

A space of stability conditions that is not a length space

Yu-Wei Fan

Abstract

We show that the space of Bridgeland stability conditions equipped with the canonical metric is, in general, not a length space, thereby providing a negative answer to a question posed by Kikuta.

1 Introduction

Stability conditions on triangulated categories were introduced in [Bri07], inspired by work in string theory. Since their introduction, the theory of stability conditions has had far-reaching influences on many areas of mathematics, such as algebraic geometry, mirror symmetry, symplectic geometry, and representation theory, among others.

The space of stability conditions $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ can be endowed with a canonical metric d . A fundamental theorem proved in [Bri07] states that, with the topology on $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ induced by the metric d , the map

$$\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C}); \quad \sigma = (Z, P) \mapsto Z$$

is a local homeomorphism. This gives $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ the structure of a complex manifold.

The metric properties of stability spaces have been studied from various perspectives: the completeness of the metric $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ is proven in [Woo12, Theorem 3.6]; CAT(0) properties have been conjectured and discussed in [BB17, Remark 1.5], [All13, Section 7], [Smi18, Section 3.2], and [Kik23]; and a Weil–Petersson metric is proposed in [FKY21]. It is also closely related to recent developments on (partial) compactifications of stability spaces. See, for instance, [BDL20, BPPW22, Bol23, HL23, BMS24, KKO24], just to name a few.

It is proven in [Kik23] that $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ and $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})/\mathbb{C}, \bar{d})$ are, in general, not CAT(0) spaces. The following question, which asks for a weaker metric property, is proposed in the same paper:

Is the metric space $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ a length space?

Note that, as pointed out in [Kik23, Proposition 5.2], since $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ is locally compact and complete, by Hopf–Rinow theorem, $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ is a length space if and only if it is geodesic.

We provide an example where $(\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D}), d)$ is not geodesic, therefore giving a negative answer to the above question.

Theorem 1.1. *The metric spaces $(\text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)), d)$ and $(\text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}, \bar{d})$ are not geodesic.*

The idea of the proof is sketched at the beginning of Section 3.5. We note here that the non-geodesicness arises due to the fact that there are both “geometric” and “algebraic” stability conditions on $\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$. It is still possible that the metric has nicer properties when $\mathbb{D}^b(X)$ admits only geometric stability conditions, for instance, when the Albanese morphism of X is finite [FLZ22].

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Yi Huang for stimulating discussions on hyperbolic metrics.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Stability conditions. In this subsection, we recall the notion of stability conditions on triangulated categories, and the canonical metric on the space of stability conditions, introduced by Bridgeland [Bri07].

Let Λ be a free abelian group of finite rank, $v: K_0(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \Lambda$ a group homomorphism, and $\|\cdot\|$ a norm on $\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.1 ([Bri07, Definition 5.1]). A stability condition $\sigma = (Z, P)$ on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} (with respect to Λ and v) consists of a group homomorphism $Z: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and a collection $P = \{P(\phi)\}_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}}$ of full additive subcategories of \mathcal{D} , such that:

- (i) for $E \in P(\phi) \setminus \{0\}$, $Z(v(E)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot e^{i\pi\phi}$,
- (ii) for all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$, $P(\phi + 1) = P(\phi)[1]$,
- (iii) if $\phi_1 > \phi_2$ and $E_i \in P(\phi_i)$, then $\text{Hom}(E_1, E_2) = 0$,
- (iv) for each nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{D}$, there is a collection of exact triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 0 = E_0 & \longrightarrow & E_1 & \longrightarrow & E_2 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & E_{k-1} & \longrightarrow & E \\
 & & \searrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & A_1 & & & & A_2 & & A_k
 \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

where $A_i \in P(\phi)$ and $\phi_1 > \cdots > \phi_k$,

- (v) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|Z(v(E))| \geq C \cdot \|v(E)\|$ holds for any $E \in \cup_{\phi} P(\phi) \setminus \{0\}$.

The set of such stability conditions is denoted $\text{Stab}_{\Lambda}(\mathcal{D})$.

Notation 2.2. With the Harder–Narasimhan filtration (2.1), define

$$m_{\sigma}(E) := \sum_{i=1}^k |Z(A_i)|; \quad \phi_{\sigma}^{+}(E) := \phi_1, \quad \phi_{\sigma}^{-}(E) := \phi_k.$$

Definition 2.3 ([Bri07, Proposition 8.1]). Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category. The function

$$d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) := \sup_{E \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \left| \log \frac{m_{\sigma_1}(E)}{m_{\sigma_2}(E)} \right|, |\phi_{\sigma_1}^+(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^+(E)|, |\phi_{\sigma_1}^-(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^-(E)| \right\} \in [0, +\infty]$$

defines a generalized metric on $\text{Stab}_\Lambda(\mathcal{D})$.

For later purposes, it would be convenient to separate the contributions of the *mass* part m_σ and the *phase* parts ϕ_σ^\pm in the distance function.

Notation 2.4. We denote the *mass-distance* and the *phase-distance* as:

$$d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) := \sup_{E \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \left| \log \frac{m_{\sigma_1}(E)}{m_{\sigma_2}(E)} \right| \right\},$$

$$d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) := \sup_{E \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ |\phi_{\sigma_1}^+(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^+(E)|, |\phi_{\sigma_1}^-(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^-(E)| \right\}.$$

Then $d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \max \{d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2), d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\}$.

This generalized metric induces a topology on the space of stability conditions. The main theorem of [Bri07] asserts that $\text{Stab}_\Lambda(\mathcal{D})$ can be endowed with the structure of a complex manifold.

Theorem 2.5 ([Bri07, Theorem 7.1]). *The map*

$$\text{Stab}_\Lambda(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C}); \quad \sigma = (Z, P) \mapsto Z$$

is a local homeomorphism, where $\text{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C})$ is equipped with the linear topology. Therefore, $\text{Stab}_\Lambda(\mathcal{D})$ is naturally a complex manifold of dimension $\text{rank}(\Lambda)$.

There are natural group actions on $\text{Stab}_\Lambda(\mathcal{D})$ by the group of autoequivalences $\widetilde{\text{Aut}}(\mathcal{D})$ and the group $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$. Later, we will only use the action by the subgroup $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$. For $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}$, define a right \mathbb{C} -action by:

$$\sigma = (Z, P) \mapsto \sigma.(x, y) := (e^{x+i\pi y} \cdot Z, P'), \quad \text{where } P'(\phi) = P(\phi - y).$$

Here, the x -component acts on the masses, and the y -component acts on the phases. One can easily see that the actions by \mathbb{C} on the stability space are isometries with respect to the metric d .

Definition 2.6. The induced quotient metric on $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})/\mathbb{C}$ is:

$$\bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) = \inf_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}} d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2.(x, y)).$$

Every \mathbb{C} -orbits are closed [Woo12, Section 2], thus the quotient metric is well-defined. The mass-distance $\bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2)$ and the phase-distance $\bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2)$ are defined similarly as in Notation 2.4:

$$\bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sup_{E \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \left| \log \frac{m_{\sigma_1}(E)}{m_{\sigma_2}(E)} - x \right| \right\} \right\},$$

$$\bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) := \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sup_{E \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ |\phi_{\sigma_1}^+(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^+(E) - y|, |\phi_{\sigma_1}^-(E) - \phi_{\sigma_2}^-(E) - y| \right\} \right\}.$$

Remark 2.7. For $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{D}^b\mathrm{Coh}(X)$, the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on X , one usually takes $\Lambda = N(\mathrm{D}^b\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ to be the numerical Grothendieck group. For a curve X , $N(\mathrm{D}^b\mathrm{Coh}(X)) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, with the quotient map $K_0(\mathrm{D}^b\mathrm{Coh}(X)) \rightarrow N(\mathrm{D}^b\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ sending a class to its rank and degree.

2.2 Geodesic spaces.

Definition 2.8. Let (X, d) be a metric space.

- A curve $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is called a *geodesic* if $d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2| \cdot d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))$ for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$.
- A metric space (X, d) is called *geodesic* if any two points in X can be connected by a geodesic.

Lemma 2.9. Let (X, d) be a metric space, and let $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be a curve without self-intersection. Suppose for any $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq 1$, we have:

$$d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_3)) = d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) + d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_3)).$$

Then there exists a reparametrization $\tilde{\gamma}$ of the underlying curve that is a geodesic.

Proof. Consider the function

$$F(t) := \frac{d(\gamma(0), \gamma(t))}{d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))}.$$

By the given condition, $F(t)$ is a strictly increasing and continuous function on $t \in [0, 1]$, with $F(0) = 0$ and $F(1) = 1$. Let $G: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the inverse function of F , and consider the reparametrization

$$\tilde{\gamma}(s) := \gamma(G(s)).$$

Then, for any $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq 1$,


$$\begin{aligned} d(\tilde{\gamma}(s_1), \tilde{\gamma}(s_2)) &= d(\tilde{\gamma}(0), \tilde{\gamma}(s_2)) - d(\tilde{\gamma}(0), \tilde{\gamma}(s_1)) \\ &= d(\gamma(0), \gamma(G(s_2))) - d(\gamma(0), \gamma(G(s_1))) \\ &= (F(G(s_2)) - F(G(s_1))) \cdot d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) \\ &= (s_2 - s_1) \cdot d(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)). \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 Metrics on the upper half-plane. Let $\mathbb{H} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$ be the upper half-plane. It can be equipped with the Poincaré hyperbolic metric, under which the geodesics are either half-circles with their centers on the x -axis, or straight vertical rays orthogonal to the x -axis. The distance between two points $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{H}$ can be computed as follows. Consider the unique geodesic passing through τ_1 and τ_2 , which intersects the boundary of $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ at two points, say $t_1, t_2 \in \partial\overline{\mathbb{H}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, where t_1 is closer to τ_1 and t_2 is closer to τ_2 . Then

$$d_{\mathrm{hyp}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \log \frac{|\tau_1 - t_2| |\tau_2 - t_1|}{|\tau_2 - t_2| |\tau_1 - t_1|}.$$

Here $|\cdot|$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm.



Lemma 2.10. *The hyperbolic distance can be expressed as*

$$d_{\text{hyp}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - s_2| |\tau_2 - s_1|}{|\tau_2 - s_2| |\tau_1 - s_1|} \right) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Q}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - s_2| |\tau_2 - s_1|}{|\tau_2 - s_2| |\tau_1 - s_1|} \right).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that the supremum of the above expression is achieved when $s_1 = t_1$ and $s_2 = t_2$. Let $\rho \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ be a Möbius transformation that maps τ_1, τ_2 to points on the y -axis, where $\text{Im}(\rho(\tau_1)) > \text{Im}(\rho(\tau_2))$. Since cross-ratios are preserved under Möbius transformations, we have

$$\sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - s_2| |\tau_2 - s_1|}{|\tau_2 - s_2| |\tau_1 - s_1|} \right) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\log \frac{|\rho(\tau_1) - \rho(s_2)| |\rho(\tau_2) - \rho(s_1)|}{|\rho(\tau_2) - \rho(s_2)| |\rho(\tau_1) - \rho(s_1)|} \right)$$

Since Möbius transformations preserve the boundary $\partial \overline{\mathbb{H}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, it is clear that the supremum is achieved when $\rho(s_1) = 0$ and $\rho(s_2) = \infty$, i.e. when $\rho(\tau_1), \rho(\tau_2), \rho(s_1), \rho(s_2)$ are on the same geodesic. This happens if and only if $s_1 = t_1$ and $s_2 = t_2$. \square

Let us introduce a modified metric on \mathbb{H} that will be used in the next section.

Definition 2.11. The metric $d_{\mathbb{Z}}$ on the upper half-plane \mathbb{H} is defined as follows:


$$d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - s_2| |\tau_2 - s_1|}{|\tau_2 - s_2| |\tau_1 - s_1|} \right).$$

Note that it can be extended, using the same formula, to a metric on $\mathbb{H} \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z})$.

Proposition 2.12. *The metric space $(\mathbb{H} \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}), d_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is geodesic. In fact, geodesics with respect to the standard hyperbolic metric d_{hyp} remain geodesics under the new metric $d_{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Proof. Let τ_1 and τ_2 be two points in $\mathbb{H} \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z})$. Choose a Möbius transformation $\rho \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ that maps τ_1, τ_2 to points on the y -axis, where $\text{Im}(\rho(\tau_1)) > \text{Im}(\rho(\tau_2))$. Since cross-ratios are preserved under Möbius transformations, we have

$$d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - s_2| |\tau_2 - s_1|}{|\tau_2 - s_2| |\tau_1 - s_1|} \right) = \sup_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\log \frac{|\rho(\tau_1) - \rho(s_2)| |\rho(\tau_2) - \rho(s_1)|}{|\rho(\tau_2) - \rho(s_2)| |\rho(\tau_1) - \rho(s_1)|} \right)$$



Since $\rho(\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, it is clear that

$$d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \log \frac{|\rho(\tau_1) - m||\rho(\tau_2) - M|}{|\rho(\tau_2) - m||\rho(\tau_1) - M|},$$

where

$$m := \inf_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} |\rho(s)| \quad \text{and} \quad M := \sup_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} |\rho(s)|.$$

To show that hyperbolic geodesics remain geodesics with respect to $d_{\mathbb{Z}}$, it suffices, by Lemma 2.9, to verify that $d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_3) + d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_3, \tau_2)$ for any τ_3 lying in between τ_1 and τ_2 on the hyperbolic geodesic passing through them. Under the Möbius transformation ρ , the point τ_3 is mapped to a point on the y -axis that lies between $\rho(\tau_1)$ and $\rho(\tau_2)$. Observe that

$$d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_3) = \log \frac{|\rho(\tau_1) - m||\rho(\tau_3) - M|}{|\rho(\tau_3) - m||\rho(\tau_1) - M|} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_3, \tau_2) = \log \frac{|\rho(\tau_3) - m||\rho(\tau_2) - M|}{|\rho(\tau_2) - m||\rho(\tau_3) - M|}.$$

Thus, the desired equality $d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_3) + d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_3, \tau_2)$ is obtained. \square

3 Proof of non-geodesicness

3.1 Stability space of projective line. The space of Bridgeland stability conditions on $D^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$ has been studied in detail in [Oka06]. In this subsection, we recall some of the results from that study. Additionally, we fix some notations for parametrizing the stability space, which will be used subsequently.

Stability conditions on $D^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$ can be classified into two types:

- (i) *Geometric*, with respect to which all line bundles and skyscraper sheaves are stable.
- (ii) *Algebraic*, with respect to which only $\mathcal{O}(k)$, $\mathcal{O}(k+1)$, and their shifts are stable for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Geometric stability conditions. We denote the subset of geometric stability conditions as $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(D^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \subseteq \text{Stab}(D^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$. It is known that $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(D^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \cong \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$, where the \mathbb{C} -factor arises from the free \mathbb{C} -action on stability spaces. A section of this action can be described as follows. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$. There is a unique stability condition such that:

- The central charge is $Z(E) = -\deg(E) + \tau \cdot \text{rank}(E)$.
- Skyscraper sheaves have phase $\phi(\mathcal{O}_x) = 1$.
- Line bundles have phases $0 < \phi(\mathcal{O}(n)) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arg(\tau - n) < 1$.

Notation 3.1. We use $(\tau, x, y) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ to parametrize the set of geometric stability conditions $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$. For each triple (τ, x, y) , let $\sigma_{\tau, x, y}$ be the unique (geometric) stability condition such that:

- The central charge is $Z_{\tau, x, y}(E) = e^{x+i\pi y} (-\deg(E) + \tau \cdot \text{rank}(E))$.
- Skyscraper sheaves have phase $\phi_{\tau, x, y}(\mathcal{O}_x) = y + 1$.
- Line bundles have phases $y < \phi_{\tau, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(n)) = y + \frac{1}{\pi} \arg(\tau - n) < y + 1$.

Note that for any fixed τ , the stability conditions $\sigma_{\tau, x, y}$ form a single \mathbb{C} -orbit. Therefore, we will use $\bar{\sigma}_\tau$ to denote an element of $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{H}$.

The subsets X_k . Moving beyond geometric stability conditions, let us consider the subset

$$X_k := \{ \sigma \in \text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) : \mathcal{O}(k) \text{ and } \mathcal{O}(k+1) \text{ are } \sigma\text{-stable} \} \subseteq \text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)).$$

The set X_k contains all geometric stability conditions, as well as some algebraic stability conditions. In fact, the algebraic stability conditions within each X_k are disjoint:

$$\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) = \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \amalg \left(\prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (X_k \setminus \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))) \right).$$

The set X_k is isomorphic to $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where the \mathbb{C} -factor again arises from the free \mathbb{C} -action on stability spaces. A section of this action can be described as follows. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cong \mathbb{H}$. There is a unique stability condition such that:

- Both $\mathcal{O}(k)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k+1)$ are stable.
- $Z(\mathcal{O}(k)) = 1$ and $\phi(\mathcal{O}(k)) = 0$.
- $Z(\mathcal{O}(k+1)) = e^{\alpha+i\pi\beta}$ and $\phi(\mathcal{O}(k+1)) = \beta$.

Notation 3.2. We use $\{(\alpha, \beta, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \beta > 0\} \cong \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ to parametrize the set X_k . For each quadruple (α, β, x, y) , let $\sigma_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}$ be the unique stability condition such that:

- Both $\mathcal{O}(k)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k+1)$ are $\sigma_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}$ -stable.
- $Z_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(k)) = e^{x+i\pi y}$ and $\phi_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(k)) = y$.
- $Z_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(k+1)) = e^{x+\alpha+i\pi(y+\beta)}$ and $\phi_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(k+1)) = y + \beta$.

Note that for any fixed $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$, the stability conditions $\sigma_{\alpha, \beta, x, y}$ form a single \mathbb{C} -orbit. Therefore, we will use $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha, \beta}$ to denote an element of $X_k/\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{H}$.

The subset $\{(\alpha, \beta, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < \beta < 1\} \subseteq X_k$ parametrizes the geometric stability conditions. This parametrization and the previous one by $(\tau, x, y) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ are related by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let σ be a geometric stability condition such that its parametrization in Notation 3.2 in X_k is $(\alpha, \beta, x_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, where $0 < \beta < 1$. Then, in the parametrization in Notation 3.1, its coordinates (τ, x, y) are given by:*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= k + \frac{1}{1 - e^{\alpha + i\pi\beta}}, \\ x &= x_k + \log |1 - e^{\alpha + i\pi\beta}|, \\ y &= y_k + \frac{1}{\pi} \arg(1 - e^{\alpha + i\pi\beta}).\end{aligned}$$

Here, the number $1 - e^{\alpha + i\pi\beta}$ lies in the lower half-plane, and its argument $\arg(1 - e^{\alpha + i\pi\beta})$ takes value in $(-\pi, 0)$.

Proof. It follows from comparing the central charges and phases of $\mathcal{O}(k)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k+1)$. \square

Remark 3.4. Let $\overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \subseteq \text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$ be the closure of the set of geometric stability conditions in the entire stability space. The boundary

$$\overline{\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} = \overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \setminus \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$$

consists of \mathbb{Z} -many connected components, each of which lies in an X_k . In terms of Notation 3.1, the boundary points can be parametrized by

$$(\tau, x, y) \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{R}^2 = \coprod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k, k+1) \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Suppose $\tau \in (k, k+1)$, then the unique corresponding stability condition satisfies:

- The central charge is $Z_{\tau, x, y}(E) = e^{x + i\pi y} (-\deg(E) + \tau \cdot \text{rank}(E))$.
- Skyscraper sheaves have phase $\phi_{\tau, x, y}(\mathcal{O}_x) = y + 1$.
- Line bundles have phases $\phi_{\tau, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(n)) = y + 1$ if $n \geq k + 1$, and $\phi_{\tau, x, y}(\mathcal{O}(n)) = y$ if $n \leq k$.

Such a stability condition lies in X_k , with $\beta = 1$ in Notation 3.2. The components of $(\tau, x, y) \in (k, k+1) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and $(\alpha, 1, x_k, y_k) \in X_k$ are related as in Lemma 3.3:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= k + \frac{1}{1 + e^\alpha}, \\ x &= x_k + \log(1 + e^\alpha), \\ y &= y_k.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.5. We define a projection map

$$p: \text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))}$$

as follows:

- for $\sigma \in \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$, $p(\sigma) := \sigma$,
- for $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta,x,y} \in X_k \setminus \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$, $p(\sigma_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}) := \sigma_{\alpha,1,x,y}$.

Similarly, define

$$\bar{p}: \text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}}$$

where:

- for $\bar{\sigma} \in \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}$, $\bar{p}(\bar{\sigma}) := \bar{\sigma}$,
- for $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta} \in (X_k/\mathbb{C}) \setminus (\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C})$, $\bar{p}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}) := \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha,1}$.

In words, the maps contract algebraic stability conditions to the boundary of the space of geometric stability conditions, while fixing all geometric stability conditions.

3.2 Distance between two geometric stability conditions. Let us begin with an easy lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *To compute the metrics on $\text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$ and $\text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}$ (see Section 2.1), it suffices to take the supremum among all line bundles $\mathcal{O}(n)$ and skyscraper sheaves \mathcal{O}_x on \mathbb{P}^1 .*

Proof. This follows from the fact that any coherent sheaf on \mathbb{P}^1 is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of line bundles and skyscraper sheaves. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\sigma_1 = \sigma_{\tau_1,x_1,y_1}$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_{\tau_2,x_2,y_2}$ be two geometric stability conditions (see Notation 3.1). The distance between them is*

$$d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \max \{d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2), d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \max \left\{ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \left| \log \frac{|\tau_1 - n|}{|\tau_2 - n|} + (x_1 - x_2) \right| \right\}, |x_1 - x_2| \right\}, \\ d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \max \left\{ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{\pi} \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right) + (y_1 - y_2) \right| \right\}, |y_1 - y_2| \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.a)$$

Here, $\arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right)$ takes values in $(-\pi, \pi)$.

Proof. This follows from the fact that all line bundles and skyscraper sheaves are stable with respect to geometric stability conditions. \square

Remark 3.8. Note that the formula (3.a) for d_{mass} extends to the closure $\overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \cong (\mathbb{H} \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z})) \times \mathbb{R}^2$, since line bundles and skyscraper sheaves are still semistable with respect to stability conditions on the boundary of $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$.

However, the formula for d_{phase} does not directly extend to the closure due to the multivaluedness of \arg . It turns out to be easier to use the coordinates in X_k when computing the phase-distance involving algebraic stability conditions.

The following elementary lemma will be useful for computing the quotient metric on $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\{A_\alpha\}$ be a set of real numbers such that*

$$\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha \geq 0 \geq \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha.$$

Then

$$\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \max \left\{ \sup_{\alpha} \{ |A_\alpha + \lambda| \}, |\lambda| \right\} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha - \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right).$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\max \left\{ \sup_{\alpha} \{ |A_\alpha + \lambda| \} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha - \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right) \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that the infimum can be achieved by some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\lambda = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha + \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right).$$

Then

$$|A_\alpha + \lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha - \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right) \quad \text{for any } \alpha,$$

and

$$|\lambda| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha + \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha - \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha \right)$$

since $\sup_{\alpha} A_\alpha \geq 0 \geq \inf_{\alpha} A_\alpha$. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let $\bar{\sigma}_{\tau_1}$ and $\bar{\sigma}_{\tau_2}$ be two elements of $\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{H}$. Then*

$$\bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_{\tau_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\tau_2}) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2), \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right) \right\} - \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - m}{\tau_2 - m} \right) \right\} \right) \right\}.$$

Here, the metric $d_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined in Definition 2.11, and the arguments \arg take values in $(-\pi, \pi)$.

Proof. It is not hard to see that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \log \frac{|\tau_1 - n|}{|\tau_2 - n|} \right\} \geq 0 \geq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \log \frac{|\tau_1 - m|}{|\tau_2 - m|} \right\},$$

and

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \log \frac{|\tau_1 - n|}{|\tau_2 - n|} \right\} - \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \log \frac{|\tau_1 - m|}{|\tau_2 - m|} \right\} = \sup_{n, m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\log \frac{|\tau_1 - n| |\tau_2 - m|}{|\tau_2 - n| |\tau_1 - m|} \right) = d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.9, the mass-distance is

$$\bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\tau_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\tau_2}) = \frac{1}{2} d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2). \tag{3.b}$$

The phase-distance is

$$\bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right) \right\} - \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - m}{\tau_2 - m} \right) \right\} \right).$$

This follows again from Lemma 3.9, and the simple observation that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right) \right\} \geq 0 \geq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - m}{\tau_2 - m} \right) \right\}.$$

□

Remark 3.11. Note that the phase-distance satisfies

$$\bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - n}{\tau_2 - n} \right) \right\} - \inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \arg \left(\frac{\tau_1 - m}{\tau_2 - m} \right) \right\} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} (\pi - (-\pi)) = 1.$$

Therefore, one has

$$\bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_{\tau_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\tau_2}) = \frac{1}{2} d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad \text{whenever } d_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq 2.$$

Remark 3.12. If X is a smooth projective curve of genus $g(X) \geq 1$, then $\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(X)) \cong \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{C}$ consists of only geometric stability conditions [Mac07, Theorem 2.7], and the quotient metric \bar{d} on $\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(X))/\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{H}$ coincides with $\frac{1}{2}d_{\text{hyp}}$ [Woo12, Proposition 4.1]. The reason we obtain a different metric in the case of \mathbb{P}^1 is that the phases of semistable objects are dense in \mathbb{R} for $g(X) \geq 1$, whereas this is not true for $X = \mathbb{P}^1$.

3.3 Distance between geometric and algebraic stability conditions.

Lemma 3.13 ([Oka06, Lemma 3.1]). *In $\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$, there are exact triangles:*

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{O}(k+1)^{\oplus(n-k)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(k)^{\oplus(n-k-1)}[1] \xrightarrow{+1} \quad \text{if } n > k+1 \\ \mathcal{O}(k+1)^{\oplus(k-n)}[-1] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(k)^{\oplus(k-n+1)} \xrightarrow{+1} \quad \text{if } n < k \\ \mathcal{O}(k+1) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_x \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(k)[1] \xrightarrow{+1} \end{array}$$

Moreover, these exact triangles give the Harder–Narasimhan filtrations of line bundles $\mathcal{O}(n)$ (for $n \neq k, k+1$) and skyscraper sheaves \mathcal{O}_x with respect to algebraic stability conditions in $X_k \setminus \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$.

For algebraic stability conditions in $X_k \setminus \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \cong \{(\alpha, \beta, x, y) : \beta \geq 1\}$ (see Notation 3.2), the masses and phases of line bundles and skyscraper sheaves are given in the following table (Table 1).

Proposition 3.14. *Let σ_1 and σ_2 be two stability conditions on $\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$. Then*

$$d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = d_{\text{mass}}(p(\sigma_1), p(\sigma_2)) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) = \bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{p}(\bar{\sigma}_1), \bar{p}(\bar{\sigma}_2)).$$

Here, p and \bar{p} are the projections that contract algebraic stability conditions to the boundary of the geometric stability space (see Definition 3.5).

The mass-distances can then be computed via formulae (3.a) and (3.b), as both formulae extend to the closure of geometric stability conditions (see Remark 3.8).

(for $\beta \geq 1$)	$m_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}$	$\phi_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}^+$	$\phi_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}^-$
$\mathcal{O}(n)$ ($n < k$)	$((k-n)e^\alpha + (k-n+1))e^x$	$\beta + y - 1$	y
$\mathcal{O}(k)$	e^x	y	y
$\mathcal{O}(k+1)$	$e^{\alpha+x}$	$\beta + y$	$\beta + y$
$\mathcal{O}(n)$ ($n > k+1$)	$((n-k)e^\alpha + (n-k-1))e^x$	$\beta + y$	$y + 1$
\mathcal{O}_x	$(e^\alpha + 1)e^x$	$\beta + y$	$y + 1$

Table 1: Masses and phases of objects with respect to an algebraic stability condition.

Proof. This follows from the observation that the masses $m_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}$ of line bundles and skyscraper sheaves are independent of β , as long as the stability is algebraic, i.e. $\beta \geq 1$. \square

Let σ_1 be a geometric stability condition and σ_2 be an algebraic stability condition. There exists a unique $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that X_k contains both of them. Let us compute the distance between them in terms of their coordinates in Notation 3.2

$$(\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The mass-distance can be computed via Proposition 3.14. To compute the phase-distance, we also present the table of masses and phases of line bundles and skyscraper sheaves with respect to geometric stability conditions (i.e. $0 < \beta < 1$).

(for $0 < \beta < 1$)	$m_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}$	$\phi_{\alpha,\beta,x,y}^\pm$
$\mathcal{O}(n)$ ($n < k$)	$ (k-n)e^{\alpha+i\pi\beta} - (k-n+1) e^x$	$\beta + y - 1 < \phi(\mathcal{O}(n)) < y$
$\mathcal{O}(k)$	e^x	y
$\mathcal{O}(k+1)$	$e^{\alpha+x}$	$\beta + y$
$\mathcal{O}(n)$ ($n > k+1$)	$ (n-k)e^{\alpha+i\pi\beta} - (n-k-1) e^x$	$\beta + y < \phi(\mathcal{O}(n)) < y + 1$
\mathcal{O}_x	$ e^{\alpha+i\pi\beta} - 1 e^x$	$\beta + y < \phi(\mathcal{O}_x) < y + 1$

Table 2: Masses and phases of objects with respect to a geometric stability condition.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\sigma_{\alpha_1,\beta_1,x_1,y_1}$ be a geometric stability condition and $\sigma_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,x_2,y_2}$ be an algebraic stability condition in X_k (therefore, $0 < \beta_1 < 1 \leq \beta_2$). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1,\beta_1,x_1,y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,x_2,y_2}) &= d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_{\tilde{\tau}_1,\tilde{x}_1,\tilde{y}_1}, \sigma_{\tilde{\tau}_2,\tilde{x}_2,\tilde{y}_2}), \\ d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1,\beta_1,x_1,y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,x_2,y_2}) &= \max\{ |(\beta_1 - \beta_2) + (y_1 - y_2)|, |y_1 - y_2| \}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_1 &= k + \frac{1}{1 - e^{\alpha_1 + i\pi\beta_1}}, & \tilde{\tau}_2 &= k + \frac{1}{1 + e^{\alpha_2}}, \\ \tilde{x}_1 &= x_1 + \log \left| 1 - e^{\alpha_1 + i\pi\beta_1} \right|, & \tilde{x}_2 &= x_2 + \log(1 + e^{\alpha_2}), \\ \tilde{y}_1 &= y_1 + \frac{1}{\pi} \arg(1 - e^{\alpha_1 + i\pi\beta_1}), & \tilde{y}_2 &= y_2 \end{aligned}$$

are coordinates in $(\tau, x, y) \in (\mathbb{H} \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z})) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \cong \overline{\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))}$.

Proof. The mass-distance follows from Proposition 3.14 and the change-of-variable formula between the (α, β, x, y) -coordinate and the (τ, x, y) -coordinate in Lemma 3.3 (with Remark 3.4 for the boundary case). The phase-distance is determined by computing the phase differences using Tables 1 and 2. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Let $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}$ and $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}$ be two elements of $X_k/\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Suppose $0 < \beta_1 < 1 \leq \beta_2$, i.e. $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}$ is geometric and $\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}$ is algebraic. Then*

$$\bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}) = \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ d_{\mathbb{Z}} \left(k + \frac{1}{1 - e^{\alpha_1 + i\pi\beta_1}}, k + \frac{1}{1 + e^{\alpha_2}} \right), \beta_2 - \beta_1 \right\}.$$

Proof. The mass-distance again follows from Proposition 3.14. The phase-distance follows from the one before taking the quotient (Lemma 3.15) and Lemma 3.9. \square

3.4 Distance between two algebraic stability conditions. In this subsection, we compute the distance between two algebraic stability conditions. Although this calculation is not essential for proving the non-geodesicness of $\text{Stab}(\mathbb{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$, we include it here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $\sigma_1 = \sigma_{\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1} \in X_k$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_{\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2} \in X_\ell$ be two algebraic stability conditions.*

(i) *Suppose $k = \ell$, i.e. σ_1 and σ_2 are in the same algebraic chamber. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2}) &= \max \{ |(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + (x_1 - x_2)|, |x_1 - x_2| \} \\ d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2}) &= \max \{ |(\beta_1 - \beta_2) + (y_1 - y_2)|, |y_1 - y_2| \} \\ \bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}) &= \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \\ \bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}) &= \frac{1}{2} |\beta_1 - \beta_2| \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Suppose $k \neq \ell$, say $k < \ell$ without loss of generality. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2}) &= \max \{ |\log((\ell - k)(1 + e^{\alpha_1}) - 1) + (x_1 - x_2)|, \\ &\quad |\log((\ell - k + 1)(1 + e^{\alpha_1}) - 1) - \alpha_2 + (x_1 - x_2)|, \\ &\quad |-\log((\ell - k)(1 + e^{\alpha_2}) + 1) + (x_1 - x_2)|, \\ &\quad |\alpha_1 - \log((\ell - k - 1)(1 + e^{\alpha_2}) + 1) + (x_1 - x_2)| \} \\ d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_{\alpha_1, \beta_1, x_1, y_1}, \sigma_{\alpha_2, \beta_2, x_2, y_2}) &= \max \{ |\beta_1 + (y_1 - y_2)|, |(1 - \beta_2) + (y_1 - y_2)| \} \\ \bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}) &= \frac{1}{2} d_{\mathbb{Z}} \left(k + \frac{1}{1 + e^{\alpha_1}}, \ell + \frac{1}{1 + e^{\alpha_2}} \right) \\ \bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, \bar{\sigma}_{\alpha_2, \beta_2}) &= \frac{1}{2} (\beta_1 + \beta_2 - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The mass-distances are computed using Proposition 3.14, and the phase-distances are derived from Table 1. \square

Note that the case when $k = \ell$ has already been discussed in [Kik23, Section 3.2].

3.5 Proof of non-geodesicness. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.1, which states that $(\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1), d)$ and $(\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)/\mathbb{C}, \bar{d})$ are not geodesic.

The idea is as follows. First, we choose a geometric stability condition σ_1 that is “far away” from the boundary $\overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))}$. Then, we choose a stability condition σ_2 on the boundary $\overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))}$ such that:

- (i) $d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ achieves the infimum $\inf \left\{ d(\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}) : \tilde{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \right\}$, and
- (ii) $d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \gg d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$.

Suppose $\sigma_2 = \sigma_{\alpha, 1, x, y} \in X_k$. We then consider a small deformation σ_3 into the algebraic chamber, say $\sigma_3 = \sigma_{\alpha, 1+\epsilon, x, y} \in X_k$. According to Proposition 3.14, the mass-distance remains unchanged under the deformation: $d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. By Lemma 3.15, $d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) \leq d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) + \epsilon$, which is still less than $d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. Therefore, $d(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. However, any path connecting σ_1 and σ_3 must cross the boundary $\overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))}$ separating them. Thus, there is no geodesic connecting σ_1 and σ_3 .

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the geometric stability condition:

$$\sigma_1 = \sigma_{\frac{1}{2}+10i, 0, 0}.$$

Here, $(\frac{1}{2} + 10i, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ are its coordinates as defined in Notation 3.1. It is not hard to see from Lemma 3.7 that the infimum $\inf \left\{ d(\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}) : \tilde{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \right\}$ can be achieved by

$$\sigma_2 = \sigma_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401}, 0} \in \overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \cap X_0.$$

Here, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401}, 0) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ are its coordinates as defined in Notation 3.1 and Remark 3.4. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \inf \left\{ d(\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}) : \tilde{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial\text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} \\ d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} \\ d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) &< 1 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we express $\sigma_2 \in X_0$ using the (algebraic) coordinates as in Notation 3.2. By Remark 3.4, we have:

$$\sigma_2 = \sigma_{0, 1, \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} - \log 2, 0} \in X_0.$$

Now, we consider a small deformation of σ_2 into the algebraic chamber, such as:

$$\sigma_3 = \sigma_{0, 1.1, \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} - \log 2, 0} \in X_0,$$

where we increase the β -component by $\frac{1}{10}$.

Let us consider the distance between σ_1 and σ_3 .

- $d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401}$ by Proposition 3.14.

- $d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) \leq d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) + d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_2, \sigma_3) < 1.1 < \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401}$.

Therefore, the distance is

$$d(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = \max \{d_{\text{mass}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3), d_{\text{phase}}(\sigma_1, \sigma_3)\} = d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401}.$$

We claim that there is no geodesic connecting σ_1 and σ_3 . Assuming the contrary, suppose there exists such a geodesic, say γ . Then γ must intersect the boundary $\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)) \cap X_0$, which separates σ_1 and σ_3 . Let us denote an intersection point as σ^* . By the definition of geodesics, we have:

$$d(\sigma_1, \sigma^*) < d(\sigma_1, \sigma_3).$$

Recall that σ_2 achieves the infimum $\inf \left\{ d(\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}) : \tilde{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \right\}$. Thus,

$$d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \inf \left\{ d(\sigma_1, \tilde{\sigma}) : \tilde{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))} \right\} \leq d(\sigma_1, \sigma^*) < d(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2).$$

This proves that $\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))$ is not geodesic.

The proof of non-geodesicness of $\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}$ goes exactly the same. Consider

$$\bar{\sigma}_1 = \bar{\sigma}_{\frac{1}{2}+10i} \in \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}.$$

Then the infimum $\inf \left\{ \bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}) : \bar{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}} \right\}$ can be achieved by

$$\bar{\sigma}_2 = \bar{\sigma}_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We still have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) &= \inf \left\{ \bar{d}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}) : \bar{\sigma} \in \overline{\partial \text{Stab}^{\text{Geo}}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} \\ \bar{d}_{\text{mass}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \sqrt{401} \\ \bar{d}_{\text{phase}}(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2) &< 1 \end{aligned}$$

In terms of the algebraic coordinates as in Notation 3.2, we have:

$$\bar{\sigma}_2 = \bar{\sigma}_{0,1} \in X_0.$$

Let $\bar{\sigma}_3$ be a small deformation of it into the algebraic chamber, such as:

$$\bar{\sigma}_3 = \bar{\sigma}_{0,1.1}.$$

Then we can prove by the same argument that there is no geodesic connecting $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_3$. Therefore, $\text{Stab}(\text{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1))/\mathbb{C}$ is not geodesic. \square

References

- [All13] Daniel Allcock, *Completions, branched covers, Artin groups, and singularity theory*, Duke Math. J. **162** (2013), no. 14, 2645–2689.
- [BB17] Arend Bayer and Tom Bridgeland, *Derived automorphism groups of K3 surfaces of Picard rank 1*, Duke Math. J. **166** (2017), no. 1, 75–124.
- [BDL20] Asilata Bapat, Anand Deopurkar, and Anthony M. Licata, *A Thurston compactification of the space of stability conditions*, arXiv e-prints (2020), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.07908>.
- [BMS24] Anna Barbieri, Martin Möller, and Jeonghoon So, *A smooth compactification of spaces of stability conditions: the case of the A_n -quiver*, Forum Math. Sigma **12** (2024), Paper No. e101.
- [Bol23] Barbara Bolognese, *A partial compactification of the Bridgeland stability manifold*, Adv. Geom. **23** (2023), no. 4, 527–541.
- [BPPW22] Nathan Broomhead, David Pauksztello, David Ploog, and Jon Woolf, *Partial compactification of stability manifolds by massless semistable objects*, arXiv e-prints (2022), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.03173>.
- [Bri07] Tom Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on triangulated categories*, Ann. of Math. (2) **166** (2007), no. 2, 317–345.
- [FKY21] Yu-Wei Fan, Atsushi Kanazawa, and Shing-Tung Yau, *Weil-Petersson geometry on the space of Bridgeland stability conditions*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **29** (2021), no. 3, 681–706.
- [FLZ22] Lie Fu, Chunyi Li, and Xiaolei Zhao, *Stability manifolds of varieties with finite Albanese morphisms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), no. 8, 5669–5690.
- [HL23] Daniel Halpern-Leistner, *The noncommutative minimal model program*, arXiv e-prints (2023), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13168>.
- [Kik23] Kohei Kikuta, *Curvature of the space of stability conditions*, Manuscripta Math. **171** (2023), no. 3-4, 437–456.
- [KKO24] Kohei Kikuta, Naoki Koseki, and Genki Ouchi, *Thurston compactifications of spaces of stability conditions on curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **377** (2024), no. 4, 2897–2923.
- [Mac07] Emanuele Macrì, *Stability conditions on curves*, Math. Res. Lett. **14** (2007), no. 4, 657–672.
- [Oka06] So Okada, *Stability manifold of \mathbb{P}^1* , J. Algebraic Geom. **15** (2006), no. 3, 487–505.
- [Smi18] Ivan Smith, *Stability conditions in symplectic topology*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. II. Invited lectures, 2018, pp. 969–991.
- [Woo12] J. Woolf, *Some metric properties of spaces of stability conditions*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **44** (2012), no. 6, 1274–1284.

Yu-Wei Fan

YAU MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY

BEIJING 100084, CHINA

ywfan@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn