slope) of a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} over B is defined as $\mu(\mathcal{E}) := \deg(\mathcal{E}) / (\text{rk}(\mathcal{E}) \cdot \int_B [\omega_B]^m)$, where the degree, $\deg(\mathcal{E})$, is given by $\deg(\mathcal{E}) := \int_B c_1(\det(\mathcal{E})) \cdot [\omega_B]^{m-1}$, and $\det \mathcal{E}$ is Knudsen-Mumford determinant of \mathcal{E} , see [43]. A torsion-free coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} is called *semistable* (or $[\omega_B]$ -*semistable*) if for every coherent subsheaf \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{E} , verifying $\text{rk}(\mathcal{F}) > 0$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{E})$. Remark that our normalization of the slope by the factor $\int_B [\omega_B]^m$ is absent in the usual definition.

Recall that any vector bundle E on $(B, [\omega_B])$ admits a unique filtration by subsheaves, also called the *Harder-Narasimhan filtration*:

$$E = \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1}^{HN} \supset \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_2}^{HN} \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_q}^{HN}, \quad (1.3)$$

defined so that for any $1 \leq i \leq q$, the quotient sheaf $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN}$ is the maximal semistable (torsion-free) subsheaf of $E / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN}$, i.e. for any subsheaf of \mathcal{F} of a (torsion-free) sheaf $E / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN}$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN})$ and $\text{rk}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \text{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN})$ if $\mu(\mathcal{F}) = \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN})$, and $\lambda_i = \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN})$, where here and later we use the convention $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{q+1}}^{HN} = \{0\}$.

We define the *Harder-Narasimhan slopes*, $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{\text{rk}(E)}$, of E , so that λ_i appears among $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{\text{rk}(E)}$ exactly $\text{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}^{HN})$ times, and the sequence $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{\text{rk}(E)}$ is non-decreasing. We call $\mu_{\min} := \mu_1$ and $\mu_{\max} := \mu_{\text{rk}(E)}$, the minimal and the maximal slopes respectively.

Now, in our fibered setting, for a relatively ample line bundle L on X and $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we denote the direct image sheaves by $E_k := R^0 \pi_* L^{\otimes k}$. For k big enough, a standard argument shows that E_k are locally free. From now on, we use the same symbol, E_k , for the associated vector bundle. We let $N_k := \text{rk}(E_k)$, and denote by $\mu_1^k, \dots, \mu_{N_k}^k$ the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of E_k . Define the probability measure η_k^{HN} on \mathbb{R} as

$$\eta_k^{HN} := \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \delta \left[\frac{\mu_i^k}{k} \right], \quad (1.4)$$

where $\delta[x]$ is the Dirac mass at $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

It was established by Chen in [12, Theorem 4.3.6] (in the case $\dim B = 1$) and by the author [36, Theorem 1.5] (for general Kähler manifolds B) that the sequence of probability measures

η_k^{HN} converges weakly, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, to a probability measure of compact support η^{HN} on \mathbb{R} . Moreover, the support of η^{HN} equals $[\text{ess inf } \eta^{HN}, \text{ess sup } \eta^{HN}]$, and η^{HN} is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, except probably for a point mass at $\text{ess sup } \eta^{HN}$.

We can now state the main result of this article.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\text{WZW}(c_1(L) - t\pi^*[\omega_B], \omega_B) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^*[\omega_B]^m \cdot (n + 1). \quad (1.5)$$

Remark 1.2. a) Remark that while the left-hand side of (1.5) is a differential-geometric quantity, the right-hand side is purely an algebraic one. Also, as η^{HN} depends only on the cohomological class $[\omega_B]$, the quantity $\text{WZW}(c_1(L) - t\pi^*[\omega_B], \omega_B)$ ultimately also depends only on $[\omega_B]$.

b) If for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta_1(x) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta_2(x)$, for some Radon measures η_1, η_2 of compact support on \mathbb{R} , then $\eta_1 = \eta_2$. In particular, Theorem 1.1 gives a differential-geometric characterization of the measure η^{HN} .

c) It is easy to see, cf. (2.5), that Theorem 1.1 establishes for $p = 1$ the conjecture of the author from [36] about the optimality of the lower bound on the Fibered Yang-Mills functional.




Figure 1: Sharp and trivial lower bounds on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional.

As a direct application of Theorem 1.1, we have the following result, which makes a connection between the existence of approximate solutions of (1.1) and algebraic obstructions precise.

Corollary 1.3. The measure η^{HN} is the Dirac mass at λ if and only if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -form ω_ϵ in the class $c_1(L)$, which is positive along the fibers of π , such that

$$\int_X |\omega_\epsilon^{n+1} \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^{m-1} - \lambda(n + 1) \cdot \omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^m| < \epsilon. \quad (1.6)$$

Remark 1.4. As we explain in Section 12, Corollary 1.3 generalizes the Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence. The latter statement roughly corresponds to $\pi : \mathbb{P}(E^*) \rightarrow B$, $L := \mathcal{O}(1)$ for a holomorphic vector bundle E over B . Then η^{HN} is the Dirac mass if and only if E is semistable.

Let us now explain an application of Theorem 1.1 towards asymptotic cohomology. Recall that on a compact complex manifold Y of dimension n with a holomorphic line bundle F , the q -th asymptotic cohomology is defined as

$$\hat{h}^q(Y, F) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!}{k^n} \dim H^q(Y, F^{\otimes k}). \quad (1.7)$$

Refer to [46] and [19] for the proof of some fundamental properties of $\hat{h}^q(Y, F)$. Holomorphic Morse inequalities of Demailly [18] give the following upper bounds

$$\hat{h}^q(Y, F) \leq \int_{Y(\alpha, q)} (-1)^q \alpha^n, \quad (1.8)$$

where α is an arbitrary smooth form in the class $c_1(F)$, and $Y(\alpha, q)$ is the open set of points $x \in Y$, so that $\alpha(x)$ has signature $(n - q, q)$.

Conjecture 1. (Demailly [19, Question 1.13]) We have $\hat{h}^q(Y, F) = \inf \int_{Y(\alpha, q)} (-1)^q \alpha^n$, where the infimum is taken over all smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -forms α in the class $c_1(F)$.

As explained in [20, p. 3], cf. also the end of Section 11, the conjecture above is related to the Andreotti-Grauert vanishing theorem [1], and in a way it should be seen as an asymptotic converse of it. Besides the cases $q = 0$ and $n \leq 2$, proved in [20, Theorems 1.3, 1.4], the conjecture remains largely open. The major difficulty is, of course, to construct a differential form from the algebraic datum of asymptotic cohomology. In Section 11, we will make a connection between the above conjecture and a question asked in the beginning of this article. As an application of this and Theorem 1.1, we have the following result.

Corollary 1.5. For a holomorphic submersion $p : Y \rightarrow C$ between a complex projective manifold Y and a compact Riemann surface C , Conjecture 1 holds for any holomorphic line bundle F on Y which is relatively ample with respect to p .

We will in fact show that in the setting of Corollary 1.5, the sequence of $(1, 1)$ -forms, minimizing the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional, saturates the lower bound (1.8).

Let us briefly explain the structure of this paper. In Section 2, we establish the lower bound from (1.5) on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional. We do so by studying asymptotically, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, the lower bound on the Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals of E_k . We describe a precise relation between the minimization of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional and Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals. We describe a construction of the sequence of $(1, 1)$ -forms, which gives a sharp lower bound on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional. We prove that this sequence is indeed the minimizing one in Section 3, modulo a number of technical results which are treated later in Sections 4-9. In Section 10, we describe an application of Theorem 1.1 which gives a Mehta-Ramanathan type formula for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional. In Section 11, we establish Corollary 1.5. Finally, in Section 12, we describe a connection between Corollary 1.3, Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence and Hessian quotient equations.

Notations. We use the notation $N_k := \text{rk}(E_k)$ throughout the text. For $b \in B$, we denote by $X_b, E_{k,b}$, etc., the fibers of X, E_k , etc., at b . For a Hermitian vector bundle (E, h^E) on B , a bounded section A of $\text{End}(E)$ and a positive volume form η on B , we define

$$\|A \cdot \eta\|_{L^1(B, h^E)} = \int_{b \in B} \|A(b)\| \cdot \eta(b), \quad \|A \cdot \eta\|_{L^1(B, h^E)}^{\text{tr}} = \int_{b \in B} \text{Tr}[|A(b)|] \cdot \eta(b), \quad (1.9)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the subordinate operator norm, calculated with respect to h^E , and $|A|$ is the absolute value of an operator, defined as $\sqrt{AA^*}$. Clearly, $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(B,h^E)}$ is a norm. In fact, $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(B,h^E)}^{\text{tr}}$ is also a norm; the triangle inequality is satisfied by Ky Fan inequalities, cf. [6, Exercise II.1.15].

Let (V, H) be a Hermitian vector space. For Hermitian $A_0, A_1 \in \text{End}(V)$, we note $A_0 \geq A_1$ if the difference $A_0 - A_1$ is positive semi-definite. When the choice of the Hermitian structure is not clear from the context, we use notation $A_0 \geq_H A_1$.

We endow $\text{Sym}^l V$ with a Hermitian metric $\text{Sym}^l H$ induced by the induced metric on $V^{\otimes l}$ and the inclusion $\text{Sym}^l V \rightarrow V^{\otimes l}$, defined as

$$v_1 \odot \dots \odot v_l \mapsto \frac{1}{l!} \sum v_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\sigma(l)}, \quad (1.10)$$

where the sum runs over all permutations σ on l indices. Clearly, if v_1, \dots, v_r form an orthonormal basis of V , then $\sqrt{l!/|\alpha|} \cdot v^{\odot \alpha}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^l$, $|\alpha| = l$, forms an orthonormal basis of $\text{Sym}^l V$ with respect to $\text{Sym}^l H$. Similarly, for an arbitrary filtration \mathcal{F} of V , we define the filtration $\text{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}$ on $\text{Sym}^l V$.

For any $A \in \text{End}(V)$, we define $\text{Sym}^l A \in \text{End}(\text{Sym}^l V)$ as the symmetrization of the map $l \cdot A \otimes \text{Id}_V \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Id}_V$. In other words, if A is self-adjoint and (v_1, \dots, v_r) form a basis of V , consisting of eigenvectors of A corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$, then $v^{\odot \alpha}$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) \in \mathbb{N}^l$, $|\alpha| = l$, forms a basis of eigenvectors of $\text{Sym}^l A$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $\alpha \cdot \lambda := \alpha_1 \lambda_1 + \dots + \alpha_r \lambda_r$.

Consider now a surjection $p : V \rightarrow Q$ between two complex vector bundles. Once we fix a Hermitian metric H on V , one can naturally identify V with $Q \oplus \ker p$ using the dual to p map $p^* : Q \rightarrow V$. Using this identification, for any $A \in \text{End}(V)$, we then can define the operator $A|_Q \in \text{End}(Q)$ by $A|_Q(q) = p(A(p^*(q)))$.

A filtration \mathcal{F} on V is a map from \mathbb{R} to vector subspaces of V , $t \mapsto \mathcal{F}_t V$, verifying $\mathcal{F}_t V \subset \mathcal{F}_s V$ for $t > s$, and such that $\mathcal{F}_t V = V$ for sufficiently small t and $\mathcal{F}_t V = \{0\}$ for sufficiently big t . We always assume that it left-continuous, i.e. for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that $\mathcal{F}_t V = \mathcal{F}_{t-\epsilon} V$ for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Sometimes, we define filtrations by prescribing their jumping numbers and respective vector subbundles. In this way, the corresponding map from \mathbb{R} is defined as the only left-continuous map, which is constant between the jumping numbers.

A norm $N_V = \|\cdot\|_V$ on V naturally induces the quotient norm $\|\cdot\|_Q := [N_V]$ on Q as follows

$$\|f\|_Q := \inf \{ \|g\|_V : g \in V, p(g) = f \}, \quad f \in Q. \quad (1.11)$$

Similarly, for any filtration \mathcal{F} on V , we can form a quotient filtration $[\mathcal{F}]$ on Q . More precisely, recall that a filtration \mathcal{F} on V defines the norm and weigh functions $\chi_{\mathcal{F}} : V \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, $\chi_{\mathcal{F}} : V \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$, as follows

$$w_{\mathcal{F}}(s) := \sup \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : s \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda} \}, \quad \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(s) := \exp(-w_{\mathcal{F}}(s)). \quad (1.12)$$

Clearly, $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a non-Archimedean norm on V with respect to the trivial absolute value on \mathbb{C} , i.e. it satisfies the following axioms: a) $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(f) = 0$ if and only if $f = 0$, b) $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda f) = \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(f)$, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f \in V$, c) $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(f + g) \leq \max\{\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(f), \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(g)\}$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f, g \in V$. Moreover, any function verifying the above properties is associated with a filtration. If we now use the definition (1.11) to define the quotient norm $[\chi_{\mathcal{F}}]$ from $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$, it will satisfy the same properties of a non-Archimedean norm and, hence, defines a filtration, which we denote by $[\mathcal{F}]$.

For a coherent sheaf \mathcal{E} on B , we denote by $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{E})$ the saturation of \mathcal{E} , defined as the minimal subsheaf containing \mathcal{E} with torsion free quotient. A sheaf \mathcal{E} is saturated if $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}$.

Acknowledgement. Author acknowledges the support of CNRS and École Polytechnique.

2 A minimizing sequence for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional

The main goal of this section is to give an outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. More precisely, we first show that the lower bound on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional follows directly from the previous work [36] of the author. We then describe a relation between the fact that this lower bound is sharp and the fact that, asymptotically, the infimum of the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional on direct images is saturated by the L^2 -metrics. Finally, we describe a sequence of relatively positive $(1, 1)$ -forms which saturates the lower bound on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional.

We follow the notations introduced before Theorem 1.1. Fix an arbitrary smooth closed relatively positive $(1, 1)$ -form α in the class $c_1(L) - t\pi^*[\omega_B]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 2.1. For any α as above, we have

$$\text{WZW}(\alpha, \omega_B) \geq \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^*[\omega_B]^m \cdot (n + 1). \quad (2.1)$$

Let us introduce some notations which will be useful in the proof of Proposition 2.1 and later on. We define the $(1, 1)$ -form $\omega := \alpha + t\pi^*\omega_B$. As ω is positive along the fibers, it provides a (smooth) decomposition of the tangent space TX of X into the vertical component $T^V X$, corresponding to the tangent space of the fibers, and the horizontal component $T^H X$, corresponding to the orthogonal complement of $T^V X$ with respect to ω . The form ω then decomposes as $\omega = \omega_V + \omega_H$, $\omega_V \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \wedge^{1,1} T^V X)$, $\omega_H \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \wedge^{1,1} T^H X)$. Upon the natural identification of $T^H X$ with π^*TB , we may view ω_H as an element from $\mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \wedge^{1,1} \pi^*T^*B)$. We define $\wedge_{\omega_B} \omega_H \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$, as $\wedge_{\omega_B} \omega_H := \omega_H \wedge \omega_B^{m-1} / \omega_B^m$. We also fix a relatively positive Hermitian metric h^L on L verifying $c_1(L, h^L) = \omega$.

We will now define a map (sometimes called *quantization*), which for a relatively positive Hermitian metric h^L on L associates a Hermitian metric $\text{Hilb}_k^\pi(h^L)$ on E_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, defined for smooth elements f, f' of $E_{k,b}$, $b \in B$, as follows

$$\langle f, f' \rangle_{\text{Hilb}_k^\pi(h^L)} := \int_{X_b} \langle f(x), f'(x) \rangle_{(h^L) \otimes k} \cdot dv_{X_b}(x), \quad (2.2)$$

where dv_{X_b} is the Riemannian volume form induced by the restriction of $c_1(L, h^L)$ to the fibers.

Recall now that for a Hermitian metric h^E on a holomorphic vector bundle E over B , for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the *Hermitian Yang-Mills functional* is defined as

$$\text{HYM}_t(E, h^E, \omega_B) := \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{h^E} \wedge \omega_B^{m-1} - t \text{Id}_E \cdot \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B, h^E)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where here and after R^{h^E} is the curvature of the Chern connection of (E, h^E) . Remark that our terminology is slightly different from the generally accepted one, where the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional is related to the L^2 -norm instead of the L^1 -norm.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We will show that Proposition 2.1 is an easy consequence of a more general result giving lower bounds on the Fibered Yang-Mills functionals introduced in [36, Theorem 1.7]. Directly from the definition of $\wedge_{\omega_B} \omega_H$, we have

$$\alpha^{n+1} = (\wedge_{\omega_B} \omega_H - t) \cdot \omega^n \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^m \cdot (n + 1). \quad (2.4)$$

Hence, by the relative positivity of ω , we have

$$\text{WZW}(\alpha, \omega_B) = \int_X |\wedge_{\omega_B} \omega_H - t| \cdot \omega^n \wedge \pi^* \omega_B^m \cdot (n+1). \quad (2.5)$$

But for a Hermitian metric h^L on L , such that ω coincides with the first Chern form, $c_1(L, h^L)$, of L , the right-hand side of (2.5) corresponds (up to a multiplication by $(n+1)$) to the Fibered Yang-Mills functional, $\text{FYM}_{1,t}(\pi, h^L)$, introduced by the author in [36, (1.5)]. The result now follows directly from (2.5) and [36, Theorem 1.7]. For further purposes, let us recall the crucial steps from the argument. First, by [36, (2.15)] and (2.5), we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kN_k} \text{HYM}_{tk}(E_k, \text{Hilb}_k^\pi(h^L), \omega_B) = \frac{1}{\pi_* c_1(L)^n \cdot (n+1)} \text{WZW}(\alpha, \omega_B), \quad (2.6)$$

From the lower bounds on the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional due to Atiyah-Bott [2, Proposition 8.20] (for $\dim B = 1$) and Daskalopoulos-Wentworth [16, Lemma 2.17, Corollary 2.22, Proposition 2.25] (for general Kähler B), applied for E_k for k big enough, so that E_k is locally free, for any Hermitian metric H_k on E_k , we have

$$\frac{1}{kN_k} \text{HYM}_{tk}(E_k, H_k, \omega_B) \geq \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta_k^{HN}(x) \cdot \int_B [\omega_B]^m. \quad (2.7)$$

From the weak convergence, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, of the measures η_k^{HN} , (1.4), established by Chen in [12, Theorem 4.3.6] (in the case $\dim B = 1$) and then by the author [36, Theorem 1.5] (for general Kähler B), we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta_k^{HN}(x) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x). \quad (2.8)$$

The proof now follows from (2.6) and (2.7), (2.8). \square

Now, Theorem 1.1 claims that the lower bound established in Proposition 2.1 is sharp, and so the proof of it reduces to a construction of a minimizing sequence of the relatively positive $(1, 1)$ -forms for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional, which saturates the lower bound (2.1). Before describing our construction of this minimizing sequence, which is the main contribution of this article, let us explain a connection between Theorem 1.1 and the asymptotic minimization of the Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals.

Theorem 2.2. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a relatively positive Hermitian metric h_ϵ^L on L , and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \geq k_0$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\text{HYM}_{tk}(E_k, \text{Hilb}_k^\pi(h_\epsilon^L), \omega_B) \leq \inf_{H_k} \text{HYM}_{tk}(E_k, H_k, \omega_B) + \epsilon k N_k, \quad (2.9)$$

where the infimum is taken over all Hermitian metrics H_k on E_k .

Remark 2.3. a) By (2.7) and (2.8), $\inf_{H_k} \text{HYM}_{tk}(E_k, H_k, \omega_B)$ is comparable with kN_k .

b) Not every Hermitian metric on E_k is the L^2 -metric of some metric on the line bundle, cf. [65]. Hence, even the existence of h_ϵ^L , verifying (2.9) for one fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ seems to be non trivial. Theorem 2.2, claims much more: such L^2 -metrics can be chosen in a related manner.

Proof of Theorem 2.2 assuming Theorem 1.1. First of all, for any $\epsilon > 0$, Theorem 1.1 assures the existence of a relatively positive metric h_ϵ^L on L , verifying

$$\text{WZW}(c_1(L, h_\epsilon^L) - t\pi^*\omega_B, \omega_B) \leq \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^*[\omega_B]^m \cdot (n+1) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \quad (2.10)$$

It then follows by (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8) that (2.9) holds for h_ϵ^L as in (2.10). \square

To explain our construction of a minimizing sequence for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional, recall that for k sufficiently large so that L^k is relatively very ample, *Fubini-Study* operator associates for any Hermitian metric H_k on E_k a relatively positive Hermitian metric $FS(H_k)$ on L^k in the following way. Consider the relative Kodaira embedding $\text{Kod}_k : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(E_k^*)$, which can be put into the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\text{Kod}_k} & \mathbb{P}(E_k^*) \\ & \searrow \pi & \downarrow p \\ & & B. \end{array} \quad (2.11)$$

It is well-known that (2.11) is compatible with the isomorphism

$$\text{Kod}_k^* \mathcal{O}(1) \rightarrow L^k, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is the relative hyperplane bundle on $\mathbb{P}(E_k^*)$. We define the metric $FS(H_k)$ on L^k as the pull-back of the Fubini-Study metric on $\mathcal{O}(1)$ induced by H_k . Alternatively, $FS(H_k)$ is the only metric on L^k , which for any $x \in X$, $b := \pi(x)$, and for an orthonormal basis s_1, \dots, s_{N_k} of $(E_{k,b}, H_{k,b})$ satisfies the following equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^l |s_i(x)|_{FS(H_k)}^2 = 1. \quad (2.13)$$

Now, our construction of the minimizing sequence for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional will be done by *dequantization* (i.e. an application of the Fubini-Study operator) to some sequence of metrics on E_k , which saturate the lower bound on the respective Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals. One of the main difficulties in our analysis lies in the fact that these Hermitian metrics on E_k have a priori nothing to do with the Hermitian metrics constructed by the quantization, which were used in (2.7) to get lower bounds for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional.

The motivation behind the above construction lies in the estimates (2.6) and (2.7). Moreover, recall that a theorem of Tian, [67], says that for an arbitrary smooth relatively positive Hermitian metric h^L , the sequence of metrics $FS(\text{Hilb}_k^\pi(h^L))^{1/k}$ converges to h^L uniformly, as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (the convergence holds even with all its derivatives, as it was subsequently established by Zelditch [74], Catlin [10], Bouche [8], and Dai-Liu-Ma [15] among others). So if the sequence of Hermitian metrics on E_k ends up being associated with some metric on the line bundle L by the quantization, then the metric on L can be reconstructed from the metrics on E_k by the dequantization.

We will now describe a specific choice of the minimizing sequence of metrics for the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional on E_k one has to choose so that its dequantization saturates the lower bound on the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional.

For this, let us recall a definition of *approximate critical Hermitian structures*. Roughly, an approximate critical Hermitian structure on a vector bundle E over B is a Hermitian metric on E , which is in some sense well-adapted to the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, \mathcal{F}^{HN} , of E . In order to better explain the definition, we need to introduce the *weight operator* of a filtration.

We fix a complex vector space V , $\dim V = r$. Let $V = F_{\lambda_1} \supset F_{\lambda_2} \supset \cdots \supset F_{\lambda_r}$, $\lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_r$, be an arbitrary complete filtration, F , of V , i.e. such that $\dim F_{\lambda_i} = r + 1 - i$, for any $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let H be an arbitrary Hermitian product on V . Let e_1, \dots, e_r be the orthonormal basis of V (with respect to H) adapted to the filtration in the sense that $e_i \in F_{\lambda_i}$, for any $i = 1, \dots, r$, and $e_i \perp F_{\lambda_{i+1}}$, for any $i = 1, \dots, r - 1$. The *weight operator*, $A(H, F) \in \text{End}(V)$, associated with the filtration F and the Hermitian product H , is then defined in the basis e_i as

$$A(H, F)e_i = \lambda_i e_i. \quad (2.14)$$

Clearly, one can non-ambiguously extend this definition to non-complete filtrations by completing them. The above construction also makes sense in the family setting: when a vector space is replaced by a vector bundle over a manifold, a Hermitian product is replaced by a Hermitian metric, and the filtration is replaced by filtrations by subsheaves over the manifold. When the filtration is given by subbundles (and not by subsheaves), and the Hermitian metric is smooth, it is immediate to see that the weight operator becomes a smooth section of the respective endomorphism bundle.

Following Kobayashi [45], we say that a Hermitian metric h^E on a holomorphic vector bundle E over B is a *critical Hermitian structure* on E if the curvature of it satisfies $\sqrt{-1}R^{h^E} \wedge \omega_B^{m-1} = 2\pi A(H, \mathcal{F}^{HN}) \cdot \omega_B^m$. Critical Hermitian structures correspond to the minimizers of the Hermitian-Yang-Mills functional. Unfortunately, these do not exist on arbitrary vector bundles, see [69], [25] and [45, Theorem 4.3.27], and so cannot be used for our purposes.

To circumvent this, following Daskalopoulos-Wentworth, [16], we say that h^E is an L^1 δ -*approximate critical Hermitian structure* on E if

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{h^E} \wedge \omega_B^{m-1} - A(H, \mathcal{F}^{HN}) \cdot \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B, h^E)} \leq \delta, \quad (2.15)$$

where $A(H, \mathcal{F}^{HN})$ is the weight operator associated with the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, \mathcal{F}^{HN} , on E . A result of Atiyah-Bott [2, proof of Proposition 8.20] (for $\dim B = 1$), Daskalopoulos-Wentworth, [16, Theorem 3.11] (for $\dim B = 2$) and Sibley [61, Theorem 1.3] (for any dimension), says that, unlike critical Hermitian structures, L^1 δ -approximate critical Hermitian structures exist on arbitrary holomorphic vector bundles over compact manifolds for any $\delta > 0$. It is then an easy verification that, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, these metrics saturate the sharp lower bounds (as in (2.7)) on the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional. Later, for brevity, we omit L^1 from the above notation.

Another fundamental ingredient in our construction is the one of *geodesic rays*. For a complex vector space V , $\dim V = r$, we fix a filtration F , for which we use the same notations as from (2.14). We say that the Hermitian products H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, on V form a *geodesic ray* departing from H associated with the filtration F , if $e_i \cdot \exp(s\lambda_i/2)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, form an orthonormal basis for H_s . As in the case of the weight operator, the above construction makes sense in the family setting. Again, it is easy to verify that the resulting ray is a ray of smooth metrics if the initial metric is smooth, and the filtration of a vector bundle is given by subbundles.

The terminology “geodesic ray” comes from the fact that the above rays are metric geodesics in the space of all Hermitian products on V for the invariant metric coming from the $SL(V)/SU(V)$ -homogeneous structure. Finite segments of this ray will be called geodesics.

We establish in Theorem 3.8 that the construction of geodesic rays associated with the Harder-Narasimhan filtration and δ -approximate critical Hermitian structures are in certain sense compatible. Motivated by this, our construction of a minimizing sequence for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional is given by the dequantization of these geodesic rays. However, as the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations are given by subsheaves and not by subbundles (unless $\dim B = 1$), the resulting sequence of metrics would not be smooth in general. To overcome this issue, we need to resolve the singularities of the filtration first.

For this, we need to show that the value of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional is not affected by the birational modifications of the base. More precisely, let $\mu_0 : B_0 \rightarrow B$ be a modification. We define X_0 through the pull-back of μ and π , and let $\pi_0 : X_0 \rightarrow B_0$, $p_0 : X_0 \rightarrow X$ be the corresponding projection maps, i.e. for $k := 0$, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_k & \xrightarrow{p_k} & X \\ \downarrow \pi_k & & \downarrow \pi \\ B_k & \xrightarrow{\mu_k} & B. \end{array} \quad (2.16)$$

Proposition 2.4. For any relatively Kähler class $[\alpha]$ on X , we have

$$\text{WZW}([\alpha], \omega_B) = \text{WZW}(p_0^*[\alpha], \mu_0^* \omega_B), \quad (2.17)$$

where we extended the definition of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional to the semi-positive form $\mu_0^* \omega_B$ in a natural way.

Proof. The inequality $\text{WZW}([\alpha], \omega_B) \geq \text{WZW}(p_0^*[\alpha], \mu_0^* \omega_B)$ is immediate. The proof of the opposite inequality is an easy modification of [20, Proposition 2.1] left to the reader. \square

In particular, in order to construct a minimizing sequence of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional on the family $\pi : X \rightarrow B$, it suffices to construct a minimizing sequence of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional on a sequence of birational modifications over the base of this family.

Now, using the resolution of indeterminacy of meromorphic maps, see Hironaka [39], [40], it is classical, cf. [61, Proposition 4.3], that for any filtration of a holomorphic vector bundle E over B by saturated subsheaves $E = \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1} \supset \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_2} \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_q}$, there is a modification $\mu_0 : B_0 \rightarrow B$ of B such that $\tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i} := \text{Sat}(\mu_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i})$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, are locally free, and form a filtration

$$\mu_0^* E = \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1} \supset \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_2} \supset \cdots \supset \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_q}, \quad (2.18)$$

which we denote by $\tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}$.

We denote by $\mu_k : B_k \rightarrow B$ a modification of B , corresponding to the resolution of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration (given by the saturated subsheaves, see [45, Lemma 5.7.5])

$$\mu_k^* E_k = \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1}^{HN,k} \supset \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_2}^{HN,k} \supset \cdots \supset \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{q_k}}^{HN,k}, \quad (2.19)$$

constructed as in (2.18), i.e. $\tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN,k} = \text{Sat}(\mu_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN,k})$. Denote by X_k the pull-back of μ_k and π , and by $\pi_k : X_k \rightarrow B_k$, $p_k : X_k \rightarrow X$ be the corresponding projection maps, i.e. such that the diagram (2.16) is commutative. For further purposes, we introduce the following subsets

$$S_k := \cup_{i=1}^{q_k} \text{supp}(\tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN,k} / \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN,k}), \quad S_k^0 := \cup_{i=1}^{q_k} \text{Singsupp}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}^{HN,k}). \quad (2.20)$$

Clearly, S_k and S_k^0 are proper analytic subsets (of B_k and B respectively) and $\mu_k(S_k) \subset S_k^0$.

Theorem 2.5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $\delta > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure $H_{\delta,k}$ on E_k , there is $s \in [0, +\infty[$, such that for the geodesic ray of Hermitian metrics $H_{\delta,k,s}$ on $\mu_k^* E_k$, departing from $\mu_k^* H_{\delta,k}$ and associated with the resolution of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration (2.19), the following holds. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -form $\omega_{\delta,k,s} := c_1(p_k^* L, FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{\frac{1}{k}})$ verifies*

$$\text{WZW}(\omega_{\delta,k,s} - t\pi_k^* \mu_k^* \omega_B, \mu_k^* \omega_B) \leq \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot (n+1) \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^* [\omega_B]^m + \epsilon. \quad (2.21)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Propositions 2.1, it suffices to establish the bound

$$\text{WZW}(c_1(L) - t\pi^* [\omega_B], \omega_B) \leq \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^* [\omega_B]^m \cdot (n+1). \quad (2.22)$$

But it follows directly by a combination of Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 2.4. \square

The rest of the article until Section 10 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.5.

3 Dequantization of approximate critical Hermitian structures

The main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 2.5 modulo a number of technical results which will be treated later in this article. We will conserve the notations from Introduction and Section 2.

Our proof of Theorem 2.5 is based on the well-known fact that section rings of polarized projective manifolds are finitely generated. More precisely, the following family version of this result is used: there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $k_0 | k$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the multiplication map

$$\text{Mult}_{k,l} : \text{Sym}^l E_k \rightarrow E_{kl}, \quad (3.1)$$

is surjective, cf. [32, Proposition 3.1] for a proof of a finite generation of section rings associated with ample line bundles, which easily adapts to the family setting considered here. In particular, by the surjectivity of (3.1), the constructions of the quotients from (1.11) can be applied. From now on, for an arbitrary Hermitian metric H_k on E_k (resp. $\mu_k^* E_k$), we denote by $[\text{Sym}^l H_k]$ the induced quotient metric on E_{kl} (resp. $\mu_k^* E_{kl}$). Similar notations are used for respective filtrations. Our proof of Theorem 2.5 is based on a detailed study of the metric $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]$ on E_{kl} , as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof decomposes into 2 parts. First, we show that the metric $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]$ is very close to the one provided by the quantization. Second, even though we do not present our results in exactly this way, we show that for carefully chosen parameters l, δ, k, s , the value of the Hermitian Yang-Mills functional on $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]$ is close to the infimum.

We now describe the ingredients of the proof in details. First, we compare the curvatures of Hermitian metrics constructed through the quotient procedure with those given by the quantization.

Theorem 3.1. *There is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_0 | k$, and a Hermitian metric H_k on E_k , there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R_{[\text{Sym}^l H_k]} - \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^\pi(FS(H_k)^{1/k})} \right\| \leq C\sqrt{l}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is for a norm induced by a fixed metric on TB , and the subordinate norm on $\text{End}(E_k)$ is associated with $\text{Hilb}_{kl}^\pi(FS(H_k)^{1/k})$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be established in Section 4 and it relies on the semiclassical Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem from [30] and on subsequent works [32], [31].

We will also need to compare the metrics themselves. In this direction, the following easy consequence of [31], [34], will be explained in details in Section 4.

Proposition 3.2. *There is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_0|k$, and a Hermitian metric H_k on E_k , there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, we have*

$$1 - \frac{C}{l} \leq \frac{[\text{Sym}^l H_k]}{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^\pi(FS(H_k)^{1/k})} \cdot \frac{1}{k^m l^n} \leq 1 + \frac{C}{l}. \quad (3.3)$$

In order to state the next result, let us recall the definition of Toeplitz operators. We introduce directly their family version. Let $\pi_* L^{\otimes k}$ be the (infinite-dimensional) vector bundle over B , defined so that for any open $U \subset B$, we have $\mathcal{C}^\infty(U, \pi_* L^{\otimes k}) := \mathcal{C}^\infty(\pi^{-1}(U), L^{\otimes k})$. The *Bergman projector* B_k^{π, h^L} is a section of the infinite-dimension bundle $\text{End}(\pi_* L^{\otimes k})$, defined as the orthogonal projection (with respect to $\text{Hilb}_{kl}^\pi(h^L)$) from $\pi_* L^{\otimes k}$ to E_k . For a smooth vector bundle G on B , we fix $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \pi^* G)$, $f = g \cdot \pi^* h$, $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$, $h \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, G)$, and define the Toeplitz operator, $T_k^{\pi, h^L}(f) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(E_k) \otimes G)$, for any $s \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, E_k)$ as follows

$$T_k^{\pi, h^L}(f)(s) = B_k^{\pi, h^L}(h \cdot s) \cdot \pi^* h. \quad (3.4)$$

Clearly, the definition doesn't depend on the choice of the decomposition of f .

We now fix a relatively positive Hermitian metric h^L on L , and denote $\omega := c_1(L, h^L)$. We denote by $\omega_H \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \wedge^{1,1} \pi^* T^* B)$ the horizontal part of the curvature, ω , defined as before Proposition 2.1. The following result, which was already used in our proof of (2.6) from [36], will continue to play a crucial role in our work.

Theorem 3.3 (Ma-Zhang [52, Theorem 0.4]). *There are $C > 0$, $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$,*

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(h^L)} - l \cdot T_l^{\pi, h^L}(\omega_H) \right\| \leq C, \quad (3.5)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ here is as in (3.2).

Next, we need to compare the weight operators associated with the Harder-Narasimhan filtration $\mathcal{F}^{HN, k}$ on E_k and on its quotients. The following result will be established in Sections 6, 7, 8, and it relies on the methods developed in study of submultiplicative norms carried out by the author in [33] and [35] as well as on the analysis from Phong-Sturm [58].

Theorem 3.4. *There is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_0|k$, $\delta > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, $s \geq 1$, there is $B_{\delta, k, l, s} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B_k, \mu_k^* \text{End}(E_{kl}))$, which is Hermitian with respect to both $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k, s}]$ and $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k, 0}]$, and such that we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sym}^l A(H_{\delta, k, s}, \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN, k})|_{E_{kl}} &\geq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k, s}]} B_{\delta, k, l, s}, \\ B_{\delta, k, l, s} &\geq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k, 0}]} A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k, 0}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN, k}]) - \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + \epsilon l \right) \text{Id}_{\mu_k^* E_{kl}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Remark 3.5. As we show in (6.3), for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $k, \text{lin}\mathbb{N}^*$, the following bound holds

$$\text{Sym}^l A(H_{\delta,k,s}, \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k})|_{E_{kl}} \leq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]). \quad (3.7)$$

The fact that the bounds (3.6) essentially invert the inequality (3.7) for big $s \in [0, +\infty[$, is the main reason why we introduce the geodesic rays in our construction from Section 2.

We will also use the following much simpler statement established in Section 5.

Proposition 3.6. For any $k, l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\delta, s > 0$, $b \in B_k$, verifying $\mu_k(b) \in B \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{+\infty} S_{ki}^0$, we have

$$A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl})_b \geq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]_b} A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}])_b. \quad (3.8)$$

For the next ingredient of our proof, we need to introduce the volume of a filtration. For a complex vector space V , $\dim V = r$, endowed with a filtration F with the jumping numbers $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the volume, $\text{vol}(F)$, of F as

$$\text{vol}(F) := \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r. \quad (3.9)$$

This notion also makes sense in a family setting, i.e. if instead of a filtration by vector subspaces of a vector space, we consider a filtration of a vector bundle by subsheaves. The volume is then defined as the volume of the induced filtration on the generic fiber (i.e. away from the singular set of subsheaves). In Section 5, relying on the submultiplicative nature of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, due to Chen [12] and the author [37], and on the approximation properties of submultiplicative filtrations due to Boucksom-Jonsson [9, Theorem 3.18], we establish the following result.

Proposition 3.7. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k_0 | k, l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\text{vol}([\text{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \geq \text{vol}(\mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) - \epsilon l N_{kl}. \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, we will rely on the following result about the compatibility of the construction of geodesic rays and approximate critical Hermitian structures, see (2.15) and (2.18) for notations.

Theorem 3.8. For any δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure H on E , the geodesic ray, H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, of Hermitian metrics on $\mu_0^* E$, departing from $\mu_0^* H$ associated with the resolution of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, $\tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}^{HN}$, of E , satisfies

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{H_s} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - A(H_s, \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}^{HN}) \cdot \mu_0^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_s)} \leq \delta \text{rk}(E)^3 8^{\text{rk}(E)+4}, \quad (3.11)$$

where $A(H_s, \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}^{HN})$ is the weight operator, introduced in (2.14).

Remark 3.9. In particular, if the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of E is given by the vector subbundles (and not by subsheaves), then the geodesic ray associated with the Harder-Narasimhan filtration departing from an δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure consists of $\delta \text{rk}(E)^3 8^{\text{rk}(E)+4}$ -approximate critical Hermitian structures on E .

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We use the notations $\omega_{\delta,k,s,H}$ for the horizontal component, defined as before Proposition 2.1, of the $(1, 1)$ -form $\omega_{\delta,k,s}$, defined in Theorem 2.5. First of all, let us establish that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $\delta > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_{kl}} \left\| T_{kl}^{\pi, FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}} (\omega_{\delta, k, s, H}) \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - t \cdot \text{Id}_{\mu_k^* E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}} \\ = \frac{1}{\pi_*(c_1(L)^n) \cdot (n+1)} \text{WZW}(\omega_{\delta, k, s} - t \mu_k^* \omega_B, \mu_k^* \omega_B). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

As the argument for (3.12) is rather close to the one behind (2.6), we will be brief. To simplify the notations, we establish (3.12) for $t = 0$; the general case is done analogously. We fix $b_0 \in B_k$, and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m(m-1)/2}$ be a local frame of $(1, 1)$ -differential forms defined in a neighborhood $U \subset B_k$ of b_0 . We denote by η a volume form on B_k , and decompose $\omega_{\delta, k, s, H} = \sum f_i \pi_k^* \alpha_i$, where $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\pi_k^{-1}(U))$, $i = 1, \dots, m(m-1)/2$. We define $g_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\pi_k^{-1}(U))$, $i = 1, \dots, m(m-1)/2$, through the identity $g_i \eta = \alpha_i \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1}$. Then by the weak convergence of spectral measures of Toeplitz operators due to Boutet de Monvel-Guillemin [47, Theorem 13.13], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_{kl}} \left\| T_{kl}^{\pi, FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m(m-1)/2} f_i g_i \right) \cdot \eta \right\|_{L^1(U, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}} \\ = \frac{1}{\pi_*(c_1(L)^n)} \int_{x \in \pi_k^{-1}(U)} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m(m-1)/2} f_i(x) g_i(x) \right| \cdot \omega_{\delta, k, s}^n \wedge \eta(\pi_k(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Remark that the reference [47] treats only the spectral theory of Toeplitz operators considered individually, and not in families, as we need in (3.13). However, as the alternative proofs of this convergence from [49, Theorem 7.4.1], [3, Theorem 3.8] or [29, Appendix A] ultimately rely only on the off-diagonal expansion of the Bergman kernel of Dai-Liu-Ma [15], which holds in the family setting, the statement (3.13) holds in the family setting as well.

It is then a matter of a simple verification that

$$\int_{x \in \pi_k^{-1}(U)} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m(m-1)/2} f_i(x) g_i(x) \right| \cdot \omega_{\delta, k, s}^n \wedge \eta(\pi_k(x)) = \int_{\pi_k^{-1}(U)} \left| \omega_{\delta, k, s}^n \wedge \omega_{\delta, k, s, H} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right|. \quad (3.14)$$

By taking a weighted sum of (3.13) over a covering of B_k with respect to a partition of unity, and using (2.5) with (3.14), we deduce (3.12).

The proof of Theorem 2.5 now rests upon establishing that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $\delta, C > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $s > 1$, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, so that for $l \geq l_0$, the following bound holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T_{kl}^{\pi, FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}} (\omega_{\delta, k, s, H}) \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - t \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta, k, s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}} \\ \leq \frac{(1+\epsilon)}{kl} \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k}], \mathcal{F}^{HN, kl}) - tkl \cdot \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ + C \frac{N_{kl}}{s} + \frac{\epsilon N_{kl}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Let us explain why it is sufficient to establish (3.15) in order to prove Theorem 2.5. It is immediate by the definition of the weight operator and the set S_k^0 , see (2.20), that for $b \in B \setminus S_k^0$, we have

$$\text{Tr} \left[\left[A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta, k}], \mathcal{F}^{HN, kl})_b - tkl \cdot \text{Id}_{E_{kl, b}} \right] \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{kl}} |\mu_i^{kl} - \lambda kl|, \quad (3.16)$$

where μ_i^{kl} are the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of E_{kl} , introduced in (1.4), and the absolute value of the operator is calculated with respect to the Hermitian product $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k}]_b$. By (3.14) and the weak convergence of η_{kl}^{HN} , as $l \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that for any $b \in B \setminus \cup_{i=0}^{+\infty} S_i^0$, we have

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{klN_{kl}} \text{Tr} \left[\left| A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k}], \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl})_b - tkl \cdot \text{Id}_{E_{kl,b}} \right| \right] = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - \lambda| d\eta^{HN}(x), \quad (3.17)$$

and the convergence is uniform over $b \in B \setminus \cup_{i=0}^{+\infty} S_i^0$. Since S_i^0 , $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, are proper analytic subsets of B , we see that once (3.15) is established, the proof of (2.21) follows directly from (3.12) and (3.17) by taking $s = 4C/\epsilon$.

Let us now establish (3.15). By the triangle inequality and the fact that the trace norm of an operator is majorized by the operator norm multiplied by the rank, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_{kl}^{\pi, FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}} (\omega_{\delta,k,s,H}) \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - t \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq N_{kl} \left\| \left(T_{kl}^{\pi, FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}} (\omega_{\delta,k,s}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi kl} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} \right) \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}))} \\ & + \frac{1}{kl} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Now, directly from Proposition 3.2, we obtain that there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_0 | k$, $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, $s \in [0, +\infty[$, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k}))}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

We now use the triangle inequality further to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq N_{kl} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \left(R^{\text{Hilb}_{kl}^{\pi}(FS(H_{\delta,k,s})^{1/k})} - R^{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \right) \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])} \\ & + \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - B_{\delta,k,l,s} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & + \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

where $B_{\delta,k,l,s}$ is from Theorem 3.4. Remark now that since $B_{\delta,k,l,s}$ is Hermitian with respect to both $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]$ and $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ &= \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

By the triangle inequality, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}])) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & + \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl})) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & + \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Finally, remark that by definition, we have $[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}] = \mu_k^* [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k}]$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) - tkl \cdot \mu_k^* \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ &= \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k}], \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) - tkl \cdot \text{Id}_{E_{kl}}) \cdot \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k}])}^{\text{tr}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

By Theorems 3.1, 3.3 and (3.18)-(3.23), we see that in order to show (3.15), it is sufficient to establish that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $\delta, C > 0$, $k, l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $s > 1$, $l \geq l_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} - B_{\delta,k,l,s} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + 2\epsilon l + \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+5} \right) N_{kl}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (B_{\delta,k,l,s} - A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}])) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + 2\epsilon l + \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+5} \right) N_{kl}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\text{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - A([\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl})) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\text{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\text{tr}} \leq \epsilon l N_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

While the proofs of (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26) are different, they all rely on the following elementary fact. If for some bounded functions $f, g, h : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $\int_B |h(b)| \omega_B^m(b) \leq \epsilon$, $\int_B f(b) \omega_B^m(b) \leq \int_B g(b) \omega_B^m(b) + \eta$ for some $\epsilon, \eta \geq 0$, and almost everywhere $f \geq g + h$, then

$$\int_B |f(b) - g(b)| \omega_B^m(b) \leq \epsilon + \eta. \quad (3.27)$$

Using this, let us now establish (3.26). For $b \in B_k$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} f(b) &:= \operatorname{Tr} \left[A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl})_b \right], \\ g(b) &:= \operatorname{Tr} \left[A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\operatorname{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}])_b \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

By the definition of the weight operator and the fact that resolution of singularities of a filtration doesn't change the filtration at a generic point, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B f(b) \mu_k^* \omega_B^m(b) &= \operatorname{vol}(\mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) \cdot \int_B [\omega_B]^m, \\ \int_B g(b) \mu_k^* \omega_B^m(b) &= \operatorname{vol}([\operatorname{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \cdot \int_B [\omega_B]^m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

In particular, by Proposition 3.7, we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $k, l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $\delta > 0, l \geq l_0$, we have

$$\int_B f(b) \omega_B^m \leq \int_B g(b) \omega_B^m(b) + \epsilon l N_{kl}. \quad (3.30)$$

Then Proposition 3.6 implies that almost everywhere we have $f \geq g$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B |f(b) - g(b)| \omega_B^m(b) &= \left\| \left(A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], [\operatorname{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}], \mu_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) \right) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, [\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,0}])}^{\operatorname{tr}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

The estimate (3.26) now follows from (3.27), (3.30) and (3.31).

We will now prove (3.24) and (3.25). Remark first that the curvature of a Hermitian vector bundle only increases under taking quotients, cf. [21, Theorem V.14.5], so we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \geq_{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}}|_{E_{kl}} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1}. \quad (3.32)$$

By Theorem 3.8 and the formula for the curvature of symmetric powers, for any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we conclude that the curvature of the Hermitian metric $\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}$ on $\operatorname{Sym}^l E_k$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right. \\ \left. - \operatorname{Sym}^l A(H_{\delta,k,s}, \tilde{\mu}_k^*, \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_k, \operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s})} \leq \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+4}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Then from Theorem 3.4 and (3.33), there is $g_{\delta,k,l,s} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B_k, \mu_k^* \operatorname{End}(E_{kl}))$, verifying

$$\|g_{\delta,k,l,s} \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m\|_{L^1(B_k, [\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}])} \leq \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+4}, \quad (3.34)$$

such that the following bound holds

$$\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}}|_{E_{kl}} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \geq_{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} (B_{\delta,k,l,s} + g_{\delta,k,s}) \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m. \quad (3.35)$$

Now, we claim that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $C > 0$, $k, l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $s > 1$, $\delta > 0$, $l \geq l_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right] \\ \leq \int_B \operatorname{Tr} [B_{\delta,k,l,s}] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m + \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + \epsilon l + \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+4} \right) N_{kl}, \\ \int_B \operatorname{Tr} [B_{\delta,k,l,s}] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \leq \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], [\operatorname{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m \\ + \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + \epsilon l + \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+4} \right) N_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

Remark that once (3.36) is established, the estimates (3.24) and (3.25) would follow from Theorem 3.4, (3.27), (3.32) (3.35) and (3.36) similarly to the proof of (3.26).

Let us now establish (3.36). By Chern-Weil theory, we have

$$\int_{B_k} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right] = \int_B c_1(E_{kl}) [\omega_B]^{m-1}. \quad (3.37)$$

By the definition of the Harder-Narasimhan slopes and the fact that the first Chern class is an additive functor, we conclude that

$$\int_B c_1(E_{kl}) \omega_B^{m-1} = \operatorname{vol}(\mathcal{F}^{HN,kl}) \cdot \int_B [\omega_B]^m. \quad (3.38)$$

From Proposition 3.7 and (3.29), (3.37) and (3.38), we establish that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $k, l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $s > 1$, $\delta > 0$, $l \geq l_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right] \\ \leq \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], [\operatorname{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m + \epsilon l N_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

But by Theorem 3.4 and (3.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}]} \wedge \mu_k^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right] &\geq \int_B \operatorname{Tr} [B_{\delta,k,l,s}] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m - \delta l N_k^3 8^{N_k+4} N_{kl}, \\ \int_B \operatorname{Tr} [B_{\delta,k,l,s}] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m & \\ &\geq \int_B \operatorname{Tr} \left[A([\operatorname{Sym}^l H_{\delta,k,s}], [\operatorname{Sym}^l \tilde{\mu}_k^* \mathcal{F}^{HN,k}]) \right] \cdot \mu_k^* \omega_B^m - \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + \epsilon l \right) N_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

A combination of (3.39) and (3.40) yields (3.36) for $\epsilon := 2\epsilon$. This finishes the proof. \square

4 Curvature of direct images and semiclassical extension theorem

The main goal of this section is to establish Theorem 3.1. The proof relies heavily on the semiclassical Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem. This is a version of the extension theorem [55], where

instead of a single line bundle, we consider a sequence of line bundles given by high tensor powers of a fixed ample line bundle. By doing so, it is possible to study explicitly not only the optimal constant of the extension theorem, but also an asymptotic formula for the optimal extension itself. Some weak versions of this result concerning subexponential bounds on the optimal constant were previously established by Bost [7] and Zhang [75], but the version we need here comes from [30] (cf. also [34] for an alternative proof) and concerns the study of the optimal extension itself.

To put Theorem 3.1 in the framework of the semiclassical extension theorem, consider a holomorphic submersion $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ between compact Kähler manifolds X and B of dimensions $n + m$ and m respectively. We fix a compact complex manifold P of dimensions $n' + m$, $n' > n$, with a submersion $p : P \rightarrow B$ and a complex embedding $\iota : X \rightarrow P$, so that we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & P \\ & \searrow \pi & \downarrow p \\ & & B \end{array} \quad (4.1)$$

Consider a relatively positive Hermitian line bundle (F, h^F) over P . For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $G_l := R^0 \pi_* (\iota^* F^{\otimes l})$ and $K_l := R^0 p_* F^{\otimes l}$. It is a classical consequence of Serre's vanishing theorem that for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough, the restriction map

$$\text{Res}_l : K_l \rightarrow G_l \quad (4.2)$$

is surjective. From now on, we only work with $l \in \mathbb{N}$ verifying this, and such that both G_l and K_l are locally free.

We denote by $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)$ (resp. $\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)$) the L^2 -product on G_l (resp. K_l) induced by h^F as in (2.2). Recall that in [31], [34], we compared the Hermitian metrics $[\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]$ and $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)$ on G_l . Let us recall this statement.

Theorem 4.1. *There are $C > 0$, $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, we have*

$$1 - \frac{C}{l} \leq \frac{[\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]}{\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)} \cdot l^{n'-n} \leq 1 + \frac{C}{l}. \quad (4.3)$$

Remark 4.2. In [31], [34], Theorem 4.1 appeared in the non-family version. However, as the proof ultimately depends only on the off-diagonal asymptotic expansion of the Bergman kernel, which holds in families, it adapts to the version we need here, cf. proof of Theorem 4.4.

The main result of this section goes further and compares the curvatures of these metrics.

Theorem 4.3. *There are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that we have*

$$\left\| \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{[\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]} - \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} R^{\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)} \right\| \leq C\sqrt{l}, \quad (4.4)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is for a norm induced by a fixed metric on TB , and the subordinate norm on $\text{End}(G_l)$ associated with $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)$.

Before providing the details of the proofs of these statements, let us show how they can be adapted to the setting required for Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1 will be based on the application of Theorem 4.3 to the relative Kodaira embedding defined in (2.11). In other words, we take $P := \mathbb{P}(E_k^*)$, $\iota := \text{Kod}_k$, $p : \mathbb{P}(E_k^*) \rightarrow B$ the usual projection, $F := \mathcal{O}(1)$ and h^F the Fubini-Study metric induced by H_k . Then, by the definition of the Fubini-Study metric, cf. (2.11), the Hermitian vector bundle (ι^*F, ι^*h^F) is isomorphic with $(L^k, FS(H_k))$. Also, G_l is isomorphic with E_{kl} , and by the well-known calculation of the twisted structure sheaf cohomology on the projective space, K_l is isomorphic with $\text{Sym}^l E_k$.

A direct calculation, cf. [35, Lemma 4.15], shows the following relation

$$\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F) = \frac{l!}{(l + N_k - 1)!} \cdot \text{Sym}^l(H_k). \quad (4.5)$$

Remark that in [35, Lemma 4.15], there was a square root in front of $\text{Sym}^l(H_k)$ since we worked on the level of norms and not Hermitian products, as we do here. In particular, the identity (4.5) shows that the norm $\text{Sym}^l(H_k)$ in the statement can be replaced by $\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)$.

We denote by $\text{Res}_{k,l} : K_l \rightarrow G_l$ the restriction operator associated with the Kodaira embedding. Recall that the multiplication map $\text{Mult}_{k,l}$ was defined in (3.1). Then it is an easy verification, cf. [32, (4.62)], that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sym}^l(E_k) & \xlongequal{\quad} & K_l \\ \downarrow \text{Mult}_{k,l} & & \downarrow \text{Res}_{k,l} \\ E_{kl} & \xlongequal{\quad} & G_l. \end{array} \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, the quotient of a norm with respect to $\text{Mult}_{k,l}$ is identified with the quotient with respect to $\text{Res}_{k,l}$. With these identifications, Theorem 3.1 then becomes a restatement of Theorem 4.3. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We use the same notations as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Directly from Theorem 4.1 and (4.6), we obtain

$$1 - \frac{C}{l} \leq \frac{[\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]}{\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS(H_k))} \cdot l^{N_k - n - 1} \leq 1 + \frac{C}{l}. \quad (4.7)$$

Remark now that $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS(H_k)) = k^m \cdot \text{Hilb}_{kl}^\pi(FS(H_k)^{1/k})$, and that $l^{N_k - 1} \cdot l! \sim (l + N_k - 1)!$, as $l \rightarrow \infty$. The result now follows from this, (4.5) and (4.7). \square

To prove Theorem 4.3, we define the Hermitian section $D_l \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$, as follows

$$\langle s_0, s_1 \rangle_{[\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]} = \langle D_l s_0, s_1 \rangle_{\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^*h^F)}, \quad (4.8)$$

for any $s_0, s_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, G_l)$. The main technical result of this section goes as follows.

Theorem 4.4. *For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, there are $C > 0$, $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, we have*

$$\left\| D_l - \frac{1}{l^{n'-n}} \text{Id}_{G_l} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(B)} \leq \frac{C l^{r/2}}{l^{n'-n+1/2}}, \quad (4.9)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(B)}$ is defined for $s \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$, as follows

$$\|s\|_{\mathcal{C}^l(B)} := \sup_{b \in B} \sup \left\| \nabla_{U_1}^{\text{End}(G_l)} \dots \nabla_{U_r}^{\text{End}(G_l)} s(b) \right\|, \quad (4.10)$$

where the first supremum is taken over all possible vector fields U_1, \dots, U_r over B of unit \mathcal{C}^r -norm (with respect to some fixed metric on B), $\nabla^{\text{End}(G_l)}$ is the Chern connection associated with the norm $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)$, and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm subordinate to $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F)$.

In order to prove Theorem 4.4, we define the extension operator

$$\text{Ext}_l : G_l \rightarrow K_l, \quad (4.11)$$

so that for $g \in G_{l,b}$, $b \in B$, we put $\text{Ext}_l g = f$, $f \in K_{l,b}$, where $\text{Res}_l(f) = g$, and f has the minimal norm with respect to $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(h^F)$ among all $f, \tilde{f} \in K_{l,b}$, verifying $\text{Res}_l(f) = g$. It is immediate that Ext_l is a linear map. We shall establish in the proof of Theorem 4.4 that Ext_l is smooth, i.e. $\text{Ext}_l \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{Hom}(G_l, K_l))$.

We will also need a technical lemma which makes a connection between the operator norm and the Schwartz kernel. We fix $R_l \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$ and for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$, verifying $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2) = b$, we denote its fiberwise Schwartz kernel by $R_l(x_1, x_2) \in F_{x_1}^{\otimes l} \otimes (F_{x_2}^{\otimes l})^*$. By the definition, for any $s \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, G_l)$, we have

$$(R_l s)(x_1) = \int_{x_2 \in X_b} R_l(x_1, x_2) \cdot s(x_2) dv_{X_b}(x_2), \quad (4.12)$$

where dv_{X_b} is the volume form on the fiber X_b induced by the Kähler form $\iota^* c_1(F, h^F)|_{X_b}$. We assume that there are $c, C > 0, r \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the following bound holds

$$\|R_l(x_1, x_2)\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(X \times_B X)} \leq C l^{n+r/2} \exp(-c\sqrt{l} \text{dist}(x_1, x_2)), \quad (4.13)$$

where $\text{dist}(x_1, x_2)$ is the distance induced by $\iota^* c_1(F, h^F)|_{X_b}$ (in P_b) between $\iota(x_1)$ and $\iota(x_2)$.

Lemma 4.5. Under the above assumptions, there is $C > 0$, such that $\|R_l\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(B)} \leq C l^{r/2}$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(B)}$ is defined as in Theorem 4.4.

Proof. Directly from (4.13), there is $C > 0$, such that for any $x \in X$, $b := \pi(x)$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z \in X_b} |\nabla^r R_l(x, z)|_{(h^F)^{\otimes l}} dv_{X_b}(z) &\leq C l^{r/2}, \\ \int_{z \in X_b} |\nabla^r R_l(z, x)|_{(h^F)^{\otimes l}} dv_{X_b}(z) &\leq C l^{r/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

The result is then a direct consequence of Young's inequality for integral operators, cf. [31, Proposition 2.9 and Corollary 2.10]. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4. By the definition of the quotient metric and Ext_l , we have

$$\text{Ext}_l^* \circ \text{Ext}_l = D_l. \quad (4.15)$$

Let us recall that the *multiplicative defect*, A_l , is a section of $\text{End}(G_l)$, defined in [31, Theorem 4.3], as the only operator verifying

$$\text{Res}_l^* = \text{Ext}_l \circ A_l. \quad (4.16)$$

As it is explained in [31, Theorem 4.3], the existence of A_l is a consequence of the surjectivity of (4.2). Let us now establish that there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, so that for any $l \geq l_0$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\|A_l - l^{n'-n} \text{Id}_{G_l}\|_{\mathcal{C}^r(B)} \leq C l^{n'-n+(r-1)/2}. \quad (4.17)$$

Remark that (4.17) appeared in [31, Theorem 4.3] in the non-family version (i.e. for B equal to a point). As we explain below, the proof generalizes to our setting here.

Directly from (4.16), we see that

$$A_l = \text{Res}_l \circ \text{Res}_l^*. \quad (4.18)$$

Now, for any $y_1, y_2 \in P$, verifying $p(y_1) = p(y_2) = b$, we denote by $B_l^{p,h^F}(y_1, y_2) \in F_{y_1}^{\otimes l} \otimes (F_{y_2}^{\otimes l})^*$ the fiberwise Bergman kernel, i.e. the section such that in the notations of (3.4), for any $s \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, p_* F^{\otimes l})$, the following identity is satisfied

$$(B_l^{p,h^F} s)(y_1) = \int_{y_2 \in P_b} B_l^{p,h^F}(y_1, y_2) \cdot s(y_2) dv_{P_b}(y_2), \quad (4.19)$$

where dv_{P_b} is the volume form on the fiber P_b induced by the Kähler form $c_1(F, h^F)|_{P_b}$. Similarly, for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$, verifying $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2) = b$, we define $B_l^{\pi, \iota^* h^F}(x_1, x_2) \in F_{x_1}^{\otimes l} \otimes (F_{x_2}^{\otimes l})^*$. From (4.18), we see that the Schwartz kernel, $A_l(x_1, x_2) \in F_{x_1}^{\otimes l} \otimes (F_{x_2}^{\otimes l})^*$, of A_l , is given by

$$A_l(x_1, x_2) = B_l^{p,h^F}(\iota(x_1), \iota(x_2)). \quad (4.20)$$

Now, as the Bergman kernel in smooth families is smooth, see [15] and [52], we conclude that the section $A_l(x_1, x_2)$ is also smooth. As a consequence, we get $A_l \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$.

As $B_l^{\pi, \iota^* h^F}$ acts as identity on K_l , the estimate (4.17) follows directly from Lemma 4.5 and the following bound: there are $c, C > 0$, such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| B_l^{p,h^F}(\iota(x_1), \iota(x_2)) - l^{n'-n} \cdot B_l^{\pi, \iota^* h^F}(x_1, x_2) \right|_{\mathcal{C}^r(X \times_B X)} \\ \leq C l^{n'+(r-1)/2} \exp(-c\sqrt{l} \text{dist}(x_1, x_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

The estimate (4.21) for $r = 0$ was deduced in [31, proof of Theorem 4.3] from the off-diagonal expansion of the Bergman kernel due to Dai-Liu-Ma [15, Theorem 4.18] and the exponential decay of the Bergman kernel of Ma-Marinescu [51, Theorem 1]. Both of the latter bounds are established for \mathcal{C}^r -norm, cf. [52, Theorem 1.6], and so the estimate (4.21) is valid for an arbitrary $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

In particular, by (4.17), we see that there is $l_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, so that for $l \geq l_1$, the section A_l has an inverse A_l^{-1} , defined using the infinite sum. Using the fact that the space of operators with exponential decay as in (4.21), is an algebra, see [30, §3], cf. also [50], we deduce, following the lines of [32, §5.4], that the Schwartz kernel of A_l^{-1} is smooth, which implies that $A_l^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$. Then it is a direct consequence of (4.15) and (4.16), cf. [31, (5.6)], that the following relation holds

$$D_l = (A_l^*)^{-1}. \quad (4.22)$$

The statement (4.9) now follows directly from (4.17) and (4.22).

Remark also that from (4.16), we have

$$\text{Ext}_l = \text{Res}_l^* \circ A_l^{-1}. \quad (4.23)$$

From the smoothness of the Schwartz kernel of A_l^{-1} and of the Bergman kernel, we deduce that the Schwartz kernel of Ext_l is smooth, which implies that $\text{Ext}_l \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{Hom}(G_l, K_l))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. From the definition (4.8) of D_l , we conclude, cf. [63, (1.9.1)], that we have

$$R^{[\mathrm{Hilb}_l^p(h^F)]} - R^{\mathrm{Hilb}_l^r(l^*h^F)} = \bar{\partial}((\nabla^{\mathrm{End}(G_l), (1,0)} D_l) D_l^{-1}). \quad (4.24)$$

The result now follows directly from Theorem 4.4 and (4.24). \square

5 Submultiplicative nature of the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations

The main goal of this section is to establish Propositions 3.6 and 3.7. The submultiplicativity of the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations, proved in [12] and [37], plays a crucial role in this.

We recall some definitions first. Consider a graded filtration $\mathcal{F} := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_k$ on the section ring $R(Y, F) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} H^0(Y, F^k)$ of a complex projective manifold Y polarized by an ample line bundle F . We say that \mathcal{F} is *submultiplicative* if for any $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$, $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}^t H^0(Y, F^k) \cdot \mathcal{F}^s H^0(Y, F^l) \subset \mathcal{F}^{t+s} H^0(Y, F^{k+l}). \quad (5.1)$$

We say that \mathcal{F} is *bounded* if there is $C > 0$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathcal{F}^{Ck} H^0(Y, F^k) = \{0\}$. Remark that it is an immediate consequence of the submultiplicativity and the fact that $R(Y, F)$ is a finitely generated ring that there is $C > 0$, such that $\mathcal{F}^{-Ck} H^0(Y, F^k) = H^0(Y, F^k)$.

To make a connection between the theory of submultiplicative filtrations and the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations, we will need the following result, which in the case when $\dim B = 1$ is due to Chen [12], and for $\dim B \geq 1$ is due to the author, see [36], cf. also [37] for the projective setting. We use the notations from the Introduction and (2.20) in the following statement.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $b \in B \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{+\infty} S_k^0$, the filtration on $R(X_b, L_b)$ induced by the Harder-Narasimhan filtration on E_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is submultiplicative and bounded.*

Remark 5.2. When $\dim B = 1$, the sets S_k^0 are empty.

We will now recall some basic results concerning submultiplicativity. We say that a filtration \mathcal{F}_1 dominates (\geq) \mathcal{F}_2 if on the level of associated non-Archimedean norms, see (1.12), we have $\chi_{\mathcal{F}_1} \geq \chi_{\mathcal{F}_2}$. We denote by $[\mathrm{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}_k]$ the quotient of the symmetrisation of \mathcal{F}_k with respect to the multiplication operator $\mathrm{Sym}^l H^0(Y, F^k) \rightarrow H^0(Y, F^{kl})$. The following consequence of submultiplicativity, cf. [33, §3.1], will play a crucial role in what follows.

Lemma 5.3. For any submultiplicative filtration \mathcal{F} on $R(Y, F)$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$[\mathrm{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}_k] \geq \mathcal{F}_{kl}. \quad (5.2)$$

To make a connection between the order on the space of filtrations and the natural order on the weight operators, we need the following result.

Lemma 5.4. For any Hermitian product H on a vector space V and an ordered pair of filtrations, $\mathcal{F}_1 \geq \mathcal{F}_2$, on V , the associated weight operators relate as $A(H, \mathcal{F}_1) \leq A(H, \mathcal{F}_2)$.

For the proof of Lemma 5.4, let us recall the following result from [35, Proposition 4.12]. We use the notations from (1.11).

Proposition 5.5. Let H_0 (resp. H_1) be a fixed Hermitian metric on V (resp. Q) and \mathcal{F} (resp. \mathcal{G}) is a filtration on V (resp. Q). We assume that $[H_0] \geq H_1$ and $[\mathcal{F}] \geq \mathcal{G}$. Then the geodesic ray H_s^V , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, of Hermitian metrics on V associated with \mathcal{F} and emanating from H_0 compares to the geodesic ray H_s^Q of Hermitian metrics on Q associated with \mathcal{G} and emanating from H_1 as

$$[H_s^V] \geq H_s^Q. \quad (5.3)$$

Let us single out the following immediate corollary of Proposition 5.5.

Proposition 5.6. We fix two Hermitian metrics H, H' and a filtration \mathcal{F} on V . We denote by $H_s, H'_s, s \in [0, +\infty[$, the geodesic rays of Hermitian metrics on V associated with \mathcal{F} and emanating from H and H' respectively. If $H \geq H'$, then for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $H_s \geq H'_s$.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. By Proposition 5.6, the geodesic rays $H_{s,i}, s \in [0, +\infty[, i = 1, 2$, associated with \mathcal{F}_i and emanating from H compare as follows $H_{s,1} \geq H_{s,2}$. By taking the derivative (in s) at $s = 0$, we conclude that $-A(H, \mathcal{F}_1) \geq_H -A(H, \mathcal{F}_2)$, which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 5.7. Directly from the proof, $\mathcal{F}_1 \geq \mathcal{F}_2$ is equivalent to the fact that for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$, we have $\exp(-sA(H, \mathcal{F}_1)) \geq_H \exp(-sA(H, \mathcal{F}_2))$. Remark that since the logarithm is a matrix monotone function, the latter condition implies $A(H, \mathcal{F}_1) \leq_H A(H, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Since the exponential is not a matrix monotone function, the condition $\exp(-sA(H, \mathcal{F}_1)) \geq_H \exp(-sA(H, \mathcal{F}_2)), s \in [0, +\infty[$, is more restrictive than $A(H, \mathcal{F}_1) \leq_H A(H, \mathcal{F}_2)$, cf. [48] and [62]. It is, in fact, rather easy to see that for any decreasing function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $f(A(H, \mathcal{F}_1)) \geq_H f(A(H, \mathcal{F}_2))$.

We will also need the following version of the result of Boucksom-Jonsson [9, Theorem 3.18]. See also [35, Proposition 2.8] for a proof of this result relying on complex pluripotential theory.

Theorem 5.8. For any bounded submultiplicative filtration \mathcal{F} on $R(Y, F)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k \geq k_0, l \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\text{vol}([\text{Sym}^l \mathcal{F}_k]) \geq \text{vol}(\mathcal{F}_{kl}) - \epsilon l \dim H^0(Y, F^{kl}). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof of Proposition 3.6. It is a direct consequence of Theorems 5.1 and Lemmas 5.3, 5.4. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.7. It is a direct consequence of Theorems 5.1, 5.8. \square

6 Restriction of the weight operator over the geodesic ray

The main goal of this section is to establish Theorem 3.4, concerning the comparison of restriction of the weight operator and the weight operator of the quotient.

We will first formulate a more general statement. Consider a holomorphic submersion $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ between compact Kähler manifolds X and B of dimensions $n+m$ and m respectively. Consider a relatively very ample line bundle F over X . For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $G_l := R^0 \pi_*(F^{\otimes l})$. Assume that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the multiplication map $\text{Sym}^l G_1 \rightarrow G_l$ is surjective. By (3.1), this can always be achieved by replacing F by its sufficiently big power.

Consider a filtration of G_1 by vector subbundles

$$G_1 = F_{\lambda_1} \supset F_{\lambda_2} \supset \cdots \supset F_{\lambda_q}. \quad (6.1)$$

We fix a Hermitian metric H on G_1 , and denote by H_s the geodesic ray departing from H and associated with the filtration (6.1). We denote by $[\text{Sym}^l H_s]$ the quotient norm on G_l , induced by H_s . We denote by $\text{Sym}^l F$ the filtration on $\text{Sym}^l G_1$ induced by F , and by $[\text{Sym}^l F]$ the associated quotient filtration on G_l (note that the latter filtration is defined by subsheaves and not subbundles in general). The following result is the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}, C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0, s \geq 1$, there is $B_{l,s} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \text{End}(G_l))$, which is Hermitian with respect to both $[\text{Sym}^l H_s]$ and $[\text{Sym}^l H_0]$, so that*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sym}^l A(H_s, F)|_{G_l} &\geq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_s]} B_{l,s}, \\ B_{l,s} &\geq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_0]} A([\text{Sym}^l H_0], [\text{Sym}^l F]) - \left(\frac{Cl}{s} + C + \epsilon s\right) \text{Id}_{G_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Moreover, for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\text{Sym}^l A(H_s, F)|_{G_l} \leq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_s]} A([\text{Sym}^l H_s], [\text{Sym}^l F]). \quad (6.3)$$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Direct consequence of Theorem 6.1. \square

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is based on the comparison of the related geodesic rays. More precisely, we denote by $[\text{Sym}^l H]_s$ the geodesic ray of Hermitian metrics on G_l departing from $[\text{Sym}^l H]$ and associated with the filtration $[\text{Sym}^l F]$. The following result will be established in Sections 7, 8, and it lies at the heart of our approach to Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 6.2. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}, C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0, s \geq 0$, we have*

$$[\text{Sym}^l H_s] \leq [\text{Sym}^l H]_s \cdot \exp(Cl + Cs + \epsilon ls). \quad (6.4)$$

Remark 6.3. a) From Proposition 5.5, for any $l \geq l_0, s \geq 0$, we also have $[\text{Sym}^l H]_s \leq [\text{Sym}^l H_s]$.

b) In the non-family version, a related result appeared in [35, Theorem 4.8].

In order to apply Theorem 6.2 in the proof of Theorem 6.1, we need to make a more precise relation between geodesic rays and weight operators. For this, we consider a surjection $p : V \rightarrow Q$ between two finitely dimensional vector spaces V, Q . We fix a Hermitian metric H^V on V and a filtration \mathcal{F} as in (2.14). We denote by H_s^V the geodesic ray of Hermitian metrics on V departing from H^V and associated with \mathcal{F} . We denote by $[H_s^V]$ the induced quotient metric on Q . We leave the verification of the following elementary lemma to the interested reader.

Lemma 6.4. For any $s_0 \geq 0$, the following identities take place

$$\begin{aligned} ([H_s^V]^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} [H_s^V])|_{s=0} &= -A(V, \mathcal{F})|_Q, \\ ((H_s^V)^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} H_s^V)|_{s=0} &= ((H_{s_0}^V)^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} H_{s_0}^V)|_{s=s_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover, $((H_s^V)^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} H_s^V)|_{s=0}$ is Hermitian with respect to H_s^V for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$.

We will also need the following result from interpolation theory, which reader should compare with Proposition 5.5.

Proposition 6.5. Let H_0^V, H_1^V be two Hermitian metrics on V and H_0^Q, H_1^Q be the induced quotient Hermitian metrics on Q . For $s \in [0, 1]$, we denote by H_s^V the geodesics between H_0^V and H_1^V , and by H_s^Q the geodesics between H_0^Q and H_1^Q . Then for any $s \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$[H_s^V] \geq H_s^Q. \quad (6.6)$$

Proof. It follows easily from the interpolation theorem of Stein-Weiss, cf. [4, Theorem 5.4.1], see [32, Corollary 4.22] for details. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We will establish that Theorem 6.1 holds for $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$ as in Theorem 6.2. We fix $s_0 \in [1, +\infty[$, and consider the geodesic H'_s , $s \in [0, s_0]$, of Hermitian metrics on G_l , such that $H'_0 = [\text{Sym}^l H]$ and $H'_{s_0} = [\text{Sym}^l H_{s_0}]$. By Proposition 6.5, for any $s \in [0, s_0]$, we have

$$[\text{Sym}^l H_s] \geq H'_s. \quad (6.7)$$

We let $B_{l,s_0} := -((H'_s)^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} H'_s)|_{s=0}$ and take the derivative of (6.7) at $s = s_0$ to get

$$[\text{Sym}^l H_{s_0}]^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} [\text{Sym}^l H_s]|_{s=s_0} \leq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_{s_0}]} -B_{l,s_0}, \quad (6.8)$$

where we implicitly used the second equation from Lemma 6.4. The first inequality of (6.2) then follows directly from (6.8) and the first equation from Lemma 6.4.

Remark now that by Theorem 6.2, we have the following bound

$$\exp(-s_0 B_{l,s_0}) \leq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_0]} \exp(-s_0 A([\text{Sym}^l H], [\text{Sym}^l F])) \exp(Cl + Cs_0 + \ell s_0). \quad (6.9)$$

From (6.9), and the fact that the logarithm is a matrix monotone function, cf. Remark 5.7, we have

$$-B_{l,s_0} \leq_{[\text{Sym}^l H_0]} -A([\text{Sym}^l H], [\text{Sym}^l F]) + \left(\frac{Cl}{s_0} + C + \ell \right) \cdot \text{Id}_{G_l}, \quad (6.10)$$

which gives us the second inequality of (6.2).

We fix $s_0 > 0$ and consider the geodesic ray H''_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, of Hermitian metrics on G_l , departing from $H''_0 = [\text{Sym}^l H_{s_0}]$ and associated with $[\text{Sym}^l F]$. Then by Proposition 5.5, we have

$$[\text{Sym}^l H_{s+s_0}] \geq H''_s. \quad (6.11)$$

Then by taking the derivatives of (6.11) at $s = 0$, and using again the first equation from Lemma 6.4, we get (6.3) for $s := s_0$. \square

Remark 6.6. While the geometric situation here is very different, our argument on comparing the derivatives from (6.8) was inspired by Berndtsson [5, (3.2) and (3.3)].

7 Symmetric powers of geodesic rays and holomorphic extension theorem

The main goal of this section is to establish Theorem 6.2. We decompose this statement into two parts, and show that one part follows from the holomorphic extension theorem. We conserve the notations from Section 6.

We fix a (n, n) -form $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \wedge^{n,n} T^* X)$ so that its restriction to each fiber, $\eta|_{X_b}$, $b \in B$, gives a positive volume form normalized so that the volume of each fiber equals to 1. For any relatively positive Hermitian metric h^F on F , we denote by $\text{Hilb}_l^\pi(h^F, \eta)$ a Hermitian metric on G_l , $l \in \mathbb{N}$, defined as in (2.2), but instead of the volume form dv_{X_b} , we use $\eta|_{X_b}$.

We will use the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 7.1. For any Hermitian metric H_l on G_l , we have $H_l \geq \text{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS(H_l)^{\frac{1}{l}}, \eta)$.

Proof. First of all, directly from (2.13), we obtain, cf. [33, Lemma 2.1], that for any $x \in X$, $e \in F_x^{\otimes l}$, $b = \pi(x)$, the following identity takes place $|e|_{FS(H_l)} = \inf \|s\|_{H_l}$, where the infimum is taken over all $s \in G_{l,b}$, verifying the constraint $s(x) = e$. In particular, for any $f \in G_{l,b}$, we get $|f(x)|_{FS(H_l)}^2 \leq \|f\|_{H_l}^2$. By integrating this inequality over the whole fiber, X_b , with respect to the volume form $\eta|_{X_b}$, and using the fact that $\eta|_{X_b}$ is of unit volume, we obtain the result. \square

The other two ingredients in the proof of Theorem 6.2 are given below

Theorem 7.2. *There are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, $s \geq 1$, we have*

$$[\mathrm{Sym}^l H_s] \leq \mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS(H_s), \eta) \cdot \exp(Cl + Cs). \quad (7.1)$$

Theorem 7.3. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, $s \geq 0$, we have*

$$FS(H_s) \leq FS([\mathrm{Sym}^l H]_s)^{\frac{1}{l}} \cdot \exp(C + \epsilon s). \quad (7.2)$$

The proof of Theorem 7.2 will be given in the end of this section, and the proof of Theorem 7.3 is deferred until the next section.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Remark first that by Theorem 7.3, for $C > 0$ as in Theorem 7.3, we have

$$\mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS(H_s), \eta) \leq \mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS([\mathrm{Sym}^l H]_s)^{\frac{1}{l}}, \eta) \cdot \exp(Cl + \epsilon ls). \quad (7.3)$$

Now, by Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(FS([\mathrm{Sym}^l H]_s)^{\frac{1}{l}}, \eta) \leq [\mathrm{Sym}^l H]_s. \quad (7.4)$$

Theorem 6.2 now follows directly by a combination of Theorem 7.2 and (7.3), (7.4). \square

Let us now prove Theorem 7.2. A related result in a non-family version has already appeared in [35, Theorem 4.5]. We will use now the notations introduced in Section 4.

We fix a relatively positive Hermitian metric h_0^F on F over P , an (n, n) -form η_X over X and an (n', n') -form η_P over P , verifying similar hypotheses as the form η from the beginning of this section. We need the following result, which we suggest to compare with Theorem 4.1, from which we borrow the notations.

Theorem 7.4. *There are $C > 0$, $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, and an arbitrary relatively positive Hermitian metric h^F on F , we have*

$$[\mathrm{Hilb}_l^p(h^F, \eta_P)] \leq \mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F, \eta_X) \cdot \left(\sup \max \left(\frac{h^F}{h_0^F}, \frac{h_0^F}{h^F} \right) \right)^C \cdot \exp(C). \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. The statement can be rephrased in the following manner: for any $b \in B$, $f \in G_{l,b}$, there is $\tilde{f} \in K_{l,b}$, so that $\mathrm{Res}_l(\tilde{f}) = f$, and we have

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{\mathrm{Hilb}_l^p(h^F, \eta_P)} \leq \|f\|_{\mathrm{Hilb}_l^\pi(\iota^* h^F, \eta_X)} \cdot \left(\sup \max \left(\frac{h^F}{h_0^F}, \frac{h_0^F}{h^F} \right) \right)^C \cdot \exp(C). \quad (7.6)$$

In the non-family version, such a statement appeared in [35, Theorem 4.14] and [32, Theorem 2.5] as an easy consequence of a version of Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem from [22]. In the

end, the only thing which was used there was the inequality [32, (2.11)] which says that there is a uniform constant $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $p_0 c_1(F, h_0^F) - c_1(\wedge^{n'} T^{(1,0)*} P_b, h^{\eta_P}) + \sqrt{-1} \alpha \partial \bar{\partial} \delta_{X_b} / 2\pi$ is a non-negative current over each fiber, for any $\alpha \in [1, 2]$, where h^{η_P} is the Hermitian metric associated with η_P , δ_{X_b} is a quasi-psh function with logarithmic singularities along X_b , and h_0^F is an arbitrary relatively positive metric on F . But as the latter bound clearly holds in families, the whole estimate continues to hold as well. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. We follow the same line of thought as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, from which we borrow the notations. Directly from (4.5), we see that in the left-hand side of (7.1), we can replace $\text{Sym}^l H_s$ by $\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^{H_s})$, where h^{H_s} is the Fubini-Study metric on $F := \mathcal{O}(1)$ over $\mathbb{P}(G_1^*)$ induced by H_s . From the definition of the geodesic ray, there is $C > 0$, such that

$$h^{H_0} \cdot \exp(-Cs) \leq h^{H_s} \leq h^{H_0} \cdot \exp(Cs). \quad (7.7)$$

Moreover, as the symplectic volume form on the fibers $P_b = \mathbb{P}(G_1^*)$ of $\pi : \mathbb{P}(G_1^*) \rightarrow B$, induced by $c_1(F, h^{H_s})|_{P_b}$, coincides with the Riemannian volume form induced by the Fubini-Study metric, we conclude by (7.7) that there is a constant $C > 0$, such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $s > 0$, we have

$$\text{Hilb}_l^p(h^{H_s}) \leq \exp(C + Cs) \cdot \text{Hilb}_l^p(h^{H_s}, \eta_P), \quad (7.8)$$

where η_P is an arbitrary relative volume form chosen as in the beginning of this section. The result now follows directly from Theorem 7.4 and (7.7), (7.8). \square

8 Geodesic rays of symmetric powers and fibration degenerations

The main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 7.3. We will in fact establish the following stronger result, for which we conserve the notations from Section 7.

Theorem 8.1. *Assume that the filtration from (6.1) has rational weights, i.e. $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$. Then there are $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, $s \geq 0$, we have*

$$FS(H_s) \leq FS([\text{Sym}^l H]_s)^{\frac{1}{l}} \cdot \exp(C). \quad (8.1)$$

Proof of Theorem 7.3 assuming Theorem 8.1. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, we fix rational weights λ'_i , $i = 1, \dots, q$, verifying $\lambda'_i < \lambda_i < \lambda'_i + \epsilon$. We also assume that $\epsilon < \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i$, for any $i = 1, \dots, q-1$, so that we have $\lambda'_1 < \lambda'_2 < \dots < \lambda'_q$.

We consider a filtration given by $F'_{\lambda'_i} := F_{\lambda_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, and denote by H'_s , $[\text{Sym}^l H]'_s$, $s \in [0, +\infty[$, the geodesic rays defined analogously to H_s and $[\text{Sym}^l H]_s$, but with filtration $E = F'_{\lambda'_1} \supset F'_{\lambda'_2} \supset \dots \supset F'_{\lambda'_q}$ instead of (6.1).

From Proposition 5.6, for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$H'_s \cdot \exp(-\epsilon s) \leq H_s \leq H'_s, \quad [\text{Sym}^l H]'_s \cdot \exp(-\epsilon l s) \leq [\text{Sym}^l H]_s \leq [\text{Sym}^l H]'_s. \quad (8.2)$$

Theorem 7.3 then follows directly from (8.2) and Theorem 8.1 applied for H'_s and $[\text{Sym}^l H]'_s$. \square

Our proof of Theorem 8.1 is greatly inspired by Phong-Sturm [58, Lemma 4], which treats a related problem in the non-family setting.

First of all, it is immediate that if Theorem 8.1 holds under the additional assumption of integer weights of the filtration, then it holds in general. Indeed, if the filtration has rational weights, then

the ray H_{Ns} , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, is associated with a filtration with integer weights, for $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ divisible enough. Moreover, by shifting the weights, we can always assume that $\lambda_1 = 0$. We make these two assumptions in what follows.

Our proof will be based on the precise relation between geodesic rays and smooth Hermitian metrics on certain degenerations of a vector bundle. We first recall that an arbitrary filtration (6.1) of G_1 induces a degeneration \tilde{G}_1 over $B \times \mathbb{C}$, defined as follows

$$\tilde{G}_1 := \text{Coker}(F_{\lambda_q} \oplus F_{\lambda_{q-1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus F_{\lambda_1} \rightarrow E \oplus F_{\lambda_q} \oplus F_{\lambda_{q-1}}/F_{\lambda_q} \oplus \cdots \oplus F_{\lambda_1}/F_{\lambda_2}), \quad (8.3)$$

where over $B \times \{z\}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the above map is defined as

$$(f_q, \dots, f_1) \mapsto (\bar{f}_q + \cdots + \bar{f}_1, z^{\lambda_q} f_q, z^{\lambda_{q-1}} \tilde{f}_{q-1}, \dots, z^{\lambda_1} \tilde{f}_1), \quad (8.4)$$

where $\bar{f}_i \in E$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, are the images of $f_i \in F_i$ in E , and $\tilde{f}_i \in F_{\lambda_i}/F_{\lambda_{i+1}}$, $i = 1, \dots, q-1$, are respective elements in the quotient spaces. Our assumption $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}$ assures that (8.4) is well-defined. This is the only place in the proof where we use the fact that $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let us describe the basic properties of this construction. First of all, it is immediate to verify that a vector bundle \tilde{G}_1 carries a natural \mathbb{C}^* -action, compatible with the diagonal action on $p : B \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, acting trivially at the first factor and by the standard action on the second one. Second, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $z \neq 0$, the restriction of \tilde{G}_1 over $(B, \{z\})$ is isomorphic with G_1 , and over $(B, \{0\})$, the restriction of \tilde{G}_1 is isomorphic with the vector bundle $\text{gr}(G_1) := F_{\lambda_q} \oplus F_{\lambda_{q-1}}/F_{\lambda_q} \oplus \cdots \oplus F_{\lambda_1}/F_{\lambda_2}$. In particular, by the \mathbb{C}^* -action, once restricted over $B \times \mathbb{C}^*$, \tilde{G}_1 is canonically isomorphic with q^*G_1 , where $q : B \times \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow B$ is the natural projection.

Using this isomorphism, for an arbitrary ray of Hermitian metrics H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, on G_1 , we construct the S^1 -equivariant Hermitian metric H° over $B \times \mathbb{D}^*$, defined so that the restriction H_τ° , $\tau \in \mathbb{D}^*$, of H° over $B \times \{\tau\}$ is given by $H_\tau^\circ := H_{-\log|\tau|/2}$. The following basic observation lies at the heart of our approach to Theorem 8.1.

Lemma 8.2. For a geodesic ray H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, associated with the filtration (6.1), the associated S^1 -equivariant Hermitian metric H° on \tilde{G}_1 over $B \times \mathbb{D}^*$ extends smoothly to a Hermitian metric on \tilde{G}_1 over $B \times \mathbb{D}$.

Proof. First, the metric H_0 on G_1 defines the quotient metric H'° on \tilde{G}_1 . Since the rank of the map (8.4) is independent on $z \in \mathbb{C}$, H'° extends smoothly to a Hermitian metric over $B \times \mathbb{D}$. Let us compare H_s with the Hermitian metrics H'_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, on G_1 , constructed from H'° using the above correspondence between rays of metrics on G_1 and S^1 -equivariant metrics on \tilde{G}_1 . Assume for simplicity of the notations that the filtration is complete, and denote by e_i , $i = 1, \dots, q$, $q := \text{rk}(G_1)$, an orthonormal local frame of (G_1, H) , adapted to the filtration (6.1). By this we mean that $e_i \in F_{\lambda_i}$ and $e_i \perp F_{\lambda_{i-1}}$. Then an easy calculation reveals that for any $s \in [0, +\infty[$,

$$\|e_i\|_{H_s} = \exp(-s\lambda_i/2), \quad \|e_i\|_{H'_s} = \frac{\exp(-s\lambda_i/2)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(-s\lambda_i)}}. \quad (8.5)$$

As H'° extends smoothly to a Hermitian metric over $B \times \mathbb{D}$, the same is true for H° . \square

Now, using the \mathbb{C}^* -action on \tilde{G}_1 , let us construct a certain degeneration of the family $\pi : X \rightarrow B$. More precisely, we denote by $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}(\tilde{G}_1^*)$ the (analytic Zariski) closure of $\mathbb{C}^* \cdot \text{Kod}(X) \subset$

$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{G}_1^*)$, where $\text{Kod} : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(G_1^*)$ is the relative Kodaira embedding as in (2.11), and we implicitly identified $\mathbb{P}(G_1^*)$ with the fiber at $B \times \{1\}$ of $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{G}_1^*)$. We then have a natural embedding

$$\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tilde{G}_1^*), \quad (8.6)$$

and we introduce the following line bundle $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{O}(1)$ over \mathcal{X} .

Then by definition \mathcal{X} is a complex analytic space, and it is classical, cf. [38, Proposition III.9.8] and [23, Lemma 3.2], that the restriction, \mathcal{X}^* , of \mathcal{X} to a family over $B \times \mathbb{C}^*$ is isomorphic with $X \times \mathbb{C}^*$ under the \mathbb{C}^* -action. In other words, we constructed a *fibration degeneration* in the terminology of Dervan-Sektnan [23], and the fibers of this degeneration correspond to *test configurations*, introduced by Tian [68] and Donaldson [27].

We extend the definition of the Fubini-Study operator from (2.12) in such a way that any Hermitian metric H° on \tilde{G}_1 induces a Hermitian metric $FS(H^\circ)$ on \mathcal{F} over \mathcal{X} , given by the pull-back of the induced metric on $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

We denote by $\hat{p} : \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ a resolution of singularities of \mathcal{X} . We use the notations $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$, $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$ for the restrictions of $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ to the families over $B \times \mathbb{D}$ and $B \times \mathbb{D}^*$ respectively. By Lemma 8.2, the $(1, 1)$ -form $\Omega_1 := \hat{p}^* c_1(\mathcal{F}, FS(H^\circ))$, defined over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$, extends smoothly over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$.

For any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we will now introduce a function $\phi_l : \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which under the identification of $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$ with $X \times \mathbb{D}^*$, is given by

$$\phi_l(x, \tau) := \frac{1}{l} \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_l} |s_j^{(l)}(x)|_{(h^F)_{\otimes k}}^2 |\tau|^{-2\lambda_j^{(l)}} \right) - \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} |s_i(x)|_{h^F}^2 |\tau|^{-2\lambda_i} \right), \quad (8.7)$$

where h^F is an arbitrary metric on F (the definition is clearly independent on its choice), s_i , $i = 1, \dots, N_1$, (resp. $s_j^{(l)}$, $j = 1, \dots, N_l$) is an orthonormal basis of H (resp. $[\text{Sym}^l H]$) adapted to the (resp. quotient) filtration induced by (6.1).

Directly from (2.13) and the definition of the geodesic rays, for any $\tau \neq 0$, we have

$$\phi_l(x, \tau) = 2 \log \left(FS(H_{-2 \log |\tau|}) / FS([\text{Sym}^l H]_{-2 \log |\tau|})^{\frac{1}{l}} \right). \quad (8.8)$$

The following result is the technical backbone of our analysis.

Lemma 8.3. The function ϕ_l extends as a Ω_1 -psh function over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$, i.e. there is $C_l > 0$, such that $\phi_l \leq C_l$ over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$, and over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$, we have

$$\sqrt{-1} \partial_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*} \phi_l \geq -\Omega_1. \quad (8.9)$$

Proof. By the classical extension result, cf. [21, Corollary I.5.25], it is enough to show the existence of C_l as above and to establish the inequality (8.9) over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$ instead of $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Directly from (8.7), we obtain

$$\phi_l(x, \tau) = \frac{1}{l} \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_l} |s_j^{(l)}(x)|_{FS(H_\tau^\circ)}^2 |\tau|^{-2\lambda_j^{(l)}} \right). \quad (8.10)$$

Remark now that by Poincaré-Lelong equation, $\frac{1}{l} \log |s_j^{(l)}(x)|_{FS(H_\tau^\circ)}^2$, $x \in X$, $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$, is a Ω_1 -psh function over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}^*$. By (8.10), it is then classical, cf. [21, Theorem I.4.16], that ϕ_l is also Ω_1 -psh.

Let us now establish the existence of a constant C_l as above. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{N_1}$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N_1})$, we denote by $s^\alpha := s_1^{\otimes \alpha_1} \otimes \dots \otimes s_{N_1}^{\otimes \alpha_{N_1}}$, and let $\alpha \cdot \lambda := \alpha_1 \lambda_1 + \dots + \alpha_{N_1} \lambda_{N_1}$. Clearly, by the definition of the quotient filtration, there are $c_{\alpha j} \in \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{N_1}$, $|\alpha| = l$, $\alpha \cdot \lambda \geq \lambda_j^{(l)}$, so that

$$s_j^{(l)} = \sum_{\alpha \cdot \lambda \geq \lambda_j^{(l)}} c_{\alpha j} s^\alpha. \quad (8.11)$$

Then there is $C'_l > 0$, such that for any $x \in B$, $|\tau| \leq 1$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$|s_j^{(l)}(x)|_{(h^F) \otimes k}^2 |\tau|^{-2\lambda_j^{(l)}} \leq C'_l \cdot \left(\sum_{\alpha \cdot \lambda \geq \lambda_j^{(l)}} |s^\alpha(x)|_{(h^F) \otimes k}^2 |\tau|^{-2\lambda \cdot \alpha} \right). \quad (8.12)$$

It is then a simple manipulation to see that one can take $C_l := \log(C'_l N_l)/l$ to satisfy the claim of the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Remark first that by (8.8), we have $\phi_l|_{\partial \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}} = 2 \log(FS(H_0)/FS([\text{Sym}^l H_0])^{\frac{1}{l}})$. However, it is easy to verify that $FS(H_0) = FS([\text{Sym}^l H_0])^{\frac{1}{l}}$, cf. [32, Lemma 4.11]. We fix a Hermitian $(1, 1)$ -form $\omega_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$ over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$. Directly from (8.9), we conclude that there is $C' > 0$, such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\Delta_{\omega_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}} \phi_l \geq -C'. \quad (8.13)$$

Let us now fix a solution $u : \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to the following Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta_{\omega_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}} u = -C', \quad u|_{\partial \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}} = 0. \quad (8.14)$$

Then by the maximal principle, we have $\phi_l \leq u$. As u is continuous over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$, there is $C > 0$, so that $u < C$ over $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathbb{D}}$. But then $\phi_l < C$ for any $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, which finishes the proof by (8.8). \square

9 Approximate critical Hermitian structures and geodesic rays

The main goal of this section is to establish Theorem 3.8. The proof will be based on some local calculations of the curvature of geodesic rays. More precisely, for a holomorphic vector bundle E over B with a filtration by subbundles $E = F_{\lambda_1} \supset F_{\lambda_2} \supset \dots \supset F_{\lambda_q} \supset F_{\lambda_{q+1}} = \{0\}$, we consider a geodesic ray H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, associated with the filtration and departing from a Hermitian metric H on E . We denote $G_i := F_{\lambda_i}/F_{\lambda_{i+1}}$, $q_i = \text{rk}(F_{\lambda_i})$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, and assume that the filtration is decreasing, i.e. $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_q$.

Consider a local holomorphic frame e_1, \dots, e_r of E adapted to the filtration in the sense that e_{r-q_i+1}, \dots, e_r form a holomorphic frame F_{λ_i} for any $i = 1, \dots, q$. We now construct a (non-holomorphic) frame f_1, \dots, f_r by projecting orthogonally e_{r-q_i+j} , $j = 1, \dots, q_i - q_{i+1}$, onto the orthogonal complement of $F_{\lambda_{i+1}}$. It is then immediate that

$$\|f_{r-q_i+j}\|_{H_s} = \exp(-s\lambda_i/2) \cdot \|f_{r-q_i+j}\|_{H_0}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, q \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, q_i - q_{i+1}. \quad (9.1)$$

We denote by α_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, the connection form of the Chern connection on (E, H_s) with respect to the frame f_1, \dots, f_r . We write it in a matrix form

$$\alpha_s = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11,s} & \beta_{12,s} & \dots & \beta_{1q,s} \\ \beta_{21,s} & \beta_{22,s} & \dots & \beta_{2q,s} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{q1,s} & \beta_{q2,s} & \dots & \beta_{qq,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9.2)$$

where $\beta_{ij,s}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, q$, are differential forms of degree 1 with values in $\text{Hom}(G_j, G_i)$. Recall the following well-known calculation, cf. [45, Propositions 1.6.4 - 1.6.6], [42, Lemmas 3.1, 3.2].

Lemma 9.1. For $i > j$, $\beta_{ij,s}$ has only $(0, 1)$ -differential form components, and for $i < j$, $\beta_{ij,s}$ has only $(1, 0)$ -differential form components. Moreover, $(\beta_{ij,0})^* = -\beta_{ji,0}$, and we have

$$\beta_{ij,s} = \begin{cases} \beta_{ij,0}, & \text{if } i > j \\ \exp(-s(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)) \cdot \beta_{ij,0}, & \text{if } i \leq j. \end{cases} \quad (9.3)$$

We will now apply Lemma 9.1 for the study of geodesic rays associated with the Harder-Narasimhan filtrations. More precisely, consider the Harder-Narasimhan filtration of a vector bundle E as in (1.3). We use the notations (2.18) for a resolution of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration, and let $G_i^{HN} = \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i} / \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$. We fix a δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure H on E and construct the geodesic ray, H_s , $s \in [0, +\infty[$, associated with the resolution of the Harder-Narasimhan filtration and departing from H , as in Theorem 3.8.

We choose a cover of B_0 by open subsets U_u , $u = 1, \dots, v$, with a subordinate partition of unity $\rho_u : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and local holomorphic frames e_1^u, \dots, e_r^u of $\mu_0^* E$ over U_u adapted to the filtration $\tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{F}$ as before (9.2). We denote by $\alpha_s^{HN,u}$, $s \in [0, +\infty[$, $u = 1, \dots, v$, the connection form of the Chern connection on (E, H_s) with respect to the frame f_1^u, \dots, f_r^u associated with e_1^u, \dots, e_r^u in the same way as f_1, \dots, f_r was associated with e_1, \dots, e_r in (9.2). We denote by $\beta_{ij,s}^{HN,u}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, q$, the components of the associated connection form as in (9.2).

We denote by $R_i^{G_i^{HN}}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, the curvature of the Chern connection on G_i^{HN} with the metric induced by H . For $b \in U_u$, we denote by $dz_l(b) \in T_b^{1,0*} B_0$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, some orthogonal frame (with respect to $\mu_0^* \omega_B$). For $i, j = 1, \dots, q$, $i < j$, $u = 1, \dots, v$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, we define the section A_{ijl}^u of $\text{Hom}(G_j^{HN}, G_i^{HN})$ as follows

$$\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} = \sum_{l=1}^m dz_l \cdot A_{ijl}^u. \quad (9.4)$$

Then by Lemma 9.1, for any $i > j$, we have

$$\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} = - \sum_{l=1}^m d\bar{z}_l \cdot A_{jil}^{u*}. \quad (9.5)$$

We also denote by $R_{ij,s}^E \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(B, \wedge^{1,1} T^* B \otimes \text{Hom}(G_j^{HN}, G_i^{HN}))$ the components of the curvature tensor of the Chern connection on $(\mu_0^* E, H_s)$.

Lemma 9.2. For any $i, j = 1, \dots, q$, $i \neq j$, the following estimates hold

$$\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot d\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)} \leq 2\pi \delta r q 8^{q+3}, \quad (9.6)$$

$$\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ji,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)} \leq 2\pi \delta r 8^{q-\max(i,j)+1}. \quad (9.7)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\left\| R_i^{G_i^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - \lambda_i \text{Id}_{G_i^{HN}} \cdot \mu_0^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_0)} \leq 2\pi \delta r 8^{q-i+1}. \quad (9.8)$$

Proof. Remark first that by Lemma 9.1, in order to prove (9.6), (9.7), in their full generality, it is enough to establish them for $i < j$. By the definition of $\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u}$, cf. [21, (V.14.6)], we have

$$\sqrt{-1}R_{ii,0}^E = \sqrt{-1}R_i^{G^{HN}} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^q \sum_{u=1}^v \rho_u \sqrt{-1}\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ji,0}^{HN,u}. \quad (9.9)$$

However, directly from (9.4) and (9.5), we see that

$$\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ji,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} = \begin{cases} -\sum_{l=1}^m dz_l \wedge d\bar{z}_l \cdot A_{ijl}^u A_{ijl}^{u*} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1}, & \text{if } i < j, \\ \sum_{l=1}^m dz_l \wedge d\bar{z}_l \cdot A_{jil}^{u*} A_{jil}^u \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1}, & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases} \quad (9.10)$$

Also, by the Chern-Weil theory, we have

$$\int_B \text{Tr}[\sqrt{-1}R_i^{G^{HN}}] \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} = 2\pi \int_B c_1(G_i^{HN}) \mu_0^* [\omega_B]^{m-1}. \quad (9.11)$$

Since H is an δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure, we have

$$\left\| \sqrt{-1}R_{ii,0}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - 2\pi \lambda_i \text{Id}_{G_i^{HN}} \mu_0^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \leq 2\pi \delta r. \quad (9.12)$$

And by the definition of λ_i , we have

$$\lambda_i \int_B \omega_B^m = \int_B c_1(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}) [\omega_B]^{m-1}. \quad (9.13)$$

As the saturation can only increase the first Chern class, cf. [45, Lemma 5.7.5], we have

$$\int_{B_0} c_1(G_i^{HN}) \mu_0^* [\omega_B]^{m-1} \geq \int_B c_1(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i} / \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{i+1}}) [\omega_B]^{m-1}. \quad (9.14)$$

A combination of (9.11)-(9.14) gives us

$$\int_B \text{Tr}[\sqrt{-1}R_i^{G^{HN}}] \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \geq \int_B \text{Tr}[\sqrt{-1}R_{ii,0}^E] \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - 2\pi \delta r. \quad (9.15)$$

Remark now that by (9.10), in the sum (9.9), each summand is negative for $i = q$ (it goes in line with the fact that the the curvature of a Hermitian vector bundle decreases under taking subbundles, cf. [21, Theorem V.14.5]). Hence, we have

$$\sqrt{-1}R_q^{G^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \leq \sqrt{-1}R_{qq,0}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1}. \quad (9.16)$$

By an argument similar to (3.27), from (9.15) and (9.16), we obtain

$$\left\| R_{qq,0}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - R_q^{G^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \leq 2\pi \delta r. \quad (9.17)$$

From (9.12) and (9.17), we obtain (9.8) for $i = q$. Moreover, from (9.9) and (9.17), we get

$$\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \sqrt{-1}\beta_{qj,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{jq,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \leq 2\pi \delta r. \quad (9.18)$$

By the linearity of the trace and again the fact that in the sum under the norm (9.18), each summand is positive by (9.10), we see that (9.18) implies (9.7) for $i = q$.

Let us now describe the first step of induction, i.e. establish (9.7) and (9.8) for $i = q - 1$. First, by the similar argument as in (9.16), we get

$$\sqrt{-1}R^{G_{q-1}^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} + \sum_{u=1}^v \rho_u \sqrt{-1} \beta_{q-1q,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{qq-1,0}^{HN,u} \leq \sqrt{-1}R_{q-1q-1,0}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1}. \quad (9.19)$$

But then we already know that (9.7) holds for $i = q$, and since it is symmetric in i, j , it also holds for $j = q$. Using this, by an argument similar to (3.27), from (9.15) and (9.19), we obtain

$$\left\| R_{q-1q-1,0}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - R^{G_{q-1}^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_0)} \leq 2\pi\delta r 9. \quad (9.20)$$

From (9.12) and (9.20), we get (9.8) for $i = q - 1$. From (9.9), the fact that the estimate (9.7) holds for $i = q$ and (9.20), we get (9.7) for $i = q - 1$. The rest of induction is done similarly.

Let us establish (9.6). Since H is an δ -approximate critical Hermitian structure, for $i \neq j$,

$$\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \left(d\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} + \sum_{k=1}^q \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{kj,0}^{HN,u} \right) \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)} \leq 2\pi\delta. \quad (9.21)$$

However, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{kj,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ki,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \right) \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{u=1}^v \left\| \rho_u \cdot \beta_{jk,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{kj,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)}^{\text{tr}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9.22)$$

We obtain (9.6) from (9.7), (9.21) and (9.22). \square

As an application of Lemmas 9.1 and 9.2, we establish the following result.

Lemma 9.3. For any $i \neq j$, the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sqrt{-1}R_{ij,s}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_s)} \leq 2\pi\delta r q 8^{q+4}, \\ & \left\| \sqrt{-1}R_{ii,s}^E \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^{m-1} - 2\pi\lambda_i \cdot \text{Id}_{G_i^{HN}} \wedge \mu_0^* \omega_B^m \right\|_{L^1(B_0, H_s)} \leq 2\pi\delta r q 8^{q+3}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.23)$$

Proof. We will establish the first bound of (9.23) under the assumption $i < j$, as the other case is completely analogous. By Lemma 9.1, for $i \leq j$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ij,s}^E &= d\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \cdot \exp(-s(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)) + \sum_{k=1}^i \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ki,0}^{HN,u} \cdot \exp(-s(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=i+1}^j \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ki,0}^{HN,u} \cdot \exp(-s(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=j+1}^r \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ki,0}^{HN,u} \cdot \exp(-s(\lambda_k - \lambda_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (9.24)$$

Remark now that by (9.1) for a section A of $\text{Hom}(G_j^{HN}, G_i^{HN})$, we have

$$\|A\mu_0^*\omega_B^m\|_{L^1(U_u, H_s)} = \|A\mu_0^*\omega_B^m\|_{L^1(U_u, H_0)} \cdot \exp(s(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)/2). \quad (9.25)$$

Then by (9.24) and (9.25) it is clear that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{-1}R_{ij,s}^E \wedge \mu_0^*\omega_B^{m-1}\|_{L^1(B_0, H_s)} &\leq \|d\beta_{ij,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^*\omega_B^{m-1}\|_{L^1(B_0, H_0)} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^q \|\beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{kj,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \mu_0^*\omega_B^{m-1}\|_{L^1(B_0, H_0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.26)$$

The first bound of (9.23) for $i < j$ then follows directly from Lemma 9.2, (9.22) and (9.26).

Similarly, by (9.24), we have

$$R_{ii,s}^E = R^{G_i^{HN}} + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^q \beta_{ik,0}^{HN,u} \wedge \beta_{ki,0}^{HN,u} \cdot \exp(-s|\lambda_i - \lambda_k|). \quad (9.27)$$

The second bound from (9.23) then follows from Lemma 9.2 and (9.27). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Remark that the components of the weight operator, $A(H_s, \tilde{\mu}_0^*\mathcal{F}^{HN})_{ij} \in \text{Hom}(G_j^{HN}, G_i^{HN})$, in the frame f_1^u, \dots, f_r^u are given by $A(H_s, \tilde{\mu}_0^*\mathcal{F}^{HN})_{ij} = \lambda_i \delta_{ij} \text{Id}_{G_i^{HN}}$, where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. The result now follows directly from this and Lemma 9.3. \square

10 Mehta-Ramanathan type formula for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional

The main goal of this section is to describe an application of Theorem 1.1 giving a Mehta-Ramanathan type formula for the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional. Roughly, this formula says that for projective families, the value of the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional can be determined from the values of the respective functionals on the restriction of our family to generic curves.

To state our result precisely, we assume that $[\omega_B] \in H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ (in particular, B is projective) and $m \geq 2$. By Bertini's theorem, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $l \geq l_0$, a generic curve C_l , $\iota_l : C_l \hookrightarrow B$ obtained as an intersection of $m - 1$ generic divisors in the class $l[\omega_B]$, is regular. Denote by Y_l the pull-back of ι_l and π , and by $\pi_l : Y_l \rightarrow C_l$, $i_l : Y_l \hookrightarrow X$ the natural corresponding maps, verifying the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_l & \xleftarrow{i_l} & X \\ \downarrow \pi_l & & \downarrow \pi \\ C_l & \xleftarrow{\iota_l} & B. \end{array} \quad (10.1)$$

The main result of this section goes as follows.

Theorem 10.1. *For any $l \geq l_0$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the value $\inf \int_{Y_l} |\beta^{n+1}|$, where the infimum is taken over all smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -forms β in the class $i_l^*(c_1(L) - t\pi^*[\omega_B])$, which are positive along the fibers of π_l , is independent on the choice of a generic curve C_l . Moreover, the limit below exists, and the following formula holds*

$$\text{WZW}(c_1(L) - t\pi^*[\omega_B], \omega_B) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l^{m-1}} \inf \int_{Y_l} |\beta^{n+1}|. \quad (10.2)$$

The proof of Theorem 10.1 is based on a combination of Theorem 1.1 and Mehta-Ramanathan type theorem for the measures η^{HN} . Recall that the classical Mehta-Ramanathan theorem from [53], [54] says that if a vector bundle E is (semi)stable, then for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough, the vector bundle $i_l^* E$ is (semi)stable over a generic curve C_l . In particular, the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of an arbitrary vector bundle can be recovered from the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of the restriction of this vector bundle to generic curves of sufficiently large degree.

The main result of [37] roughly says that a weak uniform version of the Mehta-Ramanathan theorem holds if instead of a single vector bundle E , we consider a sequence of vector bundles E_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, given by direct images. More precisely, we denote by $\eta^{HN,l}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the measure constructed similarly to η^{HN} , but associated with the family $\pi_l : Y_l \rightarrow C_l$, $i_l^* L$, $[\omega_B]|_{C_l}$, where C_l is the generic curve as above (it is standard that the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of the restrictions of a vector bundle to curves, given by complete intersections, are independent on the choice of *generic* curve, cf. [37, Corollary 3.8]). The main result of [37] goes as follows.

Theorem 10.2 ([37, Theorem 1.2]). *The measures $\eta^{HN,l}$ converge weakly to η^{HN} , as $l \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof of Theorem 10.1. By applying Theorem 1.1 to $\pi_l : Y_l \rightarrow C_l$, $i_l^* L$ and $[\omega_B]|_{C_l}$, we obtain

$$\inf \int_{Y_l} |\beta^{n+1}| = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x - t| d\eta^{HN,l}(x) \cdot \int_{Y_l} c_1(i_l^* L)^n \pi_l^* \iota_l^* [\omega_B] \cdot (n+1), \quad (10.3)$$

where the infimum is taken over β as in (10.2). This formula and the fact that $\eta^{HN,l}$ doesn't depend on the choice of generic curve implies that the value $\inf \int_{Y_l} |\beta^{n+1}|$ doesn't depend on the choice of generic curve either. Remark that by the definition of C_l , we have $\int_{Y_l} c_1(i_l^* L)^n \pi_l^* \iota_l^* [\omega_B] = l^{m-1} \cdot \int_X c_1(L)^n \pi^* [\omega_B]^m$. The result now follows from this, Theorem 10.2, (1.5) and (10.3). \square

11 Asymptotic cohomology and the absolute Monge-Ampère functional

The main goal of this section is to establish Corollary 1.5. This will be done through an interpretation of Conjecture 1 in terms of a related conjecture on the sharp lower bound on the absolute Monge-Ampère functional, and then by an application of Theorem 1.1 along with some calculations concerning the limiting Harder-Narasimhan measures.

Let us introduce some notations first. We fix a compact complex manifold Y of dimension $n+1$. For an arbitrary class $[\alpha] \in H^{1,1}(Y)$ and a smooth closed $(1,1)$ -differential form α , we introduce the absolute Monge-Ampère functional as follows

$$|\text{MA}|(\alpha) := \int_Y |\alpha^{n+1}|, \quad |\text{MA}|([\alpha]) = \inf |\text{MA}|(\alpha), \quad (11.1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all smooth closed $(1,1)$ -forms α in the class $[\alpha]$. We fix a holomorphic line bundle F .

Proposition 11.1. For an arbitrary smooth closed $(1,1)$ -form α in the class $c_1(F)$, we have

$$|\text{MA}|(\alpha) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \hat{h}^q(Y, F). \quad (11.2)$$

Proof. By the definition of the sets $Y(\alpha, q)$ from (1.8), we can rewrite

$$|\mathrm{MA}|(\alpha) = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \int_{Y(\alpha, q)} (-1)^q \alpha^{n+1}. \quad (11.3)$$

The result now follows directly from (1.8). \square

Conjecture 2. We have $|\mathrm{MA}|(c_1(F)) = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \hat{h}^q(Y, F)$.

From (1.8) and (11.2), Conjecture 2 refines Conjecture 1. Moreover, Conjecture 2 is equivalent to the following statement: for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -form α_ϵ in the class $c_1(F)$, such that $\int_{Y(\alpha_\epsilon, q)} (-1)^q \alpha_\epsilon^n \leq \hat{h}^q(Y, F) + \epsilon$, for any $q = 0, \dots, n+1$.

Now, we argue that

$$\sum_{q=0}^{n+1} (-1)^q \hat{h}^q(Y, F) = \int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1}. \quad (11.4)$$

Indeed, by Riemann-Roch-Hirzebruch theorem, we have

$$\sum_{q=0}^{n+1} (-1)^q \dim H^q(Y, F^{\otimes k}) = \int_Y \mathrm{Td}(TY) \cdot \mathrm{ch}(F^{\otimes k}), \quad (11.5)$$

where Td and ch are Todd and Chern classes. Using the fact that in (1.7), \limsup is actually a limit (see Demailly [19, Proposition 1.7] for a proof), we deduce (11.4) by dividing both sides of (11.5) by k^{n+1} and then by taking a limit $k \rightarrow \infty$.

From (11.4), it is then immediate to see that we have

$$\sum_{q=0}^{n+1} \hat{h}^q(Y, F) \geq \left| \int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1} \right|. \quad (11.6)$$

In particular, the lower bound from Proposition 11.1 refines the trivial bound $|\mathrm{MA}|(\alpha) \geq \left| \int_Y [\alpha]^{n+1} \right|$. It strictly refines the above bound if neither all even or all odd asymptotic cohomologies vanish.

We can now state the main result of this section, refining Corollary 1.5.

Theorem 11.2. *In the setting of Corollary 1.5, Conjecture 2 holds. Moreover, in this setting, it is enough to consider relatively positive α in the definition of $|\mathrm{MA}|([\alpha])$, i.e. for an arbitrary Kähler form ω_B on Y , we have $|\mathrm{MA}|([\alpha]) = \mathrm{WZW}([\alpha], \omega_B)$.*

Proof. We first argue that

$$\hat{h}^q(Y, F) = 0, \text{ for any } q > 1. \quad (11.7)$$

By Serre vanishing theorem, it is immediate to see that Leray spectral sequence associated with $F^{\otimes k}$ and π degenerates at the second page for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough. In particular, for any $q = 0, \dots, n+1$, and k large enough, we have

$$H^q(Y, F^{\otimes k}) = H^q(C, E_k). \quad (11.8)$$

However, since C is a Riemann surface, we clearly have $H^q(C, E_k) = 0$ for any $q > 1$. Together with (11.8), this implies (11.7).

Now, by using the fact that when the base of the fibration is 1-dimensional, the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional coincides with the absolute Monge-Ampère functional, Theorem 1.1 gives us

$$|\text{MA}|(c_1(F)) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1). \quad (11.9)$$

It is one of the two crucial places in the proof where we use the fact that $\dim B = 1$.

We argue that

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1) = \hat{h}^0(Y, F) + \hat{h}^1(Y, F). \quad (11.10)$$

Once (11.10) is established, the proof of Theorem 11.2 follows by (11.7), (11.9) and (11.10).

Let us now establish (11.10). We first show that

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1) = \int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1}. \quad (11.11)$$

Recall that η^{HN} is the weak limit of η_k^{HN} (the latter measures were defined in (1.4)), as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we have

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x d\eta^{HN}(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k \cdot N_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \mu_i^k, \quad (11.12)$$

where N_k and μ_i^k were defined before (1.4). However, by the additivity of the degree, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \mu_i^k = \frac{\deg(E_k)}{\int_C [\omega_B]}. \quad (11.13)$$

By Riemann-Roch-Grothendieck theorem, similarly to (11.4) and (11.5), it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\deg(E_k)}{k \cdot N_k} = \frac{\int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1}}{(n+1) \cdot p_* c_1(F)^n}. \quad (11.14)$$

A combination of (11.12), (11.13) and (11.14) implies (11.11).

Now, from (11.11), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x| d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1) \\ = 2 \int_{x \geq 0} x d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1) - \int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.15)$$

Recall, however, that Chen in [13, Theorem 1.1] established that there is the following relation

$$\hat{h}^0(Y, F) = \int_{x \geq 0} x d\eta^{HN}(x) \cdot \int c_1(F)^n \pi^*[\omega_B] \cdot (n+1). \quad (11.16)$$

This is the second crucial place in the proof where we use the fact that $\dim B = 1$. Remark that due to our unusual normalization of the slopes, (11.16) differs slightly from [13, Theorem 1.1], where instead of $\int c_1(F)^n [\omega_B]$, there was $\pi_* c_1(F)^n$. From (11.4) and (11.7), we get

$$\hat{h}^0(Y, F) - \hat{h}^1(Y, F) = \int_Y c_1(F)^{n+1}. \quad (11.17)$$

Now, a combination of (11.15), (11.16) and (11.17) imply (11.10), which finishes the proof. \square

In conclusion to this section, let us point out a relation – originally described in [20] – between Corollary 1.5 and the Andreotti-Grauert theorem. Recall that the Andreotti-Grauert theorem asserts the vanishing of some cohomology groups, associated with high tensor powers of a line bundle, carrying a metric with curvature having enough of positive eigenvalues at every point. The converse of this statement asks for the existence of metrics on the line bundle with certain positivity constraints on the curvature, provided that some cohomology groups vanish. It is known to hold in some special cases, cf. [73], but it fails in general, see [56]. What Conjecture 1 asks is a version of this converse statement, saying that *asymptotic* vanishing of the cohomology implies the existence of a *sequence of metrics* with suitable curvature.

12 Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence and Hessian quotient equations

The goal of this section is to describe a connection between the Wess-Zumino-Witten equation, Hermite-Einstein and Hessian quotient equations.

Let us first explain the relation with Hermite-Einstein equation and show that Corollary 1.3 can be seen as a generalization of Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence to fibrations which are not necessarily associated with vector bundles.

More precisely, let F be a holomorphic vector bundle of rank r over B . Let $L := \mathcal{O}(1)$ be the hyperplane bundle over $X := \mathbb{P}(F^*)$, and let $\pi : \mathbb{P}(F^*) \rightarrow B$ be the natural projection.

Let us recall how to calculate the limiting Harder-Narasimhan measure η^{HN} for this family. First, it is classical that the vector bundles $E_k = R^0\pi_*L^{\otimes k}$ are isomorphic with $\text{Sym}^k F$. It is also easy to see that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the Harder-Narasimhan slopes of $\text{Sym}^k F$ can be easily expressed in terms of the Harder-Narasimhan slopes, μ_1, \dots, μ_k of F . To describe the limit of this relation, we denote by $\Delta = \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) : x_1 + \dots + x_r = 1, x_i \geq 0\}$ the $r - 1$ -simplex, and by $d\lambda$ the Lebesgue measure on Δ , normalized so that $\int_{\Delta} d\lambda = 1$. We denote by $\phi : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the map $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \mapsto x_1\mu_1 + \dots + x_r\mu_r$. Then according to [13, Proposition 3.5], we have $\eta^{HN} = \phi_*d\lambda$. In particular, the measure η^{HN} is a singleton if and only if $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_k$, i.e. F is semistable.

Let us now describe the geometric side of Theorem 1.1 in this specific setting. We fix a Hermitian metric h^F on F . We endow L with the metric h^L induced by h^F . It is then a classical calculation, cf. [44], [36, Lemma 3.3 and Remark 3.4], that the metric h^F solves the Hermite-Einstein equation $\sqrt{-1}R^{h^F} \wedge \omega_B^{m-1} = 2\pi\lambda\omega_B^m$ if and only if $\omega := c_1(L, h^L)$ solves

$$\omega^{n+1} \wedge \pi^*\omega_B^{m-1} = \lambda(n+1) \cdot \omega^n \wedge \pi^*\omega_B^m. \quad (12.1)$$

Moreover, following a question raised by Kobayashi [44], it was established by Feng-Liu-Wang in [28, Corollary 3.3] that if there is a metric h^L on L such that $\omega := c_1(L, h^L)$ solves (12.1), then one can cook up from it a Hermitian metric on F , solving the Hermite-Einstein equation (in particular, F is then polystable).

What Corollary 1.3 tells us in this specific setting is that if the vector bundle F is semistable, then (12.1) can be solved approximately. Due to the explanations above, this gives us a weak version of Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence, and Corollary 1.3 in its full generality is a generalization of this correspondence to more general fibrations. We say “weak version” for two reasons: first, Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence asserts existence of a Hermitian metric on F . As it is not clear what is the fibered analogue of a Hermitian metric on F , Corollary 1.3 can only provide the existence of a Finsler metric (a metric on $\mathcal{O}(1)$). Second, Corollary 1.3 proves that L^1 -approximate solutions exists for semistable vector bundles, but Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence provides L^∞ -approximate solutions, cf. [45, Theorem 6.10.13].

Let us now describe a connection with the so-called *Hessian quotient equations*. Here we no longer assume that our fibration is associated with a vector bundle as we did before. We fix a Kähler form χ and a Kähler class $[\omega]$ on X . The Hessian quotient equation, introduced by Székelyhidi in [66, (185)], is then given by

$$\omega^{n+1} \wedge \chi^{m-1} = \lambda(n+1) \cdot \omega^n \wedge \chi^m, \quad (12.2)$$

where λ is a certain (topological) constant, and ω is the unknown Kähler form from $[\omega]$.

Remark that (12.1) has the same form as (12.2) with only one difference that instead of the positive $(1,1)$ -form χ , we have a semi-positive form $\pi^*\omega_B$. This – seemingly minor – change breaks down many of the known techniques for the study of (12.2), as the linearization of (12.1), unlike (12.2), is not elliptic. Also, the notion of subsolution from [66, (12)] collapses in this degenerate setting, as it is easy to see there is no relatively positive $(1,1)$ -form ω , which verifies the inequality $\omega^n \wedge \pi^*\omega_B^{m-1} - \lambda n \omega^{n-1} \wedge \pi^*\omega_B^m > 0$ (and if we replace the sign $>$ with \geq , then any form verifying this bound automatically solves (12.1)).

Another difference between (12.1) and (12.2) is that we only assume that $[\omega]$ is relatively Kähler in Corollary 1.3 instead of the Kähler assumption from (12.2). However, this issue is a minor one, as (12.1) doesn't change much if one changes ω to $\omega + T\pi^*\omega_B$ for some $T > 0$ big enough, and $[\omega] + T\pi^*[\omega_B]$ becomes Kähler for T big enough.

We will now show that, at least when $\dim B = 1$, when L is ample, the forms appearing in Corollary 1.3 can be given by the solutions of the Hessian quotient equation, (12.2).

More precisely, for $\epsilon > 0$, we consider a $(1,1)$ -form $\chi_\epsilon := \pi^*\omega_B + \epsilon\omega_0$, where ω_0 is an arbitrary Kähler form from $[\omega]$. Clearly, the form χ_ϵ is Kähler for $\epsilon > 0$. We denote $\lambda_\epsilon := \int_X [\omega]^{n+1} [\chi_\epsilon]^{m-1} / (\int_X [\omega]^n [\chi_\epsilon]^m (n+1))$.

Proposition 12.1. Assume that $\dim B = 1$, and η^{HN} is the Dirac mass. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, the J -equation, given by

$$\omega^{n+1} = \lambda_\epsilon(n+1) \cdot \omega^n \wedge \chi_\epsilon, \quad (12.3)$$

admits a solution, $\omega := \omega_\epsilon$, from the class $[c_1(L)]$. Moreover, the $(1,1)$ -form α from Corollary 1.3 can be taken as $\omega_{\epsilon'}$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$ small enough.

This result will be established as a consequence of the numerical criteria for the existence of the solutions to (12.3) and the fact that η^{HN} is the Dirac mass. More precisely, we first have the following result established in [36, Theorem 1.3].

Theorem 12.2. *If $\dim B = 1$, then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- a) *The measure η^{HN} is the Dirac mass at λ .*
- b) *For any irreducible complex analytic subspace $Y \subset X$ of dimension $k+1$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the restriction of π to Y is a surjection, we have $\int_Y c_1(L)^{k+1} \geq \lambda(k+1) \cdot \int_Y c_1(L)^k \pi^*[\omega_B]$ with an equality if $Y = X$.*

Second, we have the following statement proved by Datar-Pingali [17, Theorem 1.1], see also Székelyhidi [66] and Chen [11] for related results.

Theorem 12.3. *For any Kähler form χ on X from the class $[\chi]$ and a Kähler class $[\omega]$, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- a) *For $\lambda = \int_X [\omega]^{n+1} / (\int_X [\omega]^n [\chi] (n+1))$, the equation $\omega^{n+1} = \lambda(n+1) \cdot \omega^n \wedge \chi$ admits a unique solution ω from the class $[\omega]$, so that the (n,n) -form $\omega^n - \lambda n \omega^{n-1} \wedge \chi$ is positive.*

b) For any irreducible complex analytic subspace $Y \subset X$ of dimension $k + 1$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$, we have $\int_Y [\omega]^{k+1} > \lambda(k + 1) \cdot \int_Y [\omega]^k [\chi]$.

Proof of Proposition 12.1. Now, in order to show that the equation (12.3) has solutions, we will verify that the second condition from Theorem 12.3 is satisfied.

Remark first that it is immediate that if the inequality $\int_Y c_1(L)^{k+1} \geq \lambda_\epsilon(k + 1) \cdot \int_Y c_1(L)^k \pi^*[\chi_\epsilon]$ holds for $\epsilon = 0$, then it holds (with a sign $>$ instead of \geq if $k < n$) for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Now, remark that Theorem 12.2 remains valid if in the second condition, we consider all irreducible complex analytic subspaces $Y \subset X$ of dimension $k + 1$ instead of those projecting surjectively over B . Indeed, this is due to the fact that if the projection is not surjective, then by the Grauert's theorem, it has to be a proper analytic subset of B (hence, a point). The term on the right-hand side is then zero, and the requirement is automatically satisfied by the ampleness of L .

A combination of these two remarks shows that the second condition if Theorem 12.3 holds for any $\epsilon > 0$. By Theorem 12.3, we conclude that for any $\epsilon > 0$, the equation $\omega^{n+1} = \lambda_\epsilon(n+1)\omega^n \wedge \chi_\epsilon$ has a solution, which we denote by ω_ϵ .

Now, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$|\omega_\epsilon^{n+1} - \lambda(n+1)\omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \pi^*\omega_B| \leq (\lambda - \lambda_\epsilon)(n+1)\omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \chi_\epsilon + \epsilon\lambda(n+1)\omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \omega_0, \quad (12.4)$$

which immediately implies the result, as by Chern-Weil theory, we have $\int_X \omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \chi_\epsilon = \int_X [\omega]^{n+1} [\chi_\epsilon]$, $\int_X \omega_\epsilon^n \wedge \omega_0 = \int_X [\omega]^n [\omega_0]$, and these quantities remain bounded, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

It will be interesting to know if for $\dim B \geq 2$ the forms from Corollary 1.3 can also be taken as solutions of some auxiliary differential equations.

Also, taken into account the fact that the continuity method and the method of geometric flows plays a crucial role in Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence and the study of Hessian quotient equations, it is interesting to know if these methods can be used to give alternative proofs for the results from this paper, obtained through quantization. This is particularly relevant as in the situations analogous to the one of Theorem 1.1, cf. [72] [41], [24], the minimizing sequences for other functionals were obtained through solutions of some geometric flows.

As a concluding remark, we would like to mention some related works concerning the equation (1.1) in the setting when B has a boundary. First, when B is an annuli in \mathbb{C} , weak solutions to the Dirichlet problem associated with (1.1) correspond to the Mabuchi geodesics in the space of all Kähler potentials, [60] [26], and they always exist, see [14] (cf. also [71] for a related result on pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^m). Moreover, the results [57], [59], [64], [71] show that the solution to this equation can be obtained as a dequantization of solutions to a Dirichlet problem associated with the Hermite-Einstein equations on E_k , as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Of course in the setting of a manifold with boundary, the solution to (1.1) minimizes the Wess-Zumino-Witten functional, and the solutions to the Hermite-Einstein equations minimize the respective Hermitian Yang-Mills functionals (both minimal values are zero). The major difference between these results and the ones from this article are due to the fact in the boundaryless setting considered here, neither (1.1), nor Hermite-Einstein equation have solutions. And even when the solutions exist, they are generally non-unique.

References

- [1] A. Andreotti and H. Grauert. Théorèmes de finitude pour la cohomologie des espaces complexes. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 90:193–259, 1962.

-
- [2] M. F. Atiyah and R. Bott. The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A*, 308:523–615, 1983.
- [3] T. Barron, X. Ma, G. Marinescu, and M. Pinsonnault. Semi-classical properties of Berezin-Toeplitz operators with C^k -symbol. *J. Math. Phys.*, 55(4):042108, 25, 2014.
- [4] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*, volume 223 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* 1976.
- [5] B. Berndtsson. Probability measures associated to geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics. In *Algebraic and analytic microlocal analysis. AAMA, Evanston, Illinois, USA, May 14–26, 2012 and May 20–24, 2013. Contributions of the workshops*, pages 395–419. Cham: Springer, 2018.
- [6] R. Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169 of *Grad. Texts Math.* New York, NY: Springer, 1996.
- [7] J.-B. Bost. Germs of analytic varieties in algebraic varieties: canonical metrics and arithmetic algebraization theorems. In *Geometric aspects of Dwork theory. Vol. I, II*, pages 371–418. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- [8] T. Bouche. Sur les inégalités de Morse holomorphes lorsque la courbure du fibré en droites est dégénérée. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa*, 18(4):501–523, 1991.
- [9] S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson. A non-Archimedean approach to K-stability, I: Metric geometry of spaces of test configurations and valuations, ArXiv: 2107.11221. 2021.
- [10] D. Catlin. The Bergman kernel and a theorem of Tian. In *Proceedings of the 40th Taniguchi symposium, Katata, Japan, June 23–28, 1997*, pages 1–23. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1999.
- [11] G. Chen. The J-equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation. *Invent. Math.*, 225(2):529–602, 2021.
- [12] H. Chen. Convergence of Harder-Narasimhan polygons. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr., Nouv. Sér.*, 120:112, 2010.
- [13] H. Chen. Computing the volume function on a projective bundle over a curve. *RIMS Kôkyûroku*, 1745:169–182, 2011.
- [14] X. Chen. The space of Kähler metrics. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 56(2):189–234, 2000.
- [15] X. Dai, K. Liu, and X. Ma. On the asymptotic expansion of bergman kernel. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 72(1):1–41, 2006.
- [16] G. D. Daskalopoulos and R. A. Wentworth. Convergence properties of the Yang-Mills flow on Kähler surfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 575:69–99, 2004.
- [17] V. Datar and V. P. Pingali. A numerical criterion for generalised Monge-Ampère equations on projective manifolds. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 31(4):767–814, 2021.
- [18] J.-P. Demailly. Champs magnétiques et inégalités de Morse pour la d'' -cohomologie. *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 35(4):189–229, 1985.
- [19] J.-P. Demailly. Holomorphic Morse inequalities and asymptotic cohomology groups: a tribute to Bernhard Riemann. *Milan J. Math.*, 78(1):265–277, 2010.
- [20] J.-P. Demailly. A converse to the Andreotti-Grauert theorem. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse, Math. (6)*, 20:123–135, 2011.
- [21] J.-P. Demailly. *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*. 2012.

-
- [22] J.-P. Demailly. Extension of holomorphic functions defined on non reduced analytic subvarieties. In *The legacy of Bernhard Riemann after one hundred and fifty years. Volume I*, pages 191–222. Somerville, MA: International Press; Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2016.
- [23] R. Dervan and L. M. Sektnan. Moduli theory, stability of fibrations and optimal symplectic connections. *Geom. Topol.*, 25(5):2643–2697, 2021.
- [24] R. Dervan and G. Székelyhidi. The Kähler-Ricci flow and optimal degenerations. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 116(1):187–203, 2020.
- [25] S. K. Donaldson. Anti self-dual Yang Mills connections over complex algebraic surfaces and stable vector bundles. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 50:1–26, 1985.
- [26] S. K. Donaldson. Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics. In *Northern California symplectic geometry seminar*, pages 13–33. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1999.
- [27] S. K. Donaldson. Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 62(2):289–349, 2002.
- [28] H. Feng, K. Liu, and X. Wan. Geodesic-Einstein metrics and nonlinear stabilities. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 371(11):8029–8049, 2019.
- [29] S. Finski. On Monge-Ampère volumes of direct images, rna058, 24 p. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2021.
- [30] S. Finski. Semiclassical Ohsawa-Takegoshi extension theorem and asymptotic of the orthogonal Bergman kernel, arXiv: 2109.06851, 73 p., to appear in *Journal of Differential Geometry*. 2021.
- [31] S. Finski. Complex embeddings, Toeplitz operators and transitivity of optimal holomorphic extensions, arXiv:2201.04102, 52 p. 2022.
- [32] S. Finski. On the metric structure of section ring, arXiv: 2209.03853, 50 p. 2022.
- [33] S. Finski. Submultiplicative norms and filtrations on section rings, arXiv: 2210.03039, 43 p. 2022.
- [34] S. Finski. The asymptotics of the optimal holomorphic extensions of holomorphic jets along submanifolds, arXiv: 2207.02761, 42 p., to appear in *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*. 2022.
- [35] S. Finski. Geometry at the infinity of the space of positive metrics: test configurations, geodesic rays and chordal distances, arXiv: 2305.15300, 48 p. 2023.
- [36] S. Finski. Lower bounds on fibered Yang-Mills functionals: generic nefness and semistability of direct images, arXiv:2402.08598. 2024.
- [37] S. Finski. On Harder-Narasimhan slopes of direct images, arXiv:2402.08554. 2024.
- [38] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*, volume 52 of *Grad. Texts Math.* Springer, Cham, 1977.
- [39] H. Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 79:109–203, 1964.
- [40] H. Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. II. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 79:205–326, 1964.
- [41] T. Hisamoto. Geometric flow, multiplier ideal sheaves and optimal destabilizer for a Fano

- manifold. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 33(8):30, 2023. Id/No 265.
- [42] M. Jonsson, N. McCleerey, and S. Shivaprasad. Geodesic Rays in the Donaldson-Uhlenbeck-Yau Theorem, arXiv: 2210.09246. 2022.
- [43] F. Knudsen and D. Mumford. The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves I: Preliminaries on 'det' and 'Div'. *Math. Scand.*, 39:19–55, 1976.
- [44] S. Kobayashi. Complex Finsler vector bundles. In *Finsler geometry. Joint summer research conference, July 16-20, 1995, Seattle, WA, USA*, pages 145–153. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1996.
- [45] S. Kobayashi. *Differential Geometry of Complex Vector Bundles*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2014.
- [46] A. Küronya. Asymptotic cohomological functions on projective varieties. *Am. J. Math.*, 128(6):1475–1519, 2006.
- [47] L. Boutet de Monvel and V. Guillemin. *The Spectral Theory of Toeplitz Operators*. Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [48] K. Löwner. Über monotone Matrixfunktionen. *Math. Z.*, 38:177–216, 1934.
- [49] X. Ma and G. Marinescu. *Holomorphic Morse inequalities and Bergman kernels*, volume 254 of *Progr. Math.* Birkhäuser Verlag Basel, 2007.
- [50] X. Ma and G. Marinescu. Toeplitz operators on symplectic manifolds. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 18(2):565–611, 2008.
- [51] X. Ma and G. Marinescu. Exponential estimate for the asymptotics of Bergman kernels. *Math. Ann.*, 362(3-4):1327–1347, 2015.
- [52] X. Ma and W. Zhang. Superconnection and family Bergman kernels. *Math. Ann.*, 386(3-4):2207–2253, 2023.
- [53] V. B. Mehta and A. Ramanathan. Semistable sheaves on projective varieties and their restriction to curves. *Math. Ann.*, 258:213–224, 1982.
- [54] V. B. Mehta and A. Ramanathan. Restriction of stable sheaves and representations of the fundamental group. *Invent. Math.*, 77:163–172, 1984.
- [55] T. Ohsawa and K. Takegoshi. On the extension of L^2 holomorphic functions. *Math. Z.*, 195:197–204, 1987.
- [56] J. C. Ottem. Ample subvarieties and q -ample divisors. *Adv. Math.*, 229(5):2868–2887, 2012.
- [57] D. H. Phong and J. Sturm. The Monge-Ampère operator and geodesics in the space of Kähler potentials. *Invent. Math.*, 166(1):125–149, 2006.
- [58] D. H. Phong and J. Sturm. Regularity of geodesic rays and Monge-Ampère equations. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 138(10):3637–3650, 2010.
- [59] Y. A. Rubinstein and S. Zelditch. Bergman approximations of harmonic maps into the space of Kähler metrics on toric varieties. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 8(3):239–265, 2010.
- [60] S. Semmes. Complex Monge-Ampère and symplectic manifolds. *Am. J. Math.*, 114(3):495–550, 1992.
- [61] B. Sibley. Asymptotics of the Yang-Mills flow for holomorphic vector bundles over Kähler manifolds: the canonical structure of the limit. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 706:123–191, 2015.

- [62] B. Simon. *Loewner's theorem on monotone matrix functions*, volume 354 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Cham: Springer, 2019.
- [63] Y.-T. Siu. *Lectures on Hermitian-Einstein metrics for stable bundles and Kähler-Einstein metrics. Delivered at the German Mathematical Society Seminar in Düsseldorf (FRG) in June, 1986*, volume 8 of *DMV Semin.* Birkhäuser Verlag, Stuttgart. Deutsche Mathematiker-Vereinigung e.V., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1987.
- [64] J. Song and S. Zelditch. Bergman metrics and geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics on toric varieties. *Anal. PDE*, 3(3):295–358, 2010.
- [65] J. Sun. On the image of the Hilbert map, arXiv: 2208.13407. 2022.
- [66] G. Székelyhidi. Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 109(2):337–378, 2018.
- [67] G. Tian. On a set of polarized Kähler metrics on algebraic manifolds. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 32(1):99–130, 1990.
- [68] G. Tian. Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature. *Invent. Math.*, 130(1):1–37, 1997.
- [69] K. Uhlenbeck and S. T. Yau. On the existence of Hermitian-Yang-Mills connections in stable vector bundles. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 39:s257–s293, 1986.
- [70] E. Witten. Global aspects of current algebra. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 223(2):422–432, 1983.
- [71] K.-R. Wu. A Wess-Zumino-Witten type equation in the space of Kähler potentials in terms of Hermitian-Yang-Mills metrics. *Anal. PDE*, 16(2):341–366, 2023.
- [72] M. Xia. On sharp lower bounds for Calabi-type functionals and destabilizing properties of gradient flows. *Anal. PDE*, 14(6):1951–1976, 2021.
- [73] X. Yang. A partial converse to the Andreotti-Grauert theorem. *Compos. Math.*, 155(1):89–99, 2019.
- [74] S. Zelditch. Szegő kernels and a theorem of Tian. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 6:317–331, 1998.
- [75] S. Zhang. Positive line bundles on arithmetic varieties. *J. Am. Math. Soc.*, 8(1):187–221, 1995.

SIARHEI FINSKI, CNRS-CMLS, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE F-91128 PALAISEAU CEDEX, FRANCE.

E-mails: finski.siarhei@gmail.com or siarhei.finski@polytechnique.edu.