

WEIGHT FUNCTIONS, TILTS, AND STABILITY CONDITIONS

JASON LO

ABSTRACT. In this article, we treat stability conditions in the sense of King, Bridgeland and Bayer in a single framework. Following King, we begin with weight functions on a triangulated category, and consider increasingly specialised configurations of triangulated categories, t-structures and stability functions that give equivalent categories of stable objects. Along the way, we recover existing results in representation theory and algebraic geometry, and prove a series of new results on elliptic surfaces, including correspondence theorems for Bridgeland stability conditions and polynomial stability conditions, local finiteness and boundedness for mini-walls for Bridgeland stability conditions, isomorphisms between moduli of 1-dimensional twisted Gieseker semistable sheaves and 2-dimensional Bridgeland semistable objects, the preservation of geometric Bridgeland stability by autoequivalences on elliptic surfaces of nonzero Kodaira dimension, and solutions to Gepner equations on elliptic surfaces.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	5
3. Weight functions, stability, Configurations I and II	6
4. Polynomial stability conditions	13
5. Polynomial stability and Configuration III	18
6. Preliminaries on elliptic fibrations	26
7. Elliptic curves	28
8. Elliptic surfaces: $GL^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ -action	29
9. A polynomial stability and twisted Gieseker stability on surfaces	31
10. Elliptic surfaces: a second polynomial stability	32
11. Elliptic surfaces: Bridgeland stability	38
12. Applications: wall-crossing for Bridgeland stability	40
13. Applications: action on stability manifold	43
References	45

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview. In representation theory, moduli spaces of modules are defined using stability in the sense of King [20], i.e. using a weight function. In its original form, this concept of stability is closely related to Mumford's stability for vector bundles on a curve. In algebraic geometry, μ -stability and other types of stability defined via slope functions have been used to study moduli spaces of coherent sheaves on varieties of any dimension. Out of a need to understand stability arising from mathematical physics, Bridgeland coined a concept of stability condition on triangulated categories [10], the definition of which was relaxed by Bayer to give more flexibility in understanding objects such as Pandharipande-Thomas stable pairs [4] (see also Toda's limit stability, which can be interpreted to be under Bayer's framework [40]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14D20; Secondary: 14J27, 16G20.

Key words and phrases. weight function, stability condition, autoequivalence, elliptic surface.

In this article, we present configurations of t-structures and stability conditions that give rise to equivalent categories of semistable objects and hence isomorphic moduli spaces of semistable objects. Instead of understanding relations among *moduli spaces* alone, which require fixing numerical classes of objects, we consider relations among notions of *stability* themselves. We also consider stability conditions in the sense of King, Bridgeland and Bayer as part of a single, connected framework.

In the first thread within this framework, following King, we define a weight function on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} to be a group homomorphism $S : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$ from the Grothendieck group of \mathcal{D} to a totally ordered abelian group. Then, for any abelian subcategory \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{D} , the weight function defines a notion of stability for objects in \mathcal{A} . In a separate thread, we extend the definition of Bayer's polynomial stability by allowing central charges to take values in convergent Laurent series that are expansions of analytic functions. Using this extended definition of polynomial stability, a Bridgeland stability condition is a polynomial stability condition where the central charge takes values in constant functions. In addition, slope functions for sheaf stability such as μ -stability can be defined as the slope functions coming from 'weak' polynomial stability functions.

These two threads are then connected by defining a suitable weight function anytime we have a weak polynomial stability function and a fixed nonzero object - this generalises a construction that appeared in Rudakov's work [39].

We note that constructions passing between Bridgeland stability and King's stability, or hints of such constructions, already exist in the literature [6, 12, 15]. Also, our technical results such as Theorems 3.6, 3.12, 5.6(iii) and 5.7(iv) can be interpreted as formal results on how stability can be "preserved" under tilting, which is also studied in [7, Sections 14, 19] for weak stability conditions where the central charges take values in \mathbb{C} . One of the differences between our approach and that in [7] is that we do not assume the Harder-Narasimhan property in proving the preservation of stability.

Although we will give a proper outline of the article in Section 1.1, we include here a quick list of our main results that is more descriptive than the abstract:

Starting with weight functions alone, we prove results describing how weight functions in certain compatible configurations give rise to the same semistable objects. Then, via the connection between weight functions and polynomial stability functions, we prove a similar result for compatible polynomial stability conditions. Only homological algebra is needed up to this point. With different inputs, these homological statements lead to a series of results - both old and new - including:

- (1) We recover a result in the classification of finite-dimensional algebras, which uses a tilting equivalence to establish isomorphisms between moduli spaces of semistable modules for different weight functions (Theorem 3.13).
- (2) We recover a fundamental result on elliptic curves, that the Fourier-Mukai transform from the Poincaré line bundle preserves stability of coherent sheaves (Theorem 7.1).

Then, using a relative Fourier-Mukai transform Φ on Weierstraß elliptic surfaces, we prove:

- (3) There are two polynomial stability conditions that correspond to each other via Φ , one being the large volume limit (Theorem 10.12).
- (4) There are two families of Bridgeland stability conditions whose members correspond to each other via Φ (Theorem 11.7).
- (5) For fixed Chern classes, Φ induces a correspondence of the wall and chamber structures in the families in (4); in each family, the walls are locally finite and bounded (Theorem 12.5 and proof).
- (6) In terms of the moduli spaces they define, the outermost chambers for the two families of Bridgeland stability conditions in (4) coincide with the two polynomial stability conditions in (3) (Theorem 12.3).

Applications of the results on Weierstraß elliptic surfaces include:

- (7) We construct isomorphisms from moduli spaces of 1-dimensional twisted Gieseker semistable sheaves to moduli spaces of Bridgeland semistable objects of nonzero rank (Corollary 12.8).
- (8) We prove that the autoequivalence group preserves the geometric component of the Bridgeland stability manifold when the elliptic surface has nonzero Kodaira dimension (Theorem 13.2).
- (9) We construct Gepner-type Bridgeland stability conditions (Example 13.7).

1.1. Outline and summary. We now describe the outline of this article and give a more detailed summary of our main results.

After fixing some notations in Section 2, we begin Section 3 with the definition of a weight function on a triangulated category in 3.1. We describe Configuration I in 3.2, a setting where weight functions satisfy sign compatibility, and introduce the refinement property in 3.3, which generalises the concept of ‘well-positioned’ functions by Chindris. Our first theorem, Theorem 3.6, states that given two weight functions S, S' on a triangulated category in Configuration I where S satisfies the refinement property, an object is S -semistable if and only if it is $(-1)^i S'$ -semistable after a shift by i . Then, by bringing exact equivalences of triangulated categories into the picture, we describe Configuration II in 3.8 and prove Theorem 3.12 as a counterpart of Theorem 3.6. We end Section 3 by using Theorem 3.12 to recover a theorem of Chindris’ [14, Theorem 1.3(a)] (Theorem 3.13), which identifies two moduli spaces of semistable modules from different weights, a result integral to the classification of wild tilted algebras.

In Section 4, we extend Bayer’s notion of polynomial stability using convergent Laurent series, and consider Bridgeland stability conditions as polynomial stability conditions. We also describe a process for producing weight functions using a weak polynomial stability function and a nonzero object (Lemma 4.8), which generalises a result of Rudakov’s [39, Proposition 3.4].

In Section 5, we modify Configuration II to Configuration III by replacing weight functions with polynomial stability functions, the latter of which are more suitable for applications in algebraic geometry than in representation theory. Configuration III involves an exact equivalence $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ of triangulated categories, hearts of t-structures \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} on \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} , respectively, with polynomial stability functions $Z_{\mathcal{A}}, Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ on \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , and a linear operation T that accounts for the difference between $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ and the image of $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ under the action of Φ . In Theorem 5.7, we prove that under Configuration III, $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable objects correspond to $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable objects up to a shift - this is without assuming the Harder-Narasimhan property for the stability functions involved. When the polynomial stability functions $Z_{\mathcal{A}}, Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ do have the Harder-Narasimhan property, we obtain the equation

$$(1.1.1) \quad \Phi \cdot (Z_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) = (Z_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the slicings of the respective polynomial stability conditions and $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$ is a path in $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$, the universal cover of $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$.

In Configurations I, II and III, the idea is that once all the required inputs (of exact equivalences, stability functions, and t-structures) are in place, the output is a correspondence theorem of semistable objects or an equation for stability conditions analogous to (1.1.1). The remainder of this article concerns applications of Theorem 5.7 on elliptic curves and elliptic surfaces.

Section 6 sets up the necessary terminology for Weierstraß elliptic fibrations X and introduces a fundamental autoequivalence Φ of $D^b(X)$, which is a relative Fourier-Mukai transform.

Section 7 contains our first application of Theorem 5.7: We recover, in the form of Theorem 7.1, the well-known result that under the Fourier-Mukai transform on an elliptic curve whose kernel is the Poincaré line bundle, a semistable sheaf is taken to a semistable sheaf. Previous expositions on this fundamental result on elliptic curves can be found in Bridgeland [9, 3.2], Hein-Ploog [17], Polishchuk [36, Lemma 14.6], and [3, Corollary 3.29].

Section 8 considers the cohomological formula for the autoequivalence Φ , and rewrites it in a simpler form using $\mathrm{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ -actions. In Section 9, we recall the large volume limit on surfaces - a polynomial stability condition we denote as Z_l -stability - and check that it coincides with twisted Gieseker stability (a stability defined using a slope function) in the case of 1-dimensional sheaves.

In Section 10, we solve a system of polynomial equations, which in turn allows us to "patch" central charges together up to the autoequivalence Φ . The solutions can be expressed as convergent Laurent series, which lead to the use of polynomial stability conditions. We also recall Z^l -stability, a polynomial stability condition first defined in the author's joint work with Liu and Martinez [25] by deforming the ample class along a hyperbola in the ample cone. Then we prove a polynomial-stability generalisation of Theorem 7.1 on elliptic surfaces X : an object E in the derived category $D^b(X)$ is Z_l -semistable if and only if ΦE is Z^l -semistable; moreover, the equation (1.1.1) specialises to a correspondence between Z_l -stability and Z^l -stability via Φ (Theorem 10.12). This is the second application of Theorem 5.7.

On the other hand, whenever there is a solution to the patching equations in Section 10, we obtain a generalisation of Theorem 7.1 to Bridgeland stability on elliptic surfaces: for ample divisors $\overline{\omega}, \omega$ and \mathbb{R} -divisors \overline{B}, B that satisfy the patching equations, an object E in $D^b(X)$ is $Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$ -semistable if and only if ΦE is $Z_{\omega, B}$ -semistable (Theorem 11.7). We also prove the stronger statement

$$(1.1.2) \quad ([1] \circ \Phi) \cdot \sigma_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} = \sigma_{\omega, B} \cdot (T, g)$$

where $\sigma_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \sigma_{\omega, B}$ are Bridgeland stability conditions with central charges $Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, Z_{\omega, B}$, respectively. In this equation, $[1]$ denotes the shift functor in $D^b(X)$, and (T, g) is an element of $\widetilde{\mathrm{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$. Our approach gives explicit coordinates for $\overline{\omega}, \omega, \overline{B}$ and B .

Another way to interpret equation 5.1 is: for suitable $\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}$, the image of the Bridgeland stability condition $\sigma_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$ under the autoequivalence $[1] \circ \Phi$ is, up to a $\widetilde{\mathrm{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ -action (which simply relabels the phases of semistable objects), again of the form $\sigma_{\omega, B}$. Moreover, we can compute ω, B explicitly.

At this point, we have constructed a clear picture of the behaviours of moduli spaces of Bridgeland stability conditions under the autoequivalence Φ on a Weierstraß elliptic surface X - this is summarised in the form of Theorem 12.3 and diagram (12.3.1). Roughly speaking, there is a countable number of rays in the space $\mathrm{Stab}(X)$ of Bridgeland stability conditions on $D^b(X)$, each of which is partnered with a hyperbola in $\mathrm{Stab}(X)$. Sufficiently away from the origin, stability conditions on each ray corresponds to stability conditions on its partner hyperbola. As a result, the local finiteness and boundedness of mini-walls on the rays in the author's joint work with Qin [30] give corresponding local finiteness and boundedness results of mini-walls on the hyperbolas (Theorem 12.5).

Moreover, when a Chern character is fixed, the Bridgeland moduli space in the outer-most mini-chamber on a ray, which corresponds to Z_l -moduli space (proved in [30]), now corresponds via Φ to the Bridgeland moduli space in the outer-most mini-chamber on its partner hyperbola, which corresponds to Z^l -moduli space. A consequence of this picture is, that for Chern classes of 1-dimensional sheaves, the moduli space of twisted Gieseker semistable 1-dimensional sheaves is isomorphic to a moduli space of Bridgeland semistable objects of nonzero rank (Corollary 12.7). This improves a previous result in the author's joint work with Liu and Martinez, in which an embedding of moduli spaces was obtained via a different, more direct wall-crossing result [25, Corollary 6.14].

We conclude the paper with two applications of Theorem 11.7 that are concerned with Bridgeland stability manifolds for surfaces.

The first application is related to a conjecture [11, Conjecture 1.2] of Bridgeland's on the structure of the autoequivalence group $\mathrm{Aut}(D^b(X))$ when X is a K3 surface. The first part of the conjecture asserts that the autoequivalence group preserves the connected component of $\mathrm{Stab}(X)$ containing geometric stability conditions. We show that the corresponding statement holds for Weierstraß elliptic surfaces of non-zero Kodaira dimensions.

The second application concerns Gepner-type Bridgeland stability conditions in the sense of Toda [41]. A Gepner-type Bridgeland stability condition on a smooth projective variety is an orbifold point of $\text{Aut}(D^b(X)) \backslash \text{Stab}(X) / \mathbb{C}$. When X is a Calabi-Yau threefold, such stability conditions mimic stability conditions on Orlov's triangulated category of graded matrix factorisations, and can impose constraints and reveal symmetries in Donaldson-Thomas invariants on X . Using Theorem 11.7, we construct Gepner points in $\text{Stab}(X)$ for Weierstraß elliptic surfaces X (Theorem 13.6 and Example 13.7).

1.2. Acknowledgements. The author thanks Conan Leung, Yu-Shen Lin, Wu-Yen Chuang, Cristian Martinez, Wanmin Liu, Zhenbo Qin, and Ziyu Zhang for helpful discussions during various stages of this project. He would also like to thank Arend Bayer for pointing out a gap in an earlier version of this work and suggesting a fix.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. For any abelian category \mathcal{A} , we will write $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ for the bounded derived category of \mathcal{A} . When X is a smooth projective variety, we will write $\text{Coh}(X)$ to denote the category of coherent sheaves on X , and write $D^b(X)$ to denote $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$. For any divisor class B on X and any $E \in D^b(X)$, we will write $\text{ch}^B(E)$ to denote the twisted Chern character $e^{-B} \text{ch}(E)$ of E . That is, we have $\text{ch}_0^B(E) = \text{ch}_0(E)$, $\text{ch}_1^B(E) = \text{ch}_1(E) - B \text{ch}_0(E)$, etc.

2.1.1. Unless otherwise stated, all the t-structures on triangulated categories that appear in this article will be bounded.

2.1.2. Suppose \mathcal{T} is a triangulated category and \mathcal{A} is the heart of a t-structure on \mathcal{T} ; then we write $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^i : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ to denote the i -th cohomology functor with respect to the t-structure. When \mathcal{T} is the bounded derived category $D^b(\mathcal{B})$ of an abelian category \mathcal{B} , we write H^i instead of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}^i$, i.e. H^i denotes the i -th cohomology functor on $D^b(\mathcal{B})$ with respect to the standard t-structure. When the triangulated category \mathcal{T} is understood, for any integers $a \leq b$ we define the full subcategory of \mathcal{T}

$$D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[a,b]} := \{E \in \mathcal{T} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}^i(E) = 0 \text{ for all } i \notin [a, b]\}.$$

2.1.3. WIT _{i} . Let $\Phi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be an exact equivalence of triangulated categories.

- Suppose \mathcal{B} is the heart of a t-structure on \mathcal{U} . We will write $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^i$ to denote the composite functor $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}^i \circ \Phi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$. We will say an object $E \in \mathcal{T}$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT _{i} if ΦE is isomorphic to an object in $\mathcal{B}[-i]$, i.e. if $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^j(E) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$.
- Suppose \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are hearts of bounded t-structures in \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U} , respectively. For any integer i , we define the full subcategory of \mathcal{A}

$$W_{i,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} := \{E \in \mathcal{A} : E \text{ is } \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_i\}.$$

- When $\mathcal{U} = D^b(\mathcal{B})$ is the bounded derived category of an abelian category \mathcal{B} , we simply write $\Phi\text{-WIT}_i$ instead of $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_i$.
- When $\mathcal{T} = D^b(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{U} = D^b(\mathcal{B})$ are bounded derived categories of abelian categories \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , respectively, we simply write $W_{i,\Phi}$ for $W_{i,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$, and we write \widehat{E} to denote $\Phi E[i]$ when E is a $\Phi\text{-WIT}_i$ object in \mathcal{A} .

2.2. Torsion pair and tilting. Given an abelian category \mathcal{A} , a pair of full subcategories $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of \mathcal{A} will be called a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} if they satisfy the following two conditions:

- For any $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(T, F) = 0$.
- Every $E \in \mathcal{A}$ fits in some short exact sequence in \mathcal{A}

$$0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$$

where $E' \in \mathcal{T}$ and $E'' \in \mathcal{F}$.

Whenever $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} , we will refer to \mathcal{T} (resp. \mathcal{F}) as a *torsion class* (resp. *torsion-free class*) in \mathcal{A} . When \mathcal{A} is a noetherian abelian category, a full subcategory of \mathcal{A} is a torsion class if and only if it is closed under extension and quotient in \mathcal{A} [38, Lemma 1.1.3]. Given an abelian category \mathcal{A} and a torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{A} , the extension closure in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$

$$\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$$

is again the heart of a t-structure on $D^b(\mathcal{A})$, which we refer to as the *tilt* of the heart \mathcal{A} at the torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$.

2.3. Given an abelian category \mathcal{A} and a collection of full subcategories $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$ of \mathcal{A} , we will write $[\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n]$ to denote the full subcategory of all objects E in \mathcal{A} that admit a filtration of the form

$$(2.3.1) \quad 0 =: E_0 \subseteq E_1 \subseteq E_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq E_n = E$$

where $E_i/E_{i-1} \in \mathcal{C}_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

2.4. Torsion n -tuple. Following [37, Section 2.2] (see also [42, Definition 3.5]), given an abelian category \mathcal{A} , we will say an n -tuple $(\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n)$ of full subcategories of \mathcal{A} is a *torsion n -tuple in \mathcal{A}* if they satisfy the following two conditions:

- (a) For any $E' \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and $E'' \in \mathcal{C}_j$ where $i < j$, we have $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(E', E'') = 0$.
- (b) $[\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n] = \mathcal{A}$.

When $(\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n)$ is a torsion n -tuple in \mathcal{A} , it is clear that for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the pair $([\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_i], [\mathcal{C}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n])$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} . As a result, the filtration (2.3.1) for the object E is canonical, and we will refer to the subfactor E_i/E_{i-1} as the \mathcal{C}_i -component of E , and refer to (2.3.1) as the $(\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n)$ -decomposition of E . When $n = 2$, the definition of a torsion n -tuple reduces to that of a torsion pair.

2.5. Subcategories of $\text{Coh}(X)$. Let X be a smooth projective variety. For any integers $0 \leq e \leq d$, we define the full subcategories of $\text{Coh}(X)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Coh}^{\leq d}(X) &= \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) : \dim \text{supp}(E) \leq d\} \\ \text{Coh}^{\geq d}(X) &= \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) : \text{Hom}_{\text{Coh}(X)}(F, E) = 0 \text{ for all } F \in \text{Coh}^{\leq d-1}(X)\} \\ \text{Coh}^=d(X) &= \text{Coh}^{\leq d}(X) \cap \text{Coh}^{\geq d}(X). \end{aligned}$$

Given a morphism of smooth projective varieties $p : X \rightarrow B$, we also define the full subcategories of $\text{Coh}(X)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Coh}(p)_{\leq d} &= \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) : \dim p(\text{supp}(E)) \leq d\} \\ \text{Coh}(p)_0 &= \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) : \dim p(\text{supp}(E)) = 0\} \\ \{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger &= \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) : E|_b \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X_b) \text{ for all closed points } b \in B\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X_b)$ denotes the category of coherent sheaves F supported on the fiber $p^{-1}(b) = X_b$, with b being a closed point of B , such that F is supported in dimension 0. We will also refer to coherent sheaves on X that are supported on a finite number of fibers of p as *fiber sheaves* on X , i.e. $\text{Coh}(p)_0$ is the category of fiber sheaves on X .

3. WEIGHT FUNCTIONS, STABILITY, CONFIGURATIONS I AND II

In this section, we focus on stability arising from weight functions. We give two configurations of weight functions, and show that together with the ‘refinement property’, weight functions in these configurations define equivalent categories of semistable objects.

3.1. Weight functions and King's stability. Suppose (R, \preceq) is a totally ordered abelian group under addition $+$, with 0 as the identity element. That is, R is an abelian group such that (R, \preceq) is a totally ordered set satisfying the translation invariance property: for any $a, b, c \in R$, we have $a \preceq b$ implies $a + c \preceq b + c$. Then for any triangulated category \mathcal{D} , any bounded t-structure on \mathcal{D} with heart \mathcal{A} , and any group homomorphism $S : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$, we define a notion of semistability on \mathcal{A} by declaring a nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ to be an S -semistable (resp. S -stable) object in \mathcal{A} , or simply S -semistable in \mathcal{A} (resp. S -stable in \mathcal{A}), if $E \in \mathcal{A}$ and

- (i) $S(E) = 0$;
- (ii) $S(E') \preceq 0$ (resp. $S(E') \prec 0$) for all nonzero proper subobjects E' of E in \mathcal{A} .

We will refer to S as a *weight function* on the triangulated category \mathcal{D} . Note that the zero object is always S -semistable in \mathcal{A} . Also, given condition (i), condition (ii) for S -semistable (resp. S -stable) objects is equivalent to the following by the translation invariance of \preceq :

- (ii') $0 \preceq S(E'')$ (resp. $0 \prec S(E'')$) for all nonzero proper quotients E'' of E in \mathcal{A} .

Example 3.1.1. For any $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, (R, \preceq)$ as above, if we take the weight function $S : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$ to be the zero function, then every object in the abelian category \mathcal{A} is S -semistable.

Example 3.1.2. Given any abelian category \mathcal{A} , we can take $\mathcal{D} = D^b(\mathcal{A})$ and take $(R, \preceq) = (\mathbb{R}, \leq)$. Then S -semistability is King's semistability on an abelian category as originally defined in [20], with the opposite sign.

Example 3.1.3. Let X be a smooth projective curve, $\mathcal{A} = \text{Coh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{D} = D^b(X)$. Fix any nonzero object M in \mathcal{A} and consider the weight function $S : K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$S(E) = (\text{rk } M)(\deg E) - (\deg M)(\text{rk } E).$$

On the other hand, we have the usual slope function on $\text{Coh}(X)$ defined by $\mu(E) = \deg E / \text{rk}(E)$ (taken to be ∞ if $\text{rk } E = 0$). One can check that for any nonzero coherent sheaf E , the following are equivalent:

- E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} ;
- $\mu(E) = \mu(M)$ and E is a μ -semistable sheaf.

This is an example of Lemma 4.8 where we take $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to be $Z(E) = -\deg E + i \text{rk } E$.

3.1.4. Signs. Given a totally ordered abelian group (R, \preceq) , we define the sign function $\text{sgn} : R \rightarrow \{0, \pm 1\}$ in the obvious manner, i.e. for $r \in R$ we set $\text{sgn}(r)$ to be $1, 0$ or -1 if $r \succ 0, r = 0$ or $r \prec 0$, respectively.

3.2. Configuration I. We say we are in Configuration I when we have the following setting: \mathcal{D} is a triangulated category, \mathcal{A} is the heart of a bounded t-structure on \mathcal{D} , and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} . Additionally, (R, \preceq) is a totally ordered abelian group and $S, S' : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$ are group homomorphisms satisfying the sign compatibility

- (S) For any G lying in either \mathcal{T} or \mathcal{F} , we have $\text{sgn } S(G) = \text{sgn } S'(G)$.

Note that when \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A} and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ are fixed, the statement of Configuration I is symmetric in S and S' .

3.3. Refinement property. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category, \mathcal{A} the heart of a bounded t-structure on \mathcal{D} , and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} . Suppose $\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is the corresponding tilted heart. Given a totally ordered abelian group (R, \preceq) and for $i = 0, 1$, we say a weight function $S : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$ satisfies *refinement- i with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$* if:

Every nonzero S -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} lies in $\mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{A}^\dagger[-i])$, and for every nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{A}^\dagger[i-1])$ we have $(-1)^i \text{sgn}(S(G)) = -1$.

More explicitly, a weight function S satisfies refinement-0 or refinement-1 when:

- (Refinement-0) Every nonzero S -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} lies in \mathcal{T} (so that $E[0] \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$), and for every nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $S(G) \prec 0$.
- (Refinement-1) Every nonzero S -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} lies in \mathcal{F} (so that $E[1] \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$), and for every nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{T}$ we have $S(G) \succ 0$.

We also say a weight function satisfies the refinement property if it satisfies either refinement-0 or refinement-1.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume Configuration I. For $i = 0$ or 1 , if S satisfies refinement- i with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$, then $(-1)^i S'$ satisfies refinement- $(1-i)$ with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$, considered as a torsion pair in the heart $\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$.*

Proof. (a) The case $i = 0$: Suppose S satisfies refinement-0 with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. To show that S' satisfies refinement-1 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$, take any nonzero S' -semistable object E in \mathcal{A}^\dagger and consider the $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$ -decomposition of E in \mathcal{A}^\dagger

$$0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$$

where $E' \in \mathcal{F}[1]$ and $E'' \in \mathcal{T}$. By the S' -semistability of E in \mathcal{A}^\dagger , we have $-S'(E'[-1]) = S'(E') \preceq S'(E) = 0$. On the other hand, since $E'[-1] \in \mathcal{F}$, the refinement-0 property of S implies that $S(E'[-1]) \preceq 0$ with equality if and only if $E' = 0$. By condition 3.2(S), we have $S'(E'[-1]) \preceq 0$, i.e. $-S'(E'[-1]) \succeq 0$. Hence $S'(E'[-1]) = 0$ overall, forcing $E' = 0$, i.e. $E \cong E'' \in \mathcal{T}$. Then we have $S(E) = 0$ by 3.2(S) again.

It remains to show that $S'(G) \succ 0$ for every nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{F}[1]$. Take any nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{F}[1]$. Then $G[-1] \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $S(G[-1]) \prec 0$ by the refinement-0 property of S . Then $S'(G[-1]) \prec 0$ by 3.2(S) and so $S'(G) \succ 0$ as wanted.

(b) The case $i = 1$: Even though the argument is analogous to that for $i = 0$, we give the full argument to show how the sign changes are compatible with the tilt. Suppose S satisfies refinement-1 with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. To show that $(-S')$ satisfies refinement-0 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$, take any nonzero $(-S')$ -semistable object E in \mathcal{A}^\dagger and consider its $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$ -decomposition in \mathcal{A}^\dagger

$$0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$$

where $E' \in \mathcal{F}[1]$ and $E'' \in \mathcal{T}$. Since S satisfies refinement-1, we have $S(E'') \succeq 0$, with equality if and only if $E'' = 0$; this implies $S'(E'') \succeq 0$ by 3.2(S). On the other hand, by the $(-S')$ -semistability of E , we have $(-S')(E'') \succeq 0$. Hence $S'(E'') = 0$ overall and $E'' = 0$, i.e. $E \cong E' \in \mathcal{F}[1]$.

It remains to show that $(-S')(G) \prec 0$ for every nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{T}$. Take any nonzero object $G \in \mathcal{T}$. Then $S(G) \succ 0$ since S satisfies refinement-1. Hence $S'(G) \succ 0$ by 3.2(S) and so $(-S')(G) \prec 0$ as wanted. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.5 shows, that if S and S' are weight functions with sign compatibility as in Configuration I, then the refinement property on S ensures that S -semistability implies S' -semistability under a suitable shift and sign change.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume Configuration I. For $i = 0$ or 1 , suppose S satisfies refinement- i with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. If E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} , then $E[i]$ is $(-1)^i S'$ -semistable in the heart $\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$. The same statement holds if we replace ‘semistable’ by ‘stable.’*

Proof. (a) The case $i = 0$: Suppose S satisfies refinement-0 and E is a nonzero S -semistable object in \mathcal{A} . Then $E \in \mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{A}^\dagger$ and $S(E) = 0$. By 3.2(S) we have $S'(E) = 0$. Now take any \mathcal{A}^\dagger -short exact

sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ where $M, N \neq 0$; considering it as an exact triangle in \mathcal{D} , we can take its \mathcal{A} -long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\alpha} E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(N) \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(M) = 0$ and so M lies in \mathcal{T} . By the S -semistability of E , we have $S(\text{im } \alpha) \preceq 0$. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \in \mathcal{F}$, the refinement-0 property of S implies $S(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)) \prec 0$ if $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)$ is nonzero, giving us $S(M) \preceq 0$. Since $M \in \mathcal{T}$, condition 3.2(S) applies and gives $S'(M) \preceq 0$, showing that E is S' -semistable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger .

Suppose E is S -stable in \mathcal{A} . If $\text{im } \alpha = E$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(N) = 0$ and $N = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)[1]$ is nonzero, which implies $S(N) \succ 0$ from above. On the other hand, if $\text{im } \alpha \subsetneq E$ then either $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \neq 0$ or $0 \neq \text{im } \alpha \subsetneq E$; in either case, we have $S(M) \prec 0$, which implies $S'(M) \prec 0$ by 3.2(S). Hence E is S' -stable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger .

(b) The case $i = 1$. Suppose S satisfies refinement-1 and E is a nonzero S -semistable object in \mathcal{A} . Then $E \in \mathcal{F}$ and $E[1] \in \mathcal{A}^\dagger$. We need to show that $E[1]$ is $(-S')$ -semistable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger .

Take any \mathcal{A}^\dagger -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E[1] \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ where $M, N \neq 0$; the associated \mathcal{A} -long exact sequence is

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(M) \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M) \rightarrow 0$$

and we see $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(N) = 0$. That $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $\text{im } \alpha \in \mathcal{F}$, and so by the S -semistability of E we have $S(\text{im } \alpha) \succeq 0$. On the other hand, we have $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M) \in \mathcal{T}$; since S satisfies refinement-1, we have $S(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M)) \succeq 0$. Overall, we have $S(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)) \succeq 0$. By condition 3.2(S), this means $S'(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)) \succeq 0$, and so $S'(N) = S'(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)[1]) \preceq 0$, i.e. $(-S')(N) \succeq 0$. This shows the $(-S')$ -semistability of $E[1]$ in \mathcal{A}^\dagger .

Suppose E is S -stable in \mathcal{A} . We cannot have $\text{im } \alpha = 0$ as that would imply $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N) \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M)$ lies in both \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{F} , forcing both to vanish and thus $N = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\text{im } \alpha \neq 0$. If $E = \text{im } \alpha$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(M) = 0$ and $M = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M)$ is nonzero, and by refinement-1 we have $S(M) \succ 0$, i.e. $(-S')(M) \prec 0$; if $0 \neq \text{im } \alpha \subsetneq E$, then $S(\text{im } \alpha) \succ 0$ since E is S -stable, giving us $S(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(N)) \succ 0$, and subsequently $(-S')(N) \succ 0$ by the same argument as above. Hence $E[1]$ is $(-S')$ -stable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger . ■

Lemma 3.4 allows us to prove the converse of Lemma 3.5, giving us:

Theorem 3.6. *Assume Configuration I, and let $\mathcal{A}^\dagger = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$. For $i = 0$ or 1 , suppose S satisfies refinement- i with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. Then an object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} if and only if $E[i]$ is $(-1)^i S'$ -semistable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger . The same statement holds if we replace ‘semistable’ with ‘stable.’*

Proof. Since Lemma 3.5 gives the ‘only if’ statements, we only need to prove the ‘if’ statements for $i = 0, 1$; furthermore, we will prove only the ‘semistable’ case, since the adjustments needed for the ‘stable’ case are obvious.

(a) When $i = 0$: Assume that E is an S' -semistable object in \mathcal{A}^\dagger . Since S satisfies refinement-0 with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$, from Lemma 3.4 we know S' satisfies refinement-1 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$, and so E must lie in \mathcal{T} . Now that S', S are in Configuration I with S' satisfying refinement-1 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$, applying Lemma 3.5 gives that $E[1]$ is $(-S)$ -semistable in the heart $\langle \mathcal{T}[1], \mathcal{F}[1] \rangle = \mathcal{A}[1]$.

Now take any \mathcal{A} -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$, which induces the $\mathcal{A}[1]$ -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow E'[1] \rightarrow E[1] \rightarrow E''[1] \rightarrow 0$. The $(-S)$ -semistability of $E[1]$ in $\mathcal{A}[1]$ then implies $(-S)(E'[1]) \preceq 0$, i.e. $S(E') \preceq 0$, showing the S -semistability of E in \mathcal{A} .

(b) When $i = 1$: Assume that $E[1]$ is $(-S')$ -semistable in \mathcal{A}^\dagger . Since S satisfies refinement-1 with respect to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$, from Lemma 3.4 we know $(-S')$ satisfies refinement-0 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$. Now that $(-S'), (-S)$ are in Configuration I with $(-S')$ satisfying refinement-0 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T})$,

applying Lemma 3.5 gives that $E[1]$ is $(-S)$ -semistable in $\mathcal{A}[1]$. The same argument as in (a) then shows that E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} . \blacksquare

Stability defined in terms of weight functions can also be pulled back via an exact equivalence in the obvious manner:

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be an exact equivalence of triangulated categories, and let Φ^K denote the induced isomorphism $K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{U})$ on the Grothendieck groups. Let \mathcal{C} denote the heart of a t-structure on \mathcal{D} and $S' : K(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow R$ be a weight function for some totally ordered abelian group (R, \preceq) . Then an object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is $(S'\Phi^K)$ -semistable in \mathcal{C} if and only if ΦE is S' -semistable in $\Phi\mathcal{C}$. The same statement holds if we replace ‘semistable’ by ‘stable.’*

Under the setup of Lemma 3.7, we have the following commutative diagram

$$(3.7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathcal{U} \\ \downarrow [\] & & \downarrow [\] \\ K(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi^K} & K(\mathcal{U}) \\ & \searrow S'\Phi^K & \downarrow S' \\ & & R \end{array} .$$

We often suppress the notation for the maps $[\]$.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. By the symmetry in the statement of Lemma 3.7, it suffices to prove the ‘only if’ direction. Suppose E is an $(S'\Phi^K)$ -semistable object in \mathcal{C} . Then $\Phi E \in \Phi\mathcal{C}$ and $0 = (S'\Phi^K)(E) = S'(\Phi E)$. Any $\Phi\mathcal{C}$ -short exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow \Phi E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ then induces a \mathcal{C} -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \Psi M \rightarrow E \rightarrow \Psi N \rightarrow 0$ where $\Psi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a quasi-inverse of Φ . The $(S'\Phi^K)$ -semistability of E implies that $0 \succeq (S'\Phi^K)(\Psi M) = S'(\Phi\Psi M) = S'(M)$, showing that ΦE is S' -semistable. The above argument can be easily adjusted to show the ‘stable’ case. \blacksquare

3.8. Configuration II. We say we are in Configuration II when we have the following setting: (R, \preceq) is a totally ordered abelian group, and

- (a) $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $\Psi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are exact equivalences between triangulated categories \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} satisfying $\Psi\Phi \cong \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}[-1]$ and $\Phi\Psi \cong \text{id}_{\mathcal{U}}[-1]$.
- (b) \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are hearts of bounded t-structures on \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} , respectively, such that $\Phi\mathcal{A} \subset D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[0,1]}$. (Given (a), this implies $\Psi\mathcal{B} \subset D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[0,1]}$ by Lemma 3.9 below.)
- (c) $S_{\mathcal{A}} : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow R$ and $S_{\mathcal{B}} : K(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow R$ are group homomorphisms such that, for any $E \in \mathcal{A}$ that is either $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT₀ or $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT₁, we have $\text{sgn } S_{\mathcal{A}}(E) = \text{sgn } S_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E)$.

Configuration II above involves equivalences of triangulated categories, and will be more readily applied to situations in representation theory and algebraic geometry involving tilting equivalences and Fourier-Mukai transforms.

Let us consider some consequences of conditions (a) and (b) in 3.8 before moving on.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} are triangulated categories with exact equivalences $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $\Psi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $\Psi\Phi \cong \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}[-1]$, $\Phi\Psi \cong \text{id}_{\mathcal{U}}[-1]$. If \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are hearts of bounded t-structures on \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} , respectively, such that $\Phi\mathcal{A} \subset D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[0,1]}$, then we also have $\Psi\mathcal{B} \subset D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[0,1]}$.*

Proof. The assumption $\Phi\mathcal{A} \subset D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[0,1]}$ implies $\Phi\mathcal{A} \subset \langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}[-1] \rangle$, and so $\Phi\mathcal{A}$ is a tilt of $\mathcal{B}[-1]$ at some torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in $\mathcal{B}[-1]$ [8, Proposition 2.3.2]. Then $\Phi\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$ while $\mathcal{B}[-1] = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F} \rangle$, from

which we see $\mathcal{B}[-1]$ is a tilt of $\Phi\mathcal{A}[-1]$, i.e. $\mathcal{B}[-1] \subset \langle \Phi\mathcal{A}, \Phi\mathcal{A}[-1] \rangle$, which gives $\Psi\mathcal{B} \subset \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}[-1] \rangle$, i.e. $\Psi\mathcal{B} \subset D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[0,1]}$. \blacksquare

Recall the notation defined in 2.1.3.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose conditions (a) and (b) of Configuration II are satisfied. Then*

- (i) *For $i = 0, 1$, if E is a $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_i$ object in \mathcal{A} then $\Phi E[i]$ is a $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_{1-i}$ object in \mathcal{B} .*
- (ii) *$(W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}, W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}})$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} .*

The same statements hold if we switch the roles of Φ and Ψ and the roles of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Proof. By symmetry in the setup of Lemma 3.9, it suffices to prove statements (i) and (ii).

(i) If $E \in \mathcal{A}$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_0$, then $\Phi E \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\Psi(\Phi E)[1] \cong E \in \mathcal{A}$, showing that ΦE is a $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_1$ object in \mathcal{B} . Similarly, if $E \in \mathcal{A}$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_1$, then $\Phi E \in \mathcal{B}[-1]$ and $\Psi(\Phi E[1]) \cong E \in \mathcal{A}$, showing $\Phi E[1]$ is a $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_0$ object in \mathcal{B} .

(ii) Take any $E \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\Phi E \in D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[0,1]}$, we have an exact triangle

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E \rightarrow \Phi E \rightarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E[-1] \rightarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E[1]$$

which in turn gives the exact triangle

$$(3.10.1) \quad \Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E)[1] \rightarrow E \rightarrow \Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E) \rightarrow \Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E)[2].$$

Since $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E)[1] \in D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[-1,0]}$ while $\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E) \in D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[0,1]}$ by Lemma 3.9. Taking the long exact sequence of cohomology of (3.10.1) with respect to the heart \mathcal{A} gives:

- $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}(\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E)[1]) = 0$, which means that $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E$ is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_1$; by (i), this means $\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^0 E)[1]$ is a $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_0$ object in \mathcal{A} .
- $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E)) = 0$, which means $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E$ is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_0$; by (i), this means $\Psi(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^1 E)$ is a $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_1$ object in \mathcal{A} .

Hence (3.10.1) gives an \mathcal{A} -short exact sequence. That $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}, W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}) = 0$ is clear, and so (ii) follows. \blacksquare

3.10.2. The proof of Lemma 3.10(ii) shows that, when conditions (a) and (b) of Configuration II are in place, given any $E \in \mathcal{A}$, the object $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^i E$ is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT $_{1-i}$ for $i = 0, 1$.

3.11. Passing between Configuration I and Configuration II. We can pass between Configuration I and Configuration II as follows.

3.11.1. To pass from Configuration I to Configuration II, assume the setting and notation of Configuration I in 3.2. By setting $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{D}$, $\Phi = \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\Psi = \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}[-1]$, we obtain condition 3.8(a). Putting $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$, we obtain condition 3.8(b). Finally, choose $S_{\mathcal{A}} = S$ and $S_{\mathcal{B}} = S'$; then an object $E \in \mathcal{A}$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_0$ (resp. $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_1$) if and only if E lies in \mathcal{T} (resp. \mathcal{F}); condition 3.2(S) of Configuration I then implies condition 3.8(c). So we are now in Configuration II.

3.11.2. To pass from Configuration II to Configuration I, assume the setting and notation of Configuration II in 3.8. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \Psi\mathcal{B}[1]$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \subset D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[-1,0]}$ by Lemma 3.9, and so $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is a tilt of \mathcal{A} with respect to some torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{A} by [8, Proposition 2.3.2(b)]. Then $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F} \rangle$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$ while

$$W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} = \{E \in \mathcal{A} : \Phi E \in \mathcal{B}\} = (\Psi[1])(\Phi\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{T},$$

$$W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} = \{E \in \mathcal{A} : \Phi E \in \mathcal{B}[-1]\} = (\Psi[1])(\Phi\mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{B}[-1])) = \mathcal{A} \cap (\tilde{\mathcal{B}}[-1]) = \mathcal{F}.$$

Let Φ^K denote the K -theoretic isomorphism $K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{U})$ induced by the exact equivalence Φ [18, Remark 5.25 i)]. Take $S = S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $S' = S_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \Phi^K$. Condition 3.8(c) in Configuration II now implies the sign condition in Configuration I for S, S' , and we are now in Configuration I.

3.11.3. It is easy to check, that if one starts with the data in Configuration I as in 3.2, and apply the construction in 3.11.1 followed by the construction in 3.11.2, then one obtains the same data that one starts with.

Theorem 3.12. *Assume Configuration II. For $i = 0$ or 1 , suppose the weight function $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies refinement- i with respect to the torsion pair $(W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}, W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}})$ in \mathcal{A} . Then the functor $\Phi[i]$ induces an equivalence from the category of $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable objects in \mathcal{A} to the category of $(-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable objects in \mathcal{B} . The same statement holds if we replace ‘semistable’ by ‘stable.’*

Proof. Assume Configuration II. Using the argument and notation in 3.11.2, we can pass to Configuration I. In particular, we have $S = S_{\mathcal{A}}$, and the torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is the same as $(W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}, W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}})$. Then the weight function S satisfies the refinement property with respect to the torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{A} . By Theorem 3.6, an object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} if and only if $E[i]$ is $(-1)^i S'$ -semistable in the tilted heart $\langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$. Since $(-1)^i S' = (-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}} \Phi^K$ and $\Phi \langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle = \mathcal{B}$, Lemma 3.7 in turn implies that $E[i]$ is $(-1)^i S'$ -semistable in $\langle \mathcal{F}[1], \mathcal{T} \rangle$ if and only if $(\Phi E)[i]$ is $(-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable in \mathcal{B} . This shows the ‘semistable’ case of the theorem. The ‘stable’ case of the theorem follows from the corresponding cases of Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. \blacksquare

We can now recover the following result on representations of algebras due to Chindris. Chindris used Theorem 3.13 to prove the existence of singular moduli spaces of modules for wild tilted algebras, which in turn showed one implication of a conjecture of Weyman’s on strongly simply connected algebras [14, Section 1].

Theorem 3.13. [14, Theorem 1.3(a)] *Let A be a bound quiver algebra, T a basic tilting A -module, and θ an integral weight of A which is well-positioned with respect to T . Let F be either the functor $\text{Hom}_A(T, -)$ in case there are nonzero θ -semistable torsion A -modules or the functor $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, -)$ in case there are nonzero θ -semistable torsion-free A -modules. Denote $\text{End}_A(T)^{op}$ by B and let $u : K(A\text{-mod}) \rightarrow K(B\text{-mod})$ be the isometry induced by the tilting module T . Then the functor F defines an equivalence from the category of θ -semistable A -modules, to the category of $|\theta \circ u^{-1}|$ -semistable B -modules.*

Proof. That T is a tilting module means we have the following derived equivalences that are quasi-inverse to each other

$$\begin{aligned} R\text{Hom}_A(T, -) &: D^b(A\text{-mod}) \rightarrow D^b(B\text{-mod}), \\ T \otimes_B^L - &: D^b(B\text{-mod}) \rightarrow D^b(A\text{-mod}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we know that $R\text{Hom}_A(T, E) \in D_{B\text{-mod}}^{[0,1]}$ for any $E \in A\text{-mod}$, while $T \otimes_B^L F \in D_{A\text{-mod}}^{[-1,0]}$ for any $F \in B\text{-mod}$.

Let us set $\mathcal{A} = A\text{-mod}$ and $\mathcal{B} = B\text{-mod}$, take $\mathcal{D} = D^b(A)$ and $\mathcal{U} = D^b(B)$, take Φ to be the functor $R\text{Hom}_A(T, -)$ and Ψ the functor $(T \otimes_B^L -)[-1]$. Then 3.8(a),(b) are satisfied.

In addition, let us identify $K(\mathcal{A}), K(\mathcal{B})$ with $K(\mathcal{D}), K(\mathcal{U})$, respectively. Let $(R, \preceq) = (\mathbb{Z}, \leq)$, let $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an integral weight $\theta \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K(\mathcal{A}), \mathbb{Z})$ and let $S_{\mathcal{B}} = \theta \circ u^{-1}$ where $u : K(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{B})$ satisfies $u(\dim M) = \dim(\Phi M)$, with $\dim(-)$ denoting the dimension vector of a module. Then we obtain the

commutative diagram

(3.13.1)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathcal{U} \\
 \dim \downarrow & & \downarrow \dim \\
 K(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{u} & K(\mathcal{U}) \\
 & \searrow S_A & \downarrow S_B \\
 & & \mathbb{Z}
 \end{array}$$

Then for any $E \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$S_A(\dim E) = \theta(\dim E) = (\theta \circ u^{-1})(\dim \Phi E) = S_B(\dim \Phi E),$$

which implies that 3.8(c) is also satisfied. Hence we are in Configuration II. Moreover, Chindris' definition of θ being well-positioned with respect to T implies the refinement property for S_A with respect to the torsion pair $(W_{0,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}, W_{1,\Phi,\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}})$ (see [14, Definition 3.2]). Depending on whether S_A satisfies refinement-0 or refinement-1, $|S_B|$ -semistability in the sense of [14, Section 3B] coincides with $(-1)^i S_B$ -semistability. Theorem 3.12 now specialises to Theorem 3.13. \blacksquare

4. POLYNOMIAL STABILITY CONDITIONS

We slightly extend the definition of polynomial stability conditions as originally given by Bayer [4]. In particular, we allow our central charges to take values in the ring $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ of convergent Laurent series in $\frac{1}{v}$, instead of only the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[v]$.

4.1. Big O , big Θ . Given functions $f, g : (l, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $l \in \mathbb{R}$, recall that we write $f = O(g)$ if there exist constants $C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $k \in (l, \infty)$ such that $|f(v)| \leq C|g(v)|$ for all $v > k$, and we write $f = \Theta(g)$ if $f = O(g)$ as well as $g = O(f)$.

4.1.1. Power series. For $K = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , we will write $K[[w]]$ to denote the ring of power series in the indeterminate w over K . We will write $K[[w]]^c$ to denote the K -subalgebra of power series with positive radii of convergence. We can also regard $\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$ as a subring of $\mathbb{C}[[w]]^c$ by [1, Theorem 2, Chap. 2].

4.1.2. Laurent series. For $K = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , we will write $K((w))$ to denote the field of formal Laurent series in the indeterminate w over K , which we take to be series of the form

$$\sum_{k \geq m} a_k w^k \quad \text{where } m \in \mathbb{Z}, a_k \in K \text{ for all } k \geq m.$$

We only allow finitely many negative-degree terms in a formal Laurent series. We will write $K((w))^c$ to denote the subfield of $K((w))$ consisting of series that are convergent on punctured disks of positive radii centered at 0, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
 K((w))^c &= \{f(w) \in K((w)) : f \text{ converges on } 0 < |w| < R \text{ for some } R > 0\} \\
 &= \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \frac{1}{w^k} K[[w]]^c.
 \end{aligned}$$

In particular, every element of $K((w))^c$ is uniformly convergent on some punctured disk of positive radius centered at 0. For any $f \in \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$, if we write $f = \sum_{k \geq m} a_k (\frac{1}{v})^k$ where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ for $k \geq m$ and $a_m \neq 0$, then we have $\Theta(f) = \frac{1}{v^m}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

4.1.3. We have a partial order \preceq on $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ determined by

$$f \preceq g \text{ if and only if } f(v) \leq g(v) \text{ for } v \gg 0.$$

It is clear that $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ is totally ordered with respect to \preceq , and so $(\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c, \preceq)$ is a totally ordered abelian group with respect to addition.

4.2. Polynomial phase function. Given any nonzero $f(v) \in \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$, we can write $f(v) = \sum_{k \leq m} a_k v^k$ where $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ for $k \leq m$, for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $a_m \neq 0$. Then $f(v) = v^m g(v)$ for some $g(v) \in \mathbb{C}[[\frac{1}{v}]]^c$. Thus $f(v)$ is an analytic function in the region $|v| > r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and, in particular, if we let $v \rightarrow \infty$ along the positive real axis, then there is a continuous function germ $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi\phi(v)} \quad \text{for } v \gg 0.$$

Note that the choice of the function germ ϕ is only unique up to translation by integer multiples of 2. Any function germ ϕ arising in this manner will be called a *polynomial phase function*. Since $a_m \neq 0$ by assumption, $g(v)$ has nonzero constant term a_m , which means the limit $\phi(\infty) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi(v)$ exists and $a_m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi\phi(\infty)}$.

Given polynomial phase functions ϕ_1, ϕ_2 , we write $\phi_1 \prec \phi_2$ (resp. $\phi_1 \preceq \phi_2$) if $\phi_1(v) < \phi_2(v)$ (resp. $\phi_1(v) \leq \phi_2(v)$) for $v \gg 0$.

Lemma 4.3. *The set of all polynomial phase functions is totally ordered with respect to \preceq .*

Proof. Suppose f_1, f_2 are nonzero elements of $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ that give rise to polynomial phase functions ϕ_1, ϕ_2 , respectively. We need to show that ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are comparable with respect to \preceq .

From above, we know that the limits of $\phi_1(v), \phi_2(v)$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ along the real axis exist. If these two limits are not equal, then either $\phi_1 \prec \phi_2$ or $\phi_1 \succ \phi_2$. Therefore, it remains to consider the case where the limits are equal.

Suppose now $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi_1(v) = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi_2(v)$, and let ϕ denote the particular branch of phase functions of the quotient f_1/f_2 satisfying $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi(v) = 0$, and that $\phi(v) \in (-1, 1)$ for $v \gg 0$. Then determining the order relation between ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is equivalent to determining the order relation between ϕ and the constant phase function 0. Since $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ is a field, we can write

$$\frac{f_1}{f_2} = v^m \sum_{j \geq 0} a_j \left(\frac{1}{v}\right)^j$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_0 \neq 0$. Note that $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ since $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi(v) = 0$. If all the coefficients a_k lie in \mathbb{R} , then $\phi = 0$; otherwise, let j' be the least positive integer such that $a_{j'} \notin \mathbb{R}$. Then we have $\phi \prec 0$ (resp. $\phi \succ 0$) if the imaginary part of $a_{j'}$ is negative (resp. positive), and the lemma follows. \blacksquare

4.4. (Weak) polynomial stability function. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category, and \mathcal{A} the heart of a bounded t-structure on \mathcal{D} . We say a group homomorphism $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ is a *weak polynomial stability function* on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(\phi_0, \phi_0 + 1]$ if there exists a polynomial phase function ϕ_0 such that, for all nonzero objects E in \mathcal{A} , we have

$$Z(E)(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot e^{i\pi(\phi_0(v), \phi_0(v)+1]} \quad \text{for } v \gg 0.$$

Note that we allow the possibility of $Z(E) = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ for a nonzero object E in \mathcal{A} . Whenever Z is a weak polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} , we will set

$$\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z} = \{E \in \mathcal{A} : Z(E) = 0\}.$$

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z}$ is a Serre subcategory of \mathcal{A} (i.e. closed under subobject and quotient).

A weak polynomial stability function Z will be called a *polynomial stability function* if $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z} = \{0\}$, i.e. for all nonzero objects E in \mathcal{A} we have

$$Z(E)(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot e^{i\pi(\phi_0(v), \phi_0(v)+1]} \quad \text{for } v \gg 0.$$

Remark 4.4.1. Every real number r is a (constant) polynomial phase function, since it arises from the constant polynomial $e^{ir\pi}$ in $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ (see 4.2).

4.4.2. Given a weak polynomial stability function Z as in 4.4, for every $0 \neq E \in \mathcal{A}$ we define the (polynomial) phase function $\phi_Z(E)$ as a function germ $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via the relations

$$\begin{cases} Z(E)(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi\phi_Z(E)(v)} \text{ for } v \gg 0, \text{ and } \phi_0 \prec \phi_Z(E) \preceq \phi_0 + 1 & \text{if } Z(E) \neq 0, \\ \phi_Z(E) = \phi_0 + 1 & \text{if } Z(E) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that we always have $\phi_0 \prec \phi_Z(E) \preceq \phi_0 + 1$ for $0 \neq E \in \mathcal{A}$. A nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable) if, for every \mathcal{A} -short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

where $M, N \neq 0$, we have

$$\phi_Z(M) \preceq \phi_Z(N) \quad (\text{resp. } \phi_Z(M) \prec \phi_Z(N)).$$

More generally, we say that an object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable) if $E[j]$ is a Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable) object in \mathcal{A} for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, in which case we define $\phi_Z(E)$ via the relation $\phi_Z(E) + j = \phi_Z(E[j])$. We say Z satisfies the Harder-Narasimhan (HN) property on \mathcal{A} if every nonzero object E in \mathcal{A} admits an \mathcal{A} -filtration

$$(4.4.3) \quad 0 = E_0 \subsetneq E_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq E_m = E$$

for some $m \geq 1$, where each quotient E_i/E_{i-1} ($1 \leq i \leq m$) is a Z -semistable object and

$$\phi_Z(E_1/E_0) \succ \phi_Z(E_2/E_1) \succ \cdots \succ \phi_Z(E_m/E_{m-1}).$$

4.4.4. (Weak) polynomial stability condition. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category and \mathcal{A} the heart of a bounded t-structure on \mathcal{D} . If Z is a (resp. weak) polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} (with respect to $(\phi_0, \phi_0 + 1]$ for some ϕ_0) that satisfies the HN property, then we say (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a (resp. weak) polynomial stability condition on \mathcal{D} .

4.4.5. Bayer's polynomial stability condition. If we require the central charge Z of a polynomial stability condition to take values in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[v]$, then we obtain the original definition of a polynomial stability condition in the sense of Bayer [4].

4.4.6. Bridgeland stability condition. A stability condition as defined by Bridgeland in [10] is a polynomial stability condition (Z, \mathcal{A}) where $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a (constant) polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(0, 1]$, where we regard 0 and 1 as constant polynomial phase functions (see Remark 4.4.1). We will write $\text{Stab}(X)$ to denote the space of stability conditions as defined by Bridgeland that are both full and locally finite (these two properties together are equivalent to the support property - see [33, Section 5.2]); $\text{Stab}(X)$ has the structure of a complex manifold.

4.4.7. Note on terminology. For convenience, we will say a pair (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a Bridgeland stability condition on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} with respect to $(a, a + 1]$, or simply a Bridgeland stability condition, if (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a polynomial stability condition on \mathcal{D} with respect to $(a, a + 1]$ for some constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ takes values in \mathbb{C} . In particular, we do not require that $a = 0$ as in [10]. This use of terminology gives more consistency with the literature on polynomial stability conditions such as [4, 8], and gives us more flexibility in manipulating stability using both autoequivalences and "GL-actions" (see 5.2) simultaneously, especially when we are more interested in the semistability of objects themselves and their moduli spaces.

4.5. Slicing. Suppose (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a polynomial stability condition on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} . For any polynomial phase function ϕ , let us write $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$ to denote the full subcategory of Z -semistable objects

E in \mathcal{D} with phase function $\phi_Z(E) = \phi$, together with the zero object. For any interval I of polynomial phase functions, we will define $\mathcal{P}(I)$ as a full subcategory of \mathcal{D} via the extension closure

$$\mathcal{P}(I) = \langle \mathcal{P}(\phi) : \phi \in I \rangle.$$

On the other hand, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we will write $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}(r)$ to denote the full subcategory of Z -semistable objects E in \mathcal{D} with $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \phi_Z(E)(v) = r$, together with the zero object. For any interval I in \mathbb{R} , we will define $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}(I)$ as a full subcategory of \mathcal{D} via the extension closure

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}(I) = \langle \widehat{\mathcal{P}}(r) : r \in I \rangle.$$

If (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a polynomial stability condition with respect to $(a, a + 1]$ on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{P} denotes its slicing, then the data of $(Z, \mathcal{A}, (a, a + 1])$ is equivalent to the data (Z, \mathcal{P}) [4, Proposition 2.3.3]. As a result, we also refer to (Z, \mathcal{P}) as a polynomial stability condition (which was how the notion was originally defined by Bayer [4]). For a triangulated category \mathcal{D} , we formally define $\text{Stab}_{\text{pol}}(\mathcal{D})$ to be the set of all polynomial stability conditions (Z, \mathcal{P}) on \mathcal{D} .

4.6. Slope functions. Suppose \mathcal{D} is a triangulated category, $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ is a group homomorphism, and \mathcal{A} is an abelian subcategory of \mathcal{D} such that

$$Z(E)(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} e^{i\pi(0,1]} \quad \text{for } v \gg 0$$

for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$. Then we can define a function $\mu_Z : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \cup \{\infty\}$ by setting

$$\mu_Z(E) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\Re Z(E)}{\Im Z(E)} & \text{if } \Im Z(E) \neq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } \Im Z(E) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

The partial order \preceq on $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ (see 4.1.3) can be extended to $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \cup \{\infty\}$ by declaring $f \prec \infty$ for any $f \in \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$. We then define a nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{A}$ to be μ_Z -semistable (resp. μ_Z -stable) if, for every \mathcal{A} -short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

where $M, N \neq 0$, we have $\mu_Z(M) \preceq \mu_Z(N)$ (resp. $\mu_Z(M) \prec \mu_Z(N)$). We will refer to any function of the form μ_Z as a *slope function* on \mathcal{A} . In particular, we do not require \mathcal{A} to be the heart of a t-structure on \mathcal{D} .

4.6.1. In the setting of 4.6, even though \mathcal{A} is not necessarily the heart of a t-structure on \mathcal{D} , we can still define polynomial phase functions $\phi_Z(-)$ associated to Z and define the notion of Z -(semi)stability for objects in \mathcal{A} . For any nonzero objects $E, E' \in \mathcal{A}$, it is easy to see that $\mu_Z(E) \preceq \mu_Z(E')$ if and only if $\phi_Z(E) \preceq \phi_Z(E')$. Therefore, a nonzero object E of \mathcal{A} is μ_Z -semistable (resp. μ_Z -stable) if and only if it is Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable). When Z has the HN property on \mathcal{A} , we will say that μ_Z has the HN property. In particular, when \mathcal{A} is a noetherian abelian category, if we assume that the image of Z is contained in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$, then Z always satisfies the HN property on \mathcal{A} [32, Proposition 3.4]. When μ_Z is a slope function with the HN property and E is a nonzero object in \mathcal{A} with Z -HN filtration as in (4.4.3), we set $\mu_{Z, \max}(E) = \mu_Z(E_1/E_0)$ and $\mu_{Z, \min}(E) = \mu_Z(E_m/E_{m-1})$.

Example 4.6.2. Let X be a smooth projective curve and $\mathcal{A} = \text{Coh}(X)$ as in Example 3.1.3. Consider the polynomial stability function $Z : K(D^b(\mathcal{A})) = K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on \mathcal{A} given by

$$Z(E) = -\deg E + irk E.$$

Then the slope function $\mu_Z(E) = (\deg E)/(rk E)$ is the usual slope function for slope stability for coherent sheaves on X .

4.7. Different types of stability so far. So far in this article, we have defined two main types of stability:

- (i) stability defined by a weight function on a triangulated category (in 3.1);
- (ii) stability defined by a weak polynomial stability function on a triangulated category (in 4.4.2).

Our definition of a weak polynomial stability condition specialises to a particular type of Bayer's polynomial stability condition (see 4.4.5 and [4, Definition 2.3.1]), which in turn specialises to stability in the sense of Bridgeland (see 4.4.6 and [10]). Notions of stability that arise from 'slope functions' such as those in Example 4.6.2 or slope-like functions as in [32, 3.2] can also be interpreted as arising from weak polynomial stability conditions (see 4.6).

In Lemma 4.8, we show how a weak polynomial stability function can be used to construct weight functions. This lemma generalises [39, Proposition 3.4] by Rudakov:

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose \mathcal{D} is a triangulated category, and \mathcal{A} is the heart of a bounded t -structure on \mathcal{D} . Suppose $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ is a weak polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(0, 1]$, and M is a fixed object in \mathcal{A} such that $Z(M) \neq 0$. Consider the group homomorphism $S : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ given by*

$$(4.8.1) \quad S(E) := S_{Z,M}(E) := \begin{vmatrix} \Re Z(M) & \Im Z(M) \\ \Re Z(E) & \Im Z(E) \end{vmatrix} = -(\Im Z(M))(\Re Z(E)) + (\Re Z(M))(\Im Z(E)).$$

Then $S(M) = 0$, and for any object $E \in \mathcal{A}$ with $Z(E) \neq 0$, we have

- (i) $\phi_Z(E) \prec \phi_Z(M) \Leftrightarrow S(E) \prec 0$.
- (ii) $\phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M) \Leftrightarrow S(E) = 0$. When $S(E) = 0$, we have $\Im Z(E) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Im Z(M) = 0$.
- (iii) $\phi_Z(E) \succ \phi_Z(M) \Leftrightarrow S(E) \succ 0$, provided $\Im Z(M) \succ 0$.

For (iv) and (v), assume further that $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z}, E) = 0$:

- (iv) E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} if and only if $\begin{cases} \phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M) \\ E \text{ is } Z\text{-semistable in } \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$.
- (v) If E is S -stable in \mathcal{A} , then $\begin{cases} \phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M) \\ E \text{ is } Z\text{-stable in } \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$. If Z is a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} , then the converse also holds.

Proof. Let μ_Z denote the slope function constructed from Z as in 4.6. Note that for any two objects $C, D \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Z(C), Z(D) \neq 0$, we have $\mu_Z(C) \prec \mu_Z(D) \Leftrightarrow \phi_Z(C) \prec \phi_Z(D)$.

(i)-(iii): Since $Z(M), Z(E)$ are both nonzero, for $v \gg 0$, the two by two determinant in (4.8.1) equals the area of the parallelogram formed by $Z(M)(v)$ and $Z(E)(v)$ on the complex plane, given by $|Z(M)(v)||Z(E)(v)| \sin \theta$ where θ is the angle from $Z(M)$ to $Z(E)$ measured in the counterclockwise direction. The equivalences in (i), the first part of (ii), and (iii) then follow immediately.

Note that for any $0 \neq C \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $\Im Z(C) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi_Z(C) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mu_Z(C) = \infty$, regardless of whether $Z(C)$ itself is zero. Thus the second part of (ii) follows from the first part of (ii).

(iv): Suppose E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} . Then $S(E) = 0$ by definition and $\phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M)$ by (ii). Take any short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} where $E', E'' \neq 0$. By the S -semistability of E , we have $S(E') \leq 0$. By our assumption on E , we also have $Z(E') \neq 0$, and so replacing E by E' in (i) and (ii) gives $\phi_Z(E') \leq \phi_Z(M) = \phi_Z(E)$. Since $Z(E')$ is nonzero, this implies $\phi_Z(E') \leq \phi_Z(E'')$.

For the converse, suppose $\phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M)$ and E is Z -semistable in \mathcal{A} . Take any $0 \neq E' \subsetneq E$ in \mathcal{A} and complete it to a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Then $E'' \neq 0$, and by the Z -semistability of E we have $\phi_Z(E') \leq \phi_Z(E'')$. We also have $Z(E') \neq 0$ by our assumption on E . We now have two cases:

- (a) If $Z(E'') = 0$, then $Z(E') = Z(E)$ and so $\phi_Z(E') = \phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M)$, implying $S(E') = 0$ by (ii).
- (b) If $Z(E'') \neq 0$, then $Z(E'), Z(E'')$ are both nonzero, and the assumption $\phi_Z(E') \leq \phi_Z(E'')$ implies $\phi_Z(E') \leq \phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M)$, which in turn implies $S(E') \leq 0$ by (i) and (ii).

Hence E is S -semistable in \mathcal{A} .

(v) The first part of (v) follows from the same proof as the first part of (iv), with the argument adapted in the obvious manner for E being S -stable.

For the second part of (v), we assume that Z is a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} . This means that every nonzero object C of \mathcal{A} satisfies $Z(C) \neq 0$. The proof for the second part of (iv) then applies with the obvious adjustments, the main difference being that since $E'' \neq 0$, we must have $Z(E'') \neq 0$, and so case (a) in the proof of (iv) does not occur. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.8(v) suggests that when Z is a weak polynomial stability function on a heart \mathcal{A} that is not a polynomial stability function, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z} \neq \{0\}$, the notion of Z -stability is weaker than the notion of S -stability in general (with M, S chosen as in the Lemma). A concrete example is as follows:

Example 4.8.2. Suppose X is a smooth projective surface and ω an ample divisor on X . Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{Coh}(X)$ and $Z(E) = -\omega \text{ch}_1(E) + i \text{ch}_0(E)$. Then (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a weak polynomial stability condition on $D^b(X)$ with respect to $(0, 1]$, and \mathcal{O}_X is a Z -stable object in \mathcal{A} . Nonetheless, Z is not a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} since $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z} = \text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X)$. If we choose $M = \mathcal{O}_X$ and define S as in Lemma 4.8, then \mathcal{O}_X is not S -stable because, for any 0-dimensional subscheme W of X , if we write I_W to denote its ideal sheaf then $0 \neq I_W \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_X$ but $S(I_W) = S(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$.

Remark 4.8.3. Previous constructions that pass between King's stability and Bridgeland stability can be found in [12, 6.2] and [6, Lemma 7.1.3].

Given any polynomial stability condition on a triangulated category, the following lemma shows that the associated weight function constructed in Lemma 4.8 always satisfies a refinement property.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a weak polynomial stability condition with respect to $(0, 1]$. Let M be a fixed object of \mathcal{A} such that $Z(M) \neq 0$, and let S be the weight function (4.8.1). Then for any polynomial phase function ϕ_0 satisfying $0 \prec \phi_0 \leq 1$, the weight function S satisfies the refinement property with respect to the torsion pair*

$$(\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1], \mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0])$$

in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. That $(\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1], \mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0])$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{A} follows from the HN property of Z . For any nonzero S -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} , we have $S(E) = 0$ and hence $\phi_Z(E) = \phi_Z(M)$ by Lemma 4.8(ii). Depending on whether $\phi_Z(E) \succ \phi_0$ or $\phi_Z(E) \leq \phi_0$ (where $\phi_Z(E)$ and ϕ_0 are comparable by Lemma 4.3), the object E lies in either $\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1]$ or $\mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0]$, respectively.

Lastly, suppose every nonzero S -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} lies in $\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1]$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0]$); then for every nonzero object F in $\mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0]$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1]$), we have $\phi_Z(E) \succ \phi_Z(F)$ (resp. $\phi_Z(E) \prec \phi_Z(F)$), which is equivalent to $0 = S(E) \succ S(F)$ (resp. $0 = S(E) \prec S(F)$) by Lemma 4.8(i) (resp. Lemma 4.8(iii)). Hence S satisfies the refinement property with respect to $(\mathcal{P}_Z(\phi_0, 1], \mathcal{P}_Z(0, \phi_0])$. \blacksquare

5. POLYNOMIAL STABILITY AND CONFIGURATION III

In this section, we give a configuration of weak polynomial stability functions, and prove a general 'preservation of stability' result under this configuration without assuming the Harder-Narasimhan property.

5.1. Group actions on Bridgeland stability. For a triangulated category \mathcal{D} , recall that the space $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ of Bridgeland stability conditions on \mathcal{D} possesses a right action by the group $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$, the universal covering space of $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$, and a left action by $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$, the group of exact autoequivalences of \mathcal{D} , and that these two actions commute (see [10, Lemma 8.2] or [33, Remark 5.14]). Elements of $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ can be considered as pairs (T, g) where $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is an orientation-preserving

\mathbb{R} -linear isomorphism, and $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an increasing map such that $g(x+1) = g(x) + 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, with the compatibility that the induced maps on $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{R}_{>0} = \mathbb{R}/2\mathbb{Z}$ are the same.

In particular, if (Z, \mathcal{A}) is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(a, a+1]$ on a triangulated category \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{P} denotes its slicing, then the data of (Z, \mathcal{A}) together with the data $(a, a+1]$ are determined by the pair (Z, \mathcal{P}) , and vice versa [10, Proposition 5.3]. Given an element (T, g) of $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$, we set $(Z, \mathcal{P}) \cdot (T, g) = (Z', \mathcal{P}')$ where $Z'(-) = T^{-1} \cdot (Z(-))$ and $\mathcal{P}'(x) = \mathcal{P}(g(x))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, given an element $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$, we set $\Phi \cdot (Z, \mathcal{P}) = (Z'', \mathcal{P}'')$ where $Z'' = Z \circ (\Phi^K)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{P}''(x) = \Phi(\mathcal{P}(x))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the heart notation, we can also say $\Phi \cdot (Z, \mathcal{P})$ is the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z'', \Phi(\mathcal{P}(a, a+1]))$ with respect to $(a, a+1]$.

We will now extend these group actions to polynomial stability conditions.

5.2. Induced map on polynomial phase functions. We define induced maps on the set of polynomial phase functions using certain elements of $\text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$. Given an element $T \in \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$, there exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $T_v := T(v)$ lies in $\text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ for all $v \geq v_0$. This defines a path

$$\text{Pa}(T) : [v_0, \infty) \rightarrow \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto T_v$$

in $\text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. We now set

$$\text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c) = \{T \in \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c) : T_v \in \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) \text{ for } v \gg 0\}.$$

5.2.1. Suppose $T \in \text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$. There exists $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $T_v \in \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ for all $v \geq v_1$, i.e. by restricting the domain if necessary, we can assume the path $\text{Pa}(T)$ is a path in $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$, and hence can be lifted to a path in the universal covering space $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ of $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$:

$$(5.2.2) \quad \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T) : [v_1, \infty) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto (T_v, g_v).$$

Now, given a polynomial phase function ϕ , take any $0 \neq f \in \mathbb{C}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ that gives rise to ϕ , i.e. any f satisfying

$$f(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi\phi(v)} \text{ for } v \gg 0.$$

By regarding $\mathbb{C}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ as an $\mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ -vector space in the obvious manner, elements of $\text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$ act on $\mathbb{C}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ from the left and we have

$$(Tf)(v) = T_v \cdot f(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi g_v(\phi(v))} \text{ for } v \gg 0.$$

As a result, $v \mapsto g_v(\phi(v))$ defines a polynomial phase function. Writing P to denote the set of all polynomial phase functions, we obtain an order-preserving bijection $\Gamma_T : P \rightarrow P : \phi \mapsto \phi'$ where

$$\phi'(v) = g_v(\phi(v)) \text{ for } v \gg 0.$$

In this notation, we have

$$(Tf)(v) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot e^{i\pi(\Gamma_T\phi)(v)} \text{ for } v \gg 0.$$

Note that the definition of Γ_T is independent of the choice of f since T is a $\mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ -linear automorphism of $\mathbb{C}(\frac{1}{v})^c$. On the other hand, the definition of Γ_T is dependent on the choice of the lifted path $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$ in $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ (and in particular, dependent on the choice $\{g_v\}_v$).

It is clear, that for any $T \in \text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$, we have $\Gamma_T(\phi+1) = \Gamma_T(\phi) + 1$.

5.2.3. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category and $Z : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(\frac{1}{v})^c$ a weak polynomial stability function on a heart \mathcal{A} with respect to $(\phi_0, \phi_0 + 1]$, for some polynomial phase function ϕ_0 . For any $T \in \text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}(\frac{1}{v})^c)$, set $(TZ)(E) = T \cdot Z(E)$. Then TZ is a weak polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(\Gamma_T(\phi_0), \Gamma_T(\phi_0) + 1]$ for any choice of Γ_T from 5.2.1. Moreover, if E_1, E_2 are nonzero objects of \mathcal{A} , then $\phi_Z(E_1) \prec \phi_Z(E_2)$ if and only if $\phi_{TZ}(E_1) \prec \phi_{TZ}(E_2)$. Additionally, a nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable) in \mathcal{A} of phase ϕ if and only if it is (TZ) -semistable (resp. (TZ) -stable) in \mathcal{A} of phase $\Gamma_T(\phi)$.

5.2.4. Group of lifted paths. Let $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ denote the set of germs of all possible lifted paths of the form $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$ in (5.2.2), for some $T \in \text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$. That is, elements of $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ are represented by paths in $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ of the form (5.2.2), and two such paths

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T) &: [v_1, \infty) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto (T_v, g_v), \\ \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T') &: [v_2, \infty) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto (T'_v, g'_v)\end{aligned}$$

are identified if, for some $v_3 \geq \max\{v_1, v_2\}$, we have $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)|_{[v_3, \infty)} = \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T')|_{[v_3, \infty)}$. The set $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ has a natural group structure with multiplication given by

$$\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T') : [\max\{v_1, v_2\}, \infty) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto (T_v, g_v)(T'_v, g'_v)$$

which is clearly a lift of the path $[\max\{v_1, v_2\}, \infty) \rightarrow \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto T_v T'_v$.

5.2.5. We are now ready to extend the group actions on Bridgeland stability conditions in 5.1 to the setting of polynomial stability conditions. Recall from 4.5 the definition of the set $\text{Stab}_{\text{pol}}(\mathcal{D})$ of polynomial stability conditions on \mathcal{D} . The group $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ acts on $\text{Stab}_{\text{pol}}(\mathcal{D})$ as follows: given an element

$$\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T) : [v_1, \infty) \rightarrow \widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) : v \mapsto (T_v, g_v)$$

of $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ and an element (Z, \mathcal{P}) of $\text{Stab}_{\text{pol}}(\mathcal{X})$ where \mathcal{P} denotes the slicing, we set $(Z, \mathcal{P}) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T) = (Z', \mathcal{P}')$ where $Z' = T^{-1}Z(-)$ and $\mathcal{P}'(\phi) = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_T(\phi))$. On the other hand, if $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is an exact equivalence of triangulated categories, $\Phi \cdot (Z, \mathcal{P}) = (Z'', \mathcal{P}'')$ is the polynomial stability condition on \mathcal{U} where $Z'' = Z \circ (\Phi^K)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{P}''(\phi) = \Phi(\mathcal{P}(\phi))$. When $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}$, it is easy to check that the actions of $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$ and $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$ on $\text{Stab}_{\text{pol}}(\mathcal{D})$ commute.

5.2.6. For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we will set $\mathbb{H}[r] := \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi(r, r+1]}$ and simply write \mathbb{H} for $\mathbb{H}[0]$, the usual "upper half plane" in the literature on stability conditions. For any $f \in \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ and any polynomial phase function ψ , we will write $f \in \mathbb{H}[\psi]$ to mean $f(v) \in \mathbb{H}[\psi(v)]$ for $v \gg 0$.

Example 5.2.7. (Dilation) Suppose d_1, d_2 are elements of $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ such that $d_1, d_2 \succ 0$. Then $T = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$ gives an $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ -linear map (also denoted by T by abuse of notation)

$$\begin{aligned}T : \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \\ f &\mapsto (d_1 \Re f) + i(d_2 \Im f)\end{aligned}$$

and T is an element of $\text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$. Let Γ_T denote the choice of induced map $P \rightarrow P$ on the set of polynomial phase functions, such that Γ_T fixes elements of $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. Notice that for every $v \gg 0$, the map $T(v) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfies the following properties:

- (1) $T(v)$ preserves each half-axis.
- (2) $T(v)$ preserves each quadrant.

Under our assumption that Γ_T fixes elements of $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, property (2) implies that if ϕ is a polynomial phase function such that $\phi \in \mathbb{H}[k]$ for some $k \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, then $\Gamma_T(\phi) \in \mathbb{H}[k]$ as well.

Example 5.2.8. (Rotation) Consider the $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ -linear map $T : \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ given by multiplication by $(-i)$, i.e.

$$Tf := (-i)f = (\Im f) + i(-\Re f) \quad \text{for } f \in \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c.$$

Then we can choose Γ_T to be $\Gamma_T(\phi) = \phi - \frac{1}{2}$. Also, under the identification $\mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)^{\oplus 2} : f \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$Tf = T \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re f \\ \Im f \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, T lies in $\mathrm{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$.

5.3. Configurations III-w and III. We say we are in Configuration III-w when we have the following setting:

- (a) $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and $\Psi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are exact equivalences between triangulated categories \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} satisfying $\Psi\Phi \cong \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}}[-1]$ and $\Phi\Psi \cong \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{U}}[-1]$.
- (b) \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are hearts of bounded t-structures on \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U} , respectively, such that $\Phi\mathcal{A} \subset D_{\mathcal{B}}^{[0,1]}$.
- (c) There exist *weak* polynomial stability functions $Z_{\mathcal{A}} : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ and $Z_{\mathcal{B}} : K(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ on \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} with respect to $(a, a+1], (b, b+1]$, respectively, together with an element $T \in \mathrm{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$ such that

$$(5.3.1) \quad Z_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) = TZ_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \quad \text{for all } E \in \mathcal{D}$$

and a choice of an induced map Γ_T such that

$$(5.3.2) \quad a \prec \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec a + 1.$$

We say we are in Configuration III if conditions (a), (b), and (c) all hold, with the additional condition that the stability functions $Z_{\mathcal{A}}, Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ in (c) are polynomial stability functions, i.e. $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(C) \neq 0$ (resp. $Z_{\mathcal{B}}(C) \neq 0$) for every nonzero object C in \mathcal{A} (resp. \mathcal{B}). We do not impose the HN property in either Configuration III-w or Configuration III.

Note that Conditions (a) and (b) in Configuration III-w are exactly the same as Conditions (a) and (b) in Configuration II in 3.8. Also, imposing (5.3.1) is equivalent to imposing commutativity in the lower square of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathcal{U} \\ \downarrow [\] & & \downarrow [\] \\ K(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi^K} & K(\mathcal{U}) \\ \downarrow Z_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow Z_{\mathcal{B}} \\ \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c & \xrightarrow{T} & \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c \end{array} .$$

Although all the applications in Section 7 and later in this article use Configuration III, we prove some results for Configuration III-w in this section as they may be useful in future work.

5.3.3. Notation. Under the setting of Configuration III-w, for any object $0 \neq E \in \mathcal{B}$ and any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we will set $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(E[j]) = \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(E) + j$. Also, for convenience, we will write $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}, \phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ for the phase functions $\phi_{Z_{\mathcal{A}}}, \phi_{Z_{\mathcal{B}}}$, respectively.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume Configuration III-w. For any object E in \mathcal{A} with $Z(E) \neq 0$ and any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$Z_{\mathcal{B}}(E[j]) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} e^{i\pi\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(E[j])}.$$

Moreover, if E is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_j$ where $j = 0$ or 1 , then

$$(5.4.1) \quad \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) = \Gamma_T(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)).$$

Proof. The first assertion is clear. To see the second assertion, suppose E is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_j$. Using the first assertion together with (5.3.1), we obtain

$$(-1)^j TZ_{\mathcal{A}}(E) = (-1)^j Z_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) = Z_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E[j]) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot e^{i\pi\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E[j])}$$

while we also have $TZ_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cdot e^{i\pi(\Gamma_T(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)))}$. Altogether, these give

$$\Gamma_T(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)) + j + 2k = \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E[j]) \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We would be done if we can show that $k = 0$.

Since $\Phi E \in \mathcal{B}[-j]$, we have

$$(5.4.2) \quad \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) \in (b - j, b + 1 - j].$$

On the other hand, since $E \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$(5.4.3) \quad \Gamma_T(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)) + 2k \in (\Gamma_T(a) + 2k, \Gamma_T(a + 1) + 2k].$$

Hence the intersection of the intervals

$$(b - j, b + 1 - j] \cap (\Gamma_T(a) + 2k, \Gamma_T(a + 1) + 2k]$$

must be nonempty, i.e.

$$(\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) - j, \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) + 1 - j] \cap (a + 2k, a + 1 + 2k]$$

is nonempty. The assumption (5.3.2) now gives $(\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) - j, \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) + 1 - j] \subset (a - j, a + 2 - j)$, so in order for the above intersection to be nonempty, we are forced to have $k = 0$, proving (5.4.1) for $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_j$ objects E in \mathcal{A} . \blacksquare

Remark 5.4.4. The proof of Lemma 5.4 stills works when we have a non-strict inequality on the right of (5.3.2), i.e.

$$a \prec \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \preceq a + 1.$$

5.5. Symmetry in Configuration III-w. Assume Configuration III-w. Note that conditions (a) and (b) in 5.3 are symmetric in Φ, Ψ and \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} by Lemma 3.9. To see the symmetry in 5.3(c), let us write $F = \Phi E$ so that $E = \Psi F[1]$. Then (5.3.1) yields $T^{-1}Z_{\mathcal{B}}(F) = Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi F[1])$, i.e.

$$Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi F) = (-T^{-1})Z_{\mathcal{B}}(F)$$

where $\widehat{T} := -T^{-1} = (-1)T^{-1}$ also lies in $\mathrm{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$. If we choose $\Gamma_{\widehat{T}} : P \rightarrow P$ to be the induced map on polynomial phase functions (see 5.2.1) such that $\Gamma_{\widehat{T}} = (\Gamma_T)^{-1} - 1$, then $(\Gamma_{\widehat{T}})^{-1} = \Gamma_T + 1$ and the relation (5.3.2) implies

$$\Gamma_T(a) \prec b \prec \Gamma_T(a) + 1,$$

which in turn implies

$$b \prec \Gamma_T(a) + 1 \prec b + 1$$

where $\Gamma_T(a) + 1 = (\Gamma_{\widehat{T}})^{-1}(a)$. Thus overall, Configuration III-w is symmetric in the following pairs: Φ and Ψ , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$, a and b , T and \widehat{T} and also Γ_T and $\Gamma_{\widehat{T}}$.

Theorem 5.6. *Assume Configuration III-w. Then*

- (i) *For any $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_0$ object E and any $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_1$ object F in \mathcal{A} such that where $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(E), Z_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \neq 0$, we have*

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \preceq \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E).$$

- (ii) *Suppose E is a $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable object in \mathcal{A} such that $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \neq 0$ and*
 – *the only strict \mathcal{A} -injection from an object in $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z_{\mathcal{A}}} \cap W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ to E is the zero morphism;*
 – *the only strict \mathcal{A} -surjection from E to an object in $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z_{\mathcal{A}}} \cap W_{1, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ is the zero morphism.*
Then E is either $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_0$ or $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT $_1$.

- (iii) *Suppose $E \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the same hypotheses as in (ii). Then*

$$E \text{ is } Z_{\mathcal{A}}\text{-semistable} \Rightarrow \Phi E \text{ is } Z_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-semistable.}$$

Proof. (i) Take any E, F as described. We have $\Phi E \in \mathcal{B}$ and so $b \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) \preceq b + 1$, implying $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)$ by (5.4.1). On the other hand, $\Phi F \in \mathcal{B}[-1]$ so $b - 1 \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F) \preceq b$, implying $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \preceq \Gamma_T^{-1}(b)$ by (5.4.1). Part (i) thus follows.

(ii) By Lemma 3.10(ii), we have an \mathcal{A} -short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow E_0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow E_1 \rightarrow 0$$

where E_i is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_i$ for $i = 0, 1$. Suppose $E_0 \neq 0$. Then we must have $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(E_0) \neq 0$, and hence $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E_0)$ by part (i). If we also have $E_1 \neq 0$, then $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(E_1)$ must be nonzero, in which case part (i) also gives $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E_1) \preceq \Gamma_T^{-1}(b)$. Then $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E_0) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E_1)$, contradicting the semistability of E .

(iii) Let E be as described, and suppose E is $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable in \mathcal{A} . By part (ii), E is either $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$ or $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_1$. Although the proofs of the two cases are similar, we include them both for the sake of completeness.

Case 1: E is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$. Take any \mathcal{B} -short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow \Phi E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

where $M, N \neq 0$. That E is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$ implies ΦE is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}\text{-WIT}_1$ by Lemma 3.10(i). Hence M is also $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}\text{-WIT}_1$ since $W_{1, \Psi, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}}$ is a torsion-free class in \mathcal{B} by Lemma 3.10(ii). We then have the \mathcal{A} -long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N \rightarrow \Psi M[1] \xrightarrow{\alpha} E \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 N \rightarrow 0.$$

If $\alpha = 0$, then $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N \cong \Psi M[1]$ where $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_1$ while $\Psi M[1]$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$ by Lemma 3.10(i) again; this forces $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N = \Psi M[1] = 0$, i.e. $M = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\text{im } \alpha \neq 0$, and the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistability of E implies $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)$. On the other hand, since $\Psi M[1]$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$, the \mathcal{A} -quotient $\text{im } \alpha$ is also $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_0$ (since $W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ is a torsion class in \mathcal{A}). Then the first vanishing condition in (ii) ensures $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \neq 0$. Part (i) then gives $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$. Now we divide further into two cases:

If $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N) \neq 0$, then from part (i) we have $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N) \preceq \Gamma_T^{-1}(b)$; together with $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$ from above and noting $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N), Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$ are both nonzero, we obtain $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M[1]) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$ and hence $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M[1]) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E)$. Then $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E)$ by (5.4.1) and hence $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$.

If $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 N) = 0$, then $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M[1]) = Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \neq 0$. If we also have $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 N) = 0$, then $Z_{\mathcal{B}}(N) = 0$ by (5.3.1) and $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$ follows. On the other hand, if $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 N) \neq 0$, then the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistability of E gives $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M[1]) = \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 N) = \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi N[1])$, which implies $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$.

Hence ΦE is $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable in Case 1.

Case 2: E is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_1$. Take any \mathcal{B} -short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow \Phi E[1] \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

where $M, N \neq 0$. Since $\Phi E[1]$ is a $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}\text{-WIT}_0$ object in \mathcal{B} , its \mathcal{B} -quotient N is also $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}\text{-WIT}_0$ by Lemma 3.10(ii), giving us the \mathcal{A} -exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 M \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Psi N \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 M \rightarrow 0.$$

As in Case 1, we must have $\text{im } \alpha \neq 0$, and the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistability of E implies $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$. Since ΨN is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}\text{-WIT}_1$, so is $\text{im } \alpha$, and by the second vanishing in (ii) we must have $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \neq 0$. We now divide further into two cases:

If $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 M) \neq 0$, then by (i), we have $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 M)$ and hence $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi N) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 M)$. On the other hand, the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistability of E gives $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha)$, giving us $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi N)$, which in turn gives $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E[1]) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$ and then $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$.

If $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 M) = 0$, then $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) = Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi N)$ while $Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 M) = Z_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M)$ and, as above, the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistability of E gives $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi M) = \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 M) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{im } \alpha) = \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\Psi N)$, and so $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \preceq \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(N)$.

Hence $\Phi E[1]$ is Z_B -semistable in Case 2. ■

When we are in Configuration III, the functions Z_A, Z_B are polynomial stability functions, meaning $\mathcal{A}_{\ker Z_A}, \mathcal{B}_{\ker Z_B}$ are both trivial, giving us cleaner statements:

Theorem 5.7. *Assume Configuration III. Then*

- (i) *For any Φ_B -WIT₀ object E and any Φ_B -WIT₁ object F in \mathcal{A} where $E, F \neq 0$, we have*

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \preceq \Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E).$$

- (ii) *(Z_A -semistable implies Φ_B -WIT _{i}) Any nonzero Z_A -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} is either Φ_B -WIT₀ or Φ_B -WIT₁.*
- (iii) *Let M be any nonzero Φ_B -WIT _{i} object in \mathcal{A} where $i = 0$ or 1 , and let S_A denote be the weight function $S_{Z'_A, M} : K(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ defined as in (4.8.1) using $Z'_A := e^{i\pi(-a)}Z_A$. Then S_A satisfies refinement- i with respect to the torsion pair $(W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}, W_{1, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}})$ in \mathcal{A} .*
- (iv) *(correspondence of stability) For a nonzero object $E \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$E \text{ is } Z_A\text{-semistable} \Leftrightarrow \Phi E \text{ is } Z_B\text{-semistable}.$$

The same statement holds if we replace ‘semistable’ by ‘stable.’

- (v) *Suppose (Z_A, \mathcal{A}) and (Z_B, \mathcal{B}) are polynomial stability conditions with respect to $(a, a+1], (b, b+1]$, respectively, and $\mathcal{P}_A, \mathcal{P}_B$ denote their respective slicings. Then*

$$(5.7.1) \quad \Phi \cdot (Z_A, \mathcal{P}_A) = (Z_B, \mathcal{P}_B) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$$

where $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$ is as defined in (5.2.2).

Even though part (iv) of Theorem 5.7 can be proved via symmetry in Configuration III and adapting the argument for Theorem 5.6(iii) for the ‘stable’ case, we give a proof using Configuration II. This shows that all the applications of Configuration III in the later parts of this article can be traced back to Configuration II and hence Configuration I.

Proof. (i), (ii): These follow from their counterparts in Theorem 5.6.

(iii) Let M, Z'_A, S_A be as described. Then Z'_A is a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(0, 1]$, and Z_A -semistability is equivalent to Z'_A -semistability (the phases are simply translated by a). By Lemma 4.8, every S_A -semistable object F in \mathcal{A} is Z_A -semistable with $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F) = \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$; by parts (i) and (ii), M and F are both Φ_B -WIT _{i} . Then by part (i), all the nonzero S_A -semistable objects in \mathcal{A} lie in $W_{i, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ for some fixed i . If $i = 0$ (resp. $i = 1$), then for every nonzero object G in $W_{1, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ (resp. $W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$) we have $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ (resp. $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$) by part (i), and so $S_A(G) \prec 0$ (resp. $S_A(G) \succ 0$) by Lemma 4.8. Hence S_A satisfies the refinement property with respect to $(W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}, W_{1, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}})$.

(iv) By the symmetry in Configuration III (see 5.5), we only need to prove the ‘only if’ direction. Let us fix a nonzero Z_A -semistable object E in \mathcal{A} . Then E is Φ_B -WIT _{i} for $i = 0$ or 1 by part (ii). Set $\widehat{E} := \Phi E[i]$, which lies in \mathcal{B} . Let S_A be the weight function $S_{Z'_A, E}$ as defined in (4.8.1) where $Z'_A = e^{i\pi(-a)}Z_A$ as in part (iii), and let S_B be the weight function $S_{Z'_B, \widehat{E}} : K(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ defined as in (4.8.1) where $Z'_B := e^{i\pi(-b)}Z_B$.

We will now show that the weight functions S_A and $(-1)^i S_B$ satisfy condition 3.8(c). To see this, take any $F \in \mathcal{A}$ that is Φ_B -WIT _{j} where $j = 0$ or 1 . We need to show that $\text{sgn } S_A(F) = \text{sgn } ((-1)^i S_B)(\Phi F)$. We divide into the following cases:

- $i = 0, j = 1$: By part (i), we have $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F)$ and hence $S_A(F) \prec 0$ by Lemma 4.8. On the other hand, \widehat{E} is Ψ_A -WIT₁ while \widehat{F} is Ψ_A -WIT₀ by Lemma 3.10(i), so by the symmetry in Configuration III and part (i), we have $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{E})$, implying $-S_B(\Phi F) = S_B(\Phi F[1]) = S_B(\widehat{F}) \succ 0$, i.e. $S_B(\Phi F) \prec 0$. Hence $\text{sgn } S_A(F) = \text{sgn } ((-1)^i S_B)(\Phi F)$ in this case.

- $i = 1, j = 0$: The argument is similar to the previous case. By part (i), we have $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F)$ and hence $S_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \succ 0$ by Lemma 4.8. On the other hand, \widehat{E} is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT₀ while \widehat{F} is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT₁, so by the symmetry in Configuration III and part (i), we have $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) \prec \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{E})$, implying $S_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F) = S_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) \prec 0$, i.e. $(-1)S_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F) \succ 0$. Hence $\text{sgn } S_{\mathcal{A}}(F) = \text{sgn } ((-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}})(\Phi F)$ in this case.
- $i = j$: Let us write $\phi'_{\mathcal{A}}, \phi'_{\mathcal{B}}$ to denote the phase functions for the polynomial stability functions $Z'_{\mathcal{A}}, Z'_{\mathcal{B}}$, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \succ 0 &\Leftrightarrow \phi'_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \succ \phi'_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \quad \text{by Lemma 4.8} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(F) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(E) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) \quad \text{by Lemma 5.4 and (5.4.1)} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \phi'_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F) \succ \phi'_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi E) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \phi'_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) \succ \phi'_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{E}) \quad \text{since } i = j \\
&\Leftrightarrow S_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) \succ 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and all these equivalences still hold if we replace all instances of ' \succ ' by '=' or ' \prec '. Together with

$$S_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{F}) = S_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F[j]) = S_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi F[i]) = ((-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}})(\Phi F),$$

we obtain $\text{sgn } S_{\mathcal{A}}(F) = \text{sgn } ((-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}})(\Phi F)$ in this case.

Therefore, the equivalences Φ, Ψ , the hearts \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , and the weight functions $S_{\mathcal{A}}, (-1)^i S_{\mathcal{B}}$ are in Configuration II. Moreover, $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies refinement- i with respect to $(W_{0, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}, W_{1, \Phi, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}})$ by part (iii). Then by Theorem 3.12, \widehat{E} is a semistable object in \mathcal{B} with respect to the weight function $(-1)^{2i} S_{\mathcal{B}} = S_{\mathcal{B}}$, meaning \widehat{E} is a $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable object in \mathcal{B} . The 'stable' case of part (iv) follows from the correspondence case of Theorem 3.12.

(v) Suppose $\Phi \cdot (Z_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) = (Z'', \mathcal{P}'')$ and $(Z_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T) = (Z', \mathcal{P}')$. Then $Z'' = Z_{\mathcal{A}} \circ (\Phi^K)^{-1} = T^{-1} \cdot Z_{\mathcal{B}} = Z'$ where the second equality follows from (5.3.1). Also, for any polynomial phase function ϕ , we have $\mathcal{P}''(\phi) = \Phi(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(\phi)) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}}(\Gamma_T(\phi)) = \mathcal{P}'(\phi)$, where the second equality follows from (5.4.1) together with part (iv). \blacksquare

Proposition 5.8. *Assume Configuration III. If $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ has the Harder-Narasimhan property on \mathcal{A} , then $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ has the Harder-Narasimhan property on \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Suppose $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ has the HN property on \mathcal{A} . Fix any $E \in \mathcal{B}$, and we will construct the $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -HN filtration for E .

To begin with, we have $\Psi \mathcal{B} \subset D_{\mathcal{A}}^{[0,1]}$ by Lemma 3.9, giving us an exact triangle

$$(5.8.1) \quad (\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E)[1] \rightarrow \Psi E[1] \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 E \rightarrow (\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E)[2].$$

Suppose

$$(5.8.2) \quad 0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq M_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_k = \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E$$

is the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -HN filtration of $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E$ in \mathcal{A} , and

$$0 = N_0 \subsetneq N_1 \subsetneq N_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq N_l = \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 E$$

the $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -HN filtration of $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 E$ in \mathcal{A} . In particular, we have

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_1) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_2/M_1) \succ \cdots \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_k/M_{k-1})$$

and

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(N_1) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(N_2/N_1) \succ \cdots \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(N_l/N_{l-1}).$$

The filtration (5.8.2) gives the sequence of exact triangles

$$(5.8.3) \quad 0 = M_0[1] \longrightarrow M_1[1] \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow M_{k-1}[1] \longrightarrow M_k[1] = (\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E)[1].$$

\swarrow $M_1[1]$ \searrow \swarrow $(M_k/M_{k-1})[1]$ \searrow
 $[1]$ $[1]$

Using the octahedral axiom, we can construct lifts $\widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_l$ in \mathcal{D} of N_1, \dots, N_l with respect to the morphism $\Psi E[1] \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^1 E$, respectively, together with a sequence of exact triangles

$$(5.8.4) \quad (\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E)[1] \longrightarrow \widetilde{N}_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \widetilde{N}_{l-1} \longrightarrow \widetilde{N}_l = \Psi E[1].$$

\swarrow N_1 \searrow \swarrow N_l/N_{l-1} \searrow
 $[1]$ $[1]$

We will now show that Φ takes the concatenation of (5.8.3) and (5.8.4) to the $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -HN filtration of E .

Since $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^0 E$ is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT₁, so is M_1 , and so $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \succeq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_1)$ by Theorem 5.7(i). On the other hand, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, the factor M_i/M_{i-1} is $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable with $\Gamma_T^{-1}(b) \succeq \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_1) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{A}}(M_i/M_{i-1})$, and so M_i/M_{i-1} is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT₁ by parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 5.7. A similar argument shows that for each $1 \leq i \leq l$, the factor N_i/N_{i-1} is $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ -semistable and $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ -WIT₀ with $\phi_{\mathcal{A}}(N_i/N_{i-1}) \succ \Gamma_T^{-1}(b)$. Hence Φ takes each $(M_i/M_{i-1})[1]$ and each N_j/N_{j-1} into \mathcal{B} , and all of $\Phi((M_i/M_{i-1})[1])$, $\Phi(N_j/N_{j-1})$ are $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable by Theorem 5.7(iv).

From (5.4.1), we now have

$$\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(M_1)[1]) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(M_2/M_1)[1]) \succ \cdots \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(M_k/M_{k-1})[1])$$

and

$$\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi N_1) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(N_2/N_1)) \succ \cdots \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(N_l/N_{l-1})).$$

Since $\Phi(M_k/M_{k-1})[1]$ is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT₀ and ΦN_1 is $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ -WIT₁, we have

$$\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi(M_k/M_{k-1})[1]) \succ \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\Phi N_1)$$

by Theorem 5.7(i). Overall, the concatenation of (5.8.3) with (5.8.4) gives a filtration of $\Psi E[1]$, and this filtration is taken by Φ to a filtration of E in \mathcal{B} where each factor is $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -semistable and the factors have strictly decreasing $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$. That is, we have constructed the $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ -HN filtration of E . \blacksquare

Remark 5.9. Even though it is possible to write down a generalisation of Proposition 5.8 to weak polynomial stability conditions, as is done in [7, Section 19] when the central charge takes values in \mathbb{C} along with other assumptions, it is not clear whether there is a canonical way to do so. Since we do not require such a generalisation in this article, we refrain from stating it here.

6. PRELIMINARIES ON ELLIPTIC FIBRATIONS

In this section, we fix our notation and terminology on elliptic fibrations.

6.1. $\mu_{\omega, B}$ -stability and $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$. Suppose X is a smooth projective variety of dimension n , and ω, B are \mathbb{R} -divisor classes on X where ω is ample. The usual slope function for coherent sheaves E on X is defined as

$$\mu_{\omega, B}(E) = \begin{cases} \frac{\omega^{n-1} \text{ch}_1^B(E)}{\text{ch}_0^B(E)} & \text{if } \text{ch}_0^B(E) \neq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } \text{ch}_0^B(E) = 0 \end{cases}.$$

Note that $\mu_{\omega, B}(E) = \mu_{\omega, 0}(E) - \omega^{n-1}B$ when $\text{ch}_0(E) \neq 0$, while $\mu_{\omega, 0}$ itself has the HN property even when ω is not over \mathbb{Q} by [16, Corollary 2.27]. Hence $\mu_{\omega, B}$ itself has the HN property for any \mathbb{R} -divisors ω, B where ω is ample.

We will write $K(X)$ for $K(D^b(X))$. In terms of the notation of 4.6, $\mu_{\omega, B}$ is precisely the slope function μ_Z for the weak polynomial stability function $Z : K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on $\text{Coh}(X)$ with respect to $(0, 1]$ given by

$$Z(E) = -\omega^{n-1} \text{ch}_1^B(E) + i \text{ch}_0^B(E).$$

We define the following full subcategories of $\text{Coh}(X)$ via extension closures

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\omega, B} &= \langle F \in \text{Coh}(X) : F \text{ is } \mu_{\omega, B}\text{-semistable with } \mu_{\omega, B}(F) > 0 \rangle \\ \mathcal{F}_{\omega, B} &= \langle F \in \text{Coh}(X) : F \text{ is } \mu_{\omega, B}\text{-semistable with } \mu_{\omega, B}(F) \leq 0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The HN property of $\mu_{\omega, B}$ implies that $(\mathcal{T}_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{F}_{\omega, B})$ is a torsion pair in $\text{Coh}(X)$, and so the extension closure in $D^b(X)$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\omega, B} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega, B}[1], \mathcal{T}_{\omega, B} \rangle$$

is the heart of a bounded t-structure on $D^b(X)$.

6.2. The central charge $Z_{\omega, B}$. Given any smooth projective variety X and \mathbb{R} -divisor classes ω, B on X where ω is ample, we define the group homomorphism $Z_{\omega, B} : K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$Z_{\omega, B}(E) = - \int_X e^{-(B+i\omega)} \text{ch}(E) = - \int_X e^{-i\omega} \text{ch}^B(E).$$

On a smooth projective surface X , the pair $(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$ is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(0, 1]$. (We do not need to assume ω, B are over \mathbb{Q} here - see [2, Section 2] or [33, Theorem 6.10].)

When $B = 0$, we will drop the subscript B , and similarly for the notations in 6.1.

6.3. The heart Coh^p . On a smooth projective variety X , we will write Coh^p or $\text{Coh}^p(X)$ to denote the heart of bounded t-structure on $D^b(X)$ associated to the perversity function $p(d) = -\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$, the general definition of which can be found in [4, Section 3.1]. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Coh}^p(X) &= \text{Coh}(X) \quad \text{when } \dim X = 1, \\ \text{Coh}^p(X) &= \langle \text{Coh}^{\geq 2}(X)[1], \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \rangle \quad \text{when } \dim X = 2, \\ \text{Coh}^p(X) &= \langle \text{Coh}^{\geq 2}(X)[1], \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \rangle \quad \text{when } \dim X = 3. \end{aligned}$$

6.4. Elliptic fibrations $p : X \rightarrow B$. Unless otherwise stated, in the remainder of this article, we will write $p : X \rightarrow B$ to denote a Weierstraß elliptic fibration in the sense of [28, 2.1] where X, B are both smooth projective varieties. In particular, by p being an elliptic fibration, we mean that p is a flat morphism whose fibers are Gorenstein curves of arithmetic genus 1. The Weierstraß condition means that all the fibers of p are geometrically integral, and p has a section $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ such that its image $\Theta = \sigma(B)$ does not intersect any singular point of any singular fiber. The smoothness of X implies that the generic fiber of p is a smooth elliptic curve, while the Weierstraß assumption means that the singular fibers are at worst nodal or cuspidal. When X is a surface (resp. threefold), we will refer to $p : X \rightarrow B$ or simply X as a Weierstraß elliptic surface (resp. Weierstraß elliptic threefold).

We will write f to denote the class of a fiber of p . Since Θ is a section of p , it is a p -ample divisor on X by the Nakai-Moishezon criterion [22, Theorem 1.42]. As a result, given any ample divisor H_B on B , divisors on X of the form $\Theta + vp^*H_B$ are ample for $v \gg 0$ [22, Proposition 1.45]. We also define the slope function μ_f on $\text{Coh}(X)$ by

$$\mu_f(E) = \begin{cases} \frac{f \text{ch}_1(E)}{\text{ch}_0(E)} & \text{if } \text{ch}_0(E) \neq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } \text{ch}_0(E) = 0 \end{cases},$$

which has the HN property.

6.4.1. Another word on notation. We adopt a good deal of notation surrounding elliptic fibrations from the reference [3, 6.2.6]. In continuing with their notation, we use the letter B to denote the base of the elliptic fibration $p : X \rightarrow B$. On the other hand, we also use B to denote the \mathbb{R} -divisor on X

(sometimes called the ‘ B -field’) used in ‘twisting’ Chern classes in defining slope functions and central charges. Although there is a conflict of notation here, we believe that no confusion should arise as the meaning of B will always be clear from the context.

6.4.2. Self-intersection of Θ . We will write the self-intersection of Θ on X as $\Theta^2 = -e$. Note that $e = \deg \mathbb{L}$ where $\mathbb{L} = (R^1 p_* \mathcal{O}_X)^*$ (e.g. see [25, 2.3]), while $\deg \mathbb{L} \geq 0$ by [35, Lemma II.5.6, Definition II.4.1, (II.3.6)]. Hence $\Theta^2 = -e \leq 0$ overall.

6.5. Fourier-Mukai transforms $\Phi, \widehat{\Phi}$. For a Weierstraß elliptic fibration $p : X \rightarrow B$, we will write Φ to denote the relative Fourier-Mukai transform $D^b(X) \rightarrow D^b(X)$ as defined in [3, 6.2.3], the kernel \mathcal{P} of which is a relative Poincaré sheaf. In particular, \mathcal{P} is a universal sheaf for a moduli problem parametrising rank-one torsion-free sheaves on the fibers of p . That is, for any closed point $x \in X$, if \mathcal{O}_x denotes the structure sheaf of $\{x\}$ then $\Phi \mathcal{O}_x$ is a rank-one torsion-sheaf supported on the fiber of p containing x . There is another relative Fourier-Mukai transform $\widehat{\Phi} : D^b(X) \rightarrow D^b(X)$ satisfying

$$\widehat{\Phi} \Phi \cong \text{id}_{D^b(X)}[-1] \cong \Phi \widehat{\Phi},$$

and the kernel of $\widehat{\Phi}$ is also a universal sheaf for a moduli problem of rank-one torsion-free sheaves on fibers of p (see [3, Theorem 6.18, Lemma 6.22] and also [13, 8.4]).

We say an object $E \in D^b(X)$ is Φ -WIT $_i$ if ΦE is isomorphic to an object in $\text{Coh}(X)[-i]$, in which case we write \widehat{E} for any coherent sheaf satisfying $\Phi E \cong \widehat{E}[-i]$; we similarly define the notion of $\widehat{\Phi}$ -WIT $_i$. These definitions are in line with those in 2.1.3.

7. ELLIPTIC CURVES

Let X be a smooth elliptic curve, so that the base B of our elliptic fibration $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a single point. Set ω to be a single closed point on X and the B -field in 6.2 to be zero, so that the central charge $Z(E) := Z_{\omega, B}(E)$ takes the form

$$Z(E) = - \int_X \text{ch}_1(E) + i \text{ch}_0(E) \int_X \omega = -(\deg E) + i(\text{rk } E).$$

The pair $(Z, \text{Coh}(X))$ is a polynomial stability function $Z : K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with respect to $(0, 1]$, and the corresponding slope function (see 4.6.2), being the usual slope function for Mumford stability for sheaves, has the Harder-Narasimhan property. Therefore, $(Z, \text{Coh}(X))$ is a Bridgeland stability condition, and an object $E \in D^b(X)$ is a Z -semistable (resp. Z -stable) object in $\text{Coh}(X)$ if and only if it is a slope semistable (resp. slope stable) coherent sheaf on X (see 4.6.1).

Recall the following classification result for slope semistable sheaves on a smooth elliptic curve, which can be found in the works of Bridgeland [9, 3.2], Hein-Ploog [17], Polishchuk [36, Lemma 14.6], and also in [3, Corollary 3.29]:

Theorem 7.1. *Let X be a smooth elliptic curve, and $\Phi : D^b(X) \rightarrow D^b(X)$ the Fourier-Mukai transform with Poincaré line bundle as the kernel. Then for any $E \in D^b(X)$,*

E is a slope semistable sheaf if and only if ΦE is a slope semistable sheaf (up to a shift).

The same result holds when ‘semistable’ is replaced with ‘stable’ on both sides.

Theorem 7.1 can be recovered using Configuration III and Theorem 5.7(iv). To begin with, for any $E \in D^b(X)$ we have

$$(7.1.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \text{rk } \Phi E \\ \deg \Phi E \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{rk } E \\ \deg E \end{pmatrix}$$

(e.g. see [3, Proposition 3.25], which uses a functor that is dual to Φ but has the same cohomological Fourier-Mukai transform), which can be rewritten as

$$Z(\Phi E) = (-i)Z(E).$$

Since p has relative dimension 1 and the kernel of Φ is a sheaf sitting at degree 0, we have $\Phi \text{Coh}(X) \subset D_{\text{Coh}(X)}^{[0,1]}$ [3, p.186].

Proof of Theorem 7.1. We are in Configuration III if we take $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U} = D^b(X)$, $\Psi = \widehat{\Phi}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = \text{Coh}(X)$, $Z_{\mathcal{A}} = Z_{\mathcal{B}} = Z$, $a = b = 0$, and T, Γ_T to be as in Example 5.2.8 where T corresponds to multiplication by $(-i)$. The theorem then follows from Theorem 5.7(iv). \blacksquare

Let \mathcal{P} denote the slicing of the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z, \text{Coh}(X))$ with respect to $(0, 1]$ and write $\sigma = (Z, \mathcal{P})$. Then the proof of Theorem 7.1 together with Theorem 5.7(v) give

$$(7.1.2) \quad \Phi \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot (T, g)$$

where T corresponds to multiplication by $(-i)$ and $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 7.1 can be generalised to higher dimensional elliptic fibrations using Theorem 5.7. This requires choosing appropriate input for Configuration III. A choice of such input on elliptic surfaces will be constructed in Sections 8 and 10.

8. ELLIPTIC SURFACES: $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ -ACTION

On a smooth projective surface X , we have

$$Z_{\omega, B}(E) = - \int_X e^{-i\omega} \text{ch}^B(E) = -\text{ch}_2^B(E) + \frac{\omega^2}{2} \text{ch}_0^B(E) + i\omega \text{ch}_1^B(E).$$

In this section, we will take X to be a Weierstraß elliptic surface and study the following question:

Question 8.1. *Given \mathbb{R} -divisors $\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}$ on X , can we find \mathbb{R} -divisors ω, B and $g \in \text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) = T Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) \quad \text{for all } E \in D^b(X)?$$

That is, we will find solutions to equation (5.3.1) in Configuration III, where the central charges are those frequently used in the study of Bridgeland stability conditions, and where T is a constant function.

8.2. Cohomological Fourier-Mukai transform. Suppose $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a Weierstraß elliptic surface. For an object $E \in D^b(X)$, let us write

$$(8.2.1) \quad \text{ch}_0(E) = n, \quad f \text{ch}_1(E) = d, \quad \Theta \text{ch}_1(E) = c, \quad \text{ch}_2(E) = s.$$

We have the following formulas from [3, (6.21)]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ch}_0(\Phi E) &= d, \\ \text{ch}_1(\Phi E) &= -\text{ch}_1(E) + def + (d - n)\Theta + (c - \frac{1}{2}ed + s)f, \\ \text{ch}_2(\Phi E) &= -c - de + \frac{1}{2}ne, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$f \text{ch}_1(\Phi E) = -n, \quad \Theta \text{ch}_1(\Phi E) = (s - \frac{e}{2}d) + ne$$

where we recall $\Theta^2 = -e \leq 0$ from 6.4.2. An analogous formula for the cohomological Fourier-Mukai transform associated to $\widehat{\Phi}$ can be found in [3, (6.22)].

8.3. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and any \mathbb{R} -divisor B on X , we will write

$$Z_{a,b,B}(E) = -\text{ch}_2^B(E) + a \text{ch}_0^B(E) + i(\Theta \text{ch}_1^B(E) + b f \text{ch}_1^B(E))$$

and

$$Z'_{a,b,B}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -fB \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} Z_{a,b,B}(E)$$

for any $E \in D^b(X)$. Note that when ω is an ample divisor of the form $\omega = x\Theta + yf$ where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we can write

$$(8.3.1) \quad Z_{\omega,B}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix} Z_{\frac{\omega^2}{2}, \frac{y}{x}, B}(E).$$

Hence every central charge of the form $Z_{\omega,B}$ is equal to $gZ'_{a,b,B}$ for some $g \in \mathrm{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ depending only on ω . Therefore, if we only consider divisors $\bar{\omega}, \omega$ lying in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}\Theta + \mathbb{R}_{>0}f$, then Question 8.1 is equivalent to the following:

Question 8.4. *Given $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and an \mathbb{R} -divisor \bar{B} , can we find $\epsilon, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, an \mathbb{R} -divisor B and $T \in \mathrm{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$(8.4.1) \quad Z'_{\epsilon,\zeta,B}(\Phi E) = TZ'_{\gamma,\delta,\bar{B}}(E) \quad \text{for all } E \in D^b(X)?$$

Remark 8.4.2. When $b > 0$ is chosen so that $\Theta + bf$ is an ample divisor on X and $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the same argument as in the proof of [2, Corollary 2.1] shows that $(Z_{a,b,B}, \mathcal{B}_{\Theta+bf,B})$ is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(0, 1]$.

8.5. Let us consider the equation (8.4.1) under the additional constraint that \bar{B}, B lie in $\mathbb{R}\Theta + \mathbb{R}f$. Suppose $\bar{B} = k\Theta + lf$ and $B = p\Theta + qf$ where $k, l, p, q \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the notation for $\mathrm{ch}(E)$ from 8.2, we have

$$Z'_{\gamma,\delta,\bar{B}}(E) = -s + (l - k\delta)d + \left(\gamma + \left(\delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)k^2\right)n + i(c + \delta d - (l - ek + \delta k)n)$$

and

$$Z'_{\epsilon,\zeta,B}(\Phi E) = c + \left(e - \frac{\epsilon}{2}p^2 + \epsilon + p^2\zeta\right)d + \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2} - q + p\zeta\right)n + i\left(s + \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2} - (q - ep) - p\zeta\right)d + (e - \zeta)n\right).$$

Using the last two formulas and the cohomological Fourier-Mukai transform for $\hat{\Phi}$ in [3, (6.22)], we can compute

$$Z'_{\gamma,\delta,\bar{B}}(\mathcal{O}_x) = -1, \quad Z'_{\epsilon,\zeta,B}(\Phi\mathcal{O}_x) = i, \quad \text{and} \quad Z'_{\gamma,\delta,\bar{B}}(\hat{\Phi}\mathcal{O}_x) = i, \quad Z'_{\epsilon,\zeta,B}(\Phi\hat{\Phi}\mathcal{O}_x) = 1.$$

Putting $E = \mathcal{O}_x$ in (8.4.1) now gives $i = T \cdot (-1)$, while putting $E = \hat{\Phi}\mathcal{O}_x$ gives $1 = T \cdot i$. It follows that the only element $T \in \mathrm{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ that can satisfy (8.4.1) for all $E \in D^b(X)$ is $T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, i.e.

T is simply multiplication by $-i$. In this case, (8.4.1) holds for all $E \in D^b(X)$ whenever the following relations are satisfied:

$$(8.5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} l - k\delta &= \frac{\epsilon}{2} + (q - ep) + p\zeta \\ \gamma + \left(\delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)k^2 &= \zeta - e \\ \delta &= e - \frac{\epsilon}{2}p^2 + \epsilon + p^2\zeta \\ l - ek + \delta k &= \frac{\epsilon}{2} + q - p\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

8.5.2. In the special case $k = p, l = q, \gamma = \epsilon$ and $\delta = \zeta$, in which case $\bar{B} = B$ and $Z'_{\gamma,\delta,\bar{B}} = Z'_{\epsilon,\zeta,B}$, the four relations in (8.5.1) together simplify to just three relations

$$e = 0, \quad p\zeta = 0, \quad \zeta = \epsilon.$$

In particular, with $g = -i$ and for $e = 0$, if $k = p = 0$ then any $l = q$ and any $\gamma = \delta = \epsilon = \zeta > 0$ give a solution to (8.4.1).

9. A POLYNOMIAL STABILITY AND TWISTED GIESEKER STABILITY ON SURFACES

In this section, we take X to be an arbitrary smooth projective surface. We describe the large volume limit, which can be defined as a polynomial stability condition denoted as Z_l -stability. Then we prove that 1-dimensional Z_l -semistable objects coincide with 1-dimensional twisted Gieseker semistable sheaves.

9.1. Z_l -stability. On a surface X , we have $\text{Coh}^p(X) = \langle \text{Coh}^{\leq 2}(X)[1], \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \rangle$ from 6.3. Then for any fixed \mathbb{R} -divisors $\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}$ on X where $\tilde{\omega}$ is ample, and any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we set $\overline{\omega} = \beta\tilde{\omega}$ and define

$$Z_l(E) = Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = Z_{\beta\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E)$$

for $E \in D^b(X)$. By regarding β as the parameter, the pair (Z_l, Coh^p) is a polynomial stability condition on $D^b(X)$ with respect to $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{5}{4}]$ [4, Proposition 4.1(b)]. The wall and chamber structure of (Z_l, Coh^p) as a polynomial stability condition was studied in [23], while the mini-wall and mini-chamber structure of the associated Bridgeland stability conditions $\{(Z_{\beta\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\beta\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}})\}_\beta$ was studied in [30]. For a fixed Chern character of objects in $D^b(X)$, there is an effective bound β_0 such that, for $\beta \geq \beta_0$, the moduli of Z_l -semistable objects (i.e. the moduli of polynomial semistable objects) with that Chern character can be identified with the moduli of $Z_{\beta\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}}$ -semistable objects (i.e. the moduli of Bridgeland semistable objects) with the same Chern character [30, Theorem 4.4].

9.2. Twisted Gieseker stability. Let X be a smooth projective surface and L a line bundle on X . The L -twisted Euler characteristic of a coherent sheaf E on X is defined as

$$\chi_L(E) := \chi(E \otimes L) = \int_X \text{ch}(E \otimes L) \text{td}(T_X)$$

where the second equality follows from Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch. Given a fixed ample divisor $\tilde{\omega}$ on X , we say a coherent sheaf E in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ is L -twisted $\tilde{\omega}$ -Gieseker semistable, or simply *twisted Gieseker semistable*, if for every short exact sequence of sheaves $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ on X where $M, N \neq 0$ we have

$$\frac{\chi_L(M)}{\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1(M)} \leq \frac{\chi_L(N)}{\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1(N)}$$

(e.g. see [25, Definition 6.1]). We say E is twisted Gieseker stable if we always have a strict inequality above.

9.3. Suppose L is a line bundle on X such that $\text{ch}_1(L)K_X = 0$. Then for any $E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ we have $\chi_L(E) = \text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E)$ if we put $\overline{B} = \text{ch}_1(L^*) + \frac{1}{2}K_X$; furthermore, for any ample \mathbb{R} -divisor $\tilde{\omega}$ we have

$$Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = -\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) + i\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1^{\overline{B}}(E) = -\chi_L(E) + i\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1(E).$$

Corollary 9.4. *Let X be a smooth projective surface and $\tilde{\omega}$ a fixed ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on X . Suppose L is a line bundle on X such that $\text{ch}_1(L)K_X = 0$, and $\overline{B} = \text{ch}_1(L^*) + \frac{1}{2}K_X$. Then for any $E \in D^b(X)$,*

E is an L -twisted $\tilde{\omega}$ -Gieseker semistable sheaf in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \Leftrightarrow E$ is Z_l -semistable with $\text{ch}_0(E) = 0$ where Z_l -stability is defined as in 9.1. The same statements holds if we replace ‘semistable’ with ‘stable.’

Proof. For any $0 \neq E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$, we have

$$Z_l(E) = Z_{\beta\tilde{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = -\text{ch}_L(E) + i\beta\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1(E)$$

and $Z_l(E) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}e^{i\pi(0,1]}$. Considering $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ as an abelian subcategory of $D^b(X)$, we have the slope function

$$\mu_{Z_l}(E) = \frac{\text{ch}_L(E)}{\beta\tilde{\omega} \text{ch}_1(E)}$$

for $0 \neq E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ as defined in 4.6.

Now, given any $E \in D^b(X)$, if E is an L -twisted $\tilde{\omega}$ -Gieseker semistable sheaf in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$, then $E \in \text{Coh}^p(X)$, and any $\text{Coh}^p(X)$ -short exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ (assuming $M, N \neq 0$) is a $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ -short exact sequence. Since twisted Gieseker semistability clearly coincides with μ_{Z_l} -semistability on $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$, we have $\mu_{Z_l}(M) \preceq \mu_{Z_l}(N)$ and hence $\phi_{Z_l}(M) \preceq \phi_{Z_l}(N)$ (see 4.6.1), showing that E is Z_l -semistable in $\text{Coh}^p(X)$.

Conversely, if E is a Z_l -semistable object in $\text{Coh}^p(X)$ with $\text{ch}_0(E)$, then $H^{-1}(E)$ must vanish and so $E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$. Since $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ is a subcategory of $\text{Coh}^p(X)$, every $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ -short exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ (assuming $M, N \neq 0$) is also a $\text{Coh}^p(X)$ -short exact sequence. Then the Z_l -semistability of E in $\text{Coh}^p(X)$ implies $\mu_{Z_l}(M) \preceq \mu_{Z_l}(N)$ by 4.6.1, which in turn shows E is twisted Gieseker semistable. Hence the 'semistable' case is proved.

The above arguments can be easily modified to show the 'stable' case. \blacksquare

10. ELLIPTIC SURFACES: A SECOND POLYNOMIAL STABILITY

In this section, we continue to take X to be a Weierstraß elliptic surface as we did in Section 8 unless otherwise stated. We describe another polynomial stability which we denote as Z^l -stability. As opposed to Z_l -stability, the definition of which involves deforming an ample class towards infinity along a ray in the ample cone of X , the definition of Z^l -stability involves deforming an ample class towards the fiber class along a hyperbola in the ample cone. We prove that Z_l -semistable objects correspond to Z^l -semistable objects under the autoequivalence Φ , for all Chern classes.

10.1. Notation. Fix an $m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\Theta + kf$ is ample for all $k \geq m$. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we will write $\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\Theta + mf) + f$ and

$$\bar{\omega} = \beta\tilde{\omega} = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}(\Theta + mf) + \beta f = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}(\Theta + (m + \alpha)f).$$

Then $\tilde{\omega}$ and $\bar{\omega}$ are both ample by our choice of m . In addition, for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we write

$$\omega = u(\Theta + mf) + vf = u(\Theta + (m + \frac{v}{u})f),$$

which is also ample by our choice of m . Since $\Theta^2 = -e$ and $\Theta + mf$ is ample by assumption, we have $\Theta(\Theta + mf) > 0$, i.e. $m - e > 0$.

10.2. \bar{B}, B in $\mathbb{R}f$. In the rest of this section, we will focus on B -fields of the form $\bar{B} = lf$ and $B = qf$ where $l, q \in \mathbb{R}$. We do not consider the case where $f\bar{B}, fB$ are nonzero because, in extending the construction of Z^l -stability in [25] to such nonzero B -fields, essential ingredients such as [25, 3.2(iii), (v)] will no longer hold (one might have to replace the autoequivalence Φ by a Fourier-Mukai transform between X and one of its Fourier-Mukai partners constructed in [13]). With $\bar{B} = lf$ and $B = qf$, we have $f\bar{B} = fB = 0$ and so from 8.3 and 8.5 we have $Z'_{\gamma, \delta, \bar{B}} = Z_{\gamma, \delta, \bar{B}}, Z'_{\epsilon, \zeta, B} = Z_{\epsilon, \zeta, B}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\gamma, \delta, \bar{B}}(E) &= (-s + ld + \gamma n) + i(c + \delta d - ln), \\ Z_{\epsilon, \zeta, B}(\Phi E) &= c + (e + \epsilon)d + (-\frac{\epsilon}{2} - q)n + i(s + (-\frac{\epsilon}{2} - q)d + (e - \zeta)n) \end{aligned}$$

which satisfy

$$(10.2.1) \quad Z_{\epsilon, \zeta, B}(\Phi E) = (-i)Z_{\gamma, \delta, \bar{B}}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z_{\gamma, \delta, \bar{B}}(E) \quad \text{for any } E \in D^b(X)$$

provided we have the relations

$$(10.2.2) \quad l = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + q, \quad \gamma = \zeta - e, \quad \delta = e + \epsilon.$$

10.3. We will now rewrite the computations in 10.2 in terms of $Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$ and $Z_{\omega, B}$. From (8.3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} Z_{\frac{\overline{\omega}^2}{2}, m+\alpha, \overline{B}}(E) \\ Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} Z_{\frac{\omega^2}{2}, m+\frac{v}{u}, B}(\Phi E) \end{aligned}$$

and so by choosing

$$\gamma = \frac{\overline{\omega}^2}{2}, \quad \delta = m + \alpha, \quad \epsilon = \frac{\omega^2}{2}, \quad \zeta = m + \frac{v}{u}$$

in 10.2, the relations (10.2.2) can be rewritten as

$$(10.3.1) \quad l = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + q,$$

$$(10.3.2) \quad \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha^2} (m + \alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) = m + \frac{v}{u} - e,$$

$$(10.3.3) \quad m + \alpha - e = (m - \frac{\epsilon}{2})u^2 + uv.$$

Under these relations, (10.2.1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} Z_{\epsilon, \zeta, B}(\Phi E) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z_{\gamma, \delta, \overline{B}}(E) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$(10.3.4) \quad Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} (-i) Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E).$$

Remark 10.3.5. Note that equation (10.3.1) is independent of equations (10.3.2) and (10.3.3). Also, there is always a solution to (10.3.2) and (10.3.3): We can rewrite (10.3.3) as

$$(m - \frac{\epsilon}{2})u^2 + vu - (m + \alpha - e) = 0$$

and think of it as a quadratic equation in u with discriminant $\Delta = v^2 + 4(m - \frac{\epsilon}{2})(m + \alpha - e)$. Since $m - e > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, given any $v > 0$, this quadratic always has a positive real solution in u . We can then solve for β using (10.3.2).

10.4. Solving equations. To relate Bridgeland stability to polynomial stability later on, let us solve (10.3.2) and (10.3.3) in terms of Laurent series in v . To this end, let us make the change of variable $w = \frac{1}{v}$ so that (10.3.3) reads

$$(10.4.1) \quad u = ((m + \alpha - e) - (m - \frac{\epsilon}{2})u^2) w.$$

By [21, Theorem 1.1, Remark 1.2(2)], this power series is convergent on a neighbourhood of 0, i.e. the relation (10.3.3) defines u as an implicit function in v (hence w), and u can be represented by an element of $(m + \alpha - e)w\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$. Since $m - e > 0$ from 10.1 and $\alpha > 0$, it follows that $u = \Theta(\frac{1}{v})$ for $v \gg 0$; in particular, as $v \rightarrow \infty$ we have $u \rightarrow 0^+$.

Since $m > e \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq 0$, for any $\alpha, u, v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the equation (10.3.2) has a solution

$$(10.4.2) \quad \beta = \alpha \sqrt{\frac{m + \frac{v}{u} - e}{m + \alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2}}} > 0.$$

If we set $C = \alpha^2 / (m + \alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2})$, then (10.3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\beta^2 = C \left(\frac{1}{uw} + (m - e) \right).$$

Since $u \in w\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$ and u has a zero of order 1 at $w = 0$ from above, $\frac{1}{u^2}$ has a pole of order 2 at $w = 0$ and $\frac{1}{u^2} \in \frac{1}{w^2}\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$. On the other hand, from (10.4.1) we have

$$\frac{1}{uw} = (m + \alpha - e)\frac{1}{u^2} - (m - \frac{e}{2}),$$

which also has a pole of order 2 at $w = 0$. Overall, we obtain

$$\beta^2 = \frac{C}{m+\alpha-e}w^{-2} + (\text{higher-degree terms in } w).$$

In particular, β^2 is an implicit function in v that is represented by an element of $\frac{1}{w^2}\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$. Since the lowest-degree term of β^2 has positive coefficient, we can solve for β as a series in w directly and see that β is represented by an element of $\frac{1}{w}\mathbb{R}[[w]]^c$. Note that $\beta = \Theta(v)$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Regarding u, β as elements of $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ allows us to consider $Z_{\overline{w}, \overline{B}}, Z_{\omega, B}$ as group homomorphisms $K(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$.

10.4.3. In a subsequent article [31], the coefficients of u as a power series in w are worked out explicitly in terms of the constants m, α, e and the Catalan numbers, along with the radius of convergence of u . The coefficients of β as a power series in w , and hence the coefficients of u and β as Laurent series in $\frac{1}{v}$, can then be worked out completely following the recipe above.

We include the following lemma here, although it will not be needed until Theorem 12.5:

Lemma 10.4.4. *Consider β, u as function in v as in 10.4, and suppose $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is such that, on $[v_0, \infty)$, both β, u are positive and convergent as Laurent series in v . Then there exists $v' > v_0$ such that u is monotone decreasing while β is monotone increasing for $v \in [v', \infty)$.*

Proof. From (10.4.2), it suffices to show that $\frac{v}{u}$ is monotone increasing for $v \gg 0$. On the other hand, rewriting (10.3.3) as

$$(m + \alpha - e)\frac{1}{u^2} = (m - \frac{e}{2}) + \frac{v}{u},$$

it suffices to show that $\frac{1}{u^2}$ is monotone increasing. From (10.4.1), we have

$$u = (m + \alpha - e)w(1 - (m - \frac{e}{2})w^2 + \text{higher-order terms in } w)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{u^2} &= \frac{1}{(m+\alpha-e)^2} \left(\frac{1}{w^2} + 2(m - \frac{e}{2}) + \text{higher-order terms in } w \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(m+\alpha-e)^2} \left(v^2 + 2(m - \frac{e}{2}) + \text{lower-order terms in } v \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which we see the derivative of $\frac{1}{u^2}$ with respect to v is a series where the highest-degree term is $\frac{2}{(m+\alpha-e)^2}v$, and so $\frac{1}{u^2}$ is monotone increasing as a function in v on the interval $[v', \infty)$ for some $v' > v_0$. \blacksquare

10.5. The heart \mathcal{B}^l . With $\omega = u(\Theta + mf) + vf$ and $B = qf$, for any coherent sheaf A of nonzero rank on X we have

$$\mu_{\omega, B}(A) = \frac{\omega \text{ch}_1^B(A)}{\text{ch}_0^B(A)} = u\mu_{\Theta+mf, B}(A) + v\mu_f(A).$$

The proof of [25, Lemma 3.1] can then be easily modified to show:

Lemma 10.5.1. *Suppose $m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is as in 10.1, and $\omega = u(\Theta + mf) + vf$ where $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is fixed, $B = qf$ for some $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and F is a coherent sheaf on X .*

- (1) *The following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *There exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\omega, B}$ for all $(v, u) \in (v_0, \infty) \times (0, u_0)$.*
 - (b) *There exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every nonzero subsheaf $A \subseteq F$, we have $\mu_{\omega, B}(A) \leq 0$ for all $(v, u) \in (v_0, \infty) \times (0, u_0)$.*
 - (c) *For every nonzero subsheaf $A \subseteq F$, either (i) $\mu_f(A) < 0$, or (ii) $\mu_f(A) = 0$ and also $\mu_{\Theta+mf, B}(A) \leq 0$.*
- (2) *The following are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $F \in \mathcal{T}_{\omega,B}$ for all $(v, u) \in (v_0, \infty) \times (0, u_0)$.*
- (b) *There exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every nonzero quotient sheaf A of F we have $\mu_{\omega,B}(A) > 0$ for all $(v, u) \in (v_0, \infty) \times (0, u_0)$.*
- (c) *For every nonzero quotient sheaf A of F , either (i) $\mu_f(A) > 0$, or (ii) $\mu_f(A) = 0$ and $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(A) > 0$.*

We now define \mathcal{F}^l (resp. \mathcal{T}^l) to be the extension closure in $\text{Coh}(X)$ of all coherent sheaves F satisfying condition (1)(c) (resp. (2)(c)) in Lemma 10.5.1, and define the extension closure in $D^b(X)$

$$\mathcal{B}^l = \langle \mathcal{F}^l[1], \mathcal{T}^l \rangle.$$

10.5.2. Now suppose $u : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is any continuous function in v such that $u \rightarrow 0$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$, such as when u is defined as an implicit function in v via (10.3.3) as in 10.4. Then we can equivalently define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^l &= \{F \in \text{Coh}(X) : F \in \mathcal{T}_{\omega,B} \text{ for all } v \gg 0\}, \\ \mathcal{F}^l &= \{F \in \text{Coh}(X) : F \in \mathcal{F}_{\omega,B} \text{ for all } v \gg 0\} \end{aligned}$$

just as we did in [29, Remark 4.4(vi)].

10.6. Fixing a relation between u, v . From now on, we will assume that u, v satisfy the relation (10.3.3) and regard u as a function in v as we did in 10.4. Then many of the arguments and results in [25] carry over directly, including: $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \subset \mathcal{T}^l$, $\mathcal{F}^l \subset \text{Coh}^{\leq 2}(X)$, $W_{0,\hat{\Phi}} \subset \mathcal{T}^l$, and that $f\text{ch}_1(E) \geq 0$ for all $E \in \mathcal{B}^l$ (see [25, 3.2] and [29, Remark 4.4]). Replacing μ^* with $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}$ in the proof of [29, Lemma 4.6] (see also [25, Lemma 3.3]) gives that $(\mathcal{T}^l, \mathcal{F}^l)$ is a torsion pair in $\text{Coh}(X)$, and so \mathcal{B}^l is the heart of a t-structure on $D^b(X)$. The inclusion $W_{0,\hat{\Phi}} \subset \mathcal{T}^l$ then implies $\mathcal{F}^l \subset W_{1,\hat{\Phi}}$. We also have the analogue of [25, Lemma 3.4]:

Lemma 10.6.1. *Fix $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as in 10.1, consider u as a function in v as in 10.4 and let $B \in \mathbb{R}f$. Then for any nonzero $F \in \mathcal{B}^l$, we have $Z_{\omega,B}(F) \in \mathbb{H}$ for $v \gg 0$.*

10.7. Z^l -stability. Suppose X is a Weierstraß elliptic surface. By regarding u as a function in v as in 10.4, for any $B \in \mathbb{R}f$ we now define a group homomorphism $Z^l : K(D^b(X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ via

$$Z^l(E) = Z_{\omega,B}(E)$$

for $E \in D^b(X)$. By Lemma 10.6.1, the pair (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) is a polynomial stability function with respect to $(0, 1]$. (The HN property of Z^l on \mathcal{B}^l will be established below using Proposition 5.8.)

The next main goal in this section is to establish a relation between Z_l -stability and Z^l -stability. For this, we need a little more technical preparation.

10.8. Under the relations (10.3.1), (10.3.2) and (10.3.3), any $E \in D^b(X)$ with $\text{ch}_0(E) = 0$ satisfies

$$-\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) = \Re Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E) = -\frac{1}{u} \Im Z_{\omega,B}(\Phi E) = -\frac{1}{u} \omega \text{ch}_1^B(\Phi E)$$

where the second equality follows from (10.3.4).

10.9. Consider the abelian subcategory $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow$ of $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$. Any nonzero $E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$ with $f\text{ch}_1(E) = 0$ must be a fiber sheaf; if E also lies in $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow$, then E must be a 0-dimensional sheaf and hence $\text{ch}_2(E) > 0$. Hence for any \mathbb{R} -divisor \overline{B} on X , we have the slope function on $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow$

$$\mu_{*, \overline{B}}(E) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E)}{f\text{ch}_1(E)} & \text{if } f\text{ch}_1(E) \neq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } f\text{ch}_1(E) = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{for } E \in \{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow.$$

Note that $\text{ch}_1^{\overline{B}}(E) = \text{ch}_1(E)$ for any $E \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$. The HN property of $\mu_{*, \overline{B}}$ on $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow$ follows from [32, Proposition 3.4].

Lemma 10.10. *Suppose $\overline{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$ and $E \in \{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger$ is a $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ -semistable sheaf supported in dimension 1. Then ΦE lies in \mathcal{T}^l (resp. \mathcal{F}^l) if $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) > 0$ (resp. $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) \leq 0$).*

Proof. Every coherent sheaf in $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger$ is Φ -WIT₀ [27, Remark 3.14], so $\Phi E \in \text{Coh}(X)$. Take any short exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow \Phi E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

where $M, N \neq 0$. Since ΦE is $\widehat{\Phi}$ -WIT₁, so is M . Hence we have a long exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{\Phi}^0 N \rightarrow \widehat{M} \xrightarrow{g} E \rightarrow \widehat{\Phi}^1 N \rightarrow 0.$$

Since E lies in $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger$ and is supported in dimension 1, we have $f\text{ch}_1(E) \neq 0$; we also know ΦE is a torsion-free sheaf [27, Lemma 4.3(ii)], so M is also torsion-free.

Since $\overline{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$, we have $f\text{ch}_1^{\overline{B}}(F) = f\text{ch}_1(F)$ for any coherent sheaf F on X and similarly for ch_1^B .

Case 1: $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) > 0$. To prove $\Phi E \in \mathcal{T}^l$, we use the characterisation of \mathcal{T}^l in Lemma 10.5.1(2)(c), by which it suffices to show either $\mu_f(N) > 0$, or $\mu_f(N) = 0$ together with $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(N) > 0$, for any nonzero quotient sheaf N of ΦE . In particular, we can assume $\text{ch}_0(N) \neq 0$.

That M is $\widehat{\Phi}$ -WIT₁ gives $f\text{ch}_1(M) \leq 0$ [28, Lemma 5.4(a)], while $\text{ch}_0(E) = 0$ gives $f\text{ch}_1(\Phi E) = 0$. Hence $f\text{ch}_1(N) \geq 0$. Suppose $f\text{ch}_1(N) = 0$. Then $f\text{ch}_1(M) = 0$ and hence $\text{ch}_0(\widehat{M}) = 0$, i.e. \widehat{M} is a torsion sheaf. This implies $\widehat{\Phi}^0 N$ is a Φ -WIT₁ torsion sheaf, and hence a fiber sheaf [26, Lemma 2.6], and so $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^0 N) \leq 0$ [28, Lemma 5.4(a)].

If $\widehat{\Phi}^1 N$ is also a fiber sheaf, then N itself is a fiber sheaf, and hence a torsion sheaf, and so $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(N) = \infty$.

So let us assume $\widehat{\Phi}^1 N$ is not a fiber sheaf, in which case $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^1 N) < \infty$. The $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ -semistability of E then gives $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^1 N) > 0$, and we have $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^1 N) < 0$ overall. We are also assuming $f\text{ch}_1(N) = 0$ which implies $\text{ch}_0(\widehat{\Phi}^1 N) = 0$. Applying 10.8 to $\widehat{\Phi}^1 N$ and noting $0 > \text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^1 N)$, we obtain $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(N) > 0$. Since $f\text{ch}_1^B(N) = 0$, we have $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(N) = u(\Theta + mf)\text{ch}_1^B(N) > 0$ and hence $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(N) > 0$.

Case 2: $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(E) \leq 0$. In this case, we want to prove that $\Phi E \in \mathcal{F}^l$. By the characterisation of \mathcal{F}^l in Lemma 10.5.1(1)(c), it suffices to show either $\mu_f(M) < 0$, or $\mu_f(M) = 0$ together with $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(M) \leq 0$. As in Case 1, we know M is a torsion-free sheaf with $f\text{ch}_1(M) \leq 0$. If $f\text{ch}_1(M) < 0$ then we are done, so let us assume $f\text{ch}_1(M) = 0$, which gives $f\text{ch}_1(N) = 0$. The same argument as in Case 1 then gives $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^0 N) \leq 0$.

If $\text{im } g = 0$, then $\widehat{\Phi}^0 N \cong \widehat{M}$ is both Φ -WIT₁ and Φ -WIT₀, forcing $M = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\text{im } g \neq 0$. Since $\text{im } g$ is a subsheaf of E , which is pure 1-dimensional and lies in $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger$, it follows that $f\text{ch}_1(\text{im } g) \neq 0$. Hence $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\text{im } g) \leq 0$ by the $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ -semistability of E . Thus $\text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{M}) = \text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\widehat{\Phi}^0 N) + \text{ch}_2^{\overline{B}}(\text{im } g) \leq 0$. Applying 10.8 to \widehat{M} now gives $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(M) \leq 0$. Since $f\text{ch}_1(M) = 0$, it follows that $(\Theta + mf)\text{ch}_1^B(M) \leq 0$ and hence $\mu_{\Theta+mf,B}(M) \leq 0$. \blacksquare

Proposition 10.11. *Fix an \mathbb{R} -divisor $B \in \mathbb{R}f$ on X . Then $\Phi\text{Coh}^p \subset D_{\mathcal{B}^t}^{[0,1]}$.*

Proof of Proposition 10.11. For any $E \in \text{Coh}^p$, consider the canonical exact triangle

$$H^{-1}(E)[1] \rightarrow E \rightarrow H^0(E) \rightarrow H^{-1}(E)[2]$$

where $H^{-1}(E) \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 2}(X)$ and $H^0(E) \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$. Fix an \mathbb{R} -divisor $\overline{B} \in \mathbb{R}f$ on X . Since $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\dagger$ is a torsion class in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$, we have a filtration in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X)$

$$A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq A_3 = H^0(E)$$

where A_2 is the maximal subsheaf of $H^0(E)$ lying in $\{\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}\}^\uparrow$, A_0 is the maximal subsheaf of A_2 lying in $\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X)$, all the $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ -HN factors of A_1/A_0 have $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ in the range $(0, \infty)$, and all the $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ -HN factors of A_2/A_1 have $\mu_{*,\overline{B}}$ in the range $(-\infty, 0]$. Since $\text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X) \subset \text{Coh}^p$, we can construct a filtration of E in Coh^p with factors $H^{-1}(E)[1], A_0, A_1/A_0, A_2/A_1$ and A_3/A_2 .

Since $H^{-1}(E)$ is a torsion-free sheaf, we have $\Phi H^{-1}(E)[1] \in \mathcal{B}^l$ by [25, 3.9] (the proof of which depends on [25, 3.7, 3.8], which still apply). Next we have $\Phi A_0 \in \text{Coh}(p)_0 \subset \mathcal{B}^l$. Then, by Lemma 10.10, we have $\Phi(A_1/A_0) \in \mathcal{T}^l \subset \mathcal{B}^l$ while $\Phi(A_2/A_1) \in \mathcal{F}^l \subseteq \mathcal{B}^l[-1]$. Lastly, since A_3/A_2 is necessarily a fiber sheaf, both its $\Phi\text{-WIT}_0$ and $\Phi\text{-WIT}_1$ components are fiber sheaves, implying $\Phi(A_3/A_2) \in \langle \text{Coh}(p)_0, \text{Coh}(p)_0[-1] \rangle \subseteq D_{\mathcal{B}^l}^{[0,1]}$. Overall, we have $\Phi E \in D_{\mathcal{B}^l}^{[0,1]}$ and the proposition follows. \blacksquare

We now have all the input for Configuration III to prove a correspondence theorem between Z_l -stability and Z^l -stability via the autoequivalence Φ :

Theorem 10.12. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a Weierstraß elliptic surface and $\Phi : D^b(X) \rightarrow D^b(X)$ the Fourier-Mukai transform given by a relative Poincaré sheaf as in 6.5. Let \overline{B}, B be divisors in $\mathbb{R}f$ satisfying (10.3.1), and let $\overline{\omega}, \omega$ be ample \mathbb{R} -divisors written in the form of 10.1, where we regard u, β as elements of $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ as in 10.4 (so that (10.3.2) and (10.3.3) holds). Then for any $E \in D^b(X)$,*

$$E \text{ is } Z_l\text{-semistable if and only if } \Phi E \text{ is } Z^l\text{-semistable.}$$

The same result holds when ‘semistable’ is replaced with ‘stable’ on both sides. In fact, we have

$$\Phi \cdot (Z_l, \mathcal{P}_{Z_l}) = (Z^l, \mathcal{P}_{Z^l}) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$$

for some element $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}(T)$ of $\widetilde{\text{Pa}}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{Z_l}, \mathcal{P}_{Z^l}$ denote the slicings for the polynomial stability conditions $(Z_l, \text{Coh}^p), (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l)$, respectively.

Proof. We will check that we are in Configuration III; the theorem will then follow from Theorem 5.7(iv).

Let $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U} = D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$, Φ as described and $\Psi = \widehat{\Phi}$ where $\widehat{\Phi}$ is as in 6.5. Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{Coh}^p, \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^l$, $Z_{\mathcal{A}} = Z_l$ and $Z_{\mathcal{B}} = Z^l$, while $a = \frac{1}{4}, b = 0$ and $T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GL}^{l,+}(2, \mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c)$.

Condition 5.3(a) now follows from the identities in 6.5, while condition 5.3(b) follows from Proposition 10.11. From 9.1, we know $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $(a, a + 1]$; from 10.7, we know $Z_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a polynomial stability function on \mathcal{B} with respect to $(b, b + 1]$. The identity (5.3.1) then follows from (10.3.4). Choosing Γ_T to be the branch satisfying $\Gamma_T(\phi') = \phi' - \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\phi' \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, we obtain $\Gamma_T^{-1}(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and so (5.3.2) holds. Therefore, we are in Configuration III and the first claim follows from Theorem 5.7(iv). The second claim then follows from Theorem 5.7 together with Lemma 10.13 below. \blacksquare

Lemma 10.13. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a Weierstraß elliptic surface, B a divisor in $\mathbb{R}f$, ω an ample \mathbb{R} -divisor on X written as in 10.1, where we regard u as an element of $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ as in 10.4 (so that (10.3.3) holds). Then (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) is a polynomial stability condition on $D^b(X)$ with respect to $(0, 1]$.*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 10.12, we know that if we choose $\overline{B}, \overline{\omega}$ in a suitable manner then (Z_l, Coh^p) and (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) are in Configuration III. Since (Z_l, Coh^p) has the HN property [4, Theorem 3.2.2], the HN property of (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) follows from Proposition 5.8. \blacksquare

10.14. Bogomolov inequality. On a smooth projective surface X , we define the discriminant of any object $E \in D^b(X)$ as

$$\Delta(E) = \text{ch}_1(E)^2 - 2\text{ch}_0(E)\text{ch}_2(E).$$

The usual Bogomolov inequality on a smooth projective surface X says, that when E is a torsion-free slope semistable sheaf on X , we have $\Delta(E) \geq 0$. It is easy to check that Δ is invariant under the shift functor in $D^b(X)$ and twisting the Chern character by a B -field.

10.14.1. Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a Weierstraß elliptic surface. Given any $E \in D^b(X)$, a straightforward computation using the formulas in 8.2 shows

$$(10.14.2) \quad \Delta(\Phi E) + e(\text{fch}_1(\Phi E))^2 = \Delta(E) + e(\text{fch}_1(E))^2,$$

or equivalently

$$(10.14.3) \quad \Delta(\Phi E) - e(\text{ch}_0(\Phi E))^2 = \Delta(E) - e(\text{ch}_0(E))^2.$$

If $E \in \text{Coh}^p$ is a Z_l -semistable object of nonzero rank, then $H^{-1}(E)$ is a torsion-free slope semistable sheaf while $H^0(E)$ is a 0-dimensional sheaf [4, Lemma 4.2], and so

$$\Delta(E) = \Delta(H^{-1}(E)) - 2\text{ch}_0(H^{-1}(E)[1])\text{ch}_2(H^0(E)) \geq \Delta(H^{-1}(E)) \geq 0.$$

That is, a Z_l -semistable object E satisfies $\Delta(E) \geq 0$. Therefore, by Theorem 10.12 and Lemma 10.13, any Z^l -semistable object F (i.e. a shift of some Z^l -semistable object in \mathcal{B}^l) satisfies

$$\Delta(F) \geq e(\text{ch}_0(F))^2 - (\text{fch}_1(F))^2.$$

In particular, when $e = 0$ (such as when X is a product and p is the trivial elliptic fibration), we have $\Delta(F) \geq 0$ for any Z^l -semistable object F .

11. ELLIPTIC SURFACES: BRIDGELAND STABILITY

In this section, $p : X \rightarrow B$ will be a Weierstraß elliptic fibration. We will fix the parameter v (and subsequently u, β) and consider the resulting Bridgeland stability conditions. We give a countable family of rays in the space of Bridgeland stability conditions on $D^b(X)$ such that, for every stability condition σ on such a ray sufficiently away from the origin, we are able to describe precisely the image of σ under the action of the autoequivalence Φ .

11.1. Notation. Let us continue with the notation from 10.1, where $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ are fixed such that $\Theta + kf$ is ample on X for all $k \geq m$ (which implies $m > e$). Let us now fix parameters l, q, β, u, v so that (10.3.1), (10.3.2) and (10.3.3) all hold, in which case $\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}, \omega, B$ are fixed divisors such that the relation (10.3.4)

$$Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} (-i) Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}(E)$$

holds for any $E \in D^b(X)$. Here, $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix}$ is an element of $\text{GL}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$.

11.2. Let $\widehat{\Phi}$ be a quasi-inverse of $\Phi[1]$ as in 6.5 so that $\widehat{\Phi}\Phi \cong \text{id}[-1]$, and let us write $\widehat{\Phi}^K$ to denote the induced map on $K(X)$. Since $(Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})$ is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(0, 1]$, the pair $(Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} \circ \widehat{\Phi}^K, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$ is also a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(0, 1]$. For any $F \in \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1]$, we have $\widehat{\Phi}F \in \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$ and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left((Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} \circ \widehat{\Phi}^K)(F) \right) = Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi \widehat{\Phi}F) = Z_{\omega, B}(F[-1])$$

from (10.3.4). Hence $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$ is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. In particular, for any $0 \neq F \in \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1]$ we have $\Re Z_{\omega, B}(F) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, and if $\Re Z_{\omega, B}(F) = 0$ then $\Im Z_{\omega, B}(F) < 0$ must hold.

Lemma 11.3. $\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X)$ is a Serre subcategory of \mathcal{B}^l .

Proof. Take any $T \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X)$ and any \mathcal{B}^l -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow T \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$. Since $\text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X) \subset \mathcal{B}^l$, it follows that $H^{-1}(M) = 0$ and we have an exact sequence of sheaves $0 \rightarrow H^{-1}(N) \rightarrow H^0(M) \xrightarrow{\alpha} T \rightarrow H^0(N) \rightarrow 0$ in which $\text{im } \alpha \in \text{Coh}^{\leq 0}(X)$. Then $f\text{ch}_1^B(H^{-1}(N)) = f\text{ch}_1^B(H^0(M)) = 0$ from Lemma 10.5.1, which implies $H^{-1}(N) \in \mathcal{F}^{l,0}$ and $H^0(M) \in \langle \text{Coh}^{\leq 1}(X), \mathcal{T}^{l,0} \rangle$ using the notation in and given the torsion quintuple in \mathcal{B}^l from [25, (3.7.2)].

If $\text{ch}_0(H^0(M)) > 0$, then from the description of the categories $\mathcal{T}^{l,0}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{l,0}$ in [25, 3.7] and Lemma 10.5.1, we have $(\Theta + mf)\text{ch}_1^B(H^0(M)) > 0$ while $(\Theta + mf)\text{ch}_1^B(H^{-1}(N)) \leq 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\text{ch}_0(H^0(M)) = 0$, forcing $H^{-1}(N) = 0$, and the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 11.4. *Suppose X is a smooth projective surface and ω, B are fixed \mathbb{R} -divisors on X where ω is ample. Suppose $\bar{m} = \min\{\omega\text{ch}_1^B(F) > 0 : F \in \text{Coh}(X)\}$ exists and A is a pure 1-dimensional sheaf on X such that $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(A) = \bar{m}$. Then A is a stable object with respect to the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$.*

Proof. Let us write ϕ to denote the phase function associated to the Bridgeland stability $(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$. Take any $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$ -short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow A \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ where $M, N \neq 0$, and consider the corresponding long exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow H^{-1}(N) \rightarrow H^0(M) \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \rightarrow H^0(N) \rightarrow 0.$$

If $\dim(\text{im } \alpha) = 0$, then by the purity of A we have $\text{im } \alpha = 0$, forcing $H^{-1}(N) = 0 = H^0(M)$, i.e. $M = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\dim(\text{im } \alpha) = 1$ and $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(\text{im } \alpha) > 0$. The minimality assumption on $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(A)$ then implies $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(\text{im } \alpha) = \bar{m} = \omega\text{ch}_1^B(A)$, and so $H^0(N)$ is supported in dimension 0. We now divide into two cases:

Case 1: $\text{ch}_0(H^{-1}(N)) = 0$. Then $H^{-1}(N) = 0$ and $N = H^0(N)$ is a 0-dimensional sheaf from above, giving us $\phi(N) = 1 > \phi(A)$.

Case 2: $\text{ch}_0(H^{-1}(N)) > 0$. Then $\text{ch}_0(H^{-1}(N)) = \text{ch}_0(H^0(M)) > 0$ and so $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^0(M)) > 0$. Since $-\omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^{-1}(N)) \geq 0$ and

$$\bar{m} = \omega\text{ch}_1^B(\text{im } \alpha) = \omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^0(M)) - \omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^{-1}(N)),$$

the minimality of \bar{m} implies $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^0(M)) = \bar{m}$ and $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(H^{-1}(N)) = 0$. Since $H^0(N)$ is supported in dimension 0, it follows that $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(N) = 0$ whereas $\omega\text{ch}_1^B(M) > 0$, giving us $\phi(M) < \phi(N)$.

Hence A is a $Z_{\omega, B}$ -stable object in $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$. \blacksquare

In part (a) of the next proposition, we describe the transform of the heart $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}$ under Φ in terms of the slicing for the polynomial stability condition (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) in 10.7 (see also Lemma 10.13); for part (b) of the proposition, recall that m, α are defined in 10.1 and l defined in 10.2, and recall from 11.2 that $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}[1])$ is a Bridgeland stability condition with respect to $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$.

Proposition 11.5. *Recall the notation in 11.1.*

- (a) $\Phi\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}[1] = \mathcal{P}_{Z^l}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$ where \mathcal{P}_{Z^l} is the $\mathbb{R}((\frac{1}{v}))^c$ -valued slicing of the polynomial stability condition (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) .
- (b) Suppose $m + \alpha$ and l are both integers. Then for any closed point $x \in X$, its structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_x is stable with respect to the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}[1])$.

Proof. (a) Let \mathcal{P}_{Z^l} denote the polynomial slicing of the polynomial stability condition (Z^l, Coh^p) . From the proof of [4, Proposition 4.1], we have $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}} = \mathcal{P}_{Z^l}(0, 1]$. By Theorem 10.12 and (10.3.4), we have $\Phi\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}[1] = \mathcal{P}_{Z^l}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. (Note that \mathcal{O}_x , being an object in \mathcal{B}^l of maximal phase 1 with respect to Z^l , lies in $\mathcal{P}_{Z^l}(1)$, while $\hat{\Phi}\mathcal{O}_x$, being a fiber sheaf, lies in $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}$.)

(b) Let $x \in X$ be a closed point. By the discussion in 11.2, the skyscraper sheaf \mathcal{O}_x is stable with respect to $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$ if and only if $\widehat{\Phi} \mathcal{O}_x$ is stable with respect to the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})$. For any $A \in \text{Coh}(X)$, we have

$$\overline{\omega} \text{ch}_1^{\overline{B}}(A) = \overline{\omega} \text{ch}_1(A) - \overline{\omega} \overline{B} \text{ch}_0(A) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \left((\Theta + (m + \alpha)f) \text{ch}_1(A) - l \text{ch}_0(A) \right),$$

which lies in $\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \mathbb{Z}$ under our assumption that both $m + \alpha$ and l are integers. In particular, the minimum of $\{\overline{\omega} \text{ch}_1^{\overline{B}}(F) > 0 : F \in \text{Coh}(X)\}$ exists, is equal to $\frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ and is attained when $F = \widehat{\Phi} \mathcal{O}_x$. By Lemma 11.4, $\widehat{\Phi} \mathcal{O}_x$ is stable with respect to $(Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})$ as wanted. \blacksquare

Proposition 11.6. *With notation as in 11.1, suppose $m + \alpha$ and l are both integers. Let \mathcal{P} denote the \mathbb{R} -valued slicing of the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$. Then $\mathcal{P}(0, 1] = \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 11.5(b), every skyscraper sheaf \mathcal{O}_x on X is stable of phase 1 with respect to the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$. On the other hand, $(Z_{\omega, B}, \Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1])$ satisfies the support property since $(Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})$ does and by the argument in 11.2. Then by a standard argument (see [33, Lemma 6.20], [19, Theorem 3.2] or [11, Proposition 10.3]), we must have $\mathcal{P}(0, 1] = \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$. \blacksquare

Theorem 11.7. *With notation as in 11.1, suppose $m + \alpha$ and l are both integers. Consider the Bridgeland stability conditions $\sigma_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} = (Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})$ and $\sigma_{\omega, B} = (Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$ on $D^b(X)$, both of which are with respect to $(0, 1]$. Then*

$$(11.7.1) \quad ([1] \circ \Phi) \cdot \sigma_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} = \sigma_{\omega, B} \cdot (T, g)$$

where (T, g) is an element of $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ with $T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. In particular, for any $E \in D^b(X)$,

$$E \text{ is } (Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}})\text{-semistable if and only if } \Phi E \text{ is } (Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})\text{-semistable.}$$

The statement also holds if we replace ‘semistable’ with ‘stable.’

Proof. Let us use Configuration III. Using the notation of Proposition 11.6, we have $\Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}[1] = \mathcal{P}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$, i.e. $\Phi \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}} \subset D_{\mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}}^{[0, 1]}$. If we choose $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U} = D^b(X)$, $\Psi = \widehat{\Phi}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}$, $Z_{\mathcal{A}} = Z_{\overline{\omega}, \overline{B}}$, $Z_{\mathcal{B}} = Z_{\omega, B}$, $a = b = 0$, $T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\Gamma_T = g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, then (5.3.1) follows from (10.3.4), and we are in Configuration III. The second half of the theorem then follows from Theorem 5.7, part (iv), while (11.7.1) follows from part (v) of the same theorem. \blacksquare

In the following two sections, we present several applications of Theorem 11.7.

12. APPLICATIONS: WALL-CROSSING FOR BRIDGELAND STABILITY

In this section, $p : X \rightarrow B$ will be a Weierstraß elliptic surface unless otherwise stated. We give the first series of applications of Theorem 11.7, including wall-crossing for Bridgeland stability conditions, and relations among Bridgeland stability, polynomial stability and twisted Gieseker stability for sheaves.

12.1. Notation. We will continue the notation from 10.1 where $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ are fixed such that $\Theta + kf$ is ample on X for all $k \geq m$ (which implies $m > e$). Regarding u, β as functions in v as in 10.4, let us fix a $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, on the region $v > v_0$, the functions u, β are both positive and their Laurent series representations in v are convergent. Now fix any $v > v_0$; then $u, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ are also fixed, and

$\tilde{\omega}, \bar{\omega}, \omega$ are all fixed ample divisors on X . Let us also fix \mathbb{R} -divisors $\bar{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$ on X such that (10.3.1) holds. Then for any $E \in D^b(X)$, we have the relation (10.3.4)

$$Z_{\omega, B}(\Phi E) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} (-i) Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}(E).$$

12.2. Mini-walls and Bridgeland stability. Using the author's joint work with Qin on mini-walls for Bridgeland stability [30], we can now complete the following diagram relating Bridgeland stability conditions and polynomial stability conditions on a Weierstraß elliptic surface:

Theorem 12.3. *Suppose $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and ample \mathbb{R} -divisors $\bar{\omega}, \omega$ are as in 10.1, and $m + \alpha, l$ are integers. Suppose $\bar{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$ are divisors satisfying (10.3.1). Let (Z_l, Coh^p) , (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l) be polynomial stability conditions defined in 9.1 and 10.7, respectively. For Bridgeland stability conditions $(Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}})$ and $(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$, use the notation in 12.1.*

Then for any fixed Chern character ch , there exists $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for every $v \geq v_1$ and $E \in D^b(X)$ of Chern character ch , we have the equivalences

$$(12.3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E \text{ is } (Z_l, \text{Coh}^p)\text{-semistable} & \iff & \Phi E \text{ is } (Z^l, \mathcal{B}^l)\text{-semistable} \\ \updownarrow & & \updownarrow \\ E \text{ is } (Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}})\text{-semistable} & \iff & \Phi E \text{ is } (Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})\text{-semistable} \end{array}$$

Proof. The upper horizontal equivalence follows immediately from Theorem 10.12. For the other equivalences, let $v_0 > 0$ be fixed as in 12.1. Then the lower horizontal equivalence holds for any $v \geq v_0$ by Theorem 11.7, which uses the assumption $m + \alpha, l \in \mathbb{Z}$. With $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, we have $\omega \in \text{NS}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ and by [30, Theorem 4.4], there exists $v_1 \geq v_0$ such that, for any fixed v satisfying $v \geq v_1$, the left vertical equivalence holds. The right vertical equivalence then follows. \blacksquare

12.4. Mini-walls along (10.3.3). In our notation in 10.1, we write $\bar{\omega} = \beta \tilde{\omega}$ where $\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\Theta + m.f)$ is a fixed ample class and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. As β varies, we obtain a 1-parameter family of Bridgeland stability conditions $\{(Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}) : \beta > 0\}$. For any fixed Chern character ch , it was proved in [30, Theorem 1.1] that the mini-walls for this 1-parameter family of Bridgeland stability conditions are locally finite.

On the other hand, we also write $\omega = u(\Theta + (m + \frac{v}{u})f)$ and, from 12.1, we know there exists $v_0 > 0$ such that, on the region $v > v_0$, we can regard u as a positive analytic function in v subject to the relation (10.3.3). This gives us another 1-parameter family of Bridgeland stability conditions $\{(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}) : v \in (v_0, \infty)\}$. For any fixed Chern character ch , we can then define mini-walls in the interval (v_0, ∞) in the same way as in [30, Definition 3.2]. At this point, it is natural to ask whether an analogue of [30, Theorem 1.1] holds for this family of Bridgeland stability conditions, i.e. whether boundedness and local finiteness of mini-walls hold. We give a positive answer below using Theorem 11.7:

Theorem 12.5. *Suppose $m \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ is as in 10.1, and $\omega = u(\Theta + (m + \frac{v}{u})f)$ where we regard u as a function in v as in 10.4. Let $B = qf$ where $q \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Fix a Chern character ch . Let v_1 be as in Theorem 12.3. Then there exists $v_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that the following statements hold for mini-walls for $\{(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}) : v \in (v_0, \infty)\}$:*

- (i) *(local finiteness) The set of mini-walls for ch is locally finite in (v_2, ∞) .*
- (ii) *(boundedness) There are no mini-walls for ch in $[v_1, \infty)$.*

Proof. In terms of our notation $\bar{B} = lf$, the condition $B \in (\mathbb{Z} + \frac{\epsilon}{2})f$ means that if \bar{B}, B satisfy (10.3.1), then l is forced to be an integer. Now, choosing $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ so that $m + \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and choosing ω as in 12.1,

Theorem 12.3 applies (for suitable $\bar{\omega}$ and \bar{B}) and the right vertical equivalence in (12.3.1) gives part (ii).

For part (i), let v_0 be as in 12.1 so that on the region $v \geq v_0$, the functions u, β in v both take on positive values, and the lower horizontal equivalence in (12.3.1) holds. By Lemma 10.4.4, there exists $v' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that β is monotone increasing for $v \in [v', \infty)$. Let $v_2 = \max\{v_0, v'\}$ and take any closed interval $I \subset (v_2, \infty)$. Let W be the set of mini-walls in (v_2, ∞) for the family of Bridgeland stability conditions $\{(Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}, \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}) : v \in (v_2, \infty)\}$. Then $W \cap I$ is finite by [30, Theorem 4.5(i)]. Hence for any $v'' \in I \setminus W$, the set of $Z_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}}$ -semistable objects of Chern character $\widehat{\Phi}^{\text{ch}}(\text{ch})$ is constant as v varies in the connected component of $I \setminus W$ containing v'' . By the lower horizontal equivalence in (12.3.1), the set of $Z_{\omega, B}$ -semistable objects of Chern character ch is also constant as v varies within the same connected component. This means that the set of mini-walls for the family $\{(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}) : v \in (v_2, \infty)\}$ is contained in W , and hence is locally finite. \blacksquare

In the author's joint work with Liu and Martinez [25, p.30], mini-walls along the curve (10.3.3) were studied (including using computational techniques such as from [24]). The boundedness of mini-walls was shown directly for the Chern characters of Fourier-Mukai transforms of 1-dimensional sheaves. Theorem 12.5 generalises the result to all Chern characters in the form of local finiteness and boundedness.

12.6. Twisted Gieseker semistable sheaves. The boundedness of mini-walls in [25] allowed Liu, Martinez and the author to show that twisted Gieseker semistable 1-dimensional sheaves are sent by Φ to Bridgeland semistable objects:

Proposition 12.7. [25, Corollary 6.14] *Let L be a \mathbb{Q} -line bundle with $\text{ch}_1(L) = \frac{1}{2}p^*K_B$. Suppose E is a 1-dimensional twisted Gieseker semistable sheaf with $\chi_L(E) \geq 0$ and $f\text{ch}_1(E) > 0$ and $m + \alpha \gg 0$. Then for $v \gg 0$ under the relation (10.3.3), the transform ΦE is Z_ω -semistable.*

We can now show not only an embedding of moduli spaces, but an isomorphism of moduli spaces:

Corollary 12.8. *Suppose $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$ are as in 12.1 and $m + \alpha, l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $\bar{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$ also satisfy (10.3.1), and L is a line bundle on X such that $\bar{B} = \text{ch}_1(L^*) + \frac{1}{2}K_X$. Then for any fixed Chern character ch of a 1-dimensional sheaf, if $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is as in Theorem 12.3 then for any $v \geq v_1$ and $E \in D^b(X)$ of Chern character ch we have*

$$E \text{ is an } L\text{-twisted } \tilde{\omega}\text{-Gieseker semistable sheaf} \Leftrightarrow \Phi E \text{ is } (Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})\text{-semistable.}$$

Proof. Since $K_X \in \mathbb{R}f$ [35, Proposition III.1.1], for any \bar{B} satisfying the hypotheses, we can find a line bundle L satisfying $\bar{B} = \text{ch}_1(L^*) + \frac{1}{2}K_X$ and $\text{ch}_1(L)$ would be a multiple of the fiber class and hence $\text{ch}_1(L)K_X = 0$, and so Corollary 9.4 applies. On the other hand, all the hypotheses of Theorem 12.3 are also satisfied, and the equivalence between the upper left and the lower right corners in (12.3.1), together with the equivalence in Corollary 9.4, implies this corollary. \blacksquare

12.9. When e is even, we can put $l = \frac{e}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q = 0$, in which case the condition $\bar{B} = \text{ch}_1(L^*) + \frac{1}{2}K_X$ in Corollary 12.8 reduces to the condition $\text{ch}_1(L) = \frac{1}{2}p^*K_B$ in Proposition 12.7 via the formula $K_X = p^*K_B + ef$ [25, 2.3]. For these particular parameters, Corollary 12.8 generalises Proposition 12.7.

13. APPLICATIONS: ACTION ON STABILITY MANIFOLD

In this section, we give the second series of applications of Theorem 11.7, covering the preservation of a connected component of $\text{Stab}(X)$ under the autoequivalence group, and solutions to Gepner equations.

13.1. Preservation of connected component. For a smooth projective surface X , let $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$ denote the connected component of $\text{Stab}(X)$, the stability manifold of X , containing the geometric stability conditions, i.e. the Bridgeland stability conditions for which skyscraper sheaves of points are stable of the same phase. When X is a K3 surface, Bridgeland conjectured that the autoequivalence group of a K3 surface preserves the connected component $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$ [11, Conjecture 1.2]. For K3 surfaces of Picard rank 1, this conjecture was proved by Bayer-Bridgeland [5, Theorem 1.3]. We now prove an analogue of this conjecture when X is an elliptic surface of nonzero Kodaira dimension:

Theorem 13.2. *Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a Weierstraß elliptic surface.*

- (i) *The autoequivalence Φ preserves the connected component $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$.*
- (ii) *If the Kodaira dimension of X is nonzero, then $\text{Aut}(D^b(X))$ preserves $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$.*

Proof. (i) This part follows immediately from Theorem 11.7 and the fact that any Bridgeland stability condition of the form $(Z_{\omega', B'}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega', B'})$, where ω', B' are \mathbb{R} -divisors with ω' ample, lies in $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$.

(ii) Since our Weierstraß elliptic surface $p : X \rightarrow B$ has a section, the greatest common divisor λ_X of all fiber degrees of objects in $D^b(X)$ is 1. Together with our assumption on the Kodaira dimension of X , we have a short exact sequence of groups

$$1 \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{O}_X(D) : fD = 0 \rangle \rtimes \text{Aut}(X) \times \mathbb{Z}[2] \rightarrow \text{Aut}(D^b(X)) \xrightarrow{s} \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 1$$

by [43, Theorem 4.1, Remark 1.2(iii)] (see also [34]), where we write s for the induced map on $H^{\text{even}}(C, \mathbb{Z})$ of a smooth fiber C of p . We can write $H^{\text{even}}(C, \mathbb{Z}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \text{ch}_0(E) \\ \text{ch}_1(E) \end{pmatrix} : E \in D^b(F) \right\}$, so that s takes an autoequivalence to its induced map on Chern characters.

Clearly, tensoring by line bundles on X , automorphisms of X and the shift functor preserve the connected component $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$. If we write T to denote tensoring by the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(\Theta)$, then $s(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ while $s(\Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since the images of T and Φ under s generate $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$, and Φ preserve the connected component $\text{Stab}^\dagger(X)$ by part (i), part (ii) follows. ■

13.3. Gepner equations. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category and $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ the Bridgeland stability manifold on \mathcal{D} . A Gepner equation on $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ is an equation of the form

$$\Phi \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot (s)$$

where $(\Phi, s) \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{D}) \times \mathbb{C}$ and $\sigma \in \text{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$. If we write $\sigma = (Z, \mathcal{P})$ where \mathcal{P} is the slicing, then by $\sigma \cdot (s)$ we mean the Bridgeland stability condition (Z', \mathcal{P}') where $Z' = e^{-i\pi s} Z$ and $\mathcal{P}'(x) = \mathcal{P}(x + \Re(s))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Following Toda [41, Definition 2.3], a Bridgeland stability condition σ satisfying a Gepner equation as above is said to be of Gepner type with respect to (Φ, s) .

13.4. For our next theorem, we need the following facts: Given a smooth projective surface X and \mathbb{R} -divisors ω, B on X where ω is ample, $\mu_{\omega, B}$ -stability for coherent sheaves on X is independent of the divisor B and is invariant under tensoring with any line bundle L on X . In addition, for any coherent sheaf E on X we have

$$\mu_{\omega, B'}(E \otimes L) = \mu_{\omega, B}(E) + \omega(B - B' + \text{ch}_1(L))$$

for any \mathbb{R} -divisor B' on X . Putting all these together, if L is a line bundle satisfying $\omega B' = \omega(B + \text{ch}_1(L))$, then $\{E \otimes L : E \in \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B}\} = \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B + c_1(L)}$. On the other hand, for any $E \in D^b(X)$, we have

$$Z_{\omega, B}(E \otimes L^*) = - \int_X e^{-(B + c_1(L))} \text{ch}(E) = Z_{\omega, B + c_1(L)}(E).$$

In summary, if we write $\otimes L$ to denote the functor of (derived) tensoring with L and let $\sigma_{\omega, B}$ denote the Bridgeland stability condition $(Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$ with respect to $(0, 1]$, then

$$(13.4.1) \quad (\otimes L) \cdot \sigma_{\omega, B} = \sigma_{\omega, B + c_1(L)}.$$

13.5. Gepner-type stability on elliptic surfaces. Let $p : X \rightarrow B$ be a Weierstraß elliptic surface. Fix $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as in 10.1. Then $m > e$ and so $m + \alpha - \frac{e}{2} > 0$. In this case, if we choose

$$(13.5.1) \quad u = \sqrt{\frac{m + \alpha - e}{m + \alpha - \frac{e}{2}}}, \quad \beta = \alpha u, \quad v = \beta$$

then (10.3.2) and (10.3.3) hold and, in particular, we have $\frac{v}{u} = \alpha$, $\frac{\beta}{\alpha} = u$ and $\bar{\omega} = \omega$. If we further choose $l, q \in \mathbb{R}$ so that they satisfy (10.3.1), then we have a solution to (10.3.4) with $\bar{\omega} = \omega$. This leads us to the following result, which in turn gives us solutions to Gepner equations on elliptic surfaces:

Theorem 13.6. *Suppose $p : X \rightarrow B$ is a Weierstraß elliptic surface, and L is a line bundle on X such that $\text{ch}_1(L) = \frac{e}{2}f$. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be as in 10.1 and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be such that $m + \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Set $u = \sqrt{\frac{m + \alpha - e}{m + \alpha - (e/2)}}$, $\omega = u(\Theta + (m + \alpha)f)$ and $B = qf$. Then the Bridgeland stability condition $\sigma = (Z_{\omega, B}, \mathcal{B}_{\omega, B})$ is a solution to the equation*

$$(13.6.1) \quad (\otimes L \circ [1] \circ \Phi) \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot (T, g)$$

where $\otimes L$ denotes tensoring with L , and (T, g) is the element in $\widetilde{\text{GL}}^+(2, \mathbb{R})$ where $T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{u} & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Let use the notation in 10.1 and 10.2, and further assume $m, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ satisfy $m + \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Choose u, β, v as in (13.5.1), which ensures $\bar{\omega} = \omega$. Then choose $\bar{B}, B \in \mathbb{R}f$ to satisfy (10.3.1), i.e. $\bar{B} - B = \frac{e}{2}f = \text{ch}_1(L)$. With (T, g) as described, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\otimes L \circ [1] \circ \Phi) \cdot \sigma_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}} &= (\otimes L) \cdot \sigma_{\omega, B} \cdot (T, g) \quad \text{by (11.7.1)} \\ &= \sigma_{\bar{\omega}, \bar{B}} \cdot (T, g) \quad \text{by (13.4.1) and } \bar{\omega} = \omega. \end{aligned}$$

■

Example 13.7. (Gepner points) Assume the setting of Theorem 13.6. Note that $T^2 = -1$, and so (13.6.1) gives

$$(\otimes L \circ [1] \circ \Phi)^2 \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot (1).$$

If we specialise to the case where $e = 0$ (i.e. when X is a product elliptic surface), then $u = 1$ and T corresponds to multiplication by $-i$. In this case, (13.6.1) can be rewritten as

$$([1] \circ \Phi) \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] L. V. Ahlfors. *Complex Analysis: an Introduction to the Theory of Analytic Functions of One Complex Variable*. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill, New York, 3rd edition, 1953.
- [2] D. Arcara, A. Bertram, and M. Lieblich. Bridgeland-stable moduli spaces for K-trivial surfaces. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 15(1):1–38, 2013.
- [3] C. Bartocci, U. Bruzzo, and D. Hernández-Ruipérez. *Fourier-Mukai and Nahm Transforms in Geometry and Mathematical Physics*, volume 276. Birkhäuser, 2009. Progress in Mathematics.
- [4] A. Bayer. Polynomial Bridgeland stability conditions and the large volume limit. *Geom. Topol.*, 13:2389–2425, 2009.
- [5] A. Bayer and T. Bridgeland. Derived automorphism groups of K3 surfaces of Picard rank 1. *Duke Math. J.*, 166(1):75–124, 2017.
- [6] A. Bayer, A. Craw, and Z. Zhang. Nef divisors for moduli spaces of complexes with compact support. *Selecta Math. (N. S.)*, 23(2):1507–1561, Apr 2017.
- [7] A. Bayer, M. Lahoz, E. Macrì, H. Nuer, A. Perry, and P. Stellari. Stability conditions in families. Preprint. arXiv:1902.08184 [math.AG], 2019.
- [8] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, and Y. Toda. Bridgeland stability conditions on threefolds I: Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequalities. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 23:117–163, 2014.
- [9] T. Bridgeland. Fourier-Mukai transforms for elliptic surfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 498:115–133, 1998.
- [10] T. Bridgeland. Stability conditions on triangulated categories. *Ann. Math.*, 166:317–345, 2007.
- [11] T. Bridgeland. Stability conditions on K3 surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 141:241–291, 2008.
- [12] T. Bridgeland. Scattering diagrams, Hall algebras and stability conditions. *Algebr. Geom.*, 4(5):523–561, 2017.
- [13] T. Bridgeland and A. Maciocia. Fourier-Mukai transforms for K3 and elliptic fibrations. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 11:629–657, 2002.
- [14] C. Chindris. On the invariant theory for tame tilted algebras. *Algebra Number Theory*, 7(1):193–214, 2013.
- [15] G. Dimitrov, F. Haiden, L. Katzarkov, and M. Kontsevich. Dynamical systems and categories. Preprint. arXiv:1307.8418 [math.CT], 2013.
- [16] D. Greb, S. Kebekus, and T. Peternell. Movable curves and semistable sheaves. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2016(2):536–570, 2016.
- [17] G. Hein and D. Ploog. Fourier-Mukai transforms and stable bundles on elliptic curves. *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, 46(2):423–434, 2005.
- [18] D. Huybrechts. *Fourier-Mukai Transforms in Algebraic Geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Clarendon Press, 2006.
- [19] D. Huybrechts. Introduction to stability conditions. In *Moduli Spaces*, volume 411. Cambridge University Press, 2014. LMS Lecture Note Series.
- [20] A. D. King. Moduli of representations of finite dimensional algebras. *Q. J. Math.*, 45(4):515–530, 1994.
- [21] J. Kollár. *Lectures on Resolution of Singularities (AM-166)*. Princeton University Press, 2007.
- [22] J. Kollár and S. Mori. *Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties*, volume 134 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [23] W.-P. Li and Z. Qin. Polynomial Bridgeland stability conditions for the derived category of sheaves on surfaces. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 19(1):31–52, 2011.
- [24] W. Liu. Bayer-Macri decomposition on Bridgeland moduli spaces over surfaces. *Kyoto J. Math.*, 58(3):595–621, 2018.
- [25] W. Liu, J. Lo, and C. Martinez. Fourier-Mukai transforms and stable sheaves on Weierstrass elliptic surfaces. Preprint. arXiv:1910.02477 [math.AG], 2019.
- [26] J. Lo. Stability and Fourier-Mukai transforms on elliptic fibrations. *Adv. Math.*, 255:86–118, 2014.
- [27] J. Lo. t-structures on elliptic fibrations. *Kyoto J. Math.*, 56(4):701–735, 2016.
- [28] J. Lo. Fourier-Mukai transforms of slope stable torsion-free sheaves and stable 1-dimensional sheaves on Weierstrass elliptic threefolds. Preprint. arXiv:1710.03771 [math.AG], 2017.
- [29] J. Lo. Fourier-Mukai transforms of slope stable torsion-free sheaves on a product elliptic threefold. *Adv. Math.*, 358:106846, 2019.
- [30] J. Lo and Z. Qin. Mini-walls for Bridgeland stability conditions on the derived category of sheaves over surfaces. *Asian J. Math.*, 18(2):321–344, 2014.
- [31] J. Lo and K. Wong. A note on bridgeland stability conditions and catalan numbers. Preprint. arXiv:2012.12851 [math.AG], 2020.
- [32] J. Lo and Z. Zhang. Preservation of semistability under Fourier–Mukai transforms. *Geom. Dedicata*, 193(1):89–119, 2018.
- [33] E. Macrì and B. Schmidt. Lectures on Bridgeland stability. In *Moduli of Curves*, volume 21 of *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*, pages 139–211. Springer, 2017.
- [34] A. C. López Martín, D. Sánchez Gómez, and C. T. Prieto. Relative Fourier-Mukai transforms for Weierstrass fibrations, abelian schemes and Fano fibrations. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 155(1):129–153, 2013.
- [35] R. Miranda. *The basic theory of elliptic surfaces*. Dipartimento di Matematica dell’ Università di Pisa, ETS Editrice Pisa, 1989.
- [36] A. Polishchuk. *Abelian varieties, theta functions and the Fourier transform*, volume 153. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- [37] A. Polishchuk. Holomorphic bundles on 2-dimensional noncommutative toric orbifolds. In C. Consani and M. Marcolli, editors, *Noncommutative Geometry and Number Theory*, pages 341–359. Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics, Bonn, 2006.
- [38] A. Polishchuk. Constant families of t-structures on derived categories of coherent sheaves. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 7:109–134, 2007.
- [39] A. Rudakov. Stability for an abelian category. *J. Algebra*, 197(1):231–245, 1997.
- [40] Y. Toda. Limit stable objects on Calabi-Yau 3-folds. *Duke Math. J.*, 149(1):157–208, 2009.
- [41] Y. Toda. Gepner type stability conditions on graded matrix factorizations. *Algebr. Geom.*, 1(5):613–665, 2014.
- [42] Y. Toda. Hall algebras in the derived category and higher rank DT invariants. Preprint. arXiv:1601.07519 [math.AG], 2016.
- [43] H. Uehara. Autoequivalences of derived categories of elliptic surfaces with non-zero Kodaira dimension. *Algebr. Geom.*, 3(5):543–577, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, 18111 NORDHOFF STREET, NORTHRIDGE
CA 91330, USA

Email address: `jason.lo@csun.edu`