

# WALL-CHAMBER DECOMPOSITIONS FOR GENERALIZED MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

SOHAIB KHALID AND ZAKARIAS SJÖSTRÖM DYREFELT

ABSTRACT. Generalized Monge-Ampère equations form a large class of PDE including Donaldson’s J-equation, inverse Hessian equations, some supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang Mills equations, and some Z-critical equations. Solvability of these equations is characterized by numerical criteria involving intersection numbers over all subvarieties, and in this paper, we aim to characterize algebraically what happens when these nonlinear Nakai-Moishezon type criteria fail. As a main result, we show that under mild positivity assumptions, there is a finite number of subvarieties violating the Nakai type criterion, and such subvarieties are moreover rigid in a suitable sense. This gives first effective solvability criteria for these families of PDE, thus improving on work of Gao Chen, Datar-Pingali, Song and Fang-Ma. As an application, we obtain first examples in higher dimension of polarized compact Kähler manifolds exhibiting a natural PDE analog of Bridgeland’s locally finite wall-chamber decomposition.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(X, \omega)$  be a compact Kähler manifold, with  $\alpha := [\omega] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$  its associated Kähler class. Fix moreover real closed differential  $(p, p)$ -forms  $\Theta_p$  and consider

$$\Theta = \sum_{p=1}^n \Theta_p.$$

The generalized Monge-Ampère equation, introduced by Pingali [26], seeks a Kähler form  $\omega_\varphi := \omega + dd^c\varphi \in \alpha$  such that

$$(1) \quad (\Theta \wedge \exp(\omega_\varphi))^{[n,n]} = \kappa \exp(\omega_\varphi)^{[n,n]},$$

where  $\alpha^{[n,n]}$  denotes the  $(n, n)$ -part of a differential form  $\alpha$ , and  $\kappa$  is the only possible cohomological constant. Note especially that if  $\Theta = \kappa\theta^k$  is a Kähler form, then (1) is an inverse Hessian equation, and if  $k = 1$  this is the J-equation. We refer to [19, 12] for details on this broad formalism, including how special cases of interest (e.g. J-equation, inverse Hessian equations, dHYM equation) can be interpreted within this framework ([20, 12, 19]).

In one of the most studied special cases of Donaldson’s J-equation [18], seminal work has shown that the associated J-flow converges away from a union of subvarieties given roughly by the singular part of the Siu decomposition of a certain form. Moreover, recent work of [13] paints an intriguing conjectural picture where the J-equation, despite apparent obstructions coming from *unstability*, can be solved *in the weak sense of currents* away from certain subvarieties. In each of these cases, these exceptional subvarieties remain to be well understood.

From a related point of view other influential work on the J-equation, and the strongly related deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills (dHYM) equation, have shown that

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J60, 32Q26, 53C07, 53C55, 53E30.

existence of a solution to these equations can be characterized *numerically* via conditions tested against *all proper irreducible subvarieties*  $V \subset X$ . Mirroring the theory of K-stability and the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture, a characterization testing on all *test configurations* also exist (see [24]). In each of these cases, it is natural to expect that it is in fact enough to test for a finite number of test configurations (resp. subvarieties), related to the previously mentioned locus where the J-flow blows up.

Finally, a recent idea is that of a differential geometric analog to the celebrated wall-chamber decompositions exhibited in Bridgeland stability. More precisely, the existence of a (locally) finite number of subvarieties characterizing stability via e.g. the criteria of Gao Chen [5], would lead to (locally) finite wall-chamber decompositions; a question where in higher dimension the main challenge includes understanding the interaction between subvarieties of different (co-)dimension, and their respective roles in the theory. In this paper, we set out to answer this question for the aforementioned *generalized Monge-Ampère (gMA) equations*, and more generally, the Z-critical equation (see [17]), which is conjectured to be the correct analog to Bridgeland stability on the side of PDE. Our results include 1) A comprehensive analysis of the J-equation on threefolds, providing the first natural higher-dimensional wall-chamber decompositions and effective testing criteria beyond the case of surfaces (cf. [22]). 2) Extensions of these results to a broad class of gMA equations and Z-critical equations in arbitrary dimensions under suitable positivity conditions. 3) Explicit constructions of non-trivial locally finite wall-chamber decompositions in any dimension, for gMA equations.

Alongside direct implications for the study of geometric PDE, the core idea of the paper is to consider what happens algebraically when Nakai-Moishezon type conditions fail (cf. also the Demailly-Paun theorem [15]). We thus address (special cases of) the following basic and natural question. Suppose  $\Omega$  denotes some specific PDE which cannot be solved. What are the possible subvarieties  $V$  that violate the Nakai-Moishezon type numerical criterion for solvability, that is, for which subvarieties  $V$  (which we shall call *destabilizing subvarieties*) do we have

$$\int_V \vartheta_p(\Omega) \leq 0?$$

Here  $\vartheta_p(\Omega)$  are the degree  $(p, p)$  cohomology classes coming from the Nakai-Moishezon criterion associated to  $\Omega$ . More precisely:

- (1) What constraints, if any, are there on the geometry of such  $V$ ?
- (2) What is the cardinality of the set of such  $V$  if we keep  $\Omega$  fixed?
- (3) If  $\Omega_b, b \in \mathcal{B}$  is a continuous family of PDEs parametrized by  $\mathcal{B}$ , what can we say about the set of subvarieties that occur as destabilizing subvarieties for  $\Omega_{b_0}$  for some  $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ ?

### 1.1. Effective testing and wall-chamber decomposition for the J-equation.

The first results in this direction were recently proven in [22], showing that locally finite wall-chamber decompositions always exist on Kähler surfaces. In dimension 3 and onwards the question is completely open, lacking even non-trivial examples confirming this conjectural picture. Compared with the surface case the higher dimensional picture is much more subtle, for the two main reasons that: a) intersection theory and positivity notions are much more well-behaved on surfaces b) in higher dimension there is a complex interaction between subvarieties of different codimensions.

In the spirit of slope stability, we will use the following notation: if  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold and  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$ , set

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V) := (\dim V) \frac{\alpha^{\dim V - 1} \cdot \beta \cdot [V]}{\alpha^{\dim V} \cdot [V]}.$$

We will abbreviate  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(X) =: \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ . The triple  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is called  $J$ -stable (respectively  $J$ -semistable) if for all proper irreducible analytic subvarieties  $V$  of  $X$ , we have  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V) < \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$  (respectively  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V) \leq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ ), and  $J$ -unstable if it is not  $J$ -semistable. We will often drop the prefix and refer to these notions as simply stable or semistable respectively. We will also make use of the *stability threshold* studied in e.g. [28], given by

$$\Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) := \inf_{V \subset X} \frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)),$$

which is strictly positive precisely if the  $J$ -equation is solvable for  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$ .

As main objects of study we then consider the following sets of destabilizing (resp. optimally destabilizing) subvarieties for the  $J_{\alpha, \beta}$ -equation:

$$(2) \quad \text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta} := \{V \subset X \mid \mu_{\alpha, \beta} \leq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)\}$$

$$(3) \quad \text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{opt}} := \left\{ V \subset X \mid \frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)) = \Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) \leq 0 \right\}$$

It is natural to aim to understand elements of these sets, in particular under which conditions they are finite. We begin by stating a general version of our main result for the  $J$ -equation.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that for each  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$  the generic Lelong numbers  $\nu((\mu - (n-p+\varepsilon)\lambda)\alpha - p\beta, V)$  vanish for every subvariety with  $\dim V \geq p+1$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0^1$ . Then there is a finite number of subvarieties satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)) \leq \lambda.$$

In more detail, we have the following:

- (1) ([22]) *Suppose  $\dim X = 2$ . Then, there are only finitely many destabilising curves, each of which is a curve of negative self-intersection.*
- (2) *Suppose  $\dim X = 3$  and*

$$\tau_2(\alpha, \beta) := \mu\alpha - 2\beta$$

*is a big cohomology class on  $X$ . Then, there exists a proper analytic subset  $V_{\alpha, \beta}$  such that each irreducible component of  $V_{\alpha, \beta}$  is a destabilising subvariety and all destabilising subvarieties are contained in  $V_{\alpha, \beta}$ . If moreover  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is  $J$ -semistable, then there exist only finitely many destabilising subvarieties. Each irreducible component  $V$  of the set  $V_{\alpha, \beta}$  is moreover rigid in the following sense:*

- *every irreducible surface component is the unique effective analytic cycle representing its homology class.*

---

<sup>1</sup>This condition is called being  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler in the literature. Indeed, the classes  $\tau$  for which  $\nu(\tau, V) = 0$  for all subvarieties  $V \subset X$  with  $\dim V \geq p$  forms a closed convex cone, the modified nef cone, containing the Kähler cone, and contained in the big cone. We refer to its interior as *the  $p$ -modified Kähler cone*, cf. [32].

- every irreducible curve component  $C$  satisfies the following: for every irreducible surface  $S$  containing  $C$ , either  $C$  is an irreducible component of the singular locus of  $S$  or (the strict transform of)  $C$  is a curve of negative self-intersection in (any resolution of singularities of)  $S$ .

(3) *Suppose*

$$\tau_p(\alpha, \beta) := \mu\alpha - p\beta$$

is a  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler class for each  $p = 1, 2, \dots, \dim X - 1$ . If moreover  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is  $J$ -semistable, then there exist only finitely many destabilising subvarieties, and each destabilising **divisor** is the only effective analytic cycle representing its homology class.

(4) *Suppose*

$$(\mu - (n-p)\Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha))\alpha - p\beta$$

is a  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler class for each  $p = 2, 3, \dots, \dim X - 1$ . Then, there is a finite number of **optimal** destabilizers. The set of destabilizing subvarieties is non-empty if  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is unstable.

**Remark 1.2.** There are many cases of  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  for which  $\Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha)$  is naturally negative enough so that  $(\mu - (n-p)\Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha))\alpha - p\beta$  are all in fact  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler. This ensures that the above statements are not void, and in fact we will show that they are applicable to large classes of examples, see Section 4 and Theorem 1.10 below.

**Remark 1.3.** The proof gives a finite list of subvarieties over which it is enough to test  $J$ -positivity (similarly, from the point of view of  $J$ -stability, it suffices to consider test configurations arising as the deformation to the normal cone for these finitely many  $V_i$ ). Moreover, if  $\dim X = 2$  or  $3$ , then any optimally destabilizing subvariety is rigid in a suitable sense, see Section 3. More generally, the divisors occurring as potential optimal destabilizers can be recognized as precisely those with strictly positive Lelong number  $\nu(\mu\alpha - (n-1)\beta, D) > 0$ , i.e. the finitely many divisors in the negative part of the divisorial Boucksom-Zariski decomposition [2].

**Remark 1.4.** The case (3) corresponds to  $\lambda = 0$ , and (4) to  $\lambda = \Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha)$ . Given the flexibility of choosing  $\lambda$ , one may also note that if the classes  $\mu\alpha - p\beta$  are all  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler, then, by openness of the modified Kähler cones, there is a strictly positive  $\lambda > 0$  such that the  $(\mu - (n-p)\lambda)\alpha - p\beta$  remain  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler. This leads to a fascinating ‘gap statement’, that only finitely many subvarieties satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)) \leq \Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) + \lambda.$$

**Remark 1.5.** The above theorem holds under certain positivity assumptions on  $\mu\alpha - p\beta$  being  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler. While we do expect that these statements can be improved in general, some hypotheses on these classes are necessary, and the statement 1) is sharp at least on threefolds: Indeed, it suffices to consider the blow up  $\mathbb{P}^3$  at a point, where the exceptional divisor  $E$  contains infinitely many lines that, depending on the classes  $\alpha, \beta$  considered, may all be destabilizing. However, as long as  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  is assumed to be big, the above theorem prohibits these lines from being destabilizing at semistability, and one may verify by direct computation that as we pass from the stable to the unstable locus only  $E$  itself will in fact destabilize. Interestingly, if we drop the bigness hypothesis on  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  there may be infinitely many destabilizers (see Example 4.1). In this sense, Main Theorem 1.1 1) is sharp. See also Example 4.2 and Section 4.3 for a discussion in the higher dimensional case.

We now discuss several applications of the above theorem, that serve as key motivation for this paper. First, it provides an improvement to results of Gao Chen [5] and Datar-Pingali [12], Song [30], and takes steps toward a more effective testing of solvability of the J-equation. That solvability implies stability in this context is known from [10], and with our contribution it adds up to the following strengthening of [5, Main theorem]:

**Theorem 1.6.** *Suppose we are in the setting of Main Theorem 1.1. Then the J-equation is solvable on  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  if and only if for all the finitely many subvarieties  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  with strictly positive generic Lelong number  $\nu((\mu - (n - p + \epsilon)\lambda)\alpha - p\beta, V_r) > 0$ , we have*

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta} > \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V_i)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ .

Second, Theorem 1.1 provides a first result in the direction of wall-chamber decompositions for PDE, formulated as follows for the J-equation:

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, J)$  be the set comprising pairs of Kähler classes  $(\alpha, \beta)$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - p\beta$  is a  $(p + 1)$ -modified Kähler class for  $p = 1, \dots, \dim X - 1$ , and set*

$$\mathcal{S}_+(X, J)^{\text{Stab}} := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_+(X, J) : (X, \alpha, \beta) \text{ is } J\text{-stable}\}.$$

*Then, the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{S}_+(X, J)^{\text{Stab}}$  is a locally finite union of smooth submanifolds of codimension one in  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, J)$ . Each such submanifold is cut out by a destabilising subvariety  $V$ , that is by a condition of the form*

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V) = 0.$$

In order to illustrate that the above positivity conditions in fact occur naturally in many situation, we have the following sufficient condition for a pair  $(\alpha, \beta)$  to be an element of  $\mathcal{P}_X$ :

**Theorem 1.8.** *Fix  $X$  a compact Kähler manifold and  $\alpha, \beta$  Kähler classes on  $X$ . Then, the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and Corollaries 1.6 and 1.7 above all hold, if there exists a nef class  $\eta \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{K}_X$  such that  $\alpha = (1 - r)\eta + r\beta$  for some  $r \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\eta$  is 3-modified Kähler<sup>2</sup>.*

**Remark 1.9.** Such manifolds do exist, in any dimension, thus giving first examples of wall-chamber decomposition phenomena for generalized Monge-Ampère equations beyond the surface case. In particular, this is true for a family of Kähler  $n$ -folds  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^\vee)^{\otimes a_1} \oplus \dots \oplus (L^\vee)^{\otimes a_{n-1}})$  studied by Wu [32], see Section 4.2 for notation and details.

The above theorem is particularly useful if  $X$  is a threefold, when the above condition becomes  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}_3\mathcal{K}_X = \mathcal{B}_X$ , the big cone of  $X$ ; something which is often checkable in practice. As a consequence any threefold where  $\mathcal{B}_X \neq \mathcal{K}_X$  carries many pairs of classes  $(\alpha, \beta)$  such that  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}$  is a finite set.

More generally, if  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}_k\mathcal{K}_X$  for some  $k$ ,  $3 \leq k \leq n$ , then  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}$  contains no subvarieties of dimension  $k$  or higher.

The above in particular shows that our main theorems give non-trivial results on the blow-up of *any* compact Kähler threefold, for all Kähler classes  $\alpha$  in an open *subset* of the Kähler cone, in the following sense.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that this automatically implies that  $\eta$  is big, and thus  $\eta^n > 0$ .

**Theorem 1.10.** *Let  $X$  be any compact Kähler threefold, and let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be the blow up of  $X$  at a point  $x \in X$ . If  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$ , then consider the nef and big classes  $\pi^*\alpha, \pi^*\beta$  on  $Y$  and write  $\alpha_\epsilon := \pi^*\alpha - \epsilon[E]$ , and  $\beta_\epsilon := \pi^*\beta - \epsilon[E]$ . If moreover  $0 < \epsilon \ll \epsilon'$  are both small enough, then the set  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha_\epsilon, \beta_{\epsilon'}}^{\text{opt}}$  of optimally destabilizing subvarieties is finite, and any divisor component has strictly positive generic Lelong number*

$$\nu((\mu - \Delta_{\beta_{\epsilon'}}^{pp}(\alpha_\epsilon))\alpha_\epsilon - 2\beta_{\epsilon'}, D) > 0$$

If we have strict inequality in Lemma 4.4 then any optimal destabilizer is a divisor.

**1.2. Extension of main results to generalized Monge-Ampère equations.** We also adapt our techniques to a much broader situation, namely the class of gMA equations of the form (1). The first key observation here is that *any* gMA equation is *factorizable* in the sense of Definition 5.3. Concretely, this means that we can associate to a gMA equation certain  $(1, 1)$ -classes  $\tau_p = \tau_p(\alpha, \Theta)$  (for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ ) depending only on the gMA equation under consideration, that is, on the data  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$ , which we call the *factor classes*. We refer to Lemma 5.6 for details on how to obtain  $\tau_p$  from  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$ , where we also prove that all gMA equations are in fact factorizable.

**Theorem 1.11.** *All generalized Monge-Ampère equations satisfying the condition [12, (1.2)] are factorizable. Moreover, all supercritical deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equations are factorizable if  $\dim X \leq 3$ .*

**Remark 1.12.** We can also show that some supercritical dHYM equations are factorizable when  $\dim X = 4$ , see Theorem 5.15.

From the above, and by virtue of the the numerical criterion established by the work of Datar-Pingali [12] and Fang-Ma [19], nearly all of our arguments about the J-equation then extend to this much more flexible situation to yield the most general statement in this paper and gives a tool for effective testing for solvability:

**Theorem 1.13.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $n$  and let  $\alpha, \beta$  be Kähler classes on  $X$  and  $\theta \in \beta$  a fixed Kähler form.*

(1) **(Effective testing)** *Suppose that*

$$\Theta = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k \theta^k + f \theta^n$$

*with  $c_k \geq 0, f \geq 0$  not all zero, and the associated factor classes  $\tau_p$  are  $(p + 1)$ -modified Kähler for each  $p = 1, \dots, n - 1$ . Then, there is a finite set of subvarieties  $V_1, \dots, V_l$  such that*

$$\int_{V_i} \exp(\alpha) \cdot (\kappa - [\Theta]) > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, l$$

*implies existence of a solution to the gMA equation (1).*

(2) **(Chamber decomposition)** *Let  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})(\alpha)$  be the set of all  $\Theta$  as above with  $f = c_n$  a constant, endowed with the natural Euclidean topology. Let  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})(\alpha)^{\text{Stab}}$  denote the locus of those  $\Theta$  which define a gMA equation admitting a smooth solution. For every  $\Gamma \in \partial \mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})(\alpha)^{\text{Stab}}$  belonging to the boundary there exists an open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})(\alpha)$  such*

that  $U \cap \partial S_+(X, \text{gMA})(\alpha)^{\text{stab}}$  is a finite union of walls cut out by equations of the form

$$\int_V \exp(\alpha) \cdot (\kappa - [\Theta]) = 0.$$

We reiterate that Main Theorem 1.13 applies in particular to inverse Hessian equations, and a version of this result also holds for the supercritical deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills (dHYM) equation, see Section 5.2. The close parallels with the chamber decompositions occurring in Bridgeland stability are elaborated on in Section 6.

**Remark 1.14.** (Z-critical equations) Another important class studied in recent literature are the Z-critical equations, introduced in [17] as differential geometric analogues of special polynomial stability conditions [1] modeled on the theory of Bridgeland [3]. The above theorem applies to a subclass of these, given appropriate choice of stability datum. We explain a particular example of this more concretely, adopting the notation and conventions of [17, Section 2.1]. Let  $L$  be a holomorphic line bundle on a compact Kähler manifold  $X$  of dimension  $n$ . Let us consider unipotent cohomology classes of the form  $U = \exp(A)$  where  $A \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$  is any cohomology class such that  $A + c_1(L) \in \mathcal{K}_X$ . Then, for any stability datum  $\Omega = (\beta, \rho, \exp(A))$  where the stability vector  $\rho = (\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_n)$  satisfies

$$b_k := \frac{\text{Im} \left( \overline{Z_\Omega(L) \rho_k} \right)}{\text{Im} \left( \overline{Z_\Omega(L) \rho_0} \right)} < 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

we obtain a gMA equation satisfying the positivity conditions given in [12, (1.2)] for the Kähler class  $\alpha = A + c_1(L)$  and

$$\Theta = \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \theta^k$$

for any Kähler form  $\theta \in \beta$ .

**1.3. Acknowledgements.** We are grateful to Ved Datar, Jian Song, Julius Ross, Sivaram Petchimuthu, Masafumi Hattori and Antonio Trusiani for helpful discussions. The authors would also like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme “New equivariant methods in algebraic and differential geometry” where work on this paper was undertaken. This work was supported by EPSRC grant no EP/R014604/1. The second named author is moreover supported by an AIAS-COFUND II Marie Curie Grant, and Villum Young Investigator Grant, project no. 60786.

## 2. BACKGROUND ON POSITIVE CONES AND NON-KÄHLER LOCI

**2.1. Currents and positive cones.** For complete background we refer to Demailly and Boucksom.

Recall that given a pseudoeffective class  $\tau$  on a compact Kähler manifold  $(X, \omega)$ , we can define the *minimal multiplicity*  $\nu(\tau, x)$  of  $\tau$  at  $x$  by

$$\nu(\tau, x) := \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \nu(T_{\min, \varepsilon}, x)$$

where  $T_{\min,\varepsilon}$  is a closed  $(1, 1)$  current of minimal singularities in  $\tau$  that satisfies  $T_{\min,\varepsilon} \geq -\varepsilon\omega$ . This definition is independent of the choice of the Kähler metric  $\omega$ . If  $V$  is any irreducible analytic subvariety of  $X$ , we denote

$$\nu(\tau, V) := \inf_{x \in V} \nu(\tau, x).$$

See [2, Section 2.8] for precise definitions.

The following definition is due to [32] and generalizes the notion of a *modified nef class* defined by Boucksom in [2].

**Definition 2.1** (nef and Kähler in codimension  $q$ ). *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $n$ . A pseudoeffective  $(1, 1)$  class  $\tau$  on  $X$  is said to be nef in codimension  $q$  or  $(n - q)$ -modified nef if the minimal multiplicity  $\nu(\tau, Z) = 0$  for any irreducible analytic subvariety of codimension  $k \leq q$ . These classes comprise a closed cone  $\mathcal{M}^q\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_{n-q}\mathcal{N}$ , which we shall call the  $(n - q)$ -modified nef cone and its interior  $\mathcal{M}^q\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}_{n-q}\mathcal{K}$  the  $(n - q)$ -modified Kähler cone. A class  $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$  is called a  $p$ -modified Kähler class.*

**Remark 2.2.** *We have an obvious inclusion of cones*

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_0\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1\mathcal{N} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{E}$$

and similarly for  $\mathcal{M}_i\mathcal{K}$ . In particular, note that  $\mathcal{M}_n\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{B}$  is the big cone. In fact, as a corollary of a result of Paun (see Lemma 2 in [32]), we also have  $\mathcal{M}^{n-1}\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_1\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}$ . In [2], the cone  $\mathcal{M}_{n-1}\mathcal{N}$  is called the modified nef cone.

Recall that the non-Kähler locus  $E_{nK}(\tau)$  of a big class  $\tau$  is given

$$E_{nK}(\tau) := \bigcap_{\tilde{T} \in \tau} E_+(\tilde{T})$$

where the intersection ranges over all strictly positive closed currents  $\tilde{T}$  representing  $\tau$ . Here  $E_+(\tilde{T})$  is the set comprising  $x \in X$  such that  $\nu(\tilde{T}, x) > 0$ . The set  $E_{nK}(\tau)$  is always a closed analytic subset of  $X$  whenever  $\tau$  is a big class on  $X$ .

The following is a straightforward consequence of standard results and the above definitions.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $n$  and let  $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_n\mathcal{K}$  be a big class on  $X$ . Then,  $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$  on  $X$  if and only if every irreducible component of  $E_{nK}(\tau)$  has dimension strictly less than  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a Kähler metric  $\omega$  on  $X$ . First suppose  $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$ . Then, we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  so small that  $\tau - 2\varepsilon[\omega] \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{N}$ . Thus, for any  $V \subseteq X$  of dimension at least  $p$ , we have by definition

$$\nu(\tau - 2\varepsilon[\omega], V) = 0.$$

In particular, we have

$$\nu(T_{\min,\varepsilon}, V) = 0$$

where  $T_{\min,\varepsilon}$  is a current of minimal singularities in  $\tau - 2\varepsilon[\omega]$  satisfying  $T_{\min,\varepsilon} \geq -\varepsilon\omega$ . But then, the current

$$T := T_{\min,\varepsilon} + 2\varepsilon\omega$$

lies in the class  $\tau$  and satisfies  $T \geq \varepsilon\omega$ . Thus,  $T$  is a Kähler current in  $\tau$  and satisfies  $\nu(T, V) = 0$  for all  $V \subseteq X$  of dimension at least  $p$ . Since  $E_{nK}(\tau) \subseteq E_+(T)$ , we see that no such  $V$  can be contained in  $E_{nK}(\tau)$ .



Conversely, suppose that  $E_{nK}(\tau)$  does not contain any irreducible analytic subset of dimension greater than or equal to  $p$ . Then, because  $\tau$  is big, by [2, Theorem 3.17(ii)] there exists a Kähler current  $T \in \tau$  such that  $E_+(T) = E_{nK}(\tau)$ . Because  $T$  is a Kähler current, we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that  $T \geq 2\varepsilon\omega$  and  $\tau - \varepsilon[\omega]$  is a big class. In particular,  $\nu(T - \varepsilon\omega, V) = 0$  for all  $V \subseteq X$  of dimension at least  $p$ . Let  $T_{\min}$  be any current of minimal singularities in  $\tau - \varepsilon[\omega]$  satisfying  $T_{\min} \geq 0$ . Then, by minimality, we have

$$\nu(T_{\min}, x) \leq \nu(T - \varepsilon\omega, x)$$

for all  $x \in X$ . Thus,  $\nu(T_{\min}, V) = 0$  for all  $V$  of dimension at least  $p$ . Now, by [2, Proposition 3.6(ii)], we have  $\nu(T_{\min}, x) = \nu(\tau - \varepsilon[\omega], x)$ , and so we obtain  $\nu(\tau - \varepsilon[\omega], V) = 0$  whenever  $V$  is of dimension at least  $p$ . Thus,  $\tau - \varepsilon[\omega] \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{N}$ . Since this holds for an arbitrary Kähler class  $[\omega]$ , we obtain that  $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$  is a  $p$ -modified Kähler class.  $\square$

Throughout this paper, we shall use Lemma 2.3 in conjunction with the following straightforward consequence of results of Boucksom [2] and Demailly [14].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\tau$  be a big cohomology class on a compact Kähler manifold  $X$ , and  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_{p-1}$  be smooth Kähler forms on  $X$ . Then, for any  $p$ -dimensional subvariety  $V$  satisfying  $V \not\subseteq E_{nK}(\tau)$ , we have*

$$\int_V \tau \cdot [\omega_1] \cdot [\omega_2] \cdot \dots \cdot [\omega_{p-1}] > 0.$$

*Proof.* By a result of Boucksom [2, 3.17 (ii)], there exists a Kähler current with analytic singularities  $T \in \tau$  such that  $E_+(T) = E_{nK}(\tau)$ . By rescaling  $\omega_1$  if necessary, we may assume that  $T \geq \omega_1$ . By Demailly regularization [14, Main Theorem 1.1] there exist smooth forms  $\theta_k$  representing  $\tau$  and continuous functions  $\lambda_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\theta_k$  converge weakly to  $T$ ,  $\theta_k + \lambda_k\omega_1 \geq \omega_1$  in the sense of currents and  $\lambda_k(x)$  decrease to  $\nu(T, x)$ . Since  $X$  is compact, we can find smooth functions  $\rho_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $x \in X$  we have

$$0 \leq \rho_k(x) - \lambda_k(x) \leq 2^{-k}.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\theta_k + \rho_k\omega_1 \geq (1 + 2^{-k})\omega_1.$$

From this, it follows that

$$(\theta_k + \rho_k\omega_1) \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{p-1} \geq (1 + 2^{-k})\omega_1^2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{p-1}$$

as smooth measures on the regular part of  $V$ . Thus, we have

$$\int_V \tau \cdot [\omega_1] \cdot \dots \cdot [\omega_{p-1}] + \int_V \rho_k \omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{p-1} \geq (1 + 2^{-k}) \int_V \omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{p-1}.$$

Now  $\rho_k(x)$  also converges to  $\nu(T, x)$ , and thus the sequence  $\rho_k$  of smooth functions converges to zero almost everywhere on the regular part of  $V$  with respect to the measure  $\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{p-1}$ . Thus, taking the limit and applying the bounded convergence theorem, we obtain that

$$\int_V \tau \cdot [\omega_1] \cdot \dots \cdot [\omega_{p-1}] \geq \int_V [\omega_1]^2 \cdot [\omega_2] \cdot \dots \cdot [\omega_{p-1}] > 0.$$

$\square$

Finally, we shall need the following statement, which will be used to establish statements related to wall-chamber decompositions.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold and  $\tau$  a  $p+1$ -modified Kähler class on  $X$ . Then, there exists an open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\tau$  in  $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$  and a finite set  $S = \{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$  of irreducible  $p$ -dimensional subvarieties of  $X$  such that for all Kähler forms  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{p-1}$  and all  $\tau' \in U$  whenever we have*

$$\int_V \tau \cdot [\omega_1] \cdots [\omega_{p-1}] \leq 0$$

then  $V \in S$ .

*Proof.* By the openness of the  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler cone  $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}\mathcal{K}$ , we can find  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell$  such that

$$\tau \in U := \text{Int}(\text{conv}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_\ell)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Since  $\tau_i$  is  $p+1$ -modified Kähler,  $E_{nK}(\tau_i)$  contains no  $(p+1)$ -dimensional irreducible subvarieties of  $X$ . Let  $S$  be the union of all the  $p$ -dimensional irreducible subvarieties of  $X$  contained in  $E_{nK}(\tau_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . Now, let  $\tau' \in U$  and  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{p-1}$  be Kähler classes on  $X$ . Suppose that we have

$$\int_V \tau' \cdot [\omega_1] \cdots [\omega_{p-1}] \leq 0$$

for some  $p$ -dimensional irreducible subvariety  $V$  of  $X$ . Then, since  $\tau' \in U$ , we can write

$$\tau' = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a_i \tau_i$$

where  $a_i > 0$  and  $\sum_i a_i = 1$ . From this, it follows that

$$\int_V \tau_i \cdot [\omega_1] \cdots [\omega_{p-1}] \leq 0,$$

for some  $i$ , and this in turn implies (by Lemma 2.4) that  $V$  lies in  $E_{nK}(\tau_i)$ , and therefore  $V \in S$ .  $\square$

### 3. DESTABILISING SUBVARIETIES FOR THE J-EQUATION

In the spirit of slope stability, we will use the following notation: if  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold and  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$ , set

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) := (\dim Z) \frac{\alpha^{\dim Z - 1} \cdot \beta \cdot [Z]}{\alpha^{\dim Z} \cdot [Z]}.$$

We will abbreviate  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(X) =: \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ . The triple  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is called  $J$ -stable (respectively  $J$ -semistable) if for all proper irreducible analytic subvarieties  $Z$  of  $X$ , we have

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) < \mu_{\alpha, \beta} \quad (\text{respectively } \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) \leq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}),$$

and  $J$ -unstable if it is not  $J$ -semistable. We will often drop the prefix and refer to these notions as simply stable or semistable respectively.

**3.1. For threefolds.** We are now in a position to prove one of the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler 3-fold and let  $\alpha, \beta$  be Kähler classes on  $X$  such that the triple  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is  $J$ -semistable and the class  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  is big. Then, there exist at most finitely many irreducible subvarieties  $Z \subseteq X$  such that*

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}.$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is semistable but not stable precisely if there exists an irreducible proper subvariety  $Z$  of  $X$  satisfies  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ , i.e. if

$$(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - (\dim Z)\beta) \cdot \alpha^{\dim Z - 1} \cdot [Z] = 0.$$

Because  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  (and hence also  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - \beta$ ) is big, by the lemma above, such a  $Z$  necessarily satisfies  $Z \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - (\dim Z)\beta)$ . Thus, if an irreducible surface  $S$  satisfies  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ , then  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta)$  implies necessarily that  $S$  must be one of the finitely many irreducible surface components of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta)$ .

Similarly, if  $C$  is an irreducible curve satisfying  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(C) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ , then  $C \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - \beta)$ . If  $C$  is not one of the finitely many irreducible components of this analytic set, then  $C \subseteq S$  for some irreducible surface in  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - \beta)$ . Suppose first that  $S$  is a smooth surface. Then, we have

$$(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta)^2 \cdot [S] = \beta^2 \cdot [S] > 0,$$

and

$$(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta) \cdot \alpha \cdot [S] = \alpha \cdot \beta \cdot [S] > 0.$$

From this, it follows that the class  $(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta)|_S$  is big on  $S$  and therefore by the [22, Proposition 3.1] there exist only finitely many curves  $C$  on  $S$  such that  $(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta) \cdot [C] \leq 0$ . Moreover, by semistability of  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  we have  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S) \leq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ , so  $(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - \beta) \cdot [C] \leq 0$  for only finitely many curves  $C \subset S$ , as desired.

In case  $S$  is singular, let  $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  be any birational morphism such that the proper transform  $\tilde{S}$  of  $S$  in  $\tilde{X}$  is smooth and an isomorphism away from the singular set of  $S$ . (Such a morphism always exists by Hironaka's theorem on resolution of singularities.) Then,  $f_*[\tilde{S}] = [S]$  in homology and by the projection formula, we have

$$\mu_{f^*\alpha, f^*\beta}(\tilde{S}) = \frac{2f^*(\alpha \cdot \beta) \cdot [\tilde{S}]}{f^*(\alpha^2) \cdot [\tilde{S}]} = \frac{2\alpha \cdot \beta \cdot [S]}{\alpha^2 \cdot [S]} = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S).$$

From this, we obtain (after another application of the projection formula) that

$$(\mu_{f^*\alpha, f^*\beta}(\tilde{S})f^*\alpha - f^*\beta)^2 \cdot [\tilde{S}] = f^*(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta)^2 \cdot [\tilde{S}] = f^*\beta^2 \cdot [\tilde{S}] = \beta^2 \cdot [S] > 0.$$

Moreover, since  $\alpha$  is a Kähler class,  $f^*\alpha$  can be represented by a semipositive form on  $\tilde{X}$  (and hence also on  $\tilde{S}$ ) and we have

$$(\mu_{f^*\alpha, f^*\beta}(\tilde{S})f^*\alpha - f^*\beta) \cdot f^*\alpha \cdot [\tilde{S}] = f^*(\alpha \cdot \beta) \cdot [\tilde{S}] = \alpha \cdot \beta \cdot [S] > 0.$$

This implies, by Lamari (see [23, Theorem 5.5]) that the class  $f^*(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S)\alpha - \beta)$  is a big class on  $\tilde{S}$ . As before, it follows from semistability of  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  that

$$(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}f^*\alpha - f^*\beta) - (\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(\tilde{S})f^*\alpha - f^*\beta) = (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(S))f^*\alpha$$

is nef on  $\tilde{X}$ , therefore also on  $\tilde{S}$ , and in particular, the class  $f^*(\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - \beta)|_{\tilde{S}}$  is a big class on  $\tilde{S}$ . Hence one concludes from the main theorem in our previous work (see [22, Theorem 5.3]) that there are finitely many curves  $\tilde{C}$  in  $\tilde{S}$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(\tilde{C}) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ . But this implies that if  $C \subseteq S$  does not lie entirely in the singular locus of  $S$ , then its

proper transform can only be one of the finitely many  $\tilde{C}$  in  $\tilde{S}$ , and this implies that there are at most finitely many destabilising curves  $C \subseteq S$ .

We have therefore proven that the destabilising subvarieties are among the finite list of

- (1) irreducible curve components  $C$  of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$
- (2) irreducible surface components  $S$  of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - 2\beta)$
- (3) the irreducible curve components of the singular locus of  $S$  as  $S$  ranges over the surface components of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$
- (4) for every irreducible surface component  $S$  of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$  the curves  $C \subseteq S$  not lying entirely in the singular locus of  $S$  whose strict transform, under any resolution of singularities  $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  of  $S$  as above, occurs as an irreducible component of the negative part of the Zariski decomposition of the class  $f^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$  on  $\tilde{S}$ .

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *We note that the choice of resolution  $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  of the irreducible surface  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$  does not affect the set of potential destabilizers described in the proof. More precisely, let  $f_i : \tilde{X}_i \rightarrow X$  be two resolutions of  $S$  coming from Hironaka's proof, i.e. the strict transform  $\tilde{S}_i$  of  $S$  in  $\tilde{X}_i$  is smooth and  $f_i$  is a composition of blowing up repeatedly in points or smooth curves contained in the singular locus of (the strict transforms of)  $S$ . Then, by resolving the indeterminacy of the rational map  $f_2^{-1} \circ f_1$  we get a common resolution  $g : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  with morphisms  $g_i : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_i$  with  $f_i \circ g_i = g$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If we denote by  $\tilde{S}$  the strict transform of  $S$  in  $\tilde{X}$ , then by what we said above about Hironaka's proof,  $g_i : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \tilde{S}_i$  is a composition of blowups in points of the smooth surface  $\tilde{S}_i$ . Now the formulas (see [2, Lemma 5.8])*

$$(g_i)_* N(g_i^* f_i^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)) = N(f_i^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta))$$

*imply that the support of the negative part  $N(g^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta))$  comprises the strict transforms of the irreducible components of  $N(f_i^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta))$  plus a possible union of a divisor supported on the exceptional locus of  $g_i$ . Since this is true for  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , it follows that for each curve  $C \subseteq S$ , if the strict transform  $\tilde{C}_1 \subseteq \tilde{S}_1$  under  $f_1$  occurs as a component of  $N(f_1^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta))$ , then its strict transform  $\tilde{C}_2 \subseteq \tilde{S}_2$  under  $f_2$  also occurs as a component of  $N(f_2^*(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta))$ , and vice versa.*

Away from semistability, it may happen that there are infinitely many destabilising subvarieties, even under the assumption that the class  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  be big. However, in this case we still have adequate control over the destabilising subvarieties in the following precise sense:

**Theorem 3.3.** *Suppose  $X$  is a compact Kähler 3-fold and  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  is a big class. Let  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  be the union of all irreducible subvarieties  $Z$  of  $X$  with  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(Z) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Then,  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  is a proper analytic subset of  $X$ .*

**Remark 3.4.** *In particular,  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  has finitely many irreducible components.*

*Proof.* If  $S$  is any destabilising irreducible surface in  $X$ , then  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - 2\beta)$ . So, there are always at most finitely many destabilising surfaces. Let  $V_2$  be the union of all of these.

We must prove that all but finitely many destabilising curves  $C$  are contained in  $V_2$ . But a destabilising curve  $C$  likewise satisfies  $C \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$ . There are only finitely many irreducible components of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$  of dimension one. Assume

therefore that  $C$  is not an irreducible component of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$ . Then  $C$  lies instead in a surface  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta)$ . If  $S \subseteq V_2$ , there is nothing to check. So, suppose  $S$  is not contained in  $V_2$ , i.e.  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S) < \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Then, by the same argument as in the proof above, there exist at most finitely many curves  $C \subseteq S$  with  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S)$  and therefore also only finitely many curves  $C$  with  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta} > \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S)$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

The proof of the theorem in particular yields the following useful corollary:

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  be as in the Theorem. Then, for each surface  $S \subseteq V_{\alpha,\beta}$  satisfying  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S) \leq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$  there are only finitely many curves  $C \subseteq S$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S) \leq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$  is all one needs to conclude that the class  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - \beta$  is big on  $S$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta_i, i = 1, 2$  be Kähler classes on a compact Kähler 3-fold  $X$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}\alpha - 2\beta_i$  is a big class for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then for any  $t \in [0, 1]$  we have*

$$V_{\alpha,\beta_1} \cap V_{\alpha,\beta_2} \subseteq V_{\alpha,t\beta_1+(1-t)\beta_2} \subseteq V_{\alpha,\beta_1} \cup V_{\alpha,\beta_2}.$$

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of

$$(4) \quad \mu_{\alpha,t\beta_1+(1-t)\beta_2}(Z) = t\mu_{\alpha,\beta_1}(Z) + (1-t)\mu_{\alpha,\beta_2}(Z).$$

$\square$

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta_i$  be Kähler classes for  $i = 1, \dots, s$  on a compact Kähler 3-fold  $X$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}\alpha - 2\beta_i$  is a big class for each  $i$ . Then as  $\beta$  ranges over the convex hull of  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$ , the collection of irreducible subvarieties of  $X$  occurring as irreducible components  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  is a finite set.*

*Proof.* By the lemma, we have that

$$(5) \quad V_{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^s V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$$

as  $\beta$  ranges over  $\text{conv}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ . This implies that the irreducible surface components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  are among the finitely many irreducible surface components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . Therefore, we only need to prove that the irreducible curve components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  only take values in a finite set.

Denote by  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  the finitely many irreducible surfaces occurring as irreducible components of all the  $V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , and let  $C$  be an irreducible curve component of some  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  for  $\beta \in \text{conv}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ . Then, by (5) we have  $C \subseteq V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$  for some  $i$ . If  $C$  is not contained in any  $S_i$ , then  $C$  can only be one of the finitely many irreducible curve components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$ . Thus, all the curves  $C$  that occur as irreducible components of some  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  not contained in one of the  $S_i$  are among the finitely many irreducible curve components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . It remains to treat the case of curves lying in some  $S_i$ .

For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , consider the following partition

$$K := \text{conv}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s) = K_1^{(i)} \cup K_2^{(i)},$$

where

$$K_1^{(i)} := \{\beta \in K \mid \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S_i) \leq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}\}, \quad K_2^{(i)} := \{\beta \in K \mid \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S_i) > \mu_{\alpha,\beta}\}.$$

Then, it is clear that  $S_i$  occurs as an irreducible component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  for each  $\beta \in K_2^{(i)}$ . On the other hand,  $\beta \mapsto \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S_i) - \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$  is a linear map. Thus, the closed set  $K_1^{(i)}$  is also the convex hull of finitely many points, say  $\beta_1^{(i)}, \dots, \beta_{r_i}^{(i)}$ . Now, if  $\beta \in K_1^{(i)}$  and  $C$  is an irreducible component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  lying in  $S_i$ , then, by definition, we have  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ . But then (4) implies that

$$\mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}$$

for some  $1 \leq j \leq r_i$ . But we also have that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}(S_i) \leq \mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}$  and thus, by the Corollary 3.5, there are only finitely many curves  $C$  in  $S_i$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}$ . Therefore, the irreducible components of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  for  $\beta \in K$  are among the following finite list:

- (1) the irreducible curve components of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}\alpha - \beta_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ .
- (2) the irreducible surface components  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}\alpha - 2\beta_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ .
- (3) the finitely many curves  $C$  in  $S_i$  such that

$$\mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}(C) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta_j^{(i)}}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ .

□

**3.2. Rigidity.** Aside from the production of a finite list of subvarieties that destabilize (or optimally destabilize) the J-equation, it is also desirable to note that they have certain special properties in common. Most notably, we have the following rigidity statement in the case of threefolds.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  and  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  be as in the statement of Theorem 3.3, with  $X$  projective. Then every irreducible component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  is rigid. More precisely, every irreducible surface component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  is the unique effective cycle representing its homology class, and every irreducible curve component  $C$  of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$  satisfies the following: for every irreducible surface  $S$  containing  $C$ , either  $C$  is an irreducible component of the singular locus of  $S$  or the strict transform of  $C$  under any resolution of singularities of  $S$  is a curve of negative self-intersection.*

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a surface component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Then the conclusion about  $S$  follows immediately from [2, Proposition 3.13] noting that  $S$  is then an irreducible component of the negative part of the divisorial Boucksom-Zariski decomposition, and hence exceptional. Now let  $C$  be a curve component of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Then, by the definition of  $V_{\alpha,\beta}$ , it follows that if  $S'$  is any irreducible surface that contains  $C$ , then  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S') < \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Since  $X$  is projective, we can always find some  $S'$  with this property. But then the proof of 3.3 shows that either  $C$  is contained in the singular locus of  $S$  or the proper transform of  $C$  is an irreducible component in the negative part of the Zariski decomposition of the class  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}(S')\alpha - \beta$  on any resolution of singularities of  $S'$ . Thus,  $C$  has negative self-intersection as a divisor in any resolution of singularities of  $S'$ . □

**3.3. Extension of Theorem 3.1 to dimension  $\geq 4$ .** In the theory of divisorial Zariski decompositions the convex *modified Kähler* (and *modified nef*) cones in  $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$  play central roles (see Section 2). The same argument as for 3-folds can still be carried out on compact Kähler manifolds of arbitrary dimension as long as the restrictions of certain classes are always big. This is guaranteed by assuming a stronger positivity conditions, as per the following statement:

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold and  $\alpha, \beta$  Kähler classes on  $X$ . Suppose moreover that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}$  is  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler on  $X$  for every  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ . Then, there exist at most finitely many irreducible subvarieties  $V \subseteq X$  such that*

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V) \geq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(X) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $1 \leq p \leq n-1$  and  $Z$  an irreducible analytic subvariety of  $X$  of dimension  $p$ . Note that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) \geq \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$  is equivalent to

$$\int_V (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta) \cdot \alpha^{p-1} \leq 0,$$

which implies, by Lemma 2.4 that  $Z \subseteq E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\alpha)$ . But the class  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}$  is a  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler class. Thus,  $Z$  must be one of the finitely many  $p$ -dimensional irreducible components of the proper analytic subset  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta)$  because this set does not contain any irreducible subvarieties of dimension greater than or equal to  $p+1$  thanks to Lemma 2.3.  $\square$

An improved version for optimal destabilizers is the following:

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler manifold and  $\alpha, \beta$  Kähler classes on  $X$  such that  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is not  $J$ -stable, i.e.  $\Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) \leq 0$ . Suppose moreover that*

$$(6) \quad (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - (n-p)\Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha)) \alpha - p\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}_X$$

for all  $p = 2, \dots, n-1$  (note that we do not require this for  $p = 1$  here). Then  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{opt}}$  is a non-empty and finite.

Moreover, there is a uniform constant  $\lambda > 0$  depending only on  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  such that all except finitely many subvarieties  $V \subset X$  satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)) \geq \Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) + \lambda.$$

**Remark 3.11.** *Another way of thinking of this hypothesis is to consider  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta'} \alpha - p\beta'$  for  $\beta' := \beta - \Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) \alpha$ , as used in the proof below. Note that the hypothesis (6) is invariant under replacing  $\beta$  by  $\beta + r\alpha$  where  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . In addition, since  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is assumed unstable, by definition  $\Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) < 0$ , and hence the above theorem in particular holds under the stronger hypothesis that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}_X$ .*

*Proof.* Write

$$\beta' := \beta - \Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) \alpha$$

and note that

$$\mu_{\alpha, \beta'} \alpha - p\beta' = (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - (n-p)\Delta_{\beta}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha)) \alpha - p\beta,$$

and

$$\Delta_{\beta'}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) = 0.$$

Hence for this choice of  $\beta'$ , the triple  $(X, \alpha, \beta')$  is semistable. Since also  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta'} \alpha - p\beta'$  is  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler for all  $p = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$ , this combined implies that  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta'}^{\text{opt}}$  is a finite set. It is moreover non-empty since the infimum defining  $\Delta_{\beta'}^{\text{pp}}(\alpha)$  is realized by a finite number of subvarieties (see also [28]). Finally, since

$$\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta'}^{\text{opt}} = \text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{opt}},$$

this concludes the proof of the first part.

For the second part, start from  $(X, \alpha, \beta')$  which is semistable and such that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta'} \alpha - p\beta' \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}_X$  for all  $p = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$ . By openness of the modified Kähler

cones, fix  $\lambda > 0$  such that while  $(X, \alpha, \beta' - \lambda\alpha)$  is no longer semistable, the classes  $(\mu\alpha - p\beta' - (n-p)\lambda\alpha)|_{S_i}$  remain big on each of the finitely many irreducible surface components of  $E_{nK}(\mu_{\alpha,\beta'}\alpha - \beta)$ . We then conclude as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 that all except a finite number of subvarieties  $V \subset X$ ,  $\dim V = p$ , satisfy

$$\int_V (\mu_{\alpha,\beta'}\alpha - p\beta' - (n-p)\lambda\alpha) \wedge \alpha^{p-1} > 0.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_V (\mu_{\alpha,\beta'}\alpha - p\beta' - (n-p)\lambda\alpha) \wedge \alpha^{p-1}}{\int_V (n-p)\alpha^p} &= \frac{\int_V (\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - p\beta) \wedge \alpha^{p-1}}{\int_V (n-p)\alpha^p} - \Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) - \lambda = \\ &= \frac{1}{n-p} (\mu_{\alpha,\beta} - \mu_{\alpha,\beta}(V)) - \Delta_\beta^{\text{pp}}(\alpha) - \lambda > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms yields the desired conclusion.  $\square$

**Remark 3.12.** *In Section 4 we discuss the hypothesis of  $p$ -modified Kähler classes, and show that it holds in many natural situations.*

#### 4. NECESSITY OF POSITIVITY CONDITIONS AND FIRST EXAMPLES

In our previous work [22] on surfaces as well as that of [13] a key observation was that the  $(1, 1)$ -class  $\mu\alpha - 2\beta$  playing the central role in the proof, is *always* big, based on Lamari's criterion [23]. We would expect that producing an analogue of this in higher dimension will be of importance to further work also on, for example, the conjectures [13] of Datar-Mete-Song.

In particular, it is natural to ask when the hypotheses in the main theorem 3.1 are optimal.

**4.1. The positivity assumption for  $\mu\alpha - (n-1)\beta$  is necessary. Theorem 1.1 is sharp on threefolds.** As a first remark, we show that the hypotheses in 1.1 that the hypothesis is sometimes sharp in the sense that semistability implies bigness of the appropriate class, and if we drop the bigness hypothesis then there is actually an infinite number of destabilizers. In particular, the hypothesis that  $\mu\alpha - (n-1)\beta$  be big cannot be dropped in general, as illustrated already for blowups of  $\mathbb{P}^2$ :

**Example 4.1.** (Infinitely many destabilizers if  $\mu\alpha - (n-1)\beta$  is not big) *If  $X = \text{Bl}_p\mathbb{P}^n$  is the blowup of  $\mathbb{P}^n$  in one point  $p \in \mathbb{P}^n$ , then whenever  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$  with  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$   $J$ -stable, then the class  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - (n-1)\beta$  is big. Indeed, write  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - (n-1)\beta = xH + yE$  where  $H$  is the pullback of a linear hyperplane not passing through  $p$  and  $E$  is the exceptional divisor. Then, for  $xH + yE$  to not be big on  $X$ , we must have either  $x < 0$  or  $x + y < 0$ . In the case  $x < 0$ , we have that*

$$\int_H (\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - (n-1)\beta) \cdot \alpha^{n-2} < 0$$

and in the second case

$$\int_P (\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - (n-1)\beta) \cdot \alpha^{n-2} < 0$$

where  $P$  is the strict transform of any linear hyperplane passing through  $p$ . It is interesting to note that in both cases, there are infinitely many destabilising divisors. Moreover, in the case  $x + y < 0, x > 0$ , we actually have

$$\int_E (\mu_{\alpha,\beta}\alpha - (n-1)\beta) \cdot \alpha^{n-2} > 0.$$



Thus, if we drop the bigness hypothesis, then it is no longer enough to test against  $E$ .

The above simple example motivates a deeper study of the imposed hypotheses that  $\mu\alpha - p\beta$  be  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler. Other aspects are investigated in the following subsection.

**4.2. Pairwise distinct modified Kähler cones: The Cutkoski construction and examples of Wu.** Here, we recall an example (a special case of an example found in [32]) of a manifold  $X$  of dimension  $n$  such that on  $X$  the cones  $\mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$  of  $p$ -modified Kähler classes are all pairwise distinct (except, of course,  $\mathcal{M}_1\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}_0\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}$ ). To begin with, we proceed in slightly more generality than we need. Let  $Y$  be a smooth projective variety and  $L$  a very ample line bundle on  $Y$ .  $E$  denote the vector bundle

$$E := \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^{\otimes a_1})^{\oplus b_1} \oplus \dots \oplus (L^{\otimes a_r})^{\oplus b_r}$$

on  $Y$ , where  $a_0 := 0 < a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_r$  is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers and each  $b_i$  is a positive integer. We shall denote by  $X := \mathbb{P}(E^\vee)$  the projective bundle of one-dimensional subspaces of the fibres of  $E \rightarrow Y$  and  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  the associated projection map. Then (for  $r \geq 1$ ) we have

$$H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}H \oplus \pi^*H^{1,1}(Y, \mathbb{R})$$

where  $H = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(E)}(1)$  is the dual of the tautological sub-line bundle of  $\pi^*E$ . For  $i, j = 1, \dots, r$ , denote by  $D_{ij}$  the divisor associated to the (dual of the) surjection

$$E \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^{\otimes a_1})^{\oplus b_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \widehat{(L^{\otimes a_i})^{\oplus b_i}} \oplus \dots \oplus (L^{\otimes a_r})^{\oplus b_r}.$$

where  $\widehat{(L^{\otimes a_i})^{\oplus b_i}}$  means we omit the  $j$ -th summand equal to  $L^{\otimes a_i}$ . Note that the class of  $D_{ij}$  is equal to  $H - a_iL$  (where we denote by  $L$  again the pullback  $\pi^*L$ ). We can apply [32, Proposition 4] to deduce that the class  $aL + bH$  is pseudoeffective (respectively nef) on  $X$  if and only if  $b \geq 0$  and  $a + a_r b \geq 0$  (respectively  $b \geq 0$  and  $a \geq 0$ ). Note that if  $aL + bH$  is pseudoeffective, then we can write

$$aL + bH = (a + a_r b)L + bD_{rj} \text{ for any } j = 1, \dots, b_r$$

whence we see (since  $(a + a_r b)L$  is nef) that the non-nef locus of every pseudoeffective class of the form  $aL + bH$  satisfies

$$E_{nm}(aL + bH) \subseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^{b_r} D_{rj}.$$

In fact, the non-nef loci of pseudoeffective classes are much more constrained on  $X$ . Indeed, whenever  $a + a_p b \geq 0$  for any  $p = 0, 1, \dots, r$ , we can write the decomposition

$$aL + bH = (a + a_p b)L + bD_{pj} \text{ for any } j = 1, \dots, b_p.$$

This shows that  $\nu(aL + bH, x) = 0$  for  $x \notin V_p$  where

$$V_p := \bigcap_{i \geq p} \bigcap_{j=1}^{b_i} D_{ij}.$$

In other words, if  $a + a_p b \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 0$ , the non-nef locus of  $aL + bH$  is contained in  $V_p$ , which is a  $d_p$ -dimensional smooth subvariety of  $X$ , with  $d_p := n + b_1 + \dots + b_p$ . This proves that

$$\mathcal{M}_{d_p+1}\mathcal{K} \supseteq \{aL + bH \mid a + a_p b > 0, b > 0\}.$$

On the other hand, let  $aL + bH$  be a big class, i.e.  $a + a_r b > 0$  and  $b > 0$ . Then, according to the proof of [32, Proposition 5] we get that

$$\nu(aL + bH, V_{p+1}) \geq \min\{t \geq 0 \mid 0 \in (a + t[a_{p+1}, a_r] + (b - t)[0, a_p])\}.$$

This implies that if  $a + a_p b < 0$  then we have

$$\nu(aL + bH, V_{p+1}) \geq -\frac{a + a_p b}{a_r - a_p} > 0.$$

Since  $d_{p+1} = \dim V_{p+1} \geq d_p + 1$ , this shows that  $aL + bH \notin \mathcal{M}_{d_{p+1}}\mathcal{K}$  if  $a + a_p b < 0$ . Thus, we have shown that for  $p = 1, \dots, n + r$  we have

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L, H) \cap \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K} = \{aL + bH \mid a + a_{q-1}b > 0, b > 0\}$$

where  $q$  is the unique integer satisfying  $d_{q-1} < p \leq d_q$ . It is instructive to examine special cases of this construction.

- (1) Let  $Y$  be a Riemann surface,  $r = n - 1$ ,  $L$  any line bundle on  $Y$  of degree  $d > 0$ . Set  $b_1 = b_2 = \dots = b_{n-1} = 1$ , then  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^\vee)^{\otimes a_1} \oplus \dots \oplus (L^\vee)^{\otimes a_{n-1}})$  is an  $n$ -dimensional projective manifold. We see that the cones  $\mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}$  are given by

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K}_X = \{aL + bH \mid a + a_{p-1}b > 0, b > 0\}$$

and hence are all pairwise distinct for all  $p = 1, \dots, n$ . Intersection theory on  $X$  is given by the formulas

$$(8) \quad H^n = d \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i, \quad H^{n-1} \cdot L = d, \quad H^{n-i} \cdot L^i = 0 \text{ for } i \geq 2.$$

- (2) In the above special case, let  $Y = \mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $L = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ ,  $r = 2$  and  $a_1 = 1, a_2 = 3$ . Then,  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-3))$ . Let  $\alpha = L + H$  and  $\beta = L + bH$  for  $b > 0$ . Let us examine all the possible destabilising subvarieties for the  $J$ -equation on  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$ . Denote by  $S$  and  $C$  respectively the subvarieties

$$S := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)) \subseteq X, \quad C := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}) \subseteq X.$$

Making use of (7) and (8), one can show that the class  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}\alpha - 2\beta$  is big if and only if  $b > 1/15$ . In the notation of Theorem 3.3 we then have

$$V_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{cases} S & \text{for } 1/15 < b \leq 5/26 \\ C & \text{for } 5/26 < b \leq 2/9 \\ \emptyset & \text{for } b > 2/9. \end{cases}$$

In fact, we have

$$\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{cases} \{S, C\} & \text{for } 1/15 < b \leq 5/26 \\ \{C\} & \text{for } 5/26 < b \leq 2/9 \\ \emptyset & \text{for } b > 2/9, \end{cases}$$

whereas for  $b \leq 1/29$ ,  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}$  contains infinitely many curves.

- (3) Let  $Y$  be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $n$ ,  $L$  an ample line bundle on  $Y$ ,  $r = 1$  and  $b_1 = m + 1$ . Then  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^\vee)^{\oplus(m+1)})$  has dimension  $n + m + 1$ . Then, for any big class of the form  $aL + bH$ , the non-nef locus is empty if and only if  $a + b \geq 0, b > 0$ , and equal to  $P = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Y) \subseteq X$  if and only if  $a + b < 0, b > 0$ . Thus, (writing  $\mathcal{M}'_p\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{M}_p\mathcal{K} \cap \text{span}(H, L)$ ) we have

$$\mathcal{M}'_0\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}'_1\mathcal{K} = \dots = \mathcal{M}'_{n-1}\mathcal{K} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}'_n\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}'_{n+1}\mathcal{K} = \dots = \mathcal{M}'_{n+m+1}\mathcal{K}.$$

In this situation, [13] have shown that if  $\alpha = L + aH$ ,  $\beta = L + bH$ , for  $a, b > 0$ , and  $\omega_0, \theta$  are fixed Kähler metrics in  $\alpha, \beta$  respectively satisfying a *Calabi-ansatz*, then, in the case that  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is  $J$ -unstable, the  $J$ -flow with initial metric  $\omega_0$  converges smoothly away from  $P$ . It therefore seems natural to ask whether, under suitable hypotheses, in the setting of Theorems 3.3 and 3.9 the  $J$ -flow should always converge smoothly away from the union of some collection of destabilising subvarieties.

**4.3. Sufficient conditions when the main results 1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 1.13 apply.** We finish this section by discussing a sufficient condition for when Theorem 3.1 and its higher dimensional analogue 3.9 apply. Moreover, note that no examples in this paper exclude the possibility that there may always exist a finite number of *optimal* destabilizers. Motivated by this, we discuss some results also regarding optimal destabilising subvarieties.

To introduce our condition we associate to each pair  $(\alpha, \beta)$  of Kähler classes on  $X$ , a third nef class  $\eta := \text{proj}_\alpha(\beta)$  which we call the *projection of  $\beta$  through  $\alpha$* , defined as the unique  $(1, 1)$ -class on  $X$  which is nef, not Kähler, and of the form  $(1 - t)\beta + t\alpha$  for some  $t > 0$ . It is straightforward to see that such a class exists up to possibly rescaling  $\beta \mapsto \lambda\beta$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ .

This allows us to formulate the following result, which provides a useful sufficient condition for when our main results for the  $J$ -equation apply (Theorem 1.1 and Corollaries 1.6 and 1.7):

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose that  $X$  is a compact Kähler and  $\alpha_0, \beta$  are Kähler classes such that  $\eta := \text{proj}_{\alpha_0}(\beta)$  is  $k$ -modified Kähler for some  $3 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . Then there exists a Kähler class  $\alpha$  such that*

- $\eta = \text{proj}_\alpha(\beta)$
- $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is unstable
- The classes

$$\gamma(p, \alpha, \beta) := (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - (n - p)\Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha))\alpha - p\beta$$

are  $k$ -modified Kähler for each  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .

In particular, Theorem 1.1 and Corollaries 1.6 and 1.7 all apply to  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$ . Moreover, this holds true for all  $\alpha'$  of the form  $(1 - r)\eta + r\beta$  with  $r > 0$  small enough.

**Remark 4.3.** *Note that it is easy to find many examples when  $\text{proj}_\alpha(\beta)$  is big (i.e.  $n$ -modified Kähler where  $n := \dim X$ ) as long as we consider a Kähler manifold  $X$  for which the inclusion of the Kähler cone in the big cone is strict, i.e.  $\mathcal{K}_X \neq \mathcal{B}_X$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Fix  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  and  $\eta := \text{proj}_\alpha(\beta) \in \partial\mathcal{K}_X$  the projection of  $\beta$  through  $\alpha$ . By definition of  $\text{proj}_\alpha(\beta)$  we can then write  $\alpha := \alpha_R$ , where

$$\alpha_R := (1 - R)\alpha + R\beta$$

for some  $R \in (0, 1]$ .

We then have the following useful double inequality:

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $\alpha_t = (1 - t)\eta + t\beta$  with  $t \in (0, 1)$ . If there exists a  $t_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha_{t_0}) \leq 0$ , then we have the following double inequality*

$$(9) \quad \mu_{\beta, \alpha_t} - (n - 1)t^{-1} \leq \Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha_t) \leq \frac{1}{n - 1} (\mu_{\beta, \alpha_t} - t^{-1})$$

for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

*Proof of Lemma.* This is essentially proven in [28], but for completeness we here include an argument. We first prove the second inequality in (9). Start by observing that if  $(X, \alpha_t, \beta)$  is stable (i.e.  $\Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha_t) > 0$ ) then [10] and [18] implies that  $\mu_{\beta, \alpha_t} \alpha_t - \beta > 0$ , which by a straightforward modification of the proof of [28, Lemma 16] is equivalent to  $\mu_{\beta, \alpha_t} - t^{-1} > 0$ . To prove the lemma we then exploit linearity of  $\Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha)$  in the  $\beta$ -argument (see [28]). To this end, fix any  $t \in (0, 1)$  and consider the corresponding class  $\alpha_t$ . Let  $\eta^*$  be the unique nef but not Kähler class of the form  $(1 - t)\eta + t\alpha$  for  $t > 1$ . Consider a second path

$$\beta_s := (1 - s)\alpha_{t_s} + s\eta^*$$

where  $t_s \in (0, 1]$  is defined so that  $\alpha_{t_s} := (1 - t_s)\eta + t_s\beta = \alpha_t$  (so for some  $s_0 \in (0, 1)$  we have  $\beta_{s_0} = \beta$ ,  $t_{s_0} = t$ , and  $\alpha_{t_s} = \alpha_t$  for all  $s \in [0, 1)$ ). Now consider, for short, the functions

$$L(s) := \Delta_{\beta_s}^{pp}(\alpha_{t_s}), \quad R(s) := \frac{1}{n-1} (\mu_{\beta_s, \alpha_{t_s}} - t_s^{-1}).$$

As recalled above we conclude that whenever  $\Delta_{\beta_s}^{pp}(\alpha_{t_s}) \geq 0$  then also  $\mu_{\beta_s, \alpha_{t_s}} - t_s^{-1} \geq 0$ , i.e.  $L(s) \geq 0$  implies  $R(s) \geq 0$ . Moreover, at  $s = 0$  (corresponding to  $t_0 = 1$ ) we have  $\Delta_{\beta_0}^{pp}(\alpha_{t_0}) = 1$  and

$$\frac{1}{n-1} (\mu_{\beta_0, \alpha_{t_0}} - t_0^{-1}) = \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot (n-1) = 1,$$

i.e.  $L(0) = R(0) = 1$ . Finally we claim that both sides of the sought inequality are linear in the  $\beta$ -argument, as we move along  $\beta_s := (1 - s)\alpha_{t_s} + s\eta^*$  for  $s \geq 0$  (this is clear for  $R(s)$ , and for  $L(s)$  this is the main theorem of [28]). To summarize, we have  $L(0) = R(0) = 1$ , and  $L(s) \geq 0$  implies  $R(s) \geq 0$ . Moreover, by assumption, there exists an  $s$  such that  $L(s) \leq 0$ . Putting it all together we find that  $L(s) = R(s)$  for all  $s \geq 0$ . Thus, we have the inequality

This gives the second inequality in (9). The first inequality is proven similarly.  $\square$

As an application of the lemma one computes

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(p, \alpha_R, \beta) &\geq \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta} - \left( \frac{n-p}{n-1} \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta} - \frac{n-p}{n-1} \frac{1}{R} \right) \alpha_R - p\beta = \\ &= \left[ \frac{p-1}{n-1} \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta} + \frac{n-p}{n-1} \frac{1}{R} \right] [(1-R)\eta + R\beta] - p\beta \end{aligned}$$

where as usual  $\theta \geq \theta'$  means that the cohomology class  $\theta - \theta'$  is nef. Using the shorthand notations

$$f(p, R) := \frac{p-1}{n-1} \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta} + \frac{n-p}{n-1} \frac{1}{R}, \quad C_R := n \frac{\eta \cdot \alpha_R^{n-1}}{\alpha_R^n}$$

we thus have

$$(10) \quad \gamma(p, \alpha_R, \beta) \geq (1-R)f(p, R)\eta - (p-Rf(p, R))\beta.$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} p - f(p, R)R &= \frac{1}{n-1} (p-1)(n - \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta}R) \\ &= \frac{p-1}{n-1} n \left( \frac{((1-R)\eta + R\beta) \cdot \alpha_R^{n-1}}{\alpha_R^n} - \frac{R\beta \cdot \alpha_R^{n-1}}{\alpha_R^n} \right) = \frac{p-1}{n-1} (1-R)n \frac{\eta \cdot \alpha_R^{n-1}}{\alpha_R^n} \\ &= \frac{p-1}{n-1} (1-R)C_R \end{aligned}$$

and moreover  $f(p, R) > 0$  always holds, because  $\alpha_R$  and  $\beta$  are Kähler classes. Therefore, if  $R \in (0, 1)$ , the right hand side of (10) lies in any given convex open cone  $\mathcal{C} \subset H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$  if and only if

$$\eta - \left[ \frac{p-1}{n-1} \frac{n - \mu_{\alpha_R, \beta} R}{(1-R)f(p, R)} \right] \beta = \eta - \left[ \frac{p-1}{n-1} \frac{C_R}{f(p, R)} \right] \beta \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Applying this to any of the convex open cones  $\mathcal{M}_k \mathcal{K}_X$  yields the desired conclusion. Note in particular that Lemma 4.4 implies that the stability threshold  $\Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha_R)$  tends to minus infinity as  $R$  approaches zero, so for small enough  $R > 0$  this quantity is always negative.  $\square$

As a first consequence, we now deduce the following statement, which has the advantage that the hypothesis is possible to verify in many examples.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Suppose  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  satisfies that  $\eta := \text{proj}_\alpha(\beta)$  is 3-modified Kähler. Then the conclusion of Theorem 3.10 holds. Namely, there is a finite number of subvarieties achieving the following infimum*

$$\inf_{V \subset X} \left( \frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V} \right) (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V)) = \Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha),$$

and there is a uniform  $\lambda := \lambda(\alpha, \beta) > 0$  such that only finitely many subvarieties  $V' \subset X$ , satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\dim X - \dim V'} (\mu_{\alpha, \beta} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta}(V')) \leq \Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha) + \lambda.$$

*Proof.* Combine Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 3.10.  $\square$

It is also interesting to note the following. Recalling that we have fixed  $\alpha$  and chosen  $R \in (0, 1)$  so that  $\alpha_R = \alpha$  we immediately conclude from the above that

$$\gamma(1, \alpha, \beta) \geq \frac{(1-R)}{R} \eta,$$

i.e. this class is always nef. In fact, it is clear that there are optimally destabilizing curves precisely if there is equality in Lemma 4.4, and this is equivalent to  $\gamma(1)$  being nef but not Kähler. From this one may also extrapolate bounds for the other classes  $\gamma(p, \alpha, \beta)$  for  $p \geq 2$ , yielding

$$\gamma(p, \alpha, \beta) = \gamma(1, \alpha, \beta) - (p-1)(\beta - \Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha)\alpha) \geq \frac{(1-R)}{R} \eta - (p-1)(\beta - \Delta_\beta^{pp}(\alpha)\alpha),$$

which is true for any given  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$ . From this can equally well conclude that if  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}_k \mathcal{K}_X$  and  $R > 0$  is small enough, then so is  $\gamma(p, \alpha_R, \beta)$  for all  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ .

The main motivation of the above sufficient criteria, is to ensure that the finiteness of (optimal) destabilizing subvarieties holds for a large class of  $n$ -folds, possibly all compact Kähler manifolds. In this direction, the above Corollary can be summarized in the following slightly more general way:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Kähler  $n$ -fold on which there is a strict inclusion of cones  $\mathcal{K}_X \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_3 \mathcal{K}_X$ . Then, there exist  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  Kähler classes for which  $(X, \alpha, \beta)$  is not stable, and Theorems 1.1, 1.13 apply. In particular, there is a finite number of (optimal) destabilizing subvarieties, i.e.  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}$  and  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{opt}}$  are both finite sets.*

This holds in particular when  $X$  is an  $n$ -fold of the form  $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Y \oplus (L^\vee)^{a_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus (L^\vee)^{a_n})$  for some  $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_n$  (see Section 4.2), providing general families of manifolds in arbitrary dimension where our main results hold.

It is moreover interesting to observe that the result holds on blow-ups, starting from any initial threefold, in the following sense:

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $X$  be any compact Kähler threefold, and let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$  be the blow up of  $X$  at a point  $x \in X$ . If  $\alpha, \beta$  are Kähler classes on  $X$ , then consider the nef and big classes  $\pi^*\alpha, \pi^*\beta$  on  $Y$  and write  $\alpha_\epsilon := \pi^*\alpha - \epsilon[E]$ , and  $\beta_{\epsilon'} := \pi^*\beta - \epsilon'[E]$ . If moreover  $0 < \epsilon \ll \epsilon'$  are both small enough, then the set  $\text{Dest}_{\alpha_\epsilon, \beta_{\epsilon'}}^{\text{opt}}$  of optimally destabilizing subvarieties is finite, and its elements are precisely the subvarieties with strictly positive generic Lelong numbers*

$$\nu((\mu - \Delta_{\beta_{\epsilon'}}^{pp}(\alpha_\epsilon))\alpha_\epsilon - (n-1)\beta_{\epsilon'}, V) > 0$$

*Proof.* Write  $\epsilon' = \lambda\epsilon$  where  $\lambda > 1$ . Assume moreover that  $\lambda > 1$  is large enough so that  $\lambda\alpha - \beta$  is nef. Then  $(1-t)\beta_{\lambda\epsilon} + t\alpha_\epsilon$  is on the boundary of the nef cone  $\overline{\mathcal{K}_X}$ , precisely if  $(1-t)\lambda + t = 0$ , that is  $t = \frac{1}{\lambda-1}$ . Hence

$$\eta := \text{proj}_{\alpha_\epsilon}(\beta_{\lambda\epsilon}) = \pi^*(\lambda\alpha - \beta) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda-1}$$

and this class is nef and big, so that  $\eta^n > 0$ . Moreover

$$(1-R)\frac{1}{\lambda-1}\pi^*(\lambda\alpha - \beta) + R(\pi^*\beta - \lambda\epsilon E) = \pi^*\alpha - \epsilon E$$

if and only if  $R = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . If  $\epsilon > 0$  is small enough (and  $\lambda > 0$  large enough, with the constraint that  $\lambda\epsilon$  is bounded above by the relevant Seshadri constant, so that  $\beta_{\lambda\epsilon}$  is Kähler) then by Proposition 4.2 it follows that  $\gamma(p, \alpha_\epsilon, \beta_{\lambda\epsilon})$  is a big cohomology class for all  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , for all  $\lambda \gg 1$  large enough (and  $\epsilon > 0$  correspondingly small enough). The last assertion regarding Lelong numbers follows from Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** *We expect that the strategy of proof generalizes beyond the J-equation, to partly cover the PDE considered in Section 5 below. Since this would require the introduction of heavy notational machinery, we leave these aspects for future work.*

## 5. DESTABILISING SUBVARIETIES FOR OTHER PDE

In this section we finally clarify how the above arguments in fact apply also to a broad class of geometric PDE, which include many special cases of the  $Z$ -critical equations introduced in [17], inverse  $\sigma_k$  equations in the sense of [12] (including the J-equation), as well as the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation under certain phase hypotheses.

**5.1. Generalized Monge-Ampère equations.** This class of PDE has been studied in the projective case by Datar-Pingali [12] under the name of *generalized Monge-Ampère (gMA) equations*. The same kinds of techniques may also be applied to more general  $Z$ -critical equations (introduced in [17]) in the special case of rank 1. This special case has recently been studied in [19] by Fang-Ma, where their solvability is linked to a Nakai-Moishezon type criterion, generalising previous works of G. Chen [5], Song [30], Datar-Pingali [12] and others. However, for the sake of clarity, we shall here illustrate the ideas in the case of gMA equations.

In formulating the equation we let  $(X, \theta)$  be a compact Kähler manifold and let  $\alpha$  be a Kähler class on  $X$ . Moreover, let  $c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$  be real constants and  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function such that the cohomological condition

$$\int_X \frac{\alpha^n}{n!} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{c_k}{(n-k)!} \int_X [\theta]^k \cdot \alpha^{n-k} + \int_X f \theta^n$$

is satisfied. Then, the *generalized Monge-Ampère equation* seeks a smooth Kähler form  $\omega \in \alpha$  such that

$$(11) \quad \frac{\omega^n}{n!} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{c_k}{(n-k)!} \theta^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} + f \theta^n$$

It will be convenient to employ the following natural shorthand notation:

$$\exp(\omega) := \sum_{k=0}^n \omega^k / k! \quad \Theta := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k \theta^k + f \theta^n.$$

We shall also write  $\eta^{[k,k]}$  for the degree  $(k, k)$ -part of a multi-degree differential form  $\eta$ . If we denote  $\omega_\varphi := \omega_0 + \frac{i}{2\pi} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi \in [\omega_0] = \alpha$ , then in this notation, the generalized Monge-Ampère equation seeks a Kähler potential  $\varphi$  such that

$$(12) \quad \exp(\omega_\varphi)^{[n,n]} = (\Theta \wedge \exp(\omega_\varphi))^{[n,n]}.$$

Note especially that if  $\Theta = \mu_{\alpha, [\theta]}^{-1} \theta$  then (1) is just the J-equation. We refer to [19, 12] for details on this broad formalism, including how special cases of interest (e.g. J-equation, inverse Hessian equations, dHYM equation) can be interpreted within this framework.

The key result of [12] in the projective case and of [19] in general is that if we moreover assume certain positivity conditions on  $\Theta$ , then the solvability of (1) can be characterized by a Nakai-Moishezon type criterion involving intersection numbers on  $X$ . More precisely, assume that  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfy the positivity conditions in [12, (1.2)]. Then, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1** (Datar-Pingali, Fang-Ma). *Let  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfy the positivity hypotheses above. Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a smooth Kähler form  $\omega \in \alpha$  that solves the gMA equation (12).*
- (2) *For every proper irreducible analytic subvariety  $V \subseteq X$  we have*

$$\int_V (\exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - [\Theta])) > 0.$$

In the light of the above theorem, and following [13] we introduce the following natural definition.

**Definition 5.2.** *Suppose  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfy the positivity condition above. Then we say that  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is (gMA-)semistable (resp. stable) if for every proper irreducible analytic subvariety  $V \subseteq X$  we have*

$$\int_V (\exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - [\Theta])) \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } > 0).$$

*If  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is not semistable, we say that it is unstable. If  $V$  violates the above inequality, we say that it (gMA)-destabilizes the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$ .*

In order to apply our techniques, we finally need to restrict the class of generalized Monge-Ampère equations considered. We shall focus on those gMA equations whose associated numerical criterion given by Theorem 5.1 ‘factorizes’. We explain this more precisely now. Let us define the polynomials

$$P(y) := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k y^k$$

and for  $p = 1, \dots, \dim X - 1$ ,

$$(13) \quad Q_p(x, y) := (\exp(x)(1 - P(y)))^{[p]}$$

where by  $R(x, y)^{[p]}$  we mean the degree  $p$  homogeneous part of the power series  $R(x, y)$ . We note that the polynomials  $Q_p(x, y)$  only depend on the coefficients  $c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$  and not on  $\theta$  or  $\alpha$ .

**Definition 5.3** (Factorizable gMA equation). *We say that the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  defines a factorizable gMA equation if for each  $p = 1, \dots, \dim X - 1$ , the polynomial  $Q_p(x, y)$  can be factorized as*

$$Q_p(x, y) = (x - r_p y) \tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$$

where

- (1) the constant  $r_p \geq 0$ ,
- (2) the polynomial  $\tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$  is a polynomial with nonnegative real coefficients.

The cohomology class  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) := \alpha - r_p \beta$  is called the associated factor class at dimension  $p$ .

**Example 5.4** (Inverse Hessian equations). *For  $k \geq 1$ , let  $\Theta = \kappa \theta^k$  where  $\kappa$  is the uniquely determined cohomological constant*

$$\kappa = \frac{n! \int_X [\theta]^k \cdot \alpha^{n-k}}{(n-k)!} > 0.$$

*This choice of  $\Theta$  defines an inverse Hessian equation. Then, for  $p < k$  we have*

$$Q_p(x, y) = \frac{1}{p!} x^p$$

*and for  $p \geq k$  we have*

$$Q_p(x, y) = \frac{1}{p!} x^p - \frac{\kappa}{(p-k)!} x^{p-k} y^k = (x - \kappa_p^{1/k} y) \left( \frac{1}{p!} \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \kappa_p^{r/k} x^{p-1-r} y^r \right),$$

*where  $\kappa_p := p! \kappa / (p-k)! > 0$ . Thus we see that all inverse Hessian equations are factorizable, with the associated factor class at each dimension  $p = k, \dots, \dim X - 1$  given by*

$$\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) := \alpha - \kappa_p^{1/k} [\theta].$$

*When  $k = 1$  this corresponds to the J-equation.*

**Example 5.5** (gMA equation on three-folds). *Let  $\dim X = 3$  and define*

$$\Theta = c\theta + d\theta^2 + f\theta^3$$

*where  $c, d$  are real constants and  $f$  is a smooth function such that the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfies the above positivity hypotheses. Then, we have*

$$Q_2(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} x^2 - cxy - dy^2 = \frac{1}{2} (x + (-c + \sqrt{c^2 + 2d})y) ((x + (-c - \sqrt{c^2 + 2d})y)$$



and

$$Q_1(x, y) = x - cy.$$

Thus, we see that the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  defines a factorizable gMA equation whenever  $d > 0$ , with associated factor class at dimension two equal to

$$\tau_2(\alpha, [\theta]) = \alpha + (-c - \sqrt{c^2 + 2d})[\theta].$$

In fact, the notion of a factorizable gMA is not any more restrictive than equations of the form (12). More precisely, we have the following result

**Lemma 5.6.** *Suppose  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfies the cohomological condition (11) and the positivity hypothesis in [12, (1.2)]. Then,  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  defines a factorizable gMA equation.*

*Proof.* We must prove that if  $Q_p(x, y)$  is defined by (13), then it can be factorized as

$$Q_p(x, y) = (x - r_p)\tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$$

where  $r_p \geq 0$  and all the coefficients of  $\tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$  are non-negative. It suffices to prove that if  $h_p(x) = Q_p(x, 1)$ , then each  $h_p(x)$  can be factorized as

$$h_p(x) = (x - r_p)g_p(x)$$

with  $r_p \geq 0$  and  $g_p(x)$  is a polynomial with non-negative coefficients, for then the claim will follow by homogenising  $h_p(x)$  and  $g_p(x)$ .

Now note that

$$h_p(x) = \frac{x^p}{p!} - \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{c_k}{(p-k)!} x^{p-k}.$$

It is clear that  $h_p(x) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ , and  $h(\varepsilon) \leq 0$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, with strict inequality if some  $c_k > 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . Therefore,  $h_p(x)$  admits a non-negative real root. Let  $r_p$  be the largest non-negative real root of  $h_p(x)$ . Then,  $r_p = 0$  if and only if  $c_k = 0$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . Now, we may write

$$h_p(x) = (x - r_p)g_p(x)$$

where  $g_p(x)$  is a polynomial with real coefficients. We must prove that all the coefficients of  $g_p(x)$  are non-negative. Clearly, if  $r_p = 0$ , then all the  $c_k = 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, p$ , so in that case  $g_p(x) = x^{p-1}/p!$  certainly has non-negative coefficients. So we may assume that  $r_p > 0$ . Write  $g_p(x) = P_p(x) - N_p(x)$ , where both  $P_p(x)$  and  $N_p(x)$  have non-negative coefficients. If  $N_p(x) \neq 0$ , then let  $k_0$  be the smallest integer such that the coefficient of  $x^{k_0}$  in  $N_p(x)$  is strictly positive. Since  $g_p(x)$  has degree  $p-1$ ,  $k_0 < p$ . Then, we have the identity

$$\frac{x^p}{p!} - \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{c_{p-k}}{k!} x^k = xP_p(x) + r_p N_p(x) - (xN_p(x) + r_p P_p(x)).$$

The monomial  $x^{k_0}$  occurs with non-zero coefficient on the right-hand-side of this identity only in the terms  $r_p N_p(x)$  (where it has a strictly positive coefficient) and (possibly) in  $xP_p(x)$  (where it has a non-negative coefficient). On the other hand, all the coefficients of  $x^k$  with  $k < p$  have non-positive coefficients on the left-hand-side of this identity. This is a contradiction. Hence,  $N_p(x) = 0$  and  $g_p(x) = P_p(x)$  has non-negative coefficients.  $\square$

One key feature of the factor classes  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta])$  is that they are descending in  $p$ . More precisely, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  define a factorizable gMA equation. Then, for each  $p = 1, \dots, n-2$ , we have  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) \geq \tau_{p+1}(\alpha, [\theta])$  with strict inequality whenever  $\tau_{p+1}(\alpha, [\theta]) \neq \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  defines a factorizable gMA equation, the polynomials  $Q_p$  given by (13) factorize as

$$Q_p(x, y) = (x - r_p y) \tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$$

where  $r_p \geq 0$  and  $Q_p(x, y)$  has nonnegative coefficients. Note that this implies that  $x \mapsto Q_p(x, 1)$  has at most one nonnegative real root, namely  $r_p$ . But it is easy to verify by straightforward computation that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} Q_{p+1}(x, y) = Q_p(x, y).$$

If  $r_{p+1} = 0$ , i.e.  $\tau_{p+1}(\alpha, [\theta]) = \alpha$ , then this implies that  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) = \alpha$  also, and so  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) \geq \tau_{p+1}(\alpha, [\theta])$ . So, suppose  $r_{p+1} > 0$ . Then, the factorization of  $Q_{p+1}(x, y)$  above implies that the polynomial function  $x \mapsto Q_{p+1}(x, 1)$  has exactly one zero on the positive real axis, namely  $r_{p+1}$ . But since

$$Q_p(x, 1) = \frac{d}{dx} Q_{p+1}(x, 1)$$

we see immediately  $Q_p(r_{p+1}, 1) > 0$ . Thus,  $r_p < r_{p+1}$  because  $x \mapsto Q_p(x, 1)$  has at most one nonnegative real root. This shows that  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) > \tau_{p+1}(\alpha, [\theta])$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.8.** *Suppose  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfy the positivity hypothesis above and define a factorizable gMA equation whose associated factor class  $\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) \in \mathcal{M}_p \mathcal{K}$  at dimension  $p$  belongs to the  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler cone. Then, there exist at most finitely many subvarieties that (gMA-)destabilize  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$ .*

*Proof.* Any destabilizer  $V$  of dimension  $p$  satisfies

$$\int_V \tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]) \cdot \tilde{Q}_p(\alpha, [\theta]) \leq 0.$$

By Lemma 2.4,  $V$  must therefore be contained in  $E_{nK}(\tau_p(\alpha, [\theta]))$ . This is a proper analytic subset not containing any  $(p+1)$ -dimensional subvarieties, so  $V$  must be one of its finitely many irreducible components.  $\square$

We should also point out that we get a much better result when  $\dim X = 3$ , just as in the special case of the  $J$ -equation.

**Theorem 5.9.** *Suppose  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $\dim X = 3$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  Kähler classes, with  $\omega \in \alpha, \theta \in \beta$  Kähler forms. Let  $\Theta = c_1 \theta + c_2 \theta^2 + f \theta^3$  be such that  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfies the cohomological constraint (11) and the positivity condition given in [12, (1.2)]. Suppose that the factor class  $\tau_2(\alpha, \beta)$  at dimension 2 associated to  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is big, and  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is gMA-semistable. Then, there are finitely many curves and surfaces that (gMA-)destabilize the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$ .*

*Proof.* The argument is very similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1. We sketch the parts that are identical and elaborate on the parts that are different. Let us briefly recall the notation. The polynomials  $Q_p(x, y)$  for  $p = 1, 2$  are given by

$$Q_2(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} x^2 - c_1 x y - c_2 y^2, \quad Q_1(x, y) = x - c_1 y.$$

Observe that if  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ , then the equation reduces to the complex Monge-Ampère equation and there are no destabilizers in this case. So we may assume that  $c_1 > 0$

or  $c_2 > 0$ . When the triple  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is (gMA)-semistable, a destabilising surface  $S$  (respectively, a destabilising curve  $C$ ) satisfies

$$\int_S Q_2(\alpha, \beta) = 0, \quad (\text{respectively, } \int_C Q_1(\alpha, \beta) = 0).$$

By what was said in Example 5.5, we can write

$$Q_2(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - r_2\beta) \cdot (\alpha + s\beta)$$

where

$$r_2 = c_1 + \sqrt{c_1^2 + 2c_2}, \quad s = -c_1 + \sqrt{c_1^2 + 2c_2}.$$

It is clear that  $r_2 > 0, s \geq 0$ . Recall also that  $\tau_2(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha - r_2\beta$ . Now, if  $S$  is a (gMA)-destabilising surface, then by Lemma 2.4 we must have  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\tau_2(\alpha, \beta))$ , and there are only finitely many surfaces  $S$  which are contained in  $E_{nK}(\tau_2(\alpha, \beta))$ . Suppose  $C$  is a (gMA)-destabilising curve. Then, we have

$$\int_C \alpha - c_1\beta = 0.$$

Now  $\alpha - c_1\beta \geq \alpha - r_p\beta$  (either by direct observation, or by Lemma 5.7), so  $\alpha - c_1\beta$  is a big class as well. Once again, by Lemma 2.4 this implies that  $C \subseteq E_{nK}(\alpha - c_1\beta)$ . Thus,  $C$  is either an irreducible curve component of  $E_{nK}(\alpha - c_1\beta)$  or  $C$  is contained in an irreducible surface component  $S$  of  $E_{nK}(\alpha - c_1\beta)$ . It therefore remains to show that for each of the finitely many surface components  $S$  of  $E_{nK}(\alpha - c_1\beta)$ , there are only finitely many curves  $C \subseteq S$  such that

$$\int_C \alpha - c_1\beta = 0.$$

But now we note that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_S (\alpha - c_1\beta)^2 = \int_S \left( \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 - c_1\alpha \cdot \beta + c_1^2\beta^2 \right) = \int_S Q_2(\alpha, \beta) + \frac{1}{2}(c_1^2 + 2c_2) \int_S \beta^2 > 0,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_S (\alpha - c_1\beta) \cdot (\alpha + s\beta) = \int_S Q_2(\alpha, \beta) + \sqrt{c_1^2 + 2c_2} \int_S \beta \cdot (\alpha + s\beta) > 0.$$

This shows that, if  $S$  is smooth, then  $(\alpha - c_1\beta)|_S$  is a big class on  $S$ . Now we argue exactly as in the proof of 3.1 to conclude.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10.** *In fact, with exactly the same strategy of proof as in Section 3, one can also obtain the more general analogues of Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.8 for the generalized Monge-Ampère equations when  $\dim X = 3$ , making necessary adjustments just as in the proof of Theorem 5.9.*

**Theorem 5.11.** *Suppose  $X$  is a compact Kähler manifold of dimension  $\dim X = 3$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  Kähler classes, with  $\omega \in \alpha, \theta \in \beta$  Kähler forms. Let  $\Theta = c_1\theta + c_2\theta^2 + f\theta^3$  be such that  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  satisfies the cohomological constraint (11) and the positivity condition given in [12, (1.2)]. Suppose that the factor class  $\tau_2(\alpha, \beta)$  at dimension 2 associated to  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  is big. Let  $V_{\alpha, \Theta}$  be the union of all irreducible subvarieties  $Z$  of  $X$  such that*

$$\int_Z \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - [\Theta]) \leq 0.$$

*Then,*

- (1)  $V_{\alpha, \Theta}$  is a proper analytic subset of  $X$ ,
- (2) Every irreducible component of  $V_{\alpha, \Theta}$  is rigid in the sense of Proposition 3.8.

**5.2. Supercritical deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equations.** Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety and let  $\alpha$  be a  $(1, 1)$ -cohomology class on  $X$  (not necessarily Kähler) and  $\theta$  a Kähler metric on  $X$ , as above. Then the *deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills* (*dHYM*) equation seeks a smooth form  $\omega \in \alpha$  such that the nowhere-zero complex valued function  $F_\theta(\omega) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  defined by

$$(\theta + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n = F_\theta(\omega)\theta^n$$

has constant argument. In order to state the *supercritical phase hypothesis* we shall need a further assumption, namely that there exists a representative  $\omega \in \alpha$  such that  $F_\theta(\omega)$  takes values in some half-plane. If such a representative  $\omega \in \alpha$  exists, then in particular

$$Z_{[\theta]}(\alpha) := \int_X (\theta + \sqrt{-1}\omega)^n \neq 0.$$

Let  $\varphi_{[\theta]}(\alpha) := \arg Z_{[\theta]}(\alpha)$ , and define  $\Phi_\theta(\omega)$  by the formula

$$\Phi_\theta(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^n \arctan \lambda_k$$

where  $\lambda_i$  are the (real) eigenvalues of the endomorphism  $\theta^{-1}\omega$ . It can be shown that  $\Phi_\theta(\omega)$  is a smooth real-valued function  $X \rightarrow (-n\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2})$ . Moreover, under the assumption that  $F_\theta(\omega)$  takes values in some half-plane, we also have

$$\Phi_\theta(\omega) = \arg F_\theta(\omega) + 2\pi k$$

for some integer  $k$ . We define the *lifted angle*  $\hat{\varphi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha)$  by

$$\hat{\varphi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha) := \varphi_{[\theta]}(\alpha) + 2\pi k.$$

It follows (see [11, Lemma 2.4]) that under this assumption, the integer  $k$  is determined uniquely by  $[\theta]$  and  $\alpha$ , i.e. if  $\omega, \omega' \in \alpha$  and  $\theta, \theta' \in [\theta]$  are such that both  $F_\theta(\omega), F_{\theta'}(\omega')$  take values in some (potentially different) half-planes, then  $\Phi_\theta(\omega) - \arg F_\theta(\omega) = \Phi_{\theta'}(\omega') - \arg F_{\theta'}(\omega')$ . We say that  $(X, [\theta], \alpha)$  satisfies the *supercritical phase hypothesis* if the lifted angle  $\hat{\varphi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha) \in ((n-2)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2})$ , or equivalently the *complementary lifted angle*

$$\hat{\phi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha) := n\frac{\pi}{2} - \hat{\varphi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha) \in (0, \pi).$$

In this notation, the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation seeks a smooth  $(1, 1)$ -form representing  $\alpha$  such that

$$(14) \quad \operatorname{Im} \left( e^{-\hat{\phi}_{[\theta]}(\alpha)} (\omega + \sqrt{-1}\theta)^n \right) = 0.$$

Under these assumptions, Chu-Lee-Takahashi [8] prove the following numerical criterion characterising solvability of the dHYM equation.

**Theorem 5.12** (Chu-Lee-Takahashi). *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety,  $\beta$  a Kähler class on  $X$  and  $\alpha$  a  $(1, 1)$ -cohomology class. Suppose  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  satisfies the supercritical phase hypothesis. Then, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) For every Kähler form  $\theta \in \beta$ , there exists a smooth  $(1, 1)$ -form  $\omega$  representing  $\alpha$  solving the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation (14).

(2) For all proper irreducible subvarieties  $V \subseteq X$ , we have

$$\int_V \left( \operatorname{Re}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} - \cot \hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} \right) > 0.$$

**Definition 5.13.** Suppose  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  satisfies the supercritical phase hypothesis. Then we say that  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  is (dHYM-)semistable (resp. stable) if for every closed, proper, irreducible subvariety  $V \subseteq X$  we have

$$\int_V \left( \operatorname{Re}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} - \cot \hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} \right) \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } > 0).$$

If  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  is not semistable, we say that it is unstable. If  $V$  violates the above inequality, we say that it (dHYM-)destabilizes the triple  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$ .

From the point of view of the above theorem, we are naturally led to consider the following family of polynomials. Fix  $\hat{\phi} \in (0, \pi)$  and  $p \geq 0$ , and define

$$Q_{p, \hat{\phi}}^{\text{dHYM}}(x, y) := \operatorname{Re}(x + iy)^p - (\cot \hat{\phi}) \operatorname{Im}(x + iy)^p.$$

**Lemma 5.14.** The polynomials  $Q_{p, \hat{\phi}}^{\text{dHYM}}(x, y)$  admit the factorization

$$(15) \quad Q_{p, \hat{\phi}}^{\text{dHYM}}(x, y) = \prod_{l=0}^{p-1} \left( x - \cot \left( \frac{\hat{\phi} + l\pi}{p} \right) y \right).$$

*Proof.* A straightforward calculation shows that  $Q_{p, \hat{\phi}}^{\text{dHYM}}(x, y)$  admits  $p$  distinct roots given by

$$(x_l, y_l) = \left( \cos \left( \frac{\hat{\phi} + l\pi}{p} \right), \sin \left( \frac{\hat{\phi} + l\pi}{p} \right) \right)$$

for  $l = 0, \dots, p-1$ . Now  $\hat{\phi} \in (0, \pi)$  implies that  $y_l > 0$  and the result follows.  $\square$

The above factorization allows us to deduce the following analogue of Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 5.15.** Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension  $n \leq 4$ ,  $\beta$  a Kähler class on  $X$  and  $\alpha$  a real  $(1, 1)$ -cohomology class. Suppose  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  satisfies the supercritical phase hypothesis. If  $\dim X = 4$  suppose moreover that  $\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ . If the classes

$$\tau_p^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta) := \alpha - \cot \left( \frac{\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha)}{p} \right) \beta$$

for  $p = 1, \dots, \dim X - 1$  lie in the  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler cone, then there exist at most finitely many (dHYM)-destabilising proper irreducible subvarieties  $V \subseteq X$ , i.e. proper subvarieties  $V$  satisfying

$$\int_V \left( \operatorname{Re}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} - \cot \hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^{\dim V} \right) \leq 0.$$

*Proof.* By hypothesis, the class  $\tau_p^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)$  is  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler, and the classes

$$\alpha - \cot \left( \frac{\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) + \pi l}{p} \right) \beta$$

for  $l = 1, \dots, p-1$  are also Kähler. Indeed,  $\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \in (0, \pi)$  implies that  $\cot((\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) + \pi)/2) < 0$ , and  $\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \in (\pi/2, \pi)$  implies that

$$\cot\left(\frac{\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) + \pi}{3}\right) < 0, \quad \cot\left(\frac{\hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) + 2\pi}{3}\right) < 0.$$

Thus, in view of the factorization (15) and Lemma 2.4, any  $p$ -dimensional irreducible subvariety  $V$  such that

$$\int_V \left( \operatorname{Re}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^p - \cot \hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \operatorname{Im}(\alpha + \sqrt{-1}\beta)^p \right) \leq 0.$$

must satisfy

$$V \subseteq E_{nK}(\tau_p^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)),$$

but the latter set contains at most finitely many irreducible subvarieties of dimension  $p$ , since it does not contain any  $(p+1)$ -dimensional subvariety and is a proper analytic subset of  $X$ . Thus,  $V$  must be one of the finitely many irreducible components of  $E_{nK}(\tau_p^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta))$ .  $\square$

As for the  $J$ -equation, we obtain a slightly sharper result in the three dimensional setting, albeit under the condition that  $\alpha$  is a Kähler class.

**Theorem 5.16.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension three. Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be Kähler classes on  $X$  such that  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  satisfies the supercritical phase hypothesis and is (dHYM-)semistable. Suppose the class  $\tau_2^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)$  is big. Then, there are only finitely many (dHYM-)destabilising subvarieties of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* If  $S$  is any destabilising surface in  $X$ , then the proof of the above theorem shows that  $S \subseteq E_{nK}(\tau_2^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta))$  and so there are always at most finitely many destabilising surfaces.

A destabilising curve  $C$  must satisfy

$$C \subseteq E_{nK}(\tau_1^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)) = E_{nK}(\alpha - \cot \hat{\phi}_\theta(\alpha)\beta).$$

If  $\hat{\phi} := \hat{\phi}_\beta(\alpha) \in [\pi/2, \pi)$ , then  $\tau_1^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)$  is a Kähler class, so there are no such curves. So, suppose  $\hat{\phi} \in (0, \pi/2)$ , i.e.  $\cot \hat{\phi} > 0$ . Now observe that by semistability, for any surface  $S$ , we have

$$0 \leq \int_S (\alpha - \cot(\hat{\phi}/2)\beta) \cdot (\alpha - \cot((\hat{\phi} + \pi)/2)\beta) = \int_S (\alpha - \cot(\hat{\phi})\beta)^2 - (\csc(\hat{\phi}))^2 \int_S \alpha \cdot \beta,$$

where we have used the identity  $\cot x = \cot 2x + \csc 2x$ . Thus, we have

$$\int_S (\alpha - \cot(\hat{\phi})\beta)^2 \geq (\csc \hat{\phi})^2 \int_S \alpha \cdot \beta > 0, \quad \int_S (\alpha - \cot(\hat{\phi})\beta) \cdot \alpha \geq \cot(\hat{\phi}) \int_S \alpha \cdot \beta > 0.$$

Thus, if  $S$  is any surface component of  $E_{nK}(\tau_1^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta))$ , and  $S$  is smooth, the class  $\tau_1^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)$  restricts to a big class on  $S$  and therefore we conclude as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 above that  $S$  contains only finitely many destabilising curves. If  $S$  is singular, we again conclude as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 above.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.17.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety of dimension three. Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be Kähler classes on  $X$  such that  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  satisfies the supercritical phase hypothesis. Suppose the class  $\tau_2^{\text{dHYM}}(\alpha, \beta)$  is big. Then, the union  $V_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{dHYM}}$  of all subvarieties of  $X$  that (dHYM-)destabilize the triple  $(X, \beta, \alpha)$  is a proper analytic subset of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* This argument is very nearly identical to the proof of Theorem 3.3 above after making appropriate straightforward changes.  $\square$

## 6. WALL-CHAMBER DECOMPOSITIONS FOR PDE

One key motivation behind results like Theorems 5.11 and 3.3 is to understand the nature of stability (and hence solvability) when we vary the PDEs in continuous families. This motivation comes from analogous questions in algebraic geometry, where one finds that if certain numerical invariants are fixed, the space of all stability data admits a locally finite wall-chamber decomposition, with the notion of stability of any given object being the same for each element in any given chamber. By analogy, one should therefore expect something similar to happen in the case of PDEs. In [22], the authors do indeed hold in the case of surfaces for the  $J$ -equation, dHYM equation, and, under mild and natural hypotheses, the  $Z$ -critical equations. In this Section, we aim to show that in higher dimensions, under the positivity conditions described in the previous Sections, we are still able to get closely analogous results. These results are the first in the literature of their kind in higher dimensions.

6.1. Wall-chamber decompositions for the  $J$ -equation. Fix

$$S = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_X,$$

a finite set of Kähler classes on  $X$ . Given  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  denote

$$\mathfrak{M}_\beta = \{\alpha \in S \mid (X, \alpha, \beta) \text{ is stable}\}.$$

An interesting conjecture, inspired by variation of stability in algebraic geometry, is the following.

**Conjecture 6.1.** *There exists a locally finite collection of closed real submanifolds  $W_\sigma$  of codimension one of the Kähler cone  $\mathcal{K}_X$  (that is, for each  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$ , there exists an open neighbourhood of  $\beta$  which meets at most finitely many of the  $W_\sigma$ ) such that for each connected component  $K$  of*

$$\mathcal{K}_X \setminus \bigcup_{\sigma} W_\sigma$$

and each  $\beta, \beta' \in K$ , we have that  $\mathfrak{M}_\beta = \mathfrak{M}_{\beta'}$ .

Fixing the set  $S$  of Kähler classes  $\alpha$  and varying the auxiliary class  $\beta$  corresponds roughly to varying the choice of stability condition, and this can be considered a rather simple analogue of the phenomena for Bridgeland stability for the special case of the  $J$ -equation. Here,  $\mathfrak{M}_\beta$  serves as a very simple prototype of the corresponding moduli space. As an application of our main results Theorem 3.1 (or 3.9), we can prove this conjecture for a subset of all  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  :

**Theorem 6.2.** *Conjecture 6.1 is true with  $\mathcal{K}_X$  replaced by  $\mathcal{K}'$ , the open convex cone comprising the classes  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  such that for each  $\alpha \in S$  and  $p = 1, 2, \dots, \dim X - 1$ , the class  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha - p\beta$  lies in the  $(p + 1)$ -modified Kähler cone.*

*Proof.* For every  $\alpha \in S$  and every irreducible subvariety  $Z \subseteq X$ , let  $W_{(Z, \alpha)}$  be the locus given by  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}'$  such that  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta}(Z) = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ . Let  $K$  be any connected component of

$$\mathcal{K}' \setminus \bigcup_{\sigma} W_\sigma$$

as  $\sigma$  ranges over all pairs  $(Z, \alpha)$  with  $Z \subseteq X$  subvarieties and  $\alpha \in S$ . If  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in K$  then  $\mu_{\alpha, \beta_i} - \mu_{\alpha, \beta_i}(Z)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  have the same sign for each  $(Z, \alpha)$ , so the triples  $(X, \alpha, \beta_i)$  are either both  $J$ -semistable or not, and so  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}_{\beta_1}$  if and only if  $\beta \in \mathfrak{M}_{\beta_2}$ .

It only remains to prove that for any  $\beta \in \mathcal{K}'$ , there exists an open neighbourhood  $U \subseteq \mathcal{K}'$  which meets at most finitely many of the loci  $W_\sigma$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}'$  is an open convex

cone, we can pick  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s \in \mathcal{K}'_X$  such that  $\beta$  lies in the interior  $U$  of the convex hull  $\text{conv}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$ . By Theorem 3.9, for each of the finitely many  $\alpha \in S$ , there exists a (possibly empty) finite set  $\mathcal{D}_{i,\alpha}$  of irreducible subvarieties  $Z$  satisfying  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}(Z) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ . If  $\tilde{\beta} \in U$  lies on some  $W_\sigma$ , then  $\mu_{\alpha,\tilde{\beta}}(Z) = \mu_{\alpha,\tilde{\beta}}$  for some  $\alpha \in S$  and some  $Z$ . By linearity of  $\tilde{\beta} \mapsto \mu_{\alpha,\tilde{\beta}}(Z)$ , it follows that  $\mu_{\alpha,\beta_i}(Z) \geq \mu_{\alpha,\tilde{\beta}}$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . But this implies that  $Z \in \mathcal{D}_{i,\alpha}$ . Thus, the only walls meeting  $U$  are  $W_{(Z,\alpha)}$  as  $\alpha$  ranges over the finite set  $S$  and  $Z$  ranges over the finite set  $\bigcup_i \mathcal{D}_{i,\alpha}$ .  $\square$

**6.2. Wall-chamber decompositions for gMA equations.** As a final application of these ideas, we illustrate how our arguments for the  $J$ -equation can be generalized to a wider class of PDEs. We choose the setting of generalized Monge-Ampère equations, all of which satisfy the condition of factorizability introduced in Definition 5.3.

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective variety, with  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}_X$  Kähler classes and  $\theta \in \beta$  a fixed Kähler form. Recall that a gMA equation is given by data  $(X, \alpha, \Theta)$  where

$$\Theta = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k \theta^k + f \theta^n$$

with the  $c_k \geq 0$  and  $f$  satisfying the cohomological condition (11) and the required positivity condition given in [12, (1.2)]. Recall moreover that the numerical criterion for gMA equations says that the equation (12) is solvable precisely when

$$\int_V \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - [\Theta]) > 0$$

for all proper irreducible subvarieties of  $X$ .

For the sake of clarity, we make another simplifying assumption. We assume that  $f = c_n$  is a constant. In this case, the positivity condition [12, (1.2)] simplifies considerably, and is equivalent to demanding that the  $c_k$  are not all zero. This includes the case of all inverse Hessian equations.

The space of gMA equations with  $f = c_n$  a constant is in a natural way a codimension one closed submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}_+[y]_n \times \mathcal{K}_X \times \mathcal{K}_X$  where  $\mathbb{R}_+[y]_n$  denotes the set of degree  $n$  non-zero real polynomials in one variable  $y$  with zero constant term and all of whose coefficients are either zero or strictly positive. (We note that  $\mathbb{R}_+[y]_n \times \mathcal{K}_X \times \mathcal{K}_X$  is in a natural way a manifold with corners.) We now explain this correspondence. Let  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_+[y]_n \times \mathcal{K}_X \times \mathcal{K}_X$  satisfy the cohomological condition (11) given by

$$\int_X \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - P(\beta)) = 0.$$

This locus of triples  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta)$  is a smooth submanifold because it is the zero locus of the function  $F(P(y), \alpha, \beta) = \int_X \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - P(\beta))$  and we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} F(P(y) - ry^k, \alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{(n-k)!} \int_X \alpha^{n-k} \cdot \beta^k > 0$$

where  $k$  is any positive integer such that the coefficient of  $y^k$  in  $P(y)$  is non-zero. Such a  $k$  always exists by assumption. Then, for any choice of Kähler forms  $\omega \in \alpha, \theta \in \beta$  the triple  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta)$  corresponds to the gMA equation that seeks a smooth  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}(\omega)$  such that

$$(16) \quad \exp(\omega_\psi)^{[n,n]} = (\exp(\omega_\psi) \wedge P(\theta))^{[n,n]},$$

where  $P(\theta)$  is the multi-degree form given by substituting  $\theta$  for  $y$  in the polynomial  $P(y)$ . Let us denote by  $\mathcal{S}(X, \text{gMA})$  the set of triples  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_+[y]_n \times \mathcal{K}_X \times \mathcal{K}_X$



that satisfy the cohomological condition (16). Recall that by Proposition 5.6, each triple  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}(X, \text{gMA})$  defines a factorizable gMA equation. Let us denote by  $\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y))$  the associated factor class of degree  $p$ , as given by Definition 5.3. We shall denote by  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$  the subset of those triples  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta)$  such that the associated factor classes  $\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y))$  of degree  $p$  are  $(p+1)$ -modified Kähler classes. Our aim is to prove a wall structure type statement for the set  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** *For each  $p = 1, \dots, \dim_{\mathbb{C}} X - 1$ , the assignment*

$$T : \mathcal{S}(X, \text{gMA}) \rightarrow (H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R}))^{n-1}, \quad (P(y), \alpha, \beta) \mapsto (\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y)))_{p=1}^{n-1}$$

*is continuous.*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y)) = \alpha - r_p \beta$ , where  $x - r_p y$  is the linear form given by the factorization

$$Q_p(x, y) = (x - r_p y) \tilde{Q}_p(x, y).$$

Here  $Q_p(x, y)$  is the degree  $p$  homogeneous part of the power series  $\exp(x)(1 - P(y))$ , and  $\tilde{Q}_p(x, y)$  has non-negative coefficients. By the proof of Lemma 5.6, it follows that  $r_p$  is uniquely determined as the largest real root of  $h_p(x) = Q_p(x, 1)$ . But the roots of a polynomial depend continuously on the coefficients.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.4.** *The subset  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$  is an open subset of the manifold with corners  $\mathcal{S}(X, \text{gMA})$ .*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the Lemma and the fact that  $\mathcal{M}_p \mathcal{K}_X$  are open (by definition) in  $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ .  $\square$

Now, let  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$  be given. Using Lemma 2.5, we can find open neighbourhoods  $U_p \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{p+1} \mathcal{K}_X$  of  $\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y))$  and finite sets  $S_p$  of  $p$ -dimensional irreducible subvarieties of  $X$  such that for all  $\tau' \in U_p$ , all irreducible  $p$ -dimensional subvarieties  $V$  and all Kähler forms  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{p-1}$  whenever we have

$$\int_V \tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y)) \cdot [\omega_1] \cdots [\omega_{p-1}] \leq 0$$

then  $V \in S_p$ . Let  $U = T^{-1}(U_1 \times U_2 \times \cdots \times U_{n-1})$ . Then  $U$  is an open neighbourhood of  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta)$  in  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$ . In fact, for any Kähler form  $\theta \in \beta$ , if  $V$  is any (gMA) destabilizer for the triple  $(X, \alpha, P(\theta))$  then we have

$$\int_V \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - P(\beta)) = \int_V \tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y)) \cdot \tilde{Q}_p(\alpha, \beta) \leq 0,$$

but since  $\tilde{Q}_p(\alpha, \beta)$  is a non-negative linear combination of products of powers of Kähler classes  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we must have

$$\int_V \tau_p(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \alpha^r \cdot \beta^{r-p-1} \leq 0$$

for some  $0 \leq r \leq p-1$ . But since  $\tau_p(\alpha, \beta, P(y)) \in U_p$  we get immediately that this implies that  $V \in S_p$ .

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})^{\text{Stab}}$  the locus of those  $(P(y), \alpha, \beta)$  such that  $(X, \alpha, P(\theta))$  is (gMA) stable for any choice of Kähler form  $\theta \in \beta$ .

**Theorem 6.5.** *The boundary  $\partial \mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})^{\text{Stab}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})^{\text{Stab}}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$  is a locally finite union of closed submanifolds  $W$  of  $\mathcal{S}_+(X, \text{gMA})$  of (real) codimension one, each one of them cut out by an equation of the form*

$$\int_V \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - P(\beta)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* The local finiteness follows from the discussion preceding the statement of the Theorem. The only claim that needs justification is that the boundary loci are submanifolds of codimension one. But they are the zero locus of a function  $F$  of the form  $F(P(y), \alpha, \beta) = \int_V \exp(\alpha) \cdot (1 - P(\beta))$ . One can easily show that zero is a regular value of this function.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bayer, Polynomial Bridgeland stability conditions and the large volume limit, *Geom. Topol.* 13 (2009), no. 4, 2389–2425.
- [2] S. Boucksom, Cônes positifs des variétés complexes compactes, PhD thesis, Mathématiques [math]. Université Joseph-Fourier-Grenoble I, 2002. tel-00002268. 67 (2017) no. 2, 743–841.
- [3] T. Bridgeland, Stability conditions on triangulated categories, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 166 (2007), no. 2, 317–345.
- [4] T. Bridgeland, Stability conditions on K3 surfaces, *Duke Math. J.* 141 (2008), no. 2, 241–291.
- [5] G. Chen, The J-equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation, *Invent. Math.* 225 (2021), no. 2, 529–602.
- [6] E. Calabi, The space of Kähler metrics, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematics 1954* 2 (1954), 206–
- [7] J. Chu, T. Collins, M. Lee, The space of almost calibrated  $(1, 1)$  forms on a compact Kähler manifold, *Geom. Topol.* 25 (2021), no. 5, 2573–2619.
- [8] J. Chu, M. Lee, R. Takahashi, A Nakai-Moishezon type criterion for supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation, to appear in *J. Differential Geom.* Preprint arXiv:2105.10725v3 [math.DG].
- [9] T. Collins, A. Jacob, S.-T. Yau,  $(1, 1)$  forms with specified Lagrangian phase: a priori estimates and algebraic obstructions, *Camb. J. Math.* 8 (2020), 407–452.
- [10] T. Collins, G. Székelyhidi, Convergence of the J-flow on toric manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* 107 (2017) no. 1, 47–81.
- [11] T. Collins, D. Xie, S.-T. Yau, The deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation in geometry and physics, *Geometry and physics. Vol. I*, 69–90, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2018.
- [12] V. Datar, V. Pingali, A numerical criterion for generalized Monge-Ampère equations on projective manifolds, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 31 (2021), no. 4, 767–814.
- [13] V. Datar, R. Mete, J. Song. Minimal slopes and bubbling for complex Hessian equations. Preprint arXiv:2312.03370.
- [14] J.-P. Demailly, Regularization of closed positive currents and intersection theory. *J. Algebraic Geom.* 1 (1992), no. 3, 361–409.
- [15] J.-P. Demailly and M. Păun, Numerical characterization of the Kähler cone of a compact Kähler manifold, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 159 (3) (2004), 1247–1274.
- [16] R. Dervan, Stability conditions in geometric invariant theory, Preprint arXiv:2207.04766v1 [math.AG].
- [17] R. Dervan, J.B. McCarthy, L.M. Sektnan,  $Z$ -critical connections and Bridgeland stability conditions, Preprint arXiv:2012.10426v3 [math.DG].
- [18] S. K. Donaldson, Moment maps and diffeomorphisms, *Asian J. Math.* 3 (1999), no. 1, 1–15.
- [19] H. Fang, B. Ma. On a fully nonlinear elliptic equation with differential forms. Preprint arXiv:2309.15451.
- [20] H. Fang, M. Lai, and X. Ma. On a class of fully nonlinear flows in Kähler geometry. *J. für die reine ang. Math.* 653 (2011): 189–220.
- [21] A. Jacob, S.-T. Yau, A special Lagrangian type equation for holomorphic line bundles, *Math. Ann.* 369 (2017), no. 1–2, 869–898.
- [22] S. Khalid, Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, The set of destabilizing curves for deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills and  $Z$ -critical equations on surfaces, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, Volume 2024, Issue 7, April 2024, Pages 5773–5814.
- [23] A. Lamari, Le cône kählérien d’une surface, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* 78 (1999), no. 3, 249–263.
- [24] M. Lejmi, G. Székelyhidi, The J-flow and stability, *Adv. Math.* 274 (2015), 404–431.
- [25] J. B. McCarthy, Stability conditions and canonical metrics, PhD thesis (2022).

- [26] P. Pingali, The deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation on three-folds, *Anal. PDE* 15 (2022), no. 4, 921–935.
- [27] L.M. Sektnan, C. Tipler, Analytic K-semistability and wall-crossing, Preprint arXiv:2212.08383 [math.DG].
- [28] Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, Optimal lower bounds for Donaldson’s J-functional, *Adv. Math.* 374 (2020), 107271, 37 pp.
- [29] J. Song, B. Weinkove, On the convergence and singularities of the J-flow with applications to the Mabuchi energy, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 61 (2008), no. 2, 210–229.
- [30] J. Song, Nakai-Moishezon criteria for complex Hessian equations, Preprint arXiv:2012.07956v1 [math.DG].
- [31] G. Tian, Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature, *Invent. Math.* 130 (1997), no. 1, 1–37.
- [32] X. Wu, A study of nefness in higher codimension, *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.* 150 (2022), no. 1, 209–249.
- [33] S.-T. Yau, On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), no. 3, 339–411.
- [34] O. Zariski, The theorem of Riemann-Roch for high multiples of an effective divisor on an algebraic surface, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 76 (1962), 560–615.
- [35] Z. Zhang, Optimal destabilizing centers and equivariant K-stability, *Invent. Math.* 226 (2021), no. 1, 195–223.
- [36] C. Zhou, On the shape of K-semistable domain and wall crossing for K-stability, Preprint arXiv:2302.13503 [math.AG].
- [37] C. Zhou, Chamber decomposition for K-semistable domains and VGIT, Preprint arXiv:2303.10963 [math.AG].

SOHAIB KHALID, SCUOLA INTERNAZIONALE SUPERIORE DI STUDI AVANZATI (SISSA), VIA BONOMEA, 265, 34136 TRIESTE TS, ITALY.

*Email address:* mkhalid@sissa.it

ZAKARIAS SJÖSTRÖM DYREFELT, INSTITUT FOR MATEMATIK AND AARHUS INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED STUDIES, AARHUS UNIVERSITY, NY MUNKEGADE 118, 8000, AARHUS C, DENMARK.

*Email address:* dyrefelt@aias.au.dk