

ON THE COUPLED DING STABILITY AND THE YAU–TIAN–DONALDSON CORRESPONDENCE FOR FANO MANIFOLDS

KENTO FUJITA AND YOSHINORI HASHIMOTO

ABSTRACT. We interpret the coupled Ding semistability and the reduced coupled uniform Ding stability of log Fano pairs in the notion of coupled stability thresholds and reduced coupled stability thresholds. As a corollary, we solve a modified version of the conjecture by Hultgren and Witt Nyström for coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Torus actions on polarized varieties	3
3.	The sum of test configurations	13
4.	The sum of filtrations	19
5.	The sum of non-Archimedean metrics	22
6.	The coupled Ding invariant	25
7.	The coupled stability threshold	37
8.	On the conjecture of Hultgren and Witt Nyström	44
	Appendix A. On semiample divisors	55
	References	58

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us consider an n -dimensional Fano manifold X over the complex numbers \mathbb{C} . Take ample \mathbb{Q} -divisors L_1, \dots, L_k with $-K_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L_1 + \dots + L_k$, and Kähler metrics $\omega_i \in c_1(L_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Following Hultgren–Witt Nyström [HWN19], we say that $(\omega_i)_{i=1}^k$ are *coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics* (cKE metrics) if

$$\operatorname{Ric} \omega_1 = \dots = \operatorname{Ric} \omega_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \omega_i$$

holds. Obviously, when $k = 1$, this is nothing but the Kähler–Einstein metric on a Fano manifold X . Hultgren and Witt Nyström conjectured [HWN19, Conjecture 1.16] that the existence of cKE metrics is equivalent to an algebraic stability condition. In fact, they conjectured that the condition should be the K-polystability or the Ding polystability of $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$. However, in their definition of K-stability/Ding stability, they assumed that the total spaces of test configurations of (X, L_i) are isomorphic to each other [HWN19, Definition 1.3]. Later, the second author [Has21] observed that we should consider test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) such that the total spaces \mathcal{X}_i are different to each other in general, and defined the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})/\mathbb{A}^1$ generated by the \mathbb{C}^* -actions of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ [Has21, Definition 18], and then introduced the coupled Ding invariant of

Date: December 6, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14J45; Secondary 32Q20, 14L24, 53C55.

Key words and phrases. K-stability, Fano varieties.

$\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ from $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})/\mathbb{A}^1$ [Has21, Definition 19]. He conjectured [Has21, Remark 11] that, for a Fano manifold X (without any assumption of the automorphism group of X), the existence of cKE metrics should be equivalent to an equivariant version of the *uniform coupled Ding stability*, which he did not define precisely.

On the other hand, assuming that the automorphism group of X is finite, Kewei Zhang showed [Zha23, Remark 5.3] that the existence of cKE metrics follows from the condition

$$\delta\left(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) > 1,$$

where $\delta\left(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k\right)$ is the *coupled stability threshold* (see [Fuj24] for the basic theory, see also [RTZ21]). Therefore, it is important to see the relationship between the coupled stability threshold and the coupled Ding stability to consider the modified version (in the sense of [Has21]) of the conjecture of Hultgren and Witt Nyström.

The purpose of the article is to see the relationship between (a reduced version of) the uniform coupled Ding stability and the coupled stability thresholds for log Fano pairs, and also the cKE metrics for Fano manifolds. Let (X, Δ) be a *log Fano pair*, i.e., (X, Δ) is a projective klt pair with Δ an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is ample. Fix an algebraic torus $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ and take \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles L_1, \dots, L_k on X such that $L := \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$ coincides with $-(K_X + \Delta)$ with the standard \mathbb{T} -linearization. As in the standard textbook [Xu24, §2.2], we firstly introduce the coupled weighted barycenter $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} := \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}$, and define the notion of $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ *with vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters* as $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. We also define the *sum configuration* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of the test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) (see Definition 3.2). It is worth mentioning that, even when all constituents \mathcal{X}_i are normal, the sum \mathcal{X} may not be normal in general (see §A). Moreover, the sum configuration coincides with the one generated by the \mathbb{C}^* -actions of the given test configurations (see Proposition 3.11). We also define the *sum filtration* of given filtrations in §4, which is a natural generalization of sum configurations. Discussions from the point of view of the non-Archimedean metrics are given in §5. In §6, we introduce the coupled Ding invariant, which turns out to be the same as the one in [Has21, Definition 19], and the coupled J-norm for test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ of (X, L_i) . Moreover, we introduce the notion of *\mathbb{T} -equivariant coupled Ding semistability* and *\mathbb{T} -reduced uniform coupled Ding stability* (see Definition 6.3). In §7, as a generalization of the reduced stability thresholds [Li22b, XZ20] and the coupled stability thresholds [RTZ21, Fuj24], we introduce the *\mathbb{T} -reduced coupled stability threshold*

$$\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}\left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k\right)$$

of $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ (see Definition 7.2). The relationship to the cKE metrics is discussed in §8.

Here is the main result of this article.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a Fano manifold over the complex number field \mathbb{C} , with $\Delta = 0$, and let $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}_0(X)$ be a maximal torus with the maximal compact subgroup $\mathbb{T}_r \subset \mathbb{T}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.
- (2) $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters and $\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) > 1$.
- (3) $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ admits a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metric.

In the above and throughout this article, $\text{Aut}_0(X)$ stands for the identity component of $\text{Aut}(X)$. Note that the proof of Theorem 1.1 for the case when $\text{Aut}(X)$ is finite can be simplified significantly, since essentially it reduces to proving (1) \implies (2); (2) \implies (3) was already proved in this case by Kewei Zhang [Zha23, Remark 5.3], and the proof of (3) \implies (1), given in Theorem 8.5, is much easier than the converse.

Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 stated below. The first result establishes (1) \iff (2) and holds for any log Fano pairs over any algebraically closed field of characteristic zero.

Theorem 1.2 (see Corollary 7.10 in detail). (1) *The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is coupled Ding semistable.
 - (ii) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable.
 - (iii) $\delta(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq 1$ holds.
- (2) *If $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable, then $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ must be a maximal torus.*
- (3) *The following are equivalent for a maximal torus $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$:*
- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.
 - (ii) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters and

$$\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) > 1$$

holds.

For the proof of Theorem 1.2, we *heavily* depend on the recent progress in K-stability of log Fano pairs. In fact, the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.2 is very close to the construction of the arguments in [Xu24]. We refer the reader to the new book [Xu24] for the terminologies used in this article.

Furthermore, relying on the recent progress in the variational methods for Kähler–Einstein and constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics such as [BBJ21, BJ22, Dar19, DZ24, GZ17, Li22a, Li22b, Zha24], we solve a modified version of the conjecture [HWN19, Conjecture 1.16] by Hultgren and Witt Nyström in the affirmative, establishing (1) \iff (3) in Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be a Fano manifold over the complex number field \mathbb{C} , with $\Delta = 0$, and let $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}_0(X)$ be a maximal torus with the maximal compact subgroup $\mathbb{T}_r \subset \mathbb{T}$. Then $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ admits a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metric if and only if $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.*

In this paper, we only consider a torus $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ which is often assumed to be maximal. We believe that the results in this paper can be generalized to the situation where we consider any connected reductive subgroup \mathbb{G} of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, as Chi Li [Li22b] proves results for the \mathbb{G} -reduced uniform Ding stability and the \mathbb{G} -reduced stability threshold for the Kähler–Einstein case ($k = 1$). We do not pursue this direction any further in this paper as the problem seems nontrivial, particularly since [Li22b] uses the \mathbb{G} -equivariant minimal model program which does not seem readily extendable to our situation.

Throughout the rest of this article (except for §8), we work over any algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic zero.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Chenyang Xu who wrote the nice book [Xu24]. The authors thank Chi Li for answering our questions on Remark 2.9. K.F. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K03269, Royal Society International Collaboration Award ICA\1\23109 and Asian Young Scientist Fellowship. Y.H. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K03120 and 24K00524, and part of this work was carried out when he was visiting Centre de Recherche Mathématique as a CRM-Simons Scholar supported by the CRM and the Simons Foundation.

2. TORUS ACTIONS ON POLARIZED VARIETIES

We recall the results in [Li22b, §2–3] and [Xu24, §6]. In this section, we fix an n -dimensional projective klt pair (X, Δ) (with Δ an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor), an algebraic torus

$\mathbb{T} \simeq \mathbb{G}_m^p$ with $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, an injection $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, and a \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle L on X , i.e., there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that rL is a \mathbb{T} -linearized ample line bundle on X . As in [Xu24, §2.2.1], we set

$$\begin{aligned} M(\mathbb{T}) &:= \text{Hom}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{G}_m), & M_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{T}) &:= M(\mathbb{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{K}, \\ N(\mathbb{T}) &:= \text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{T}), & N_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{T}) &:= N(\mathbb{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{K} \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbb{K} \in \{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}\}$. Set

$$R := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} R_m := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(X, mL),$$

and let

$$R_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} R_{m,\alpha}$$

be the weight decomposition of R_m , i.e.,

$$R_{m,\alpha} := \{s \in R_m \mid \xi(t) \cdot s = t^{(\alpha, \xi)} \cdot s \ (\forall \xi \in N(\mathbb{T}), \forall t \in \mathbb{G}_m)\},$$

as in [Xu24, (2.22)].

Definition 2.1 ([Li22b, §2.4], [XZ20, §A], [Xu24, §6.1]). Let $\text{Val}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$ be the set of all \mathbb{T} -invariant valuations on X , and let us set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}} &:= \{v \in \text{Val}_X^{\mathbb{T}} \mid A_{X, \Delta}(v) < \infty\}, \\ \text{QM}_X^{\mathbb{T}} &:= \{v \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}} \mid v : \text{quasi-monomial}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{X, \Delta}(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the log discrepancy of (X, Δ) along v . For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, as in [Xu24, Definition-Lemma 6.15], we can define $\text{wt}_{\xi} \in \text{QM}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$. Moreover, for any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$, we can define the ξ -twist $v_{\xi} \in \text{Val}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$ of v . We know that, if $v \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}}$ (resp., if $v \in \text{QM}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$), then we have $v_{\xi} \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}}$ (resp., $v_{\xi} \in \text{QM}_X^{\mathbb{T}}$). We set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Val}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}} &:= \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}} \setminus \{\text{wt}_{\xi} \mid \xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})\}, \\ \text{QM}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}} &:= \text{QM}_X^{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \{\text{wt}_{\xi} \mid \xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2 ([Xu24, §2.2.1]). (1) For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_m^L &:= \{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T}) \mid R_{m,\alpha} \neq 0\}, \\ \mathbf{P}_m^L &:= \text{Conv}(\Lambda_m^L) \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}), \\ \mathbf{P}^L &:= \text{Conv}\left(\bigcup_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{P}_m^L\right). \end{aligned}$$

As in [Xu24, Lemma 2.33], the set \mathbf{P}^L is a rational polytope of maximal dimension. Moreover, for any sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have $\mathbf{P}^L = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{P}_m^L$.

(2) The \mathbb{T} -equivariant Duistermaat–Heckman measure $d\nu_{\text{DH}, \mathbb{T}}$ on $\mathbf{P}^L \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ is defined to be the weak limit of

$$d\rho_{m, \mathbb{T}} := \frac{1}{m^n} \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \dim R_{m,\alpha} \cdot \delta_{\frac{\alpha}{m}}.$$

The weighted barycenter $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^L \in M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ of \mathbf{P}^L is defined to be

$$\alpha_{\text{bc}}^L := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m \dim R_m} \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \dim R_{m,\alpha} \cdot \alpha = \frac{n!}{\text{vol}(L)} \int_{\mathbf{P}^L} \alpha d\nu_{\text{DH}, \mathbb{T}}.$$

As in [Xu24, Lemmas 2.33 and 2.35], we know that $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^L \in M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ with $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^L \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P}^L)$.

Definition 2.3 ([Xu24, §2.2.1]). (1) For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L$, we set

$$I_{m,\alpha} := \text{Image} (R_{m,\alpha} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X(-mL) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X).$$

Note that the graded \mathcal{O}_X -algebra

$$\bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} I_{m,\alpha}$$

is finitely generated. For any $v \in \text{Val}_X$, we set

$$v(I_{\bullet(m,\alpha)}) := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{v(I_{km,k\alpha})}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v(I_{km,k\alpha})}{k}.$$

From the above finite generation, we have

$$v(I_{\bullet(m,\alpha)}) = \frac{v(I_{km,k\alpha})}{k}$$

holds for any sufficiently divisible $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

(2) For any $v \in \text{Val}_X$, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_v: \mathbf{P}^L \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\ \alpha &\mapsto \frac{v(I_{\bullet(k,k\alpha)})}{k} \end{aligned}$$

for a sufficiently divisible $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$. By [ELMNP06, Proposition 4.7], the above function uniquely extends to a convex, continuous and rationally piecewise affine function

$$\gamma_v: \mathbf{P}^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

More precisely, \mathbf{P}^L can be covered by finitely many rational polytopes C_λ such that $\gamma_v|_{C_\lambda}$ is affine for each C_λ .

(3) (cf. [Li22b, §2.5.3]) Take any $v \in \text{Val}_X$ and $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$.

- For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we set

$$\theta_{\xi,m}^L(v) := \frac{1}{m} \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - v(I_{m,\alpha})\}.$$

- Set

$$\theta_{\xi}^L(v) := \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha)\}.$$

The maximum of the right hand side can be attained by an element in $\mathbf{P}^L \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ since γ_v is rationally piecewise affine. By the following Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\theta_{\xi}^L(v) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{\xi,m}^L(v).$$

Lemma 2.4. *We have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{\xi,m}^L(v) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha)\}.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \theta_{\xi,m}^L(v) &= \sup_m \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \left\{ -\left\langle \frac{\alpha}{m}, \xi \right\rangle - \frac{1}{m} v(I_{m,\alpha}) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha)\} = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $\alpha_0 \in \mathbf{P}^L \cap M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ and a sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha)\} &= -\langle \alpha_0, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha_0), \\ m\alpha_0 &\in \Lambda_m^L, \\ \gamma_v(\alpha_0) &= \frac{1}{m}v(I_{m,m\alpha_0}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\theta_{\xi,m}^L(v) \geq \frac{1}{m}(-\langle m\alpha_0, \xi \rangle - v(I_{m,m\alpha_0})) = -\langle \alpha_0, \xi \rangle - \gamma_v(\alpha_0).$$

Thus the assertion follows. \square

Definition 2.5 ([Xu24, §6.1.1]). A \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F} on R in this article is defined to be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant linearly bounded and graded multiplicative filtration on R in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 3.14 and §6.1.1]. For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$, we denote the restriction of \mathcal{F} to $R_{m,\alpha}$ by \mathcal{F} again. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}^x R_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{F}^x R_{m,\alpha}.$$

For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$I_{(m,\alpha;x)}(\mathcal{F}) := \text{Image}(\mathcal{F}^x R_{m,\alpha} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X(-mL) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X)$$

and

$$I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}) := \sum_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} I_{(m,\alpha;x)}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Image}(\mathcal{F}^x R_m \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X(-mL) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X).$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$ be the (\mathbb{G}_m -invariant) fractional ideal sheaf on $X_{\mathbb{A}^1} := X \times \mathbb{A}_t^1$ defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}) := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m,\lambda)}(\mathcal{F}).$$

We also define the following:

- (1) For any $C \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{[C]}$ be the C -shift of \mathcal{F} , i.e., $\mathcal{F}_{[C]}^x R_m := \mathcal{F}^{x-Cm} R_m$.
- (2) For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, let \mathcal{F}_{ξ} be the ξ -twist of \mathcal{F} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi}^x R_m := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{F}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha}.$$

It is obvious from the definition that, both $\mathcal{F}_{[C]}$ and \mathcal{F}_{ξ} are \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtrations of R . Moreover, we have $\mathcal{F}_{[C],\xi} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi,[C]}$.

Example 2.6. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be any \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L) in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 2.3 and Remark 2.20]. Then, as in [Xu24, Example 3.34], after replacing $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ if necessary, we get the \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}$ on R associated to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$. For any $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$, the ξ -twisted test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_{\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{\xi})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ as in [Xu24, Example 6.9] satisfies that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_{\xi},\mathcal{L}_{\xi}} = (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}})_{\xi}$ by [Xu24, Lemma 6.10].

Lemma 2.7. Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R and take any $v \in \text{Val}_X$ and $\lambda \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}))$, where λ_{\max} is as in [Xu24, Definition 3.20]. Then, the sequence

$$\left\{ x \mapsto \frac{v(I_{(m;mx)}(\mathcal{F}))}{m} \right\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$$

of functions over $x \in (-\infty, \lambda]$ uniformly converges to the function $x \mapsto v(I_{\bullet}^{(x)}(\mathcal{F}))$, where $I_{\bullet}^{(x)}(\mathcal{F})$ is the sequence of graded ideal sheaves on X defined by $I_m^{(x)}(\mathcal{F}) := I_{(m;mx)}(\mathcal{F})$ (see [Xu24, Definition 3.42]).

Proof. Set $f_m(x) := v(I_{(m;mx)}(\mathcal{F}))/m$ and $f(x) := v\left(I_{\bullet}^{(x)}(\mathcal{F})\right)$. We know that, over $x \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}))$, the functions $f_m(x)$ and $f(x)$ are *non-decreasing* functions. Moreover, the function $f(x)$ is *continuous* since it is convex. The sequence of functions $\{f_m(x)\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ pointwise converges to $f(x)$. Moreover, there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_m(x) = f(x) = 0$ for any $x < a$. Thus it is enough to show the uniform convergence over the area $[a, \lambda]$, but then the assertion is well-known: if a sequence of monotone functions over $[a, \lambda]$ pointwise converges to a continuous function, then the convergence is uniform. \square

Proposition 2.8 (cf. [Li22b, Proposition 3.3]). *Take any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{\leq \infty, \mathbb{T}}$. Then the value $\theta_{\xi}^L(v)$ in Definition 2.3 coincides with the one in [Li22b, (111), (121)] (see Remark 2.9). In particular, if $L = -(K_X + \Delta)$ with the standard \mathbb{T} -linearization, then we have the equality*

$$\theta_{\xi}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}(v) = A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) - A_{X, \Delta}(v).$$

Proof. We follow the notation in [Li22b]. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}$ be the trivial filtration on R (in the sense of [Xu24, Example 3.21]). Let $\phi^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}$ be the non-Archimedean potential associated with $\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}, -\xi}$ in the sense of [BJ22]. As in [Li22b, Proposition 3.9], we have

$$\phi^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi_m^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v),$$

where we have

$$\phi_m^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v) = \frac{1}{m} \max_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R} \\ s \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}, -\xi}^x R_m}} \{x - v(s)\}$$

by [Li22b, (98), (100)]. Since

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}, -\xi}^x R_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T}); x \leq -\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m, \alpha},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_m^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v) &= \frac{1}{m} \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ x - v \left(\sum_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T}), x \leq -\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} I_{m, \alpha} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T}); x \leq -\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} \{x - v(I_{m, \alpha})\} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - v(I_{m, \alpha})\} = \theta_{\xi, m}^L(v). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion follows by Lemma 2.4. \square

Remark 2.9. In our terminologies of group actions, on the left hand side of the equations (111), (121), (130), (131) in [Li22b], we must replace ξ with $-\xi$. For example, the equation (111) should be replaced by

$$\phi_{(\mathcal{Z}_{-\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{-\xi})}(w) = \phi_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{L})}(w_{\xi}) + \theta_{\xi}^L(w).$$

Let us consider a simple example. Let us assume that $L = -(K_X + \Delta)$ with the standard \mathbb{T} -linearization for simplicity. For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we know that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{wt}_{\xi}} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}, \xi, [\theta_{\xi}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}(v_{\text{triv}})]}$$

by [Xu24, Lemma 6.22], where v_{triv} is the trivial valuation and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}$ is the trivial filtration on R . Thus, by [Xu24, Example 6.13], we must have

$$\theta_{\xi}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}(v_{\text{triv}}) = -\lambda_{\mathbf{P}}(\xi),$$

where

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{P}}(\xi) := \min_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\}.$$

On the other hand, by (the corrected version of) [Li22b, (121)] shows that

$$\phi^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v_{\text{triv}}) = \theta_{\xi}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}(v_{\text{triv}}).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2.8, we have

$$\phi^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, -\xi}(v_{\text{triv}}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^{-(K_X + \Delta)}} \{-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle - v_{\text{triv}}(I_{m, \alpha})\} = -\lambda_{\mathbf{P}}(\xi).$$

We note that

$$\phi^{\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}, \xi}(v_{\text{triv}}) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^{-(K_X + \Delta)}} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\},$$

which is different from $-\lambda_{\mathbf{P}}(\xi)$ in general.

Corollary 2.10 (cf. [Li22b, Proposition 3.3], [Xu24, Lemma 6.21]). *For any $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$, let $\phi_{\xi}: \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ be the one-parameter subgroup of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ defined by $-\xi$. Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\xi}: X \times \mathbb{G}_m &\rightarrow X \times \mathbb{G}_m \\ (x, t) &\mapsto (\phi_{\xi}(t) \cdot x, t). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider a birational model resolving σ_{ξ} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{W} & \\ \mu_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \mu_2 \\ X_{\mathbb{A}^1} & \overset{\sigma_{\xi}}{\dashrightarrow} & X_{\mathbb{A}^1}. \end{array}$$

For any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{< \infty, \mathbb{T}}$, let $G(v)$ be the Gauss extension of v in the sense of [Li22b, (93)], which is a valuation on the left hand side of $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Then we have

$$\theta_{\xi}^L(v) = G(v) (\mu_2^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - \mu_1^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1}).$$

Proof. Follows immediately from [Li22b, (94), (121)]. \square

Corollary 2.11 (cf. [Xu24, Lemma 6.22]). *For any $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$, $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $s \in R_{m, \alpha} \setminus \{0\}$, $v \in \text{Val}_X^{< \infty, \mathbb{T}}$ and $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$v_{\xi}(s) = v(s) + \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle + m\theta_{\xi}^L(v).$$

In particular, we have $\mathcal{F}_{v_{\xi}} = (\mathcal{F}_v)_{\xi, [\theta_{\xi}^L(v)]}$.

Proof. The proof is same as the proof of [Xu24, Lemma 6.22]. When $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$, we have the assertion by using Corollary 2.10 and the argument in [Xu24, Lemma 6.22]. For any $e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we know that $\theta_{e\xi}^L(ev) = e\theta_{\xi}^L(v)$ and $e(v_{\xi}) = (ev)_{e\xi}$, we get the assertion when $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$. Thus we get the assertion when $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ by the continuities. \square

Corollary 2.12 (cf. [Xu24, Lemma 6.23]). *For any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{< \infty, \mathbb{T}}$ and $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$S_L(v_{\xi}) = S_L(v) + \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^L, \xi \rangle + \theta_{\xi}^L(v),$$

where S_L is the S -invariant [Xu24, (4.42)].

Proof. The proof is same as the proof of [Xu24, Lemma 6.23]. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_L(v_{\xi}) &= S_L(\mathcal{F}_{v_{\xi}}) = S_L\left((\mathcal{F}_v)_{\xi, [\theta_{\xi}^L(v)]}\right) \\ &= \theta_{\xi}^L(v) + S_L\left((\mathcal{F}_v)_{\xi}\right) = \theta_{\xi}^L(v) + S_L(\mathcal{F}_v) + \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^L, \xi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Corollary 2.11, the third equality follows from the obvious equality $S_L(\mathcal{F}_{[C]}) = S_L(\mathcal{F}) + C$, and the last equality follows from [Xu24, Lemma 6.4]. \square

Recall the following notations in [Xu24, §3.4]:

Definition 2.13 ([Xu24, §3.4]). Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R .

- (1) [Xu24, Definitions 3.2 and 3.16] We say that \mathcal{F} is a \mathbb{Z} -valued filtration if $\mathcal{F}^x R_m = \mathcal{F}^{\lceil x \rceil} R_m$ holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F} on R , let us define the \mathbb{Z} -valued filtration $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}^x R_m := \mathcal{F}^{\lceil x \rceil} R_m$.
- (2) [Xu24, Definition 3.55] A sequence of \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtrations $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ on R is said to be an *approximating sequence of \mathcal{F}* if, for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have:
 - (i) $\mathcal{F}_{(m)} \subset \mathcal{F}$,
 - (ii) $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^x R_m = \mathcal{F}^x R_m$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and
 - (iii) for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^x R_{ms} = \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_s \geq x} \mathcal{F}^{x_1} R_m \cdots \mathcal{F}^{x_s} R_m.$$

By [Xu24, Definition-Lemma 3.56], for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F} on R , there exists a (\mathbb{T} -equivariant) approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 2.14. *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R . Set $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Then we have*

$$S_L(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = S_L(\mathcal{G}_{\xi}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}_{\xi}).$$

Proof. Take any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. From the definition, we have $\mathcal{G}_{\xi}^{mx} R_m \subset \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{mx} R_m$. On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, if we take $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with $m\varepsilon > 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{\xi}^{m(x-\varepsilon)} R_m &= \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \mathcal{F}^{\lceil m(x-\varepsilon) - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle \rceil} R_{m,\alpha} \\ &\supset \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \mathcal{F}^{mx - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{mx} R_m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get the assertion. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R , and let $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ be an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} .*

- (1) *For any $C \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{(m),[C]}$ be the C -shift of $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$. Then $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m),[C]}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of $\mathcal{F}_{[C]}$.*
- (2) *For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, let $\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}$ be the ξ -twist of $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$. Then $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F}_{ξ} .*

Proof. (1) is trivial. We only see (2). Observe the following:

- (i) $\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}^x R_{m',\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m',\alpha} \subset \mathcal{F}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m',\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^x R_{m',\alpha}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}^x R_{m,\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha} = \mathcal{F}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^x R_{m,\alpha}$.
- (iii) For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}^x R_{ms,\alpha} &= \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{x-\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{ms,\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_s = \alpha}} \sum_{y_1 + \dots + y_s \geq x - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} \mathcal{F}^{y_1} R_{m,\alpha_1} \cdots \mathcal{F}^{y_s} R_{m,\alpha_s} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_s = \alpha}} \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_s \geq x} \mathcal{F}^{x_1 - \langle \alpha_1, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha_1} \cdots \mathcal{F}^{x_s - \langle \alpha_s, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha_s} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_s = \alpha}} \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_s \geq x} \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{x_1} R_{m,\alpha_1} \cdots \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{x_s} R_{m,\alpha_s}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion (2) follows. \square

We recall the following result:

Lemma 2.16 ([Xu24, Theorems 3.58 and 3.60]). *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R , and let $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ be an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} . Then we have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_L(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) = S_L(\mathcal{F}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Definition 2.17. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L) . For any $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let us set

$$(\mathcal{X}^{(e)}, \mathcal{L}^{(e)}) := (\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathbb{A}^1, \pi_e} \mathbb{A}^1, \pi_e^* \mathcal{L}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_e: \mathbb{A}^1 &\rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1 \\ t &\mapsto t^e. \end{aligned}$$

The $(\mathcal{X}^{(e)}, \mathcal{L}^{(e)})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is also a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L) . Moreover, let $\nu: \mathcal{X}^{(\overline{e})} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(e)}$ be the normalization and set $\mathcal{L}^{(\overline{e})} := \nu^* \mathcal{L}^{(e)}$. The $(\mathcal{X}^{(\overline{e})}, \mathcal{L}^{(\overline{e})})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is obviously a \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configuration of (X, L) .

Definition 2.18 ([Xu24, Definitions 2.8, 3.40 and 6.28]). Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R . Let

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{F}) := \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) - S_L(\mathcal{F})$$

be the **J**-norm of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$. If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L) , then we set $\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) := \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}})$. As in [Xu24, Definitions 2.8 and 3.40 and Proposition 3.41], $\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ can be expressed in terms of intersection numbers [Xu24, (2.8)]. If $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$, then, by [Xu24, Definition 6.28], we have the equality

$$\mathbf{J}\left((\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}})_{\xi}\right) = \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{J}\left((\mathcal{X}^{(e)})_{e\xi}, (\mathcal{L}^{(e)})_{e\xi}\right),$$

where $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is any positive integer with $e\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$. We set $\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{\xi}) := \mathbf{J}\left((\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}})_{\xi}\right)$. If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is the trivial test configuration of (X, L) (in the sense of [Xu24, Example 2.5]), then we write $\mathbf{J}(X_{\xi}, L_{\xi}) := \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{\xi})$.

Lemma 2.19. *For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$\mathbf{J}(X_{\xi}, L_{\xi}) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\} - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^L, \xi \rangle.$$

Proof. We may assume that $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$. Note that $S_L(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = S_L(\mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}) + \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^L, \xi \rangle = \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^L, \xi \rangle$ by [Xu24, Lemma 6.4]. Moreover, we know that $\lambda_{\max} = T$, the T -invariant (see [Xu24, Lemma 3.22]). Since

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi}^x R_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{F}_{\text{triv}}^{x - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m, \alpha},$$

we get

$$T_m(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = \frac{1}{m} \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\}.$$

Thus we get $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\}$. \square

Definition 2.20 ([Xu24, Definition 3.62]). Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R . Take any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let

$$q_{(m)}: \mathcal{Y}_{(m)} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

be the normalized blowup along the fractional ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$ (see Definition 2.5), and let mE be the Cartier divisor on $\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}$ defined by the equation $q_{(m)}^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}}(-mE)$. (Since $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$ is a fractional ideal, the Cartier divisor mE may not be effective.) Set

$$\mathcal{M}_{(m)} := q_{(m)}^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - E,$$

where $L_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is the pullback of L under the projection $X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \rightarrow X$. By [Xu24, Lemma 3.61], the $\mathcal{M}_{(m)}$ is semiample over \mathbb{A}^1 . The ample model $(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of $(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)})$ over \mathbb{A}^1 is said to be the *normalized blowup test configuration along $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$* .

Proposition 2.21. *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{Z} -valued and \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R . For $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the normalized blowup test configuration along $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$.*

(1) *For any $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$, set*

$$\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})_\xi := \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}_\xi) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle)}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Then the ξ -twisted test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_{(m), \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{(m), \xi})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of $(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is equal to the normalized blowup test configuration along $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})_\xi$.

(2) *For any $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{G} on R , let us define the \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration $\mathcal{G}^{(e)}$ on R as*

$$\mathcal{G}^{(e), x} R_m := \mathcal{G}^{\lceil x/e \rceil} R_m$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then the test configuration $\left((\mathcal{X}_{(m)})^{\overline{(e)}}, (\mathcal{L}_{(m)})^{\overline{(e)}} \right) / \mathbb{A}^1$ (see Definition 2.17 for the notation) is equal to the normalized blowup test configuration along $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}^{(e)})$.

Proof. (1) is trivial from the definition of ξ -twisted test configurations. Let us show (2). For the morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_e: X_{\mathbb{A}^1} &\rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1} \\ (x, t) &\mapsto (x, t^e), \end{aligned}$$

we can directly check that $\pi_e^{-1} \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}^{(e)})$. Therefore, the assertion immediately follows by the universality of blowups. \square

Proposition 2.22. *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{Z} -valued and \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R , and let $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ be a \mathbb{Z} -valued approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} . For any $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)} := (\mathcal{F}_{(m)})^{(e)}$ be as in Proposition 2.21 (2). Then $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$.*

Proof. Observe the following:

(i) For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e), \lambda} R_{m'} = \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\lceil \lambda/e \rceil} R_{m'} \subset \mathcal{F}^{\lceil \lambda/e \rceil} R_{m'} = \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda} R_{m'}.$$

(ii) For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e), \lambda} R_m = \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\lceil \lambda/e \rceil} R_m = \mathcal{F}^{\lceil \lambda/e \rceil} R_m = \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda} R_m.$$

(iii) Note that $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)}$ is $e\mathbb{Z}$ -valued. For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\lambda \in e\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e), \lambda} R_{ms} &= \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{\lambda/e} R_{ms} = \sum_{\substack{\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_s = \lambda/e; \\ \mu_1, \dots, \mu_s \in \mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{F}^{\mu_1} R_m \dots \mathcal{F}^{\mu_s} R_m \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s = \lambda; \\ \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in e\mathbb{Z}}} \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda_1} R_m \dots \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda_s} R_m = \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s \geq \lambda; \\ \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \in \mathbb{R}}} \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda_1} R_m \dots \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda_s} R_m, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the assumption \mathcal{F} is \mathbb{Z} -valued, and the fourth equality follows from the fact $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$ is $e\mathbb{Z}$ -valued.

Thus the assertion follows. \square

We prepare the following lemmas:

Lemma 2.23 (see [Xu24, Proof of Theorem 3.52]). *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R , and let us take any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Set*

$$\mu := \mu(\mathcal{F}; \delta) := \sup \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(t)}(\mathcal{F})) \geq \delta\}$$

as in [Xu24, Definition 3.45], where $I_{\bullet}^{(t)}(\mathcal{F})$ is as in Lemma 2.7. If $\mu < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$, then we have $\delta = \text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}(\mathcal{F}))$. Moreover, there exists $v \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}}$ such that

- we have

$$\delta = \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v)}{v(I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}(\mathcal{F}))},$$

i.e., v computes the log canonical threshold, and

- satisfying that

$$\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{v, \left[\mu - \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v)}{\delta}\right]}.$$

Proof. The equality $\delta = \text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}(\mathcal{F}))$ follows by the completely same argument in the proof of [Xu24, Lemma 3.46]. Note that $I_{m; m\mu}(\mathcal{F})$ are \mathbb{T} -invariant ideals. By the equivariant version of [JM12, Theorem 7.3] (see also [BLXZ23, Remark 3.9]), there exists $v \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}}$ such that computing the log canonical threshold. The rest of the proof is completely same as the proof of [Xu24, Theorem 3.52]. \square

Lemma 2.24. *Let \mathcal{F} be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R , and let us take any $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.*

- (1) *Consider the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$ as in Proposition 2.21 (2). Then we have*

$$S_L(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}) = e \cdot S_L(\mathcal{F}), \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}) = e \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}), \quad \mu(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}) = e \cdot \mu(\mathcal{F}),$$

where $\mu(\bullet) := \mu(\bullet; 1)$ (see Lemma 2.23).

- (2) *Let us take $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} S_L\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= e \cdot S_L(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}), \\ \lambda_{\max}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= e \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}), \\ \mu\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= e \cdot \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (1) is trivial. We see (2). For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}^x R_{m, \alpha} &= \mathcal{F}^{\lceil (x - \langle \alpha, e\xi \rangle) / e \rceil} R_{m, \alpha} = \mathcal{F}^{\lceil x/e - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle \rceil} R_{m, \alpha}, \\ \left(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}\right)^x R_{m, \alpha} &= \mathcal{F}_{\xi}^{\lceil x/e \rceil} R_{m, \alpha} = \mathcal{F}^{\lceil x/e \rceil - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m, \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies that

$$\begin{aligned} S_L\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= S_L\left(\left(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}\right)^{(e)}\right), \\ \lambda_{\max}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= \lambda_{\max}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}\right)^{(e)}\right), \\ \mu\left(\left(\mathcal{F}^{(e)}\right)_{e\xi}\right) &= \mu\left(\left(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}\right)^{(e)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (1), we get the assertion (2). \square

3. THE SUM OF TEST CONFIGURATIONS

In this section, we introduce the notion of the sum of test configurations and see its basic properties. In this section, we fix an n -dimensional projective klt pair (X, Δ) , an algebraic torus $\mathbb{T} \simeq \mathbb{G}_m^p$ with $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, an injection $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, and \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles L_1, \dots, L_k on X . Fix $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that each rL_i is a \mathbb{T} -linearized ample line bundle on X . We set

$$R^i := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} R_m^i := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} H^0(X, mL_i).$$

Moreover, we set $L := \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$ with the natural \mathbb{T} -linearization, and set

$$R := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} R_m := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} H^0(X, mL).$$

After replacing $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ if necessary, we may assume that the multiplication homomorphism

$$\text{mult}_m: \tilde{R}_m \rightarrow R_m$$

is surjective for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, where we set

$$\tilde{R}_m := R_m^1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} R_m^k, \quad \tilde{R} := \bigoplus_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \tilde{R}_m.$$

Lemma 3.1. (1) Let $\mathbf{P}^{L_i} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ (resp., $\mathbf{P}^L \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$) be the moment polytope associated with (X, L_i) (resp., (X, L)). Then \mathbf{P}^L is the Minkowski sum of $\mathbf{P}^{L_1}, \dots, \mathbf{P}^{L_k}$.
 (2) For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let L'_i be another \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundle on X with $L_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L'_i$ such that $L = \sum_{i=1}^k L'_i$ holds as \mathbb{T} -linearized \mathbb{Q} -line bundles. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i} = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L'_i}.$$

(3) Take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ and $v \in \text{Val}_X^{< \infty, \mathbb{T}}$. Then we have the equality

$$\theta_{\xi}^L(v) = \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{\xi}^{L_i}(v).$$

(4) Take any proper subtorus $\mathbb{T}' \subsetneq \mathbb{T}$. Then, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T}) \setminus N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T}')$, we have

$$\inf_{\xi' \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T}')} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(X_{\xi+\xi'}, (L_i)_{\xi+\xi'}) \right\} > 0.$$

Proof. (1) For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$\Lambda_m^L = \sum_{i=1}^k \Lambda_m^{L_i},$$

where the right hand side is the Minkowski sum. Thus we get the assertion (1).

(2) Since $L_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L'_i$, there exists $\beta_i \in M_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\mathbf{P}^{L'_i} = \mathbf{P}^{L_i} + \beta_i$ and $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L'_i} = \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i} + \beta_i$. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{P}^{L_i} = \mathbf{P}^L = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{P}^{L'_i} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{P}^{L_i} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i,$$

we get $\sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i = 0$. Thus we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L'_i} = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i} + \beta_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}.$$

(3) The value $\theta_\xi^L(v)$ is continuous over $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Thus we may assume that $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$. Since $\theta_\xi^L(ev) = e\theta_\xi^L(v)$ for any $e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we may further assume that $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$. Then the assertion immediately follows by Corollary 2.10.

(4) Set

$$C_1 := \text{dist} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}, \partial(\mathbf{P}^L) \right), \quad C_2 := \text{dist}(0, \xi + N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}')).$$

By (1), we have $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P}^L)$. Thus $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Moreover, since $\xi \notin N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}')$, we also have $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. By Lemma 2.19, we have

$$\mathbf{J}(X_{\xi+\xi'}, (L_i)_{\xi+\xi'}) = \max_{\alpha_i \in \mathbf{P}^{L_i}} \{ \langle \alpha_i, \xi + \xi' \rangle \} - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}, \xi + \xi' \rangle.$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(X_{\xi+\xi'}, (L_i)_{\xi+\xi'}) \geq \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{ \langle \alpha, \xi + \xi' \rangle \} - \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}, \xi + \xi' \right\rangle \geq C_1 C_2.$$

Thus we get the assertion (4). \square

We define the sum of test configurations.

Definition 3.2. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, take any (possibly non-normal) \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration $\pi_i: (\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_t^1$ of (X, L_i) . Take a sufficiently divisible $r_0 \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Set

$$\mathcal{R}^i := \bigoplus_{m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{R}_m^i := \bigoplus_{m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(\mathcal{X}_i, m\mathcal{L}_i),$$

and let

$$\mathcal{R}_m^i = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} \mathcal{F}_i^\lambda \mathcal{R}_m^i$$

be the weight decomposition with respects to the test configuration, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}$. As in [BHJ17, Proposition 2.15], we have

$$(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) = (\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{k}[t]}(\mathcal{R}^i), \mathcal{O}(1)).$$

Set

$$I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)}^{(i)} := I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)}(\mathcal{F}_i), \quad I_{(m; \lambda)}^{(i)} := I_{(m; \lambda)}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \sum_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)}^{(i)}.$$

Let us take $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant common partial resolutions

$$\sigma_i: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$$

with \mathcal{Z} normal and σ_i an isomorphism over $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$. Then,

$$\sigma_i^* \mathcal{R}^i = \bigoplus_{m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \sigma_i^* \mathcal{R}_m^i,$$

where $\sigma_i^* \mathcal{R}_m^i$ is the image of

$$\sigma_i^*: H^0(\mathcal{X}_i, m\mathcal{L}_i) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{Z}, \sigma_i^* m\mathcal{L}_i),$$

is canonically isomorphic to \mathcal{R}^i . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_m &:= \text{Image} \left(\sigma_1^* \mathcal{R}_m^1 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \sigma_k^* \mathcal{R}_m^k \right. \\ &\hookrightarrow H^0(\mathcal{Z}, m\sigma_1^* \mathcal{L}_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} H^0(\mathcal{Z}, m\sigma_k^* \mathcal{L}_k) \\ &\left. \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{Z}, m(\sigma_1^* \mathcal{L}_1 + \cdots + \sigma_k^* \mathcal{L}_k)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R} := \bigoplus_{m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{R}_m \subset \bigoplus_{m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(\mathcal{Z}, m(\sigma_1^* \mathcal{L}_1 + \cdots + \sigma_k^* \mathcal{L}_k)).$$

By the following Lemma 3.3, the above \mathcal{R} is a finitely generated $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -algebra with the natural $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -action. As in [BHJ17, Proposition 2.15], this \mathcal{R} induces a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration $\pi: (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_t^1$ of (X, L) . The $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is said to be the *sum configuration* of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Moreover, let $\nu: \mathcal{X}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be the normalization. Then the \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}^\nu, \nu^*\mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is said to be the *normalized sum configuration* of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$.

Lemma 3.3. (1) *The above \mathcal{R} is a finitely generated $\mathbb{k}[t]$ -algebra such that each \mathcal{R}_m admits the weight decomposition*

$$\mathcal{R}_m = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{F}^\lambda R_{m,\alpha}$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda R_{m,\alpha} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = \alpha}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$.

- (2) *The definitions of the sum configurations and the normalized sum configurations do not depend on the choice of \mathcal{Z} .*
- (3) *The normalized sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ is nothing but the ample model of $(\mathcal{Z}, \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^* \mathcal{L}_i)$ over \mathbb{A}^1 .*
- (4) *Let us set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_{\text{prod}} &:= \mathcal{X}_1 \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \cdots \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathcal{X}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{prod}} &:= \mathcal{L}_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \mathcal{L}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Then there is a canonical $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant closed embedding

$$\iota^{\text{cp}}: \mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{prod}}$$

over \mathbb{A}^1 such that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{prod}}|_{\mathcal{X}} \simeq \mathcal{L}$ holds. In particular, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, there is a canonical $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant birational morphism $\tau_i: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$ over \mathbb{A}^1 .

Proof. By the Künneth formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(\mathcal{X}_{\text{prod}}, m\mathcal{L}_{\text{prod}}) &\simeq H^0(\mathcal{X}_1, m\mathcal{L}_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} H^0(\mathcal{X}_k, m\mathcal{L}_k) \\ &\simeq \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigoplus_{\alpha_1 \in M(\mathbb{T})} t^{-\lambda_1} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigoplus_{\alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T})} t^{-\lambda_k} \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{R} is obtained by the natural surjection

$$\bigoplus_{m \in r_0 \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(\mathcal{X}_{\text{prod}}, m\mathcal{L}_{\text{prod}}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{R}$$

and we have

$$\mathcal{R}_m = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} t^{-\lambda} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = \alpha}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k.$$

Thus the assertion (1) follows. Moreover, from the above $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -weight decomposition, the $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ gives a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L) . The assertion (4) is trivial from the above construction.

The assertion (2) is trivial since σ_i^* is injective. For (3), we may assume that there exists a morphism $\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ after replacing \mathcal{Z} if necessary. Then we have

$$\sigma^* \mathcal{L} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \sigma_1^* \mathcal{L}_1 + \cdots + \sigma_k^* \mathcal{L}_k.$$

Thus we get the assertion (3). \square

- Remark 3.4.** (1) Even when \mathbb{T} is trivial (i.e., $p = 0$), X is a Fano manifold and $L = -K_X$, the sum configuration of normal test configurations may not be normal in general. See §A for examples.
- (2) The sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ coincides with the test configuration generated by the \mathbb{G}_m -action of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ in the sense of [Has21, Definition 18]. See Proposition 3.11.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L_i) . Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. We set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$. Moreover, set*

$$I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)} := I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)}(\mathcal{F}), \quad I_{(m; \lambda)} := I_{(m; \lambda)}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^\lambda R_{m, \alpha} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = \alpha}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_{m, \alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_{m, \alpha_k}^k, \\ \mathcal{F}^\lambda R_m &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_m^k, \\ I_{(m, \alpha; \lambda)} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = \alpha}} I_{(m, \alpha_1; \lambda_1)}^{(1)} \cdots I_{(m, \alpha_k; \lambda_k)}^{(k)}, \\ I_{(m; \lambda)} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} I_{(m; \lambda_1)}^{(1)} \cdots I_{(m; \lambda_k)}^{(k)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Trivial from the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

The following lemma is a special case of Proposition 4.4. For the proof, see the proof of Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be as in Lemma 3.5. Take any $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$ and consider the ξ -twisted test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_{i, \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i, \xi})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ (see Example 2.6). Then the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i, \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i, \xi})\}_{i=1}^k$ is equal to the ξ -twisted test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_\xi, \mathcal{L}_\xi)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$.*

Proposition 3.7. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 3.5, assume moreover that each \mathcal{X}_i is normal. Let $\nu: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be the normalization and let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Z} & \\ \theta \swarrow & & \searrow \rho \\ \mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{A}^1} & \text{-----} & \mathcal{Y} \end{array}$$

be a $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant partial resolution with \mathcal{Z} normal and θ an isomorphism over $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$. Let us set

$$\chi_i := \tau_i \circ \nu \circ \rho: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i,$$

where τ_i be as in Lemma 3.3. Set

$$\mathcal{D}_i := \theta^*((L_i)_{\mathbb{A}^1}) - \chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i$$

supported on the fiber over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. Then, for any sufficiently divisible $m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the inverse image of the fractional ideal

$$\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m; \lambda)}^{(i)}$$

by θ^* is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-m\mathcal{D}_i)$. In particular, the inverse image of the fractional ideal

$$\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)}$$

by θ^* is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}\left(-m \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}_i\right)$.

Proof. Since $\chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i$ is semiample over \mathbb{A}^1 , we have a surjection

$$H^0(\mathcal{Z}, \chi_i^*(m\mathcal{L}_i)) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}[t]} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \chi_i^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_i}(m\mathcal{L}_i).$$

Since \mathcal{X}_i is normal, we have

$$H^0(\mathcal{Z}, \chi_i^*(m\mathcal{L}_i)) = \chi_i^* H^0(\mathcal{X}_i, m\mathcal{L}_i) = \chi_i^* \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} \mathcal{F}_i^\lambda R_m^i \right).$$

Therefore, we get the surjection

$$\theta^* \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} (\mathcal{F}_i^\lambda R_m^i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X(-mL_i)) \right) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-m\mathcal{D}_i).$$

Since

$$\mathcal{F}_i^\lambda R_m^i \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X(-mL_i) \twoheadrightarrow I_{(m;\lambda)}^{(i)},$$

the inverse image of $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)}^{(i)}$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-m\mathcal{D}_i)$. Since

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)}^{(i)} \right) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} I_{(m;\lambda_1)}^{(1)} \cdots I_{(m;\lambda_k)}^{(k)} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)},$$

we get the assertion. \square

Corollary 3.8. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configuration of (X, L_i) . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *For all $1 \leq i \leq k$, the test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ are shifts of the trivial test configurations of (X, L_i) .*
- (2) *The sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ is a shift of the trivial test configuration of (X, L) .*
- (3) *The normalized sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ is a shift of the trivial test configuration of (X, L) .*

Proof. The assertions (1) \implies (2) and (2) \implies (3) are trivial. We show the assertion (3) \implies (1). We use the notation in Proposition 3.7. By the assumption, we have $\mathcal{Y} = X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and $\nu^*(\tau_1^* \mathcal{L}_1 + \cdots + \tau_k^* \mathcal{L}_k) = L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - C \cdot (X \times \{0\})$ for some $C \in \mathbb{Q}$. Thus we have $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{A}^1} 0$. This implies that $\sum_{i=1}^k \chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} 0$. Since $\chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i$ is nef over $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, we have $\chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i \equiv_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ by the negativity lemma. Thus the ample model of $(\mathcal{Z}, \chi_i^* \mathcal{L}_i)$ over $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ itself. This implies that $\mathcal{D}_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{A}^1} 0$. This immediately implies that the condition (1). \square

From now on, for any test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) , we see that the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ coincides with the test configuration generated by the \mathbb{G}_m -actions of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ in the sense of [Has21, Definition 18]. We will use the following results only in §8. We set $r_0 \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ to be sufficiently divisible so that each $r_0 \mathcal{L}_i$ is π_i -very ample over \mathbb{A}^1 and the \mathbb{G}_m -action linearizes to \mathcal{L}_i . Let $\mathcal{R}^i, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}_i$ and \mathcal{F} be as in Definition 3.2 and Lemma 3.3. As in [BHJ17, §2.3], for any $m \in r_0 \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, m\mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, mL_i) gives a one-parameter subgroup $\rho_m^i: \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(R_m^i)$. We recall [Has21, Definition 18]:

Definition 3.9 ([Has21, Definition 18]). Let us consider the composition of the natural embeddings

$$\iota_m^{\text{cp}}: X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{R}_m).$$

(Note that the projectivizations \mathbb{P}^* are in the sense of Grothendieck.) We say that a test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L) is *generated by the \mathbb{G}_m -action of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$* , if \mathcal{Y} is defined as the reduced Zariski closure of the \mathbb{G}_m -orbit of $\iota_m^{\text{cp}}(X)$ in $\mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$, under the natural tensor product \mathbb{G}_m -action $\rho_m^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_m^k$ on $\tilde{R}_m = R_m^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes R_m^k$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}} := \frac{1}{m} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{R}_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1}(1)|_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

There is a minor difference to the original definition [Has21, Definition 18], where it was defined for a k -tuple of very ample test configurations with exponent m , but in this paper we re-scale the polarization by $1/m$.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and any $m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, \mathbb{G}_m acts on R_m^i according to the weight decomposition*

$$R_m^i = \bigoplus_{\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\lambda_i} R_m^i,$$

which naturally induces the tensor product action

$$\mathbb{G}_m \curvearrowright R_m^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes R_m^k = \tilde{R}_m.$$

Suppose furthermore that \mathbb{G}_m acts on R_m according to the weight decomposition $R_m = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}^{\lambda} R_m$ with

$$\mathcal{F}^{\lambda} R_m = \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_m^k.$$

Then the multiplication homomorphism mult_m is \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant.

Proof. The weight decomposition of the \mathbb{G}_m -action on \tilde{R}_m induced from the tensor product action is given by $\tilde{R}_m = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\lambda} \tilde{R}_m$, where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\lambda} \tilde{R}_m := \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1} R_m^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k} R_m^k.$$

Thus the homomorphism mult_m is obviously \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant. \square

Proposition 3.11. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is the test configuration generated by the \mathbb{G}_m -actions of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ in the sense of Definition 3.9 obtained by $m \in r_0\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}})/\mathbb{A}^1$ agrees with the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ in the sense of Definition 3.2.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.10, the \mathbb{G}_m -orbit of X in $\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{R}_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$ is contained in the linear subspace $\mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$, and hence the Zariski closure of its \mathbb{G}_m -orbit in $\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{R}_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$ agrees with the one in $\mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$. Thus \mathcal{Y} agrees with the Zariski closure of the \mathbb{G}_m -orbit of $X \times \mathbb{G}_m \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \times \mathbb{A}^1$ with respect to the naturally induced \mathbb{G}_m -action on R_m , which corresponds to the weight decomposition in Lemma 3.10. It is well-known [BHJ17, §1.2, 2.3, and 2.5] that such a test configuration can also be written as $(\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{A}^1}(\mathcal{R}), \frac{1}{m} \mathcal{O}(1))$. Moreover, since the embedding $\mathbb{P}^*(R_m) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{R}_m)$ is linear, we find that the natural polarization $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{A}^1}(\mathcal{R})$ agrees with $m\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}}$. Recalling that the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ can be written as $(\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{A}^1}(\mathcal{R}), \frac{1}{m} \mathcal{O}(1))$, by Definition 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we get the claimed result. \square

Remark 3.12. As proved in Corollary 3.8, the sum test configuration is trivial if and only if all the constituents $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ are trivial (and normal). For the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Y})$ generated by their \mathbb{G}_m -actions, this point was claimed in [Has21, §3.4] without detailed arguments. We provide the details omitted therein: it is easy to prove that the \mathbb{G}_m -action on \tilde{R}_m is trivial if and only if all the constituents are all trivial test configurations, and Lemma 3.10 shows that it happens if and only if the \mathbb{G}_m -action on R_m is trivial since there does not exist any weight λ such that $\text{mult}_m(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\lambda \tilde{R}_m) = 0$ if $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\lambda \tilde{R}_m \neq 0$, by the property of the multiplication homomorphism.

4. THE SUM OF FILTRATIONS

In this section, we introduce the notion of the sum of filtrations, which is a generalization of the notion of sum configurations, and see its basic properties. In this section, we follow the notation in §3.

Definition 4.1. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i . The *sum filtration* of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is the \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F} on R defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^x R_m := \sum_{\substack{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}; \\ x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq x}} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_m^k = \sum_{\substack{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}; \\ x_1 + \dots + x_k = x}} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_m^k$$

for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Lemma 4.2).

Lemma 4.2. (1) *The above \mathcal{F} is indeed a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R .*

(2) *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L_i) and let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}}$ is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k$.*

Proof. (2) is trivial by Lemma 3.5. We show (1).

- (Linearly boundedness) There exist $e_-, e_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $\mathcal{F}_i^{xm} R_m^i = R_m^i$ for any $x \leq e_-$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^{xm} R_m^i = 0$ for any $x \geq e_+$. This implies that $\mathcal{F}^{xm} R_m = R_m$ for any $x \leq ke_-$ and $\mathcal{F}^{xm} R_m = 0$ for any $x \geq ke_+$.
- (Multiplicativity) Take any $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m, m' \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Take any $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i = x$ and $x'_1, \dots, x'_k \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^k x'_i = x'$. Then we have

$$(\mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_m^k) \cdot (\mathcal{F}_1^{x'_1} R_{m'}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x'_k} R_{m'}^k) \subset \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1+x'_1} R_{m+m'}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k+x'_k} R_{m+m'}^k.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{F}^x R_m \cdot \mathcal{F}^{x'} R_{m'} \subset \mathcal{F}^{x+x'} R_{m+m'}$.

- It is obvious that $\mathcal{F}^x R_m \subset \mathcal{F}^{x'} R_m$ whenever $x \geq x'$.
- (Left continuity) Take any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $\lambda_{i,1} < \dots < \lambda_{i,M_i}$ be defined to be

$$\{\lambda_{i,1}, \dots, \lambda_{i,M_i}\} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid \dim \text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}_i}^\lambda R_m^i \neq 0\},$$

where $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}_i}^\lambda R_m^i$ be as in [Xu24, (3.1)]. Note that we have the following:

$$\mathcal{F}^x R_m = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_i \leq M_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k); \\ \lambda_{1,j_1} + \dots + \lambda_{k,j_k} \geq x}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_{1,j_1}} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_{k,j_k}} R_m^k.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a very small $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(j_1, \dots, j_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k \mid j_i \leq M_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k), \text{ and } \lambda_{1,j_1} + \dots + \lambda_{k,j_k} \geq x - \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{(j_1, \dots, j_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k \mid j_i \leq M_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k), \text{ and } \lambda_{1,j_1} + \dots + \lambda_{k,j_k} \geq x\} \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus we get $\mathcal{F}^x R_m = \mathcal{F}^{x-\varepsilon} R_m$.

- (\mathbb{T} -equivariant property) We can directly check that

$$\mathcal{F}^x R_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in M(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{F}^x R_{m,\alpha}$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}^x R_{m,\alpha} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in M(\mathbb{T}); \\ \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = \alpha}} \sum_{\substack{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}; \\ x_1 + \dots + x_k = x}} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k.$$

Thus \mathcal{F} is \mathbb{T} -equivariant.

Thus we get the assertion (1). \square

Proposition 4.3. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then we have the equality*

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i).$$

Proof. Assume that $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) < \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$. Then there exists $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_i < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $x := \sum_{i=1}^k x_i > \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$. As in [Xu24, Lemma 3.17], for any sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we know that $\mathcal{F}_i^{m x_i} R_m^i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{F}^{m x} R_m \supset \prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i^{m x_i} R_m^i \neq 0,$$

a contradiction. Thus $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ holds.

Assume that $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) > \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$. Take any $x \in \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i), \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \right)$. As in [Xu24, Lemma 3.17], for any sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we know that $\mathcal{F}^{m x} R_m \neq 0$. This implies that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exists $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i = x$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^{m x_i} R_m^i \neq 0$. This leads to the inequality $x_i \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$. Thus we get $x \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$, a contradiction. Thus $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ holds. \square

Proposition 4.4. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$.*

- (1) *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $\mathcal{F}_{i,[C_i]}$ be the C_i -shift of \mathcal{F}_i for $C_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,[C_i]}\}_{i=1}^k$ is equal to the $\left(\sum_{i=1}^k C_i\right)$ -shift $\mathcal{F}_{[\sum_{i=1}^k C_i]}$ of \mathcal{F} .*
- (2) *(cf. Lemma 3.6) Take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Let us consider the ξ -twist $\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}$ of \mathcal{F}_i for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k$ is equal to the ξ -twist \mathcal{F}_{ξ} of \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. (1) Let \mathcal{G} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,[C_i]}\}_{i=1}^k$. Then we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^x R_m &= \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_k = x} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1 - C_1 m} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k - C_k m} R_m^k \\ &= \sum_{y_1 + \dots + y_k = x - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k C_i\right)m} \mathcal{F}_1^{y_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{y_k} R_m^k \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{x - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k C_i\right)m} R_m = \mathcal{F}_{[\sum_{i=1}^k C_i]}^x R_m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus \mathcal{G} is equal to $\mathcal{F}_{[\sum_{i=1}^k C_i]}$.

(2) Let \mathcal{G} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k$. Then we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}^x R_{m,\alpha} &= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = \alpha} \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i = x} \mathcal{F}_{1,\xi}^{x_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,\xi}^{x_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = \alpha} \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i = x} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1 - \langle \alpha_1, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k - \langle \alpha_k, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = \alpha} \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k y_i = x - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} \mathcal{F}_1^{y_1} R_{m,\alpha_1}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{y_k} R_{m,\alpha_k}^k \\
&= \mathcal{F}^{x - \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle} R_{m,\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_\xi^x R_{m,\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus \mathcal{G} is equal to \mathcal{F}_ξ . \square

Proposition 4.5. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let us take an approximating sequence $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ of \mathcal{F}_i . For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$ be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k$. Then $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Observe the following:

(i) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^x R_{m'} &= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \mathcal{F}_{1,(m)}^{x_1} R_{m'}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,(m)}^{x_k} R_{m'}^k \\
&\subset \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_{m'}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_{m'}^k = \mathcal{F}^x R_{m'}.
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^x R_m &= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \mathcal{F}_{1,(m)}^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,(m)}^{x_k} R_m^k \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \mathcal{F}_1^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{x_k} R_m^k = \mathcal{F}^x R_m.
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^x R_{ms} &= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \mathcal{F}_{1,(m)}^{x_1} R_{ms}^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,(m)}^{x_k} R_{ms}^k \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq x} \sum_{\sum_{j=1}^s y_{1j} \geq x_1} (\mathcal{F}_1^{y_{11}} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_1^{y_{1s}} R_m^1) \cdots (\mathcal{F}_k^{y_{k1}} R_m^k \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{y_{ks}} R_m^k) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad \sum_{\sum_{j=1}^s y_{kj} \geq x_k} \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{j=1}^s y_j \geq x} \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k y_{i1} \geq y_1} (\mathcal{F}_1^{y_{11}} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{y_{k1}} R_m^k) \cdots (\mathcal{F}_1^{y_{1s}} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{y_{ks}} R_m^k) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^k y_{is} \geq y_s} \\
&= \sum_{\sum_{j=1}^s y_j \geq x} \mathcal{F}^{y_1} R_m \cdots \mathcal{F}^{y_s} R_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} . \square

Proposition 4.6. *Under the assumption in Proposition 4.5, assume moreover that \mathcal{F}_i and $\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}$ are \mathbb{Z} -valued. Take any $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_i^{(e)} := (\mathcal{F}_i)^{(e)}$, $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$, $\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}^{(e)} := (\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)})^{(e)}$, $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)} := (\mathcal{F}_{(m)})^{(e)}$ be as in Proposition 2.21 (2). Then we have the following:*

- (1) *The filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$ is the sum filtration of $\left\{ \mathcal{F}_i^{(e)} \right\}_{i=1}^k$.*
- (2) *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\left\{ \mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}^{(e)} \right\}_{i=1}^k$ is an approximating sequence of $\mathcal{F}_i^{(e)}$.*
- (3) *The filtration $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)}$ is the sum filtration of $\left\{ \mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}^{(e)} \right\}_{i=1}^k$.*
- (4) *$\left\{ \mathcal{F}_{(m)}^{(e)} \right\}_{i=1}^k$ is an approximating sequence of $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$.*

Proof. By Propositions 2.22 and 4.5, it is enough to show the assertion (1). We note that $\mathcal{F}^{(e)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^{(e)}$ are $e\mathbb{Z}$ -valued. Let \mathcal{G} be the sum filtration of $\left\{ \mathcal{F}_i^{(e)} \right\}_{i=1}^k$. For any $\lambda \in e\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}^\lambda R_m &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in e\mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \mathcal{F}_1^{(e), \lambda_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{(e), \lambda_k} R_m^k \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in e\mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = \lambda}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\lambda_1/e} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\lambda_k/e} R_m^k \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_k = \lambda/e}} \mathcal{F}_1^{\mu_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_k^{\mu_k} R_m^k \\
&= \mathcal{F}^{\lambda/e} R_m = \mathcal{F}^{(e), \lambda} R_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion follows. □

5. THE SUM OF NON-ARCHIMEDEAN METRICS

It is important that we extend the sum of test configurations in terms of the non-Archimedean metrics, following the approach of Boucksom–Jonsson [BJ22] and Boucksom–Hisamoto–Jonsson [BHJ17]. A detailed explanation of the non-Archimedean metrics or the Berkovich analytification is completely out of reach of this paper, and the reader is referred to the aforementioned papers for the details.

We include here the bare minimum of notation that is used afterwards. The reference that we follow is Boucksom–Jonsson [BJ22]. For a polarized projective variety (X, L) , we define a connected and compact topological space called the Berkovich analytification X^{an} . It contains a subset X^{div} consisting of divisorial valuations which is dense in X^{an} [BJ22, Theorem 2.14]. Equivalence classes [BHJ17, Definition 6.1] of semiample test configurations for (X, L) corresponds one-to-one with certain plurisubharmonic (psh) functions on X^{an} , as explained in [BHJ17, BJ22] and very briefly recalled below. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a semiample test configuration for (X, L) , and pick another test configuration $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ with morphisms $\mu : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, where $(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, L_{\mathbb{A}^1})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is the trivial test configuration. Then

$$(1) \quad D := \mu^* \mathcal{L} - \rho^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

is a \mathbb{G}_m -invariant \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor with support in $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$, and the map $\mathcal{L} \mapsto D$ is known to define a one-to-one correspondence between the set of equivalence classes of test configurations $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ (with \mathcal{L} possibly non-semiample over \mathbb{A}^1) for (X, L) and the space of piecewise linear functions on X^{an} [BJ22, Definition 2.1, Theorem 2.7, and §2.7]. Furthermore, given a test configuration $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \mu^* \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ for (X, L) , the Gauss extension yields an

embedding $\sigma_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} : X^{\text{an}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{an}}$ as in [BJ22, §1.3 and §2.1]. When D is a \mathbb{G}_m -invariant \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor with support in $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$, we define a continuous function $\varphi_D \in C^0(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{R})$ by

$$(2) \quad \varphi_D(v) := \sigma_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}(v)(D)$$

for $v \in X^{\text{an}}$ [BJ22, §2.2]. Thus, a test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ defines a function $\varphi_{\mathcal{L}} := \varphi_D \in C^0(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{R})$ by (2), where D is defined as in (1). We note that the map $D \mapsto \varphi_D$ is invariant under the pullback, i.e. $\varphi_{\mu^*D} = \varphi_D$ [BJ22, §2.2], and hence the construction above does not depend on the choice of \mathcal{X} . The map $\mathcal{L} \mapsto \varphi_{\mathcal{L}}$ is known to set up a one-to-one correspondence between the set of equivalence classes of semiample test configurations for (X, L) and the set $\mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ of rational Fubini–Study functions on X^{an} [BJ22, §2.4 and Theorem 2.31]. The set $\mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ admits a completion denoted by $\mathcal{E}^{1, \text{NA}}(L)$ [BJ22, Theorem 4.15 (ii), §7.2, §12.1]; note that our notation $\mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}} = \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}^{1, \text{NA}} = \mathcal{E}^{1, \text{NA}}(L)$) corresponds to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (resp. to \mathcal{E}^1) in [BJ22]. We also write E^{NA} for the non-Archimedean Monge–Ampère energy defined for $\phi^{\text{NA}} \in \mathcal{E}^{1, \text{NA}}$ by

$$E^{\text{NA}}(\phi^{\text{NA}}) := \frac{(L, \phi^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)} > -\infty,$$

where $(L, \phi^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}$ is the energy pairing defined in [BJ22, Theorem 7.1]. In what follows, we write $(\phi^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}$ for $(L, \phi^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}$ to simplify the notation. Moreover, in this paper we also call \mathcal{H}^{NA} the set of all non-Archimedean *metrics*, following the terminology of [BHJ17, Definition 6.4] (see also [BJ22, Example 3.3]).

In this section, let (X, Δ) , L_1, \dots, L_k , and $L = \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$ be as in §3. We write $\mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ for the set of rational Fubini–Study functions for L , and $\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_k^{\text{NA}}$ for the ones for L_1, \dots, L_k respectively.

We first observe the following straightforward consequence of Lemma 3.3 in terms of the non-Archimedean metrics in the sense of [BHJ17, §6].

Lemma 5.1. *The non-Archimedean metric on L represented by the sum configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ depends only on the non-Archimedean metrics on L_1, \dots, L_k represented respectively by $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{L}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{L}_k)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{Z} be a common partial resolution of $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{L}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{L}_k)$. If we take another representative, say $(\mathcal{X}'_i, \mathcal{L}'_i)$, of the non-Archimedean metric defined by $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$, we simply replace \mathcal{Z} by a common partial resolution of $\mathcal{Z}, (\mathcal{X}'_1, \mathcal{L}'_1), \dots, (\mathcal{X}'_k, \mathcal{L}'_k)$, which defines the same non-Archimedean metric as $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ by Lemma 3.3. \square

Thus, the following map

$$\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{H}_1^{\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_k^{\text{NA}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L),$$

taking any ample representatives from $\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_k^{\text{NA}}$ and giving (the equivalence class of) the sum test configuration of them, is well-defined. In fact, this map agrees with the sum of non-Archimedean metrics, as in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *The map \mathbf{S} above satisfies*

$$\mathbf{S}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) = \phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}}$$

where the right hand side is the the sum of non-Archimedean metrics as defined in [BHJ17, §6.2] or [BJ22, Proposition 3.6]. Moreover, if $\phi_i^{\text{NA}}, \psi_i^{\text{NA}} \in \mathcal{H}_i^{\text{NA}}$ satisfy $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \leq \psi_i^{\text{NA}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{S}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) \leq \mathbf{S}(\psi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \psi_k^{\text{NA}}).$$

Proof. We take $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \in \mathcal{H}_i^{\text{NA}}$ and take an ample representative $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. We replace this model by the common partial resolution $\sigma_i : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$ and note that $(\mathcal{Z}, \sigma_i^* \mathcal{L}_i)$ represents ϕ_i^{NA} . Then the sum $\phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}}$ is represented by $(\mathcal{Z}, \sigma_1^* \mathcal{L}_1 + \dots + \sigma_k^* \mathcal{L}_k)$,

establishing the first part of the claim by recalling Lemma 3.3. We immediately observe that, if $\phi_i^{\text{NA}}, \psi_i^{\text{NA}} \in \mathcal{H}_i^{\text{NA}}$ satisfies $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \leq \psi_i^{\text{NA}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$\phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}} \leq \psi_1^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \psi_k^{\text{NA}}$$

as claimed. \square

Proposition 5.3. *The map \mathbf{S} can be extended to the map $\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{E}_1^{1,\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^{1,\text{NA}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{1,\text{NA}}(L)$ defined by*

$$\mathbf{S}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) := \phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}}$$

which is continuous with respect to the strong topology.

This result may be well-known to the experts, particularly because it follows directly from various results in [BJ22] as we can see below. In the rest of the paper, we do not need the continuity of \mathbf{S} , but the statement is included here for completeness.

Proof. We first prove that the image of \mathbf{S} is contained in $\mathcal{E}^{1,\text{NA}}(L)$. We pick a decreasing net

$$\{(\phi_{1j}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})\}_j \subset \mathcal{H}_1^{\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_k^{\text{NA}}$$

converging (in the product topology) to $(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) \in \mathcal{E}_1^{1,\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^{1,\text{NA}}$. By (3) and the definition of \mathbf{S} , $\left\{\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\right\}_j \subset \mathcal{H}^{\text{NA}}(L)$ is a decreasing net converging pointwise to $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$ over X^{div} . Thus it suffices to prove

$$\inf_j \mathbf{E}^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}} \right) = \inf_j \frac{(\phi_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)} > -\infty.$$

We now recall from [BJ22, Lemma 7.10] that there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on n, k , and L_1, \dots, L_k such that

$$(\phi_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \dots + \phi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} > C \sum_{i=1}^k (\phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} = C \sum_{i=1}^k (L_i^n) \mathbf{E}_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}})$$

for each j , where \mathbf{E}_i^{NA} is the non-Archimedean Monge–Ampère energy for L_i . The infimum of the right hand side is finite by the monotonicity of the Monge–Ampère energy functional \mathbf{E}_i^{NA} , with $\{\phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\}_j$ decreasing to $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \in \mathcal{E}_i^{1,\text{NA}}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus we get $\inf_j \mathbf{E}^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{ij}^{\text{NA}} \right) > -\infty$ as required.

It remains to prove that $\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{E}_1^{1,\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^{1,\text{NA}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{1,\text{NA}}(L)$ is continuous with respect to the strong topology (see [BJ22, Definition 12.1]). Let $\{(\psi_{1j}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \psi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})\}_j$ be a net in $\mathcal{E}_1^{1,\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^{1,\text{NA}}$ strongly converging (in the product topology) to $(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) \in \mathcal{E}_1^{1,\text{NA}} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^{1,\text{NA}}$. Again by the definition of \mathbf{S} , we find that $\left\{\sum_{i=1}^k \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\right\}_j$ converges pointwise to $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$ over X^{div} . It thus suffices to show that $\mathbf{E}^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}} \right)$ converges to $\mathbf{E}^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}} \right)$, by [BJ22, §12.1].

To establish this convergence, we first normalize

$$\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}} = \phi_i^{\text{NA}} - \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \phi_i^{\text{NA}}, \quad \tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}} = \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}} - \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}},$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ and each j , where we note that $\sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}} \rightarrow \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ since the supremum is attained at a fixed point $v_{\text{triv}} \in X^{\text{div}}$ by [BJ22, Proposition 4.12 (ii)] (as X is assumed to be irreducible) and $\{\psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\}_j$ converges pointwise to ϕ_i^{NA} over X^{div} by the strong convergence. This in turn shows that $\{\tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\}_j$ converges strongly to $\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, since we have

$$\mathbf{E}_i^{\text{NA}}(\tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}}) = \mathbf{E}_i^{\text{NA}}(\psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}) - \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}$$

and similarly for $E_i^{\text{NA}}(\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}})$ by [BJ22, Proposition 7.7]. We then find

$$(\phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} = (\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\phi}_k^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} + (n+1)(L^n) \sum_{i=1}^k \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$$

and

$$(\psi_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \psi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} = (\tilde{\psi}_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\psi}_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} + (n+1)(L^n) \sum_{i=1}^k \sup_{X^{\text{an}}} \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}$$

by [BJ22, Proposition 3.14] and recalling $(L_1 + \cdots + L_k)^n = (L^n)$. Then, expanding out the energy pairing, [BJ22, Theorem 7.34] implies that there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on L_1, \dots, L_k, n , and $\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \tilde{\phi}_k^{\text{NA}}$ such that

$$\left| (\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\phi}_k^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} - (\tilde{\psi}_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\psi}_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} \right| \leq C \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \bar{I}(\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}}, \tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}})^{\alpha_n}$$

holds eventually for the nets $\{\tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\}_j$ converging to $\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}}$, where $\alpha_n \in (0, 1]$ is a constant depending only on n and \bar{I} is the quasi-metric defined in [BJ22, Definition 12.3] (see also [BJ22, (7.29) in Proposition 7.27]). Since $\{\tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\}_j$ converges strongly to $\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}}$, we have $\bar{I}(\tilde{\phi}_i^{\text{NA}}, \tilde{\psi}_{ij}^{\text{NA}}) \rightarrow 0$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ by [BJ22, Theorem 12.4], which shows

$$(\tilde{\psi}_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\psi}_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \tilde{\phi}_k^{\text{NA}})^{n+1}.$$

Thus, combining the above argument we have

$$(\psi_{1j}^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \psi_{kj}^{\text{NA}})^{n+1} \rightarrow (\phi_1^{\text{NA}} + \cdots + \phi_k^{\text{NA}})^{n+1},$$

which shows that $E^{\text{NA}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \psi_{ij}^{\text{NA}}\right)$ converges to $E^{\text{NA}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}}\right)$, as claimed. \square

6. THE COUPLED DING INVARIANT

In this section, we introduce the notion of coupled Ding semistability and (reduced) coupled Ding stability for log Fano pairs. In this section, we fix an n -dimensional (klt) log Fano pair (X, Δ) , an algebraic torus $\mathbb{T} \simeq \mathbb{G}_m^p$ with $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, an injection $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, and \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles L_1, \dots, L_k on X such that $L := \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$ coincides with $-(K_X + \Delta)$ with the standard \mathbb{T} -linearization.

Definition 6.1. We set

$$\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} := \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i} \in M_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$$

(see Definition 2.2). We say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has *vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters* if $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. By Lemma 3.1 (2), those definitions do not depend on the choice of \mathbb{T} -linearizations of L_i . If \mathbb{T} is a maximal torus of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$, we simply say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has *vanishing coupled Futaki characters*. Note that all maximal tori of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ are mutually conjugate to each other.

Definition 6.2. (1) For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$.

(i) We set

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) := \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

where $\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ is defined in Definition 2.18.

(ii) We set

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})} \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

By [Xu24, Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.6 (i)], the functions

$$\xi \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}), \quad \xi \mapsto S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi})$$

are continuous. Thus we have

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

(iii) For any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the *coupled Ding invariant* of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ with the slope δ is defined to be

$$\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta \right) := \mu(\mathcal{F}; \delta) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

where $\mu(\mathcal{F}; \delta)$ is the δ -lc slope of \mathcal{F} in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 3.45] (see also Lemma 2.23). We often denote $\mu(\mathcal{F}; \delta)$ by $\mu \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta \right)$. We can express

$$\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta \right) = \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}; \delta) + S_L(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

where $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}; \delta)$ is the Ding invariant of the filtration \mathcal{F} with the slope δ in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 3.45].

We define the *coupled Ding invariant* of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ as

$$\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \mu(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

where

$$\mu(\mathcal{F}) := \mu \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \mu(\mathcal{F}; 1), \quad \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}) := \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}; 1).$$

Equivalently, $\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k; 1 \right)$.

(2) For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L_i) , and let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$.

(i) We set

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i).$$

(ii) We set

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi}),$$

where the last equality follows from the observations in (1) and Definition 2.18.

(iii) The *coupled Ding invariant* of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ is defined as

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \text{Ding}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot n+1})}{(n+1)(L^{\cdot n})} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_i^{\cdot n+1})}{(n+1)(L_i^{\cdot n})},$$

where $\text{Ding}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is the Ding invariant of (the normalization of) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 2.24], and $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}})/\mathbb{P}^1$, $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_i, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_i)/\mathbb{P}^1$ are the ∞ -trivial compactifications of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$, $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 2.7], respectively.

Definition 6.3. (1) We say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable if

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \geq 0$$

holds for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) ($1 \leq i \leq k$). When \mathbb{T} is trivial (i.e., $p = 0$), we simply say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is *coupled Ding semistable*.

We remark that, for any subtorus $\mathbb{T}' \subset \mathbb{T}$, if $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T}' -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable, then $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is obviously \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable.

(2) We say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable if there exists a positive real number $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right)$$

holds for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) ($1 \leq i \leq k$). If \mathbb{T} is trivial, then we simply say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is *uniformly coupled Ding stable*. If $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ is a maximal torus, then we say that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is *reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable*. The notion does not depend on the choice of maximal tori.

Lemma 6.4. *In the above definitions of \mathbb{T} -equivariant coupled Ding semistability and \mathbb{T} -reduced uniform coupled Ding stability, we may assume that the test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) are normal. In fact, for the normalizations $\nu: \mathcal{X}'_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$, we have*

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}'_i, \nu^* \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right), \quad \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}'_i, \nu^* \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

Proof. Observe that the normalized sum configurations of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ and $\{(\mathcal{X}'_i, \nu^* \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ are equal by Lemma 3.3 (3). Moreover, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, we get

$$\mathbf{J} \left(\mathcal{X}'_{i,\xi}, (\nu^* \mathcal{L}_i)_{\xi} \right) = \mathbf{J} \left(\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi} \right)$$

by the definition of $\mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi})$ (see Definition 2.18). Thus we get the assertions. \square

We see an analogous statement in [Xu24, §3.4].

Proposition 6.5 (cf. [Xu24, Theorem 3.63]). *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration of (X, L_i) .*

(1) *We have the inequality*

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \leq \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

(2) *If moreover all \mathcal{X}_i are normal ($1 \leq i \leq k$), then we have*

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}')/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, and let $\nu: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ be the normalization and set $\mathcal{L} := \nu^* \mathcal{L}'$. We set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}$ and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}'}$. We know that \mathcal{F} is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Note that \mathcal{F} is a \mathbb{Z} -valued filtration such that, for any sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})^s = \mathcal{I}_{ms}(\mathcal{F})$ for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Moreover, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is nothing but the normalized blowup test configuration along $\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$ (see Definition 2.20).

(1) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) &= \text{Ding}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \\ &\geq \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from [Xu24, Lemma 3.35], and the second inequality follows from [Xu24, Theorem 3.63].

(2) Assume that all \mathcal{X}_i are normal. We use the notations in §3, especially, Definition 3.2, Lemma 3.5 and Proposition 3.7. Fix a sufficiently divisible $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and consider

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(i)} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)}^{(i)} = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}_i)$$

with $I_{(m;\lambda)}^{(i)} := I_{(m;\lambda)}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_m := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{-\lambda} I_{(m;\lambda)} = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F})$$

with $I_{(m;\lambda)} := I_{(m;\lambda)}(\mathcal{F})$. Set $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-m\mathcal{D}_i) := \theta^{-1}\mathcal{I}_m^{(i)}$. As in Proposition 3.7, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_m = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{I}_m^{(i)}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}_i = \theta^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - \rho^* \mathcal{L}.$$

Let us recall the \mathbf{L} -invariant $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{F})$ of \mathcal{F} in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 3.51]. Since $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is sufficiently divisible, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\mathcal{F}) &= \text{lct} \left(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{I}_m^{\frac{1}{m}}; X \times \{0\} \right) - 1 \\ &= \text{lct} \left(\mathcal{Z}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}} + E + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}_i; \mathcal{Z}_0 \right) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{Z}_0 is the fiber of $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ at $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$, and E is the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{Z} supported on \mathcal{Z}_0 defined by

$$K_{\mathcal{Z}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}} + E = \theta^* (K_{X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1}).$$

Let us consider the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}$ on \mathcal{X} in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 2.24], i.e., the \mathbb{Q} -divisor on \mathcal{X} supported on \mathcal{X}_0 with

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -\bar{\mathcal{L}} - K_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}/\mathbb{P}^1} - \Delta_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}.$$

Then we have

$$\rho^* (K_{\mathcal{X}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}) = K_{\mathcal{Z}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}} + E + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{D}_i.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{lct}(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}; \mathcal{X}_0) - 1,$$

where \mathcal{X}_0 is the fiber of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. On the other hand, by [Xu24, Theorem 3.52], we have $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{F}) = \mu(\mathcal{F})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k) &= \text{lct}(\mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{L}}; \mathcal{X}_0) - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_i^{\cdot n+1})}{(n+1)(L_i^n)} \\ &= \mu(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \end{aligned}$$

holds. where the second equality follows from [Xu24, Lemma 3.35]. \square

Lemma 6.6 (cf. [Xu24, Corollary 6.25]). *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i . For any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) = \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}}, \xi \rangle.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. By [Xu24, Lemma 6.24], we know that $\mu(\mathcal{F}) = \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})$. Moreover, by [Xu24, Lemma 6.4] and Proposition 4.4 (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) &= \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) \\ &= \mu(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k (S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) + \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}, \xi \rangle) \\ &= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{L_i}, \xi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion follows. \square

Corollary 6.7. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configuration of (X, L_i) . For any $\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$, let $(\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi})/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the ξ -twisted test configuration of $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) &= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi}}\}_{i=1}^k) \\ &= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}\}_{i=1}^k) - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}}, \xi \rangle \\ &= \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k) - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}}, \xi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable, then $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$ holds, i.e., $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters.

Proof. The first and third equalities follow from Proposition 6.5. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_{i,\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,\xi}} = (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i})_{\xi}$ (see Example 2.6), the second equality follows from Lemma 6.6. \square

Lemma 6.8. *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i . Set $\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{F}_{i,\mathbb{Z}}$ (see Definition 2.13 (1)). Then, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we have the equality*

$$\mu(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) = \mu(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k).$$

In particular, together with Lemma 2.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) &= \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k), \\ \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) &= \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k), \\ \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) &= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} (resp., \mathcal{G}) be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ (resp., $\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k$). Take any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.14, if we take $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with $m\varepsilon > k$, then we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_\xi^{mx} R_m &= \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq mx} \mathcal{F}_{1,\xi}^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,\xi}^{x_k} R_m^k \\
&\supset \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq mx} \mathcal{G}_{1,\xi}^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{G}_{k,\xi}^{x_k} R_m^k = \mathcal{G}_\xi^{mx} R_m, \\
\mathcal{G}_\xi^{m(x-\varepsilon)} R_m &= \sum_{x'_1 + \dots + x'_k \geq m(x-\varepsilon)} \mathcal{G}_{1,\xi}^{x'_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{G}_{k,\xi}^{x'_k} R_m^k \\
&\supset \sum_{x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq mx} \mathcal{F}_{1,\xi}^{x_1} R_m^1 \cdots \mathcal{F}_{k,\xi}^{x_k} R_m^k = \mathcal{F}_\xi^{mx} R_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the second inclusion follows from the observation in Lemma 2.14 that

$$\mathcal{G}_{i,\xi}^{x'_i} R_m^i \supset \mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}^{x_i} R_m^i$$

holds for any $x_i, x'_i \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x'_i > x_i - 1$. Thus we get

$$\mathcal{G}_\xi^{mx} R_m \subset \mathcal{F}_\xi^{mx} R_m \subset \mathcal{G}_\xi^{m(x-\varepsilon)} R_m,$$

which gives that $\mu\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) = \mu\left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right)$. The remaining assertions are trivial. \square

We prepare the following:

Proposition 6.9 (cf. [Xu24, Propositions 6.6 and 6.29]). *Assume that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters.*

- (1) *Set $C := \text{dist}(0, \partial(\mathbf{P}^L))$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then, for every $e_- \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathcal{F}^{e_-} R_m = R_m$ for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have*

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) \geq C|\xi| + e_-$$

for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$.

- (2) *For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and take any approximating sequence $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ of \mathcal{F}_i . Then we have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right).$$

Proof. (1) By Lemma 3.1 (1), we have $0 = \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} \in \text{int}(\mathbf{P}^L)$. In particular, we have $C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L$, let us set

$$T_{m,\alpha} := \frac{1}{m} \max\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathcal{F}^x R_{m,\alpha} \neq 0\}.$$

From the assumption, we have $T_{m,\alpha} \geq e_-$ for any $\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L$. Thus we get

$$T_m(\mathcal{F}_\xi) = \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \left\{ T_{m,\alpha} + \left\langle \frac{\alpha}{m}, \xi \right\rangle \right\} \geq e_- + \frac{1}{m} \max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_m^L} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\},$$

where T_m be as in [Xu24, §3.1.2]. By [Xu24, Lemma 3.22], we get

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) \geq \max_{\alpha \in \mathbf{P}^L} \{\langle \alpha, \xi \rangle\} + e_- \geq C|\xi| + e_-.$$

- (2) Let \mathcal{F} (resp., $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$) be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ (resp., $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k$). Take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. By Lemma 2.15 (2), $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of $\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}$.

Moreover, by Proposition 4.4 (2), the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k$ (resp., $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k$) is equal to $\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}$ (resp., \mathcal{F}_ξ). Therefore, by Lemma 2.16 and Proposition 4.3, we have

$$S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}),$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}).$$

This implies that, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) = \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right).$$

We observe the following claim:

Claim 6.10. *There exist $C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq C|\xi| + e,$$

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq C|\xi| + e.$$

Proof of Claim 6.10. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) &= \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) \\ &= \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i), \\ \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) &= \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}). \end{aligned}$$

By (1), there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that:

- there exists $e_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq C|\xi| + e_\infty - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

and

- for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists $e_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq C|\xi| + e_m - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}).$$

Moreover, since $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} , we can take the value e_m independent of $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We may assume that $e_m = e_\infty$ for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Moreover, since $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}) = \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i)$, there exists $e \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$e_\infty - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \geq e,$$

$$e_m - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}) \geq e.$$

Thus we finish to prove Claim 6.10. \square

By Claim 6.10, there exists a compact subset $\Xi \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that, the minimum of the functions

- $\xi \mapsto \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right)$ and
- $\xi \mapsto \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right)$ for all $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$

over $N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ can be attained over Ξ . Moreover, if we set

$$C_1 := \max \{ \text{dist} (0, \partial (\mathbf{P}^L)) \} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0},$$

then, for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi_1}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi_2}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \lambda_{\max} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi_1}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \lambda_{\max} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi_2}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right| \\ &\leq 2C_1 |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of [Xu24, Proposition 6.29]. Therefore, the sequence

$$\left\{ \xi \mapsto \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$$

of functions over Ξ are Lipschitz continuous with the same Lipschitz constant $2C_1$, and pointwise converges to

$$\xi \mapsto \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

Hence the sequence of functions uniformly converges to the above function over Ξ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \\ &= \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion (2) follows. \square

Theorem 6.11 (cf. [Xu24, §3.4.2 and Proposition 6.3.1]). *Assume that $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ satisfies the following: for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have*

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

Then, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have

$$\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right).$$

Proof. By Corollary 6.7, we have $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. Moreover, by Lemma 6.8, we may assume that each \mathcal{F}_i is \mathbb{Z} -valued. Let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, take any \mathbb{Z} -valued approximating sequence $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ of \mathcal{F}_i , and let $\mathcal{F}_{(m)}$ be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k$ for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Recall that, by Proposition 4.5, $\{\mathcal{F}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{F} .

Let us set

$$\begin{aligned} I_{(m;x)}^{(i)} &:= I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}_i) = I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}), \\ I_{(m;x)} &:= I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}) = I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) \end{aligned}$$

as in Definitions 2.5 and 3.2. Since \mathcal{F}_i is \mathbb{Z} -valued, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$I_{(m;\lambda)} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k \geq \lambda}} I_{(m;\lambda_1)}^{(1)} \cdots I_{(m;\lambda_k)}^{(k)}.$$

Moreover, let us consider the fractional ideals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_m^{(i)} &:= \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}), \\ \mathcal{I}_m &:= \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) \end{aligned}$$

on $X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. As above, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_m = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{I}_m^{(i)}.$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $(\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ be the normalized blowup test configuration of (X, L_i) along $\mathcal{I}_m^{(i)}$ in the sense of Definition 2.20. We recall the definition. Take a $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant birational morphism

$$p_m: \mathcal{W}_m \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

with \mathcal{W}_m normal and p_m an isomorphism over $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ and there exists a Cartier divisor $mD_m^{(i)}$ on \mathcal{W}_m such that $p_m^{-1}\mathcal{I}_m^{(i)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}_m}(-mD_m^{(i)})$ holds for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. The $(\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ is defined to be the ample model of the semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisor

$$p_m^*(L_i)_{\mathbb{A}^1} - D_m^{(i)}$$

over \mathbb{A}^1 . Since

$$p_m^{-1}\mathcal{I}_m = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}_m} \left(-m \sum_{i=1}^k D_m^{(i)} \right),$$

the normalized blowup test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L) along \mathcal{I}_m is equal to the normalized sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m)})\}_{i=1}^k$.

Let us take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$. Fix $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with $e\xi \in N(\mathbb{T})$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, set

$$(\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}) := \left(\left((\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)})^{\overline{(e)}} \right)_{e\xi}, \left((\mathcal{L}_{i,(m)})^{\overline{(e)}} \right)_{e\xi} \right)$$

(see Definition 2.17). Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \left((\mathcal{F}_i)^{(e)} \right)_{e\xi}, \quad \mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{F}^{(e)})_{e\xi}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{i,(m)} := \left((\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)})^{(e)} \right)_{e\xi}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(m)} := \left((\mathcal{F}_{(m)})^{(e)} \right)_{e\xi}$$

(in the sense of Proposition 2.21 (2)). By Propositions 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and Lemma 2.15 (2), we have:

- \mathcal{G} is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k$.
- $\{\mathcal{G}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{G} .
- $\mathcal{G}_{(m)}$ is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k$.
- $\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is an approximating sequence of \mathcal{G}_i .

Moreover, by Proposition 2.21, the test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ is equal to the normalized blowup test configuration of (X, L_i) along

$$\mathcal{J}_m^{(i)} := \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}).$$

We again recall the definition. Take a $(\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{T})$ -equivariant birational morphism

$$q_m: \mathcal{Z}_m \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

with \mathcal{Z}_m normal and q_m an isomorphism over $\mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ and there exists a Cartier divisor $mE_m^{(i)}$ on \mathcal{Z}_m such that $q_m^{-1}\mathcal{J}_m^{(i)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_m}(-mE_m^{(i)})$ holds for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. The $(\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ is defined to be the ample model of the semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisor

$$q_m^*(L_i)_{\mathbb{A}^1} - E_m^{(i)}$$

on \mathcal{Z}_m over \mathbb{A}^1 . We set

$$\mathcal{J}_m := \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{J}_m^{(i)},$$

where the last equality follows from the property that each \mathcal{G}_i is \mathbb{Z} -valued. Since

$$q_m^{-1} \mathcal{J}_m = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_m} \left(-m \sum_{i=1}^k E_m^{(i)} \right),$$

the normalized blowup test configuration $(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L) along \mathcal{J}_m is equal to the normalized sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)})\}_{i=1}^k$. Moreover, again by Proposition 2.21, we have

$$(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}) = \left(\left((\mathcal{X}_{(m)})^{\overline{(e)}} \right)_{e\xi}, \left((\mathcal{L}_{(m)})^{\overline{(e)}} \right)_{e\xi} \right).$$

Let $\theta_m: \mathcal{Z}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{(m)}$ be the natural morphism. Note that

$$q_m^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - \sum_{i=1}^k E_m^{(i)} = -\theta_m^* \left(K_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}} \right)$$

holds, where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}}$ be as in [Xu24, Definition 2.24]. Therefore, since $\{\mathcal{G}_{(m)}\}_{m \in r_{\mathbb{Z}} > 0}$ is an approximating sequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) &= \text{lct} \left(X_{\mathbb{A}^1}, \Delta_{\mathbb{A}^1} + \mathcal{J}_m^{\frac{1}{m}}; X \times \{0\} \right) - 1 \\ &= \text{lct} \left(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}}; \mathcal{Y}_{(m), 0} \right) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{(m), 0}$ is the fiber of $\mathcal{Y}_{(m)} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ at $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,(m),\xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \\ &= \text{Ding}(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)}) + \frac{\binom{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)}}{\binom{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)}} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\binom{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{i,(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L_i^n)}}{\binom{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{i,(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L_i^n)}} - \varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{e} \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} \left(\text{Ding} \left(\mathcal{X}_{(m)}^{\overline{(e)}}, \mathcal{L}_{(m)}^{\overline{(e)}} \right) + \frac{\binom{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)}}{\binom{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L^n)}} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\binom{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{i,(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L_i^n)}}{\binom{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{i,(m)}^{n+1}}{(n+1)(L_i^n)}} - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} \left(\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from [Xu24, Lemma 2.25] and the third equality follows from Proposition 6.5 (2) and Lemma 6.6. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \\ &= \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \\ &= \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}) - \varepsilon \left(\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{(m),\xi}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m),\xi}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} \left(\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) + S_L(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}) - \varepsilon \left(\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}) \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} \left(\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}} \left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 6.6 and the third equality follows from Lemma 2.24.

As in the proof of [Xu24, Theorem 3.63], more precisely, by [Xu24, equation (3.42)], we have

$$S_{L_i}(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}) \leq S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}}), \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}}).$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \\ &= \mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) - (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}) - \varepsilon \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}_{(m)}) \\ &\geq \text{lct}\left(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}} + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}}; \mathcal{Y}_{(m), 0}\right) - 1 \\ &\quad - (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}}) - \varepsilon \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}}) \\ &= \text{Ding}(\mathcal{Y}_{(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{(m)}) + \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{(m)}^{n+1})}{(n+1)(L^n)} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{i,(m)}^{n+1})}{(n+1)(L_i^n)} - \varepsilon \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}) \\ &= \text{Ding}\left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Ding}\left(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,(m), \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i,(m), \xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} \left(\text{Ding}\left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{Y}_{i,(m)}, \mathcal{M}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{e} \left(\mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{G}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m), \xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right). \end{aligned}$$

From the assumption, we get

$$\mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right)$$

for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

By Proposition 6.9 (2) and [Xu24, Theorems 3.58 and 3.60], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) &= \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{CP}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right), & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}) &= S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i), \\ \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_L(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) &= S_L(\mathcal{F}), & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) &= \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}\}_{i=1}^k\right) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}_{(m)}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,(m)}) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F}) + S_L(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we complete the proof of Theorem 6.11. \square

Corollary 6.12. (1) *The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable.
 - (ii) For any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) \geq 0$.
- (2) *The following are equivalent:*
- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.

- (ii) *There exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$.*

Proof. Trivial from Theorem 6.11, Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.5 (2). \square

Theorem 6.13 (cf. [Xu24, Theorem 4.13]). *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$.*
- (2) *There exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), there exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) \geq 0$ holds.*

Proof. We firstly remark that, each assumption implies that $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$ by Corollaries 6.12 and 6.7.

(1) \implies (2): (The proof is essentially same as the proof of [Xu24, Theorem 6.34].) Take $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ with $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, n, \alpha(X, \Delta)) > 1$ as in [Xu24, Theorem 3.50]. (The definition of $\alpha(X, \Delta) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ can be found in [Xu24, Definition 3.38] with $L = -(K_X + \Delta)$.) Take any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$). We can assume that, there exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that

$$\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k).$$

Set

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{F}_{i,\xi,[-S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi})]},$$

and let \mathcal{G} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{L_i}(\mathcal{G}_i) &= 0, \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}_i) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) - S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}), \quad \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}), \\ \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta') &= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta') \end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. In particular, we get the inequality

$$\mu(\mathcal{G}) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{G}).$$

The last three lines of the proof of [Xu24, Theorem 3.50] exactly shows that $\mu(\mathcal{G}; \delta) \geq 0$ under the above assumption. Since

$$\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) = \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) = \mu(\mathcal{G}; \delta) \geq 0,$$

we get the assertion (2).

(2) \implies (1): Let us fix a small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ satisfying

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha(X, \Delta)}\right) \geq 0.$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. There exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) \geq 0$. Recall that \mathcal{F}_{ξ} is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k$.

Set $\mu := \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})$. If $\mu = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})$, then we have

$$\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) - \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) = \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) = 0.$$

Thus we may assume that $\mu < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})$. By Lemma 2.23, we have

$$\text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})) = 1.$$

Moreover, there exists $v \in \text{Val}_X^{< \infty, \mathbb{T}}$ with $A_{X, \Delta}(v) = v(I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}))$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\xi} \subset \mathcal{F}_{v, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v)]}$. In particular, we get

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{\xi}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{v, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v)]}) = T_L(v) + \mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v),$$

where $T_L = T$ is in the sense of [Xu24, §3.1.2]. Moreover, we have

$$\mu(\mathcal{F}_\xi; \delta) \leq \mu\left(\mathcal{F}_{v, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v)]}; \delta\right) \leq \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v),$$

where the last inequality follows from the argument in [Xu24, equation (4.10)]. This implies that

$$0 \leq \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta\right) \leq \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}).$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \\ &= \mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k\right) \\ &= \mu - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}) - \varepsilon \left(\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\xi) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}) \right) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\mu - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}) \right) - \varepsilon (T_L(v) - A_{X, \Delta}(v)) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) A_{X, \Delta}(v) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta} \right) - \varepsilon (T_L(v) - A_{X, \Delta}(v)) \\ &\geq A_{X, \Delta}(v) \left((1 - \varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha(X, \Delta)} \right) \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get the assertion (1). \square

7. THE COUPLED STABILITY THRESHOLD

In this section, we introduce the notion of the \mathbb{T} -reduced coupled stability threshold and see its basic properties and relationship with coupled Ding stability. In this section, we follow the notation in §6.

We begin with the following easy lemma:

Lemma 7.1. *For any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{\leq \infty, \mathbb{T}}$ and $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$A_{X, \Delta}(v_\xi) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi) = A_{X, \Delta}(v) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v) - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}}, \xi \rangle.$$

In particular, we have

$$A_{X, \Delta}(\text{wt}_\xi) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\text{wt}_\xi) = - \langle \alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}}, \xi \rangle.$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Corollary 2.12, Proposition 2.8 and Lemma 3.1 (3). \square

Definition 7.2. We set

$$\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}\left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) := \inf_{v \in \text{Val}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}}} \sup_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})} \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v_\xi)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi)},$$

and call it the \mathbb{T} -reduced coupled stability threshold of $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$. If \mathbb{T} is trivial, then we simply write it $\delta(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ and call it the *coupled stability threshold* of $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$. If $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ is a maximal torus, then we write it $\delta^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ and call it the *reduced coupled stability threshold* of $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$. The notion of reduced coupled

stability threshold does not depend on the choice of maximal tori as we observed in Definition 6.3.

Remark 7.3. (1) Assume that \mathbb{T} is trivial. Then, as in the proof of [BJ20] (see [Fuj24] in detail), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) &= \inf_{v \in \text{Val}_X^{\leq \infty}} \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v)} = \inf_{v \in \text{QM}_X} \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v)} \\ &= \inf_{\substack{E: \text{prime divisor} \\ \text{over } X}} \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(E)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(E)} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \delta_m \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where, for $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ very big,

$$\delta_m \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) := \inf \left\{ \text{lct} \left(X, \Delta; \sum_{i=1}^k D_i \right) \mid \begin{array}{l} D_i : m\text{-basis type } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor} \\ \text{of } L_i \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \leq k \end{array} \right\}.$$

For the definition of basis type \mathbb{Q} -divisors, see [BJ20] or [Fuj24].

(2) Assume that (X, Δ) is a toric pair with $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{G}_m^n$ a maximal torus. Then $\text{Val}_X^{*,\mathbb{T}} = \emptyset$. Therefore, we must have $\delta^{\text{red}} \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \infty$.

We consider a coupled analogue of Zhuang's theorem [Zhu21, Theorem 4.4].

Proposition 7.4 (cf. [Xu24, Theorem 4.61]). *Assume that $\delta \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) < 1$. Then there exists a \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisor E over X such that E is an lc place of a \mathbb{Q} -complement of (X, Δ) (see [Xu24, Definition 1.81]) and $A_{X,\Delta}(E) < \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(E)$ holds.*

Proof. Set $\delta := \delta \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right)$. Fix a small $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\delta \cdot (1 + \varepsilon)^2 < 1$. By [BJ20, Corollary 3.6] (or [Xu24, Theorem 3.33]), there exists $m_0 \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that, for any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{\leq \infty}$, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m_0}$, we have

$$S_{L_i,m}(v) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)S_{L_i}(v).$$

(For the definition of $S_{L_i,m} = S_m$, see [Xu24, Definition 3.26].) After replacing m_0 if necessary, we may further assume that

$$\delta_m := \delta_m \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) < \delta \cdot (1 + \varepsilon)$$

for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m_0}$. Take any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m_0}$. By [Xu24, Theorem 4.61], there exists a \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisor E over X such that

$$\delta_m = \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(E)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i,m}(E)}$$

holds. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let us take an m -basis type \mathbb{Q} -divisor D_i of L_i compatible with E (see [Xu24, Definition 3.9]). Then the pair

$$\left(X, \Delta + \delta_m \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k D_i \right)$$

is a log canonical Fano pair such that E is an lc place. Therefore, E is an lc place of a \mathbb{Q} -complement of (X, Δ) . Moreover, since

$$\frac{A_{X,\Delta}(E)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(E)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(E)}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i,m}(E)} = (1 + \varepsilon)\delta_m < (1 + \varepsilon)^2\delta < 1,$$

we get the assertion. \square

Corollary 7.5. *Assume that $\delta \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) < 1$. Then, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exist \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configurations $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) / \mathbb{A}^1$ such that $\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) < 0$ holds.*

Proof. Take a \mathbb{T} -invariant prime divisor E over X as in Proposition 7.4. Since E is an lc place of a \mathbb{Q} -complement of (X, Δ) , by [BCHM10], there exists the extraction $q: Y \rightarrow X$ of E , i.e., $E \subset Y$ is a prime \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor such that $-E$ is ample over X . Moreover, Y is of Fano type. In particular, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, the divisor E is dreamy with respects to L_i in the sense of [Xu24, Definition 4.17]. As in [Xu24, Lemmas 4.16 and 4.18], for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exists a \mathbb{T} -equivariant normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) / \mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) such that the fiber of $\mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ is integral and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i} = \mathcal{F}_E$ holds. Set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i}$ on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Observe that

$$\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = \mu \left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) = \mu(\mathcal{F}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(E).$$

For any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_E \left(I_{(m; xm)}(\mathcal{F}) \right) &= \text{ord}_E \left(\sum_{t_1 + \dots + t_k = xm} I_{(m; t_1)}(\mathcal{F}_1) \cdots I_{(m; t_k)}(\mathcal{F}_k) \right) \\ &= \min_{t_1 + \dots + t_k = xm} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{ord}_E \left(I_{(m; t_i)}(\mathcal{F}_i) \right) \geq \min_{t_1 + \dots + t_k = xm} \sum_{i=1}^k t_i = xm. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mu(\mathcal{F}) \leq A_{X, \Delta}(E)$. Since $A_{X, \Delta}(E) < \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(E)$, we get the inequality $\text{Ding} \left(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) < 0$. \square

Proposition 7.6 (cf. [Xu24, Theorem 4.12]). *Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &:= \delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}} \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right), \\ \delta_0 &:= \sup \left\{ \delta' \in [0, \infty) \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{For any } \mathbb{T}\text{-equivariant filtration } \mathcal{F}_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k), \\ \text{there exists } \xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}); \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Then $\delta \geq \delta_0$ holds. If \mathbb{T} is trivial, then $\delta = \delta_0$ holds.

Proof. Let us prove $\delta \geq \delta_0$. We may assume that $\delta_0 > 0$. Take any $v \in \text{Val}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}}$ and $\delta' \in (0, \delta_0)$. Note that, for any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, the valuation v_{ξ} is not trivial. In particular, we have $A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}), S_{L_i}(v_{\xi}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_v$ on R^i . Then there exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) \geq 0$ holds. Set $\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{F}_{v_{\xi}}$ on R^i . Then, by Corollary 2.11, we have $\mathcal{G}_i = \mathcal{F}_{i, \xi, [\theta_{\xi}^{L_i}(v)]}$. Observe that

$$\mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) = \mathbf{D} \left(\left\{ \mathcal{G}_{i, [-\theta_{\xi}^{L_i}(v)]} \right\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) = \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right).$$

As in the proof of Corollary 7.5, we have

$$\mu \left(\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) \leq \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi})}{\delta'}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$0 \leq \mathbf{D} \left(\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta' \right) \leq \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi})}{\delta'} - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_{\xi}).$$

This immediately implies the inequality $\delta \geq \delta'$. Thus we get $\delta \geq \delta_0$.

From now on, let us assume that \mathbb{T} is trivial, and let us show the inequality $\delta \leq \delta_0$. Take any filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. We set $I_{(m;x)}^{(i)} := I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ and $I_{(m;x)} := I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F})$. Set $\mu := \mu(\mathcal{F}; \delta)$. We want to show the inequality $\mu - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \geq 0$. Since

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i), \quad S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i),$$

we may assume that $\mu < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$. By Lemma 2.23, we have

$$\text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}) = \delta.$$

Moreover, there exists $v \in \text{Val}_X^{\leq \infty}$ such that

$$\delta = \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{v(I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)})}, \quad \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{v, \left[\mu - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} \right]}.$$

Claim 7.7. *For any $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k t_i + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \mu \leq \sum_{i=1}^k v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (t_i)}).$$

Proof of Claim 7.7. If there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $t_i > \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$, then the right hand side of the inequality is ∞ . Thus we may assume that $t_i \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Moreover, the function $t_i \mapsto v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (t_i)})$ is non-decreasing and convex over $t_i \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)]$. Thus we may assume that $t_i < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Set $t := \sum_{i=1}^k t_i$. Fix $\lambda_i \in (t_i, \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_i))$. By Lemma 2.7, for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists $m_0 \in r\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, $x_i \in (-\infty, \lambda_i]$ and $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m_0}$, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{v(I_{(m;x_i m)}^{(i)})}{m} - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (x_i)}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{v, \left[\mu - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} \right]}$, we have

$$v(I_{(m;tm)}) \geq tm - \left(\mu - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} \right) m$$

for any $m \in r\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m_0}$. Note that

$$I_{(m;tm)} \supset I_{(m;t_1 m)}^{(1)} \cdots I_{(m;t_k m)}^{(k)}.$$

This implies that

$$t - \mu + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} \leq \frac{v(I_{(m;tm)})}{m} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{v(I_{(m;t_i m)}^{(i)})}{m} < \sum_{i=1}^k v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (t_i)}) + \varepsilon$$

for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Thus we get the assertion in Claim 7.7. \square

Claim 7.8. *Take any $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $t_1, \dots, t_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}$.*

(1) *We have*

$$\sum_{h=j}^k (S_{L_h}(v) - S_{L_h}(\mathcal{F}_h)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (t_i)})) + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \mu.$$

(2) *We have*

$$\sum_{h=j}^k (T_{L_h}(v) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_h)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i), (t_i)})) + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \mu.$$

Proof of Claim 7.8. We only see (1), since the strategy of the proof of (2) is completely the same as the proof of (1). We show (1) by induction on $-j$. Assume that $j = k$. By Claim 7.7, we have

$$v(I_{\bullet}^{(k),(t_k)}) \geq t_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \mu$$

for any $t_k \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{F}_k \subset \mathcal{F}_v, \left[-\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu \right].$$

Thus we get

$$S_{L_k}(\mathcal{F}_k) \leq S_{L_k}(v) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu,$$

which is nothing but the assertion (1) for $j = k$.

Assume that the assertion (1) holds for $j + 1$, i.e.,

$$v(I_{\bullet}^{(j),(t_j)}) \geq t_j - \sum_{h=j+1}^k (S_{L_h}(v) - S_{L_h}(\mathcal{F}_h)) + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) + \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \mu$$

holds for any $t_j \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{F}_j \subset \mathcal{F}_v, \left[\sum_{h=j+1}^k (S_{L_h}(v) - S_{L_h}(\mathcal{F}_h)) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu \right].$$

Therefore, we get

$$S_{L_j}(\mathcal{F}_j) \leq S_{L_j}(v) + \sum_{h=j+1}^k (S_{L_h}(v) - S_{L_h}(\mathcal{F}_h)) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v(I_{\bullet}^{(i),(t_i)})) - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu,$$

which is nothing but the assertion (1). Thus we have proved Claim 7.8. \square

By applying Claim 7.8 (1) with $j = 1$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v) - \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} + \mu.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) = \mu - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_i) \geq \frac{A_{X,\Delta}(v)}{\delta} - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v) \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of δ . Thus we get the inequality $\delta \leq \delta_0$ when \mathbb{T} is trivial. \square

Theorem 7.9. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$.*
- (2) *$(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters and $\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) > 1$ holds.*

Proof. (1) \implies (2): By Corollaries 6.7 and 6.12, we know that $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. The inequality $\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) > 1$ follows from Theorem 6.13 and Proposition 7.6.

(2) \implies (1): Fix any $\delta \in \left(1, \delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)\right)$, and take a small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ with $1 + n\varepsilon \leq \delta$. We show that the ε satisfies the assertion (1). For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_i

be a \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration on R^i , and let \mathcal{F} be the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. We set $I_{(m;x)} := I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F})$. Set $\mu := \mu(\mathcal{F})$. If $\mu = \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$, then

$$\mathbf{D}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) - \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}\left(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k\right) = 0.$$

Thus we may assume that $\mu < \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F})$. By Lemma 2.23, we have

$$\text{lct}(X, \Delta; I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)}) = 1,$$

Moreover, there exists $v \in \text{Val}_X^{<\infty, \mathbb{T}}$ such that $A_{X, \Delta}(v) = v(I_{\bullet}^{(\mu)})$ and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{v, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v)]}$.

We observe that, there exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) \geq \delta \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_{\xi})$. Indeed, if $v \in \text{Val}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}}$, then the above inequality follows from the definition of δ . Otherwise, we can write $v = \text{wt}_{\xi'}$ for some $\xi' \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, and then the above inequality holds if we take $\xi := -\xi'$. Note that, for such ξ , we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi} \subset \left(\mathcal{F}_{v, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v)]}\right)_{\xi} = \mathcal{F}_{v_{\xi}, [\mu - A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi})]}$$

by Corollary 2.11. Recall that \mathcal{F}_{ξ} is the sum filtration of $\{\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}\}_{i=1}^k$. Moreover, by [Xu24, Lemma 6.24], we have $\mu = \mu(\mathcal{F}_{\xi})$. Set $I_{(m;x)}^{(\xi, i)} := I_{(m;x)}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi})$. By completely the same argument in the proof of Claims 7.7 and 7.8, we get the following:

- For any $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k t_i + A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) - \mu \leq \sum_{i=1}^k v_{\xi}(I_{\bullet}^{(\xi, i), (t_i)}).$$

- For any $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $t_1, \dots, t_{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{h=j}^k (S_{L_h}(v_{\xi}) - S_{L_h}(\mathcal{F}_{h, \xi})) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v_{\xi}(I_{\bullet}^{(\xi, i), (t_i)})) + A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) - \mu, \\ \sum_{h=j}^k (T_{L_h}(v_{\xi}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{h, \xi})) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (t_i - v_{\xi}(I_{\bullet}^{(\xi, i), (t_i)})) + A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) - \mu. \end{aligned}$$

- In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_{\xi}) - A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) + \mu, \\ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i, \xi}) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k T_{L_i}(v_{\xi}) - A_{X, \Delta}(v_{\xi}) + \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha_{bc}^{\text{cp}} = 0$, we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) = \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ by Lemma 6.6. Moreover, by [BJ20, Lemma 2.6] (or [Xu24, Lemma 3.31]), we have $T_{L_i}(v_\xi) \leq (n+1)S_{L_i}(v_\xi)$. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) \\
&= \mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) - \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k) \\
&= \mu - (1-\varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) - \varepsilon \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}) \\
&\geq \mu - (1-\varepsilon) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi) - A_{X,\Delta}(v_\xi) + \mu \right) - \varepsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^k T_{L_i}(v_\xi) - A_{X,\Delta}(v_\xi) + \mu \right) \\
&= A_{X,\Delta}(v_\xi) - (1-\varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi) - \varepsilon \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k T_{L_i}(v_\xi) \\
&\geq A_{X,\Delta}(v_\xi) - (1+n\varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi) \geq A_{X,\Delta}(v_\xi) - \delta \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_\xi) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we get the assertion (1). \square

As a consequence, we get the following desired result:

Corollary 7.10. (1) *The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is coupled Ding semistable.
 - (ii) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable.
 - (iii) For any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq 0$.
 - (iv) $\delta(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq 1$ holds.
- (2) *If $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable, then $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ must be a maximal torus.*
- (3) *Let $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ be a maximal torus. The following are equivalent:*
- (i) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.
 - (ii) There exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), we have $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$.
 - (iii) There exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ such that, for any \mathbb{T} -equivariant filtration \mathcal{F}_i on R^i ($1 \leq i \leq k$), there exists $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\{\mathcal{F}_{i,\xi}\}_{i=1}^k; \delta) \geq 0$ holds.
 - (iv) $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled Futaki characters and $\delta^{\text{red}}(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) > 1$ holds.

Proof. (1) (1i) \implies (1ii) is trivial. (1ii) \iff (1iii) follows from Corollary 6.12. (1ii) \implies (1iv) follows from Corollary 7.5. (1iv) \implies (1i) follows from Proposition 7.6.

(2) Assume that $\mathbb{T} \subsetneq \tilde{\mathbb{T}} \subset \text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$. Since $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is \mathbb{T} -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable, by (1), it is $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ -equivariantly coupled Ding semistable. In particular, we have

$$N_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}) \supset \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^L \ni \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\alpha}_{bc}^{\text{cp}} = 0.$$

Take any $\tilde{\xi} \in N(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}) \setminus N(\mathbb{T})$. Consider the product test configurations $(X_{\tilde{\xi}}, (L_i)_{\tilde{\xi}}) / \mathbb{A}^1$ of (X, L_i) . Then, by Corollary 6.7, we have

$$\text{Ding}(\{X_{\tilde{\xi}}, (L_i)_{\tilde{\xi}}\}_{i=1}^k) = 0.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1 (4), we have

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}} \left(\{X_{\bar{\xi}}, (L_i)_{\bar{\xi}}\}_{i=1}^k \right) > 0.$$

This leads to a contradiction. Therefore we get the assertion (2).

(3) (3i) \iff (3ii) follows from Corollary 6.12. (3ii) \iff (3iii) follows from Theorem 6.13. (3ii) \iff (3iv) follows from Theorem 7.9. \square

Remark 7.11. One may expect that the conditions in Corollary 7.10 (1) might be equivalent to the following condition:

$$(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k) \text{ has vanishing coupled } \mathbb{T}\text{-Futaki characters and } \delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}} \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) \geq 1 \text{ holds.}$$

However, this condition is not equivalent to the conditions in Corollary 7.10 (1) in general. In fact, assume that $(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ is not coupled Ding semistable, a maximal subtorus \mathbb{T} of $\text{Aut}(X, \Delta)$ is nontrivial and $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. Take any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \text{Val}_X^{*, \mathbb{T}}$. By Lemma 7.1, we have

$$A_{X, \Delta}(v_{e\xi}) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_{e\xi}) = A_{X, \Delta}(v) - \sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v)$$

for any $e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. On the other hand, $A_{X, \Delta}(v_{e\xi}) = A_{X, \Delta}(v) + \theta_{e\xi}^L(v)$ as in Proposition 2.8. By the definition of $\theta_{e\xi}^L(v)$, we have

$$\lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{e\xi}^L(v) = \infty.$$

This implies that

$$\lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{X, \Delta}(v_{e\xi})}{\sum_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}(v_{e\xi})} = 1.$$

Together with Corollary 7.10 (3), we must have $\delta_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{red}} \left(X, \Delta; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k \right) = 1$.

8. ON THE CONJECTURE OF HULTGREN AND WITT NYSTRÖM

In this section, we work over the complex number field \mathbb{C} . Let X be an n -dimensional Fano manifold, with $\Delta = 0$. We fix a maximal (algebraic) torus $\mathbb{T} \subset \text{Aut}_0(X)$, and its maximal compact subgroup $\mathbb{T}_r \subset \mathbb{T}$ which is a real torus. We then fix \mathbb{T} -linearized ample \mathbb{Q} -line bundles L_1, \dots, L_k on X with $-K_X = \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$.

We first review the bare minimum of analytic details concerning the coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics and the coupled Ding functional. All the details can be found in the original paper [HWN19] where these objects were introduced. We pick reference \mathbb{T}_r -invariant hermitian metrics h_1, \dots, h_k on L_1, \dots, L_k respectively, and associated Kähler metrics $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ in $c_1(L_1), \dots, c_1(L_k)$. We also define the volume form $d\mu'_0$ on X by $h_1 \otimes \dots \otimes h_k$, recalling that a hermitian metric on $-K_X$ naturally defines a volume form; see [HWN19, §2] or [Has21, §3.4] for more details.

For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, we define

$$\mathcal{H}_i := \{ \phi_i \in C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}) \mid \theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i / 2\pi > 0 \}$$

to be the space of Kähler metrics in $c_1(L_i)$. We then define the space of coupled Kähler metrics as

$$\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_k.$$

Since L_1, \dots, L_k are \mathbb{T} -linearized, \mathbb{T} naturally acts on $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_k$ by pullback. With this action understood, the space of \mathbb{T}_r -invariant Kähler potentials is written as $\mathcal{H}_1^{\mathbb{T}_r}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_k^{\mathbb{T}_r}$, with

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{T}_r} := \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathbb{T}_r} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_k^{\mathbb{T}_r}.$$

Definition 8.1. The *coupled Ding functional* is a map $D^{\text{cp}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) := L^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\phi_i),$$

where

$$L^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) := -\log \int_X \exp \left(-\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \right) d\mu'_0$$

and

$$E_i(\phi_i) := \frac{1}{(n+1) \int_X c_1(L_i)^n} \sum_{j=0}^n \int_X \phi_i \theta_i^{n-j} \wedge (\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i / 2\pi)^j.$$

The coupled Ding functional is said to be \mathbb{T} -*coercive* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(4) \quad D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) \geq \varepsilon J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

holds for all $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{T}r}$; in the above, $J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}$ is a functional defined on $\mathcal{H}_i^{\mathbb{T}r}$ as

$$J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) := \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}} \sum_{i=1}^k J_i(\sigma^* \phi_i),$$

where

$$J_i(\phi_i) := \frac{1}{\int_X c_1(L_i)^n} \int_X \phi_i \theta_i^n - E_i(\phi_i).$$

Using the functional $L : \mathcal{H}(-K_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that appears in the usual Ding functional (see e.g. [BBJ21, Definition 2.7]), we may also write

$$(5) \quad L^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) = L \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \right).$$

We write $\mathcal{E}_1^1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k^1$ respectively for the completion of $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_k$ with respect to the d_1 -topology, as explained in [Dar19, GZ17]. As above, \mathbb{T}_r -invariant spaces are written as $(\mathcal{E}_1^1)^{\mathbb{T}r}, \dots, (\mathcal{E}_k^1)^{\mathbb{T}r}$, and we denote

$$\mathcal{E}^1 := \mathcal{E}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^1, \quad (\mathcal{E}^1)^{\mathbb{T}r} := (\mathcal{E}_1^1)^{\mathbb{T}r} \times \dots \times (\mathcal{E}_k^1)^{\mathbb{T}r}.$$

We give a product metric on the spaces above, induced from the d_1 metrics on each factor. In case it is necessary to make the polarization explicit, we may write $d_{1,i}$ for the d_1 metric on \mathcal{E}_i^1 .

While these spaces of metrics are defined for L_1, \dots, L_k , we also need to consider the space of Kähler metrics in $-K_X$, which we denote as $\mathcal{H}(-K_X)$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$, where the reference metric is $\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i$. The decomposition $-K_X = L_1 + \dots + L_k$ gives rise to the following natural map.

Proposition 8.2. *The map $S : \mathcal{H}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(-K_X)$ defined by*

$$S(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) := \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i$$

extends to a continuous map $S : \mathcal{E}_1^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ with respect to the d_1 metric.

In the rest of the paper, we do not need the continuity of S , but the statement is included here for completeness. This result can be regarded as an Archimedean version of Proposition 5.3.

Proof. The map $\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{H}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(-K_X)$ is well-defined since the reference Kähler metric on $\mathcal{H}^1(-K_X)$ is given by $\sum_{j=1}^k \theta_j$. We prove that $\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{E}_1^1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{E}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ is well-defined. We start by proving that if $\phi_i \in \mathcal{E}_i^1$, then $\phi_i \in \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$. We set $\omega := \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i$ for the reference metric, and assume first that $\sup_X \phi_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

It is obvious that ϕ_i is ω -psh. By the definition of \mathcal{E}_i^1 (see e.g. [GZ17, Definition 10.15]), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \phi_i (\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i)^j \wedge \theta_i^{n-j} > -\infty.$$

Since \mathcal{E}_i^1 is convex [Dar19, Corollary 2.20], we also have $s\phi_i \in \mathcal{E}_i^1$ for all $0 \leq s \leq 1$, meaning

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \phi_i (\theta_i + s\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i)^j \wedge \theta_i^{n-j} > -\infty.$$

for any $0 \leq s \leq 1$. We take $s > 0$ to be small enough so that $\theta_i \geq s\omega$, and hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \phi_i (s\omega + s\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i)^j \wedge (s\omega)^{n-j} > \sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \phi_i (\theta_i + s\sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i)^j \wedge \theta_i^{n-j} > -\infty$$

which establishes $\phi_i \in \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Again by the convexity of $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$, we thus find $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i/k \in \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$. Note on the other hand that $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i$ is ω -psh by definition, with $\sup_X \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \right) \leq 0$, and hence we get $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \in \mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^{n+1}} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i) \right)^j \wedge \omega^{n-j} \\ & > \sum_{j=1}^n \int_X \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\phi_j}{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\theta_j + \frac{1}{k} \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_j \right) \right)^j \wedge \omega^{n-j} > -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The general case is obvious by considering $\phi_i - \sup_X \phi_i$.

We prove the continuity. Pick $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k) \in \mathcal{E}^1$ and a sequence $\{(\psi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \psi_k^{(j)})\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{E}^1$ such that $d_{1,i}(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)}) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i, \sum_{i=1}^k \psi_i^{(j)} \right) \\ & \leq d_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i, \psi_1^{(j)} + \sum_{i=2}^k \phi_i \right) + d_1 \left(\psi_1^{(j)} + \sum_{i=2}^k \phi_i, \sum_{i=1}^k \psi_i^{(j)} \right) \\ & \leq d_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i, \psi_1^{(j)} + \sum_{i=2}^k \phi_i \right) + \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} d_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \psi_i^{(j)} + \sum_{i=m+1}^k \phi_i, \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \psi_i^{(j)} + \sum_{i=m+2}^k \phi_i \right), \end{aligned}$$

where d_1 is the metric on $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ with the reference metric ω and we decree $\sum_{i=m+2}^k \phi_i = 0$ for $m = k-1$. Recalling [Dar19, Theorem 3.32], it thus suffices to show

$$\int_X |\phi_i - \psi_i^{(j)}| \omega_v^n \rightarrow 0$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, for any $i = 1, \dots, k$ and for any potential v which appears in the inequality above. We take a constant $C > 0$ such that all the metrics appearing in the above inequality are within distance C from the origin with respect to d_1 . Then, [Dar19, Corollary 3.50] shows that there exists a continuous function $f_C : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $f_C(0) = 0$ such that

$$\int_X |\phi_j - \psi_i^{(j)}| \omega_v^n \leq f_C(d_1(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)})).$$

Again by [Dar19, Theorem 3.32], $d_1(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)})$ is Lipschitz equivalent to

$$\int_X |\phi_i - \psi_i^{(j)}| \omega_{\phi_i}^n + \int_X |\phi_i - \psi_i^{(j)}| \omega_{\psi_i^{(j)}}^n.$$

We now take $s > 1$ large enough so that $\omega < s\theta_i$. We then find

$$\int_X |\phi_j - \psi_i^{(j)}| \omega_{\phi_i}^n \leq s^n \int_X |\phi_i - \psi_i^{(j)}| (\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i / s)^n \rightarrow 0$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, by [Dar19, Theorem 3.46 (ii)] and $d_{1,i}(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)}) \rightarrow 0$ which follows from the hypothesis, where we note $\phi_i/s \in \mathcal{E}_i^1$ by the convexity [Dar19, Corollary 2.20]. Similarly, from $d_{1,i}(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)}) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, we also have

$$\int_X |\phi_i - \psi_i^{(j)}| \left(\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_i^{(j)} / s \right)^n \rightarrow 0$$

by a diagonal argument for j with [Dar19, Theorem 3.46 (ii)]. Thus we find $d_1(\phi_i, \psi_i^{(j)}) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ as claimed. \square

Proposition 8.3. $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ admits a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metric if and only if D^{cp} is \mathbb{T} -coercive.

Remark 8.4. Note that the existence of a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metric implies that $\text{Aut}_0(X)$ is necessarily reductive by [HWN19, Corollary 1.6].

The proof of Proposition 8.3 is an almost word-by-word repetition of [Li22b, Proof of Theorem 2.19] and relies on [DR17, Theorem 3.4] by Darvas–Rubinstein, but we provide some details for the reader’s convenience. It suffices to check (A1)–(A4) and (P1)–(P7) in [DR17, §3]. As in [Li22b, Proof of Theorem 2.19], we set

$$\mathcal{R} := (\mathcal{E}_1^1 \cap L^\infty(X))^{\mathbb{T}_r} \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{E}_k^1 \cap L^\infty(X))^{\mathbb{T}_r}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{R}} := (\mathcal{E}_1^1)^{\mathbb{T}_r} \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{E}_k^1)^{\mathbb{T}_r},$$

where we set \mathcal{M} to be the set of (smooth) \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics. Noting that (A2) follows from [HWN19, Lemma 3.1], (A1)–(A4) are immediate. (P1) again follows from [HWN19, Lemma 3.1], noting that D^{cp} is continuous along geodesics since it is lower semicontinuous and convex along geodesics. (P2) is straightforward by adapting [DR17, Proof of Proposition 5.27] to the coupled case. (P3) follows from the smoothness of the weak solution [HWN19, Proposition 2.8 and Theorem 2.9]. (P4) and (P7) are obvious. (P5) can be proved exactly as in [Li22b, Proof of Theorem 2.19], by recalling the uniqueness of coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics up to $\text{Aut}_0(X)$ [HWN19, Theorem 1.5] and noting that \mathbb{T} is reductive whose center is \mathbb{T} itself. (P6) follows from [DR17, Proposition 6.8].

We first prove the easier direction of Theorem 1.3, which generalizes [HWN19, Theorem 1.15]:

Theorem 8.5. *If $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ admits a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant coupled Kähler–Einstein metric, then it is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable.*

Proof. By Proposition 8.3, it suffices to derive the \mathbb{T} -reduced uniform coupled Ding stability from the condition (4).

It is well-known that to each test configuration we can associate a ray of smooth Kähler potentials called a subgeodesic ray [BHJ19, §3.1] (also called a psh ray in [BBJ21, Definition 1.3]), such that the non-Archimedean limit [BHJ19, Definition 3.1] of the ray agrees with the non-Archimedean metric represented by the given test configuration; see [BHJ19, §3.1] for more details. In a more down-to-earth terminology, for each k -tuple of ample test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ we have a ray $\{(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))\}_{t \geq 0} \subset \mathcal{H}$ of smooth Kähler potentials, all of which are in fact Fubini–Study metrics explicitly defined in terms of the generators of

the \mathbb{G}_m -action (see e.g. [Has21, Lemma 9 and Theorem 19]), such that the following slope formulae hold:

$$(6) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_i(\phi_i(t))}{t} = \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ by [BHJ19, Theorem 3.6], and

$$(7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} = \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$$

by [Has21, Theorem 19]. There are two important technical points in the formula (7). Firstly, the coupled Ding invariant in (7) is defined slightly differently to Definition 6.2, since the test configuration used in (7) (see [Has21, Definition 19]) is $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Y})$ generated by the \mathbb{G}_m -actions of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, but it agrees with the one in Definition 6.2 by Proposition 3.11. The second and more minor point is that [Has21, Definition 19] is defined for a k -tuple of very ample test configurations with exponent m , but the definition of the coupled Ding invariant therein involves re-scaling by the exponent and hence agrees with Definition 6.2. Thus, the right hand side of (7) is indeed the coupled Ding invariant defined in this paper.

Furthermore, if we have a k -tuple of \mathbb{T} -equivariant ample test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, we may choose the ray $\{(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))\}_{t \geq 0}$ to be contained in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{T}^r}$; in terms of the explicit formulation using the generators of the \mathbb{G}_m -action, this fact can be proved by noting that the generator is \mathbb{T}_r -invariant if it commutes with the \mathbb{T} -action (see e.g. [Has21, Lemma 5 and the discussion that follows]). Moreover, by considering $\sum_{i=1}^k J_i$ in the proof of [Li22b, Theorem 3.14] and together with the slope formula (6), we find that [Li22b, Theorem 3.14] generalizes to the coupled case so that

$$(8) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k)}{t} = \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{i, \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i, \xi}).$$

With the preparation above, suppose that we are given a k -tuple of \mathbb{T} -equivariant ample test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. The condition (4) implies

$$D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)) \geq \varepsilon J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

for any $t \geq 0$ in the associated ray $\{(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))\}_{t \geq 0} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{T}^r}$. Dividing both sides of this inequality by t and taking the limit $t \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$(9) \quad \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k) \geq \varepsilon \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{J}(\mathcal{X}_{i, \xi}, \mathcal{L}_{i, \xi}) = \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i\}_{i=1}^k)$$

by the slope formulae (7) and (8), for any k -tuple of \mathbb{T} -equivariant ample test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$.

We note that the above inequality (9) establishes the \mathbb{T} -reduced coupled uniform Ding stability. Indeed, all the terms appearing in the coupled Ding invariant depend only on the non-Archimedean metric on L_i represented by $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, by [BHJ17, §6.1 and §7], [BHJ19, Theorems 3.6 and 3.7], and Lemma 5.1. Since each non-Archimedean metric contains a unique ample normal model [BHJ17, Lemma 6.3], we thus conclude that the inequality (9) holds for any k -tuple of \mathbb{T} -equivariant semiample test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, establishing the claimed result. \square

We now prove the converse, which is generally considered to be harder. The key result is the following geodesic stability.

Theorem 8.6. *Suppose that $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters. If D^{cp} is not \mathbb{T} -coercive, there exists a k -tuple of maximal geodesic rays $\{(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))\}_{t \geq 0} \subset$*

$(\mathcal{E}^1)^{\mathbb{T}^r}$, with $\sup_X \phi_1(t) = \dots = \sup_X \phi_k(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, and a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of t such that

$$\frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)) - C}{t} \leq 0$$

for all $t > 0$, and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} > 0.$$

Remark 8.7. Results of this type are often proved by comparing the Ding functional with the K -energy, since the commonly known proof such as [BBJ21, Theorem 2.16] rests on the compactness result involving the entropy (see [BBJ21, Definition 2.12]). Surprisingly, Darvas–Zhang [DZ24, Theorem 5.3] provided a proof which uses another compactness result for psh functions, and hence circumvents the use of the K -energy. It is still natural to find an approach using the coupled version of K -energy, but this problem will be treated in a separate paper.

Before we start the proof of the theorem above, we first explain some preliminary results involving the holomorphic vector fields. Suppose that we write $\sigma_\xi : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ for the 1-parameter subgroup generated by $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{T})$, and that we extend the action to $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ by the matrix exponential function. We define a Kähler potential $\psi_{i,t}^\xi$ by

$$\sigma_\xi(t)^* \theta_i = \theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \psi_{i,t}^\xi$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and it is well-known that $\{\psi_{i,t}^\xi\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ defines a geodesic line in $\mathcal{H}_i^{\mathbb{T}^r}$. Writing $V_\xi \in H^0(X, T^{1,0}X)$ for the holomorphic vector field generated by ξ , it is well-known that $\psi_{i,t}^\xi$ is the holomorphy potential of V_ξ with respect to θ_i . With this notation, the coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki character $\text{Fut}^{\text{cp}} : H^0(X, T^{1,0}X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ was defined in [FZ21, Definition 1.1] as

$$\text{Fut}^{\text{cp}}(V_\xi) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\int_X \psi_{i,t}^\xi (\sigma_\xi(t)^* \theta_i)^n}{\int c_1(L_i)^n}.$$

We prove two auxiliary lemmas. The first lemma can be regarded as an analytic version of Corollary 6.7.

Lemma 8.8. *The coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki character vanishes for all $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$. Moreover, with respect to the notation above, we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\psi_{i,t}^\xi) = \frac{d}{dt} D^{\text{cp}}(\psi_{1,t}^\xi, \dots, \psi_{k,t}^\xi) = \text{Fut}^{\text{cp}}(V_\xi).$$

Proof. Recalling the equivariant Riemann–Roch theorem (see e.g. [Szé14, Proposition 7.12]), we find that the coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki character equals the sum of Chow weights over $i = 1, \dots, k$ for $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Thus, using [Li22a, (60)] and the necessary adaptation as in Definition 6.1, we find $\text{Fut}^{\text{cp}}(V_\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if $\alpha_{\text{bc}}^{\text{cp}} = 0$, by arguing as in [Xu24, Lemma 2.40].

The equality

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\psi_{i,t}^\xi) = \text{Fut}^{\text{cp}}(V_\xi).$$

is obvious from the formula for the derivative of E_i ; note that an essentially equivalent result is also given in [Li22a, Lemma 2.23].

We then recall that θ_i is the Kähler form of the hermitian metric h_i on L_i , and that the volume form in L^{cp} is the one naturally defined by $h_1 \otimes \dots \otimes h_k$. Thus, we find

$$\sigma_\xi(t)^*(d\mu') = \sigma_\xi(t)^*(h_1 \otimes \dots \otimes h_k) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^k \psi_{i,t}^\xi\right) d\mu',$$

which proves $\frac{d}{dt}L^{\text{cp}}(\psi_{1,t}^\xi, \dots, \psi_{k,t}^\xi) = 0$ (see also [Zha24, Lemma 2.6] for a similar argument), yielding the required result. \square

Lemma 8.9. *For any geodesic segment $\{(u_1(t), \dots, u_k(t))\}_t \subset \mathcal{E}^1$, define its twist by $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ as*

$$u_i^\xi(t) := \sigma_\xi(t)^* u_i(t) + \psi_{i,t}^\xi$$

following [Zha24, (12)]. If $(X; \{L_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ has vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters, we have

$$E_i(u_i^\xi(t)) = E_i(u_i(t))$$

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

$$L^{\text{cp}}(u_1^\xi(t), \dots, u_k^\xi(t)) = L^{\text{cp}}(u_1(t), \dots, u_k(t)).$$

Proof. Arguing as in [Zha24, Lemma 2.6], the claimed statements follow from Lemma 8.8. \square

We now prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 8.6. We largely follow the arguments in the proof of [DZ24, Theorem 5.3] and [Zha24, Theorem 3.5]. By the hypothesis, for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ there exists $(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) \in (\mathcal{E}^1)^{\mathbb{T}^r}$ such that

$$D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) \leq \frac{1}{j} J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) - j.$$

We now observe that the proof of [Li22b, Lemma 2.15] easily generalizes to the coupled case, so that we may assume that

$$J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) = \sum_{i=1}^k J_i(\phi_i^{(j)})$$

and $\sup_X \phi_i^{(j)} = 0$, which implies $J_i(\phi_i^{(j)}) \leq -E_i(\phi_i^{(j)})$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We thus get

$$L^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{j}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\phi_i^{(j)}) - j$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

We claim that $\sum_{i=1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0) \rightarrow +\infty$, and hence there is at least one index i such that $d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. If there exists $C > 0$ such that $d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0) \leq C$ for all i and j , or equivalently $E_i(\phi_i^{(j)}) \geq -C$ since $\sup_X \phi_i^{(j)} = 0$ (by [Dar19, Proposition 3.43]), there exists $\phi_i^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_i^1$ such that $\phi_i^{(j)} \rightarrow \phi_i^\infty$ in L^1 -topology as $j \rightarrow \infty$, up to passing to a subsequence, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ [GZ17, Proposition 10.23]. We may moreover assume $\phi_i^\infty \in (\mathcal{E}_i^1)^{\mathbb{T}^r}$, since it is a limit of \mathbb{T}^r -invariant functions. Since E_i is upper semicontinuous [Dar19, Corollary 4.14] and L is continuous in L^1 -topology (as pointed out in [DZ24, proof of Proposition 5.5]), together with $L^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) = L\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{(j)}\right)$ as in (5), we find

$$-\infty < D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^\infty, \dots, \phi_k^\infty) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{kC}{j} - j\right) = -\infty$$

which is a contradiction.

We thus find, together with [Dar19, Proposition 3.43], that

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{(j)}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)} = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1^{(j)}, \dots, \phi_k^{(j)}) - \sum_{i=1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)}{\sum_{i=1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)} \leq -1$$

with

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0) \rightarrow +\infty$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

By re-ordering the indices $i = 1, \dots, k$ if necessary, there exists $1 \leq l \leq k$ such that $d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if $1 \leq i \leq l$, and $d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)$ remains bounded, by $C > 0$ say, if and only if $l+1 \leq i \leq k$. For $1 \leq i \leq l$, we set $[0, d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)] \ni t \mapsto \phi_i^{(j)}(t) \in (\mathcal{E}_i^1)^{\mathbb{T}_r}$ to be the unit speed finite energy geodesic ray connecting 0 and $\phi_i^{(j)}$, noting that we may assume $\phi_i^{(j)}(t)$ is \mathbb{T}_r -invariant since it can be approximated by $C^{1,1}$ -geodesics [Dar19, Proposition 3.15] which we may assume are \mathbb{T}_r -invariant by integrating the homogeneous Monge–Ampère equation [Dar19, §3.1] over \mathbb{T}_r . With [DZ24, Remark 3.3], we thus get

$$(10) \quad \sup_X \phi_i^{(j)}(t) = 0, \quad E_i(\phi_i^{(j)}(t)) = -t$$

for all $t \in [0, d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)]$ and all $1 \leq i \leq l$. For $l+1 \leq i \leq k$, we define a constant subgeodesic ray $\phi_i^{(j)}(t) \equiv \phi_i^{(j)}$ for all $t \in [0, d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)]$. We note that $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(t)$ is a sublinear subgeodesic ray in $(\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X))^{\mathbb{T}_r}$, since

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial_{X,t} \bar{\partial}_{X,t} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(t) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial_{X,t} \bar{\partial}_{X,t} \phi_i(t)) \geq 0,$$

and the sublinearity is obvious under addition. Then the convexity of L for subgeodesics in $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ [Ber15, Theorem 1.1] implies

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{(j)}(t) \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^l d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}(t), 0) + \sum_{i=l+1}^k d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}(t), 0)} \leq -1,$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq l} d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)$. By (10) and [Dar19, Proposition 3.43], we also have

$$d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}(t), 0) = -E_i(\phi_i^{(j)}(t)) = t,$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ and all $0 \leq t \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq l} d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)$. We thus get

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{(j)}(t) \right)}{lt} \leq -1$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ and all $0 \leq t \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq l} d_{1,i}(\phi_i^{(j)}, 0)$.

By arguing exactly as in the proof of [DZ24, Theorem 5.3], we find that there exists a finite energy sublinear subgeodesic ray $\{\tilde{\phi}_i(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\phi_i^{(j)}(t)$ converges to $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$ with respect to the L^1 -convergence for all $t \in (0, +\infty) \setminus E$ for some set E of Lebesgue measure zero, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ (for $l+1 \leq i \leq k$, this is a constant subgeodesic ray). We note that $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$ is \mathbb{T}_r -invariant, since it is the limit of \mathbb{T}_r -invariant functions.

Thus, for any $t \in (0, +\infty) \setminus E$ we have

$$(11) \quad \frac{L \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\phi}_i(t) \right)}{lt} \leq -1$$

and

$$(12) \quad \sup_X \tilde{\phi}_i(t) = 0, \quad 0 \geq E_i(\tilde{\phi}_i(t)) \geq -t$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq l$, since L is L^1 -continuous, where we note that the supremum being zero is preserved under the L^1 -convergence of plurisubharmonic functions by the mean value inequality, and E_i is L^1 -usc (upper semicontinuous) by [Dar19, Corollary 4.14]. Again as in

the proof of [DZ24, Theorem 5.3] the above holds for $t \in (0, +\infty)$ and the subgeodesics are nontrivial for $1 \leq i \leq l$. We then find, from (11) and (12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\tilde{\phi}_1(t), \dots, \tilde{\phi}_k(t)) - C(k-l)}{t} &= \frac{L\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\phi}_i(t)\right) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\tilde{\phi}_i(t)) - C(k-l)}{t} \\ &\leq \frac{-lt + (lt + C(k-l)) - C(k-l)}{t} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The non-Archimedean metric ϕ_i^{NA} associated to the subgeodesic ray $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$ is defined as in [BBJ21, Definition 4.2], for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We note moreover that $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \in (\mathcal{E}_i^{1, \text{NA}})^{\mathbb{T}_r}$ (see [Li22a, §2.1.3] for the definition), since it is a decreasing limit of the approximations that are \mathbb{T}_r -invariant (see the proof of [BBJ21, Theorem 6.6]), where we recall that each approximation [BBJ21, Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7] by test configurations is given by a \mathbb{T}_r -invariant multiplier ideal sheaf. Note that ϕ_i^{NA} is trivial for $l+1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \leq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ by (12) and [BBJ21, Lemma 4.3]. We recall that there exists a maximal geodesic ray $\phi_i(t)$ whose associated non-Archimedean metric is ϕ_i^{NA} , by [BBJ21, Theorem 6.6] ([DZ24] uses the maximization, but it was not obvious to us that taking the maximization of each $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$, rather than the maximization of $\sum_i \tilde{\phi}_i(t)$, yields the required result). We may even assume that $\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)$ are all \mathbb{T}_r -invariant, since it is a decreasing limit of the approximations that are \mathbb{T}_r -invariant (see the proof of [BBJ21, Theorem 6.6]). Moreover, since $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, we find that

$$\sup_X \phi_i(t) = 0$$

for all t ; we have $\sup_X \phi_i(t) = ct$ for some $c \leq 0$ by [DZ24, Remark 3.3] and by comparing it with the trivial geodesic ray, but $c < 0$ contradicts maximality. Thus, by [BBJ21, Corollary 6.7] and [Li22a, Lemma 2.41], we have

$$(13) \quad -E_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_i^{\text{NA}}) = -\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{E_i(\phi_i(t))}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_i(\phi_i(t))}{t} = J_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_i^{\text{NA}}) \geq 0$$

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

We replace $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$ by the maximal geodesic ray $\phi_i(t)$ above. For these maximal geodesic rays, we have

$$(14) \quad \frac{L\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(t)\right)}{lt} \leq -1,$$

since its limit $t \rightarrow +\infty$ agrees with that of $L\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\phi}_i(t)\right)/(lt)$ by [BBJ21, Theorem 5.4 and the following paragraph], and again by the convexity [Ber15, Theorem 1.1]. Moreover, the slope of $-E_i(\phi_i(t))$ is smaller than that of $-E_i(\tilde{\phi}_i(t))$ by the maximality of the geodesic and the monotonicity of E_i [Dar19, Proposition 3.43]. Thus, with these replacements, we get the required inequality

$$\frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)) - C(k-l)}{t} \leq 0.$$

Now, by definition [BBJ21, Definition 4.2 and Appendix B], the non-Archimedean metric associated to the subgeodesic ray $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(t)$ in $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ is given by $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}} = \mathcal{S}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}})$ (in the sense of Proposition 5.3). The inequality (14), together with [BBJ21, Theorem 5.4 and the following paragraph], implies that $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$ cannot be trivial. Thus, recalling $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, we find that there exists at least one i with nontrivial ϕ_i^{NA} , which implies in particular $-\sum_{i=1}^k E_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_i^{\text{NA}}) > 0$ by [BJ22, Corollary 10.5], noting that X is smooth in our case. This in turn implies

$$-\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{E_i(\phi_i(t))}{t} =: a > 0$$

again by [BBJ21, Corollary 6.7].

Furthermore, recalling that we have vanishing coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters and also Lemma 8.9, we can argue as in [Li22a, Proof of Proposition 6.2] or [Zha24, page 15] to prove the following: if we have

$$-\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{E_i(\phi_i(t))}{t} \geq a > 0,$$

then

$$(15) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k)}{t} \geq a.$$

Indeed, if $\phi_i(t)$ is the maximal geodesic and $\tilde{\phi}_i(t)$ is the subgeodesic as above, [Zha24, (12)] implies that $\phi_i^\xi(t) \geq \tilde{\phi}_i^\xi(t)$ for the twist (in the sense of Lemma 8.9) by any $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. Thus, following [Zha24, page 16], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k J_i(\phi_i^\xi(t)) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\int_X c_1(L_i)^n} \int_X \phi_i^\xi(t) \theta_i^n - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\phi_i(t)) \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\int_X c_1(L_i)^n} \int_X \phi_i^{(j), \xi}(t) \theta_i^n - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i(\phi_i(t)) \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(J_i(\phi_i^{(j), \xi}(t)) - t \right) + at \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 8.8 and (10), where we used the maximality of $\phi_i(t)$ in the second line and the linearity of E_i along geodesics in the third line [Dar19, Proposition 3.42]. The claimed inequality (15) follows from the one above by arguing exactly as in [Zha24, page 16], thereby establishing all the claimed results. \square

Theorem 8.10. *If X is \mathbb{T} -reduced uniformly coupled Ding stable, then D^{cp} is \mathbb{T} -coercive.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that D^{cp} is not \mathbb{T} -coercive. Then, Theorem 8.6 implies that there exists a k -tuple of maximal geodesic rays $\{(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))\}_{t \geq 0} \subset (\mathcal{E}^1)^{\mathbb{T}_r}$ such that $\sup_X \phi_1(t) = \dots = \sup_X \phi_k(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$(16) \quad \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} \leq \frac{C}{t}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} \geq a$$

for some $C, a > 0$ and all $t > 0$, by noting that the coupled \mathbb{T} -Futaki characters must vanish due to \mathbb{T} -reduced uniform coupled Ding stability, by considering geodesic lines generated by holomorphic vector fields (see Corollary 6.7 and Lemma 8.8). Thus, taking the limit $t \rightarrow +\infty$ in the above and writing $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \in (\mathcal{E}_i^{1, \text{NA}})^{\mathbb{T}_r}$ for the non-Archimedean metric associated to $\phi_i(t)$, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} = L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_i^{\text{NA}}) \leq 0$$

and

$$(17) \quad J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) \geq a,$$

where we define

$$J_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) := \inf_{\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})} \sum_{i=1}^k J_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_{i, \xi}^{\text{NA}}),$$

in which $\phi_{i, \xi}^{\text{NA}}$ is defined as in [Li22a, Definition 2.20]. Note that (17) follows from (13) and (16), together with the definition of the twist $\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i^\xi(t) = \sigma_\xi(t)^*(\theta_i + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \phi_i(t))$, since they yield $\sum_{i=1}^k J_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_{i, \xi}^{\text{NA}}) \geq a$ for all $\xi \in N_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$; strictly speaking we need to check

that the non-Archimedean metric associated to $\phi_i^\xi(t)$ is $\phi_{i,-\xi}^{\text{NA}}$, with the sign convention as in Remark 2.9, but this follows from the computation for the Gauss extension in [Li22a, page 1542] (or alternatively from approximating $\phi_i^\xi(t)$ by a decreasing sequence of geodesic rays corresponding to test configurations [BBJ21, Proof of Theorem 6.6] and taking the limit in [Li22a, Lemma 2.19]).

We apply the construction in [BBJ21, §5.3] to the maximal geodesic rays $\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t)$, to find that the non-Archimedean metric $\phi_i^{\text{NA}} \in (\mathcal{E}_i^{1,\text{NA}})^{\mathbb{T}_r}$ associated to $\phi_i(t)$ can be approximated by $\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \in (\mathcal{H}_i^{\text{NA}})^{\mathbb{T}_r}$, by using [BBJ21, Lemma 5.7]. As previously noted, the non-Archimedean metric associated to the subgeodesic ray $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(t)$ in $\mathcal{E}^1(-K_X)$ is given by $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}}$; note that this observation, together with Lemma 5.1, leads to an alternative proof of the slope formula (7). Arguing exactly as in [BBJ21, Proof of Lemma 5.7], we find

$$L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) \rightarrow L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{\text{NA}} \right)$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Note moreover that the approximation given in [BBJ21, Lemma 5.7] converges with respect to the strong topology in \mathcal{E}_i^1 , since after re-labelling as in [Li22a, page 1548] we find that $\{\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}}\}_m$ is a decreasing sequence converging to ϕ_i^{NA} (see also [BJ22, Example 12.2]). We thus get

$$E_i^{\text{NA}}(\phi_i^{\text{NA}}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_i^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}})$$

by [BJ22, Definition 12.1], and

$$J_{\text{cp},\mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\phi_1^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \phi_k^{\text{NA}}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} J_{\text{cp},\mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{1,m}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \varphi_{k,m}^{\text{NA}})$$

by noting that the proof of [Li22a, Lemma 6.4] easily generalizes to the coupled case as above. In particular, we have

$$J_{\text{cp},\mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{1,m}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \varphi_{k,m}^{\text{NA}}) > \frac{a}{2} > 0$$

for all large enough m .

Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all large enough m , we have

$$L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}}) - \varepsilon < \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{D^{\text{cp}}(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))}{t} \leq 0,$$

but the first two terms on the left hand side add up to the coupled Ding invariant for the k -tuple of \mathbb{T} -equivariant test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m})\}_{i=1}^k$ representing $\varphi_{1,m}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \varphi_{k,m}^{\text{NA}}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} & L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}}) \\ &= L^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) - E^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) + E^{\text{NA}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k E_i^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}}) \\ &= \text{Ding}(\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{L}_m) + \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_m^{\cdot n+1})}{(n+1)(L^{\cdot n})} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{i,m}^{\cdot n+1})}{(n+1)(L_i^{\cdot n})} \\ &= \text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m}\}_{i=1}^k), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall [BBJ21, Definition 3.4] and note that the sum $\sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{i,m}^{\text{NA}}$ is represented by the sum test configuration $(\mathcal{X}_m, \mathcal{L}_m)$ of $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m})\}_{i=1}^k$ by Lemma 5.2. Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

there exists a k -tuple of test configurations $\{(\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m})\}_{i=1}^k$ such that

$$\text{Ding}(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m}\}_{i=1}^k) < \varepsilon < \varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{a} \mathbf{J}_{\text{cp}, \mathbb{T}}^{\text{NA}}(\varphi_{1,m}^{\text{NA}}, \dots, \varphi_{k,m}^{\text{NA}}) = \frac{2\varepsilon}{a} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\text{cp}}(\{\mathcal{X}_{i,m}, \mathcal{L}_{i,m}\}_{i=1}^k)$$

which contradicts the \mathbb{T} -reduced uniform coupled Ding stability. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. It is an immediate consequence of Theorems 8.5, 8.10, and Proposition 8.3. \square

APPENDIX A. ON SEMIAMPLE DIVISORS

In this section, we see basic properties of semiample divisors on normal projective varieties, and see an example that the sum of normal test configurations may not be normal.

We begin with the following basic proposition:

Proposition A.1. *Let X be a normal projective variety, L_1, \dots, L_k be semiample \mathbb{Q} -divisors on X . Set $L := \sum_{i=1}^k L_i$. Let $f_i: X \rightarrow Y_i$ (resp., $f: X \rightarrow Y$) be the ample model of L_i (resp., L) in the sense of [BCHM10, Definition 3.6.5]. It is well-known that there exists $g_i: Y \rightarrow Y_i$ such that $g_i \circ f = f_i$. Set*

$$g := (g_1, \dots, g_k): Y \rightarrow Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k.$$

Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) The morphism g is a closed embedding.
- (2) For any sufficiently divisible $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the multiplication homomorphism

$$H^0(X, mL_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0(X, mL_k) \rightarrow H^0(X, mL)$$

is surjective.

Proof. We may assume that L is ample and $f = \text{id}_X$. From the definition of ample models, there exist an ample \mathbb{Q} -divisors A_i on Y_i such that $g_i^* A_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} L_i$. We may assume that A_i are line bundles with $g_i^* A_i \sim L_i$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $I \subset \mathcal{O}_{Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k}$ be the ideal sheaf corresponds to the closed embedding $Y \subset Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k$. Note that $A_1 \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes A_k$ on $Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k$ is ample and

$$(A_1 \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes A_k)|_Y \simeq g_1^* A_1 + \dots + g_k^* A_k = L$$

holds. By Serre's vanishing theorem, for any $m \gg 0$, we have

$$H^1(Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k, I \otimes (A_1 \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes A_k)^{\otimes m}) = 0.$$

Thus

$$H^0(Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k, (mA_1) \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes (mA_k)) \rightarrow H^0(Y, mL)$$

is surjective. By the Künneth formula, we get the assertion (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1): For any sufficiently divisible $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, from the assumption, there is a natural commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{P}^* H^0(Y, mL_1) \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^* H^0(Y, mL_k) & \\ & \nearrow (\phi_{|mL_1|}, \dots, \phi_{|mL_k|}) & \downarrow \text{Segre} \\ Y & \mathbb{P}^* (H^0(Y, mL_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0(Y, mL_k)) & \\ & \searrow \phi_{|mL|} & \uparrow \text{linear} \\ & \mathbb{P}^* H^0(Y, mL) & \end{array}$$

We note that the vertical linear embedding is given by the assumption (2). Since $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is sufficiently divisible, the morphism $\phi_{|mL_i|}$ is equal to g_i and $\phi_{|mL|}$ is a closed embedding. This implies that g is a closed embedding. \square

Example A.2. Take any $k \geq 2$ and $n_1, \dots, n_k, d_1, \dots, d_k, e_1, \dots, e_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let us consider any smooth

$$B \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}}(2d_1, \dots, 2d_k)|,$$

and let

$$\tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}$$

be the double cover branched along B . Set

$$A_i := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n_i}}(e_i), \quad M_i := \tau^* p_i^* A_i, \quad M := \sum_{i=1}^k M_i,$$

where $p_i: \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ be the projection. Since M_i is semiample and the morphism $p_i \circ \tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ satisfies that $(p_i \circ \tau)_* \mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n_i}}$ and $(p_i \circ \tau)^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n_i}}(e_i) = M_i$, the morphism is the ample model of M_i . Moreover, M is ample on X . However, since

$$((p_1 \circ \tau), \dots, (p_k \circ \tau)) = \tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}$$

is not a closed embedding, the homomorphism

$$H^0(X, mM_1) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \dots \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} H^0(X, mM_k) \rightarrow H^0(X, mM)$$

is not surjective for any sufficiently divisible $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by Proposition A.1.

Example A.3. Under the assumption in Example A.2, and assume moreover that $n_i + 1 \geq d_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let us set

$$Y := \mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus M) \xrightarrow{p} X,$$

let $L_Y \in \text{Pic}(Y)$ be the tautological line bundle with respects to the projectivization, and let $X_0 := \mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{O}_X)$ be the section of p corresponding to the natural projection

$$\mathcal{O}_X \oplus M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0.$$

Of course, X_0 is canonically isomorphic to X . Set

$$H_i := L_Y + p^* M_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq k), \quad H := \sum_{i=1}^k H_i = kL_Y + p^* M.$$

Since the evaluation homomorphism

$$H^0(X, (\mathcal{O}_X \oplus M) \otimes M_i) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X \oplus M) \otimes M_i$$

is surjective, the divisor H_i is base point free for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\chi_i: Y \rightarrow Y_i$ be the ample model of H_i . An irreducible curve $C \subset Y$ is contracted by χ_i if and only if $C \subset X_0$ and C is a fiber of the morphism $p_i \circ \tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ under the canonical identification $X_0 \simeq X$. In particular, each H_i is big and H is ample. Since $n_i + 1 \geq d_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, the divisor $-K_X$ is nef. This immediately implies that $-K_Y - X_0$ is χ_i -nef and χ_i -big for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. By the Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem, we have $R^1(\chi_i)_* \mathcal{O}_Y(-X_0) = 0$. Thus we get the surjection

$$(\chi_i)_* \mathcal{O}_Y \twoheadrightarrow (\chi_i|_{X_0})_* \mathcal{O}_{X_0}.$$

Since the left hand side is nothing but \mathcal{O}_{Y_i} , we have

$$(\chi_i|_{X_0})_* \mathcal{O}_{X_0} = \mathcal{O}_{\chi_i(X_0)}.$$

In particular, we have $\chi_i(X_0) \simeq \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ and the morphism $\chi_i|_{X_0}$ is isomorphic to $p_i \circ \tau$. Thus the restriction of

$$\chi := (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_k): Y \rightarrow Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_k$$

to X_0 is isomorphic to τ , which is not an embedding. In particular, the morphism χ is not an embedding.

Remark A.4. Therefore, the surjectivity assertion in [HK00, Lemma 2.8] is not true in general, even when all of L_i are big and semiample.

Example A.5. Under the assumption in Example A.2, and assume moreover that $n_i > d_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. From now on, just for simplicity, we set

$$\mathcal{O}_X(m_1, \dots, m_k) := \tau^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}}(m_1, \dots, m_k)$$

for any $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that

$$-K_X \sim \mathcal{O}_X(n_1 + 1 - d_1, \dots, n_k + 1 - d_k).$$

Take any $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with $n_i - d_i \geq c_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, and let us take a general smooth member

$$C \in |\mathcal{O}_X(c_1, \dots, c_k)|.$$

We set $\mathcal{O}_C(m_1, \dots, m_k) := \mathcal{O}_X(m_1, \dots, m_k)|_C$ for any $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let us take the blowup

$$\sigma: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$$

along $C \times \{0\}$, let $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the exceptional divisor, and let $\hat{X}_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the strict transform of the prime divisor $X \times \{0\} \subset X_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Since

$$\mathcal{N}_{C \times \{0\}/X_{\mathbb{A}^1}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_C \oplus \mathcal{O}_C(c_1, \dots, c_k),$$

we get

$$E \simeq \mathbb{P}_C(\mathcal{O}_C \oplus \mathcal{O}_C(-c_1, \dots, -c_k)) \xrightarrow{\pi_E} C,$$

where π_E is the natural projection. Let $L_E \in \text{Pic}(E)$ be the tautological line bundle of the projective bundle under the above isomorphism. Then we have

$$-E|_E \sim L_E \sim \hat{X}_0|_E, \quad -K_E \sim 2L_E + \pi_E^* \mathcal{O}_C(n_1 + 1 - d_1, \dots, n_k + 1 - d_k).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\hat{X}_0|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim -E|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim \mathcal{O}_X(-c_1, \dots, -c_k)$$

under the canonical isomorphism $\hat{X}_0 \simeq X$.

For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, let us set

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &:= \mathcal{O}_X(c_1, \dots, c_k) + M_i, \\ \mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}} &:= \sigma^*(L_i)_{\mathbb{A}^1} - E, \end{aligned}$$

where M_i is as in Example A.2. Observe that

- $\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}}|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim L_i - E|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim M_i$ is nef, and
- $\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}}|_E \sim \pi_E^*(L_i|_C) + L_E \sim \pi_E^*(L_i|_C) + \hat{X}_0|_E$ is also nef. Moreover, any curve $\gamma \subset E$ with $(\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}} \cdot \gamma) = 0$ satisfies that $\gamma \subset \hat{X}_0$.

In particular, $\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}}$ is nef over \mathbb{A}^1 . Moreover,

- $(\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}} - K_{\mathcal{X}})|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim M_i + \mathcal{O}_X(n_1 + 1 - d_1 - c_1, \dots, n_k + 1 - d_k - c_k)$ is ample, and
- $(\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}} - K_{\mathcal{X}})|_E \sim 2L_E + \pi_E^*(M_i|_C + \mathcal{O}_C(n_1 + 1 - d_1 + c_1, \dots, n_k + 1 - d_k + c_k))$ is also ample.

In particular, $\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}} - K_{\mathcal{X}}$ is ample over \mathbb{A}^1 . By the base point free theorem, $\mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}}$ is semiample over \mathbb{A}^1 . Let

$$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}_i^{\mathcal{X}}) \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} (\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) \xrightarrow{\pi_i} \mathbb{A}^1$$

be the ample model over \mathbb{A}^1 . The $(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)/\mathbb{A}^1$ can naturally be seen as a normal test configuration of (X, L_i) . As we already observed, the morphism σ_i is an isomorphism on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \hat{X}_0$, and the set of curves contracted by σ_i is equal to the set of curves contracted by the morphism $p_i \circ \tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ under the canonical isomorphism $\hat{X}_0 \simeq X$.

Note that $(-K_{\mathcal{X}} - \hat{X}_0)|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim -K_X$ is ample. Thus $-K_{\mathcal{X}} - \hat{X}_0$ is nef and big over \mathcal{X}_i . By the Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem, we have $R^1(\sigma_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(-\hat{X}_0) = 0$. Thus we get

$$(\sigma_i|_{\hat{X}_0})_* \mathcal{O}_{\hat{X}_0} = \mathcal{O}_{\sigma_i(\hat{X}_0)}.$$

In particular, we have $\sigma_i(\hat{X}_0) \simeq \mathbb{P}^{n_i}$ and the morphism $\sigma_i|_{\hat{X}_0}$ is isomorphic to $p_i \circ \tau$.

Let us set

$$\begin{aligned} L &:= \sum_{i=1}^k L_i = \mathcal{O}_X(kc_1, \dots, kc_k) + \sum_{i=1}^k M_i, \\ \mathcal{L} &:= \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{L}_i = \sigma^* L_{\mathbb{A}^1} - kE. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}|_{\hat{X}_0} \sim \sum_{i=1}^k M_i$ and $\mathcal{L}|_E \sim k\xi + \pi_E^*(L|_E)$, the divisor \mathcal{L} is ample over \mathbb{A}^1 . In particular, by Lemma 3.3 (3), the normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})/\mathbb{A}^1$ is the normalized sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Let $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}')/\mathbb{A}^1$ be the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Then there is a morphism $\nu: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ such that $\mathcal{L} = \nu^* \mathcal{L}'$ holds. As in Lemma 3.3 (4), for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have the following natural commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\nu} & \mathcal{X}' & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{X}_{\text{prod}} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \cdots \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathcal{X}_k \\ & & & \searrow \sigma_i & \downarrow q_i \\ & & & & \mathcal{X}_i. \end{array}$$

Let $\mathcal{X}_{i,0}$ (resp., \mathcal{X}_0) be the fiber of $\mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ (resp., $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$) over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$. The fiber of the above diagram over $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1$ gives

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \hat{X}_0 & \subset & \mathcal{X}_0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}'_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}_{1,0} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_{k,0} \\ & & & \searrow (\sigma_i)|_{\hat{X}_0} & \downarrow q_i \\ & & & & \mathcal{X}_{i,0}. \end{array}$$

If ν is an isomorphism, then we get the closed embedding

$$\hat{X}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}_{1,0} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_{k,0}.$$

However, since the morphism $\sigma_i|_{\hat{X}_0}$ is isomorphic to $p_i \circ \tau$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, the above embedding must be isomorphic to $\tau: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}$. Clearly, the τ is not an embedding, a contradiction. Thus ν is not an isomorphism. In particular, the sum configuration of $\{(\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ is not normal.

REFERENCES

- [BBJ21] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson, *A variational approach to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (2021), no. 3, 605–652.
- [Ber15] B. Berndtsson, *A Brunn-Minkowski type inequality for Fano manifolds and some uniqueness theorems in Kähler geometry*, Invent. Math. **200** (2015), no. 1, 149–200.
- [BCHM10] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. D. Hacon and J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 2, 405–468.
- [BJ20] H. Blum and M. Jonsson, *Thresholds, valuations, and K-stability*, Adv. Math. **365** (2020), 107062, 57 pp.
- [BLXZ23] H. Blum, Y. Liu, C. Xu and Z. Zhuang, *The existence of the Kähler-Ricci soliton degeneration*, Forum of Math. Pi, To **11** (2023), e9.
- [BHJ17] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto and M. Jonsson, *Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **67** (2017), no. 2, 743–841.
- [BHJ19] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto and M. Jonsson, *Uniform K-stability and asymptotics of energy functionals in Kähler geometry*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **21** (2019), no. 9, 2905–2944.
- [BJ22] S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson, *Global pluripotential theory over a trivially valued field*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **31** (2022), no. 3, 647–836.
- [Dar19] T. Darvas, *Geometric pluripotential theory on Kähler manifolds*, In *Advances in complex geometry*, volume 735 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 1–104. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2019.

- [DR17] T. Darvas and Y. Rubinstein, *Tian’s properness conjectures and Finsler geometry of the space of Kähler metrics*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **30** (2017), no. 2, 347–387.
- [DZ24] T. Darvas and K. Zhang, *Twisted Kähler–Einstein metrics in big classes.*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **77** (2024), no. 12, 4289–4327.
- [ELMNP06] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, M. Mustață, M. Nakamaye and M. Popa, *Asymptotic invariants of base loci*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **56** (2006), no. 6, 1701–1734. Erratum: arXiv:2309.16722v1.
- [Fuj24] K. Fujita, *On coupled stability thresholds of graded linear series*, preprint.
- [FZ21] A. Futaki and Y. Zhang, *Residue formula for an obstruction to coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **73** (2021), no. 2, 389–401.
- [GZ17] V. Guedj and A. Zeriahi, *Degenerate complex Monge–Ampère equations*, volume 26 of *EMS Tracts in Mathematics*, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2017.
- [Has21] Y. Hashimoto, *Anticanonically balanced metrics and Hilbert–Mumford criterion for the δ_m -invariant of Fujita–Odaka*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **64**, (2023) no. 8, 40 pp.
- [HK00] Y. Hu and S. Keel, *Mori dream spaces and GIT*, Michigan Math. J. **48** (2000), 331–348.
- [HWN19] J. Hultgren and D. W. Nyström, *Coupled Kähler–Einstein metrics*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **21** (2019), 6765–6796.
- [JM12] M. Jonsson and M. Mustață, *Valuations and asymptotic invariants for sequences of ideals*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **62** (2012), no. 6, 2145–2209.
- [Li22a] C. Li, *Geodesic rays and stability in the cscK problem*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **55**, (2022), no. 6, 1529–1574.
- [Li22b] C. Li, *G-uniform stability and Kähler–Einstein metrics on Fano varieties*, Invent. Math. **227**, (2022), no. 2, 661–744.
- [RTZ21] Y. Rubinstein, G. Tian and K. Zhang, *Basis divisors and balanced metrics*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **778** (2021), 171–218.
- [Szé14] G. Székelyhidi, *An introduction to extremal Kähler metrics*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 152. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014. xvi+192 pp.
- [Xu24] C. Xu, *K-stability of Fano varieties* (version 2024/04/30), book available at <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~chenyang/Kstabilitybook.pdf>
- [XZ20] C. Xu and Z. Zhuang, *On positivity of the CM line bundle on K-moduli spaces*, Ann. of Math. **192** (2020), no. 3, 1005–1068.
- [Zha23] K. Zhang, *A quantization proof of the uniform Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (2023), DOI 10.4171/JEMS/1373.
- [Zha24] K. Zhang, *Reduced delta invariant and Kähler–Einstein metrics*, preprint available at https://keweizhang666.github.io/kwzhang.github.io/Reduced_delta-2.pdf
- [Zhu21] Z. Zhuang, *Optimal destabilizing centers and equivariant K-stability*, Invent. Math. **226** (2021), no. 1, 195–223.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, TOYONAKA, OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN

Email address: fujita@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, OSAKA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, 3-3-138, SUGIMOTO, SUMIYOSHI-KU, OSAKA, 558-8585, JAPAN.

Email address: yhashimoto@omu.ac.jp