

Z-critical equations for holomorphic vector bundles on Kähler surfaces

Julien Keller and Carlo Scarpa

We prove that the existence of a Z -positive and Z -critical Hermitian metric on a rank 2 holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Kähler surface implies that the bundle is Z -stable. As particular cases, we obtain stability results for the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation and the almost Hermite-Einstein equation for rank 2 bundles over surfaces. We show examples of Z -unstable bundles and Z -critical metrics away from the large volume limit.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Z-critical and vector bundle Monge-Ampère equations	5
2.1	Some positivity conditions for Hermitian metrics	8
3	Z-stability and Monge-Ampère stability	10
3.1	Consequences of Monge-Ampère positivity	14
3.2	Other stability conditions	19
3.3	Small variations of the charge and Mumford stability	22
4	Z-polystability, Gieseker stability, and some examples	24
4.1	Z -polystability	32
4.2	Z -stability and Gieseker stability	34
	References	37

1 Introduction

Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle over the compact complex manifold X , and assume that ω is a Kähler form on X . We consider a class of partial differential equations, called *Z -critical equations*, to be solved for a Hermitian metric h on E , that take the form

$$\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}(h)) = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

The equation depends on ω and the choice of a *polynomial central charge* as defined by Bayer [Bay09]. Briefly, a polynomial central charge Z is defined by a vector of complex numbers $\rho \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ and a unitary class $U \in H^\bullet(X, \mathbb{R})$, and associates to any subvariety $V \subset X$ and any sheaf $S \rightarrow V$ a complex number $Z_V(S)$. We refer to Section 2 for the precise definition.

The Z -critical equations have been introduced by Dervan, McCarthy, and Sektnan in [DMS24] as a possible differential-geometric counterpart to Bridgeland stability conditions; it is conjectured that the existence of solutions of (1.1) should be equivalent to an algebraic stability condition on the bundle E , at least in certain regimes. This expectation has already been partially confirmed in various interesting cases. For a line bundle and a particular choice of central charge, (1.1) becomes the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation (dHYM equation), for which it is known that the existence of solutions is equivalent to an algebraic positivity condition that is reminiscent of the Nakai-Moishezon criterion. This correspondence for the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation has attracted a lot of attention in recent years; for the sake of brevity, we refer the reader to [CJY20], [Che21], [CLT21] for an in-depth treatment of the subjects. On higher-rank bundles, one of the main results of [DMS24] is that one has a correspondence between the existence of solutions of (1.1) and the Z -stability of E in an asymptotic regime known as the *large volume limit*.

Establishing the existence of solutions of (1.1) poses in general exceptional difficulties, and most of the few results that are known are limited to low-rank and low-dimensional situations, where Z -critical equations simplify substantially. A possible exception is given by the examples of dHYM connections over a Fano threefold appearing in the recent paper [Cor23]. If X is a curve, the Z -critical equation reduces to the Hermite-Einstein problem, for E of any rank. If instead X is a complex surface and $\text{rk}(E) = 1$, the problem of the existence of solutions for any Z -critical equation is essentially settled in [DMS24, §2.3.3], at least under a mild positivity assumption called the *volume form hypothesis*. For $\text{rk}(E) = 1$, it seems likely that one can approach the Z -critical equation following the study of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation. The possible presence of a non-vanishing unitary class (see Section 2 for the definition) however greatly complicates the analysis even in the rank-1 case: it might not be possible to write the Z -critical equation as a PDE for the eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix, a feature of the dHYM equation that was crucial to develop the PDE theory of [Che21] to link the existence of solutions with an algebraic stability condition conjectured in [CJY20].

In this paper we focus instead on the case when the base manifold X is a complex surface, and E is a vector bundle of arbitrary rank. Our main goal is to refine the conjectural correspondence proposed in [DMS24] between the existence of Z -critical metrics $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ and algebraic stability conditions on the pair (X, E) . In particular, we show evidence in support of such a correspondence in *non-asymptotic regimes*, at least for bundles of rank 2. We also highlight an algebro-geometric consequence of the existence of a Z -positive metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$, due to [McC23]. This essentially is a notion of subsolution for the Z -critical equation, see Section 2.1 for the precise definition.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E \rightarrow X$ be vector bundle on the compact Kähler surface X , and fix a polynomial central charge Z . If there exists a Z -positive metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ in the sense of Definition 2.6, then*

1. $\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_V(E|_V)}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0$ for any 1-dimensional analytic subvariety $V \subset X$.

Moreover, for E simple and of rank 2, if $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Z -positive and solves the Z -critical equation,

2. $\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(S)}{Z_X(E)} \right) < 0$ for any sub-bundle $S \subset E$ such that $0 < \operatorname{rk}(S) < \operatorname{rk}(E)$,

and if the bundle is in addition strongly Z -positive (see Definition 1.2 below) the inequality in 2 holds for any coherent saturated subsheaf $S \subset E$ of rank $0 < \operatorname{rk}(S) < \operatorname{rk}(E)$.

The second part of Theorem 1.1 is the first stability result for the existence of solutions to the Z -critical equation, and the dHYM equation in particular, for bundles of rank greater than 1 in a non-asymptotic regime.

Note that we can rephrase the statements in Theorem 1.1 in a more symmetric fashion by considering quotients of E , instead of sub-sheaves. Indeed, the second conclusion of Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to

- 2'. $\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(Q)}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0$ for every quotient Q of E such that $0 < \operatorname{rk}(Q) < \operatorname{rk}(E)$.

Theorem 1.1 gives strong additional evidence for an algebraic characterisation of the existence of solutions to the Z -critical equation, along the lines of [DMS24, Conjecture 1.6]. The positivity part of Theorem 1.1 is due to McCarthy, who showed the inequality for codimension 1 analytic submanifolds of a Kähler manifold of arbitrary dimension, see [McC23, Theorem 1.6]. The proof we present here is essentially the same as in [McC23, Theorem 4.3.13]. We remark however that Theorem 1.1, as stated, might not be sharp, since the Z -positivity condition is a priori stronger than the positivity condition we need to obtain each part of the statement, see Section 3.1 below. Still, our computations and some simple examples make it natural to propose the following refinement of the conjectural stability picture of [DMS24] for the existence of Z -critical metrics, at least on surfaces.

Definition 1.2. Given a polynomial central charge Z , a holomorphic vector bundle E over X is said to be Z -positive if, for any analytic sub-variety $V \subset X$ of dimension $0 < \dim V < \dim X$,

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_V(E|_V)}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0 \tag{1.2}$$

and E is *strongly Z -positive* if in addition (1.2) holds also for 0-dimensional analytic subvarieties $V \subset X$ (i.e. finite collections of points). We say instead that E is *Z -stable* if, for any coherent torsion-free quotient Q of E of rank $0 < \operatorname{rk}(Q) < \operatorname{rk}(E)$,

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(Q)}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Remark 1.3. The Z -positivity condition can be interpreted as a Z -stability condition for certain rank-0 quotients: if $V \subset X$, then we have a surjective morphism of sheaves $E \rightarrow E \otimes \iota_* \mathcal{O}_V \rightarrow 0$, and $Z_X(E \otimes \iota_* \mathcal{O}_V) = Z_V(E|_V)$. This interpretation of Z -positivity was first noted for divisors implicitly in [McC23, Theorem 4.3.13].

Conjecture 1.4. *For any polynomial central charge Z and any simple holomorphic vector bundle E on a compact Kähler surface X , there exists a Z -positive metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ if and only if E is Z -positive. Moreover, there exists a Z -positive solution of the Z -critical equation if and only if E is Z -positive and Z -stable.*

It is likely that this conjectural correspondence between the existence of (sub)solutions to the Z -critical equation and Z -stability will need some refinement, probably in the form of a “supercritical phase condition”. Indeed, such a condition is crucial in the stability characterisation for the existence of solutions of the dHYM equation. For general central charges on line bundles over complex surfaces, we also know from [DMS24, Theorem 2.27] that Conjecture 1.4 holds under an additional positivity condition called the *volume form hypothesis*. We will briefly discuss in Section 4 why a similar hypothesis might in fact be part of the appropriate condition to establish our Conjecture. We also propose a generalisation of Conjecture 1.4 that includes decomposable bundles, leading to a notion of Z -polystability.

The main observation leading to Theorem 1.1 is that the Z -critical equation on a surface can be recast as a *vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation*, an equation that coincides with the usual complex Monge-Ampère equation in the case when the bundle has rank 1. This property was first noted for the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation in rank 1 in [CJY20], and was then exploited in [DMS24] to show that a Nakai-Moishezon-type criterion characterises the existence of solutions to the Z -critical equations in rank 1. In higher rank, a particular case of this phenomenon was noted by Takahashi in [Tak24] for the J-equation, which is the *small radius limit* of the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation. It is important to mention that [Tak24] established a result similar to 1.1 for the J-equation, again on rank 2 bundles.

The vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation was first introduced by Pingali in [Pin20]. He showed that, under some positivity assumptions, the existence of solutions of the vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation implies a condition called *Monge-Ampère stability*, see Section 2 for the definition. Theorem 1.1 will follow from a slight modification of Pingali’s stability result:

Theorem 1.5 ([Pin20], Proposition 3.1). *Assume that $E \rightarrow X$ is a simple rank 2 holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Kähler surface, and that $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is a solution of*

$$\mathcal{F}(h)^2 = \eta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \tag{1.4}$$

for a volume form η on X . If $\text{Tr } \mathcal{F}(h) > 0$, then E is Monge-Ampère stable in the sense of Definition 2.4.

The paper is organised as follows: in Section 2 we collect the definitions and some background on the Z -critical and the Monge-Ampère vector bundle equations. Section 3

is the heart of the paper and contains the proof of Theorem 1.1. We also comment on other stability notions that are closely related to Z -stability, and show an openness result for the existence of Z -critical metrics that allows to obtain many new examples starting from Mumford stable bundles. Section 4 contains some (non-)examples of Z -positive and Z -critical metrics on bundles of rank 2 and 3 on \mathbb{P}^2 . We also formulate a version of Conjecture 1.4 for decomposable bundles and we prove it for decomposable rank 2 bundles over surfaces. Finally, we show that our results can be used to deduce stability results for the almost Hermite-Einstein equation in non-asymptotic cases, showing that there is a non-asymptotic analogue of Gieseker stability.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to thank Ruadhaí Dervan, Annamaria Ortú, Vamsi Pingali, Lars Martin Sektnan, and Sohaib Khalid for some helpful remarks and discussions related to the present work, and we thank Gonalo Oliveira for a useful conversation regarding Remark 3.11 and for pointing out Remark 1.3. The second author would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme “New equivariant methods in algebraic and differential geometry” where work on this paper was undertaken. This work was supported by EPSRC grant no EP/R014604/1 and by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

2 The Z -critical and vector bundle Monge-Ampère equations

In this section we recall the definitions and some basic properties of the Z -critical and vector bundle Monge-Ampère equations. We refer the reader to [DMS24] and [McC23] for a more in-depth discussion of the former equation, and to [Pin20] for the latter.

Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle over a compact complex manifold X of complex dimension n , and assume that X carries a Kähler metric ω . Given any affine connection D on E , we denote the $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ parts of the connection by D' and D'' respectively, and the curvature by $F(D) \in \mathcal{A}^{1,1}(\text{End}E)$. It will also be convenient to also define the *normalised curvature form* of D as

$$\mathcal{F}(D) := \frac{i}{2\pi} F(D).$$

Given a Hermitian metric h on E , we will also denote by $\mathcal{F}(h)$ the normalised curvature of the Chern connection defined by h and the holomorphic structure of E , which is a $(1, 1)$ -form on X with values in the self-adjoint (with respect to h) endomorphisms of E . This normalisation is chosen so that the differential form

$$\text{Tr } e^{\mathcal{F}(h)} := \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\text{rk}(E)} \frac{1}{j!} \mathcal{F}(h)^j \right)$$

represents the total Chern character of E , $\text{ch}(E)$. We denote by $\text{ch}_d(E)$ the degree- $2d$ component of $\text{ch}(E)$, which is represented by the $(2d, 2d)$ -form $\text{Tr } \mathcal{F}^d / d!$.

The Z -critical equation (1.1) as defined in [DMS24] depends on the choice of:

- a *stability vector* $\rho \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, i.e. $n+1$ nonzero complex numbers (ρ_0, \dots, ρ_n) such that $\text{Im}(\rho_j/\rho_{j+1}) > 0$ for $0 \leq j < n$;
- the representative $u \in \mathcal{A}^\bullet(X, \mathbb{R})$ of a *unipotent class* $U = 1 + \sum_j U_j \in H^\bullet(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $U_j \in H^{j,j}(X, \mathbb{R})$ for each j .

Given these objects, Dervan-McCarthy-Sektnan [DMS24] define a $\mathcal{A}^{n,n}(\text{End} E)$ -valued differential operator,

$$\mathcal{Z}(h) = \left[\left(\sum_{j=0}^n \rho_j \omega^j \right) \wedge u \wedge e^{\mathcal{F}(h)} \right]^{\text{top}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $[\dots]^{\text{top}}$ indicates that one only has to consider the maximal-degree part of a differential form. This data also defines a *polynomial central charge* as in [Bay09]

$$Z_X(E) = \int_X \text{Tr } \mathcal{Z}(h),$$

that does not depend on the choices of $u \in U$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$. Assuming that $Z(E)$ is nonzero, the Z -critical equation for a Hermitian metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ (or the associated Chern connection D) is

$$\text{Im}(e^{-i\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}(D)) = 0$$

where the phase angle ϑ_E is determined modulo 2π through integration, i.e.

$$Z(E) = e^{i\vartheta_E} \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

Remark 2.1. There are some minor differences between how the Z -critical equation was introduced in [DMS24] and the one presented here, mainly due to the fact that in the original paper the authors focus on an asymptotic regime known as the *large volume limit*. In that context, one rescales the Kähler form by $\omega \mapsto k\omega$ and is interested in the properties of the Z -critical equation (1.1) for $k \gg 0$. The stability vectors in [DMS24] then are required to satisfy different conditions than the ones we consider: they impose $\text{Im} \rho_n > 0$ and $\text{Im}(\rho_{n-1}/\rho_n) > 0$, rather than $\text{Im}(\rho_j/\rho_{j+1}) > 0$ for $0 \leq j < n$. The condition $\text{Im} \rho_n > 0$ however is just a choice of normalisation, one can ensure this by rotating the whole stability vector without affecting the stability of the bundle nor the existence of critical metrics. The reason why in [DMS24] only the last condition of $\text{Im}(\rho_j/\rho_{j+1}) > 0$ is required, is that this is the minimum necessary to guarantee that any asymptotically Z -stable bundle (see Section 3.2) is Mumford semistable. From our point of view however, it is more natural to have the same assumptions as in the original definition of a polynomial stability condition, see [Bay09].

Remark 2.2. Here, as in [DMS24], by “imaginary part” $\text{Im}(A)$ of an endomorphism-valued form $A \in \mathcal{A}^\bullet(X, \text{End} E)$ we mean $(-i \text{ times})$ the *anti-self-adjoint* component of the endomorphism, $\text{Im}(A) = \frac{1}{2i} (A - A^*)$ with respect to the Hermitian metric on E .

Similarly, the “real part” indicates the self-adjoint component. When the Hermitian bundle has rank one, these indeed coincide with the real and imaginary parts of a complex-valued 1-form. With this convention then, if D is the Chern connection of a Hermitian bundle (E, h) , one has $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}(D)) = 0$ and $\text{Re}(\mathcal{F}(D)) = \mathcal{F}(D)$.

When X is a complex surface, the general Z -critical operator is, for $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(h) &= \left[(\rho_0 + \rho_1\omega + \rho_2\omega^2) \wedge (1 + u_1 + u_2) \wedge \left(\mathbb{1}_E + \mathcal{F}(h) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}(h)^2 \right) \right]^{\text{top}} \\ &= \rho_0 u_2 + \rho_1 \omega \wedge u_1 + \rho_2 \omega^2 + (\rho_0 u_1 + \rho_1 \omega) \wedge \mathcal{F}(h) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_0 \mathcal{F}(h)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

and the corresponding Z -charge is given by integrating the trace of (2.2) on X :

$$Z_X(E) = (\rho_0 U_2 + \rho_1 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_2 [\omega]^2) \text{rk}(E) + (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \cdot \text{ch}_1(E) + \rho_0 \text{ch}_2(E). \quad (2.3)$$

As $\mathcal{F}(h)$ is self-adjoint with respect to the metric h and U is a real class, the Z -critical equation can be written as

$$\alpha \mathcal{F}(h)^2 + \beta \wedge \mathcal{F}(h) + \gamma \otimes \mathbb{1}_E = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{A}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^{2,2}(X, \mathbb{R})$ are defined as

$$\begin{cases} \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} \rho_0) \\ \beta = \text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} (\rho_0 u_1 + \rho_1 \omega)) \\ \gamma = \text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} (\rho_0 u_2 + \rho_1 \omega \wedge u_1 + \rho_2 \omega^2)) \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Note that the coefficients β and γ are \wedge -commuting with $\mathcal{F}(h)$, so the Z -critical equation (2.4) is equivalent to

$$\left(\mathcal{F}(h) + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \right)^2 = \left(\left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^2 - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1}_E. \quad (2.6)$$

We are assuming here that $\alpha \neq 0$, the case $\alpha = 0$ essentially reduces to the Hermite-Einstein problem and will be treated separately in Section 3.3.

This simple observation shows

Lemma 2.3. *With the previous notation, let $\eta := (\beta/2\alpha)^2 - \gamma/\alpha$. Then, the Z -critical equation is equivalent to the twisted vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation*

$$\left(\mathcal{F}(h) + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \right)^2 = \eta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E. \quad (2.7)$$

When η is a volume form and $\beta = 0$ (or $\beta/2\alpha \in c_1(N)$ for a line bundle N), this equation was introduced and studied by Pingali in [Pin20]. As we mentioned in the Introduction, the existence of solutions of (1.4) is tied to the *Monge-Ampère stability* of

the bundle, at least in certain regimes, see Theorem 1.5. We introduce a version of this condition that takes into account the possible presence of a non-vanishing form β . It will be useful in what follows to let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h) := \mathcal{F}(h) + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E.$$

Generalising Pingali's Monge-Ampère slope, we define for $\vartheta := [\beta/2\alpha] \in H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$

$$\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E) := \frac{\text{ch}_2(E)}{\text{rk} E} + \frac{\text{ch}_1(E) \cdot \vartheta}{\text{rk}(E)} = \mu_{MA}(E) + \mu_{\vartheta}(E)$$

where the Chern characters of S are defined through a vector bundle resolution of S , and μ_{MA} denotes the original Monge-Ampère slope of [Pin20].

Definition 2.4 ([Pin20]). For a real $(1,1)$ -class ϑ and a vector bundle E on a Kähler surface X , we say that E is ϑ -Monge-Ampère stable with respect to ϑ if for every coherent saturated subsheaf $S \subset E$ such that $0 < \text{rk}(S) < \text{rk}(E)$ we have

$$\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) < \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E). \quad (2.8)$$

In the next section, we will show that this twisted Monge-Ampère stability is in fact equivalent to Z -stability under the correspondence of Lemma 2.3, at least when $\alpha > 0$. This shows that the (twisted) vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation is, in some sense, the main equation of interest for vector bundles on Kähler surfaces. The Z -critical equation and the vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation seem otherwise unrelated on higher dimensional manifolds, but we hope this work will stimulate further research on the vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation.

Remark 2.5. The condition $\alpha > 0$ can also be rephrased as $\text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \right) > 0$, or

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{\text{rk}(E) \rho_0}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0.$$

Note that $Z_x(E) = \text{rk}(E) \rho_0$ for any point $x \in X$, hence a Z -positive bundle is strongly Z -positive if and only if $\alpha > 0$.

2.1 Some positivity conditions for Hermitian metrics

A problematic feature of both (1.1) and (1.4) is that they might fail to be elliptic. To characterise the situations in which the Z -critical equation is elliptic at least near a solution, we can consider either the linearisation of the operator $D \mapsto e^{\mathcal{F}(D)}$, defined on the space of affine connections compatible with a fixed Hermitian metric h_0 , or the linearisation of $h \mapsto e^{\mathcal{F}(h)}$ defined on $\mathcal{H}^+(E)$. When we take a path of Hermitian metrics h_t or a path of connections D_t and consider the variation of $e^{\mathcal{F}_t}$, one finds over a complex dimension n manifold,

$$\partial_{t=0} e^{\mathcal{F}_t} = \partial_{t=0} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j!} \mathcal{F}_t^j = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{p=1}^j \mathcal{F}_0^{p-1} (\partial_{t=0} \mathcal{F}_t) \mathcal{F}_0^{j-p}.$$

We introduce a multilinear product on $\mathcal{A}^\bullet(\text{End} E)$ as

$$[A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge A_j]_{\text{sym}} := \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_j} (-1)^{\text{gr sgn}(\sigma)} A_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{\sigma(j)}$$

where the graded sign of a permutation, $\text{gr sgn}(\sigma)$, is defined as the sign obtained by permuting $A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge A_j$ to $A_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{\sigma(j)}$ as differential forms (so, ignoring $\text{End} E$ factors). Then the derivative of $e^{\mathcal{F}_t}$ can be rewritten as

$$\partial_{t=0} e^{\mathcal{F}_t} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(j-1)!} [\underbrace{\mathcal{F}_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{F}_0}_{j-1 \text{ times}} \wedge \partial_{t=0} \mathcal{F}_t]_{\text{sym}} = [e^{\mathcal{F}_t} \wedge \partial_{t=0} \mathcal{F}_t]_{\text{sym}}$$

so that the derivative of \mathcal{Z} , say along a path of connections D_t , can be written as

$$\partial_{t=0} \mathcal{Z}(D_t) = \left[\left[\left(\sum_j \rho_j \omega^j \right) \wedge u \wedge e^{\mathcal{F}(h_t)} \right]^{n-1, n-1} \wedge \partial_{t=0} \mathcal{F}(D_t) \right]_{\text{sym}}.$$

It seems reasonable then to let $\mathcal{Z}'(D) := \left[\left(\sum_j \rho_j \omega^j \right) \wedge u \wedge e^{\mathcal{F}(D)} \right]^{n-1, n-1}$. The differential of \mathcal{Z} along a path of holomorphic structures D_t'' on E generated by the action of an element of the complexified gauge group $V \in \mathfrak{i}\mathcal{A}^0(X, \text{End}(E, h))$ then becomes

$$\partial_{t=0} \mathcal{Z}(D(h, D_t'')) = \frac{\mathfrak{i}}{2\pi} [\mathcal{Z}(D)' \wedge (D'' D' - D' D'') V]_{\text{sym}}. \quad (2.9)$$

This discussion suggests to impose an additional positivity condition on Hermitian metrics on E to guarantee the ellipticity of the equation.

Definition 2.6. Given a polynomial central charge Z on a holomorphic vector bundle E , we say that a Hermitian metric h (or its Chern connection) is *Z-positive* (also called (strong) *Z-subsolution* in [DMS24]) if the $2(n-1)$ $\text{End}(E)$ -valued form $\text{Im}(e^{-\mathfrak{i}\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}'(h))$ is positive definite; i.e. for any $x \in X$ and any $\xi \in T_x^{0,1*} X \times \text{End}(E_x)$

$$\mathfrak{i} \text{Tr} [\text{Im}(e^{-\mathfrak{i}\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}'(h)) \wedge \xi^* \wedge \xi]_{\text{sym}} > 0 \quad (2.10)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}'(h)$ is the formal derivative of $\mathcal{Z}(h)$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}(h)$.

This subsolution condition is crucial for the moment map interpretation of the Z -critical equation in [DMS24]; indeed, the equation can be shown to be coming from a Hamiltonian action on the space of connections that are unitary with respect to a fixed Hermitian metric h_0 and *satisfy the subsolution condition*; the symplectic form on this space is given by the Hermitian pairing

$$\langle a, b \rangle = -\mathfrak{i} \int_X \text{Tr} [\text{Im}(e^{-\mathfrak{i}\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}'(h)) \wedge a \wedge b^*]_{\text{sym}} > 0 \quad (2.11)$$

for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1} \text{End} E$, which is positive provided that the Chern connection of h is a Z -subsolution: this also partially motivates our alternative naming of *Z-positive* metric for $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ satisfying (2.10).

There is a similar positivity notion for the vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation, that we adapt from [Pin20] to include the possible presence of a nontrivial twist.

Definition 2.7. Given a nonzero $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and a $(1, 1)$ -form β , a metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is said to be *Monge-Ampère positive* with respect to α and β if for any $x \in X$ and any $\xi \in T_x^{0,1*}X \times \text{End}(E_p)$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} i \text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h)^k \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h)^{n-k-1}] > 0.$$

The direct computation shows that in the 2-dimensional case, Z -positivity and Monge-Ampère positivity are equivalent under the correspondence of Lemma 2.3, if $\alpha > 0$. Indeed, on a complex surface we have, with the notation of (2.5),

$$\text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}') = \text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} (\rho_0 \mathcal{F} + (\rho_0 u_1 + \rho_1 \omega) \otimes \mathbb{1}_E)) = 2\alpha \mathcal{F} + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} i \text{Tr} [\text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}'(h)) \wedge \xi^* \wedge \xi]_{\text{sym}} &= i \text{Tr} [(2\alpha \mathcal{F}(h) + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \xi^* \wedge \xi]_{\text{sym}} \\ &= \alpha i \text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h) + \xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h) \wedge \xi]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

If instead $\alpha < 0$, then h is Z -positive if and only if it is Monge-Ampère *negative*, i.e. for any $x \in X$ and any nonzero $\xi \in T_x^{0,1*}X \times \text{End}(E_p)$

$$i \text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h) + \xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}(h) \wedge \xi] < 0.$$

3 Z-stability and Monge-Ampère stability

Our first result allows us to compare the inequalities (2.8) and (1.3). As a corollary, we see that Z -stability and twisted Monge-Ampère stability are equivalent. All the results in this section hold under the assumption that X is a surface.

Proposition 3.1. *For any subsheaf $S \subset E$, under the correspondence of Lemma 2.3 we have*

$$\text{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) = 2\alpha \text{rk}(S) |Z_X(E)| (\mu_{MA, \vartheta}(S) - \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(E)).$$

Proof. It is just a matter of carefully computing each term. To start, recall from the definition that

$$\mu_{MA, \vartheta}(S) - \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(E) = \frac{\text{ch}_2(S)}{\text{rk}(S)} - \frac{\text{ch}_2(E)}{\text{rk}(E)} + \left(\frac{\text{ch}_1(S)}{\text{rk}(S)} - \frac{\text{ch}_1(E)}{\text{rk}(E)} \right) \cdot \frac{[\beta]}{2\alpha}.$$

Note from (2.5) that the class of β is

$$[\beta] = \text{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega])) = |Z_X(E)|^{-1} \text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right).$$

We proceed to the computation of $\text{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right)$. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_X(E) &= (\rho_0 U_2 + \rho_1 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_2 [\omega]^2) \text{rk}(E) + (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \cdot \text{ch}_1(E) + \rho_0 \text{ch}_2(E), \\ Z_X(S) &= (\rho_0 U_2 + \rho_1 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_2 [\omega]^2) \text{rk}(S) + (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \cdot \text{ch}_1(S) + \rho_0 \text{ch}_2(S). \end{aligned}$$

The direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) &= \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_2 + \rho_1 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_2 [\omega]^2) \right] \operatorname{rk}(S) + \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right] \cdot \operatorname{ch}_1(S) + \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \right] \operatorname{ch}_2(S). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

As the only non-real quantities in $Z_X(E)$ are the coefficients ρ_i , one finds

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_2 + \rho_1 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_2 [\omega]^2) \right] = \\ &= \frac{1}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_X(E) \right] - \frac{1}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} \left((\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \cdot \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \rho_0 \operatorname{ch}_2(E) \right) \right] = \\ &= - \frac{1}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \cdot \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \operatorname{ch}_2(E) \right] = \\ &= - \frac{1}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right] \cdot \operatorname{ch}_1(E) - \frac{1}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \right] \operatorname{ch}_2(E). \end{aligned}$$

We substitute this into (3.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) &= \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right] \cdot \left(- \frac{\operatorname{rk}(S)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{ch}_1(S) \right) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Im} \left[\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \right] \left(- \frac{\operatorname{rk}(S)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \operatorname{ch}_2(E) + \operatorname{ch}_2(S) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and the right-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\operatorname{rk}(S) |Z_X(E)| \left(\frac{\operatorname{ch}_1(S)}{\operatorname{rk}(S)} - \frac{\operatorname{ch}_1(E)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \right) \cdot [\beta] + \operatorname{rk}(S) |Z_X(E)| 2\alpha \left(\frac{\operatorname{ch}_2(S)}{\operatorname{rk}(S)} - \frac{\operatorname{ch}_2(E)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \right). \quad \square$$

Pingali's Theorem 1.5 holds assuming that $\eta > 0$, $\beta = 0$ and $\operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(h) > 0$. In the case when $\beta/2\alpha \in c_1(N)$ for a line bundle N , we can reduce to this situation by considering the bundle $E' = E \otimes N$, since there is a solution of the twisted vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation on E if and only if there is a solution of the usual vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation on E' . In our setting however the “rationality assumption” $\beta \in c_1(N)$ is not very natural, as it is not satisfied by many important charges, and we will show that indeed this hypothesis is not necessary.

Still, in view of Theorem 1.5, it is natural to consider the condition

$$2\alpha \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(h) + \operatorname{rk}(E)\beta > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

We will prove shortly that any Z -positive metric, not necessarily solving the Z -critical equation, satisfies (3.3). An interesting phenomenon is that the existence of *some* $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ satisfying (3.3) is guaranteed by the inequality (1.2).

Lemma 3.2 ([McC23]). *Let Z be a polynomial central charge, and let $E \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic vector bundle on the Kähler surface X . With the notation of (2.5), the cohomology class $2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{rk}(E)[\beta]$ is positive if and only if for every curve $V \subset X$*

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_V(E|_V)}{Z_X(E)} \right) > 0,$$

i.e. if and only if E is Z -positive.

Proof. Recall that the Demailly-Păun extension of the Nakai-Moishezon criterion [DP04] (see also [Buc99] for the case of surfaces) implies that a class $[\chi]$ is positive if and only if $[\chi] \cdot [V] > 0$ for every curve $V \subset X$. Hence, $2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{rk}(E)[\beta] > 0$ if and only if for every $V \subset X$

$$(2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{rk}(E)[\beta]) \cdot [V] > 0$$

which translates to, by definition of β

$$\left(2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \frac{\operatorname{rk}(E)}{|Z_X(E)|} \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right) \right) \cdot [V] > 0.$$

On the other hand, having fixed a curve V , $\operatorname{Im} (Z_V(E) Z_X(E)^{-1}) > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_V(E) \right) > 0$$

and $Z_X(E)$ is given by (2.3), while integrating the charge over V we find

$$Z_V(E) = (\rho_0 \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{rk}(E) (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega])) \cdot [V].$$

Hence, $\operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_V(E) \right)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0 \operatorname{ch}_1(E) \right) \cdot [V] + \operatorname{rk}(E) \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right) \cdot [V] \\ &= |Z_X(E)| 2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) \cdot [V] + \operatorname{rk}(E) \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right) \cdot [V]. \end{aligned}$$

So, $\operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_V(E) \right) > 0$ is equivalent to

$$2\alpha \operatorname{ch}_1(E) \cdot [V] + \frac{\operatorname{rk}(E)}{|Z_X(E)|} \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} (\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_1 [\omega]) \right) \cdot [V] > 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.3. *If $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Z -positive, then $2\alpha \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(h) + \operatorname{rk}(E)\beta > 0$.*

Proof. Recall that a metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Z -positive if for any $x \in X$ and any $\xi \in T_x^{0,1*} X \times \operatorname{End}(E_p)$

$$i \operatorname{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge (2\alpha \mathcal{F} + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) + \xi^* \wedge (2\alpha \mathcal{F} + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \xi] > 0.$$

Hence, if we choose $\xi = v \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$ for some $v \in T_x^{0,1*} X$ we get

$$i \bar{v} \wedge v \wedge \operatorname{Tr} [2\alpha \mathcal{F} + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E] > 0$$

and as this holds for any choice of v , $2\alpha \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(h) + \operatorname{rk}(E)\beta$ is a positive $(1, 1)$ -form. \square

Putting together Proposition 3.1, Lemma 3.2, and Lemma 3.3 with Pingali's stability result (Theorem 1.5) will prove Theorem 1.1 in the case $\alpha > 0$, except for the possible non-rationality of β and the fact that the statement of Theorem 1.5 in [Pin20] requires that the form η in (1.4) is a positive top-degree form. We can translate this through the correspondence in Lemma 2.3 to obtain a condition for a general Z -critical metric: with the notation of (2.5),

$$\eta > 0 \iff \beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma > 0. \quad (3.4)$$

We call (3.4) the *volume form hypothesis*. This hypothesis is in fact not necessary for Theorem 1.5 to hold, as we show in Section 3.1.

Example 3.4. It is easy to construct rank 2 bundles over a surface which are Monge-Ampère stable, Z -stable, Z -positive but are not Mumford stable. For a positive integer r , let's consider a non-split extension

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_r \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0$$

over X , the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at one point. Denote H is the hyperplane section and E_1 is the exceptional divisor. We consider $[\omega] = pH - qE_1$ with positive integers p, q such that $p > q$. Now we choose $\mathcal{L}_r = r(qH - pE_1)$, $r \in \mathbb{N}^*$ so that

$$\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{L}_r) \cdot [\omega] = 0 = \text{ch}_1(E) \cdot [\omega], \quad (3.5)$$

and this implies that E is strictly Mumford semi-stable with respect to the positive class ω . Moreover,

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{L}_r) = \frac{r^2}{2}(q^2 - p^2) < 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Thus, for large $r \gg 1$ the extension is non trivial as $h^1(X, \mathcal{L}_r) \neq 0$. This can be deduced from the Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula, since $h^0(X, \mathcal{L}_r) - h^1(X, \mathcal{L}_r) + h^2(X, \mathcal{L}_r) = \frac{r^2}{2}(q^2 - p^2) + O(r)$ is negative for large r .

Now, let's consider a polynomial central charge Z for which U_1 is proportional to $[\omega]$. From (2.5), a computation shows that

$$|Z_X(E)|\alpha = U_1 \cdot [\omega] \text{Im}(\rho_0 \overline{\rho_1}) + [\omega]^2 \text{Im}(\rho_0 \overline{\rho_2})$$

which is independent of r and will be positive if U_1 is well-chosen. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_X(E)|\beta &= \text{ch}_2(E) \text{Im}(\overline{\rho_0} \rho_1) \omega + 2 \text{Im}((\rho_0 u_1 + \rho_1 \omega)(\overline{\rho_0} u_2 + \overline{\rho_1} u_1 \cdot [\omega] + \overline{\rho_2} [\omega]^2)) \\ &= r^2 \left(\frac{q^2 - p^2}{2} \right) \text{Im}(\overline{\rho_0} \rho_1) \omega + 2 \text{Im}(\rho_0 \overline{\rho_1} u_1 \cdot [\omega] + \rho_0 \overline{\rho_2} [\omega]^2) u_1 + 2 \text{Im}(\rho_1 \overline{\rho_2}) [\omega]^2 \omega \\ &\quad + 2 \text{Im}(\overline{\rho_0} \rho_1) U_2 \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Im}(\rho_1 \overline{\rho_0}) < 0$, we can choose U_2 proportional to $[\omega]^2$ and independent of r such that $\beta = \kappa \omega$ with $\kappa > 0$ possibly very large.

We want to show that E is Monge-Ampère stable with respect to $\vartheta = [\beta/2\alpha]$. Firstly, we note that $\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{L}_r) = \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(\mathcal{L}_r) < \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ using (3.5) and (3.6). If not, there will

be a rank 1 torsion free subsheaf \mathcal{L}' that will destabilize E with respect to the Monge-Ampère slope $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}$. In the above exact sequence, let us denote the maps $\theta_1 : E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ and $\theta_2 : \mathcal{L}' \rightarrow E$. Since \mathcal{L}' has rank one, it is Monge-Ampère stable and so the map $\theta_1 \circ \theta_2$ is either trivial or an isomorphism. In the first case, we get a new map $\mathcal{L}' \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and since \mathcal{L} is Monge-Ampère stable, this implies $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(\mathcal{L}') < \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(\mathcal{L})$. But this contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{L}' destabilizes E . In the second case, the isomorphism gives $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{O}_X$ and the extension splits which contradicts our construction. Eventually, this shows that E is Monge-Ampère stable.

Under the above assumptions, E is Z -stable by Proposition 3.1. Moreover, it is easy to check directly that E is Z -positive. Actually, $|Z_X(E)|(2\alpha \text{ch}_1(E) + [\beta] \text{rk}(E))$ is positive for large κ and thus one can apply Lemma 3.2. We investigate the existence of Z -critical metrics for this bundle in Example 4.12. Note that the choices of r and U_1, U_2 can be done effectively.

Polynomial central charges are additive on short exact sequences, and this implies in particular that

Lemma 3.5 ([DMS24]). *If $E \rightarrow X$ is a Z -stable vector bundle for some polynomial central charge Z , then E is simple.*

Proof. As the Chern character $\text{ch}(E)$ is additive on short exact sequences, if E is Z -stable any vector bundle morphism $\phi : E \rightarrow E$ is either 0 or an isomorphism. Indeed, considering the kernel and range of ϕ we obtain

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(\ker \phi)}{Z_X(E)} \right) + \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(\text{ran } \phi)}{Z_X(E)} \right) = \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(E)}{Z_X(E)} \right) = 0.$$

However $\ker \phi$ and $\text{ran } \phi$ are subsheaves of E , and if $0 < \text{rk}(\ker \phi) < \text{rk}(E)$ the Z -stability of E would imply

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(\ker \phi)}{Z_X(E)} \right) < 0 \text{ or } \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(\text{ran } \phi)}{Z_X(E)} \right) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. But then ϕ must be the multiplication by a scalar: let λ be any eigenvalue of ϕ on a fibre E_x , and apply the previous result to the morphism $\hat{\phi} = \phi - \lambda \mathbb{1}_E$. As it is not invertible, it must be identically zero. \square

3.1 Consequences of Monge-Ampère positivity

This Section rephrases and expands the proof of [Pin20, Lemma 3.1]. We write the details both for completeness and to highlight the importance of the Monge-Ampère positivity of a solution of (2.7), which is stronger than the positivity assumption in [Pin20] but is more natural from our point of view. We also highlight the fact that it is not necessary to assume the volume form hypothesis, and we take into account a non-vanishing twist $\beta/2\alpha$ in (2.7). Most of the computation will be done for vector bundles of arbitrary rank, as we hope that our approach can be used to establish Theorem 1.1 for higher rank bundles.

Consider a short exact sequence of vector bundles over the compact Kähler surface X

$$0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow E \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Fix a Hermitian metric h on E , and let $A \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(\text{Hom}(Q, S))$ be the second fundamental form of (3.7). Then the curvature forms of h , its restriction h_S on S and the induced metric h_Q on Q are related by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* & \frac{i}{2\pi} D' A \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} D'' A^* & \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.8)$$

where we denote by \mathcal{F}_S and \mathcal{F}_Q the curvature forms of h_S and h_Q respectively, and following the previous notation we set $\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} = \mathcal{F}_S + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \otimes \mathbb{1}_S$. Note also that (3.8) depends on the decomposition $\beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E = \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \oplus \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_Q$.

Squaring (3.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h)^2 &= \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \left(\mathcal{F}_{S,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^*\right)^2 - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 D' A \wedge D'' A^* & (\dots) \\ (\dots) & \left(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A\right)^2 - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 D'' A^* \wedge D' A \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that h is a solution of $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h)^2 = \eta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$; then, we must have

$$\begin{cases} \left(\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^*\right)^2 - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 D' A \wedge D'' A^* = \eta \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \\ \left(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A\right)^2 - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 D'' A^* \wedge D' A = \eta \otimes \mathbb{1}_Q. \end{cases}$$

Taking the traces and integrating, we find two equations relating $\text{ch}_2(S)$, $\text{ch}_2(Q)$, and A to $\text{rk}(S)$, $\text{rk}(Q)$, and $\vartheta = [\beta]/2\alpha$, with some spurious terms. More precisely, for S we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(S) [\eta].X &= 2 \text{rk}(S) \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) + \text{rk}(S) \vartheta^2 - \frac{2i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}((A \wedge A^*)^2) - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}(D' A \wedge D'' A^*) \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

while for Q

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(Q) [\eta].X &= 2 \text{rk}(Q) \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(Q) + \text{rk}(Q) \vartheta^2 - \frac{2i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}(D'' A^* \wedge D' A). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Note now that (1.4) implies

$$2 \text{rk}(E) \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E) + \text{rk}(E) \vartheta^2 = \text{rk}(E) [\eta].X = (\text{rk}(S) + \text{rk}(Q)) [\eta].X$$

and from the exact sequence we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \operatorname{rk}(E) \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(E) + \operatorname{rk}(E) \vartheta^2 = \\ & = 2 \operatorname{rk}(S) \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(S) + \operatorname{rk}(S) \vartheta^2 + 2 \operatorname{rk}(Q) \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(Q) + \operatorname{rk}(Q) \vartheta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, adding (3.9) and (3.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{2i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) - \frac{2i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) \\ & + \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}((A \wedge A^*)^2) + \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) \\ & - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(D'A \wedge D''A^*) - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(D''A^* \wedge D'A) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Lemma 3.6. *With the previous notation, we have*

$$\operatorname{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) + \operatorname{Tr}((A \wedge A^*)^2) = 0,$$

$$\operatorname{Tr}(D'A \wedge D''A^*) = \operatorname{Tr}(D''A^* \wedge D'A).$$

Proof. This is a consequence of the general fact that for any $C \in \mathcal{A}^k(\operatorname{End}(E))$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}^l(\operatorname{End}(E))$, $\operatorname{Tr}(C \wedge B) = (-1)^{kl} \operatorname{Tr}(B \wedge C)$. More explicitly, if B and C are $\operatorname{End}(E)$ -valued 1-forms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}(C \wedge B \wedge C \wedge B) &= \operatorname{Tr}(C_i B_j C_k B_l) dx^i \wedge dx^j \wedge dx^k \wedge dx^l = \\ &= -\operatorname{Tr}(B_j C_k B_l C_i) dx^j \wedge dx^k \wedge dx^l \wedge dx^i = -\operatorname{Tr}(B \wedge C \wedge B \wedge C). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first identity, identifying A with the $\operatorname{End}(E)$ -valued differential form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

in the matrix-block notation corresponding to the decomposition $E = S + Q$ as smooth vector bundles. The other identity is proved in the same way. \square

Hence (3.11) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) = \\ & = -\left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(D''A^* \wedge D'A). \end{aligned}$$

Substitute this expression for $\int \operatorname{Tr}(D''A^* \wedge D'A)$ in (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rk}(S) [\eta].X &= 2 \operatorname{rk}(S) \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(S) + \operatorname{rk}(S) \vartheta^2 - \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) + \\ & + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q, \alpha, \beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) + \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \operatorname{Tr}((A \wedge A^*)^2) \end{aligned}$$

As $2\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E) + \vartheta^2 = [\eta].X$, the inequality of Monge-Ampère slopes

$$\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) < \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$$

is equivalent to

$$-\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) > \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2). \quad (3.12)$$

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Monge-Ampère positive. Then,*

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) - \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) \geq 2 \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2)$$

with equality if and only if $A = 0$. If instead $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Monge-Ampère negative then

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) - \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) \leq 2 \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_X \text{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2)$$

with equality if and only if $A = 0$.

Note that this inequality (in the positive case, say) is quite similar to (3.12), the only difference is a factor of 2. Still, Lemma 3.7 implies (3.12) if $(i)^2 \text{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) > 0$, but this last inequality might not be true in general.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. The two cases are symmetrical, so we focus on the positive one.

Choose ξ to be $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. From (3.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* & \frac{i}{2\pi} D' A \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} D'' A^* & \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* & \frac{i}{2\pi} D' A \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} D'' A^* & \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (\dots) & A^* \wedge A \wedge \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} (A^* \wedge A)^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

while for the other factor we get

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h) \wedge \xi &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* & \frac{i}{2\pi} D' A \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} D'' A^* & \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A \wedge A^* & (\dots) \end{pmatrix} \wedge \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A - \frac{i}{2\pi} (A^* \wedge A)^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the trace, we see that the subsolution condition implies

$$i \operatorname{Tr} \left(A^* \wedge A \wedge \mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} - \frac{i}{2\pi} (A^* \wedge A)^2 \right) + i \operatorname{Tr} \left(A^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A - \frac{i}{2\pi} (A^* \wedge A)^2 \right) \geq 0$$

with equality if and only if $A = 0$. We rewrite this as

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \operatorname{Tr} (\mathcal{F}_{Q,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A^* \wedge A) - \frac{i}{2\pi} \operatorname{Tr} (\mathcal{F}_{S,\alpha,\beta} \wedge A \wedge A^*) - 2 \left(\frac{i}{2\pi} \right)^2 \operatorname{Tr} ((A^* \wedge A)^2) \geq 0$$

which gives the thesis. \square

As a corollary, we obtain an extension of Theorem 1.5.

Corollary 3.8. *Assume that E is a simple rank-2 vector bundle on a compact complex surface X . If there exist a Hermitian metric on E that is both a solution and a subsolution of the ϑ -twisted vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation (2.7), then E is Monge-Ampère stable with respect to ϑ .*

Proof. Assume that $0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow E \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0$ is a proper short exact sequence of holomorphic vector bundles on X . Since E has rank 2, the sub-bundle S and the quotient Q have rank 1. Hence the second fundamental form A in (3.8) is in fact a 1-form with values in $\operatorname{Hom}(S, Q) = \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \mathbb{C})$. But then $\operatorname{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) = 0$, and Lemma 3.7 implies (3.12) which in turn guarantees $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) \leq \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.7 we know that equality holds if and only if the second fundamental form vanishes, i.e. $E = S \oplus Q$ as a holomorphic vector bundle. As we are assuming that E is simple, we must have $\mu_{MA}(S) < \mu_{MA}(E)$. The inequality for general subsheaves follows as in the proof of [Pin20, Proposition 3.1]. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The positivity statement is given by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, which are a special case of [McC23, Theorem 1.6]. For the stability part, assume that $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Z -positive and Z -critical and that $S \subset E$ is a sub-bundle. Proposition 3.1 tells us that we want to establish

$$\alpha (\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) - \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)) < 0.$$

First assume that E is strongly Z -positive, so that the inequality amounts to $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) < \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$, i.e. Monge-Ampère stability. But in this case h is Z -positive if and only if it is Monge-Ampère positive, so Corollary 3.8 allows to conclude, even if S is just a saturated subsheaf of E .

If instead $\alpha < 0$, we must prove that $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) > \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$. As h is Z -positive and $\alpha < 0$, h is Monge-Ampère *negative*, and by Lemma 3.7 then we deduce that $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(S) > \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$ arguing as in Corollary 3.8. Note however that the proof of [Pin20, Proposition 3.1] does not allow us to extend this last inequality to also consider subsheaves of E when $\alpha < 0$. \square

3.2 Other stability conditions

The main result of [DMS24] is the proof of a correspondence between the existence of solutions of (1.1) and Z -stability in an asymptotic regime known as the *large volume limit*, over Kähler manifolds of arbitrary dimension. More precisely, they prove

Theorem 3.9 ([DMS24]). *Let Z be a polynomial central charge, and assume that E is simple and sufficiently smooth. Then E admits a family $\{h_k\}$ of uniformly bounded (in the C^2 -norm) Z_k -critical metrics for all $k \gg 0$ if and only if E is asymptotically Z -stable, i.e. it is Z_k -stable with respect to sub-bundles for all $k \gg 0$.*

A few comments about this result and how it relates to our Conjecture 1.4 are in order. A difference between [DMS24] and the present work is that Z -stability in [DMS24] is stated in terms of the arguments of $Z_{X,k}(S)$ and $Z_{X,k}(E)$, rather than the imaginary part of the ratio of these two complex numbers, for any subbundle $S \subset E$. However, the assumption $\text{Im}(\rho_n) > 0$ implies that, for k sufficiently large, $Z_k(N)$ lies in the upper-half plane for any vector bundle $N \rightarrow X$. Hence, the two inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \arg(Z_{X,k}(S)) &< \arg(Z_{X,k}(E)), \\ \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_{X,k}(S)}{Z_{X,k}(E)} \right) &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

are actually equivalent, for $k \gg 0$. Also, any Hermitian metric is Z_k -positive for k very large, so that Theorem 3.9 can be seen as a confirmation of the second part of Conjecture 1.4. Note however that a bundle that is asymptotically Z -stable in the sense of Theorem 3.9, i.e. Z_k -stable for all $k \gg 0$, is not necessarily Z_k -positive for all $k \gg 0$: it is however true that $\text{Im} \left(Z_{V,k}(E|_V) \overline{Z_{X,k}(E)} \right) > 0$ for any codimension 1 analytic subvariety $V \subset X$, and in particular any bundle over a surface is asymptotically Z -positive, see Lemma 3.10 below. This apparent discrepancy with Conjecture 1.4 may be considered as further evidence for the fact that Conjecture 1.4 should only be expected to hold under some *critical phase condition* for the charge. Note that it is likely that this critical phase condition will likely *not* be satisfied in the large volume limit, i.e. for a very large scale parameter k , as this is not the case for the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills equation in rank 1, which is essentially the only situation where the phase condition is well-understood.

Lemma 3.10. *Fix a polynomial central charge Z and a bundle $E \rightarrow X$ over a Kähler manifold of dimension n . If $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ all lie in the same half plane, for any analytic subset $V \subset X$ with $0 < \dim(V) < \dim(X)$ there is k_0 such that for every $k > k_0$*

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_{V,k}(E|_V)}{Z_{X,k}(E)} \right) > 0,$$

that is, E is asymptotically Z -positive. In particular, any vector bundle on a Kähler surface is asymptotically Z -positive for any polynomial central charge.

Proof. Assume that $V \subset X$ has dimension $p > 0$. By definition of a polynomial central charge, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{X,k}(E) &= \text{rk}(E) k^n \rho_n[\omega]^n + O(k^{n-1}) \\ Z_{V,k}(E|_V) &= \text{rk}(E) k^p \rho_p[\omega]^p \cdot [V] + O(k^{p-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The imaginary part of the ratio has the same sign as $\text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_{X,k}(E)} Z_{V,k}(E|_V) \right)$, and we can expand this as

$$\text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_{X,k}(E)} Z_{V,k}(E|_V) \right) = \text{rk}(E)^2 k^{n+p} [\omega]^n [\omega]^p \cdot [V] \text{Im}(\bar{\rho}_n \rho_p) + O(k^{n+p-1}).$$

If $\text{Im}(\bar{\rho}_n \rho_p) > 0$, the leading order term in this expression is positive. This condition is always true for $p = n - 1$ (by definition of a polynomial central charge) but might fail if V has higher codimension. Assume now that ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n all lie in the same half plane. Up to rotating the stability vector ρ , we can assume that they all lie in the upper half plane. Since Z is a polynomial central charge, $\text{Im}(\bar{\rho}_j \rho_{j-1}) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. In other words, using the principal value of the argument function,

$$\pi > \arg(\rho_1) > \arg(\rho_2) > \dots > \arg(\rho_{n-1}) > \arg(\rho_n) > 0,$$

so that $\text{Im}(\rho_j \bar{\rho}_i) > 0$ whenever $i > j > 0$. □

Remark 3.11. With the notation of Lemma 3.10, it is clear that if the components of the stability vector ρ_i do not lie all in the same half-plane, the inequality $\text{Im}(\rho_j \bar{\rho}_i) > 0$ might fail for some $i > j > 0$. It is however true that, for very large k and any p -dimensional subvariety $V \subset X$,

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{\rho_p}{\rho_n} \right) \text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_{V,k}(E|_V)}{Z_{X,k}(E)} \right) > 0 \tag{3.13}$$

provided that $\text{Im}(\rho_p \bar{\rho}_n) \neq 0$. Outside of the (hypothetical) supercritical range then one should not expect that the existence of a Z -positive metric implies Z -positivity of the bundle when the dimension of the manifold is greater than 2. If the existence of Z -positive metrics implies any inequalities between the charges of $E|_V$ and E , these must depend on the codimension of $V \subset X$, as in (3.13), see also [McC23, Remark 4.3.18].

One could wonder if, instead of Conjecture 1.4, we should also consider stability conditions that take into account possible subsheaves of $E|_V$ for subvarieties $V \subset X$, as is conjectured in [DMS24]. More precisely, [DMS24, Conjecture 1.6] states that E should admit a Z -critical connection if and only if the following condition holds:

Definition 3.12. A bundle $E \rightarrow X$ is *Z -stable over subvarieties* if for any $V \subset X$ and any proper short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow E|_V \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0$ of coherent sheaves over V ,

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_V(Q)}{Z_V(E|_V)} \right) > 0.$$

The following result shows that, at least in our simple setting of bundles over surfaces, this condition is probably too strong.

Lemma 3.13. *A bundle E on a compact Kähler surface X is Z -stable over subvarieties if and only if E is Mumford stable when restricted to any curve in X .*

Proof. Recall first that on a curve $V \subset X$ it is sufficient to check Mumford stability over sub-bundles rather than subsheaves, so we will assume that S is a sub-bundle of $E|_V$. We will also stop explicitly indicating the restriction of E to V .

The inequality $\text{Im}(Z_V(Q) Z_V(E)^{-1}) > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_V(Q)}{\text{rk}(Q)} \frac{\overline{Z_V(E)}}{\text{rk}(E)} \right) > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

By definition of the central charge, we have

$$\frac{Z_V(E)}{\text{rk}(E)} = \left(\rho_0 U_1 + \rho_0 \frac{\text{ch}_1(E)}{\text{rk}(E)} + \rho_1 [\omega] \right) \cdot [V] = \rho_0 (\mu_V(E) + U_1 \cdot [V]) + \rho_1 \mu_V([\omega])$$

where μ_V denotes the slopes of sheaves on V . Similarly, for Q we have

$$\frac{Z_V(Q)}{\text{rk}(Q)} = \rho_0 (\mu_V(Q) + U_1 \cdot [V]) + \rho_1 \mu_V([\omega]),$$

so we can compute the left hand-side of (3.14) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Im} \left(|\rho_0|^2 (\mu_V(Q) + U_1 \cdot [V]) (\mu_V(E) + U_1 \cdot [V]) + |\rho_1|^2 \mu_V([\omega])^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \rho_1 \bar{\rho}_0 \mu_V([\omega]) (\mu_V(E) + U_1 \cdot [V]) + \rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1 \mu_V([\omega]) (\mu_V(Q) + U_1 \cdot [V]) \right) \\ & = \text{Im}(\rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1) \mu_V([\omega]) \left((\mu_V(Q) + U_1 \cdot [V]) - (\mu_V(E) + U_1 \cdot [V]) \right) \\ & = \text{Im}(\rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1) \mu_V([\omega]) (\mu_V(Q) - \mu_V(E)). \end{aligned}$$

The central charge condition requires $\text{Im}(\rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1) > 0$, so (3.14) is equivalent to $\mu_V(Q) > \mu_V(E)$, i.e. E must be Mumford stable when restricted to V . \square

Remark 3.14. We can use Lemma 3.13 to exhibit examples of Z -stable bundles that are not Z -stable over subvarieties, see Examples 3.15 and 4.2 below. This is part of the motivation for formulating Conjecture 1.4 as a combination of a stability over subvarieties characterising the existence of Z -positive metrics (i.e. subsolutions) and an additional stability over subsheaves that should allow to pass from subsolutions to actual solutions.

Example 3.15. Consider an asymptotically Z -stable bundle E over the projective surface X polarized by an ample line bundle L . Assume that E is not Mumford stable with respect to L . Then, from [DMS24], it is known that E is Mumford semi-stable and there exists a coherent subsheaf F of E for which the slope satisfies the equality $\mu(F) = \mu(E)$. Moreover, the restriction of E over a generic curve C taken in the linear system of L^m (for m large enough) is semistable by the Mehta-Ramanathan theorem for semistable bundles. But this restriction $E|_C$ cannot be Mumford stable as its degree can be computed using the restriction to such generic curve: $\mu(F|_C) = \mu(E|_C)$. Consequently, Lemma 3.13 shows that E can never be Z_k -stable over subvarieties for large k .

3.3 Small variations of the charge and Mumford stability

We highlight a consequence of Theorem 1.1 that can be useful to provide new examples of Z -critical metrics starting from known ones. First, the Z -positivity of a Z -critical metric implies an openness result, analogously to [Tak24, Lemma 3.4].

Proposition 3.16. *If $E \rightarrow X$ is a simple bundle, the set of polynomial central charges Z for which there exists a Z -positive and Z -critical metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is open.*

Proof. We claim that the linearisation of the Z -critical equation at a Z -positive and Z -critical metric h is a self-adjoint elliptic operator, and its kernel are the holomorphic endomorphisms of E .

To prove this, we can reason as in [Tak24, Lemma 3.4] starting from the expression of the linearisation in (2.9). First of all, it is equivalent to linearise the operator with respect to a path of Hermitian metrics on E or along the action of a one-parameter subgroup of the complex gauge group, say generated by $V \in \mathfrak{i}\mathcal{A}^0(X, \text{End}(E, h))$. Then the linearised operator is

$$\mathcal{P} : V \mapsto \frac{\mathfrak{i}}{2\pi} [\text{Im} (e^{-\mathfrak{i}\vartheta_E} \mathcal{Z}_k(D)') \wedge (D''D' - D'D'')V]_{\text{sym}}$$

and it is elliptic as h is Z -positive by [DMS24, Lemma 2.36]. The Bianchi identity then shows that \mathcal{P} is self-adjoint with respect to the pairing on endomorphisms of E given by trace and integration, see [DMS24, §2.3.4].

If we assume that $\mathcal{P}(V) = 0$, then taking the trace of $\mathcal{P}(V)$ against V and integrating by parts we obtain

$$\langle D''V, D''V \rangle = 0$$

for the pairing defined in (2.11). So V must be a holomorphic endomorphism of E , proving the claim.

In our case, since E is simple the kernel of the linearisation is $\mathbb{1}_E \cdot \mathbb{C}$. The image of the Z -critical operator $h \mapsto \mathcal{Z}$ is orthogonal to this set, so the Implicit Function Theorem will give the desired h' . \square

From Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.5 then we obtain

Corollary 3.17. *Let Z be a polynomial central charge. If E is a strongly Z -positive bundle over a Kähler surface and $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is Z -positive and Z -critical for some central charge Z , for any other central charge Z' sufficiently close to Z there is $h' \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ that is Z' -positive and Z' -critical.*

We can use Proposition 3.16 to construct examples of Z -critical metrics starting from Mumford-stable bundles of arbitrary rank on a Kähler surface.

First, note that in the case $\alpha = 0$ the Z -critical equation (2.4) simplifies substantially: it essentially reduces to the Hermite-Einstein equation. It is possible then to establish a stronger result than Theorem 1.1, for bundles of arbitrary rank.

Proposition 3.18. *Fix a polynomial central charge Z , and assume that $E \rightarrow X$ is a bundle on a Kähler surface such that $\alpha = 0$, with the notation of (2.5). Then there is a Z -positive and Z -critical Hermitian metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ if and only if E is Z -positive and Z -stable.*

Proof. When $\alpha = 0$, from (2.4) we see that the Z -critical equation becomes the weak Hermite-Einstein equation

$$\mathcal{F}(h) \wedge \beta + \gamma \otimes \mathbb{1}_E = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Moreover the expressions for β and γ simplify:

$$\begin{cases} \beta = \operatorname{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} \rho_1) \omega \\ \gamma = \operatorname{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} (\rho_1 \omega \wedge u_1 + \rho_2 \omega^2)) . \end{cases}$$

The key observation is that in the present situation the Z -positivity condition for any metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is actually independent on h , and becomes just a condition on the bundle. More precisely, from (2.12) we see that Z -positivity of a metric is equivalent to $\beta > 0$, while by Lemma 3.2 the bundle E is Z -stable if and only if $[\beta] > 0$. Both conditions are equivalent to $\operatorname{Im} (e^{-i\vartheta_E} \rho_1) > 0$, as ω is Kähler.

Assuming now that β is a Kähler form, (3.15) has a solution if and only if E is Mumford stable with respect to β ; to prove our claim, it will be sufficient to show that if $\alpha = 0$ Z -stability and Mumford stability coincide. As $\alpha = 0$, (3.2) gives, for any subsheaf $S \subset E$,

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) = \operatorname{rk}(S) \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_1 \right) (- \mu_L(E) + \mu_L(S)).$$

As $\beta > 0$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_1 \right) > 0$, we see that $\operatorname{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) < 0$ if and only if $\mu_L(S) < \mu_L(E)$. \square

The condition $\alpha = 0$ is realised precisely when

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\bar{\rho}_1 \rho_0 U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \bar{\rho}_2 \rho_0 [\omega]^2 + \bar{\rho}_1 \rho_0 \frac{\operatorname{ch}_1(E) \cdot [\omega]}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \right) = 0$$

which we rewrite as

$$U_1 \cdot [\omega] + \frac{\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2 \rho_0)}{\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_1 \rho_0)} [\omega]^2 = - \frac{\operatorname{ch}_1(E) \cdot [\omega]}{\operatorname{rk}(E)}. \quad (3.16)$$

Under this assumption, the positivity condition $\beta > 0$, i.e. $\operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_1 \right) > 0$, becomes

$$\operatorname{Im}(\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2) \operatorname{rk}(E) [\omega]^2 > \operatorname{Im}(\rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1) (\operatorname{rk}(E) U_2 + U_1 \cdot \operatorname{ch}_1(E) + \operatorname{ch}_2(E)) \quad (3.17)$$

It is relatively easy to find examples of situations where (3.16) and (3.17) are satisfied; for example, consider a Mumford stable rank 2 bundle on a surface of degree zero as in Example 3.4. Then (3.16) can be satisfied by $\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_1 \rho_0) U_1 + \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2 \rho_0) [\omega] = 0$, and (3.17) becomes

$$\operatorname{Im}(\rho_1 \bar{\rho}_2) [\omega]^2 > \operatorname{Im}(\rho_0 \bar{\rho}_1) \left(U_2 - \frac{1}{4} c_2(E) \right)$$

which is satisfied for example if $4U_2 - c_2(E) < 0$.

Returning to the search for examples, we can deduce that Mumford stable bundles are Z -stable with respect to many polynomial central charges, by considering small variations around particular charges. More explicitly, for a small parameter t , assume that Z^t is a family of polynomial central charges depending on stability vectors ρ^t and unitary charges U^t , and assume that $E \rightarrow X$ is a Mumford stable bundle (with respect to $[\omega]$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z^t(E)} \rho_0^t \right) \Big|_{t=0} &= 0 \\ \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z^t(E)} \rho_1^t \right) \Big|_{t=0} &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Proposition 3.18 we can Proposition 3.16 to conclude that for every small t there is a Z_t -critical metric on E .

4 Z -polystability, Gieseker stability, and some examples

We start this Section by discussing an example showing that Z -positivity might fail even in very simple situations. Drawing from the rank-1 theories of the J-equation and the dHYM equation, we expect that the most difficult part of establishing Conjecture 1.4 on surfaces or higher-dimensional subvarieties will be addressing when a bundle admits a Z -positive metric. On the other hand, we expect that it should be relatively easy to check the Z -positivity of a vector bundle, at least over a surface. For example, in the rank 1 case it has been shown in [KSD24] that one just needs to check the inequality on a finite number of curves to ensure Z -positivity.

Example 4.1. We consider polynomial central charges on $X = \mathbb{P}^2$ defined by a unitary class of the form

$$U = e^{\lambda[\omega_{FS}]} = 1 + \lambda[\omega_{FS}] + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}[\omega_{FS}]^2$$

for some real number λ . We claim that the Fubini-Study Hermitian metric h_{FS} on the bundle $E = T\mathbb{P}^2 \rightarrow X$ is Z -critical for any choice of stability vector. To see this, note that the curvature of the Fubini-Study metric h_{FS} on E solves

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) \wedge \omega_{FS} &= \frac{3}{2} \omega_{FS}^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \\ \mathcal{F}(h_{FS})^2 &= \frac{3}{2} \omega_{FS}^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, h_{FS} is a solution of the vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation (as noted in [Pin20]), and it is also easily checked to be Monge-Ampère positive. Then the Z -critical operator will satisfy $\mathcal{Z}(h_{FS}) \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \omega^2$ and the definition of the phase $e^{i\vartheta_E}$ guarantees that for any choice of the coefficients ρ_i and λ we will get $\operatorname{Im}(e^{-i\vartheta} \mathcal{Z}(h_{FS})) = 0$.

However, for many values of these coefficients E is not Z -positive. As an example, consider $\rho = (1, -i/3, -1 + i)$. We compute

$$Z_X(E) = 2 \left(\rho_0 \frac{\lambda^2}{2} + \rho_1 \lambda + \rho_2 \right) + 3(\rho_0 \lambda + \rho_1) + \frac{3}{2} \rho_0 = \lambda^2 + \lambda \left(3 - \frac{2}{3}i \right) - \frac{1}{2} + i$$

and if $H \subset X$ is a hyperplane we have instead

$$Z_H(E|_H) = 3 + 2\lambda - \frac{2}{3}i.$$

If E were Z -positive, by Lemma 3.3 we should find $\text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_H(E|_H) \right) > 0$. However, we get $\text{Im} \left(\overline{Z_X(E)} Z_H(E|_H) \right) = \frac{2}{3}(\lambda^2 - 3\lambda - 4)$, which is negative for $-1 < \lambda < 4$.

We can use this observation on $T\mathbb{P}^2$ to also show an example of a polynomial central charge Z and a bundle that has a Z -positive and Z -critical metric, but is not Z -stable over subvarieties (c.f. Definition 3.12).

Example 4.2. Consider again the bundle $E = T\mathbb{P}^2$ over \mathbb{P}^2 and a polynomial central charge Z as in Example 4.1, i.e. $U = e^{\lambda \omega_{FS}}$, so that the Fubini-Study Hermitian metric on E is Z -critical. Lemma 3.13 shows that E is not Z -stable over subvarieties: its restriction to a hyperplane H is not even semistable, as it splits as $TH \oplus \mathcal{O}_H(1)$, see for example [OSS11, pag. 14].

It remains to show that h_{FS} is Z -positive for some central charge over \mathbb{P}^2 . We choose the dHYM charge, defined by the weights $\rho = (-i, -1, i/2)$, and set $\lambda = 0$ (so, the unitary class is trivial). Then, the charge is

$$Z_X(E) = -3 - \frac{1}{2}i$$

and the coefficients of (2.5) can be computed from the identities

$$|Z_X(E)| \alpha = \frac{3}{2}, \quad |Z_X(E)| \beta = -\frac{1}{2}\omega, \quad |Z_X(E)| \gamma = -\frac{3}{2}\omega^2.$$

Note that the volume form hypothesis (3.4) is satisfied:

$$\left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^2 - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} = \frac{1}{36}\omega^2 + \omega^2.$$

As for Z -positivity, we should check that

$$i \text{Tr} \left[\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge (2\alpha \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) + \xi^* \wedge (2\alpha \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \xi \right] > 0$$

for any $p \in X$ and any nonzero $\xi \in T_p^{0,1*} X \times \text{End}(E_p)$. In our particular case, this is equivalent to

$$3i \text{Tr} \left[\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) + \xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) \wedge \xi \right] > \omega_{FS} \wedge i \text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi]. \quad (4.1)$$

It is sufficient to check this at a single point, as the action of the unitary automorphisms is transitive. So we can perform the computation at the point $0 \in U_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. At this point ω_{FS} is the canonical symplectic form, and the Fubini-Study curvature is (up to a multiple of 2π)

$$\mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{id}z^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{id}z^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{id}z^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \text{id}z^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2.$$

If we let $\xi = U d\bar{z}^1 + V d\bar{z}^2$ for two matrices U and V , we find

$$\begin{aligned} & i \text{Tr} \left[\xi^* \wedge \xi \wedge \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) + \xi^* \wedge \mathcal{F}(h_{FS}) \wedge \xi \right] = \\ & = \left[3(|u_1^1|^2 + |u_2^1|^2 + |v_1^1|^2 + |v_2^1|^2) + |u_1^2|^2 + |u_2^2|^2 + |v_1^2|^2 + |v_2^2|^2 + \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |u_1^1 - v_2^1|^2 + |u_1^2 - v_2^2|^2 + |v_1^1 - u_2^1|^2 + |v_1^2 - u_2^2|^2 \right] \omega_{FS}^2 \end{aligned}$$

while for $\text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi]$ we have

$$\omega_{FS} \wedge i \text{Tr} [\xi^* \wedge \xi] = (|u_1^1|^2 + |u_2^1|^2 + |u_1^2|^2 + |u_2^2|^2 + |v_1^1|^2 + |v_2^1|^2 + |v_1^2|^2 + |v_2^2|^2) \omega_{FS}^2$$

and clearly (4.1) is satisfied.

Example 4.3. We consider now a slight modification of [DMS24, Example 2.20], to see what our conjecture predicts for a rank 3 bundle over $X = \mathbb{P}^2$. Take a Mumford stable bundle $S \rightarrow X$ of rank 2 such that there exists a nonzero $\tau \in H^1(X, S)$. This class τ defines a non-split extension of \mathcal{O}_X by S that we denote by

$$0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0.$$

It is easy to check that, in this situation, E and S satisfy

$$\text{ch}(S) = \text{ch}(E)$$

and the Bogomolov inequality implies $4\text{ch}_2(S)^2 \leq \text{ch}_1(S)^2$.

As in [DMS24], we choose the Fubini-Study form on \mathbb{P}^2 , $\omega \in H := c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))$ and we consider the deformed Hermitian Yang-Mills charge for some B-field class $B \in H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$, obtained by the choice of weights $\rho = (-i, -1, i/2)$

$$Z^{\text{dHYM}}(E) = -i \int_X e^{-iH} e^{-B} \text{ch}(E).$$

More explicitly, for the dHYM charge we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_X^{\text{dHYM}}(E) &= -i \left(1 - iH - \frac{1}{2}H^2 \right) \cdot \left(1 - B + \frac{1}{2}B^2 \right) \cdot (\text{rk}(E) + \text{ch}_1(E) + \text{ch}_2(E)) \\ &= \text{rk}(E) \left(H \cdot B - \frac{i}{2}B^2 + \frac{i}{2} \right) - (H - iB) \text{ch}_1(E) - i \text{ch}_2(E). \end{aligned}$$

We proceed to examine the Z -stability and Z -positivity of E . For the stability part it is sufficient to check the ratio of $Z_X(S)$ and $Z_X(E)$, which is a positive multiple of (using that $\text{ch}(E) = \text{ch}(S)$)

$$\text{Im} \left(Z_X(S) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) = \left(H.B B - \frac{1}{2}(B^2 - 1)H \right) . \text{ch}_1(S) - \text{ch}_2(S) H.B$$

If $\text{ch}_1(S) = 0$, which is the case considered in [DMS24, Example 2.20], we see that E is Z -stable if and only if $\text{ch}_2(S) H.B > 0$. As $\text{ch}_2(E) \leq 0$, we see that E is Z -stable when $\text{ch}_2(E) \neq 0$ and $H.B < 0$.

As for the Z -positivity, it is sufficient to check when $\text{Im} \left(Z_H(E|_H) \overline{Z_{\mathbb{P}^2}(E)} \right) > 0$ for a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. The direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} Z_H(E|_H) &= -i(1 - iH) \cdot (1 - B) \cdot (\text{rk}(E) + \text{ch}_1(E)) \\ &= 3(iB.H - 1) - i\text{ch}_1(E).H. \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im} \left(Z_H(E|_H) \overline{Z_X(E)} \right) &= (3B.H - \text{ch}_1(E).H)^2 + 3B.\text{ch}_1(E) - 3\text{ch}_2(E) - \frac{9}{2}(B^2 - 1) = \\ &= \frac{1}{9} \left[(B.H - \mu_H(E))^2 + \mu_B(E) - \frac{\text{ch}_2(E)}{3} - \frac{1}{2}(B^2 - 1) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $B = xH$ for some real number x . Then, E is Z -positive if and only if

$$(x - \mu_H(E))^2 + \mu_H(E)^2 + 1 > \frac{2}{3}\text{ch}_2(E)$$

while it is Z -stable if and only if

$$(x^2 + 1) H.\text{ch}_1(S) - 2x \text{ch}_2(S) < 0$$

So our conjecture predicts that, if $\text{ch}_1(S) = 0$ and $\text{ch}_2(S) \neq 0$ (so that $\text{ch}_2(E) < 0$), there is a positive solution $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ of the dHYM equation for every $x < 0$. If $x \geq 0$ instead we can not apply Theorem 1.1 directly to deduce that there is no dHYM-positive solution of the dHYM equation, as that result applies only to rank 2 bundles.

Example 4.4. As a particular case of the construction in Example 4.3, we take $S = T\mathbb{P}^2 \otimes K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. Of course S is stable, as $T\mathbb{P}^2$ is stable. Moreover, $H^1(X, S) \cong H^{1,1}(X)^\vee$ by Serre duality, so we can define a nontrivial extension E by using the Fubini-Study form.

The components of the Chern character are

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(E) &= c_1(T\mathbb{P}^2) + 2c_1(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = -3H \\ \text{ch}_2(E) &= c_1(K_{\mathbb{P}^2})^2 + c_1(T\mathbb{P}^2).c_1(K_{\mathbb{P}^2}) + \text{ch}_2(T\mathbb{P}^2) = \frac{3}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

while the Z -positivity and Z -stability conditions become, respectively,

$$\begin{cases} (x + 1)^2 + 2 > 1 \\ -(x^2 + 1) - x < 0 \end{cases}$$

so the bundle is Z -positive and Z -stable for every choice of x , and there should be a Z -positive solution of the dHYM equation.

The dHYM charge of E as a function of x is

$$Z_X^{\text{dHYM}}(E) = 3x + 3 - \frac{3}{2}i(x+2)x.$$

To write the dHYM equation we choose $x\omega$ as a representative of the class $B = xH$, and the coefficients of the equation are determined by

$$\begin{cases} |Z_X(E)|\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}\left(\overline{Z_X(E)}(-i)\right) = -\frac{3}{2}(1+x) \\ |Z_X(E)|\beta = \text{Im}\left(\overline{Z_X(E)}(ix-1)\right)\omega = \frac{3}{2}x^2\omega \\ |Z_X(E)|\gamma = \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}\left(\overline{Z_X(E)}(i(1-x^2)+2x)\right)\omega^2 = \frac{3}{2}(1+x+x^2)\omega^2. \end{cases}$$

Hence, the dHYM equation is equivalent to

$$-(1+x)\mathcal{F}(h)^2 + x^2\omega \wedge \mathcal{F}(h) + (1+x+x^2)\omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E = 0 \quad (4.3)$$

which we could rewrite as a Monge-Ampère type condition (assuming $x \neq -1$) as

$$\left(\mathcal{F} - \frac{x^2}{2(1+x)}\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E\right)^2 = \frac{(x^2 + 2(1+x))^2}{4(1+x)^2}\omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$$

and the volume form hypothesis is always satisfied.

Take $h = h_S + h_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}}$ where $h_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}}$ is the flat metric on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$, and h_S is the product of the Fubini-Study Hermitian metrics on $T\mathbb{P}^2$ and $K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. Then, letting A be the second fundamental form of $S \subset E$,

$$\mathcal{F}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_S - \frac{i}{2\pi}A \wedge A^* & -\frac{i}{2\pi}D'A \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi}D''A^* & -\frac{i}{2\pi}A^* \wedge A \end{pmatrix}$$

and \mathcal{F}_S satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_S = \mathcal{F}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{K_X} + \mathbb{1}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathcal{F}_{K_X} = \mathcal{F}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{K_X} - 3\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_S.$$

The dHYM equation (4.3) can be seen as a system of equations for

$$A \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(X, \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_X, S)) = \mathcal{A}^{0,1}(X, S).$$

Explicitly, in the usual local coordinate system over $U_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, we can locally trivialise S by the local frame $\partial_{z^b} \otimes dz^c \wedge dz^d$, and any such A can be written as

$$A = (A_{\bar{a}}^b{}_{cd} d\bar{z}^a) \otimes \partial_{z^b} \otimes dz^c \wedge dz^d$$

where we added the parenthesis to highlight the distinction between the form and the bundle parts. We choose the coefficients of A as the unique solutions of $A_{\bar{a}}^b{}_{bc} = -(g_{FS})_{c\bar{a}}$.

To ease the notation, we denote by $e_a = \partial_{z^a} \otimes dz^1 \wedge dz^2$ the local frame for S , with dual co-frame $\varepsilon^a = dz^a \otimes \partial_{z^1} \wedge \partial_{z^2}$. We also let $r^2 := |z^1|^2 + |z^2|^2$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{(1+r^2)^2} \left(z^1 \bar{z}^2 d\bar{z}^1 - (1+|z^1|^2) d\bar{z}^2 \right) \otimes e_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(1+r^2)^2} \left(-\bar{z}^1 z^2 d\bar{z}^2 + (1+|z^2|^2) d\bar{z}^1 \right) \otimes e_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Then for its adjoint A^* we have

$$\begin{aligned} A^* &= \left(\overline{A_{\bar{a}}^b} (g_{FS})_{c\bar{b}} \det(g_{FS})^{-1} dz^a \right) \otimes \varepsilon^c \\ &= \left(-(1+r^2) dz^2 \right) \otimes \varepsilon^1 + \left((1+r^2) dz^1 \right) \otimes \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that this choice of A satisfies (4.3). As each piece is equivariant with respect to the unitary action on \mathbb{P}^2 and its lift to E , it will be sufficient to check that over the point $p = \{z^1 = z^2 = 0\}$, for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= -d\bar{z}^2 \otimes e_1 + d\bar{z}^1 \otimes e_2, \\ A^* &= -dz^2 \otimes \varepsilon^1 + dz^1 \otimes \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $D'A$ vanishes at p . To prove this, we express $D'A$ in the usual local frame for S :

$$D'A = \partial(A_{\bar{a}}^i d\bar{z}^a) \otimes e_i + (A_{\bar{a}}^i d\bar{z}^a) \wedge D'e_i.$$

Note first that, at the point p , $\partial(A_{\bar{a}}^i d\bar{z}^a) = 0$ for all indices a, i , from (4.4). So it remains to show that $(D'e_i)|_p = 0$. Recall that $e_i = \partial_{z^i} \otimes dz^1 \wedge dz^2$, and that D' is the $(1,0)$ -part of the Chern connection of the Fubini-Study metric on $T\mathbb{P}^2 \otimes K_{\mathbb{P}^2}$, so $D'e_i$ is a sum of Christoffel symbols of the Fubini-Study metric, and they all vanish at p .

This observation already shows that the off-diagonal components of $\mathcal{F}(h)^2$ and $\mathcal{F}(h) \wedge \omega$ with respect to the decomposition $E = S + \mathcal{O}_X$ vanish. We proceed to compute the other components of $\mathcal{F}(h)^2$ and $\omega \wedge \mathcal{F}(h)$. The direct computation gives, at the point p

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i}{2\pi} A^* \wedge A &= \frac{1}{2\pi} (idz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 + idz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1) = \omega; \\ A \wedge A^* &= -dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \otimes e_1 \otimes \varepsilon^1 + dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \otimes e_2 \otimes \varepsilon^1 \\ &\quad + dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \otimes e_1 \otimes \varepsilon^2 - dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \otimes e_2 \otimes \varepsilon^2 \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 & dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \\ dz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 & -dz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \left(\frac{i}{2\pi} \right)^2 (A \wedge A^*)^2 &= -\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S; \\ \mathcal{F}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2\pi} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2idz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + idz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 & idz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \\ idz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 & idz^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 + 2idz^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We put together these forms to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} \wedge \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* &= -\frac{3}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S; \\ \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* \wedge \mathcal{F}_{T\mathbb{P}^2} &= -\frac{3}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S; \\ \omega \wedge \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^* &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \omega \wedge \begin{pmatrix} -\mathrm{id} z^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 & \mathrm{id} z^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^2 \\ \mathrm{id} z^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 & -\mathrm{id} z^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S.\end{aligned}$$

Using these identities, the $\mathrm{End}(S)$ part of \mathcal{F}^2 at the point p becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathcal{F}_S - \frac{i}{2\pi} A \wedge A^*\right)^2 - \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^2 D' A \wedge D'' A^* &= \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S - 3 \omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_S + 3 \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S - \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S = \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S,\end{aligned}$$

so the $\mathrm{End}(S)$ part of (4.3) is

$$-(1+x)(\omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S) + x^2(-\omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S) + (1+x+x^2)\omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S = 0,$$

which is clearly always satisfied. For the $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ part of (4.3) instead we have

$$-(1+x)(\omega^2) - x^2 \omega^2 + (1+x+x^2)\omega^2 = 0$$

that again is always true.

Our computations in Section 3.1 can be used to establish that:

Lemma 4.5. *Let E be a vector bundle over a Kähler surface. For any polynomial central charge Z such that $\mathrm{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0) > 0$, if $S \subset E$ is a sub-bundle of rank $\mathrm{rk}(E) - 1$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ is a Z -positive Z -critical metric, then*

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{Z_X(S)}{Z_X(E)}\right) \leq 0, \quad (4.5)$$

with equality if and only if E splits. The same conclusion applies if instead $\mathrm{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0)$ is negative and $\mathrm{rk}(S) = 1$.

Proof. We prove this only in the positive case, that is when $\mathrm{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0) > 0$, as the same argument with opposite inequalities applies to the negative case. Assuming that $\mathrm{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)} \rho_0) > 0$ and that the second fundamental form A satisfies $i^2 \mathrm{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) \geq 0$, the first inequality in Lemma 3.7 is stronger than (3.12), so Lemma 3.7 will imply the inequality (4.5) under these assumptions.

We prove that $i^2 \mathrm{Tr}((A^* \wedge A)^2) \geq 0$ if $\mathrm{rk}(S) = \mathrm{rk}(E) - 1$. Note first that in this case $A^* \wedge A$ is just a $(1,1)$ -form. Moreover, in an orthonormal frame for $S + Q = E$, we can write $A = A_{\bar{a}} d\bar{z}^a$ for matrices $A_{\bar{a}}$, and $A^* = A_{\bar{a}}^* dz^a$; hence,

$$(i A^* \wedge A)^2 = 2(A_{\bar{1}}^* A_{\bar{1}} A_{\bar{2}}^* A_{\bar{2}} - A_{\bar{1}}^* A_{\bar{2}} A_{\bar{2}}^* A_{\bar{1}}) \mathrm{id} z^1 \wedge d\bar{z}^1 \wedge \mathrm{id} z^2 \wedge d\bar{z}^2,$$

so it will be sufficient to show that $A_1^* A_1 A_2^* A_2 - A_1^* A_2 A_2^* A_1 \geq 0$. If we write $A_1 = (x^1, \dots, x^s)^\top$ and $A_2 = (y^1, \dots, y^s)^\top$ we get

$$\sum_{i,j} |x^i|^2 |y^j|^2 - \sum_{i,j} \bar{x}^i y^i x^j \bar{y}^j = \sum_{i \neq j} |x^i|^2 |y^j|^2 - \sum_{i \neq j} \bar{x}^i y^i x^j \bar{y}^j = \sum_{i \neq j} |\bar{x}^i y^i - x^j \bar{y}^j|^2 > 0. \quad \square$$

This can be used to exhibit examples of central charges and higher-rank bundles that do not admit a Z -positive Z -critical metric. In particular, one might wonder if the same phenomenon observed for $T\mathbb{P}^2$, i.e. that it admits Z -critical metrics for many central charges, holds for the bundle considered in Example 4.4. Using Lemma 4.5, we show that the answer is negative.

Example 4.6. Consider a polynomial central charge Z given by a vector $\rho = (\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2)$ and the short exact sequence over $X = \mathbb{P}^2$

$$0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0$$

of Example 4.4. For simplicity, we assume that the unitary class U is trivial, $U = 1$. Then the charges of E and S are, using (4.2),

$$\begin{aligned} Z_X(E) &= 3\rho_2 - 3\rho_1 + \frac{3}{2}\rho_0 \\ Z_X(S) &= 2\rho_2 - 3\rho_1 + \frac{3}{2}\rho_0 = Z_X(E) - \rho_2 \end{aligned}$$

hence we find

$$\operatorname{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)}\rho_0) = 3\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) - 3\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_1\rho_0)$$

and so $\operatorname{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)}\rho_0) > 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) > \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_1\rho_0)$. Instead, to check Z -stability we first compute

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(\overline{Z_X(E)}Z_X(S)) &= \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2 Z_X(S)) = \operatorname{Im}\left(\bar{\rho}_2 \left(2\rho_2 - 3\rho_1 + \frac{3}{2}\rho_0\right)\right) \\ &= -3\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_1) + \frac{3}{2}\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that if E is Z -stable, then it must be

$$\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) < 2\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_1).$$

By Lemma 4.5 we deduce that E can not admit any Z -positive and Z -critical metric if

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) > \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_1\rho_0) \\ \operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_0) > 2\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\rho}_2\rho_1). \end{cases}$$

Many charges satisfy this, an example is $\rho = (1, -i, -1 - 3i)$.

4.1 Z-polystability

Consider the case of a decomposable rank 2 bundle $E = L_1 \oplus L_2 \rightarrow X$. If $h_i \in \mathcal{H}^+(L_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, then we get a metric $h = h_1 \oplus h_2$ on E , and

$$\mathcal{F}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}(h_1) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{F}(h_2) \end{pmatrix}$$

under the decomposition $\text{End}(E) = \text{End}(L_1) + \text{Hom}(L_1, L_2) + \text{Hom}(L_2, L_1) + \text{End}(L_2)$. Hence, for this metric, (2.6) splits as the system

$$\begin{cases} (2\alpha\mathcal{F}(h_1) + \beta)^2 = \beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma \\ (2\alpha\mathcal{F}(h_2) + \beta)^2 = \beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Under the volume form hypothesis $\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma > 0$, by Yau's solution of the Calabi conjecture, the system (4.6) has solutions under the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} 2\alpha L_i + [\beta] \text{ has a sign} & \text{for } i = 1, 2 \\ (2\alpha L_i + [\beta])^2 = [\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma] & \text{for } i = 1, 2. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

As the bundle E is decomposable, by Lemma 3.5 it is not Z -stable. However, we have

Lemma 4.7. *The following are equivalent:*

1. $\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(S)}{Z_X(E)} \right) \leq 0$ for any proper sub-bundle $S \subset E$;
2. $\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(L_1)}{Z_X(L_2)} \right) = 0$;
3. $(2\alpha L_1 + [\beta])^2 = (2\alpha L_2 + [\beta])^2 = [\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma]$.

Proof. The equivalence between 1 and 2 is a direct consequence of the fact that each L_i is a line bundle, and that the sequence $0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow E \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$ splits, so that $Z_X(E) = Z_X(L_1) + Z_X(L_2)$. Note also that each condition is in turn equivalent to $\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(L_i)}{Z_X(E)} \right) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. From Proposition 3.1 we know that $\text{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(L_i)}{Z_X(E)} \right) = 0$ is equivalent to the equality of Monge-Ampère slopes $\mu_{MA, \vartheta}(L_i) = \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(E)$. By definition of the Monge-Ampère slope we get, for $\vartheta := [\beta/2\alpha]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(L_i) &= \text{ch}_2(L_i) + \text{ch}_1(L_i) \cdot \vartheta \\ \mu_{MA, \vartheta}(E) &= \frac{\text{ch}_2(E)}{2} + \frac{\text{ch}_1(L_1) \cdot \vartheta + \text{ch}_1(L_2) \cdot \vartheta}{2} \end{aligned}$$

hence the Monge-Ampère slopes are equal if and only if

$$(2\alpha L_1 + [\beta])^2 = (2\alpha L_2 + [\beta])^2$$

and they must each equal $[\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma]$ since $\text{ch}_2(E) + \text{ch}_1(E) \cdot \vartheta + \vartheta^2 = \vartheta^2 - \gamma/\alpha$. \square

The conditions in (4.7) imply the existence of solutions of the Z -critical equation, so they must be part of a hypothetical Z -polystability condition on $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$. From (the proof of) [DMS24, Theorem 1.4] we know that, if $\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma$ is a volume form, then the following conditions are equivalent for each $i = 1, 2$:

1. L_i admits a Z -critical metric;
2. L_i admits a Z -positive metric;
3. $2\alpha L_i + [\beta] > 0$.

In particular, under the volume form hypothesis, [DMS24, Theorem 1.4] implies Conjecture 1.4 for line bundles over surfaces. Looking at the conditions in (4.7) and Lemma 4.7, it is then natural to interpret the equation $\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(L_1)}{Z_X(L_2)} \right) = 0$ as part of a hypothetical polystability condition for $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$, which motivates an extension of Definition 1.2 and Conjecture 1.4 to the case of decomposable bundles.

Definition 4.8. Given a polynomial central charge Z , we say that a vector bundle E is Z -polystable if it is a direct sum $E = \bigoplus E_i$ of bundles that are Z -stable, such that for every i, j

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{Z_X(E_i)}{Z_X(E_j)} \right) = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Conjecture 4.9. For any polynomial central charge Z and any holomorphic vector bundle E on a compact Kähler surface, there exists a Z -positive solution $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ of the Z -critical equation if and only if E is a direct sum of vector bundles that are Z -positive, Z -stable, and satisfy (4.8).

Again, it is clear that this conjecture can only hold under some additional assumption, a *supercritical phase condition* that is yet to be understood. For the toy example we are examining, i.e. $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$, we know that we should impose the volume form hypothesis

$$\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma > 0.$$

We have already proven that, under the volume form hypothesis, if L_1 and L_2 are Z -positive and satisfy (4.8), then there is a Z -positive solution of the Z -critical equation on E . Our results in Section 3.1 give us the converse implication as well.

Lemma 4.10. Let Z be a polynomial central charge over a Kähler surface that satisfies the volume form hypothesis. Then Conjecture 4.9 holds for any rank 2 decomposable vector bundle $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$.

Proof. It remains to show that if $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$ has a Z -positive solution of the Z -critical equation then the two bundles L_i are themselves Z -positive and satisfy (4.8), as Z -stability is a void condition for line bundles. We prove this by rephrasing it through the correspondence with the Monge-Ampère equation of Lemma 2.3. We consider only the case when $\alpha > 0$, the other situation is completely symmetrical.

Assume that $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$ has a Monge-Ampère-positive metric $h \in \mathcal{H}^+(E)$ (with respect to β) that solves the twisted vector bundle Monge-Ampère equation (2.7). By (the proof of) Corollary 3.8 then $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(L_i) \leq \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$ for $i = 1, 2$. However $E = L_1 \oplus L_2$ as a holomorphic vector bundle, so $\mu_{MA,\vartheta}(L_i) = \mu_{MA,\vartheta}(E)$ and this implies that the second fundamental form of h with respect to the inclusion $L_1 \subset E$ vanishes (c.f. proof of Corollary 3.8). From (3.8) the curvature of h satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h_{L_1}) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h_{L_2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.9)$$

where h_{L_i} denotes the restriction of h to L_1 and L_2 respectively. Hence h_{L_i} satisfy

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h_{L_1})^2 = \eta = \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(h_{L_2})^2$$

so (4.8) holds. As we are assuming that h is Monge-Ampère positive, from (4.9) it also easily follows that each h_{L_i} must be Monge-Ampère positive. \square

Remark 4.11. Not every pair of solutions (h_1, h_2) of (4.6) gives a Z -critical metric $h = h_1 + h_2$ that is also Z -positive, as the signs of $2\alpha L_i + [\beta]$ might not be the same.

4.2 Z -stability and Gieseker stability

In his PhD thesis [Leu93], Leung introduced the notion of *almost Hermitian-Einstein* metric. For a given holomorphic vector bundle E over a polarised compact complex manifold $L \rightarrow X$ and k sufficiently large, a metric h_k is said to be *almost Hermitian-Einstein* if its Chern connection satisfies

$$[\exp(\mathcal{F}(h_k) + k\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \text{Todd}_X]^{\text{top}} = c_k \frac{\omega^n}{n!} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \quad (4.10)$$

where ω is a Kähler metric in $c_1(L)$ and Todd_X is the ω -harmonic representative of the Todd class of X . This equation has been introduced as an analytic counterpart to Gieseker stability.

Note that $\mathcal{F}(h_k) + k\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$ is the curvature form of a connection on $E \otimes L^k$; then, by Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch we have

$$\int_X \text{Tr} [\exp(\mathcal{F}(h_k) + k\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \text{Todd}_X]^{\text{top}} = \text{ch}(E \otimes L^k) \cdot \text{Todd}_X = \chi(E \otimes L^k),$$

where $\chi(E \otimes L^k)$ denotes the Euler Characteristic of the product bundle, so the constant c_k in (4.10) must be

$$c_k = \frac{\chi(E \otimes L^k)}{\text{Vol}(X) \text{rk} E}.$$

Leung's equation (4.10) can be reinterpreted as a special case of the Z -critical equation (1.1), given by the *almost Hermite-Einstein* charge

$$\mathcal{Z}_k^{aHE}(h) = c_k \frac{\omega^n}{n!} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + i(\exp(\mathcal{F}(h) + k\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \text{Todd}_X)^{\text{top}}.$$

Indeed, by integrating over X we find

$$\int_X \text{Tr}(\mathcal{Z}_k^{aHE}(h)) = \chi(E \otimes L^k) (1 + i)$$

so that the corresponding equation (1.1) is equivalent to (at least if $\chi(E \otimes L^k) \neq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \text{Im}((1 - i)\mathcal{Z}_k^{aHE}(h)) = \\ &= -c_k \frac{\omega^n}{n!} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + [\exp(\mathcal{F}(h) + k\omega \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \text{Todd}_X]^{\text{top}} \end{aligned}$$

which is precisely (4.10). Note that \mathcal{Z}_k^{aHE} can be expressed in a form closer to (2.1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_k^{aHE}(h) &= \left[c_k \frac{\omega^n}{n!} e^{\mathcal{F}(h)} \text{Todd}_X + i e^{k\omega} e^{\mathcal{F}(h)} \text{Todd}_X \right]^{\text{top}} \\ &= \left[\left(\left(\frac{c_k}{k^n} + i \right) \frac{(k\omega)^n}{n!} \mathbb{1}_E + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{i}{j!} (k\omega)^j \right) \right) \wedge e^{\mathcal{F}(h)} \wedge \text{Todd}_X \right]^{\text{top}}. \end{aligned}$$

The stability vector $\rho^{aHE} := (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n)$ is then

$$\begin{cases} \rho_j = \frac{i}{j!} & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \\ \rho_n = \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{c_k}{k^n} + i \right). \end{cases}$$

An important remark is that the almost Hermite-Einstein charge does not fit precisely in the discussion of [DMS24], as it is not properly a polynomial central charge: $\rho_j/\rho_{j+1} = j+1$ for $j < n-1$, hence $\text{Im}(\rho_j/\rho_{j+1})$ is *not* positive for $j < n-1$. It is however true that $\text{Im}(\rho_{n-1}/\rho_n) > 0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$ (by asymptotic Riemann-Roch), which is the assumption needed to carry out the asymptotic analysis of the equation in [DMS24]. Another issue is that the coefficient ρ_n defining the charge depends on the bundle E itself, so the charge is not additive over short exact sequences, for example.

Nevertheless, given a bundle E , we can still apply our results to the almost Hermite-Einstein charge, by considering the coefficients ρ_j as fixed. In this way we obtain a Z -critical equation for *any* bundle F , which will coincide with the almost Hermite-Einstein equation on F only if $\chi(F \otimes L^k) \text{rk}(E) = \chi(E \otimes L^k) \text{rk}(F)$: explicitly, the *almost Hermite-Einstein charge defined by $E \rightarrow X$* , $Z_{E,k}^{aHE}$, is defined by the unitary class $U = \text{Todd}_X$ and the stability vector

$$\begin{cases} \rho_j = \frac{i}{j!} & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \\ \rho_n = \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{c_k}{k^n} + i \right) \end{cases}$$

so that for any vector bundle F

$$Z_{E,k}^{aHE}(F) = \chi(E \otimes L^k) \frac{\text{rk}(F)}{\text{rk}(E)} + i \chi(F \otimes L^k).$$

In particular for any coherent subsheaf $F \subset E$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \left(\overline{Z_{E,k}^{aHE}(E)} Z_{E,k}^{aHE}(F) \right) &= \chi(E \otimes L^k) \operatorname{Im} \left((1 - i) \left(\chi(E \otimes L^k) \frac{\operatorname{rk}(F)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} + i \chi(F \otimes L^k) \right) \right) \\ &= \chi(E \otimes L^k) \left(\chi(F \otimes L^k) - \chi(E \otimes L^k) \frac{\operatorname{rk}(F)}{\operatorname{rk}(E)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi(E \otimes L^k) > 0$ for $k \gg 0$, we obtain that $Z_{E,k}^{aHE}$ -stability of E coincides with Gieseker stability for sufficiently large k .

This remark has two applications. Firstly, all our results however apply to this almost-Hermitian charge for any k , thus giving an analogue of Gieseker-stability in a non-asymptotic case, for rank 2 bundles over surfaces. Secondly, the proof of Theorem 3.9 works in that case and provides the existence of an almost Hermitian-Einstein metric on a Gieseker stable bundle which is sufficiently smooth, completing the proof of the main result of Leung's thesis. Moreover, the techniques of [DMS24] do not require k to be a integer, it can be chosen as a real positive number sufficiently large.

Example 4.12. We continue to investigate Example 3.4 in order to construct a Z -positive Z -critical metric on E , thus checking Conjecture 1.4 in this particular case. As before, we consider a non-split extension

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_r \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0$$

over X , the blow-up of \mathbb{P}^2 at one point, but we fix $[\omega] = 3H - E_1 = c_1(X)$. Given any stability vector $\rho = (\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2)$, we consider U_1 proportional to $c_1(X)$ such that $\alpha > 0$ in (2.5). Since $\operatorname{ch}_2(\mathcal{L}_r) < \operatorname{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_X)$, the same reasoning as we did for Monge-Ampère stability shows that E is Gieseker stable (and thus simple) with respect to the integral class $[\omega]$. From the exact sequence, E is also sufficiently smooth as the graded object $Gr(E) = \mathcal{L}_r \oplus E/\mathcal{L}_r$ is a holomorphic bundle. Consequently, there exists $k_0(r) > 0$ such that for any real $k > k_0(r)$, there exists a metric $h_{r,k}$ on E that solves (4.10) and this simplifies to

$$\mathcal{F}(h_{r,k})^2 + \left(2k + \frac{1}{2} \right) \omega \wedge \mathcal{F}(h_{r,k}) = c'_{r,k} \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$$

where $c'_{r,k}$ is a topological constant. We explain now how we will fix the Z -charge.

As we explained before, we have the flexibility to choose U_2 independently of r such that $|Z_X(E)|\beta$ writes as $\kappa\omega$ where $\kappa > 0$ is as large as we want. Since $|Z_X(E)|\alpha$ is positive and does not depend on U_2 , the Z -critical equation (2.4) becomes

$$\mathcal{F}(h)^2 + \kappa' \omega \wedge \mathcal{F}(h) + \gamma' \omega^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E = 0$$

where $\kappa' = \frac{\kappa}{\alpha} > 0$ is large as we want while γ' is a constant, which is fixed topologically. From above discussion, we can choose U_2 independently of r such that $\kappa' > 2k_0(r) + \frac{1}{2}$ and we can identify the topological constants $\gamma' = -c'_{r,\kappa/2-1/4}$. Consequently, the almost Hermitian-Einstein metric $h_{r,\kappa/2-1/4}$ is solution to the Z -critical equation.

To sum up, we have obtained an infinite family of Mumford semistable bundles E (in the r parameter) such that for any stability vector ρ and for an infinite choice of unipotent classes $1 + u_1 + u_2$, E is Z -stable and admits a Z -critical metric. From Theorem 3.9, the boundedness of the almost Hermitian-Einstein metrics ensure that

$$i \operatorname{Tr} \left[(2\alpha \mathcal{F}(h_{r,\kappa/2-1/4}) + \beta \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \wedge \xi^* \wedge \xi \right]_{\operatorname{sym}} > 0$$

for any $\xi \in T_p^{0,1*}X \times \operatorname{End}(E_p)$ at $p \in X$, since κ can be taken arbitrarily large. This shows that we have obtained a Z -positive metric.

References

- [Bay09] Arend Bayer, *Polynomial Bridgeland stability conditions and the large volume limit*, Geom. Topol. **13** (2009), no. 4, 2389–2425. MR 2515708
- [Buc99] Nicholas Buchdahl, *On compact Kähler surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **49** (1999), no. 1, vii, xi, 287–302. MR 1688136
- [Che21] Gao Chen, *The J -equation and the supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation*, Invent. Math. **225** (2021), no. 2, 529–602. MR 4285141
- [CJY20] Tristan C. Collins, Adam Jacob, and Shing-Tung Yau, *$(1, 1)$ forms with specified Lagrangian phase: a priori estimates and algebraic obstructions*, Camb. J. Math. **8** (2020), no. 2, 407–452. MR 4091029
- [CLT21] Jianchun Chu, Man-Chun Lee, and Ryosuke Takahashi, *A Nakai-Moishezon type criterion for supercritical deformed Hermitian-Yang-Mills equation*, 2021, [arXiv:2105.10725](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.10725).
- [Cor23] Eder M. Correa, *DHYM instantons on higher rank holomorphic vector bundles over $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbb{P}^2})$* , [arXiv:2307.05787\[math.AG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.05787), 2023.
- [DMS24] Ruadhaí Dervan, John Benjamin McCarthy, and Lars Martin Sektnan, *Z -critical connections and Bridgeland stability conditions*, Camb. J. Math., to appear (2024), [arXiv:2012.10426\[math.DG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.10426).
- [DP04] Jean-Pierre Demailly and Mihai Paun, *Numerical characterization of the Kähler cone of a compact Kähler manifold*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 3, 1247–1274. MR 2113021
- [KSD24] Sohaib Khalid and Zakarias Sjöström Dyrefelt, *The Set of Destabilizing Curves for Deformed Hermitian Yang–Mills and Z -Critical Equations on Surfaces*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2024), no. 7, 5773–5814. MR 4728721
- [Leu93] Nai-Chung Conan Leung, *Differential geometric and symplectic interpretations of stability in the sense of Gieseker*, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1993, <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/12328>.

- [McC23] John Benjamin McCarthy, *Stability conditions and canonical metrics*, Ph.D. thesis, Imperial College London, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.25560/103792>.
- [OSS11] Christian Okonek, Michael Schneider, and Heinz Spindler, *Vector bundles on complex projective spaces*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011, Corrected reprint of the 1980 edition, With an appendix by S. I. Gelfand. MR 2815674
- [Pin20] Vamsi Pritham Pingali, *A vector bundle version of the Monge-Ampère equation*, Adv. Math. **360** (2020), 106921, 40. MR 4035954
- [Tak24] Ryosuke Takahashi, *J-equation on holomorphic vector bundles*, J. Funct. Anal. **286** (2024), no. 4, Paper No. 110265, 64. MR 4673614

Département de Mathématiques, Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM), C.P. 8888, Succ. Centre-Ville. Montréal (Québec) H3C 3P8, Canada

keller.julien.3@uqam.ca

scarpa.carlo@uqam.ca