

Toric mirrors and test configurations

Jacopo Stoppa

December 5, 2024

We prove a result that relates Donaldson-Futaki type invariants (that is, the numerical invariants used to define K -stability for general polarised manifolds) for a toric polarised manifold and for a compactification of its mirror Landau-Ginzburg model, nearby the large volume limit. In general, this expansion contains a term involving the base loci of certain linear systems determined by the Landau-Ginzburg potential (as expected from known constructions of compactified mirrors), and we give a condition under which this term is subleading.

1 Introduction

K -stability and mirror symmetry are both closely related to moduli theory: the former gives (conjecturally) the correct stability condition for constructing Hausdorff moduli spaces of polarised complex structures, while the latter predicts that the complex and symplectic moduli of a mirror pair are interchanged. It seems natural to study the possible connections between the two theories.

The present paper is motivated by the problem of studying the behaviour of K -(semi)stability under mirror maps, in situations where (semi)stability is not automatic (while compact Calabi-Yau manifolds are automatically K -stable, see [19]). The most important example is given by Fano manifolds, which can be K -unstable, and whose mirror is expected to be a suitable Landau-Ginzburg model (see for example [5] for a recent collection of contributions aimed at emphasising the links between K -stability and Fano mirror symmetry). Here we work in the general *toric* case, not necessarily Fano, where very strong mirror symmetry results are available. Note that even in the Fano case it is important to allow general polarisations, since these should correspond to the complex moduli of the mirror.

Our main results, Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, give a precise relation between certain Donaldson-Futaki type invariants (the numerical invariants used to define K -stability) on the two sides of the mirror correspondence, at least nearby the large volume limit. To the author's knowledge, these are the first results relating stability invariants for mirror pairs (see Remark 1.10). Some conjectural expectations were proposed in [25], Section

1.7.1 and indeed our results provide partial confirmation for these (in particular, the appearance of twisted stability on the Landau-Ginzburg side).

However, there is an important limitation at present, since on the Landau-Ginzburg side, in general, we are only able to work with *complex* $(1, 1)$ -classes that, moreover, do not a priori satisfy *semipositivity* conditions, and so the Donaldson-Futaki invariants on that side, although well-defined, do not have an immediate link to the usual notions of K -stability applied to the mirror. In our results, reality and semipositivity must be imposed as further assumptions on the Kähler moduli (see Corollary 1.7).

Let (X, L) be a polarised toric manifold of dimension n . As we recall in Section 2, it admits a Hodge-theoretic mirror given by a toric Landau-Ginzburg (LG) model, that is, roughly speaking, a nonconstant morphism

$$W_X(L): \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{T} \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^n,$$

known as the LG potential, where \mathbb{T} is dual to structure torus of X .

As in the previous paper [26], we are interested in understanding what conditions must be satisfied by the LG potential $W_X(L)$ if it is mirror to a K -semistable pair (X, L) (the present paper can be read independently of [26]).

Recall that K -semistability is defined by requiring that a numerical weight attached to certain polarised one-parameter degenerations, known as the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of test-configurations, is nonnegative (see [29] for a general introduction).

If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is a regular compactified toric test configuration for (X, L) , i.e. the total space \mathcal{X} is smooth, toric and the map is equivariant (this can be assumed for testing K -semistability), we can apply Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry to the family $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ (in the very general form appearing in the work [2] of Coates, Corti, Iritani and Tseng, which also contains an extensive list of references to previous results due to several authors). As we recall in Section 2.2, this allows to write the Donaldson-Futaki invariant $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ intrinsically on the mirror LG model

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}): \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{T} \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1},$$

where \mathbb{T} is dual to the structure torus of \mathcal{X} .

This involves the Grothendieck residue pairing of two specific (classes of) meromorphic forms $\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ in the top cohomology of the complex $(\Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{T}), d\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\wedge)$,

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})).$$

In the case of the trivial test configuration $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with trivial action, the Donaldson-Futaki invariant vanishes of course, and abusing notation slightly we write this condition on the mirror as

$$\text{Res}_{W_X(L)}(\alpha_X(L), \beta_X(L)) = 0.$$

Moreover, as we explain in Section 2.2, it is always possible to regard $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ as a deformation of the original LG potential $W_X(L)$, in a precise sense, and similarly $\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ are deformations of $\alpha_X(L), \beta_X(L)$, so that *K -semistability becomes the condition that, for all such deformations, the Grothendieck residue remains semipositive,*

$$\text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})) \geq 0.$$

Example 1.1. A basic, well-known K -destabilising example is given by taking \mathcal{X} to be the degeneration to the normal cone of the exceptional divisor $E \subset (X, L) := (\mathrm{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2, -K_X)$ (see [22], Example 5.27), $\mathcal{X} := \mathrm{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}} X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{L} := -K_{\mathcal{X}}$. In this case we have, in suitable torus coordinates,

$$\begin{aligned} W_X(-K_X) &= x + x' + xx' + \frac{1}{xx'}, \\ \mathcal{W}_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-K_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}) &= \frac{1}{z} + \left(x + x' + xx' + \frac{1}{xx'} \right) + z, \\ \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}}) &= \frac{1}{z} + \left(x + x' + xx' + \frac{1}{xx'} \right) + z(1 + xx'), \\ \mathrm{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}})}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})) &= \mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

(see Example 2.3)), showing a deformation of $W_X(-K_X)$ with negative Grothendieck residue.

We would like to understand whether this semi-positivity condition can be translated into an algebro-geometric notion of *stability* for the LG model $W_X(L): (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, or perhaps rather of a suitable *compactification*.

Our results in the present paper are stated in terms of a notion of formal Donaldson-Futaki invariant. Recall that with our assumptions the quantity $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ can be expressed through Atiyah-Bott localisation on \mathcal{X} , with respect to the \mathbb{C}^* -action underlying the test configuration, as

$$\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_Z \int_Z \frac{(c_1(\mathcal{L}) - h_{\mathcal{L}})^n \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} (c_1(\mathcal{L}) - h_{\mathcal{L}}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_Z} w_i(v) + 1 \right)}{e(N_Z^{\mathcal{X}}(v))}, \quad (1.1)$$

where Z are the fixed loci, $c = \frac{c_1(X) \cup (c_1(L))^{n-1}}{(c_1(L))^n}$, $h_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Hamiltonian for the S^1 -action, with generator denoted by v , with respect to (a Chern representative of) $c_1(\mathcal{L})$, w_i denote the weights of the \mathbb{C}^* -action and $e(N_Z^{\mathcal{X}}(v))$ is the equivariant Euler class (see in particular [15], Section 5).

If η is a closed, *complex* $(1,1)$ -form on \mathcal{X} , invariant under the S^1 -action and with $\int_X \eta^n \neq 0$ but *without positivity assumptions* (on its real and imaginary parts), and h_{η} satisfies $\iota_v \eta = \bar{\partial} h_{\eta}$ for the generator v of the S^1 -action, then we *define* the formal invariant $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, [\eta])$ as the right hand side of (1.1), where $c_1(\mathcal{L})$, $h_{\mathcal{L}}$ are replaced by η , h_{η} (and so $c_1(L)$ is replaced by $[i_X^* \eta]$).

Similarly, there is a notion of *twisted* Donaldson-Futaki invariant $\mathrm{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N})$ for test configurations of a triple (X, L, N) , where (X, L) is a polarised manifold and N is an additional holomorphic line bundle on X , introduced in [7] (when N is positive, this is the relevant notion for twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics, with twist

lying in $c_1(N)$, see e.g. [7, 27]). This satisfies the localisation formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N}) \\ &= \sum_Z \int_Z \frac{(c_1(\mathcal{L}) - h_{\mathcal{L}})^n \left(\frac{nc_N}{n+1} (c_1(\mathcal{L}) - h_{\mathcal{L}}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_Z} w_i(v) + 1 + c_1(\mathcal{N}) - h_{\mathcal{N}} \right)}{e(N_Z^{\mathcal{X}}(v))}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where $h_{\mathcal{N}}$ is Hamiltonian with respect to $c_1(\mathcal{N})$ and $c_N = \frac{(c_1(X) - c_1(N)) \cup (c_1(L))^{n-1}}{(c_1(L))^n}$.

We also extend this formally to $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, [\eta], [\xi])$, using the right hand side as a *definition*, where $c_1(\mathcal{L})$, $c_1(\mathcal{N})$ are replaced by complex $(1, 1)$ -forms η , ξ , with complex Hamiltonians h_{η}, h_{ξ} .

Given this, we can state our result, which concerns the large volume limit, when L is replaced by kL for $k \gg 1$. It is conditional on a property of a certain cohomology intersection pairing attached to the LG potential, known as the stationary phase approximation, which we spell out in Section 4.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Fix a regular toric test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for the polarised toric manifold (X, L) . There exists a compactification $\overline{\mathbb{T}}$ of the torus \mathbb{T} , endowed with a logarithmic connection $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})}$ determined by the mirror Landau-Ginzburg potential $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})$, with the property that, if the stationary phase approximation holds for $(\overline{\mathbb{T}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})})$ for $k \gg 1$ (see condition \dagger in Section 4.1, in particular (4.2)), then one can construct regular twisted toric test configurations for a compactification X^{\vee} of the torus \mathbb{T} ,*

$$(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]), \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

for complex $(1, 1)$ -classes $[\eta_k^i]$, $[\xi_k^i]$ (without semipositivity conditions), such that their formal Donaldson-Futaki invariants are well-defined and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})}(k^{-n} \alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})) + O(k^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}))$ is an explicit quantity determined by the base loci of certain pencils defined by $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})$ on an intermediate toric compactification $\overline{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, with $\mathbb{T} \subset \overline{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} \subset \overline{\mathbb{T}}$ (see (4.10)).

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is completed in Section 4.3, after setting up the construction in Sections 4.1, 4.2, using certain facts from the theory of logarithmic connections (recalled in Section 3). Of course, we rely heavily on some aspects of toric Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry after Coates, Corti, Iritani and Tseng [2], and these are briefly recalled in Section 2.

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.2 requires some comments.

- (i) The compactification X^\vee , the total spaces $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}$, the “polarisations” $[\eta_k^i]$ and the twists $[\xi_k^i]$ are determined by the LG potentials $W_X(L)$, $\mathcal{W}_X(\mathcal{L})$ or, more precisely, by the pair $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}_X(k\mathcal{L})})$. However, X^\vee , m and the total spaces $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ can be chosen independently of k . The construction of the total spaces $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}$ from $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ is described in Section 4.2, and that of the $(1, 1)$ -classes $[\eta_k^i]$, $[\xi_k^i]$ in Section 4.3. In particular, we will see that when the general fibre $X := T_P$ is a toric Fano with reflexive fan polytope P , then X^\vee can be chosen as a resolution of the toric variety T_{P° given by the polar dual P° , as usual in Fano toric mirror symmetry.
- (ii) The appearance of the term $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_X(k\mathcal{L}))$ (described in (4.10)) is expected: it is known that, at least in the case when $\mathcal{X} = T_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a Fano surface or threefold with reflexive polytope \mathcal{P} , a genuine compactified mirror can be obtained from the polar dual $T_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}$ by resolving singularities and blowing up the base locus of the pencil defined by $\mathcal{W}_X(\mathcal{L})$ and the toric boundary (see e.g. [21]).
- (iii) As will be clear from the proof, since we are using the mirror map, the subleading term $O(k^{-1})$ is determined by the quantum cohomology of \mathcal{X} (which degenerates to usual intersection theory as $k \rightarrow \infty$), in a complicated way. It would be interesting to see if the subleading term can be understood as a suitable deformation of the invariants $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$.
- (iv) It is not hard to recognise that the quantity $\text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_X(k\mathcal{L})}(k^{-n}\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}))$, for $k \gg 1$, resembles a localised Donaldson-Futaki invariant, where, however, the total space is the affine torus \mathbb{T} , and the holomorphic vector field is given by $\nabla\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})$ (see Remark 4.11). The idea of Theorem 1.2 is to use a suitable residue theorem in order to replace $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ with compactified test configurations. This requires relating $\text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}_X(k\mathcal{L})}(k^{-n}\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L}))$, which is defined by a “stationary phase formula” (see Section 2.3), to a global intersection number. This is the role of the stationary phase approximation appearing in Theorem 1.2.
- (v) Understanding when the stationary phase approximation holds is an important problem studied in different contexts, see e.g. the discussion in [17], Section 2 (briefly recalled in our Section 4.1), which relies on recent results of Huh [12].
- (vi) The classic work of Donaldson [9] gives a complete description of toric test configurations and their invariants using convex geometry on the momentum polytope. However it seems that this description is not well suited for the application of toric mirror theorems, see Section 2.
- (vii) The famous conjecture that K -polystability is equivalent to the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics is known for toric surfaces [10] and the toric uniform case is known in all dimensions [1].

In order to relate K -(semi)stability more directly on the two sides of the mirror correspondence, it is natural to ask when the term $\mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_X(\mathcal{L}))$, determined by the base loci, is actually subleading, i.e. we have $\mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_X(\mathcal{L})) = O(k^{-1})$. In the light of Remark

1.3 (ii), we might call this the Arezzo-Pacard limit, in which the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of a test configuration for a blowup is dominated by that of the base (see e.g. [28]). From this viewpoint, at least heuristically, we are asking what Kähler classes on \mathcal{X} , nearby the large volume limit, correspond to the Arezzo-Pacard limit on the mirror, i.e. for $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$ and $k \gg 1$.

Theorem 1.4. *In the setup of Theorem 1.2, let \mathcal{A} be an ample line bundle on \mathcal{X} . Suppose that, in terms of the mirror map Θ at $k\mathcal{A}$ (see Section 2), for some $r > 0$, we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{A}) = r^{-1}\Theta_{k\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}).$$

This is the case for example if \mathcal{X} is Fano and $\mathcal{A} = -rK_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a positive multiple of $-K_{\mathcal{X}}$, so $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})) = \Theta_{k(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})}(-K_{\mathcal{X}}) = r^{-1}\Theta_{k(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})}(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})$.

Then, we have $\mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{A})) = O(k^{-1})$, so

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) + O(k^{-1}).$$

Theorem 1.4 is proved in Section 4.4.

Example 1.5. Let $(\mathcal{X} := \text{Bl}_{p \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ be the test configuration for $(X, L) = (\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$ given by the degeneration to the normal cone of a point. We will show (see Examples 4.7, 4.14) that in this case the stationary phase approximation holds, one can take $X^{\vee} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,1} \cong \text{Bl}_{q_1 \times \{0\}, q_2 \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ for $q_1 \neq q_2$, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,2} \cong \text{Bl}_{q \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ endowed with suitable Kähler classes $[\eta_k^1], [\eta_k^2]$ and twists $[\xi_k^1], [\xi_k^2]$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} &= \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,1}, [\eta_k^1], [\xi_k^1]) + \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,2}, [\eta_k^2], [\xi_k^2]) + O(k^{-1}), \\ \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,1}, [\eta_k^1], [\xi_k^1]) &= O(k^{-1}), \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,2}, [\eta_k^2], [\xi_k^2]) = \frac{1}{4} + O(k^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It is known that, for smooth curves, it is sufficient to test K -polystability on degeneration to the normal cone of a single point (see [22], Section 5.3). So in our example it is sufficient to test on $(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}})$, and this is self-mirror in the sense that $\mathcal{X} \cong \mathcal{X}^{\vee,2}$ and $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,2}, [\eta_k^2], [\xi_k^2])$ up to $O(k^{-1})$.

Example 1.6. Consider $(\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)), -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ regarded as a product test configuration for \mathbb{P}^1 . It is also known that for \mathbb{P}^1 it is sufficient to test K -polystability on this product test configuration (e.g. by a very special case of the results of [32]). We will show (see Examples 4.8, 4.15) that in this case the stationary phase approximation holds, one can take $X^{\vee} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i} \cong \text{Bl}_{q' \times \{0\}, q'' \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ for $i = 1, 2$ (with $q' \times \{0\}, q'' \times \{0\}$ infinitely close), endowed with suitable $(1, 1)$ -classes $[\eta_k^i]$ and twists $[\xi_k^i]$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,1}, [\eta_k^1], [\xi_k^1]) + \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,2}, [\eta_k^2], [\xi_k^2]) + O(k^{-1}), \\ \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) &= O(k^{-1}), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.4 and Remark 1.3 (i) have the following obvious consequences.

Corollary 1.7. *In the situation of Theorem 1.4, suppose the Kähler parameter \mathcal{A} on \mathcal{X} is such that all the classes $[\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]$ are real and semipositive for $k \gg 1$ and we have $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) < 0$ (so $(X, A := \mathcal{A}|_X)$ is K -unstable). Then, $(X^\vee, [\eta_k^i]|_{X^\vee}, [\xi_k^i]|_{X^\vee})$ is twisted K -unstable for some i and sufficiently large k . In general, with the assumptions of Theorem 1.4, $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) < 0$ implies that $\Re \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) < 0$ for some i and sufficiently large k , but $[\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]$ are not necessarily real and semipositive.*

Corollary 1.8. *In the situation of Theorem 1.4, suppose that $(X, A := \mathcal{A}|_X)$ is K -semistable. Then, for all $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ with corresponding $(\overline{\mathcal{T}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{A})})$, we have*

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_i \Re \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) \geq 0.$$

Naturally, analogous statements hold in the general case of Theorem 1.2, but they involve the term $\mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))$, that is we have

$$\min\{\{\Re \mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]\}_i, \Re \mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))\} < 0 \text{ for } k \gg 1,$$

respectively

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\{\Re \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])\}_i, \Re \mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))\} \geq 0.$$

Example 1.9. Corollary 1.7 can be applied to the example of degeneration to the normal cone $\mathcal{X} := \text{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}} X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{L} := -K_{\mathcal{X}}$ of the exceptional divisor E which K -destabilises $(X, L) = (\text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2, -K_{\text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2})$. In this case, X^\vee is the crepant resolution of the orbifold T_{P° given by a toric, singular intersection of two quadrics in \mathbb{P}^4 . Assuming the stationary phase approximation, Theorem 1.4 provides a (non-positive) “destabilising” twisted test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^\vee, [\eta], [\xi])$ for X^\vee , which is mirror to degeneration to the normal cone of E , and this can be made more explicit if we work with the orbifold T_{P° itself, see Examples 4.9, 4.16. Note that it is known that both $\text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$ and the orbifold T_{P° are K -unstable with respect to all Kähler classes, since their automorphisms groups are non-reductive. In our construction, however, there is a complex twist $[\xi]$ and the “Kähler class” $[\eta]$ is a priori only a complex $(1, 1)$ -class; both are determined by the LG potential $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$.

Remark 1.10. Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.7 apply in particular when \mathcal{X} is a product test configuration (i.e. one induced by a holomorphic vector field) for an anticanonically polarised Fano $(X, -K_X)$. The Donaldson-Futaki invariant of \mathcal{X} is determined by the classical Futaki character on the Lie algebra of holomorphic vector fields, which, in the special case of the anticanonical polarisation, is identified with the barycenter of the momentum polytope P° of $(X, -K_X)$. Sano [24] (with different motivations) defines and studies a polar dual $e_P \in P := (P^\circ)^\circ$ for a suitable multiple of the barycenter, $m_P \in P^\circ$, however, he does not discuss a relation of e_P to stability invariants of (a resolution of) the polar dual variety T_{P° .

Remark 1.11. Theorem 1.2 seems to fit well with the general notion of stability conditions for polarised varieties introduced by Dervan [8]. This is defined using certain “central

charges” $Z_k(X, L)$, $Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for polarised varieties and test configurations, and (X, L) is *asymptotically Z-semistable* if for all nontrivial test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})}{Z_k(X, L)} \right) \geq 0 \text{ for } k \gg 1.$$

This also extends to the twisted case using central charges $Z(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N})$. According to [8], Lemma 2.6, K -semistability for (X, L) is equivalent to asymptotic Z -semistability with respect to the distinguished central charge

$$Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{i}{n+1} k^n \int_{\mathcal{X}'} \mathcal{L}^{n+1} - \frac{1}{n} k^{n-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}'} K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1} \cdot \mathcal{L}^n.$$

Using the localisation formulae discussed by Corradini [3], the proof of Theorem 1.2 can be readily adapted to show that for any central charge Z one has an expansion of the form

$$Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{i=1}^m Z_k(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) + \mathcal{B}_Z(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(k\mathcal{L})) + O(k^{-1}),$$

and, under the assumption of Theorem 1.4, we have in fact

$$Z_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{i=1}^m Z_k(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) + O(k^{-1}).$$

In [6], an axiomatic approach to such stability notions is proposed, for which an additive extension of central charges plays a key role. This suggests that the compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ constructed in Theorem 1.2 can be thought of as a “test object” for the mirror X^\vee , generalising the notion of a test configuration, and obtained from the test configurations $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$ by “iterated extensions”. The central charge of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ would then be defined by the additive property of central charges, so that formally we would have

$$Z(\overline{\mathcal{T}}) = \sum_{i=1}^m Z_k(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]).$$

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Ruadhaí Dervan, Hiroshi Iritani and Yuji Odaka for helpful discussions related to the present work. This research was carried out in the framework of the project PRIN 2022BTA242 “Geometry of algebraic structures: moduli, invariants, deformations”.

2 Some background

2.1 Toric LG models

Let X be a projective toric manifold. According to the general results of [2], the mirror to X is given by a Laurent polynomial of the form

$$W(x; y) = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i Q^{\lambda(b_i)} x^{b_i} + \sum_{k \in G} y_k Q^{\lambda(k)} x^k,$$

where b_1, \dots, b_m are generators of the rays of the fan of X in its fan lattice N , the formal variable Q is known as the Novikov variable, $\lambda(b_i), \lambda(k) \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ are certain curve classes (see [2], Section 4.1), $x \in \text{Hom}(N, \mathbb{C}^*)$ is a torus coordinate, y_i, y_k are deformation parameters, and $G \subset N$ is a suitable finite subset. Thus, fixing all parameters except x , $W(x; y)$ defines a regular function on the algebraic torus $\text{Hom}(N, \mathbb{C}^*)$, known as the Landau-Ginzburg (LG) potential.

More globally, W must be regarded as a morphism $W: \widehat{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ where $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ is a degenerating family of affine toric varieties over the base $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Spf } \mathbb{C}[[\Lambda_+]] \times \text{Spf } \mathbb{C}[[y]]$ and $\Lambda_+ \subset H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ denotes the monoid of effective curve classes, so $\mathbb{C}[[\Lambda_+]]$ is the Novikov ring. There is a locus $\mathcal{M} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ over which the family $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ restricts to a trivial fibration by algebraic tori $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, and a choice of trivialisation allows to write it as a Laurent polynomial depending on parameters, as above. A polarisation L on X , or more generally a Kähler class $[\omega_X]$, defines a closed point of the base $\text{Spf } \mathbb{C}[[\Lambda_+]]$, and so specifies the exponents of the Novikov variable.

Note that the extra term $\sum_{k \in G} y_k Q^{\lambda(k)} x^k$ in the expression for $W(x; y)$ is necessary in the general case when X is not a weak Fano manifold, and is required so that the parametrisation of $W(x; y)$ by Kähler classes of X along a locus is effective. When X is weak Fano, on the other hand, one can choose $G = \emptyset$.

The Hodge-theoretic information attached to the LGmirror family is given by the *logarithmic twisted de Rham complex*

$$\left(\Omega_{\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}/\widehat{\mathcal{M}}}^\bullet, zd + dW \wedge \right).$$

The *Gauss-Manin system* $\text{GM}(W)$ is the top cohomology of this complex. It is naturally endowed with extra structure, in particular the *Gauss-Manin connection* ∇^{GM} (see [2], Section 4.4) and the *higher residue pairing*

$$P: \text{GM}(W) \times \text{GM}(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[z][[\Lambda_+]][[y]].$$

(discussed in [2], Section 6). The latter is especially important for our purposes and will be recalled in Section 2.3.

The main results of [2] (namely [2], Theorems 4.28 and 6.11, summarised in [2], Theorem 1.1) prove *Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry for the big quantum cohomology* in this case, part of which we recall briefly as follows:

- (i) the Gauss-Manin system is a free module over $\mathbb{C}[z][[\Lambda_+]][[y]]$ of rank $\dim H^*(X, \mathbb{C})$;
- (ii) there are a mirror map $\tau = \tau(y) \in H^*(X, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\Lambda_+]][[y]]$ and a $\mathbb{C}[z][[\Lambda_+]][[y]]$ -linear mirror isomorphism

$$\Theta: \text{GM}(W) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^*(X, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[z][[\Lambda_+]][[y]]$$

such that Θ intertwines the Gauss-Manin connection ∇^{GM} with the pullback $\tau^* \nabla^{\text{D}}$ of the quantum connection ∇^{D} by τ (see [2] Section 3.2 for the latter; in the $z \rightarrow 0$ limit, choosing a suitable generator for $\text{GM}(W)$, this specialises to an isomorphism between the log Jacobi ring and the quantum cohomology ring);

(iii) the linear mirror isomorphism Θ intertwines the higher residue pairing on $\text{GM}(W)$ with the Poincaré pairing on $H^*(X, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[z][[\Lambda_+]][[y]]$, that is we have

$$P(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \left(\Theta(\Omega_1) \Big|_{z \mapsto -z}, \Theta(\Omega_2) \right).$$

Note that (i) includes a convergence property for the mirror map τ which we will recall in a moment. We can summarise (i), (ii), (iii) roughly by saying that, for a fixed trivialisation of the torus fibration $\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, a choice of Kähler class $[\omega_X]$ fixes the exponents of the Novikov variable in $W(x; y)$, but not the coefficients y . Then, as shown in [2], Section 7, the formal power series mirror map τ is convergent at least after rescaling $[\omega_X]$ by a sufficiently large factor (this will be enough for our purposes), and it fixes the deformation parameters y so that, for the corresponding LG potential $W(x; y) = W(\omega_X)$, the linear mirror isomorphism

$$\Theta_{\omega_X} : \text{GM}(W(\omega_X)) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^*(X, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[[z]]$$

intertwines the Gauss-Manin and quantum connections, and preserves the higher residue pairing:

$$P_{W(\omega_X)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \left(\Theta_{\omega_X}(\Omega_1) \Big|_{z \mapsto -z}, \Theta_{\omega_X}(\Omega_2) \right).$$

2.2 DF invariant and residue pairing

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ denote a compactified toric test configuration for a polarised toric manifold (X, L) , with smooth total space \mathcal{X} (see e.g. [15], Section 4.1). It is known that K -semistability can be checked using such test configurations (see [15], Remark 4.1).

Following Odaka [20] and Wang [31] (see also [15] for the general Kähler case), we can write the corresponding Donaldson-Futaki invariant as a Poincaré pairing

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} (c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n \cup \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right) \\ &= \left((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n, \frac{nc}{n+1} c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c := \frac{c_1(X) \cup c_1^{n-1}(L)}{c_1^n(L)}.$$

On the other hand, \mathcal{X} is a smooth projective toric variety and so, according to our discussion above, it admits a LG mirror family, which we denote by $\mathcal{W} : \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with respect to a degenerating torus fibration $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Choosing a trivialisation of the torus fibration $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ we can write \mathcal{W} as a Laurent polynomial depending on parameters,

$$\mathcal{W}(x; y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} y_i Q^{\lambda(b'_i)} x^{b'_i} + \sum_{k' \in G_{\mathcal{X}}} y_{k'} Q^{\lambda(k')} x^{k'},$$

where $b'_1, \dots, b'_{m'}$ are generators of the rays of the fan of \mathcal{X} in its fan lattice $N_{\mathcal{X}}$, Q is the Novikov variable, $\lambda(b'_i), \lambda(k') \in H_2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Q})$ are curve classes, $x \in \text{Hom}(N_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbb{C}^*)$ is a torus coordinate, $y_i, y_{k'}$ are deformation parameters, and $G_{\mathcal{X}} \subset N_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a suitable finite subset.

We know that, at least for testing K -semistability, it is not restrictive to assume that \mathcal{X} (which is smooth) also admits a toric morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^1$: this can be seen by replacing \mathcal{X} by a roof resolving the toric birational morphism $X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ (see e.g. [8], Section 2.1.1). Thus, we have a natural inclusion $H_2(X, \mathbb{Q}) \subset H_2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Q})$, a canonical splitting $N_{\mathcal{X}} \cong N \times \mathbb{Z}$, and the fan of \mathcal{X} is obtained as a refinement of the fan of $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, compatible with the toric morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

This means that we can regard $\mathcal{W}(x; y)$ naturally as a deformation of $W(x, y)$,

$$\mathcal{W}(x; y) = W(x; y) + \mathcal{W}'(x; y),$$

where (abusing notation slightly) we still write x for the element of $\text{Hom}(N, \mathbb{C}^*)$ which is obtained by restriction to $N \times \{0\} \subset N \times \mathbb{Z} \cong N_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Example 2.1. Suppose $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r)$ is given by the degeneration to the normal cone of a point in $(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$, with parameter $r \in (0, 1)$. The total space \mathcal{X} is Fano, given by the del Pezzo $\text{Bl}_{p \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and the polarisation $\mathcal{L}_r := \mathcal{O}(1, 1) - rE$ is a multiple of $-K_{\mathcal{X}}$ iff $r = \frac{1}{2}$. Then, the mirror LG family is given by

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}_r) = x + \frac{e^{-2\pi}}{x} + \frac{e^{-2\pi}}{x'} + x'(1 + e^{2\pi r} x),$$

where $x + \frac{e^{-2\pi}}{x}$ is the LG potential of $(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$, and $x + \frac{e^{-2\pi}}{x} + x' + \frac{e^{-2\pi}}{x'}$ is the LG potential of the trivial test configuration $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1, 1))$. Since we will work in the large volume limit, it is also useful to note

$$\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = x + \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x} + \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x'} + x'(1 + e^{2\pi r k} x).$$

Example 2.2. Suppose \mathcal{X} is isomorphic to the Hirzebruch surface $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)) \cong \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$ endowed with the polarisation $\mathcal{L}_r = H - rE$ for $r \in (0, 1)$. Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ is a compactified toric product test configuration for \mathbb{P}^1 (i.e. it is induced by a holomorphic vector field on the fibre \mathbb{P}^1). The total space is del Pezzo and \mathcal{L}_r is a multiple of the anticanonical iff $r = \frac{1}{3}$ in which case $\mathcal{L}_r = -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}}$. A LG potential is given by

$$\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{xx'} + x + x' + e^{2\pi k r} xx'.$$

Note that this is not presented as an iterated blowup of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (for that we would need to pass to a blowup of \mathcal{X}).

Example 2.3. Let $X = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$ and $(X, L) = (X, -K_X)$. With respect to suitable torus coordinates, the LG potential is given by

$$W_X(-K_X) = x + x' + \frac{1}{xx'} + xx'.$$

Consider a compactified toric test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for (X, L) such that \mathcal{X} is given by the degeneration to the normal cone of the exceptional divisor E , namely $\mathcal{X} = \text{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}} X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then \mathcal{X} is a toric Fano threefold of rank 4, the variety 4-11 in the classification. A standard presentation of \mathcal{X} is given by the face fan of the reflexive polytope 82 in the Kreuzer-Skarke list [14],

$$\mathcal{P} = \text{conv}(\{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, -1, 0), (-1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, -1)\}).$$

A corresponding LG potential for $c_1(\mathcal{X})$, with respect to the variables of this lattice, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}}) &= XY + X + Y + Z + \frac{X}{Z} + \frac{1}{Y} + \frac{1}{X} \\ &= \frac{1}{Y} + \left(\frac{X}{Z} + Z + X + \frac{1}{X} \right) + Y + YX. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, after the change of variables $x = \frac{X}{Z}$, $x' = Z$, $z = Y$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \frac{1}{z} + \left(x + x' + xx' + \frac{1}{xx'} \right) + z(1 + xx'),$$

giving the required presentation of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}})$ as a deformation of $W_X(-K_X)$ or more precisely of

$$W_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-K_{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}) = \frac{1}{z} + \left(x + x' + xx' + \frac{1}{xx'} \right) + z.$$

The Hodge-theoretic mirror theorem for \mathcal{X} shows that we have in particular

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \left((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n, \frac{nc}{n+1}c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})} \left(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n), \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \left(\frac{nc}{n+1}c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right) \right) \in \mathbb{C}[[z]], \end{aligned}$$

using the linear mirror isomorphism $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}: \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ and higher residue pairing with respect to the LG potential $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ corresponding to \mathcal{L} .

On the other hand, $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ does not depend on the formal variable z , and so must equal the specialisation of the higher residue pairing appearing on the right hand side at $z = 0$. This is indeed well defined and known as the *Grothendieck residue pairing*, defined on the top cohomology of the complex $(\Omega^{\bullet}, d\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})\wedge)$,

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \text{Res}_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})} \left(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n) \Big|_{z=0}, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \left(\frac{nc}{n+1}c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right) \Big|_{z=0} \right). \quad (2.1)$$

See [26], Section 2 for more details.

Remark 2.4. The reference [4] shows that the usual Atiyah-Bott localisation formula for the classical Futaki character can also be expressed in terms of certain Grothendieck residue pairings on X (not on the mirror!).

2.3 Higher residue pairing

The higher residue pairing used in [2] is defined through a formal stationary phase expansion. Let us briefly review the construction.

We start with a holomorphic function f on \mathbb{C}^n with a non-degenerate critical point p . Fix a stable manifold $\Gamma(p)$ for the Morse function $\Re(f(t))$ and perform the usual stationary phase expansion as $z \rightarrow 0$ for the integral

$$\int_{\Gamma(p)} e^{f(t)/z} g(t) dt^1 \cdots dt^n$$

where $\Re(z) < 0$ and $g(t)$ is holomorphic. We write the result of the stationary phase expansion in the form

$$e^{f(p)/z} (-2\pi z)^{n/2} \text{Asym}_p (e^{f(t)/z} g(t) dt).$$

This is always possible and defines the formal power series $\text{Asym}_p (e^{f(t)/z} g(t) dt)$, which takes the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(f_{ij}(p))}} (g(p) + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + \cdots).$$

Assume, for simplicity, that the LG potential $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ has nondegenerate isolated critical points. One shows that the formal power series $\text{Asym}_p (e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega)$ vanishes if $e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega$ is exact in the complex $(\Omega^\bullet, zd + d\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})\wedge)$, so the map Asym_p descends to cohomology

$$\text{Asym}_p : e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[z]].$$

Then, one defines the higher residue pairing $P_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})} : \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})) \times \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ as

$$P_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \sum_p \overline{\text{Asym}_p (e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega_1)} \text{Asym}_p (e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega_2),$$

where the sum is over the critical points and we set

$$\overline{\text{Asym}_p (e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega_1)} = \text{Asym}_p (e^{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})/z} \Omega_1) \Big|_{z \mapsto -z}.$$

By construction, there is a formal power series expansion

$$P_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \sum_{k \geq 0} K_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})}^{(k)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) z^k,$$

such that $K_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})}^{(0)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ is the Grothendieck residue pairing, while $K_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})}^{(k)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ are also called higher residue pairings.

Remark 2.5. If $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})$ does not have isolated, nondegenerate critical points, the strategy of [2] is to pass to a suitable perturbation, by turning on certain equivariant parameters.

Going back to our application to stability, let us set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}) &= \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n) \in \mathbb{H}^n(\Omega^\bullet, zd + d\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\wedge), \\ \alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}) &= \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}((c_1(\mathcal{L}))^n)|_{z=0} \in \mathbb{H}^n(\Omega^\bullet, d\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\wedge),\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}) &= \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}\left(\frac{nc}{n+1}c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})\right) \in \mathbb{H}^n(\Omega^\bullet, zd + d\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\wedge), \\ \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}) &= \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}\left(\frac{nc}{n+1}c_1(\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1})\right)|_{z=0} \in \mathbb{H}^n(\Omega^\bullet, d\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\wedge).\end{aligned}$$

Then, by our discussion in Section 2.2, we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = P_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}\left(\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\right) = K_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}^{(0)}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})).$$

From the viewpoint of algebro-geometric stability, it would be desirable to express the quantities $P_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}\left(\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})\right)$, $K_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}^{(0)}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))$ as global intersection pairings on $\text{Hom}(N_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbb{C}^*)$ or on a suitable compactification. In fact this problem has been studied in different contexts, a priori not related to stability. We will discuss one approach in the next Section.

3 Cohomology intersection form

In the context of logarithmic connections on a smooth projective variety, under certain assumptions, the *cohomology intersection form* provides a global version of the stationary phase expansion for higher residue pairings.

Matsumoto [18] studies this intersection form in the classical case of generic hyperplane arrangements in projective space (however he does not discuss the stationary phase approximation). We will follow a recent reference, including the stationary phase approximation, due to Matsubara-Heo [17]. We also point out the work of Sabbah [23], and the L^2 approach developed by Li and Wen [16].

As in [17], Section 2.1, we consider a smooth projective variety Y endowed with a simple normal crossing divisor $D = \sum_j^N D_j$. Let $E \rightarrow Y$ denote a holomorphic vector bundle endowed with a meromorphic integrable connection ∇ with logarithmic poles along D (see e.g. [11], Chapter 5, Section 5.2 for the general theory). Writing $E_+ := E$, $E_- := E^\vee$ and $\Omega_{\log}^p := \Omega_Y^p(\log D)$ for the sheaf of logarithmic p -forms, we set

$$\Omega_+^p := \Omega_{\log}^p \otimes E_+, \quad \Omega_-^p := \Omega_{\log}^p \otimes E_-,$$

and so obtain complexes

$$(\Omega_+^\bullet, \nabla_+ := \nabla), \quad (\Omega_-^\bullet, \nabla_- := \nabla^\vee),$$

with hypercohomologies

$$\mathbb{H}_{\pm}^p := \mathbb{H}^p(Y; (\Omega_{\pm}^{\bullet}, \nabla_{\pm})).$$

Under a certain generic condition on ∇ , the cohomology intersection form is defined as a bilinear pairing

$$\langle -, - \rangle_{ch}: \mathbb{H}_{-}^n \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{H}_{+}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

Namely, introduce the conditions

$$(!)_{+}: \text{Spec}(\text{Res}_i(\nabla)) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} = \emptyset, (!)_{-}: \text{Spec}(\text{Res}_i(\nabla)) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \emptyset,$$

where $\text{Res}_i(\nabla)$ is the endomorphism given by the residue of ∇ along D_i .

Then, $(!)_{\pm}$ implies that for all p there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\text{reg}_{\pm}: \mathbb{H}_{\pm}^p \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{H}_{\pm}^p(-D) := \mathbb{H}^p(Y; (\Omega_{\pm}^{\bullet}(-D); \nabla_{\pm})),$$

where we use the fact that ∇_{\pm} also induces a connection on $E_{\pm}(jD)$ with logarithmic poles along D for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 3.1. This is a complex-analytic analogue of the fact, used in the classical reference [18], that for complements of hyperplane arrangements in projective space, at least under the stronger condition $(!)_{+} \cap (!)_{-}$, there is a natural isomorphism

$$H_c^k(Y, \nabla) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^k(Y, \nabla),$$

using twisted de Rham cohomology groups defined using compactly supported smooth forms and arbitrary smooth forms, respectively.

Remark 3.2. In fact the condition $(!)_{+} \cap (!)_{-}$ implies a strong vanishing:

$$\mathbb{H}_{\pm}^p = 0, p \neq n.$$

By the usual Dolbeault argument, the canonical morphisms of complexes

$$(\Omega_{\pm}^{\bullet}(jD), \nabla_{\pm}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{\bullet}(jD), \nabla_{\pm} + \bar{\partial}),$$

the latter involving the sheaves of *smooth* forms $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{p,q} := \Omega_{\pm}^p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{E}_Y^{0,q}$, are quasi-isomorphisms. This means in particular that we can choose smooth n -forms ω_{-} on $Y \setminus D$ and ω_{+} on Y representing given classes $[\omega_{-}] \in \mathbb{H}_{-}^n$, respectively $[\omega_{+}] \in \mathbb{H}_{+}^n(-D)$, under the Dolbeault isomorphism. So we have a well defined pairing

$$\langle -, - \rangle_{+}: \mathbb{H}_{-}^n \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{H}_{+}^n(-D) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \langle [\omega_{-}], [\omega_{+}] \rangle_{+} := \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^n \int_Y \omega_{-} \wedge \omega_{+}$$

(where we are also taking the trace of the endomorphism part).

The upshot is that we can define the cohomology intersection form as

$$\langle -, - \rangle_{ch}: \mathbb{H}_{-}^n \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{H}_{+}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \langle [\omega_{-}], [\omega_{+}] \rangle_{+} := (2\pi i)^n \langle [\omega_{-}], \text{reg}_{+}[\omega_{+}] \rangle_{+}$$

(as we noted, replacing $[\omega_{+}]$ by $\text{reg}_{+}[\omega_{+}]$ is analogous to choosing a compactly supported representative).

In particular, we obtain a cohomology intersection form

$$\langle -, - \rangle_{ch}: \mathbb{H}^0(Y, \Omega_{-}^n) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{H}^0(Y, \Omega_{+}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

by using the natural maps $\mathbb{H}^0(Y, \Omega_{\pm}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\pm}^n$.

3.1 Residue theorem

In the classical case of generic hyperplane arrangements in projective space, Matsumoto [18], Theorem 2.1, proves a *residue theorem* for the cohomology intersection form, that is, a formula computing $\langle [\omega_-], [\omega_+] \rangle_{ch}$ in terms of contributions from strata of the hyperplane arrangement.

A general version is proved in [17]. Assume the generic condition $(!)_+$. Fix logarithmic n -forms $\omega_{\pm} \in H^0(Y, \Omega_{\pm}^n)$. For a fixed ordered multi-index P_n of length n , write

$$D(P_n) := \cap_i D_{P_n(i)}$$

for the corresponding 0-dimensional stratum of the boundary divisor D . There is a natural notion of restriction $\text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega)$, i.e. factoring out the simple poles in the given order. Namely, decomposing $\omega = \frac{dx_i}{x_i} \wedge \omega' + \omega''$ near $D_i = \{x_i = 0\}$, we set

$$\text{Res}_i(\omega) := \omega'|_{D_i}$$

and extend this operation by

$$\text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega) := \text{Res}_{P_n(n)} \circ \cdots \circ \text{Res}_{P_n(1)}(\omega).$$

The residue of the connection $\text{Res}_{P_n}(\nabla)$ is defined in the same way (the ordering induced by P_n is irrelevant in this case, by integrability).

Define

$$\langle \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_+) | \text{Res}_{P_n}(\nabla)^{-1} | \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_-) \rangle := \sum_{z \in D(P_n)} \langle \text{Res}_{P_n}(\nabla)_z^{-1} \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_+), \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_-)_z \rangle,$$

where the right hand side uses the duality between E_z, E_z^{\vee} . Then we have

Theorem 3.3 (Residue Theorem, [17] Theorem 2.2).

$$\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} = (-2\pi i)^n \sum_{P_n: D(P_n) \neq \emptyset} \langle \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_+) | \text{Res}_{P_n}(\nabla)^{-1} | \text{Res}_{P_n}(\omega_-) \rangle.$$

3.2 Stationary phase formula

Suppose that the connection ∇ has rank 1, i.e. $E \rightarrow Y$ is a line bundle, and that the complement $U := Y \setminus D$ is affine. There is a 1-parameter family of connections ∇^z such that on U we have $\nabla^z = zd + \alpha \wedge$ for a fixed connection form α . Following [17], we say that the stationary phase formula holds if there is a Laurent series expansion

$$\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch, \nabla^z} = (2\pi i z)^n \sum_{k \geq 0} K^{(k)}(\omega_-, \omega_+) z^k, \quad z \rightarrow 0,$$

such that $K^{(0)}(\omega_-, \omega_+)$ is the Grothendieck residue pairing of the n -forms ω_-, ω_+ on U .

As observed explicitly in [17], Corollary 1.4, if the stationary phase formula holds for the family ∇^z , then in fact we must have

$$\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} = (2\pi i)^n K^{(0)}(\omega_-, \omega_+),$$

that is, all higher residues must vanish: this is because the residue Theorem 3.3 then implies that $\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch, \nabla^z}$ is homogeneous of degree n with respect to z . So the stationary phase formula can be stated without mentioning the higher residue pairings: it holds iff

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^n \int_Y \omega_- \wedge \text{reg}_+(\omega_+) = K^{(0)}(\omega_-, \omega_+).$$

Thus, if we are only interested in a Grothendieck residue $K^{(0)}(\omega_-, \omega_+)$ (which is the case for our expression (2.1) for the Donaldson-Futaki invariant), we could hope that, after a suitable extension to logarithmic forms, a stationary phase formula holds, allowing the application of the residue Theorem 3.3.

The stationary phase formula for logarithmic connections is proved in [17], Theorem 1.1, under some structure conditions on the connection form α (in particular, when the line bundle $E \rightarrow Y$ is trivial). This is closely related to the work of Huh [12].

Thus, as in [17], Section 2.2, we consider a logarithmic connection $\nabla = d + F \wedge$ on $U = Y \setminus D$, where

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \log f_i,$$

and the f_i are regular functions on U . Suppose that

(M) the critical locus $\text{Crit}(F)$ is discrete and the sum of Milnor numbers

$$m_p := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_{U,p} / (\partial_{x_1} F, \dots, \partial_{x_n} F)$$

satisfies

$$\sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(F)} m_p = (-1)^n \chi(U).$$

Then, combining [17], Theorem 2.5, Remark 2.6 (5), and Corollary 2.7, we obtain

Lemma 3.4 (Stationary phase formula). *In the context above, under the condition (M), we have, for $\omega_{\mp} \in H^0(U, \Omega_U^n)$,*

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^n \langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} = K^{(0)}(\omega_-, \omega_+) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^n \sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(F)} \int_{\Gamma_p} \frac{\frac{\omega_+}{dx} \frac{\omega_-}{dx}}{\partial_{x_1} F \cdots \partial_{x_n} F} dx.$$

4 Application of $\langle -, - \rangle_{ch}$ to toric LG models

4.1 DF invariants and $\langle -, - \rangle_{ch}$ on the mirror

Let $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ denote a Laurent polynomial on the affine torus $\mathbb{T} := (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ which is mirror to the polarised toric manifold $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ (in a fixed trivialisation of the mirror family $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ on the generic locus).

We introduce auxiliary logarithmic connections on $\mathbb{T} \setminus V(\mathcal{W})$ given by

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{W}} = d + d \log \mathcal{W} \wedge, \quad \nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z := zd + d \log \mathcal{W} \wedge.$$

In the light of our discussion in the previous Sections, we would like to have a global expression for the Donaldson-Futaki invariant as a cohomology intersection number,

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i z} \right)^{n+1} \langle \tilde{\omega}_-, \tilde{\omega}_+ \rangle_{ch, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z},$$

where $[\tilde{\omega}_{\pm}] \in H_{\pm}^{n+1}$ are classes of logarithmic $(n+1)$ -forms extending the classes

$$\mathcal{W}^{-n} \overline{\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}, \quad \mathcal{W}^{-1} \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$$

and we set $\overline{\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})} := \tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})|_{z \mapsto -z}$.

Several conditions are required for this. Firstly, it is in fact convenient to replace the prospective logarithmic form $(\mathcal{W})^{-n} \overline{\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}$ by a small perturbation $\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1} \overline{\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}$, where

$$\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon} := \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon}^{(i)},$$

and $\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}$ is obtained by a perturbation of the coefficients of the monomials of \mathcal{W} of order ε . Accordingly, we will work on $\mathcal{T} := \mathbb{T} \setminus (V(\mathcal{W}) \cup V(\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}))$. This will simplify the choice of a suitable compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$. This compactification should satisfy some key properties:

- (i) $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ is smooth and the complement $\overline{\mathcal{T}} \setminus \mathcal{T}$ is a simple normal crossings divisor \mathcal{D} ;
- (ii) the rank 1 holomorphic integrable connection $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z$ extends to a meromorphic flat connection on the trivial line bundle over $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ with logarithmic poles along \mathcal{D} , such that the generic condition $(!)_+$ (or $(!)_-$) holds;
- (iii) the holomorphic $n+1$ -forms $\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1} \overline{\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})}, (\mathcal{W})^{-1} \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ extend to logarithmic $n+1$ -forms on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$;
- (iv) the stationary phase formula, discussed in Section 3.2, holds for the corresponding cohomology intersection form $\langle -, - \rangle_{ch, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z}$, computed on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ with respect to $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z$.

Let us set $dx = \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} dx_i$, $\frac{dx}{x} = \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{dx_i}{x_i}$. The condition (iv) implies that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i z} \right)^{n+1} \langle \tilde{\omega}_-, \tilde{\omega}_+ \rangle_{ch, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(\log \mathcal{W})} \int_{\Gamma_p} \frac{\frac{\omega_+}{dx} \frac{\omega_-}{dx}}{\partial_{x_1}(\log \mathcal{W}) \cdots \partial_{x_{n+1}}(\log \mathcal{W})} dx \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{\mp} := \tilde{\omega}_{\mp}|_{z=0}$ are extensions of $\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1} \alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$, $(\mathcal{W})^{-1} \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$. It follows from the continuity of the Grothendieck residue that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i z} \right)^{n+1} \langle \tilde{\omega}_-, \tilde{\omega}_+ \rangle_{ch, \nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{W})} \int_{\Gamma_p} \frac{\frac{\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}}{dx} \frac{\beta_{\mathcal{X}}}{dx}}{\partial_{x_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cdots \partial_{x_{n+1}}(\mathcal{W})} dx \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{W})} \int_{\Gamma_p} \frac{\frac{\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}}{(dx/x)} \frac{\beta_{\mathcal{X}}}{(dx/x)}}{x_1 \partial_{x_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cdots x_{n+1} \partial_{x_{n+1}}(\mathcal{W})} \frac{dx}{x} \\ & = \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \end{aligned}$$

by (2.1).

In order to examine the condition (iii) it is helpful to recall some facts about the Gauss-Manin connection ∇^{GM} on $\text{GM}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathbb{H}^{n+1} \left(\Omega_{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}/\hat{\mathcal{M}}}^{\bullet}, zd + d\mathcal{W} \wedge \right)$. Following [13], Section 4, we regard the Gauss-Manin connection as a map

$$\nabla^{\text{GM}}: \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z} \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_x}} \Omega_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_x}^1 \oplus \text{GM}(\mathcal{W}) \frac{dz}{z^2}.$$

Since \mathcal{X} is toric, it can be presented as a GIT quotient

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{\xi} := (\mathbb{C}^*)^m //_{\xi} K$$

for a torus $K \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^k$, with Lie algebra \mathfrak{k} , contained in the maximal torus $K \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^m$. Here, writing $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_m \subset \text{Hom}(K, \mathbb{C}^*)$ for the components of the latter embedding, we denote by $\xi \in \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\vee}$ a ‘‘Kähler’’ or ‘‘stability’’ parameter $\xi \in \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$. Choose a splitting of the dual sequence $1 \rightarrow \tilde{T} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^m \rightarrow \tilde{K} \rightarrow 1$, as well as coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$ on $\tilde{T} \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$ on $\tilde{K} \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^k$. Write $\partial_a = q_a \partial_{q_a}$, and let Ω_0 denote the standard relative volume form of the family $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$\Omega_0 = \frac{dx}{x} = \frac{dx_1}{x_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dx_{n+1}}{x_{n+1}}.$$

Then, the Gauss-Manin connection acts by

$$\nabla^{\text{GM}}(f\Omega_0) = \sum_{a=1}^k \left(\left(\partial_a f + \frac{\partial_a \mathcal{W}}{z} f \right) \Omega_0 \right) \frac{dq_a}{q_a} + \left(\left(z \partial_z f - \frac{\mathcal{W}}{z} f - \frac{n}{2} f \right) \Omega_0 \right) \frac{dz}{z}. \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover, according to [13], Section 5, over the open torus $\check{K} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\text{GM}(\mathcal{W})$ is generated by Ω_0 as a module over the ring $\mathcal{O}_{\check{K}}[z]\langle z\partial_1, \dots, z\partial_k \rangle$, where ∂_a acts by the Gauss-Manin connection $\nabla_{\partial_a}^{\text{GM}}$.

Recall we have a presentation

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})(x; y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} y_i Q^{\lambda(b'_i)} x^{b'_i} + \sum_{k' \in G_{\mathcal{X}}} y_{k'} Q^{\lambda(k')} x^{k'},$$

introduced in Section 2.2. Note that we can write

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}^z = zd + d \log \mathcal{W} \wedge = zd + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathcal{W}^{-1} x_i \partial_{x_i} \mathcal{W} \frac{dx_i}{x_i} \wedge.$$

Choose an intermediate compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ of \mathcal{T} given by a smooth *toric* compactification of \mathbb{T} , with toric boundary $\mathcal{D}'_{\mathbb{T}}$, satisfying the properties:

- (T) all the monomials $x^{b'_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, m'$ and $x^{k'}$, $k' \in G_{\mathcal{X}}$ on \mathbb{T} appearing in the LG potential \mathcal{W} extend to sections of a holomorphic toric line bundle $E \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$.

By the momentum construction of toric varieties, the condition (T) can be achieved by choosing a Delzant momentum polytope containing the exponents $\{b'_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m'$ and $\{k'\}$, $k' \in G_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Moreover, given a choice of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ satisfying (T), by (repeatedly) blowing up torus-fixed points, we can pass to an intermediate smooth toric compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, with toric boundary $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$, satisfying the following condition:

- (T') the subvariety $V(\mathcal{W}) \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ (which is well-defined by (T)) does not contain torus-fixed points of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$.

Example 4.1. Let $(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L}_r)$ be degeneration to the normal cone of a point in \mathbb{P}^1 . The convex envelope of the exponents of the monomials

$$\left\{ x, \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x}, x', \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x'}, e^{2\pi k r} x x' \right\}$$

is not Delzant (it is the momentum polygon of an orbifold). However, it is contained in the Delzant polygon given by the convex envelope of the exponents of the monomials

$$\left\{ x, \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x}, x', \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x'}, e^{2\pi k r} x x', \frac{1}{x x'} \right\}.$$

This is the momentum polygon of the toric del Pezzo S_6 , the blowup of \mathbb{P}^2 at the torus-fixed points, with respect to $-K_{S_6}$, thus the monomials of $\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)$ correspond to anticanonical sections on S_6 . With a suitable choice of coordinates for the anticanonical embedding $S_6 \subset \mathbb{P}[x_0 : \dots : x_6]$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = x_1 + e^{-2\pi k} x_4 + e^{-2\pi k} x_6 + x_3 + e^{2\pi r k} x_2.$$

By standard results in toric geometry, the toric boundary is the union of the smooth rational curves $C_i = \mathbb{P}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$, using a cyclic index $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and so the torus fixed points are $p_i := C_i \cap C_{i+1}$. We find that in this case the torus-fixed point p_4 is contained in the anticanonical divisor $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r))$, and so an admissible choice of intermediate smooth toric compactification is given by $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} := \text{Bl}_{p_4} S_6$.

Example 4.2. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r)$ be the product test configuration given by $(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)) \cong \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2, H - rE)$. As in the previous example, the convex envelope of the monomials

$$\left\{ \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{xx'}, x, x', e^{2\pi kr} xx' \right\}$$

is not Delzant, but is contained in the momentum polygon of $(S_6, -K_{S_6})$, and in the same homogeneous coordinates we have

$$\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = e^{-2\pi k} x_5 + x_1 + x_3 + e^{2\pi kr} x_2.$$

The torus-fixed points p_3, p_5 are contained in the locus $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r))$, and an admissible choice of intermediate smooth toric compactification is given by $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} := \text{Bl}_{p_3, p_5} S_6$.

Example 4.3. Let $(\mathcal{X}, -K_{\mathcal{X}})$ be the toric test configuration for $X = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$ given by the degeneration to the normal cone of E , $\mathcal{X} = \text{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}} X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then \mathcal{X} is Fano, given by the face fan of the reflexive polytope

$$\mathcal{P}' = \text{conv}(\{(0, 0, -1), (1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0), (-1, -1, 0), (0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1)\}).$$

The polar dual of \mathcal{P}' is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}')^\circ &= \text{conv}(l), \\ l &= \{(2, -1, -1), (2, -1, 1), (-1, 2, 1), (-1, 2, -1), \\ & (0, -1, 1), (-1, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 0), (0, -1, 0), (1, -1, -1), (-1, 1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to find a choice of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ we proceed slightly differently from the previous examples. By the general theory for three-dimensional reflexive polytopes (see [21]), we know that the LG potential $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}})$ corresponds to an anticanonical section on the Gorenstein toric Fano $T_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$. Moreover, $T_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$ admits a (non-unique) crepant resolution induced by a maximal triangulation $\tilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$, and there is a natural anticanonical pencil on $\tilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$ generated by $W_{\mathcal{X}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}})$ and the toric boundary. Thus, in this case, we can take

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} := \tilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}.$$

Note that using, for example, the $GL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ -equivalence $\mathcal{P} \sim \mathcal{P}'$ with the polytope \mathcal{P} in the Kreuzer-Skarke list, one can check that $T_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$ is the Gorenstein canonical Fano threefold with degree 10 and Picard index 1 given by the reflexive polytope \mathcal{P}° with index 4185.

According to our discussion above, we have that:

- (1) by the toric condition, the 1-forms on \mathcal{T} given by $d \log(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ extend to meromorphic forms on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ with a simple pole along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$;
- (2) the connection 1-form $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i \partial_{x_i} \log \mathcal{W} \frac{dx_i}{x_i}$ extends to a meromorphic 1-form on the trivial bundle over $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, with simple poles along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $V(\mathcal{W})$, possibly away from $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}} \cap V(\mathcal{W})$ (if this intersection is nonreduced);
- (3) Ω_0 extends to a meromorphic form on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ with simple poles along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$;
- (4) over $\check{K} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the $n+1$ -form $\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ can be expressed as a linear combination of $\nabla_{\partial_a}^{\text{GM}}(\Omega_0)$, $a = 1, \dots, k$. By (4.1) and our assumption (T), each $n+1$ -form $\nabla_{\partial_a}^{\text{GM}}(\Omega_0)$ extends to a meromorphic form on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$, with values in E , with simple poles along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $V(\mathcal{W})$, possibly away from $\mathcal{D} \cap V(\mathcal{W})$ (if this is nonreduced). Therefore, $(\mathcal{W})^{-1} \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ extends to a logarithmic $n+1$ -form on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, with simple poles along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $V(\mathcal{W})$, away from the base locus of the linear system defined by $\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ and \mathcal{W} .
- (5) This argument needs to be refined in order to show that $\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1} \alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ extends to a logarithmic $n+1$ -form on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, with simple poles along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $V(\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon})$, away from the base locus of the linear system defined by the divisors $(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $(\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon})$. We will achieve this in Section 4.2, at least after replacing \mathcal{L} by $k\mathcal{L}$ for $k \gg 1$, and working modulo terms of order $O(k^{-1})$, see Remark 4.10.
- (6) Thus, assuming the extension in (5), proved in Section 4.2, we can construct a simple normal crossing compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ as an iterated blowup of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ along $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}} \cap V(\mathcal{W})$ (if this is nonreduced), and resolving the singularities of the divisors $(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}))$, $(\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon})$, $(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))$, $(\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}))$ as well as the base loci $\text{Bs}(\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{W})$, $\text{Bs}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon})$. We write its simple normal crossing boundary \mathcal{D} as the union of (the proper transform of) the toric part $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and the non-toric part $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$. Note that, by property (T'), there is a canonical embedding of the set of torus-fixed points $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ into \mathcal{D} .

Consider our fixed extension $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}$. For each irreducible component $\mathcal{D}' \subset \mathcal{D}$, the condition

$$\text{Spec}(\text{Res}_{\mathcal{D}'}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}})) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

gives a countable set of analytic constraints on $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ and so on the Kähler parameter \mathcal{L} .

The upshot of the discussion so far is that our condition (T) provides a choice of simple normal crossing compactification $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ and logarithmic extensions ω_-, ω_+ of $\mathcal{W}_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1} \alpha_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{W}^{-1} \beta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{L})$ such that the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) are satisfied, up to the generic condition $(!)_+$. Assuming $(!)_+$, the cohomology intersection pairing $\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch}$ is well defined and satisfies the residue Theorem 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} \\ &= (-2\pi i)^{n+1} \sum_{P_{n+1}: \mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) \neq \emptyset} \langle \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+) | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})})^{-1} | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_-) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, our central assumption is the condition (iv) . More precisely, we need that:

† the stationary phase approximation holds for the cohomology intersection number $\langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch}$, computed on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ with respect to $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}$ (this is well defined, under the generic condition $(!)_+$, or $(!)_-$). According to Lemma 3.4, this happens if the critical locus $\text{Crit}(\mathcal{W})$ is discrete and we have

$$\sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{W})} m_p = (-1)^{n+1} \chi(\overline{\mathcal{T}} \setminus \mathcal{D}). \quad (4.2)$$

If this is the case, we have the identities

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \langle \omega_-, \omega_+ \rangle_{ch} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{T}}} \omega_- \wedge \text{reg}_+ \omega_+, \quad (4.3)$$

where ω_- , $\text{reg}_+ \omega_+$ denote smooth representatives, as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\ &= (-1)^{n+1} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{P_{n+1}: \mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) \neq \emptyset} \langle \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+) | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L})})^{-1} | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_-) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where the right hand side is computed on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$, as a sum over the zero-dimensional strata of the boundary \mathcal{D} , and $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}}$, ω_{\mp} are determined by the Kähler parameter \mathcal{L} .

Example 4.4. In the case of the degeneration to the normal cone $(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L}_r)$ in \mathbb{P}^1 considered above, $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)) \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is a smooth curve of genus 1 and so $\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{T}$ is given by the complement of 5 points in a a genus 1 curve (the intersections $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$), thus we have $\chi(\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}) = -5$ and $\chi(\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \mathcal{D}) = \chi(\mathbb{T} \setminus \{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}) = 5$. On the other hand one can check directly that, for r sufficiently close to $\frac{1}{2}$ (i.e. for \mathcal{L}_r sufficiently close to $-\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}}$) and for all $k \gg 1$, the LG potential $\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)$ has 5 isolated critical points, not contained in the locus $\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}$ (see e.g. [26], Section 5.2). So in this example the condition (M) is satisfied and the stationary phase approximation holds.

Example 4.5. When $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r)$ is the product test configuration given by $(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)) \cong \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2, H - rE)$, the locus $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)) \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_3, p_5} S_6$ is a smooth curve of genus 1 and so $\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{T}$ is given by the complement of 4 points in a a genus 1 curve (the intersections $V(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$). So in this case we have $\chi(\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}) = -4$, $\chi(\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \mathcal{D}) = \chi(\mathbb{T} \setminus \{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}) = 4$. One can also compute directly that for all $r \in (0, 1)$ and for all $k \gg 1$, the LG potential $\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r)$ has 4 isolated critical points, not contained in the locus $\{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = 0\}$ (see e.g. [26], Example 3.1). Thus the condition (M) is satisfied and the stationary phase approximation holds.

Example 4.6. Although we do not check this here, we expect that the stationary phase approximation holds for $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-kK_{\mathcal{X}})$, for $k \gg 1$, when $\mathcal{X} = \text{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}}(\text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$, with respect to the compactification for \mathbb{T} obtained from $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \widetilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$.

4.2 Residue theorem and localisation formulae

Our aim is to show that the right hand side of the residue formula (4.4) can be interpreted naturally in terms of Donaldson-Futaki invariants for a compactification X^\vee of the torus $\mathbb{T} \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. This requires several steps.

- (i) Recall $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ was constructed as a blowup of a smooth toric variety $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$, such that there we have a canonical embedding of torus fixed points $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]} \subset \mathcal{D} \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}$. Fix a toric holomorphic vector field v , generating a \mathbb{C}^* -action λ , with isolated fixed points (this is the case for generic λ). Note that such isolated fixed points are given necessarily by the zero-dimensional stratum of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$.
- (ii) Recall \mathcal{W} is a toric mirror LG potential for \mathcal{X} , and we are assuming without loss of generality that there is a toric morphism $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ corresponding to a decomposition $N_{\mathcal{X}} \cong N \times \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, there is an induced toric morphism $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, and we denote a fixed smooth fibre by X^\vee . Note that when $X = T_P$ is a toric Fano with reflexive polytope P , we can choose $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ so that X^\vee is the polar dual T_{P° .
- (iii) By a standard construction, taking the limits of X^\vee under the action of $\lambda(t)$ on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ for $t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the total space of a non-compact test configuration

$$(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, \circ})^v \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

for X^\vee . Abusing notation, we write λ for the induced action on the corresponding canonical compactification $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Then λ has isolated fixed points $Z(v)$ on the central fibre $\mathcal{X}_0^{\vee, 0}$.

- (iv) Although $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v}$ is singular in general, we can replace it with an equivariant resolution, at the cost of allowing the ‘‘polarisation’’ $[\eta]$ and twist $[\xi]$, *which we still need to choose*, to be pulled back from the base. Although the induced action of λ on such an equivariant resolution does not have isolated fixed points on the central fibre, in general, nevertheless the non-isolated fixed points do not contribute to the Donaldson-Futaki invariant with respect to $[\eta]$, $[\xi]$ pulled back from the singular space.

On the other hand, the isolated fixed points of λ are still in natural bijection with a subset $Z(v) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]} \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}}$.

- (v) We then consider a suitable refinement of the toric fan of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and decompose this into subfans, such that each subset in the decomposition corresponds to a toric variety $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}^{i, \circ}$ mapping to \mathbb{C} , for $i = 1, \dots, m$, which can be compactified to a projective toric variety $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}^i$ with a map $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, with general fibre X^\vee . Proceeding as above for $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}^i$, we obtain a smooth test configuration \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} such that the set of isolated fixed points on the central fibre $Z(v_i)$ contains a distinguished subset $Z(v_i) \supset \tilde{Z}(v_i) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]}$, yielding a partition

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]} = \cup_{i=1}^m \tilde{Z}(v_i). \quad (4.5)$$

(vi) Given $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v}$ as in (v), suppose $D \subset \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v}$ is *any* irreducible divisor which, without loss of generality, we can assume to be smooth (otherwise we pass to a toric resolution of the pair $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v}, \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v})$ endowed with suitable pullback $(1, 1)$ -classes, similarly to (iv) above).

Let us denote by $f_{X^\vee}(D)$ the number of (isolated) zeroes of v contained in D . For our construction, in order to show the existence of suitable “polarisations” $[\eta]$ and twists $[\xi]$, we will later need the inequality

$$h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v}) + \dim D^\perp + n + 1 \geq 2|Z(v)| - f_{X^\vee}(D), \quad (4.6)$$

where $D^\perp \subset H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v})$ denotes the spece of $(1, 1)$ -classes restricting to zero on D . In this does not hold on $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v}$, we proceed as in (v), by considering suitable decompositions of a refinement of the toric fan of $\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v}$ into subfans. By increasing m and renumbering, we have corresponding (total spaces of) test configurations \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i} for $i = 1, \dots, m$ such that (4.6) holds for all \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i} and there is a partition (4.5). We can then pass to resolutions of singularities of \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i} as in (iv).

Example 4.7. Recall that, for the degeneration to the normal cone of a point in $X = \mathbb{P}^1$, we have $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_4} S_6$. Up to the action of $GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, the fan of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is spanned by the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= (1, 0), w_2 = (1, 1), w_3 = (0, 1), \\ w_4 &= (-1, 1), w_5 = (-1, 0), w_6 = (-1, -1), w_7 = (0, -1), \end{aligned}$$

with corresponding maximal cones K_i spanned by w_i, w_{i+1} for a cyclic index i . An admissible decomposition of the set of cones is given by $\{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\} \cup \{K_5, K_6, K_7\}$. The test configuration \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_1} for $X^\vee \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ corresponding to $\{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Bl}_{q_1 \times \{0\}, q_2 \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. It has central fibre \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v_1} given by a tree of 3 smooth rational curves, containing 4 torus fixed points. Let D_1 be any irreducible component of \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v_1} . Then we have $h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_1}) + \dim D_1^\perp + n + 1 \geq 7 > 6 = 8 - 2 = 2|Z(v_1)| - f_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_1}}(D_1)$. Similarly, \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_2} , corresponding to $\{K_5, K_6, K_7\}$, is isomorphic to $\text{Bl}_{q \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and has central fibre given by the transverse intersection of 2 smooth rational curves, containing 3 torus fixed points, so $h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_2}) + \dim D_2^\perp + n + 1 \geq 6 > 6 - 2 = 2|Z(v_2)| - f_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_2}}(D_2)$ for any irreducible component D_2 of \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v_2} .

Example 4.8. Recall that, for the product test configuration $\mathcal{X} \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1))$, we have $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_3, p_5} S_6$. Up to the action of $GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, the fan of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is spanned by the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= (1, 0), w_2 = (1, 1), w_3 = (1, 2), w_4 = (0, 1), \\ w_5 &= (-1, 0), w_6 = (-2, -1), w_7 = (-1, -1), w_8 = (0, -1), \end{aligned}$$

with corresponding maximal cones K_i spanned by w_i, w_{i+1} for a cyclic index i . An admissible decomposition of the set of cones is given by $\{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\} \cup \{K_5, K_6, K_7, K_8\}$. The corresponding test configurations \mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i} for $X^\vee \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, for $i = 1, 2$, are isomorphic to $\text{Bl}_{q' \times \{0\}, q'' \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ where $q' \times \{0\}, q'' \times \{0\}$ are infinitely close. The central fibre \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v_i} is given by a tree of 3 smooth rational curves, containing 4 torus fixed points, so that we have $h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i}) + \dim D_i^\perp + n + 1 \geq 8 > 8 - 2 = 2|Z(v_i)| - f_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee,v_i}}(D_i)$ for any irreducible components D_i of \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee,v_i} .

Example 4.9. We showed that, when $(\mathcal{X}, -K_{\mathcal{X}})$ is the Fano toric test configuration for $X = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$ given by the degeneration to the normal cone of E , $\mathcal{X} = \text{Bl}_{E \times \{0\}} X \times \mathbb{P}^1$, then an admissible choice of intermediate toric compactification for \mathbb{T} is given by $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \widetilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$, a crepant resolution of the Gorenstein canonical Fano threefold $T_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$ corresponding to some maximal triangulation.

Note that $(\mathcal{P}')^\circ \cap \{z = 0\}$ is the reflexive polygon

$$P^\circ = \text{conv}(\ell), \quad \ell^\circ := \{(2, -1), (-1, 2), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\}$$

polar dual to

$$P = \text{conv}(\{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (-1, -1)\}),$$

and so by our construction above each $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v}$ gives the total space of a test configuration for $X^\vee = \widetilde{T}_{P^\circ}$, the crepant resolution of the orbifold T_{P° given by a maximal triangulation of P° , which is (after resolving the base locus of $W_X(-K_X)$) the mirror of $X = T_P$. One can check that T_{P° is the singular intersection of two quadrics in \mathbb{P}^4 ,

$$T_{P^\circ} = \{x_1 x_3 = x_0 x_4, x_2 x_4 = x_0^2\} \subset \mathbb{P}[x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : x_4],$$

and its resolution is $X^\vee \cong \text{Bl}_{q'_2, q'_3} S_6 = \text{Bl}_{q'_2, q'_3} \text{Bl}_{q_1, q_2, q_3} \mathbb{P}^2$, where q'_2, q'_3 are points lying on the exceptional divisors over q_2, q_3 .

On the other hand, because of the large number of cones appearing in the fan of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \widetilde{T}_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$, it is hard to describe explicitly a collection \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} , for $i = 1, \dots, m$, such that (4.6) holds for all \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} and there is a partition (4.5).

Let us assume for a moment that we can work with the Gorenstein canonical compactification $T_{(\mathcal{P}')^\circ}$ rather than its crepant resolution.

We note that there is a presentation

$$(\mathcal{P}')^\circ = \text{conv}(\tilde{\ell}^\circ \times \{z = -1\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 0\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 1\}),$$

where $\tilde{\ell}^\circ := \{(2, -1), (-1, 2), (1, -1), (-1, 1)\}$. Then, at least formally, we can choose our (singular, total spaces of) test configurations for the orbifold X^\vee as $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i} = T_{\mathcal{Q}^i}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}^1 &:= \text{conv}((0, 0, -1) \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 0\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 1\} \setminus \{(2, -1, 1), (0, -1, 1)\}), \\ \mathcal{Q}^2 &:= \text{conv}((0, 0, -1) \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 0\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 1\} \setminus \{(-1, 2, 1), (-1, 0, 1)\}), \\ \mathcal{Q}^3 &:= \text{conv}((0, 0, 1) \cup \tilde{\ell}^\circ \times \{z = -1\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 0\} \setminus \{(2, -1, -1), (1, -1, -1)\}), \\ \mathcal{Q}^4 &:= \text{conv}((0, 0, 1) \cup \tilde{\ell}^\circ \times \{z = -1\} \cup \ell^\circ \times \{z = 0\} \setminus \{(-1, 2, -1), (-1, 1, -1)\}). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, in each case, we can compute that the Picard rank of $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}$ is 3 and the number of torus fixed points on the central fibre is 5, from which (4.6) follows. Note that there is a reflection symmetry along the plane $x = y$ yielding isomorphisms $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, 1} \cong \mathcal{X}^{\vee, 2}$, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, 3} \cong \mathcal{X}^{\vee, 4}$.

In the setup described above, our aim is to *show that there exist holomorphic vector fields v_i (generating \mathbb{C}^* -actions) and $(1, 1)$ -classes $[\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ such that, in the large volume limit (i.e. up to $O(k^{-1})$), the right hand side of the residue formula (4.4) can be identified naturally with the sum of the Atiyah-Bott equivariant localisation formulae for $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$, plus an explicit term $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}))$ determined by the base loci on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$. Note that determining such (generic) vector fields v_i is also part of the problem.*

Let us write $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}, [\eta], [\xi])$ for one of our test configurations $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$, i.e. for $v = v_i$. The Atiyah-Bott localisation formula for the Donaldson-Futaki invariant is discussed by Legendre [15] (the exposition there generalises immediately to allow a twist). In the case of isolated fixed points, it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee}, [\eta], [\xi]) \\ &= \sum_{p \in Z(v)} \left(\frac{nc_{\eta, \xi}^{\vee} (-h_{\eta}(p))^{n+1}}{n+1 e(T_p)(v)} - \frac{(\sum_{i=0}^{n+1} w_i(p) + h_{\xi}(p))(-h(p))^n}{e(T_p)(v)} + \frac{(-h_{\eta}(p))^n}{e(T_p)(v)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{p \in Z(v)} \frac{(-h_{\eta}(p))^n \left(-\frac{nc_{\eta, \xi}^{\vee}}{n+1} h_{\eta}(p) - \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} w_i(p) + 1 - h_{\xi}(p) \right)}{e(T_p)(v)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_{\eta, \xi}^{\vee} := \frac{(c_1(X^{\vee}) - \xi|_{X^{\vee}}) \cup (\eta|_{X^{\vee}})^{n-1}}{(\eta|_{X^{\vee}})^n},$$

h_{η}, h_{ξ} denote the Hamiltonians for the underlying actions with respect to η, ξ , and the sum is over zeroes $Z(v) = Z(v_i)$ lying in the central fibre \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee} .

We wish to compare this with the residue formula for a logarithmic connection. In general, this is difficult since the mirror map is quite involved. Here, however, we focus on the large volume limit, as in [26], Section 2.

Consider the classes of $n+1$ -forms

$$\begin{aligned} [\omega_-^{(k)}] &:= k^{-n} \mathcal{W}_{n, k^{-1}}^{-1}(k\mathcal{L}) \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \left((c_1(k\mathcal{L}))^n \right) \Big|_{z=0}, \\ [\omega_+^{(k)}] &:= \mathcal{W}^{-1}(k\mathcal{L}) \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \left(\frac{n(k^{-1}c)}{n+1} c_1(k\mathcal{L}) + c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}) \right) \Big|_{z=0} \end{aligned}$$

(note that we specialised the perturbation parameter ε to k^{-1}). By the scaling behaviour of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant and (4.3), under our assumption \dagger , we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = k^{-n} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L}) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^{n+1} \langle \omega_-^{(k)}, \omega_+^{(k)} \rangle_{ch} + O(k^{-1}).$$

Consider the module $\text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}))|_{z=0}$ given by the top cohomology of the complex $(\Omega^{\bullet}, d\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})\wedge)$. Choose the generator $\Theta^{-1}(1)$ for the $\text{GM}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}))|_{z=0}$ in order to obtain an algebra structure on $\text{GM}(k\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}))|_{z=0}$ and an isomorphism $\text{Jac}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})) \cong$

$(H^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{C}), *_{[c_1(k\mathcal{L})]})$ with the quantum cohomology ring, where we write $*_{[c_1(k\mathcal{L})]}$ for the quantum product evaluated at the quantum parameter Q such that

$$Q^d = \exp\left(-2\pi k \int_d c_1(\mathcal{L})\right).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k^{-n} \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}((c_1(k\mathcal{L}))^n)|_{z=0} &= k^{-n} \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(c_1(k\mathcal{L})) *_{[c_1(k\mathcal{L})]} \cdots *_{[c_1(k\mathcal{L})]} \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(c_1(k\mathcal{L})) *_{[c_1(k\mathcal{L})]} \\ &= (k^{-1} \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(c_1(k\mathcal{L})))^n (1 + O(k^{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

since the mirror map intertwines the quantum product with the product on $\text{Jac}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}))$, and the quantum product approaches the cup product in the large volume limit.

Remark 4.10. This also shows that $[\omega_-^{(k)}]$ is in fact the class of a logarithmic form on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$, at least up to terms of order $O(k^{-1})$, as required by our construction.

So, setting $\mathcal{W}_k := \mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})$, in the large volume limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ there are expansions

$$\begin{aligned} [\omega_-^{(k)}] &= (\mathcal{W}_k)^{-n} [\theta_k]^n \Omega_0 (1 + O(k^{-1})), \\ [\omega_+^{(k)}] &= (\mathcal{W}_k)^{-1} \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} [\theta_k] - [\mathcal{W}_k] + [\psi_k] \right) \Omega_0 (1 + O(k^{-1})), \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$[\theta_k] := k^{-1} \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(c_1(k\mathcal{L}))|_{z=0}, \quad [\psi_k] = \Theta_{k\mathcal{L}}^{-1}(c_1(K_{\mathcal{X}/\mathbb{P}^1}))|_{z=0} + [\mathcal{W}_k] \in \text{Jac}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})). \quad (4.8)$$

Then, according to (4.5), we can decompose the residue formula for logarithmic connections (4.4) as a sum of terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) &= \frac{\langle [\omega_-^{(k)}], [\omega_+^{(k)}] \rangle_{ch}}{(2\pi i)^{n+1}} + O(k^{-1}) \\ &= (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\mathcal{D}(P_{n+1})=p \in \tilde{Z}(v_i)} [\mathcal{W}_k^{-1} \theta_k]^n \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} [\mathcal{W}_k^{-1} \theta_k] - 1 + [\mathcal{W}_k^{-1} \psi_k] \right) \Big|_p \\ &\quad \langle \text{Res}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})}) \Big|_p \Omega_0|_p, \Omega_0|_p \rangle (1 + O(k^{-1})) \\ &+ (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{\mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]}} \langle \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+^{(k)}) \Big| \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})})^{-1} \Big| \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_-^{(k)}) \rangle + O(k^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where evaluation for classes in $H_{\mathbb{T}}^n$ is defined in terms of restrictions along toric strata (i.e. in terms of intersections $\mathcal{D}(P_{n+1})$), as explained in the discussion of the global residue Theorem, Section 3.1. Note that the subsets $\tilde{Z}(v_i) \subset Z(v_i)$ appear in the decomposition.

Remark 4.11. Using the same large volume limit expansion in the Grothendieck residue expression (2.1), when the critical points of $\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})$ are nondegenerate, we find immediately

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{p \in \text{Crit}(\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}))} \frac{(\theta_k)^n \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} \theta_k - \mathcal{W}_k + \psi_k \right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i^2 \det \nabla^2 \mathcal{W}_k} \Big|_p + O(k^{-1}).$$

The leading term clearly resembles an *ill-defined* localised Donaldson-Futaki invariant on the *noncompact* manifold \mathbb{T} , with respect to the vector field $\nabla \mathcal{W}_k$. Our construction aims precisely at turning this into a sum of well-defined formal Donaldson-Futaki invariants for compactified mirrors.

4.3 Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.2

Let us write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta} &:= \mathcal{W}_k^{-1} \theta_k, \quad \tilde{\psi} := \mathcal{W}_k^{-1} \psi_k, \\ f^{n+1}(p) &:= |P_{n+1} : \mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) = p \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}| \langle \text{Res}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})}) \Big|_p \Omega_0 \Big|_p, \Omega_0 \Big|_p \rangle \end{aligned}$$

(note that we omit k in the notation for simplicity, but all the quantities we consider in the following depend on k). Then, by (4.9), we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{p \in \tilde{Z}(v_i)} \left(-f \tilde{\theta} \right)^n \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} \left(-f \tilde{\theta} \right) + f \left(1 - \tilde{\psi} \right) \right) \Big|_p + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}),$$

where the base locus contribution is given by

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) := (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{\mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}^{[0]}} \langle \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+^{(k)}) \Big| \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})})^{-1} \Big| \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_-^{(k)}) \rangle. \quad (4.10)$$

If p is a zero of a holomorphic vector field v , we set

$$d(v) \Big|_p = (\det(\nabla v))^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \Big|_p, \quad t(v) \Big|_p = \text{tr}(\nabla v) \Big|_p - 1.$$

These quantities are well defined for all $v \in \mathfrak{t} := \text{Lie}(\mathbb{T})$, not necessarily generating a \mathbb{C}^* -action, and agree with the corresponding expressions involving the equivariant Euler class and sum of weights in the case of \mathbb{C}^* -actions (recall we are regarding v as a vector field on \mathcal{X}^\vee , and we only consider its isolated fixed points, since we will fix a class $[\eta]$ which is pulled back from $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$).

Let us introduce the functions $H_i : Z(v_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $K_i : Z(v_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_i \Big|_{\tilde{Z}(v_i)} &:= d(v_i) f \tilde{\theta}, \quad H_i \Big|_{Z(v_i) \setminus \tilde{Z}(v_i)} := 0, \\ K_i \Big|_{\tilde{Z}(v_i)} &:= -t(v_i) - d(v_i) f \left(1 - \tilde{\psi} \right), \quad K_i \Big|_{Z(v_i) \setminus \tilde{Z}(v_i)} := 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{p \in \tilde{Z}(v_i)} \frac{\left(-d(v_i)f\tilde{\theta}\right)^n \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} \left(-d(v_i)f\tilde{\theta}\right) - t(v_i) + \left(t(v_i) + d(v_i)f(1 - \tilde{\psi})\right)\right)}{(d(v_i))^{n+1}} \Big|_p \\
&+ \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{p \in Z(v_i)} \frac{(-H_i)^n \left(-\frac{nc}{n+1}H_i - t(v_i) - K_i\right)}{(d(v_i))^{n+1}} \Big|_p + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

We need to consider the question of realising H_i, K_i as the values of *complexified* Hamiltonians h_{η^i}, h_{ξ^i} for v_i , i.e. determining *both* a vector field v_i as above and complex $(1, 1)$ -forms η^i, ξ^i such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\iota_{v_i}\eta^i &= \bar{\partial}h_{\eta^i}, \quad h_{\eta^i}(p) = H_i(p) + O(k^{-1}), \\
\iota_{v_i}\xi^i &= \bar{\partial}h_{\xi^i}, \quad h_{\xi^i}(p) = K_i(p) + O(k^{-1}), \quad \text{for all } p \in Z(v_i).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Recall that the values $h_{\eta^i}(p), h_{\xi^i}(p)$ only depend on the cohomology class $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$, up to an overall constant. Thus, we can consider the corresponding problem in cohomology, so the set of values of $h_{\eta^i}(p), h_{\xi^i}(p)$ as $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$ vary in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}, \mathbb{C})^{\oplus 2}$ is a complex linear subspace of $(\mathbb{C}^{|Z(v_i)|})^{\oplus 2}$ of dimension $2h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i})$. Note that, since by construction \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} is smooth, toric and projective, the existence of such Hamiltonians is automatic.

Note that, by the definition of $\tilde{\psi}$ and our construction of the test configurations \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} , $\tilde{\psi}$ induces a rational function on each \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} for which there exists an irreducible component $D_i \subset \mathcal{X}_0^{\vee, v_i}$ such that

$$\tilde{\psi}|_{D_i} = 1 + O(k^{-1}),$$

and so

$$K_i|_{\tilde{Z}(v_i) \cap D_i} = -t(v_i) + O(k^{-1}) = -\text{tr}(\nabla v_i) + 1 + O(k^{-1}).$$

For $p \in D_i$, the quantity $\text{tr}(\nabla v_i)|_p$ equals the value at p of a Hamiltonian on D_i with respect to the class $-c_1(K_{D_i}) = -c_1(\mathcal{O}(D_i)|_{D_i})$ (see e.g. [30], Section 3.2), up to an overall constant. Thus, twists $[\xi^i]$ of the form $c_1(\mathcal{O}(D_i)) + [\tilde{\xi}^i]$ for $[\tilde{\xi}^i] \in D_i^\perp$, achieve the correct values along D_i , and letting $[\eta_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}}], [\tilde{\xi}^i]$ vary in $H^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}, \mathbb{C})$, respectively D_i^\perp yields a subspace of

$$\mathcal{V}_i := \mathbb{C}^{|Z(v_i)|} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{|Z(v_i)| - f_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}}(D_i)}$$

of dimension $h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}) + \dim D_i^\perp$ (recall that $f_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}}(D_i)$ denotes the number of isolated fixed points contained in D_i).

Now we also let the holomorphic vector field v_i vary in the generic locus in \mathfrak{t} of the maximal torus. As $v_i, [\eta^i], [\xi^i]$ vary, the target complex vector space \mathcal{V}_i remains fixed, and the values of $v_i, h_{\eta^i}(p), h_{\xi^i}(p)$ yield a complex subspace $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{t} \times \mathcal{V}_i$ of dimension $h^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i}) + \dim D_i^\perp + n + 1$. At the same time, the values of H_i, K_i as v_i varies in

the generic locus give an analytic subvariety $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathfrak{t} \times \mathcal{V}_i$ of dimension $n + 1$. By (4.6), possibly after a small linear perturbation of \mathfrak{L} of order $O(k^{-1})$, there exist a vector field v_i and classes $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$ lying in the intersection $\mathfrak{L} \cap \mathfrak{M} \neq \emptyset$ and so satisfying our condition (4.11).

This particular v_i might not generate a \mathbb{C}^* -action, but it can be approximated by \mathbb{C}^* -actions, and this approximation only introduces an error term of order $O(k^{-1})$.

The requirement $\int_{X^\vee} (\eta^i)^n \neq 0$ might not be satisfied for this particular class $[\eta^i]$, but if that happens we can perturb it to $[\eta^i + k^{-1}\varphi]$ where $[\varphi]$ is a $(1, 1)$ -class on \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} such that $\int_{X^\vee} (\eta^i)^{n-1} \wedge \varphi \neq 0$.

Finally, the equality

$$c = c_{\eta^i, \xi^i}^\vee$$

can be achieved by scaling $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$ suitably (so that (4.11) remains solvable).

The upshot is that, using the formal, twisted Donaldson-Futaki invariant introduced in Section 1, that is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{DF}((\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}}], [\xi_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}}])) \\ & := \sum_{p \in Z(v_i)} \frac{(-h_{\eta^i}(p))^n \left(-\frac{nc_{\eta^i, \xi^i}^\vee}{n+1} h_{\eta^i}(p) - \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} w_j(p) + 1 - h_{\xi^i}(p) \right)}{e(T_p)(v)}, \end{aligned}$$

(which agrees with the genuine invariant when $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$ are real and semipositive), we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, [\eta^i], [\xi^i]) + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}).$$

Note, however, that this simple approach gives no control on the positivity of (the real and imaginary parts of) $[\eta^i], [\xi^i]$.

Example 4.12. Suppose $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r)$ is given by the degeneration to the normal cone of a point in \mathbb{P}^1 . We know that in this case $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_4} S_6$, and the torus-fixed points on the central fibre of the test configurations $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1} \cong \text{Bl}_{q_1 \times \{0\}, q_2 \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_2} \cong \text{Bl}_{q \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ are given by $\{p_2, p_3, p'_4, p''_4\}$ (with p'_4, p''_4 mapping to p_4), respectively $\{p_1, p_5, p_6\}$. In Example 4.14 below we will compute the quantities $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\psi}, f$ in the case when $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r) \cong (\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ has parameter $r = \frac{1}{2}$. Using that computation, we find

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(p) &= \frac{1}{2}d(v_1)|_p, p \in \{p_2, p_3, p'_4, p''_4\}, H_2(p) = \frac{1}{2}d(v_2)|_p, p \in \{p_1, p_5, p_6\}, \\ K_1(p) &= t(v_1)|_p, p \in \{p_3, p'_4\}, K_1(p) = (t(v_1) + d(v_1))|_p, p \in \{p_2, p''_4\}, \\ K_2(p) &= t(v_2)|_p, p \in \{p_1, p_6\}, K_2(p) = (t(v_2) + d(v_2))|_p, p = p_5. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show how these prescribed values can be achieved for \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1} (i.e. solving for $v_1, [\eta_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1}}]$ and $[\xi_{\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1}}]$). A completely analogous computation holds for \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_2} .

A vector field v_1 on \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1} is induced by \hat{v}_1 on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. In suitable affine coordinates (z, w) on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, under the natural identifications, we have

$$\hat{v}_1 = az \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + bw \frac{\partial}{\partial w},$$

and so, passing to the blowup with local coordinates (z, ξ) or (η, w) , we find

$$v_1 = (a+b)z \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + b\xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}, \text{ respectively } v_1 = a\eta \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} + (a+b)w \frac{\partial}{\partial w}.$$

Using this, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} t(v_1)|_{p_2} &= 2a + b - 1, \quad t(v_1)|_{p'_4} = a + 2b - 1, \\ t(v_1)|_{p_3} &= -2a - b - 1, \quad t(v_1)|_{p''_4} = -a - 2b - 1 \\ d(v_1)|_{p_2} &= a(a+b), \quad d(v_1)|_{p'_4} = (a+b)b, \\ d(v_1)|_{p_3} &= a(a+b), \quad d(v_1)|_{p''_4} = (a+b)b. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $a = b = \frac{1}{3}$, our prescribed values on \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1} become

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(p) &= \frac{2}{9}, \quad p \in \{p_2, p_3, p'_4, p''_4\}, \\ K_1(p) &= 0, \quad p \in \{p_2, p'_4\}, \quad K_1(p) = -2, \quad p \in \{p_3, p''_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

These can be satisfied by choosing

$$\eta_1 = \pi^* p_1^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{(1)}, \quad \xi_1 = \pi^* p_2^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{(2)},$$

where $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{(i)}$ are suitable multiples of the Fubini-Study form, π denotes the blow-down map to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $p_i: \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ are the projections.

Example 4.13. Suppose $\mathcal{X} \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1))$ is a product test configuration for \mathbb{P}^1 . We know that in this case $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_3, p_5} S_6$, and the torus-fixed points on the central fibres of the test configurations $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_i} \cong \text{Bl}_{q' \times \{0\}, q'' \times \{0\}} \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, for $i = 1, 2$, are given by $\{p_2, p'_3, p''_3, p_4\}$ (with p'_3, p''_3 mapping to p_3), respectively $\{p_1, p'_5, p''_5, p_6\}$ (with p'_5, p''_5 mapping to p_5). In Example 4.15 below we will compute the quantities θ, ψ, f in the case when $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_r) \cong (\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ has parameter $r = \frac{1}{3}$. Using that computation, we find

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(p) &= \frac{1}{3}d(v_1)|_p, \quad p \in \{p_1, p_2, p'_3, p''_3, p_4\}, \\ H_2(p) &= \frac{1}{3}d(v_2)|_p, \quad p \in \{p'_5, p''_5, p_6\}, \\ K_1(p) &= t(v_1)|_p, \quad p \in \{p_2, p'_3\}, \\ K_1(p) &= (t(v_1) + d(v_1))|_p, \quad p \in \{p_1, p''_3, p_4\}, \\ K_2(p) &= t(v_2)|_p, \quad p \in \{p'_5, p_6\}, \\ K_2(p) &= (t(v_2) + d(v_2))|_p, \quad p = p''_5. \end{aligned}$$

From here one can proceed as in the previous Example.

4.4 Vanishing and proof of Theorem 1.4

Suppose \mathcal{A} is an ample line bundle on \mathcal{X} , such that

$$\Theta_{k\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})|_{z=0} = r\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{A})$$

for some $r > 0$. This happens e.g. if \mathcal{X} is Fano and $\mathcal{A} = -rK_{\mathcal{X}}$ with $r > 0$, in which case we have

$$\Theta_{k(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})}(c_1(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})) = r\Theta_{k(-rK_{\mathcal{X}})}(c_1(-K_{\mathcal{X}})) = r\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{A}).$$

Given this, we may perform our construction with respect to the polarisation $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A}$. Then, by definition, we have

$$[\theta_k] = k^{-1}\Theta_{k\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(kc_1(\mathcal{A}))|_{z=0} = \Theta_{k\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(c_1(\mathcal{A}))|_{z=0} = r\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{A}).$$

By (4.7), (4.8), each term appearing in our expression (4.10) for the base locus contribution $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k)$,

$$\langle \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+^{(k)}) | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L})})^{-1} | \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_-^{(k)}) \rangle, \mathcal{D}(P_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{T}}$$

is proportional to the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\omega_+^{(k)}) &= \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}((\mathcal{W}_k)^{-n}[\theta_k]^n \Omega_0 (1 + O(k^{-1}))) \\ &= r^n \text{Res}_{P_{n+1}}(\Omega_0 (1 + O(k^{-1}))) = O(k^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Example 4.14. Consider the degeneration to the normal cone $(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L}_r) \cong (\mathcal{X}, -\frac{k}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ of a point in \mathbb{P}^1 with parameter $r = \frac{1}{2}$. We have

$$\mathcal{W}_k = \mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = x + \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x} + \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x'} + x' + e^{\pi k}xx',$$

The mirror map does not involve quantum corrections, giving

$$\theta_k = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{W}_k, \quad \psi_k = x + \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{x} + e^{\pi k}xx'$$

(see [26], Example 2.9). As we saw, \mathcal{W}_k , θ_k and ψ_k extend to explicit anticanonical pencils on the toric del Pezzo $S_6 \subset \mathbb{P}[x_0 : \dots : x_6]$ given by the toric boundary $S_6 \cap \{x_0 = 0\}$ together with the anticanonical sections

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_k &= x_1 + e^{-2\pi k}x_4 + e^{-2\pi k}x_6 + x_3 + e^{\pi k}x_2, \\ \theta_k &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{W}_k, \\ \psi_k &= x_1 + e^{-2\pi k}x_4 + e^{\pi k}x_2 \end{aligned}$$

(we use the same notation for the sections and the corresponding pencils).

The toric boundary of S_6 is given by $C_i = \mathbb{P}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ (with $i = 1, \dots, 6$ cyclic) and so the torus fixed points are given by $p_i := C_i \cap C_{i+1}$. Thus, the only torus-fixed point of S_6 contained in the base locus of \mathcal{W}_k is $p_4 = C_4 \cap C_5$. There are torus-fixed points $p'_4 := T_{p_4}C_4$, $p''_4 := T_{p_4}C_5$ of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow S_6$ mapping to p_4 . The values of $\tilde{\theta}$, $\tilde{\psi}$ at p'_4 , p''_4 can be computed by taking the limit along $[x_4 : 1] \in C_4$ as $x_4 \rightarrow 0$, respectively $[1 : x_6] \in C_5$ as $x_6 \rightarrow 0$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\theta}|_p &\equiv \frac{1}{2}, \\ \tilde{\psi}|_{p_i} &= 1, \quad p_i = p_1, p_3, p'_4, p_6, \\ \tilde{\psi}|_{p_i} &= 0, \quad p_i = p_2, p''_4, p_5, \\ \tilde{\theta} \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} \tilde{\theta} - 1 + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the divisors along which $\tilde{\psi} \equiv 1$ are given by the proper transforms of C_1 and C_4 , which are contained in \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1} , \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_2} respectively.

It remains to compute the other factors appearing in the residue Theorem. For this, near a fixed point $p_{i-1} = C_{i-1} \cap C_i$ for $i \neq 5$, we can cover a neighbourhood of a boundary component $C_i \subset S$ with local holomorphic coordinate patches

$$(z^{(i)} := \frac{x_0}{x_i}, w^{(i)} = \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}),$$

such that C_i is cut out by $z^{(i)} = 0$. For instance, near $p_1 \in C_2$, in coordinates $(z^{(2)}, w^{(2)})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_0 &= d \log x \wedge d \log x' = d \log \frac{x_1}{x_0} \wedge d \log \frac{x_3}{x_0} \\ &= d \log \frac{1}{w^{(2)}} \wedge d \log \frac{w^{(2)}}{z^{(2)}} = -d \log z^{(2)} \wedge d \log w^{(2)},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the toric relation $x_1 x_3 = x_0 x_2$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_k &= \frac{x_1}{x_0} + e^{-2\pi k} \frac{x_4}{x_0} + e^{-2\pi k} \frac{x_6}{x_0} + \frac{x_3}{x_0} + e^{\pi k} \frac{x_2}{x_0} \\ &= \frac{1}{w^{(2)}} + e^{-2\pi k} w^{(2)} + e^{-2\pi k} \frac{z^{(2)}}{w^{(2)}} + \frac{w^{(2)}}{z^{(2)}} + e^{\pi k} \frac{1}{z^{(2)}},\end{aligned}$$

using the relations $x_1 x_4 = x_0^2$, $x_3 x_6 = x_0^2$, from which we compute

$$\partial_{z^{(2)}} \log \mathcal{W}_k = \frac{-w^{(2)} e^{3\pi k} - e^{2\pi k} w^{(2)2} + z^{(2)2}}{z^{(2)} \left(w^{(2)} e^{3\pi k} + e^{2\pi k} \left(w^{(2)2} + z^{(2)} \right) + z \left(w^{(2)2} + z^{(2)} \right) \right)}.$$

It follows that we have $\Omega_0|_{p_1} = -1$, $\text{Res}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}_k})|_{p_1} = -1$.

Similar computations show that in fact we have $\Omega_0|_{p_i} = -1$, $\text{Res}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}_k})|_{p_i} = -1$ at all torus-fixed points (including p'_4 , p''_4).

According to (4.9), we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \sum_p \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}) = \frac{1}{4} + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}).$$

On the other hand, by the intersection-theoretic formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{2}K_{\mathcal{X}}) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2}(-K_{\mathcal{X}})^2 + (K_{\mathcal{X}} - \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2)) \cdot (-K_{\mathcal{X}}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{7}{2} - 7 + 4 \right) = \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that we must have $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) = O(k^{-1})$, as required by Theorem 1.4.

Example 4.15. Consider the product test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, k\mathcal{L}_r) \cong (\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)), -\frac{k}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}})$ with parameter $r = \frac{1}{3}$. We have

$$\mathcal{W}_k = \mathcal{W}(k\mathcal{L}_r) = \frac{e^{-2\pi k}}{xx'} + x + x' + e^{\frac{2}{3}\pi k}xx'.$$

The mirror map does not involve quantum corrections, giving

$$\theta_k = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{W}_k, \quad \psi_k = x + x'.$$

We know that \mathcal{W}_k , θ_k and ψ_k extend to explicit anticanonical pencils on the toric del Pezzo $S_6 \subset \mathbb{P}[x_0 : \dots : x_6]$ given by the toric boundary $S_6 \cap \{x_0 = 0\}$ together with the anticanonical sections

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_k &= e^{-2\pi k}x_5 + x_1 + x_3 + e^{\frac{2}{3}\pi k}x_2, \\ \theta_k &= \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{W}_k, \\ \psi_k &= x_1 + x_3. \end{aligned}$$

The only torus-fixed points of S_6 contained in the base locus of \mathcal{W}_k are $p_3 = C_3 \cap C_4$ and $p_5 = C_5 \cap C_6$. There are torus-fixed points $p'_3 := T_{p_3}C_3$, $p''_3 := T_{p_3}C_4$ of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{Bl}_{p_3, p_5} S_6 \rightarrow S_6$ mapping to p_3 . The values of $\tilde{\theta}$, $\tilde{\psi}$ at p'_3 , p''_3 can be computed by taking the limit along $[x_3 : 1] \in C_3$ as $x_3 \rightarrow 0$, respectively $[1 : x_5] \in C_4$ as $x_5 \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, there are torus-fixed points $p'_5 := T_{p_5}C_5$, $p''_5 := T_{p_5}C_6$ of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ mapping to p_5 , and the values of $\tilde{\theta}$, $\tilde{\psi}$ at p'_5 , p''_5 can be computed by taking the limit along $[x_5 : 1] \in C_5$ as $x_5 \rightarrow 0$, respectively $[x_1 : 1] \in C_6$ as $x_1 \rightarrow 0$.

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}|_p &\equiv \frac{1}{3}, \\ \tilde{\psi}|_{p_i} &= 1, \quad p_i = p_2, p'_3, p''_3, p_5, p_6, \\ \tilde{\psi}|_{p_i} &= 0, \quad p_i = p_1, p'_5, p''_5, p_4, p'_5, \\ \tilde{\theta} \left(\frac{nc}{n+1} \tilde{\theta} - 1 + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p &= \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\frac{1}{3}c_1(\mathbb{P}^1)) \cdot (c_1(\mathbb{P}^1))}{(\frac{1}{3}c_1(\mathbb{P}^1))^2} \frac{1}{3} - 1 + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p = \frac{1}{3} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p. \end{aligned}$$

The divisors along which $\tilde{\psi} \equiv 1$ are the proper transforms of C_3, C_6 , contained in the central fibres of $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_1}, \mathcal{X}^{\vee, v_2}$ respectively.

Computing in local coordinates as in the previous example we also find $\Omega_0|_{p_i} = -1, \text{Res}(\nabla_{\mathcal{W}_k})|_{p_i} = -1$ at all torus-fixed points (including p'_3, p''_3, p'_5, p''_5).

According to (4.9), we have

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \sum_p \frac{1}{3} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \tilde{\psi} \right) |_p + \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) + O(k^{-1}).$$

On the other hand, since \mathcal{X} is a product, we know that $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -\frac{1}{3}K_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$. This shows that we must have $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{W}_k) = O(k^{-1})$, as required by Theorem 1.4.

Example 4.16. Following Example 4.9 for $X = \text{Bl}_p \mathbb{P}^2$, we have *singular* total spaces of test configurations $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, i}, i = 1, \dots, 4$, for the *orbifold* T_{P° “mirror” to X (i.e. the toric, singular intersection of two quadrics in \mathbb{P}^4), interchanged by a natural symmetry of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-kK_{\mathcal{X}})$ (compatible with all our constructions), $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, 1} \cong \mathcal{X}^{\vee, 2}, \mathcal{X}^{\vee, 3} \cong \mathcal{X}^{\vee, 4}$. Assuming that the stationary phase approximation holds for $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}}(-kK_{\mathcal{X}})$ on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \tilde{T}_{(P^\circ)^\circ}$, Theorem 1.4 provides smooth twisted formal test configurations $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$ (i.e. without positivity conditions on $[\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]$) such that

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -K_{\mathcal{X}}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{DF}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i]) + O(k^{-1}).$$

By choosing $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee, i}, [\eta_k^i], [\xi_k^i])$ appropriately and taking some limits in $H^{1,1}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee, i})$, we expect that this equality also induces the identity

$$0 > \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, -K_{\mathcal{X}}) = 2(\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, 1}, [\hat{\eta}_k^1], [\hat{\xi}_k^1]) + \text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, 3}, [\hat{\eta}_k^3], [\hat{\xi}_k^3])) + O(k^{-1}),$$

where $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, j}, [\hat{\eta}_k^j], [\hat{\xi}_k^j]), j = 1, 2$ are defined by the usual intersection-theoretic formula on the normal varieties $\mathcal{X}^{\vee, j}$. In particular, at least one of $(\mathcal{X}^{\vee, j}, [\hat{\eta}_k^j], [\hat{\xi}_k^j])$ “destabilises” the orbifold T_{P° .

References

- [1] X. Chen and J. Cheng. On the constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics (II)—Existence results. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 34(4):937–1009, 2021.
- [2] T. Coates, A. Corti, H. Iritani, and H.-H. Tseng. Hodge-theoretic mirror symmetry for toric stacks. *J. Differential Geom.*, 114(1):41–115, 2020.
- [3] A. Corradini. Equivariant localization in the theory of Z -stability for Kähler manifolds. *Internat. J. Math.*, 35(7):Paper No. 2450026, 29, 2024.
- [4] M. Corrêa and M. Rodríguez. Residue formula for Morita-Futaki-Bott invariant on orbifolds. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 354(11):1109–1113, 2016.

- [5] T. Delcroix, L. Heubeger, and S. Zimmermann. K-Stability, Birational Geometry and Mirror Symmetry. *Oberwolfach Rep.*, 21(1):827–870, 2024.
- [6] R. Dervan. Stability conditions in geometric invariant theory (appendix by Andrés Ibáñez Núñez). arXiv:2207.04766 [math.AG].
- [7] R. Dervan. Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (15):4728–4783, 2016.
- [8] R. Dervan. Stability conditions for polarised varieties. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 11:Paper No. e104, 57, 2023.
- [9] S. K. Donaldson. Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties. *J. Differential Geom.*, 62(2):289–349, 2002.
- [10] S. K. Donaldson. Constant scalar curvature metrics on toric surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(1):83–136, 2009.
- [11] R. Hotta, K. Takeuchi, and T. Tanisaki. *D-modules, perverse sheaves, and representation theory*, volume 236 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2008. Translated from the 1995 Japanese edition by Takeuchi.
- [12] J. Huh. The maximum likelihood degree of a very affine variety. *Compos. Math.*, 149(8):1245–1266, 2013.
- [13] H. Iritani. Quantum D-modules of toric varieties and oscillatory integrals. In *Handbook for mirror symmetry of Calabi-Yau & Fano manifolds*, volume 47 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 131–147. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, [2020] ©2020.
- [14] M. Kreuzer and H. Skarke. Classification of reflexive polyhedra in three dimensions. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2(4):853–871, 1998.
- [15] E. Legendre. Localizing the Donaldson-Futaki invariant. *Internat. J. Math.*, 32(8):Paper No. 2150055, 23, 2021.
- [16] S. Li and H. Wen. On the L^2 -Hodge theory of Landau-Ginzburg models. *Adv. Math.*, 396:Paper No. 108165, 48, 2022.
- [17] S.-J. Matsubara-Heo. Localization formulas of cohomology intersection numbers. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 75(3):909–940, 2023.
- [18] K. Matsumoto. Intersection numbers for logarithmic k -forms. *Osaka J. Math.*, 35(4):873–893, 1998.
- [19] Y. Odaka. The Calabi conjecture and K -stability. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (10):2272–2288, 2012.
- [20] Y. Odaka. A generalization of the Ross-Thomas slope theory. *Osaka J. Math.*, 50(1):171–185, 2013.

- [21] V. Przyjalkowski. Calabi-Yau compactifications of toric Landau-Ginzburg models for smooth Fano threefolds. *Sb. Math.*, 7(208):992–1013, 2017.
- [22] J. Ross and R. Thomas. An obstruction to the existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 72(3):429–466, 03 2006.
- [23] C. Sabbah. Duality for Landau-Ginzburg models. arXiv:2212.07745 [math.AG].
- [24] Y. Sano. A polar dual to the momentum of toric Fano manifolds. *Complex Manifolds*, 8(1):230–246, 2021.
- [25] C. Scarpa and J. Stoppa. Special representatives of complexified Kähler classes. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 30(4):Paper No. 64, 45, 2024.
- [26] J. Stoppa. K -stability and large complex structure limits. arXiv:2309.05291 [math.AG].
- [27] J. Stoppa. Twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics and Kähler slope stability. *J. Differential Geom.*, 83(3):663–691, 2009.
- [28] J. Stoppa. Unstable blowups. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 19(1):1–17, 2010.
- [29] G. Székelyhidi. *An introduction to extremal Kähler metrics*, volume 152 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [30] G. Tian. *Canonical metrics in Kähler geometry*. Birkhäuser, 2012.
- [31] X. Wang. Height and GIT weight. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 19(4):909–926, 2012.
- [32] X.-J. Wang and X. Zhu. Kähler-Ricci solitons on toric manifolds with positive first Chern class. *Adv. Math.*, 188(1):87–103, 2004.

SISSA, via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy
 Institute for Geometry and Physics (IGAP), via Beirut 2, 34151 Trieste, Italy
 jstoppa@sissa.it