Configurations in abelian categories. II. Combinatorial identities

Dominic Joyce Lincoln College, Oxford

1 Introduction

This is the second of three papers [5, 6] developing the concept of *configuration* in an abelian category. Given an abelian category \mathcal{A} and a finite partially ordered set (poset) (I, \preceq) , we define an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} to be a collection of objects $\sigma(J)$ and morphisms $\iota(J, K)$ or $\pi(J, K) : \sigma(J) \to \sigma(K)$ in \mathcal{A} satisfying certain axioms, where J, K are subsets of I.

The first paper [5] defined configurations and developed their basic properties. Here and in [6] we study moduli spaces of configurations. This paper considers generalized Hilbert schemes, moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ of (I, \leq, κ) configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$, for a fixed object X in \mathcal{A} . Then [6] extends our results to moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(I, \leq, \kappa)$ of (I, \leq, κ) -configurations (σ, ι, π) without fixing $\sigma(I) = X$.

Configurations are a tool for describing how an object X in \mathcal{A} decomposes into subobjects. They are especially useful for studying stability conditions on \mathcal{A} . Given a slope function Z on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , objects X in \mathcal{A} are called θ -stable, θ -semistable or θ -unstable depending on the θ -phases of subobjects $S \subset X$.

We define subspaces $\mathcal{M}_{st}, \mathcal{M}_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ with $\sigma(\{i\}) \ \theta$ -(semi)stable for all $i \in I$, and $\mathcal{M}_{all}^{b}\mathcal{M}_{st}^{b}, \mathcal{M}_{ss}^{b}(*)$ of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ with (σ, ι, π) best. We write $\delta_{all}, \ldots, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*)$ for the characteristic functions of the subspaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}, \ldots, \mathcal{M}_{ss}^{b}(*)$ of $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$.

Most of the paper is spent in proving *identities* between the functions $\delta_{all}, \ldots, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*)$, and their push-forwards under natural maps between moduli spaces. Nearly all the proofs are essentially *combinatorial* in nature. That is, they involve complicated finite sums over collections of finite sets, maps, partial orders, etc., satisfying conditions. Our most frequent technique is to substitute one sum into another, and rearrange the order of summation.

These identities really encode information about relationships between different moduli spaces of θ -stable, or θ -semistable, or general objects and morphisms. In particular, they tell us about how moduli spaces of θ -stable or θ -semistable objects change as we vary the slope function Z, θ .

As part of the reward for all this work, in §9 we define *new invariants* $I_{\text{st}}, I_{\text{ss}}, I_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}, (X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ of an abelian category \mathcal{A} , object $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and slope

function Z with phase θ satisfying certain conditions. From our equations on $\delta_{\rm st}, \ldots, \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*)$ we at once read off many identities between the $I_{\rm st}, \ldots, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*)$, including *transformation laws* from one slope function Z, θ to another.

These are prototypes for related invariants $I_{\text{st}}, I_{\text{ss}}, I_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}, I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ to be introduced in [6], which satisfy the same identities and transformation laws. I believe that when all this machinery is applied to interesting examples of abelian categories such as $\operatorname{coh}(P)$, the category of coherent sheaves over a smooth complex projective variety P, or mod-A, the category of representations of a finitedimensional algebra A over \mathbb{C} , it will generate interesting new systems of invariants of P or A, with applications in diverse areas.

I also believe that the combinatorial ideas developed in this paper are saying something new about how objects decompose into subobjects, and about slope stability conditions, that it would be difficult to say without the language of \mathcal{A} -data and configurations, or something like it. I don't yet know how this could be further developed, or applied.

These three papers are the start of a broader programme. In later papers [7] I shall extend the notion of configurations, and the corresponding moduli spaces and invariants, to *triangulated categories*, using the stability conditions of Bridgeland [1]. Then by applying them to *derived categories of coherent sheaves* on Calabi–Yau manifolds, we shall formulate some results and conjectures on Homological Mirror Symmetry, branes in String Theory, and Π -stability.

We begin in §2 with an introduction to abelian categories. Section 3 recalls some facts on complex varieties, constructible sets and functions, and the Euler characteristic. Sections 4 and 5 summarize the first paper [5], defining (I, \preceq) configurations and their moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.

The new work of the paper is §6–§9. Section 6 derives relations between the $\delta_{\rm st}, \delta_{\rm st}, \delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ for a fixed slope function Z with phase θ . Section 7 is a combinatorial interlude, defining some families of integers $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ called *transformation coefficients*, and studying their properties.

Given two slope functions Z, \tilde{Z} on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$, we can think of $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ as the coefficients of a matrix which takes the vector of all $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ to the vector of all $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$, and similarly for $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta), \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$. This is the main result of §8, and is proved by transforming via $\delta_{\rm all}^{\rm b}(*)$. We finish in §9 by defining the invariants $I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ and deriving identities and transformation laws they satisfy.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Tom Bridgeland and Frances Kirwan for useful conversations. I was supported by an EPSRC Advanced Research Fellowship whilst writing this paper.

2 Introduction to abelian categories

We review some background on abelian categories. Useful references for this section are Popescu [11], Gelfand and Manin [2, §II.5–§II.6], and Rudakov [12].

2.1 Additive and abelian categories

Here is the definition of abelian category, taken from [2, §II.5].

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{A} be a category. As a shorthand, write $X \in \mathcal{A}$ or $X \in Obj(\mathcal{A})$ when X is an object of \mathcal{A} , and $f \in Mor(\mathcal{A})$ when f is a morphism of \mathcal{A} . When $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ write Hom(X, Y) for the set of morphisms $f : X \to Y$ in \mathcal{A} . Write $id_X \in Hom(X, X)$ for the identity map $id_X : X \to X$.

We call \mathcal{A} an *additive category* if it has the properties:

- (i) Hom(X, Y) is an *abelian group* for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and composition of morphisms is *biadditive*.
- (ii) There exists a zero object $0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\operatorname{Hom}(0,0) = 0$.
- (iii) For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and morphisms $\iota_X : X \to Z$, $\iota_Y : Y \to Z, \pi_X : Z \to X, \pi_Y : Z \to Y$ with $\pi_X \circ \iota_X = \mathrm{id}_X, \pi_Y \circ \iota_Y = \mathrm{id}_Y,$ $\iota_X \circ \pi_X + \iota_Y \circ \pi_Y = \mathrm{id}_Z$ and $\pi_X \circ \iota_Y = \pi_Y \circ \iota_X = 0$. We write $Z = X \oplus Y$, the *direct sum* of X and Y. Any two such direct sums are canonically isomorphic.

Let \mathcal{A} be an additive category, and $f: X \to Y$ a morphism in \mathcal{A} . We call $k: K \to X$ a *kernel* of f if $f \circ k = 0$ and for any $k': K' \to X$ with $f \circ k' = 0$ there exists a unique $h: K' \to K$ with $k' = k \circ h$. Similarly we call $c: Y \to C$ a *cokernel* of f if $c \circ f = 0$ and for any $c': Y \to C'$ with $c' \circ f = 0$ there exists a unique $h: C \to C'$ with $c' = h \circ c$. If a kernel or cokernel exists it is unique up to canonical isomorphism. Define a morphism $f: X \to Y$ to be *injective* if it has kernel 0, and *surjective* if it has cokernel 0.

We call \mathcal{A} an *abelian category* of it satisfies (i)–(iii) above and:

(iv) For any morphism $f: X \to Y$ there is a sequence $K \xrightarrow{k} X \xrightarrow{i} I \xrightarrow{j} Y \xrightarrow{c} C$ in \mathcal{A} such that $j \circ i = f$, and K is the kernel of f, and C the cokernel of f, and I is both the cokernel of k and the kernel of c.

Let \mathbb{K} be a field. An abelian category \mathcal{A} is called \mathbb{K} -linear if $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Y)$ is a vector space over \mathbb{K} for $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and composition of morphisms is bilinear.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ a sequence in \mathcal{A} with $g \circ f = 0$. Let $k : K \to Y$ be the kernel of g and $c : Y \to C$ the cokernel of f. Then there exist unique morphisms $a : X \to K$ and $b : C \to Z$ with $f = k \circ a$ and $g = b \circ c$. We say that $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ is exact at Y if a is surjective, or equivalently if b is injective.

A complex in \mathcal{A} is called *exact* if it is exact at every term. A short exact sequence $0 \to X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \to 0$ in \mathcal{A} is called *split* if there exists an isomorphism $h: X \oplus Z \to Y$ such that the following diagram commutes:

The Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ is the abelian group generated by $\operatorname{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, with a relation [Y] = [X] + [Z] for each short exact sequence $0 \to X \to Y \to Z \to 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Throughout the paper $K(\mathcal{A})$ will mean either $K_0(\mathcal{A})$, or the quotient of $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ by some fixed subgroup. In particular, in §2.5 we shall define the numerical Grothendieck group $K^{\operatorname{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ when \mathcal{A} is of finite type over a field \mathbb{K} , and we may take $K(\mathcal{A}) = K^{\operatorname{num}}(\mathcal{A})$.

We write $[X] \in K(\mathcal{A})$ for the equivalence class of $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that for $K(\mathcal{A})$ to admit a *slope function* $Z : K(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{C}$, as in Definition 2.7 below, it is necessary that if $0 \not\cong X \in \mathcal{A}$ then $0 \neq [X] \in K(\mathcal{A})$, so we will often implicitly assume this property of $K(\mathcal{A})$.

2.2 Subobjects and factors

Subobjects of objects in \mathcal{A} are analogous to subgroups of an abelian group.

Definition 2.3. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Two injective morphisms $i: S \to X$, $i': S' \to X$ in \mathcal{A} are *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $h: S \to S'$ with $i = i' \circ h$. Then h is unique. A *subobject* of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ is an equivalence class of injective morphisms $i: S \to X$. Usually we refer to S as the subobject, taking both i and the equivalence class to be implicitly given, and write $S \subset X$ to mean S is a subobject of X. We write 0, X for the subobjects of X which are equivalence classes of $0 \to X$ and $id_X: X \to X$.

If $S, T \subset X$ are represented by $i : S \to X$ and $j : T \to X$, we write $S \subset T \subset X$ if there exists $a : S \to T$ with $i = j \circ a$. Then a is injective, and so fits into an exact sequence $0 \to S \xrightarrow{a} T \xrightarrow{b} F \to 0$ for b, F determined up to canonical isomorphism. We write F = T/S, and call F a factor of $X \in \mathcal{A}$.

We define operations \cap , + on subobjects, following Popescu [11, §2.6]. The notation comes from the intersection and sum of subgroups of abelian groups.

Definition 2.4. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and suppose injective maps $i: S \to X$, $j: T \to X$ define subobjects S, T of X. Apply part (iv) of Definition 2.1 to $f = i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T : S \oplus T \to X$. This yields $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$ and morphisms $k: U \to S \oplus T$, $l: S \oplus T \to V$ and $e: V \to X$ such that $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T = e \circ l$, and k is the kernel of $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T$, and l is the cokernel of k, and e is the *image* (the kernel of the cokernel) of $i \circ \pi_S + j \circ \pi_T$.

Define $a: U \to S$ by $a = k \circ \pi_S$, and $b: U \to T$ by $b = -k \circ \pi_T$ and $c: S \to V$ by $c = f \circ \iota_S$, and $d: T \to V$ by $d = f \circ \iota_T$. Then $i = e \circ c$ and $j = e \circ d$. Now $i \circ a = j \circ b: U \to X$ and $e: V \to X$ are *injective*. Define $S \cap T$ to be the subobject of X represented by $i \circ a: U \to X$, and S + T to be the subobject of X represented by $e: V \to X$.

As U, V, a, \ldots, e are unique up to canonical isomorphism, $S \cap T$ and S + T depend only on the subobjects S, T of X. The morphisms a, b, c, d give inclusions of subobjects $S \cap T \subset S \subset S + T \subset X$ and $S \cap T \subset T \subset S + T \subset X$. These operations \cap , + are *commutative* and *associative*. We can therefore form multiple sums and intersections. We shall write $\sum_{j \in J} T_j$ for the multiple sum + of a finite set of subobjects $T_j \subset X$, in the obvious way.

2.3 The Jordan–Hölder Theorem

The *Jordan–Hölder Theorem* in group theory decomposes a (finite) group into simple factors, using chains of normal subgroups. We shall explain the analogue of this in an abelian category.

Definition 2.5. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. We call \mathcal{A} artinian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all descending chains of subobjects $\cdots \subset A_2 \subset A_1 \subset X$ stabilize, that is, $A_{n+1} = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call \mathcal{A} noetherian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all ascending chains of subobjects $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \cdots \subset X$ stabilize, that is, $A_n = A_{n+1}$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call \mathcal{A} of finite length if it is both artinian and noetherian.

A nonzero object X in an abelian category \mathcal{A} is called *simple* if it has no nontrivial proper subobjects. That is, $X \not\cong 0$, and if $i: S \to X$ is injective then either $S \cong 0$ or i is an isomorphism.

Let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and consider *filtrations* of subobjects

$$0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_n = X \tag{2}$$

in \mathcal{A} . Such a filtration is called *without repetitions* if none of the inclusions $i_k : A_k \to A_{k+1}$ is an isomorphism. A *refinement* of (2) is any filtration obtained by inserting further terms. We allow (2) as a refinement of itself, i.e. by inserting no further terms. We call (2) a *composition series* for X if the factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ are simple objects in \mathcal{A} .

Here is the Jordan–Hölder Theorem in an abelian category, [14, Th. 2.1].

Theorem 2.6. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category of finite length. Then every filtration $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ without repetitions can be refined to a composition series for X. Suppose $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_m = X$ and $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ are two composition series for $X \in \mathcal{A}$, with simple factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ and $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$. Then m = n, and for some permutation σ of $1, \ldots, n$ we have $S_k \cong T_{\sigma(k)}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$.

2.4 Stability and Harder–Narasimhan filtrations

We now summarize the work of Rudakov [12] on *stability* in an abelian category, using the notation of Bridgeland $[1, \S 2]$.

Definition 2.7. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and $K(\mathcal{A})$ as in Definition 2.2. A *slope function* on \mathcal{A} is a group homomorphism $Z : K(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{A}$, Z([X]) lies in the upper half-plane $H = \{r \exp(i\pi\theta) : r > 0, \theta \in (0, 1]\}$ in \mathbb{C} . Given a slope function Z on \mathcal{A} , the *phase* of $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{A}$ is

$$\theta([X]) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arg Z([X]) \in (0,1].$$
(3)

Then we say that a nonzero object X in \mathcal{A} is

(i) θ -stable if for all $S \subset X$ with $S \not\cong 0, X$ we have $\theta([S]) < \theta([X])$.

- (ii) θ -semistable if for all $S \subset X$ with $S \not\cong 0$ we have $\theta([S]) \leq \theta([X])$.
- (iii) θ -unstable if it is not θ -semistable.

Suppose $0 \to X \to Y \to Z \to 0$ is a short exact sequence in \mathcal{A} with X, Y, Z nonzero. Then [Y] = [X] + [Z] in $K(\mathcal{A})$, and exactly one of $\theta([X]) < \theta([Y]) < \theta([Z])$, or $\theta([X]) > \theta([Y]) > \theta([Z])$, or $\theta([X]) = \theta([Y]) = \theta([Z])$ holds. Therefore the condition $\theta([S]) < \theta([X])$ in (i) is equivalent to $\theta([X]) < \theta([X/S])$, and the condition $\theta([S]) \leq \theta([X])$ in (ii) is equivalent to $\theta([X]) \leq \theta([X/S])$.

Using θ we can weaken the ideas of *artinian* and *noetherian* in Definition 2.5.

Definition 2.8. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ . We call $\mathcal{A} \ \theta$ -artinian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all descending chains of subobjects $\cdots \subset A_2 \subset A_1 \subset X$ with $\theta([A_{n+1}]) \ge \theta([A_n])$ for all n stabilize, that is, $A_{n+1} = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$. We call $\mathcal{A} \ \theta$ -noetherian if for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$, all ascending chains of subobjects $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \cdots \subset X$ with $\theta([A_n]) \le \theta([A_n])$ for all $n = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$.

The next three theorems follow from Rudakov [12, Th.s 1, 2 & 3].

Theorem 2.9. Let Z be a slope function on an abelian category \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ are θ -semistable. If $\theta([X]) > \theta([Y])$ then $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Y) = 0$. Suppose $\theta([X]) = \theta([Y])$ and $f: X \to Y$ is nonzero. Then

- (a) If Y is θ -stable then f is surjective.
- (b) If X is θ -stable then f is injective.
- (c) If both X, Y are θ -stable then f is an isomorphism.

Theorem 2.10. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian. Then each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ admits a unique filtration $0 = A_0 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ for $n \ge 0$, such that $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ is θ -semistable for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and $\theta([S_1]) > \theta([S_2]) > \cdots > \theta([S_n])$.

We call $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ in Theorem 2.10 a Harder-Narasimhan filtration, as it generalizes the filtrations constructed by Harder and Narasimhan [3] for vector bundles over algebraic curves. Here is an analogue of Theorem 2.6 for θ -semistable objects.

Theorem 2.11. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and suppose \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian. Then each θ -semistable $X \in \mathcal{A}$ admits a filtration $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ for $n \ge 1$, such that $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ is θ -stable for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, with $\theta([S_1]) = \cdots = \theta([S_n]) = \theta([X])$. Suppose $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_m = X$ and $0 = B_0 \subset B_1 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = X$ are two such filtrations with θ -stable factors $S_k = A_k/A_{k-1}$ and $T_k = B_k/B_{k-1}$. Then m = n, and for some permutation σ of $1, \ldots, n$ we have $S_k \cong T_{\sigma(k)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

2.5 Ext groups and extensions

Finally we recall the properties of the *Ext groups* $\text{Ext}^n(X, Y)$ for X, Y objects in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , following [2, p. 166, 184-5] and [4, p. 233–240].

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Then for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ there are abelian groups $\operatorname{Ext}^n(X, Y)$ with the following properties:

- (i) $\operatorname{Ext}^{0}(X, Y) = \operatorname{Hom}(X, Y).$
- (ii) There is a multiplication $\operatorname{Ext}^m(X,Y) \times \operatorname{Ext}^n(Y,Z) \to \operatorname{Ext}^{m+n}(X,Z)$ for $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m, n \ge 0$, which is biadditive and associative.
- (iii) An extension of Z by X is an exact sequence $0 \to X \xrightarrow{\iota} Y \xrightarrow{\pi} Z \to 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Define E(Z, X) to be the set of equivalence classes of such extensions, where two extensions are equivalent if there is a commutative diagram



Then there is a natural 1-1 correspondence $E(Z, X) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^1(Z, X)$, which identifies $0 \to X \xrightarrow{\iota_X} X \oplus Z \xrightarrow{\pi_Z} Z \to 0$ with $0 \in \operatorname{Ext}(Z, X)$.

Let \mathbb{K} be a field. We call \mathcal{A} of finite type over \mathbb{K} if $\operatorname{Ext}^m(X, Y)$ is a finitedimensional vector space over \mathbb{K} for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \ge 0$, and $\operatorname{Ext}^m(X, Y) = 0$ for $m \gg 0$, and multiplication in (ii) is *bilinear*. If \mathcal{A} is of finite type over \mathbb{K} then one can define a bilinear form on the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$, known as the *Euler form*, by

$$\chi([X],[Y]) = \sum_{m \ge 0} (-1)^m \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \operatorname{Ext}^m(X,Y).$$
(4)

The numerical Grothendieck group $K^{num}(\mathcal{A})$ is then defined to be

$$K^{\operatorname{num}}(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A}) / \{ \alpha \in K_0(\mathcal{A}) : \chi(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \text{ for all } \beta \in K_0(\mathcal{A}) \}.$$

It is a free abelian group, and the Euler form descends to a nondegenerate pairing $\chi: K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) \times K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{Z}$, also known as the Euler form. If $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ has finite rank then we call \mathcal{A} numerically finite. If P is a smooth projective variety over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} then the abelian category \mathcal{A} of coherent sheaves over P is of finite type over \mathbb{K} , and numerically finite.

3 Varieties and Euler characteristics

We now briefly recall some facts we will need about complex quasi-projective varieties, Euler characteristics, and constructible sets and functions.

3.1 Varieties, subvarieties and constructible sets

We first introduce *complex quasi-projective varieties*, following Hartshorne [4].

Definition 3.1. A complex projective variety is a subset P of \mathbb{CP}^m for some $m \ge 0$ which is the zero set of finitely many homogeneous polynomials in \mathbb{C}^{m+1} . A complex quasi-projective variety is a subset Q of \mathbb{CP}^m of the form $Q = R \setminus P$ for projective varieties $P \subseteq R \subseteq \mathbb{CP}^n$. Note that we do not require (quasi)-projective varieties to be *irreducible*, as some authors do [4, p. 10].

If $P \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathbb{CP}^m$ with P, Q quasi-projective varieties, we call P a subvariety of Q. Note that subvarieties are *locally closed* in the Zariski topology. *Morphisms of varieties* are defined in [4, §I.3]. We consider isomorphic varieties to be the same. Then a quasi-projective variety Q can be embedded in \mathbb{CP}^m in many ways for different $m \ge 0$, and no one way is preferred.

For $m, n \ge 0$ the disjoint union $\mathbb{CP}^m \amalg \mathbb{CP}^n$ can be embedded as a subvariety of \mathbb{CP}^{m+n+1} . It follows that *finite disjoint unions of varieties are varieties*. Intersections and closures of subvarieties are subvarieties.

However, finite unions of subvarieties need not be subvarieties, and the image of a subvariety $P \subseteq Q$ under a morphism $\phi : Q \to R$ need not be a subvariety. Because of this, the subvarieties of a variety Q are not a large enough class of subsets of Q for our purposes, and we work instead with *constructible sets*.

Definition 3.2. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety. A *constructible* set in Q is a finite union of subvarieties of Q.

By taking intersections, closures and complements we can always write a constructible set as a finite union of *disjoint* subvarieties of Q. Mumford [10, p. 51] proves the following. The last part is due to Chevalley.

Proposition 3.3. Let P, Q be varieties, A, B constructible sets in P, and $\phi : P \to Q$ a morphism. Then $A \cap B$, $A \cup B$ and $P \setminus A$ are constructible sets in P, and $\phi(A)$ is a constructible set in Q.

3.2 Euler characteristics

Next we discuss the *Euler characteristics* of a variety and its subvarieties.

Definition 3.4. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety. Regard Q as a topological space with the *analytic topology*, induced from the manifold topology on \mathbb{CP}^m by the inclusion $Q \subseteq \mathbb{CP}^m$. Write $\chi(Q)$ for the (topological) Euler characteristic of Q, computed using compactly-supported cohomology.

As this definition involves the analytic topology it is special to varieties over \mathbb{C} . However, it is implicit in Kennedy [8] that $\chi(Q)$ can in fact be defined purely algebraically, and the definition is then valid for varieties over any field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero. The following properties of χ are well known.

Proposition 3.5. (i) $\chi(\mathbb{C}^m) = 1$ and $\chi(\mathbb{CP}^m) = m + 1$ for all $m \ge 0$.

- (ii) If P is a closed subvariety of a variety Q, then $\chi(Q) = \chi(P) + \chi(Q \setminus P)$.
- (iii) If P, Q are varieties then $\chi(P \times Q) = \chi(P)\chi(Q)$.
- (iv) If $\phi: P \to Q$ is a morphism of varieties which is a locally trivial fibration in the analytic topology with fibre F, then $\chi(P) = \chi(F)\chi(Q)$.

In [5, Prop. 7.7] we show χ is additive over subvarieties.

Proposition 3.6. Suppose a complex quasi-projective variety Q is the disjoint union of subvarieties U_1, \ldots, U_m . Then $\chi(Q) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_m)$.

Using this we define the Euler characteristic of a *constructible set*.

Definition 3.7. Let Q be a complex quasi-projective variety and $A \subseteq Q$ a constructible set. Then we can write A as the *disjoint* union of subvarieties U_1, \ldots, U_m of Q. Define $\chi(A) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i)$. To show this is well-defined, suppose A is also the disjoint union of subvarieties V_1, \ldots, V_n . Then U_i is the disjoint union of subvarieties $U_i \cap V_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, so Proposition 3.6 gives $\chi(U_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \chi(U_i \cap V_j)$, and similarly $\chi(V_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi(U_i \cap V_j)$. Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi(U_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \chi(U_i \cap V_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi(U_i \cap V_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \chi(V_j).$$

3.3 Constructible functions

Definition 3.8. Let P be a complex quasi-projective variety. A constructible function on P is a function $f : P \to \mathbb{Z}$ such that f(P) is finite and $f^{-1}(c)$ is a constructible set for each $c \in f(P)$. Write CF(P) for the abelian group of constructible functions on P. For $f \in CF(P)$, define the weighted Euler characteristic $\chi(P, f)$ by

$$\chi(P,f) = \sum_{c \in f(P)} c \,\chi\bigl(f^{-1}(c)\bigr). \tag{5}$$

Let $\phi : P \to Q$ be a morphism of varieties, and $f : P \to \mathbb{Z}$ a constructible function on P. Define the *push-forward* $CF(\phi)f : Q \to \mathbb{Z}$ of f to Q by

$$CF(\phi)f(q) = \chi(\phi^{-1}(q), f|_{\phi^{-1}(q)}) \text{ for } q \in Q.$$
 (6)

This is well-defined as $\phi^{-1}(q)$ is a subvariety, and $f|_{\phi^{-1}(q)}$ is constructible.

MacPherson [9, Prop. 1] showed that constructible functions CF(Q) and the push-forward $CF(\phi)$ form a *functor*.

Theorem 3.9. Let $\phi : P \to Q$ be a morphism of complex quasi-projective varieties and $f : P \to \mathbb{Z}$ a constructible function. Then $CF(\phi)f$ is constructible. Thus $CF(\phi) : CF(P) \to CF(Q)$ is a morphism of abelian groups.

Suppose $\psi : Q \to R$ is another morphism of varieties. Then $CF(\psi \circ \phi) = CF(\psi) \circ CF(\phi)$ as maps $CF(P) \to CF(R)$. Hence CF is a functor from the category of complex quasi-projective varieties to the category of abelian groups.

Using results of Sabbah [13] on Lagrangian cycles, Kennedy [8] provides a purely algebraic definition of the constructible functions functor, which is valid for varieties over any field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero. It should be possible to use this to generalize the results of this paper.

Let $\{0\}$ be a single point, considered as a variety, and for a variety P let $\pi_P : P \to \{0\}$ be the projection, considered as a morphism. Then $CF(\pi_P) : CF(P) \to CF(\{0\}) = \mathbb{Z}$ maps $f \mapsto \chi(P, f)$. If $\phi : P \to Q$ is a morphism of varieties then $\pi_P = \pi_Q \circ \phi$. So from $CF(\psi \circ \phi) = CF(\psi) \circ CF(\phi)$ in Theorem 3.9 we deduce:

Corollary 3.10. Let $\phi : P \to Q$ be a morphism of complex quasi-projective varieties and $f : P \to \mathbb{Z}$ be constructible. Then $\chi(P, f) = \chi(Q, CF(\phi)f)$.

Viro [15] gives an interesting point of view on constructible functions. One can regard the Euler characteristic as a *measure*, defined on constructible sets. Then $\chi(P, f)$ is the integral of f with respect to this measure, and the pushforward $CF(\phi)f$ integrates f over the fibres of ϕ .

4 Posets (I, \preceq) and (I, \preceq) -configurations in \mathcal{A}

Next we summarize the work of $[5, \S3-\S6]$ on *configurations* in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , which will be the main tool of the paper. Their definition in §4.2 is quite complicated, so as motivation we begin in §4.1 with a result strengthening the Jordan–Hölder Theorem when $X \in \mathcal{A}$ has no repeated simple factors. We can associate a *finite partial order* (I, \preceq) to X, such that the *subobjects* S^J of X correspond in a natural way to certain subsets $J \subset I$.

Configurations abstract the properties of these families of subobjects of X. Rather than working with subobjects, it is convenient to define (I, \preceq) -configurations (σ, ι, π) as collections of objects $\sigma(J)$ and morphisms $\iota(J, K)$ or $\pi(J, K) : \sigma(J) \to \sigma(K)$. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 discuss subconfigurations, quotient configurations, substitution, refinements and improvements, which are ways of constructing new configurations from known ones.

4.1 Refining the Jordan–Hölder Theorem

Here is some notation for finite posets, [5, Def. 3.2].

Definition 4.1. If I is a set and \leq a partial order on I we call (I, \leq) a *partially* ordered set, or poset for short, and a *finite poset* if I is finite. Let (I, \leq) be a finite poset. Define $J \subseteq I$ to be

- (i) an s-set if $i \in I$, $j \in J$ and $i \preceq j$ implies $i \in J$,
- (ii) a *q*-set if $i \in I$, $j \in J$ and $j \preceq i$ implies $i \in J$, and
- (iii) an *f*-set if $i \in I$ and $h, j \in J$ and $h \preceq i \preceq j$ implies $i \in J$.

The motivation for this comes from the following theorem, which summarizes [5, §3]. It shows that if $X \in \mathcal{A}$ has nonisomorphic simple factors, then for a finite poset (I, \preceq) constructed from X s-sets correspond to subobjects $S \subset X$, q-sets to quotient objects X/S, and f-sets to factors T/S for $S \subset T \subset X$.

Theorem 4.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category of finite length, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Let the simple factors in some composition series for X be $\{S^i : i \in I\}$ for some finite indexing set I, and suppose $S^i \not\cong S^j$ for $i \neq j$ in I.

For every composition series $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_n = X$ for X there is a unique bijection $\phi : I \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $S^i \cong A_{\phi(i)}/A_{\phi(i)-1}$ for all $i \in I$. Define a partial order \preceq on I by $i \preceq j$ for $i, j \in I$ if and only if $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$ for all bijections $\phi : I \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ constructed in this way.

Then for each (I, \preceq) s-set J there is a unique subobject $S^J \subset X$ such that the simple factors of S^J are isomorphic to S^i for $i \in J$. This defines a 1-1 correspondence between subobjects $S^J \subset X$ and s-sets $J \subseteq I$. The S^J satisfy

$$S^{\emptyset} = 0, \quad S^I = X, \quad S^A \cap S^B = S^{A \cap B} \quad and \quad S^A + S^B = S^{A \cup B}.$$
(7)

There are also natural 1-1 correspondences between quotient objects of X and q-sets, between factors of X and f-sets, and between composition series for X and bijections $\phi: I \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $i \leq j$ implies $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$.

This can be regarded as a refinement of the Jordan-Hölder Theorem in the case when X has nonisomorphic simple factors, as it gives us a greater understanding of the subobjects and composition series of X.

4.2 The definition of (I, \preceq) -configurations

Here is the definition of *configurations* in an abelian category, [5, Def. 4.1].

Definition 4.3. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and use the notation of Definition 4.1. Define $\mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the set of f-sets of I. Define $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the subset of $(J, K) \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ such that $J \subseteq K$, and if $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ with $k \preceq j$, then $k \in J$. Define $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ to be the subset of $(J, K) \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ such that $K \subseteq J$, and if $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ with $k \preceq j$, then $j \in K$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \prec)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \prec)}$ have the following properties:

- (a) (J, K) lies in $\mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ if and only if $(K, K \setminus J)$ lies in $\mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (b) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $(J, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (c) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $(J, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.
- (d) If $(J,K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I,\preceq)}, (K,L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I,\preceq)}$ then $(J,J \cap L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I,\preceq)}, (J \cap L,L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I,\preceq)}$.

Define an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in an abelian category \mathcal{A} to be maps $\sigma : \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Obj}(\mathcal{A}), \iota : \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A}), \text{ and } \pi : \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A}), \text{ where}$

- (i) $\sigma(J)$ is an object in \mathcal{A} for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$, with $\sigma(\emptyset) = 0$.
- (ii) $\iota(J,K): \sigma(J) \to \sigma(K)$ is injective for $(J,K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I,\preceq)}$, and $\iota(J,J) = \mathrm{id}_{\sigma(J)}$.

(iii) $\pi(J,K): \sigma(J) \to \sigma(K)$ is surjective for $(J,K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I,\preceq)}$, and $\pi(J,J) = \mathrm{id}_{\sigma(J)}$. These should satisfy the conditions:

Inose should satisfy the conditions.

(A) Let $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and set $L = K \setminus J$. Then the following is exact in \mathcal{A} :

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma(J) \xrightarrow{\iota(J,K)} \sigma(K) \xrightarrow{\pi(K,L)} \sigma(L) \longrightarrow 0.$$
(8)

- (B) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $\iota(J, L) = \iota(K, L) \circ \iota(J, K)$.
- (C) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then $\pi(J, L) = \pi(K, L) \circ \pi(J, K)$.
- (D) If $(J, K) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$ and $(K, L) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$ then

$$\pi(K,L) \circ \iota(J,K) = \iota(J \cap L,L) \circ \pi(J,J \cap L).$$
(9)

Note that (A)–(D) make sense because of properties (a)–(d), respectively.

The motivation for this definition is that it captures the properties of the families of subobjects $S^J \subset X$ in Theorem 4.2, as we show in the following theorem, [5, Th.s 4.2 & 4.5]. However, we shall see that configurations are useful in more general situations than Jordan–Hölder decompositions with nonisomorphic simple factors.

Theorem 4.4. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Suppose that for each s-set $J \subseteq I$ we are given a subobject $S^J \subset X$, such that

$$S^{\emptyset} = 0, \quad S^I = X, \quad S^A \cap S^B = S^{A \cap B} \quad and \quad S^A + S^B = S^{A \cup B} \tag{10}$$

for all s-sets $A, B \subseteq I$. Then there exists an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$ such that for each s-set $J \subseteq I$, the equivalence class of $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \to \sigma(I) = X$ is the subobject $S^J \subset X$. This (σ, ι, π) is unique up to canonical isomorphism in \mathcal{A} .

Conversely, suppose (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} , put $X = \sigma(I)$, and for each s-set $J \subseteq I$ let the subobject $S^J \subset X$ be the equivalence class of $\iota(J, I) : \sigma(J) \to X$. Then the S^J satisfy (10).

Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then each object $\sigma(J)$ for $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ has a class $[\sigma(J)]$ in the group $K(\mathcal{A})$ of Definition 2.2. In [5, Prop. 4.6] we show how these classes are related.

Proposition 4.5. Suppose (I, \preceq) is a finite poset, \mathcal{A} an abelian category, and (σ, ι, π) an (I, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a unique map $\kappa : I \to K(\mathcal{A})$ such that $[\sigma(J)] = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$ for all f-sets $J \subseteq I$.

4.3 New (I, \preceq) -configurations from old

Given an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , the next two definitions [5, Def.s 5.1 & 5.2] construct (K, \trianglelefteq) -configurations $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ for other, simpler posets (K, \trianglelefteq) , by forgetting some of the objects and morphisms in (σ, ι, π) .

Definition 4.6. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset and J an f-set in I, so that $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Then (J, \preceq) is also a finite poset, and $K \subseteq J$ is an f-set in (J, \preceq) if and only if it is an f-set in (I, \preceq) . Hence $\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and also $\mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)} = \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)})$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)} = \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)} \cap (\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \times \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)})$.

Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and define $\sigma' : \mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Obj}(\mathcal{A}), \iota' : \mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\pi' : \mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\sigma' = \sigma|_{\mathcal{F}_{(J, \preceq)}}, \iota' = \iota|_{\mathcal{G}_{(J, \preceq)}}$ and $\pi' = \pi|_{\mathcal{H}_{(J, \preceq)}}$. Then (A)–(D) of Definition 4.3 for (σ, ι, π) imply (A)–(D) for (σ', ι', π') , so (σ', ι', π') is a (J, \preceq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . We call (σ', ι', π') a subconfiguration of (σ, ι, π) .

Definition 4.7. Let (I, \preceq) and (K, \trianglelefteq) be finite posets, and $\phi : I \to K$ a surjective map with $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ when $i, j \in I$ with $i \preceq j$. If $J \subseteq K$ is an f-set in K then $\phi^{-1}(J) \subseteq I$ is an f-set in I. Hence $\phi^*(\mathcal{F}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Similarly, if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{G}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)}$ then $(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B)) \in \mathcal{G}_{(I, \preceq)}$, and if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{H}_{(K, \oiint)}$ then $(\phi^{-1}(A), \phi^{-1}(B)) \in \mathcal{H}_{(I, \preceq)}$.

Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \preceq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , and define $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathcal{F}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \to \operatorname{Obj}(\mathcal{A}), \tilde{\iota} : \mathcal{G}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\tilde{\pi} : \mathcal{H}_{(K, \trianglelefteq)} \to \operatorname{Mor}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\tilde{\sigma}(\mathcal{A}) = \sigma(\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})), \tilde{\iota}(\mathcal{A}, B) = \iota(\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}), \phi^{-1}(B)),$ and $\tilde{\pi}(\mathcal{A}, B) = \pi(\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}), \phi^{-1}(B)).$ Then $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is a (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . We call $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ a quotient configuration of (σ, ι, π) . We also call (σ, ι, π) a refinement of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

Our third construction [5, Def. 5.7] is a special case of a more general result [5, Th. 5.5] which *glues two configurations together* to get a third.

Theorem 4.8. Let (J, \leq) and (K, \trianglelefteq) be nonempty finite posets with $J \cap K = \emptyset$, and $l \in K$. Set $I = J \cup (K \setminus \{l\})$, and define a partial order \preceq on I by

$$i \preceq j \quad \text{for } i, j \in I \text{ if } \begin{cases} i \lesssim j, & i, j \in J, \\ i \leq j, & i, j \in K \setminus \{l\}, \\ l \leq j, & i \in J, \quad j \in K \setminus \{l\}, \\ i \leq l, & i \in K \setminus \{l\}, \quad j \in J, \end{cases}$$

$$(11)$$

and a surjective map $\phi: I \to K$ by $\phi(i) = l$ if $i \in J$, and $\phi(i) = i$ if $i \in K \setminus \{l\}$.

Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, (σ', ι', π') a (J, \leq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} , and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ a (K, \leq) -configuration in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma'(J) = \tilde{\sigma}(\{l\})$. Then there exists an (I, \leq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} , unique up to canonical isomorphism, such that (σ', ι', π') is its (J, \leq) -subconfiguration, and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ its quotient (K, \leq) configuration from ϕ . We call (σ, ι, π) the substitution of (σ', ι', π') into $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

Conversely, if an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) has (J, \lesssim) -subconfiguration (σ', ι', π') and quotient (K, \trianglelefteq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, then (σ, ι, π) is canonically isomorphic to the substitution of (σ', ι', π') into $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

4.4 Improvements and best configurations

Following [5, Def. 6.1] we define improvements and best configurations.

Definition 4.9. Let I be a finite set and \preceq, \trianglelefteq partial orders on I such that if $i \preceq j$ then $i \trianglelefteq j$ for $i, j \in I$. Then we say that \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq , and \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq if \preceq, \trianglelefteq are distinct. Let s be the number of pairs $(i, j) \in I \times I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but $i \not\preceq j$. Then we say that \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by s steps. Clearly, \trianglelefteq strictly dominates \preceq if and only if s > 0. Also

$$\mathcal{F}_{(I,\underline{\triangleleft})} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(I,\underline{\dashv})}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{(I,\underline{\triangleleft})} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{(I,\underline{\dashv})} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_{(I,\underline{\triangleleft})} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{(I,\underline{\dashv})}.$$
(12)

For distinct $\leq \leq$, $\leq \leq$ the second two inclusions are strict.

For each (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in an abelian category \mathcal{A} we have a quotient (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, as in Definition 4.7 with $\phi = \operatorname{id} : I \to I$. We call (σ, ι, π) an *improvement* or an (I, \preceq) -*improvement* of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$, and a *strict improvement* if \preceq, \trianglelefteq are distinct. If \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by s steps we also call (σ, ι, π) an s step improvement of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

We call an (I, \leq) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ best if there exists no strict improvement (σ, ι, π) of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$. Note that improvements are a special kind of *refine*ment, in the sense of Definition 4.7.

In [5, Prop. 6.9 & Th. 6.10] we classify one step improvements and prove a criterion for best (I, \trianglelefteq) -configurations. Recall from Definition 2.2 that a short exact sequence $0 \to X \to Y \to Z \to 0$ in \mathcal{A} is called *split* if there is a compatible isomorphism $Y \cong X \oplus Z$.

Theorem 4.10. Let (σ, ι, π) be an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then (σ, ι, π) is best if and only if for all $i \neq j \in I$ with $i \trianglelefteq j$ but there exists no $k \in I$ with $i \not\in k \neq j$ and $i \trianglelefteq k \trianglelefteq j$, the following short exact sequence is split:

$$0 \longrightarrow \sigma(\{i\}) \xrightarrow{\iota(\{i\},\{i,j\})} \sigma(\{i,j\}) \xrightarrow{\pi(\{i,j\},\{j\})} \sigma(\{j\}) \longrightarrow 0.$$
(13)

Suppose *i*, *j* are as above, and (13) is split. Define \leq on *I* by $a \leq b$ if $a \leq b$ and $a \neq i$, $b \neq j$, so that \leq dominates \leq by one step. Then the (I, \leq) -improvements of (σ, ι, π) are in 1-1 correspondence with Hom $(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\}))$.

5 Moduli of configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$

We now recall the main results of [5, §8–§10] on generalized Hilbert schemes $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ in an abelian category \mathcal{A} .

5.1 Assumptions on \mathcal{A} and Z, θ

We shall need the following notation, [5, Def. 8.1].

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, choose $K(\mathcal{A})$ as in Definition 2.2, and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Suppose $S \subset X$ is a subobject, represented by an injective morphism $i: U \to X$. Write [S] for $[U] \in K(\mathcal{A})$. This is well-defined, as U is determined by S up to isomorphism. For $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$ define $\mathrm{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) = \{S : S \subset X \text{ is a subobject, } [S] = \alpha\}.$

Using this we set out assumptions on \mathcal{A} , [5, Assumption 8.2].

Assumption 5.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and let $K(\mathcal{A})$ be a quotient of the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ as in Definition 2.2. Suppose that:

- (i) $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Y)$ has the structure of a finite-dimensional complex vector space for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and the composition maps $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Y) \times \operatorname{Hom}(Y, Z) \to$ $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Z)$ are complex bilinear, so \mathcal{A} is \mathbb{C} -linear.
- (ii) $\operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X)$ has the structure of a *complex projective variety* for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha \in K(\mathcal{A})$.
- (iii) $\operatorname{Inc}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$ is a closed subvariety of $\operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K(\mathcal{A})$, where

$$\operatorname{Inc}^{\alpha,\beta}(X) = \{ (S,T) : S \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X), T \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(X), S \subset T \subset X \}.$$

(iv) For all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in K(\mathcal{A})$,

$$\left\{ (S,T,U) \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\gamma}(X) : U = S \cap T \right\}$$

and
$$\left\{ (S,T,U) \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\gamma}(X) : U = S + T \right\}$$

are subvarieties of $\operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(X) \times \operatorname{Sub}^{\gamma}(X)$.

(v) Let $U, V, W, X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $0 \to U \xrightarrow{i} V \xrightarrow{\pi} W \to 0$ exact and $j: V \to X$ injective. Let $R \subset X$ and $T \subset X$ be the subobjects represented by $j \circ i: U \to X$ and $j: V \to X$. Let $\alpha = [U]$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$, and for each $\beta \in K(\mathcal{A})$ define $\Theta^{\beta}: \mathrm{Sub}^{\beta}(W) \to \mathrm{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$ as follows.

Let $Q \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\beta}(W)$ be represented by $e: E \to W$. Let $c: W \to C$ be a cokernel for e. Let $k: K \to V$ be a kernel for $c \circ \pi : V \to C$. Define $\Theta^{\beta}(Q) \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$ to be the subobject represented by $j \circ k: K \to X$. Then Θ^{β} is a well-defined *isomorphism of varieties*

$$\Theta^{\beta}: \mathrm{Sub}^{\beta}(W) \longrightarrow \{ S \in \mathrm{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X) : R \subset S \subset T \subset X \},\$$

where the right hand side is a *closed subvariety* of $\operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha+\beta}(X)$.

(vi) Let $W, X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[W] = \alpha$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. Write

$$\operatorname{Inj}(W, X) = \{i \in \operatorname{Hom}(W, X) : i \text{ is injective}\}.$$

Regard $\operatorname{Hom}(W, X) \cong \mathbb{C}^l$ as an affine variety. Then $\operatorname{Inj}(W, X)$ is an open subvariety of $\operatorname{Hom}(W, X)$, and $\operatorname{Aut}(W)$ is an algebraic group which acts freely and algebraically on $\operatorname{Inj}(W, X)$. Hence $\operatorname{Inj}(W, X)/\operatorname{Aut}(W)$ is a *quasi-projective variety*. The natural 1-1 correspondence

$$\operatorname{Inj}(W,X)/\operatorname{Aut}(W) \xrightarrow{\cong} \{ S \in \operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X) : S \cong W \}$$

taking $i \operatorname{Aut}(W)$ to the subobject represented by $i : W \to X$, is an *iso-morphism of varieties*, where the r.h.s. is a *subvariety* of $\operatorname{Sub}^{\alpha}(X)$.

Although this list of assumptions is long, we show in [5, Th.s 8.3 & 8.4] that it is satisfied in many interesting cases.

Theorem 5.3. In both the following cases, \mathcal{A} , $K(\mathcal{A})$ satisfy Assumption 5.2.

- (a) Suppose P is a smooth complex projective variety, \mathcal{A} the abelian category of coherent sheaves on P, and $K(\mathcal{A}) = K_0(\mathcal{A})$ or $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$.
- (b) Suppose A is an abelian category of finite length, Hom(X,Y), Ext¹(X,Y) are finite-dimensional vector spaces over C for all X,Y ∈ A, and the multiplication maps of Definition 2.12(ii) are complex bilinear for (m, n) = (0,0), (0,1) and (1,0), and K(A) = K₀(A).

We also impose some conditions on the slope function Z, [5, Def. 9.10].

Definition 5.4. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let Z be a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ , and let $X \in \mathcal{A}$. We call Z, θ permissible with respect to X if they satisfy the conditions:

- (i) \mathcal{A} is θ -artinian and θ -noetherian, in the sense of Definition 2.8.
- (ii) There exists a subset $K_{ss}^{\theta}(X) \subseteq K(\mathcal{A})$ such that if $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ is a θ -semistable factor of X then $[Y] \in K_{ss}^{\theta}(X)$, and $\{\alpha \in K_{ss}^{\theta}(X) : |Z(\alpha)| \leq R\}$ is finite for all $R \geq 0$.

Using this we prove a *finiteness result*, [5, Prop. 9.13].

Proposition 5.5. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with phase θ , and let (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data with $\kappa(I) = [X]$. Then there exists a finite subset $P \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ such that whenever (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$, and $Y = \sigma(\{i\})$ for some $i \in I$, and $U \in \mathcal{A}$ is one of the θ -semistable factors of Y in the Harder– Narasimhan filtration of Theorem 2.10, then $[U] \in P$, and if V is one of the θ -stable factors of U in Theorem 2.11, then $[V] \in P$.

5.2 (I, \preceq, κ) -configurations and moduli spaces

Our key tool is (I, \leq, κ) -configurations, [5, Def. 9.1].

Definition 5.6. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, $K(\mathcal{A})$ be as in Definition 2.2, (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and $\kappa : I \to K(\mathcal{A})$ a map. For the rest of the paper we use the following notation: we extend κ to the set of subsets of I by defining $\kappa(J) = \sum_{j \in J} \kappa(j)$. To motivate this, note that Proposition 4.5 simplifies to $[\sigma(J)] = \kappa(J)$ for all $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$. Define a set of \mathcal{A} -data to be a triple (I, \preceq, κ) such that (I, \preceq) is a finite poset and $\kappa : I \to K(\mathcal{A})$ a map with $\kappa(J) \neq 0$ for all $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq I$. Define an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration to be an (I, \preceq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} with $[\sigma(\{i\})] = \kappa(i)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$ for all $i \in I$.

Let (σ, ι, π) , (σ', ι', π') be (I, \preceq) -configurations in \mathcal{A} . An isomorphism α : $(\sigma, \iota, \pi) \to (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ is a collection of isomorphisms $\alpha(J) : \sigma(J) \to \sigma'(J)$ for each $J \in \mathcal{F}_{(I, \preceq)}$ satisfying

$$\begin{split} &\alpha(K)\circ\iota(J,K)=\iota'(J,K)\circ\alpha(J)\quad\text{for all }(J,K)\in\mathcal{G}_{\scriptscriptstyle (I,\preceq)}\text{, and}\\ &\alpha(K)\circ\pi(J,K)=\pi'(J,K)\circ\alpha(J)\quad\text{for all }(J,K)\in\mathcal{H}_{\scriptscriptstyle (I,\preceq)}\text{.} \end{split}$$

Isomorphisms compose in the obvious way.

In [5, Def. 9.2] we define moduli spaces of configurations with $\sigma(I) = X$.

Definition 5.7. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2. Let (I, \leq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$.

- (a) Define $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ to be the set of ~-equivalence classes of (I, \preceq, κ) configurations (σ, ι, π) with $\sigma(I) = X$, where $(\sigma, \iota, \pi) \sim (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ if there
 exists an isomorphism $\alpha : (\sigma, \iota, \pi) \to (\sigma', \iota', \pi')$ with $\alpha(I) = \text{id}_X$. We
 call $\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ a generalized Hilbert scheme. Write $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ for the
 equivalence class of (σ, ι, π) .
- (b) Let $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with (σ, ι, π) best, as in Definition 4.9.

Now suppose Z is a *slope function* on \mathcal{A} with *phase* θ , as in Definition 2.7.

- (c) Let $\mathcal{M}_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with $\sigma(\{i\}) \theta$ -semistable for all $i \in I$, as in Definition 2.7.
- (d) Let $\mathcal{M}_{st}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ be the subset of $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ with $\sigma(\{i\}) \theta$ -stable for all $i \in I$, as in Definition 2.7.
- (e) Let $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa).$

We shall use the *characteristic functions* of moduli spaces, [5, Def. 9.3].

Definition 5.8. Let $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{F} be any finite disjoint union of moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$, as above. For \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) with $[X] = \kappa(I)$, define $\delta_{all}, \delta_{all}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ and $\delta_{st}, \delta_{ss}, \delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) : \mathcal{F} \to \{0, 1\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ to be the *characteristic functions* of $\mathcal{M}_{all}, \ldots, \mathcal{M}_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ on \mathcal{F} , that is, they are 1 on the appropriate subset $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa), \ldots$, and zero elsewhere.

In [5, Def. 9.6] we define natural maps between moduli spaces.

Definition 5.9. Let (I, \leq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, (K, \leq) a finite poset, and $\phi: I \to K$ a surjective map with $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$ when $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$. Define $\mu: K \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mu(k) = \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k))$. Then (K, \leq, μ) is a set of \mathcal{A} -data. Suppose $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I) = \mu(K)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$. Define a map

$$Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$$

by
$$Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \longmapsto [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})],$$
(14)

where $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is the quotient $(K, \trianglelefteq]$ -configuration of (σ, ι, π) from $\phi: I \to K$, as in Definition 4.7. In the special case when I = K and $\phi: I \to I$ is the identity map id_I , so that $\mu = \kappa$ and \trianglelefteq, \preceq are partial orders on I where \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq , write $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) = Q(I, \preceq, I, \trianglelefteq, \mathrm{id}_I)$.

Then in [5, Th.s 9.7 & 9.14, Prop. 9.8 & Cor. 9.9] we prove:

Theorem 5.10. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2. Then

- (i) $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ is a complex quasi-projective variety in Definition 5.7.
- (ii) $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)$ is a morphism of varieties in (14).
- (iii) $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a constructible set in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$.
- (iv) $\delta_{\text{all}}, \delta_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ in Definition 5.8 are constructible functions on \mathcal{F} .

Now suppose Z is a permissible slope function on A with phase θ , as in Definitions 2.7 and 5.4. Then

(v) $\mathcal{M}_{st}, \mathcal{M}_{ss}, \mathcal{M}_{st}^{b}, \mathcal{M}_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ are constructible sets in $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$. (vi) $\delta_{st}, \delta_{ss}, \delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ are constructible functions on \mathcal{F} .

This summarizes the work of [5, §9]. The basic idea is that using Theorem 4.4 we can identify isomorphism classes of (I, \preceq, κ) -configurations (σ, ι, π) with collections of subobjects $S^J \subset X$ for s-sets $J \subseteq I$. As $S^J \in \mathrm{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X)$, this identifies $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ with a subset of $\prod_{\mathrm{s-sets} J} \mathrm{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X)$.

Now $\prod_{\text{s-sets }J} \operatorname{Sub}^{\kappa(J)}(X)$ has the structure of a *complex projective variety* by Assumption 5.2(ii), and using the rest of Assumption 5.2 we show that $\mathcal{M}_{\operatorname{all}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ corresponds to a *subvariety* of this projective variety.

5.3 Euler characteristics of moduli spaces

In the situation of §5.2, the family of all best improvements of a configuration (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} is a complicated constructible set in a complex quasi-projective variety. In [5, Th. 10.1] we show that this set has *Euler characteristic* 1. We express this in terms of *constructible functions*, as in §3.3.

Theorem 5.11. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, $(I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$ be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{artial orders } \preceq \text{ on } I:\\ \lhd \text{ dominates } \prec}} \operatorname{CF} \left(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \right) \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = \delta_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa).$$
(15)

If also Z is a permissible slope function on A w.r.t. X with phase θ , then

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \operatorname{CF} \left(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \right) \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta) \quad (16)$$

and
$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \leq \text{ on } I:\\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta).$$
(17)

Here is the main idea of the proof. If an (I, \trianglelefteq) -configuration (σ, ι, π) is not best then by Theorem 4.10 there exist $i, j \in I$ and \preceq on I with $a \preceq b$ if $a \trianglelefteq b$ and $a \neq i, b \in j$, so that \trianglelefteq dominates \preceq by one step, and the (I, \preceq) -improvements of (σ, ι, π) are in 1-1 correspondence with $\operatorname{Hom}(\sigma(\{j\}), \sigma(\{i\})) \cong \mathbb{C}^m$.

Therefore, if we replace (σ, ι, π) by its family of (I, \leq) -improvements, we replace a point by a copy of \mathbb{C}^m , which does not change the Euler characteristic as $\chi(\text{point}) = \chi(\mathbb{C}^m) = 1$ by Proposition 3.5(i). So by starting with (σ, ι, π) and repeatedly taking one step improvements of non-best configurations, after finitely many steps we arrive at the family \mathcal{F} of all best improvements of (σ, ι, π) , and each step preserves χ , so $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = 1$.

Our final result [5, Th. 10.10] in effect computes the Euler characteristic of the family of all best θ -stable refinements of a θ -semistable configuration (σ, ι, π).

Theorem 5.12. Suppose \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 5.2, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (K, \leq, μ) with $\mu(K) = [X]$ we have



Only finitely many functions $\delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in this sum are nonzero.

6 Relations between $\delta_{st}, \delta_{ss}, \delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$

We prove some identities involving push-forwards of the characteristic functions $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}, \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ under the natural maps $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)$. The basic idea is that given the $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)$, any one of the four families $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}, \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ determines the other three. That is, we can write $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}, \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu, \theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$, and so on.

6.1 Inverting identities (15)-(17)

In (16)–(17) we wrote $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$. We now *invert* these, writing $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$. We shall need some numbers $n(I, \leq, \leq)$.

Definition 6.1. Let *I* be a finite set, and $\leq \leq$ partial orders on *I*, where \leq dominates \leq . Define an integer

$$n(I, \leq, \leq) = \sum_{\substack{n \ge 0, \leq = \leq_0, \leq_1, \dots, \leq_n = \leq: \\ \leq_m \text{ is a partial order on } I, \ 0 \leqslant m \leqslant n, \\ \leq_m \text{ strictly dominates } \leq_{m-1}, \ 1 \leqslant m \leqslant n} (-1)^n.$$
(19)

If \leq dominates \lesssim by l steps, as in Definition 4.9, then $0 \leq n \leq l$ in (19), so the sum (19) is finite. The $n(I, \leq, \leq)$ satisfy the following equation:

Proposition 6.2. Let I be a finite set and $\leq \leq$ partial orders on I, where \leq dominates \leq . Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{partial orders } \preceq \text{ on } I:\\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq \text{ dominates } \lesssim}} n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) = \begin{cases} 1, & \lesssim = \trianglelefteq, \\ 0, & \lesssim \neq \trianglelefteq. \end{cases}$$
(20)

Also, the same equation holds with $n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ replaced by $n(I, \leq, \preceq)$.

Proof. If $\leq = \trianglelefteq$ then in (19) there is only one possibility, n = 0 and $\leq = \preceq_0 = \trianglelefteq$, so $n(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq) = 1$. Also in (20) there is only one possibility, $\preceq = \leq = \trianglelefteq$, so the top line of (20) is immediate. Suppose now that $\leq \neq \trianglelefteq$. Then every term in (19) has $n \geq 1$, and by setting $\preceq = \preceq_1$ we may rewrite (19) as

$$n(I, \leq, \leq) = \sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s} \leq \text{ on } I: \\ \leq \text{ dominates} \leq \\ \leq \text{ strictly dominates} \leq \\ \leq \text{ strictly dominates} \leq \\ \leq \text{ strictly dominates} \leq \\ = \sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s} \leq \text{ on } I: \\ \leq \text{ dominates} \leq \\ \leq \text{ strictly dominates} \leq \\ \end{cases} n(I, \leq d),$$

replacing n by n-1 and \preceq_m by \preceq_{m+1} in the second line. The bottom line of (20) follows immediately. We prove (20) with $n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ replaced by $n(I, \lesssim, \preceq)$ in a similar way, writing \preceq for \preceq_{n-1} in (19).

Here are the inverses of the identities of Theorem 5.11.

Theorem 6.3. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, (I, \leq, κ) be a set of \mathcal{A} -data, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \ \preceq \ on \ I: \\ \trianglelefteq \ dominates \ \preceq}} n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \delta_{\operatorname{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = \delta_{\operatorname{all}}^{\operatorname{b}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa).$$
(21)

If also Z is a permissible slope function on A w.r.t. X with phase θ , then

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \leq on \ I:\\ \trianglelefteq \ dominates \leq}} n(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq) \operatorname{CF} \left(Q(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq) \right) \delta_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta), \quad (22)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \leq on \ I:\\ \blacksquare \ dominates \leq}} n(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq) \operatorname{CF} \left(Q(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq) \right) \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta). \quad (23)$$

 $\leq dominates \leq$

Proof. Substituting (15) into the left hand side of (21) gives

exchanging the sums over \preceq, \leq and using $Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \circ Q(I, \leq, \preceq) = Q(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq)$, so that $\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)) \circ \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, \preceq)) = \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq))$ by Theorem 3.9.

By (20) the bracketed sum on the last line is 0 unless $\leq \leq \leq \leq \leq \leq$, when it is 1. But then $Q(I, \leq, \leq)$ is the identity, so $\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, \leq))$ is the identity, and the final line reduces to $\delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{all}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$, giving (20). The proofs of (22) and (23) are the same, substituting in (16) and (17).

6.2 Writing $\delta_{ss}^{b}(*,\theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{st}^{b}(*,\theta)$

We will need the following notation.

Definition 6.4. Let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, K a finite set, and $\phi : I \to K$ a surjective map. We call (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) allowable if there exists a partial order \trianglelefteq on K such that $i \preceq j$ implies $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$.

For (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable, define a *binary relation* \leq on K by $k \leq l$ for $k, l \in K$ if there exist $b \geq 0$ and $i_0, \ldots, i_b, j_0, \ldots, j_b$ in I with $\phi(i_0) = k, \phi(j_b) = l$, and $i_a \leq j_a$ for $a = 0, \ldots, b$, and $\phi(i_a) = \phi(j_{a-1})$ for $a = 1, \ldots, b$.

By joining the two i_a series and two j_a series together we see that $k \leq l$ and $l \leq m$ implies $k \leq m$, that is, \leq is *transitive*. Taking b = 0 and $i_0 = j_0 = i \in I$ gives $\phi(i) \leq \phi(i)$. Hence $k \leq k$ for all $k \in K$, as ϕ is surjective.

Let \trianglelefteq and $i_0, \ldots, i_b, j_0, \ldots, j_b$ be as above. Then $i_a \preceq j_a$ implies $\phi(i_a) \trianglelefteq \phi(j_a)$, so $k = \phi(i_0) \trianglelefteq \phi(j_0) = \phi(j_1) \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq \phi(j_a) = l$. Thus $k \lesssim l$ implies $k \trianglelefteq l$. Hence, if $k \lesssim l$ and $l \lesssim k$ then $k \trianglelefteq l$ and $l \trianglelefteq k$, so k = l. Therefore \lesssim is a *partial order* on K. Write $\mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \phi) = \lesssim$. It has the property that if \trianglelefteq is a partial order on K, then $i \preceq j$ implies $\phi(i) \trianglelefteq \phi(j)$ if and only if \trianglelefteq dominates $\mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \phi)$.

Here is a *transitivity property* of allowable quadruples. The proof is elementary, and left as an exercise.

Lemma 6.5. Suppose (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$, and $\xi : J \to K$ is a surjective map. Then (J, \leq, K, ξ) is allowable if and only if $(I, \preceq, K, \xi \circ \psi)$ is allowable, and when they are $\mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \xi) = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \xi \circ \psi)$.

We can now write $\delta_{ss}^{b}(*,\theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{st}^{b}(*,\theta)$.

Theorem 6.6. Suppose \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 5.2, and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (J, \leq, λ) with $\lambda(J) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\kappa,\psi: (I, \preceq,\kappa) \text{ is } A-\text{data,}\\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \varsigma = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi),\\ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\ \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]}} \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \varsigma, \psi)) \\ \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \\ \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ss}}(X, J, \varsigma, \lambda, \theta).$$
(24)

Only finitely many functions $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in this sum are nonzero. Proof. By Definition 6.4 we may rewrite (18) with J, λ in place of K, μ as

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \psi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,},\\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \preceq \text{ dominates } \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi),\\ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\ \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]} \operatorname{CF}\left(Q(I, \preceq, J, \triangleleft, \psi)\right) \\ \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \\ \delta_{\text{ss}}(X, J, \triangleleft, \lambda, \theta),$$
(25)

with only finitely many $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in the sum nonzero. But (23) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{p.o.s.} \leq \text{ on } J:\\ \lesssim \text{ dominates } \leq}} n(J, \leq, \lesssim) \operatorname{CF}(Q(J, \leq, \lesssim)) \delta_{\operatorname{ss}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda, \theta) = \delta_{\operatorname{ss}}^{\operatorname{b}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda, \theta).$$
(26)

Noting that $\operatorname{CF}(Q(J, \leq, \leq)) \circ \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi)) = \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi))$ as $Q(J, \leq, \leq) \circ Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi) = Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi)$, substituting (25) into (26) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \psi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A} \text{-data,}\\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\ \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]} \left[\sum_{\substack{\text{partial orders } \trianglelefteq \text{ on } J:\\ \lneq \text{ dominates } \oiint,\\ \bowtie \text{ dominates } \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)} n(J, \trianglelefteq, \clubsuit) \right]$$

$$\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi))\delta_{\operatorname{st}}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{D}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\operatorname{ss}}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{D}}(X, J, \lesssim, \lambda, \theta)$$

By (20) the bracketed sum is 1 if $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ and 0 otherwise, and (24) follows.

We note that (16), (18), (24) write $\delta_{st}, \delta_{ss}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*, \theta)$ in terms of $\delta_{st}^{b}(*, \theta)$ without any correction factors $n(I, \leq, \trianglelefteq)$, etc. Therefore we regard $\delta_{st}^{b}(*, \theta)$ as the most fundamental of the four, and use it for preference.

There is a tempting, simple explanation for (24), which is *false*. Suppose (σ, ι, π) is a best (I, \preceq) -configuration, (J, \lesssim) a finite poset, and $\psi : I \to J$ a surjective map, where $i \preceq j$ implies $\psi(i) \lesssim \psi(j)$. Let $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ be the quotient (J, \lesssim) -configuration from ψ . When is $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ best?

Set $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$. Then \leq dominates \leq , and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is an improvement of the quotient (J, \leq) -configuration of (σ, ι, π) . Thus $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is best only if $\leq =$ $\mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$, which explains why $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ is necessary in (24). But the obvious explanation of (24), that $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ is best *if and only if* $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$, is false, as there exist examples with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ but $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ not best.

6.3 Inverting (24)

Finally, we invert (24). We will need the following notation.

Definition 6.7. Let *I* be a finite set. Then *equivalence relations* ~ on *I* are in 1-1 correspondence with subsets $S = \{(i, j) \in I \times I : i \sim j\}$ of $I \times I$ satisfying the properties

- (i) $(i, i) \in S$ for all $i \in I$,
- (ii) $(i, j) \in S$ implies $(j, i) \in S$, and
- (iii) $(i, j) \in S$ and $(j, k) \in S$ imply $(i, k) \in S$.

Given $S \subseteq I \times I$ satisfying (i)–(iii), define an equivalence relation \sim_S on I by $i \sim_S j$ if $(i, j) \in S$. Write $[i]_S$ for the \sim_S -equivalence class of i, set $I_S = \{[i]_S : i \in I\}$, and define $\psi_S : I \to I_S$ by $\psi_S(i) = [i]_S$.

Now let (I, \preceq) be a finite poset, and define

$$\mathcal{U}(I, \preceq) = \{ S \subseteq I \times I : S \text{ satisfies (i)} - (\text{iii}), (I, \preceq, I_S, \psi_S) \text{ is allowable} \}.$$
(27)

Suppose (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) is allowable, and define $S = \{(i, j) \in I \times I : \phi(i) = \phi(j)\}$. Then it is easy to see that $S \in \mathcal{U}(I, \preceq)$, and there is a unique 1-1 correspondence $\iota : I_S \to K$ with $\iota([i]_S) = \phi(i)$ for $i \in I$ such that $\phi = \iota \circ \psi_S$. So $\mathcal{U}(I, \preceq)$ classifies isomorphism classes of K, ϕ such that (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) is allowable. Define

$$N(I, \preceq) = \sum_{\substack{n \ge 0, S_0, \dots, S_n \in \mathcal{U}(I, \preceq):\\S_{m-1} \subset S_m, S_{m-1} \neq S_m, 1 \leqslant m \leqslant n\\S_0 = \{(i, i) : i \in I\}, S_n = I \times I} (-1)^n.$$
(28)

Now let (I, \leq, K, ϕ) be allowable, and define

$$N(I, \preceq, K, \phi) = \sum_{\substack{n \ge 0, S_0, \dots, S_n \in \mathcal{U}(I, \preceq):\\S_{m-1} \subset S_m, S_{m-1} \neq S_m, 1 \le m \le n\\S_0 = \{(i, i) : i \in I\},\\S_n = \{(i, j) \in I \times I : \phi(i) = \phi(j)\}} (-1)^n.$$
(29)

By a similar proof to Proposition 6.2, using Lemma 6.5, we can show: **Proposition 6.8.** Let (I, \leq, K, ϕ) be allowable. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{iso. \ classes\\ of finite\\ sets \ J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi : \ J \to K\\ surjective, \ \phi = \xi \circ \psi:\\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \ allowable}} N(I, \preceq, J, \psi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \phi \ is \ a \ bijection, \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$
(30)

This also holds with $N(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ replaced by $N(J, \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi), K, \xi)$.

We can also give a *multiplicative formula* for $N(I, \leq, K, \phi)$.

Proposition 6.9. Let (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) be allowable. Then

$$N(I, \preceq, K, \phi) = \prod_{k \in K} N(\phi^{-1}(k), \preceq |_{\phi^{-1}(k)}).$$
(31)

Proof. Write $I^k = \phi^{-1}(k)$ and $\preceq^k = \preceq|_{I^k}$ for $k \in K$. Using the notation of Definition 6.7, if $S \in \mathcal{U}(I, \preceq)$ then $S \cap (I^k \times I^k)$ lies in $\mathcal{U}(I^k, \preceq^k)$. Define

$$\begin{split} \Phi : \left\{ S \in \mathcal{U}(I, \preceq) : S \subseteq \left\{ (i, j) \in I \times I : \phi(i) = \phi(j) \right\} \right\} &\longrightarrow \prod_{k \in K} \mathcal{U}(I^k, \preceq^k) \\ \text{by} \quad \Phi : S \longmapsto \prod_{k \in K} S \cap (I^k \times I^k). \end{split}$$

It is easy to see that Φ is a 1-1 correspondence, with inverse $\Phi^{-1}(\prod_{k \in K} S^k) =$ $\bigcup_{k \in K} S^k, \text{ since } \{(i, j) \in I \times I : \phi(i) = \phi(j)\} = \bigcup_{k \in K} I^k \times I^k.$ Using this 1-1 correspondence we may rewrite (29) as:

$$N(I, \preceq, K, \phi) = \sum_{\substack{n \ge 0, \ S_0^k, \dots, S_n^k \in \mathcal{U}(I^k, \preceq^k), \ k \in K:\\ S_{m-1}^k \subseteq S_m^k, \text{ all } k \in K, \ 1 \le m \le n,\\ S_{m-1}^k \neq S_m^k \text{ for each } 1 \le m \le n \text{ and some } k \in K,\\ S_0^k = \{(i, i) : i \in I^k\}, \ S_n^k = I^k \times I^k \end{cases}$$
(32)

Fix a choice of n and S_0^k, \ldots, S_n^k for $k \in K$ satisfying the conditions in (32). Note that we do *not* know that $S_{m-1}^k \neq S_m^k$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n$ and $k \in K$, but only that for each m, there is at least one k with $S_{m-1}^k \neq S_m^k$. For each $k \in K$, let $n^k + 1$ be the number of distinct S_m^k for $m = 0, \ldots, n$, so that $n^k \leq n$. Let these distinct S_m^k be \hat{S}_m^k for $m = 0, \ldots, n^k$ in increasing order, so that $\hat{S}_0^k \subset \hat{S}_1^k \subset \cdots \subset \hat{S}_{n^k}^k$ with $\hat{S}_{m-1}^k \neq \hat{S}_m^k$ for $1 \leq m \leq n^k$. That is, $\hat{S}_0^k, \ldots, \hat{S}_{n^k}^k$ is S_0^k, \ldots, S_n^k with repeated elements deleted, so that

each set occurs only once. Note also that $\hat{S}_0^k = \{(i, i) : i \in I^k\}$ and $\hat{S}_{n^k}^k = I^k \times I^k$. In this way, choice of n and S_0^k, \ldots, S_n^k for $k \in K$ gives rise to data n^k and $\hat{S}_0^k, \ldots, \hat{S}_{n^k}^k$ satisfying the conditions in the sum (28) defining $N(I^k, \preceq^k)$.

Now the data n^k and $\hat{S}_0^k, \ldots, \hat{S}_{n^k}^k$ for $k \in K$ does not uniquely determine the data n and S_0^k, \ldots, S_n^k for $k \in K$. One can show using combinatorics that the sum of $(-1)^n$ over all data n and S_0^k, \ldots, S_n^k for $k \in K$ is $\prod_{k \in K} (-1)^{n^k}$. Combining this with (32) and the definition (28) of $N(I^k, \preceq^k)$ we see that $N(I, \preceq, K, \phi) = \prod_{k \in K} N(I^k, \preceq^k)$, as we have to prove 'n as we have to prove.

Here is the inverse of the identity of Theorem 6.6.

Theorem 6.10. Suppose A satisfies Assumption 5.2, and $X \in A$ and Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (K, \leq, μ) with $\mu(K) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\lesssim, \lambda, \, \chi: \, (J, \leq, \lambda) \text{ is } \mathcal{A} - data, \\ (J, \leq, K, \, \chi) \text{ is allowable}, \\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \chi), \\ \lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K, \\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \chi \equiv \theta \circ \lambda: J \to (0, 1]}} N(J, \leq, K, \chi) \operatorname{CF}(Q(J, \leq, K, \leq, \chi)) \\ \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda, \theta) = \\ \delta^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(X, K, \leq, \chi, \theta).$$
(33)

Only finitely many functions $\delta_{ss}^{b}(X, J, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$ in this sum are nonzero.

Proof. Substituting (24) into the left hand side of (33) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\leq,\lambda,\chi: (J,\leq,\lambda) \text{ is } A\text{-data,}\\(J,\leq,K,\chi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(J,\leq,K,\chi),\\\lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K,\\\theta \circ \mu \circ \chi \equiv \theta \circ \lambda: J \to (0,1]}} N(J,\leq,K,\chi))$$

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{N}, \psi: (I,\leq,\kappa) \text{ is } A\text{-data,}\\(I,\leq,J,\psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I,\leq,J,\psi),\\\kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa: I \to (0,1]} CF(Q(I,\leq,K,\leq,\chi)) = (I,\leq,K,\psi))$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\psi: (I,\leq,\kappa) \text{ is } A\text{-data,}\\(I,\leq,K,\psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I,\leq,J,\psi),\\\kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa: I \to (0,1]} CF(Q(I,\leq,K,\leq,\psi)) = (I,\leq,K,\psi))$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\psi: (I,\leq,\kappa,\psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\(I,\leq,K,\psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I,\leq,K,\phi),\\\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K,\\\theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa: I \to (0,1]} CF(Q(I,\leq,K,\chi)) = (I,\leq,K,\psi))$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\psi: (I,\leq,\kappa,\psi),\\(I,\leq,K,\psi) \text{ is allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I,\leq,J,\psi)}} N(J,\leq,K,\chi) = (I,\leq,J,\psi)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\psi: (I,\leq,\chi,\psi),\\ \forall: I \to J, \chi: J \to K,\\ \text{ surjective, } \phi = \chi \circ \psi:\\(I,\leq,J,\psi) \text{ allowable,}\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I,\leq,J,\psi)} = (I,\leq,J,\psi)}$$
(34)

setting $\phi = \chi \circ \psi$ and using $\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)) = \operatorname{CF}(Q(J, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \chi)) \circ \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi))$ in the third line.

Here, given (I, \leq, J, ψ) allowable and $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$, Lemma 6.5 shows that (J, \leq, K, χ) allowable and $\leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \chi)$ in the first line of (34) is equivalent to (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable and $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, K, \phi)$ in the third line. Also, $\theta \circ \mu \circ \chi \equiv \theta \circ \lambda$ and $\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$ in the first and second lines of (34) are equivalent to $\theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$ in the third, as $\phi = \chi \circ \psi$.

Now Proposition 6.8 shows that the bracketed term on the last line of (34) is 1 if ϕ is a bijection, and 0 otherwise. When ϕ is a bijection |I| = |K|. The first sum on the third line in (34) fixes a unique I with |I| = |K|. Then in the second sum there are |I|! bijections $\phi: I \to K$. So by dropping the factor 1/|I|! on the third line we may take I = K and $\phi = \operatorname{id}_K$. Then $\leq = \leq, \kappa = \mu$, and $\operatorname{CF}(Q(K, \leq, K, \leq, \operatorname{id}_K))$ is the identity. Thus, the last two lines of (34) reduce to $\delta_{\operatorname{st}}^{\operatorname{st}}(X, K, \leq, \mu, \theta)$, the right hand side of (33). This completes the proof. \Box

We have now constructed seven transformations between the four families of functions $\delta_{st}, \delta_{ss}, \delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*, \theta)$. The equation numbers giving the transformations are displayed below.

$$\delta_{\rm st}(*,\theta) \begin{array}{c} (22) \\ \delta_{\rm st}(*,\theta) \\ (16) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (24) \\ \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*,\theta) \\ (33) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (18) \\ \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*,\theta) \\ (23) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (17) \\ \delta_{\rm ss}(*,\theta) \\ (23) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (35) \\ (23) \end{array}$$

By combining these equations one can also write down the other five transformation rules, but we will not need them.

7 Transformation coefficients $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$

Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, let $K(\mathcal{A})$ be as in Definition 2.2, and let Z: $K(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{C}$ be a *slope function* on \mathcal{A} , as in Definition 2.7, with *phase* θ . Suppose (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data, and (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \leq, κ) -configuration in \mathcal{A} . Then as $0 \neq \sigma(\{i\})$ and $[\sigma(\{i\})] = \kappa(i)$ in $K(\mathcal{A})$, Definition 2.7 implies that

$$Z \circ \kappa(i) \in \left\{ r \exp(i\pi\theta) \in \mathbb{C} : r > 0, \, \theta \in (0,1] \right\} \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$
(36)

Hence $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \in (0, 1]$ is well-defined for all $i \in I$.

Essentially the *only* properties of \mathcal{A}, Z, θ that we shall use in the whole of this section are that $K(\mathcal{A})$ is an abelian group, $Z : K(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is a homomorphism, and (36) holds for all \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) . In particular, we shall not use Assumption 5.2, or suppose Z is permissible.

Section 7.1 defines concepts of θ -(*semi*)stable and (strictly) θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data, and show that all \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) can be decomposed uniquely into θ -(semi)stable and (strictly) θ -reversing pieces in various ways. This is generalized to allowable (I, \leq, K, ϕ) in §7.2.

Then §7.3–§7.5 define and study transformation coefficients $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$. In §8 we shall see that the $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ are the coefficients in an equation expressing $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ in terms of $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$, and similarly for $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$, $\delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$. Thus, the motivation for §7 will come later.

However, we have chosen to present this material first for two reasons: firstly, some properties of the $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ will be needed before it would make sense to define them in §8, and secondly, in §8 we suppose Assumption 5.2 holds and Z, \tilde{Z} are permissible, but the results of this section hold under much weaker assumptions, basically only that (36) holds for all \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) .

7.1 θ -(semi)stable and (strictly) θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data

We will need the following notation.

Definition 7.1. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. Then

(i) We call (I, \leq, κ) θ -stable if $\theta(\kappa(J)) < \theta(\kappa(I))$ for all (I, \leq) s-sets J with $\emptyset \neq J \neq I$, defining $\kappa(J)$ as in Definition 5.6.

(ii) We call (I, \leq, κ) θ -semistable if $\theta(\kappa(J)) \leq \theta(\kappa(I))$ for all (I, \leq) s-sets J with $\emptyset \neq J \neq I$.

This is based on Definition 2.7(i), (ii), replacing subobjects by s-sets. To motivate the notation, note that if (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \leq, κ) -configuration with $\sigma(I) \theta$ -(semi)stable, then Definition 2.7 implies that (I, \leq, κ) is θ -(semi)stable.

Definition 7.2. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. We say

- (i) (I, \preceq, κ) is θ -reversing if $i \preceq j$ implies $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(j)$ for $i, j \in I$.
- (ii) (I, \leq, κ) is strictly θ -reversing if it is θ -reversing and $i \neq j \in I$ implies $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \neq \theta \circ \kappa(j)$.
- (iii) (I, \preceq, κ) is totally θ -reversing if $i \not\leq j$ implies $\theta \circ \kappa(i) < \theta \circ \kappa(j)$ for $i, j \in I$.

We chose 'reversing' as $i \mapsto \theta \circ \kappa(i)$ reverses the order of (I, \preceq) . Clearly, totally θ -reversing implies strictly θ -reversing implies θ -reversing. Note that (I, \preceq, κ) totally θ -reversing implies that (I, \preceq) is a total order, ordered by decreasing phase $\theta \circ \kappa(i)$. We shall use the notion of totally θ -reversing at the beginning of §8 below, but nowhere else.

Our next four propositions decompose \mathcal{A} -data uniquely into θ -(*semi*)stable and (strictly) θ -reversing pieces, in various ways. Here is the first.

Proposition 7.3. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. Then there exist J, ψ such that (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable, $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable for all $j \in J$, and (J, \leq, λ) is θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data, where $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J$. If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$.

Proof. Consider (I, \preceq) s-sets $A \neq \emptyset$ satisfying:

- (a) (A, \leq, κ) is θ -stable, and
- (b) if B is an (I, \preceq) s-set with $A \subseteq B \subseteq I$ then $\theta \circ \kappa(A) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(B)$.

Suppose $I \neq \emptyset$, and let $A \neq \emptyset$ be an (I, \preceq) s-set such that $\theta \circ \kappa(A)$ is maximal amongst nonempty (I, \preceq) s-sets, and A is as small as possible with this condition. Then A exists and satisfies (a) and (b).

Construct by induction $n \ge 0$ and sequences I_1, \ldots, I_n and A_1, \ldots, A_n as follows. If $I = \emptyset$ put n = 0 and finish. Otherwise set $I_1 = I \ne \emptyset$. For $m \ge 1$, suppose we have constructed A_1, \ldots, A_{m-1} and $I_1, \ldots, I_m \ne \emptyset$. Let $\emptyset \ne A_m \subseteq I_m$ be an (I_m, \preceq) s-set satisfying (a) and (b), which exists from above. If $A_m = I_m$ set n = m and finish. Otherwise set $I_{m+1} = I_m \setminus A_m$.

Then A_1, A_2, \ldots are disjoint nonempty subsets of I, so the sequence must terminate for some $n \leq |I|$. It is easy to see that $I = \coprod_{m=1}^n A_m$, and $I_k = \coprod_{m=k}^n A_m$, and I_m is a q-set in (I, \preceq) , and A_m is an s-set in (I_m, \preceq) . Define $J = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\psi : I \to J$ by $\psi|_{A_m} \equiv m$. Then ψ is surjective.

Now $\psi^{-1}(m) = A_m$, and (A_m, \preceq, κ) is θ -stable by (a), so $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ stable for all $j \in J$, as we have to prove. Since $\psi^{-1}(\{k, \ldots, n\}) = \coprod_{k=m}^n A_m = I_k$ for k = 1, ..., n, which is an (I, \preceq) q-set, we see that $i \preceq j$ implies $\psi(i) \leq \psi(j)$. Hence (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable, taking \leq in Definition 6.4 to be \leq .

Define $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J$. Then (J, \leq, λ) is \mathcal{A} -data, as (I, \leq, κ) is. Suppose $j \neq j' \in J$ with $j \leq j'$ but there exists no $k \in J$ with $j \leq k \leq j'$ and $j \neq k \neq j'$. Then j < j', as \leq dominates \leq , and $\{j, j'\}$ is an s-set in $(\{j, \ldots, n\}, \leq)$. Therefore $\psi^{-1}(\{j, j'\}) = A_j \amalg A_{j'}$ is an s-set in (I_j, \leq) , as $I_j = \psi^{-1}(\{j, \ldots, n\})$. So (b) above for A_j, I_j implies that $\theta \circ \kappa(A_j) \geq \theta \circ \kappa(A_j \amalg A_{j'})$. Thus $\theta \circ \lambda(j) = \theta \circ \kappa(A_j) \geq \theta \circ \kappa(A_{j'}) = \theta \circ \lambda(j')$.

We have shown that if $j \neq j' \in J$ with $j \leq j'$ but there exists no $k \in J$ with $j \leq k \leq j'$ and $j \neq k \neq j'$, then $\theta \circ \lambda(j) \geq \theta \circ \lambda(j')$. It easily follows that $\theta \circ \lambda(j) \geq \theta \circ \lambda(j')$ for all $j, j' \in J$ with $j \leq j'$. Thus, (J, \leq, λ) is θ -reversing, as we have to prove. This completes the first part.

Suppose $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\lesssim}, \hat{\lambda}$ also satisfy the conditions of the proposition. Choose a total order \trianglelefteq on \hat{J} dominating $\hat{\lesssim}$ such that $j \trianglelefteq j'$ implies $\theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(j) \ge \theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(j')$. This is possible as $(\hat{J}, \hat{\leq}, \hat{\lambda})$ is θ -reversing. Then there exists a unique bijection $b : \{1, \ldots, \hat{n}\} \to \hat{J}$ with $b_*(\leqslant) = \trianglelefteq$, where $\hat{n} = |\hat{J}|$. For $m = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}$ define $\hat{A}_m = \hat{\psi}^{-1}(b(m))$ and $\hat{I}_m = \hat{\psi}^{-1}(b(\{m, \ldots, \hat{n}\}))$. Since $i \preceq i'$ implies $\hat{\psi}(i) \trianglelefteq \hat{\psi}(i')$ implies $b^{-1} \circ \hat{\psi}(i) \leqslant b^{-1} \circ \hat{\psi}(i')$, we see that \hat{I}_m is a q-set in (I, \preceq) , and \hat{A}_m is an s-set in \hat{I}_m .

We shall show that \hat{A}_m satisfies (a), (b) above in \hat{I}_m . Hence, $\hat{I}_1, \ldots, \hat{I}_{\hat{n}}$ and $\hat{A}_1, \ldots, \hat{A}_{\hat{n}}$ are possible choices for the construction in the first part of the proof. Part (a) is immediate by choice of $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}$, as $\hat{A}_m = \hat{\psi}^{-1}(b(m))$. To prove (b) we work by reverse induction on m. Part (b) holds trivially for $\hat{A}_{\hat{n}}$ in $\hat{I}_{\hat{n}}$ as $\hat{A}_{\hat{n}} = \hat{I}_{\hat{n}}$, so the only possibility is $B = \hat{A}_{\hat{n}}$.

Suppose by induction that for for some $1 \leq k < n$, part (b) holds for \hat{A}_m in \hat{I}_m for $k < m \leq n$. We shall show that (b) holds for \hat{A}_k in \hat{I}_k . Let B be an (\hat{I}_k, \preceq) s-set with $\hat{A}_k \subseteq B \subseteq \hat{I}_k$. We must prove that $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \geq \theta \circ \kappa(B)$.

Set $C = B \setminus \hat{A}_k$. Then C is an s-set in I_{k+1} . If $C = \emptyset$ then $B = A_k$, and $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(B)$ follows immediately. So suppose $C \neq \emptyset$. As $(\hat{A}_{k+1}, \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable we have

$$\theta \circ \kappa(C \cap \hat{A}_{k+1}) \leqslant \theta \circ \kappa(A_{k+1}) \quad \text{if } \hat{A}_{k+1} \cap C \neq \emptyset.$$
(37)

Since $\hat{A}_{k+1} \cup C$ is an (\hat{I}_{k+1}, \preceq) s-set, applying (b) for $\hat{A}_{k+1}, \hat{I}_{k+1}$ by the inductive hypothesis gives $\theta \circ \kappa(C \cup \hat{A}_{k+1}) \leq \theta \circ \kappa(A_{k+1})$. Hence

$$\theta \circ \kappa(A_{k+1}) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(C \setminus \hat{A}_{k+1}) \quad \text{if } \hat{A}_{k+1} \setminus C \neq \emptyset.$$
(38)

Combining (37), (38) gives $\theta \circ \kappa(A_{k+1}) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(C)$. But $b(k) \le b(k+1)$, so $\theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(b(k)) \ge \theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(b(k+1))$, that is, $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_{k+1})$. Thus $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(C)$, and hence $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(B)$ as $B = \hat{A}_k \amalg C$. So by induction \hat{A}_m, \hat{I}_m satisfy (b) above for all $m = 1, \ldots, n$.

Finally we shall show that $\hat{n} = n$, and we can choose the total order \leq above such that $b: J = \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \hat{J}$ is the unique bijection with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$. Let $k = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}$ be least such that $A_1 \cap \hat{A}_k \neq \emptyset$. Then $A_1 \subseteq \hat{I}_k$, so A_1 is an (\hat{I}_k, \preceq) s-set. Let i be \preceq -minimal in $A_1 \cap \hat{A}_k$. Then i is also \preceq -minimal in I, as A_1 and $\hat{A}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \hat{A}_k$ are (I, \preceq) s-sets. Hence $\hat{\psi}(i) = j = b(k)$ is $\hat{\leq}$ -minimal in \hat{J} . Thus $\{j\}$ is a $(\hat{J}, \hat{\leq})$ s-set, so \hat{A}_k is an (I, \preceq) s-set.

As A_1, \hat{A}_k are θ -stable we have

$$\theta \circ \kappa(A_1 \cap A_k) < \theta \circ \kappa(A_1) \quad \text{if } A_1 \cap A_k \neq A_1, \text{ and} \\ \theta \circ \kappa(A_1 \cap A_k) < \theta \circ \kappa(A_k) \quad \text{if } A_1 \cap A_k \neq A_k.$$

$$(39)$$

Applying (b) to A_1, I and to \hat{A}_k, \hat{I}_k with $B = A_1 \cup \hat{A}_k$ in each case gives

 $\theta \circ \kappa(A_1) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(A_1 \cup \hat{A}_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(A_1 \cup \hat{A}_k).$ (40)

It is not difficult to see that (39) and (40) imply that $A_1 = \hat{A}_k$. If $k \neq 1$ then $A_1 \cap \hat{A}_1 = \emptyset$, so applying (b) to A_1, I with $B = A_1 \amalg \hat{A}_1$ gives $\theta \circ \kappa(A_1) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(A_1 \amalg \hat{A}_1)$, so that $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k) = \theta \circ \kappa(A_1) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_1)$. But also $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_1) \ge \cdots \ge \theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k)$ by choice of \trianglelefteq . Hence $\theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_1) = \cdots = \theta \circ \kappa(\hat{A}_k)$, that is, $\theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(b(1)) = \cdots = \theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(b(k)) = \theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(j)$.

Therefore, as j is $\hat{\leq}$ -minimal and $\theta \circ \hat{\lambda}(j)$ is maximal in \hat{J} , we can choose \trianglelefteq such that j is least in the total order \trianglelefteq . That is, j = b(1), and then $A_1 = \hat{A}_1$. Similarly, having chosen \trianglelefteq so that $A_m = \hat{A}_m$ for $m = 1, \ldots, k$, working in $I_{k+1} = \hat{I}_{k+1}$ there is still freedom to choose \trianglelefteq to make $A_{k+1} = \hat{A}_{k+1}$. So by induction we can choose \trianglelefteq to get $A_m = \hat{A}_m$ for $m = 1, 2, \ldots$, which forces $\hat{n} = n$ and $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$. Uniqueness of b is trivial as ψ is surjective.

Next we show that \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) is θ -semistable if and only if it can be broken (uniquely) into θ -stable pieces with equal phase. This can be regarded as a configurations analogue of Theorem 2.11.

Proposition 7.4. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. Then (I, \leq, κ) is θ -semistable if and only if there exist J, ψ such that (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable, $(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable for all $j \in J$, and if $\lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A})$ is defined by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J$ then $\theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta \circ \lambda(J) = \theta \circ \kappa(I)$. If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b : J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$.

Proof. Suppose (I, \leq, κ) and J, ψ, λ satisfy the conditions of the proposition, and set $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$. Then as $\theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta(\lambda(J)) = \theta(\kappa(I))$, we see that (J, \leq, λ) is trivially θ -reversing. Thus (I, \leq, κ) and J, ψ, λ, \leq satisfy the conditions of Proposition 7.3.

Therefore, uniqueness in Proposition 7.3 proves the last part of the proposition, and shows that if J, ψ exist satisfying the conditions above then they are canonically isomorphic to J, ψ in Proposition 7.3. So let (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data, and let J, ψ, \leq, λ be as given in Proposition 7.3. We have to prove that (I, \leq, κ) is θ -semistable if and only if $\theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta \circ \lambda(J) = \theta \circ \kappa(I)$.

First suppose $\theta \circ \lambda \neq \theta \circ \lambda(J)$. Then we can write $J = A \amalg B$ with $A, B \neq \emptyset$ and $\theta \circ \lambda(a) > \theta \circ \lambda(b)$ for all $a \in A, b \in B$, so that $\theta \circ \lambda(A) > \theta \circ \lambda(J) > \theta \circ \lambda(B)$. As (J, \leq, λ) is θ -reversing, A is a (J, \leq) s-set. Since $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$, it follows that $C = \psi^{-1}(A)$ is an (I, \leq) s-set, with $\emptyset \neq C \neq I$. But $\theta \circ \kappa(C) = \theta \circ \lambda(A) > 0$ $\theta \circ \lambda(J) = \theta \circ \kappa(I)$. Hence (I, \leq, κ) is not θ -semistable, by Definition 7.1(ii). This proves the 'only if' part.

Now suppose $\theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta \circ \lambda(J)$. Let *C* be an (I, \preceq) s-set with $\emptyset \neq C \neq I$. Then for each $j \in J$, $C \cap \psi^{-1}(j)$ is an s-set in $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq)$. As $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable, it follows that if $C \cap \psi^{-1}(j) \neq \emptyset$ then $\theta \circ \kappa(C \cap \psi^{-1}(j)) \geq \theta \circ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$. But $\theta \circ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \theta \circ \lambda(j) = \theta \circ \lambda(J) = \theta \circ \kappa(I)$ by assumption.

Hence $\theta \circ \kappa (C \cap \psi^{-1}(j)) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(I)$ for all $j \in J$ with $C \cap \psi^{-1}(j) \ne \emptyset$. As the disjoint union of $C \cap \psi^{-1}(j)$ over all such j is C we see that $\theta \circ \kappa(C) \ge \theta \circ \kappa(I)$. Since this holds for all (I, \preceq) s-sets C with $\emptyset \ne C \ne I$, (I, \preceq, κ) is θ -semistable. This completes the proof.

Here is an analogue of Proposition 7.3, which decomposes (I, \leq, κ) into θ -semistable and strictly θ -reversing pieces. It is closely related to Theorem 2.10.

Proposition 7.5. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. Then there exist J, ψ such that (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable, $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -semistable for all $j \in J$, and (J, \lesssim, λ) is strictly θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data, where $\lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J$. If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$.

Proof. As in Proposition 7.3, consider (I, \preceq) s-sets $A \neq \emptyset$ satisfying:

- (a) (A, \preceq, κ) is θ -semistable, and
- (b) if B is an (I, \preceq) s-set with $A \subset B \subseteq I$ and $A \neq B$ then $\theta \circ \kappa(A) > \theta \circ \kappa(B)$.

Suppose $I \neq \emptyset$, and let $A \neq \emptyset$ be an (I, \preceq) s-set such that $\theta \circ \kappa(A)$ is maximal amongst nonempty (I, \preceq) s-sets, and A is as large as possible with this condition. Then A exists and satisfies (a) and (b).

Suppose for a contradiction that A, A' satisfy (a), (b) with $A \neq A'$. If $A \subset A'$ then (b) with B = A' implies $\theta \circ \kappa(A) > \theta \circ \kappa(A')$, which contradicts the θ -semistability of A'. Similarly $A' \subset A$ gives a contradiction. Hence $A \cap A' \neq A$, $A' \neq A \cup A'$. Putting $B = A \cup A'$, part (b) gives $\theta \circ \kappa(A), \theta \circ \kappa(A') > \theta \circ \kappa(B)$. But then $\theta \circ \kappa(A \cap A')$ is smaller than one of $\theta \circ \kappa(A), \theta \circ \kappa(A')$, contradicting (a). Therefore A is *unique*. The rest of the proof follows Proposition 7.3 with simple modifications, and we leave it as an exercise.

Lastly we prove a kind of dual result to Proposition 7.4.

Proposition 7.6. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data. Then (I, \leq, κ) is θ -reversing if and only if there exist J, ψ such that (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable, and (J, \leq, λ) is strictly θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data, where $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J$, and $\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]$. If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$.

Proof. Given \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) , let J, ψ, \leq, λ be as in Proposition 7.5. Then one way to prove the proposition is to show that (I, \leq, κ) is θ -reversing if and only if $\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$, in a similar way to Proposition 7.4. This is not difficult.

But actually, the result is more-or-less obvious. If J, ψ satisfy the conditions of the proposition, then $\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$, and $\theta \circ \lambda(j) \neq \theta \circ \lambda(j')$ for $j \neq j' \in J$. Hence $\psi(i) = \psi(i')$ if and only if $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta \circ \kappa(i')$. Define an equivalence relation \sim on I by $i \sim i'$ if $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta \circ \kappa(i')$. Then J, ψ are canonically isomorphic to $I/\sim, \pi: I \to I/\sim$. With this J, ψ , it is easy to see that (I, \leq, κ) is θ -reversing if and only if (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable and (J, \leq, λ) is strictly θ -reversing.

7.2 Generalizing §7.1 to allowable (I, \leq, K, ϕ)

We now extend the results of §7.1 from a single set of \mathcal{A} -data (I, \leq, κ) to include a surjective map $\phi : I \to K$ with (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable. Here is the generalization of Proposition 7.3.

Proposition 7.7. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and suppose (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\phi : I \to K$ is surjective with (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable. Then there exists a finite set J and surjective maps $\psi : I \to J, \xi : J \to K$ with $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$, such that

- (a) $(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable for all $j \in J$, and
- (b) (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable. Define $\lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$. Then (J, \lesssim, λ) is \mathcal{A} -data, and $(\xi^{-1}(k), \lesssim, \lambda)$ is θ -reversing for all $k \in K$.

If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\xi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$ and $\hat{\xi} = \xi \circ b^{-1}$.

Proof. For each $k \in K$ let $I_k = \phi^{-1}(k)$, so that $I = \coprod_{k \in K} I_k$. Applying Proposition 7.3 to (I_k, \preceq, κ) gives J_k, ψ_k with $(I_k, \preceq, J_k, \psi_k)$ allowable, such that $(\psi_k^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable for $j \in J_k$ and $(J_k, \lesssim_k, \lambda_k)$ is θ -reversing \mathcal{A} -data, where $\lesssim_k = \mathcal{P}(I_k, \preceq, J_k, \psi_k)$ and $\lambda_k(j) = \kappa(\psi_j^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J_k$.

where $\leq_k = \mathcal{P}(I_k, \preceq, J_k, \psi_k)$ and $\lambda_k(j) = \kappa(\psi_j^{-1}(j))$ for $j \in J_k$. Choose the J_k to be *disjoint*. Set $J = \coprod_{k \in K} J_k$, and define $\psi : I \to J$ by $\psi|_{I_k} = \psi_k$ and $\xi : J \to K$ by $\xi|_{J_k} \equiv k$. Then $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$. If $j \in J$ with $\xi(j) = k$ then $\psi^{-1}(j) = \psi_k^{-1}(k)$. Part (a) follows, as $(\psi_k^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable.

Let $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \phi)$. Define \leq on J by $j \leq j'$ if either $\xi(j) = \xi(j') = k$ and $j \leq_k j'$ for some $k \in K$, $or \xi(j) \neq \xi(j')$ and $\xi(j) \leq \xi(j')$. Then \leq is a partial order on J. As $i \leq i'$ implies $\psi_k(i) \leq_k \psi_k(i')$ for $i, i' \in I_k$, and $i \leq i'$ implies $\phi(i) \leq \phi(i')$, we see that $i \leq i'$ implies $\psi(i) \leq \psi(i')$. Therefore (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable.

Define \leq, λ as in part (b). It readily follows that $\leq |J_k| = \leq_k$ and $\lambda |J_k| = \lambda_k$ for all $k \in K$. Hence $(\xi^{-1}(k), \leq, \lambda) = (J_k, \leq_k, \lambda_k)$, which is θ -reversing for all k by choice of J_k, ψ_k . This proves (b).

Finally, suppose $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\xi}$ also satisfy the conditions in the proposition. Set $\hat{J}_k = \hat{\xi}^{-1}(k)$ for $k \in K$, so that $\hat{J} = \coprod_{k \in K} \hat{J}_k$, and $\hat{\psi}_k = \hat{\psi}|_{I_k} : I_k \to \hat{J}_k$. Then the last part of Proposition 7.3 gives a unique bijection $b_k : J_k \to \hat{J}_k$ for $k \in K$ with $\hat{\psi}_k = b_k \circ \psi_k$. Define a bijection $b : J \to \hat{J}$ by $b|_{J_k} = b_k$. Then $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$ and $\hat{\xi} = \xi \circ b^{-1}$, and b is unique as ψ is surjective.

Using the same method to generalize Propositions 7.4–7.6, we prove:

Proposition 7.8. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and suppose (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\phi: I \to K$ is surjective with (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable. Then $(\phi^{-1}(k), \leq, \kappa)$ is θ -semistable for all $k \in K$ if and only if there exists a finite set J and surjective maps $\psi: I \to J, \xi: J \to K$ with $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$, such that

- (a) $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -stable for all $j \in J$, and
- (b) (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable. Define $\lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$ and $\mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mu(k) = \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k))$. Then $\theta \circ \lambda \equiv \theta \circ \mu \circ \xi : J \to (0, 1]$.

If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\xi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$ and $\hat{\xi} = \xi \circ b^{-1}$.

Proposition 7.9. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and suppose (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\phi : I \to K$ is surjective with (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable. Then there exists a finite set J and surjective maps $\psi : I \to J, \xi : J \to K$ with $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$, such that

- (a) $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -semistable for all $j \in J$, and
- (b) (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable. Define $\lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$ and $\lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$. Then (J, \lesssim, λ) is \mathcal{A} -data, and $(\xi^{-1}(k), \lesssim, \lambda)$ is strictly θ -reversing for all $k \in K$.

If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\xi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$ and $\hat{\xi} = \xi \circ b^{-1}$.

Proposition 7.10. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and suppose (I, \preceq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\phi: I \to K$ is surjective with (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) allowable. Then $(\phi^{-1}(k), \preceq, \kappa)$ is θ -reversing for all $k \in K$ if and only if there exists a finite set J and surjective maps $\psi: I \to J, \xi: J \to K$ with $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$, such that

- (a) define $\lambda: J \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$. Then $\theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa: I \to (0, 1]$.
- (b) (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable. Define $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$. Then (J, \leq, λ) is Adata, and $(\xi^{-1}(k), \leq, \lambda)$ is strictly θ -reversing for all $k \in K$.

If also $\hat{J}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\xi}$ satisfy these conditions, there exists a unique bijection $b: J \to \hat{J}$ with $\hat{\psi} = b \circ \psi$ and $\hat{\xi} = \xi \circ b^{-1}$.

7.3 Transformation coefficients $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta}), U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$

Now we shall define some transformation coefficients $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$. In §8 we shall see that the $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ are the coefficients in an equation expressing $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ in terms of $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$, and similarly for $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$, $\delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$.

Definition 7.11. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z, \tilde{Z} be slope functions on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Let (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data, and $\xi : I \to L$ a surjective map

such that (I, \leq, L, ξ) is allowable. Define integers $T_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, T_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ by

$$T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J, K}} \frac{1}{|J|!|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \psi : I \to J, \\ \text{and } \phi : K \to L \text{ with } \xi = \phi \circ \chi \circ \psi: \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable, } \leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ (J, \lesssim, K, \chi) \text{ is allowable, } \leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \lesssim, K, \chi), \\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \kappa((\chi \circ \psi)^{-1}(k)), \\ \text{then } (\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta \text{-reversing, } j \in J, \\ \text{and } (\phi^{-1}(l), \leq \mu) \text{ is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-stable, } l \in L \end{cases}$$

$$T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J, K}} \frac{1}{|J|!|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \psi : I \to J, \\ (I, \preceq, \Lambda, \psi) \text{ is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-reversing, } j \in J, \\ \text{and } (\phi^{-1}(l), \leq \mu) \text{ is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-stable, } l \in L}} N(J, \lesssim, K, \chi).$$

$$(41)$$

$$T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J, K}} \frac{1}{|J|!|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \psi : I \to J, \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable, } \xi = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ (J, \lesssim, K, \chi) \text{ is allowable, } \xi = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ (J, \lesssim, K, \chi) \text{ is allowable, } \xi = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \kappa((\chi \circ \psi)^{-1}(k)), \\ \text{then } (\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ strictly } \theta \text{-reversing, } j \in J, \\ \text{and } (\phi^{-1}(l), \leq \mu) \tilde{\theta} \text{-semistable, } l \in L \end{cases}$$

We call $T_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, T_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ the transformation coefficients from Z, θ to $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\theta}$.

We also define $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$, which will turn out to be the coefficients in equations expressing $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ in terms of $\delta_{\rm all}^{\rm b}(*)$ in §8.

Definition 7.12. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and \tilde{Z} a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase $\tilde{\theta}$. Let (J, \leq, μ) be \mathcal{A} -data, and $\zeta : J \to L$ a surjective map such that (J, \leq, L, ζ) is allowable. Define integers $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, U_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(J, \leq, \lambda, L, \zeta, \tilde{\theta})$ by

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, L, \zeta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } K}} \frac{1}{|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\chi : J \to K, \ \phi : K \to L \text{ surjective}, \ \zeta = \phi \circ \chi: \\ (J, \leq, K, \chi) \text{ is allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \chi), \\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)), \\ \text{then } (\phi^{-1}(l), \leq, \mu) \text{ is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-stable}, \ l \in L}} N(J, \leq, K, \chi).$$

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, L, \zeta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } K}} \frac{1}{|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\chi : J \to K, \ \phi : K \to L \text{ surjective}, \ \zeta = \phi \circ \chi: \\ (J, \leq, K, \chi) \text{ is allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \chi). \\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)), \\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)), \\ \text{then } (\phi^{-1}(l), \leq, \mu) \text{ is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-semistable}, \ l \in L}}$$

$$(43)$$

Comparing (41)–(42) with (43)–(44), we see that

$$T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \zeta : J \to L \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}, \ \zeta = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{let } \lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)), \\ (\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta \text{-reversing}, j \in J}$$
(45)

$$T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \zeta : J \to L \text{ surjective}, \ \xi = \zeta \circ \psi: \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}, \ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{let } \lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)), \\ (\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is strictly } \theta \text{-reversing}, \ j \in J}}$$
(46)

Here is an important multiplicative property of the transformation coefficients. It encodes the fact that going from Z, θ to $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\theta}$ using $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ (or $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$) and then from $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\theta}$ to $\hat{Z}, \hat{\theta}$ using $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \hat{\theta})$ (or $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta})$) is equivalent to going directly from Z, θ to $\hat{Z}, \hat{\theta}$ using $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \hat{\theta})$ (or $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \hat{\theta})$).

Theorem 7.13. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and Z, \tilde{Z}, \hat{Z} be slope functions on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta}$. Let (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data, and $\phi : I \to K$ surjective with (I, \leq, K, ϕ) allowable. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi : J \to K \ surjective: \ \phi = \xi \circ \psi, \\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})}{T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \lesssim, \lambda, K, \xi, \tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta})} = (47)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi : J \to K \ surjective: \ \phi = \xi \circ \psi, \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \ \text{is allowable}, \ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), } \frac{T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \hat{\theta})}{T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \hat{\theta})},$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi : J \to K \ surjective: \ \phi = \xi \circ \psi, \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \ \text{is allowable}, \ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), } \frac{T_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})}{T_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(J, \lesssim, \lambda, K, \xi, \tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta})} = (48)$$

Proof. We shall use notation as in the following diagram:

$$I, \preceq, \kappa \xrightarrow{\phi = \xi \circ \psi} J, \lesssim, \lambda \xrightarrow{\xi = \epsilon \circ \delta \circ \eta} K$$

$$\downarrow^{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\beta} B, \trianglelefteq, \mu \xrightarrow{\zeta} \rho = \delta \circ \gamma = \delta \circ \eta \circ \zeta} C, \hat{\leqslant} \xrightarrow{\delta} D, \hat{\trianglelefteq}, \nu, \qquad (49)$$

where the left hand quadrilateral defines $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \leq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$, the right hand quadrilateral defines $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta})$, arrows refer to surjective maps between the sets I, \ldots, D , and we also show partial orders and maps to $K(\mathcal{A})$ attached to I, \ldots, D . Relabelling (41) using (49) to define $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \leq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta})$, we find that the left hand side of (47) is

$$\begin{split} \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} & \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi : \ J \to K \ \text{surjective}: \ \phi = \xi \circ \psi, \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \sum_{\substack{(I, \preceq, J, \psi) \ \text{is allowable}, \ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{define } \lambda : \ J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \ \text{by } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))}} \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes of} \\ \text{finite sets} \\ \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|!|\mathcal{B}|!|\mathcal{C}|!|\mathcal{D}|!} \\ & \sum_{\substack{\text{classes of} \\ \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}}} N(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \alpha : I \to \mathcal{A}, \ \beta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}, \\ \text{and } \zeta : \mathcal{B} \to J \ \text{with } \psi = \zeta \circ \beta \circ \alpha: \\ (I, \preceq, \mathcal{A}, \alpha) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, \mathcal{A}, \alpha), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, \leqslant, \mathcal{B}, \beta), \\ (\mathcal{A}, \otimes, \mathcal{B}, \beta) \ \text{is } \theta \text{-reversing}, a \in \mathcal{A}, \\ \text{and } (\zeta^{-1}(j), \preceq, \mu) \ \text{is } \tilde{\theta} \text{-stable}, j \in J \\ \end{cases}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes of}\\ \text{finite sets}\\ A, B, D}} \frac{1}{|A|!|B|!|D|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \alpha : I \to A, \beta : A \to B, \rho : B \to D\\ \text{and } \epsilon : D \to K \text{ with } \phi = \epsilon \circ \delta \circ \gamma \circ \beta \circ \alpha : \\ (I, \preceq A, \alpha) \text{ allowable}, \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, A, \alpha), \\ (A, \leqslant B, \beta) \text{ allowable}, \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(I, \preccurlyeq, A, \alpha), \\ (A, \leqslant B, \beta) \text{ allowable}, \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(A, \leqslant, B, \beta), \\ (B, \trianglelefteq, D, \rho) \text{ allowable}, \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(B, \triangleleft, D, \rho), \\ \text{let } \mu : B \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(b) = \kappa((\beta \circ \alpha)^{-1}(b)), \\ \text{let } \nu : D \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \nu(d) = \mu(\rho^{-1}(d)), \\ \text{then } (\alpha^{-1}(a), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta \text{-reversing, } a \in \mathcal{A}, \\ \text{and } (\epsilon^{-1}(k), \grave{\leq}, \nu) \text{ is } \hat{\theta} \text{-stable}, k \in K \end{cases} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{i \le O, \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of} \\ \text{stes } C \\ \substack{\rho = \delta \circ \gamma, \\ (B, \trianglelefteq, C, \gamma) \\ \text{allowable}, \\ \grave{\leqslant} = \mathcal{P}(B, \triangleleft, C, \gamma) \\ \alpha \text{ allowable}, \\ \grave{\leqslant} = \mathcal{P}(B, \triangleleft, C, \gamma) \\ n \text{ allowable}, \\ \grave{\leqslant} = \mathcal{P}(B, \triangleleft, C, \gamma) \\ (q^{-1}(c), \leqslant, \lambda) \tilde{\theta} \text{-reversing, } c \in C, \\ (\zeta^{-1}(j), \triangleleft, \mu) \tilde{\theta} \text{-stable}, j \in J \\ \end{array} \right\}$$

Here we have rearranged the sums using our usual techniques. Now Proposition 7.7 shows that the bracketed term $[\cdots]$ on the last line is 1, since $\gamma : B \to C$ has a unique factorization $B \xrightarrow{\zeta} J \xrightarrow{\eta} C$ up to isomorphism with the $\tilde{\theta}$ -reversing, $\tilde{\theta}$ -stable properties we want.

The second part of Proposition 6.8 then shows that the bracketed term $\{\cdots\}$ on the bottom line is 1 if $\rho : B \to D$ is a bijection, and 0 otherwise. Then |B| = |D|, and there are |D|! bijections $\rho : B \to D$. So by dropping the factor 1/|D|! on the third line we may take D = B and $\rho = \mathrm{id}_B$, and replace the fourth line by 1. By (41), the third and fourth lines above then reduce to $T^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \hat{\theta})$, the right hand side of (47). This gives (47). To prove (48), we follow the same method, using Proposition 7.9 instead of Proposition 7.7.

7.4 Properties of the transformation coefficients

Next we prove some properties of $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ we will need later. We shall see in §8 that the $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ are a bit like the components of a matrix transforming $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ into $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$, and similarly for $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$. The next result says in effect that $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta, \theta)$ correspond to the identity matrix.

Theorem 7.14. Let \mathcal{A}, Z, θ be as above, and suppose (I, \preceq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\xi : I \to L$ is surjective with (I, \preceq, L, ξ) allowable. Then

$$T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = \begin{cases} 1, & \xi \text{ is a bijection,} \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$
(50)

Proof. First suppose ξ is a bijection. Let ψ, χ, ϕ be as in (41). Then |I| = |J| = |K| = |L| and ψ, χ, ϕ are bijections. The first sum in (41) fixes unique J, K with |I| = |J| = |K| = |L|, and there are then |J|!|K|! possibilities for ψ, χ, ϕ with $\xi = \phi \circ \chi \circ \psi$. For each of these $N(J, \leq, K, \chi) = 1$, as χ is a

bijection. Cancelling factors of |J|!|K|! we see that $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = 1$. Similarly $T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = 1$.

Now suppose for a contradiction that there exist $(I, \preceq, \kappa), L, \xi$ satisfying the conditions with ξ not a bijection, but $T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) \neq 0$. Choose $(I, \preceq, \kappa), L, \xi$ such that |I| - |L| > 0 is *least* with these criteria. Applying Theorem 7.13 with $\theta = \tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta}$ and relabelling gives:

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\text{classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi: I \to J, \ \phi: \ J \to L \text{ surjective: } \xi = \phi \circ \psi,\\(I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}, \ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi),\\\text{define } \lambda: \ J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ by } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))} T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \theta) \cdot T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(J, \lesssim, \lambda, L, \phi, \theta, \theta) = (51)$$

Suppose J, ψ, ϕ are as in (51). Divide into three cases:

- (a) ψ is a bijection. Then $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, L, \phi, \theta, \theta) = T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta)$, and $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \theta) = 1$ by the first part.
- (b) ϕ is a bijection. Then $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \theta) = T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta)$, and $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, L, \phi, \theta, \theta) = 1$ by the first part.
- (c) Neither ψ nor ϕ is a bijection. Then |I| > |J| > |L|, so |I| |J| < |I| |L|and |J| - |L| < |I| - |L|. Since |I| - |L| is least with ξ not a bijection and $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) \neq 0$, this implies that $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, J, \psi, \theta, \theta) = T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \lesssim, \lambda, L, \phi, \theta, \theta) = 0$.

In case (a), the first sum in (51) fixes a unique J with |J| = |I|, and there are then |J|! bijections $\psi: I \to J$. Also ψ determines ϕ by $\phi = \xi \circ \psi^{-1}$. Cancelling factors of |J|!, we see that ψ, ϕ in case (a) contribute $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta)$ to the left hand side of (51). Similarly, ψ, ϕ in case (b) contribute $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta)$ to the left hand side of (51). Clearly, ψ, ϕ in case (c) contribute 0.

Therefore (51) reduces to $2T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta)$, so that $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = 0$, a contradiction. This proves the first part of the second line of (50). The second part follows by the same method, using (48) rather than (47).

We can relate the functions $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(*,\theta,\tilde{\theta}), T^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(*,\theta,\tilde{\theta})$ to each other.

Theorem 7.15. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and Z, \tilde{Z} be slope functions on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Suppose (I, \preceq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\xi : I \to L$ is surjective with (I, \preceq, L, ξ) allowable. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J, K}} \frac{1}{|J|!|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \psi : I \to J, \ \chi : J \to K, \\ \text{and } \phi : K \to L \text{ with } \xi = \phi \circ \chi \circ \psi : \\ (J, \leq, K, \chi) \text{ allowable, } \leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi), \\ (J, \leq, K, \chi) \text{ allowable, } \leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi), \\ \text{define } \lambda, \mu, \nu : J, K, L \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ by} \\ \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)), \ \mu(k) = \lambda(\chi^{-1}(k)), \ \nu(l) = \mu(\phi^{-1}(l)), \\ \text{then } \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1], \ \tilde{\theta} \circ \nu \circ \phi \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \mu : K \to (0, 1] \end{cases} N(I, \preceq, J, \psi) \cdot X(I, \preceq, K, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = N(I, \preceq, K, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) \cdot X(I, \Xi, K, \chi)$$

$$N(I, \preceq, J, \psi) \cdot X(I, \Xi, K, \chi) = N(I, \Xi, \chi, \psi) \cdot X(I, \Xi, \chi, \chi) + N(I, \Xi, \chi, \xi) \cdot X(I, \xi) \cdot X(I,$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}, Z, \tilde{Z}, \theta, \tilde{\theta}$ and (I, \leq, κ) be as above, and suppose $\eta : I \to K$ is surjective with (I, \leq, K, η) allowable. Consider the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\text{classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }A,B}} \frac{1}{|A|!|B|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective }\alpha : I \to A, \ \beta : A \to B,\\\text{and }\gamma : B \to K \text{ with }\eta = \gamma \circ \beta \circ \alpha:\\(I, \preceq, A, \alpha) \text{ is allowable}, \ \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, A, \alpha),\\(A, \leqslant, B, \beta) \text{ is allowable}, \ \preceq = \mathcal{P}(A, \leqslant, B, \beta),\\\text{let }\rho : B \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be }\rho(b) = \kappa((\beta \circ \alpha)^{-1}(b)),\\\text{then }(\alpha^{-1}(a), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is }\theta\text{-reversing, }a \in A,\\\text{and }(\gamma^{-1}(k), \preceq, \rho) \text{ is }\bar{\theta}\text{-semistable, }k \in K \end{cases}$$
(54)

Here (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data with (I, \leq, A, α) allowable and $(\alpha^{-1}(a), \leq, \kappa)$ θ reversing for $a \in A$. Proposition 7.10 characterizes such α uniquely up to isomorphism as $\alpha = \delta \circ \psi$, where $\psi : I \to J, \delta : J \to A$ are surjective, (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable with $\lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi), \ \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa$ for λ given by $\lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j))$, and $(\delta^{-1}(a), \leq, \lambda)$ is strictly θ -reversing for $a \in A$. Substituting this into (54) and using (42) with $J, A, B, K, \chi, \delta, \beta, \gamma, \leq, <, \lesssim, \lambda, \rho$ in place of $I, J, K, L, \psi, \chi, \phi, \xi, \leq, \leq, \kappa, \mu$ respectively, we find that (54) is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } \psi : I \to J, \\ \chi : J \to K \text{ with } \eta = \chi \circ \psi: \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ allowable, } \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{let } \lambda : J \to K(A) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)), \\ \text{then } \theta \circ \lambda \circ \psi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1] \end{cases}} T_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(J, \lesssim, \lambda, K, \chi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}).$$
(55)

In (54) (B, \preceq, ρ) is \mathcal{A} -data with (B, \preceq, K, γ) allowable and $(\gamma^{-1}(k), \preceq, \rho) \tilde{\theta}$ semistable for all $k \in K$. Proposition 7.8 characterizes such γ uniquely up to isomorphism as $\gamma = \zeta \circ \epsilon$, where $\epsilon : B \to C$ and $\zeta : C \to K$ are surjective, $(B, \preceq, C, \epsilon)$ is allowable, $(\epsilon^{-1}(c), \preceq, \rho)$ is $\tilde{\theta}$ -stable for $c \in C$, and $\tilde{\theta} \circ \mu \circ \zeta \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \sigma :$ $C \to (0, 1]$, where σ is given by $\sigma(c) = \rho(\epsilon^{-1}(c))$ and μ by $\mu(k) = \rho(\gamma^{-1}(k))$. Substituting this into (54) and using (41), we find that (54) is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\text{classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets } C}} \frac{1}{|C|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } v : I \to C,\\ \zeta : C \to K \text{ with } \eta = \zeta \circ v:\\ (I, \preceq, C, v) \text{ is allowable},\\ \text{let } \sigma : C \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \sigma(c) = \kappa(v^{-1}(c)),\\ \text{let } \mu : K \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \mu(k) = \kappa(\eta^{-1}(k)),\\ \text{then } \tilde{\theta} \circ \mu \circ \zeta \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \sigma : C \to (0, 1]} T_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, C, v, \theta, \tilde{\theta}),$$
(56)

where we have put $v = \epsilon \circ \beta \circ \alpha$, so that $v : I \to C$ is surjective.

Therefore the sums (55) and (56) are equal, as both agree with (54). Now (55) is part of the left hand side of (52), that is, setting $\eta = \chi \circ \psi$ we can regard the l.h.s. of (52) as the sum of (55) times $N(K, \leq, L, \phi)$ over K, η, ϕ with $\xi = \phi \circ \eta$. Replacing (55) by (56) in this sum, the l.h.s. of (52) becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } C}} \frac{1}{|C|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{surjective } v : I \to C, \ \omega : C \to L, \ \xi = \omega \circ v:\\ (I, \preceq, C, v) \text{ is allowable}, \ \leqslant = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, C, v) \\ \text{let } \sigma : C \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \sigma(c) = \kappa(v^{-1}(c)), \\ \text{let } v : L \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \nu(l) = \kappa(\xi^{-1}(l)), \\ \text{then } \tilde{\theta} \circ v \circ \omega \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \sigma : C \to (0, 1] \\ \end{array}} \left[\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } K}} \frac{1}{|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\zeta : C \to K, \ \phi : K \to L \text{ surjective}, \ \omega = \phi \circ \zeta:\\ (C, \lessdot, K, \zeta) \text{ allowable}, \ \leq = \mathcal{P}(C, \lt, K, \zeta)}} N(K, \triangleleft, L, \phi) \right].$$
(57)

Here we have put $\omega = \phi \circ \zeta$, so that $\omega : C \to L$ is surjective, and used the fact that $\tilde{\theta} \circ \nu \circ \phi \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \mu$ in (52) and $\tilde{\theta} \circ \mu \circ \zeta \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \sigma$ in (56) are together equivalent to $\tilde{\theta} \circ \nu \circ \omega \equiv \tilde{\theta} \circ \sigma : C \to (0, 1]$.

The second part of Proposition 6.8 shows that the second line of (57) is 1 if ω is a bijection, and 0 otherwise. If ω is a bijection then |C| = |L|. The first sum of (57) fixes a unique C with |C| = |L|. There are then |C|! bijections $\omega : C \to L$. Each ω determines v by $v = \omega^{-1} \circ \xi$, and then $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, C, v, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$.

Cancelling factors of |C|!, we see that (57) reduces to $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$, the right hand side of (52). This proves (52). The proof of (53) is similar: relabelling (55) and (56) we see that the l.h.s. of (53) is the sum of (56) times $N(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ over J, ψ and $\eta : J \to L$ with $\xi = \eta \circ \psi$, where $\eta = \phi \circ \chi$. Replacing (56) by (55) and using Proposition 6.8, the result follows.

We prove expressions for the $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*)$, similar to Proposition 6.9.

Definition 7.16. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category and Z, \tilde{Z} be slope functions on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Let (I, \leq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data, and let $\pi : I \to \{0\}$ be the projection. Then $(I, \leq, \{0\}, \pi)$ is allowable. Define integers

$$\begin{split} T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) &= T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \{0\}, \pi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}), \\ T^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) &= T^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \{0\}, \pi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}), \\ U^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \tilde{\theta}) &= U^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \{0\}, \pi, \tilde{\theta}), \quad U^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \tilde{\theta}) = U^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \{0\}, \pi, \tilde{\theta}) \end{split}$$

Theorem 7.17. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and Z, \tilde{Z} be slope functions on \mathcal{A} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Suppose (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and $\xi : I \to L$ is surjective with

 (I, \preceq, L, ξ) allowable. Then

$$\Gamma^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \prod_{l \in L} T^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}} \left(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq |_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa|_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta, \tilde{\theta} \right),$$
(58)

$$I_{st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \theta) = \prod_{l \in L} I_{st}^{z} \left(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta, \theta\right),$$
(58)
$$I_{ss}^{b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \prod_{l \in L} T_{ss}^{b} \left(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta, \tilde{\theta}\right),$$
(59)
$$I_{ss}^{b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \prod_{l \in L} U_{ss}^{b} \left(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa_{|\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta, \tilde{\theta}\right),$$
(59)

$$U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta) = \prod_{l \in L} U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq|_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa|_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta), \tag{60}$$

and
$$U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta) = \prod_{l \in L} U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b} \big(\xi^{-1}(l), \preceq |_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa|_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta \big).$$
 (61)

Proof. Let $J, K, \psi, \chi, \phi, \leq, \leq, \mu$ be as in (41). For each $l \in L$, define $I_l = \xi^{-1}(l)$, $J_{l} = \psi(I_{l}), K_{l} = \chi(J_{l}), \psi_{l} = \psi|_{I_{l}}, \chi_{l} = \chi|_{J_{l}}, \lesssim_{l} = \lesssim|_{J_{l}}, \leq_{l} = \leq|_{K_{l}}, \kappa_{l} = \kappa|_{I_{l}}$ and $\mu_{l} = \mu|_{K_{l}}$. Then $I = \coprod_{l \in L} I_{l}, J = \coprod_{l \in L} J_{l}$ and $K = \coprod_{l \in L} K_{l}$. Using Proposition 6.9 we can show that $N(J, \lesssim, K, \chi) = \prod_{l \in L} N(J_{l}, \lesssim_{l}, K_{l}, \chi_{l})$. Now the conditions on $I, J, K, \psi, \chi, \preceq, \lesssim, \preceq, \kappa, \mu$ in (41) all reduce to condi-

tions on I_l, J_l, \ldots, μ_l for each $l \in L$. Conversely, any I_l, \ldots, μ_l satisfying these conditions for all $l \in L$ come from I, \ldots, μ satisfying the conditions in (41). Hence we may rewrite (41) as

$$\begin{split} T^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \dot{\theta}) &= \\ &\prod_{l \in L} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, \ classes} \\ \mathrm{of \ finite} \\ \mathrm{sets} \ J_l, K_l}} \frac{1}{|J_l|! |K_l|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{surjective} \ \psi_l \ : \ I_l \ \rightarrow \ J_l, \ \chi_l \ : \ J_l \ \rightarrow \ K_l: \\ (J_l, \preceq_l, J_l, \psi_l) \ \mathrm{is \ allowable}, \ \lesssim_l \ = \ \mathcal{P}(I_l, \preceq_l, I_l, \psi_l), \\ (J_l, \lesssim_l, K_l, \chi_l) \ \mathrm{is \ allowable}, \ \leq_l \ = \ \mathcal{P}(J_l, \lesssim_l, K_l, \chi_l), \\ & \mathrm{let} \ \mu_l \ : \ K_l \ \rightarrow \ K(\mathcal{A}) \ \mathrm{be} \ \mu_l(k) \ = \ \kappa_l((\chi_l \ \circ \psi_l)^{-1}(k)), \\ & \mathrm{then} \ (\psi_l^{-1}(j), \preceq_l, \kappa_l) \ \mathrm{is \ } \theta \ \mathrm{reversing}, \ j \ \in \ J_l, \\ & \mathrm{and} \ (K_l, \ \leq_l, \ \mu_l) \ \mathrm{is \ } \tilde{\theta} \ \mathrm{stable}, \ l \in \ L \end{split} \right] \end{split}$$

The bracketed term $[\cdots]$ is $T^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(\xi^{-1}(l), \leq |_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \kappa|_{\xi^{-1}(l)}, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$, so this proves (58). The proofs of (59)-(61) are similar.

Alternative formulae for $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*,\theta)$ 7.5

Finally we prove explicit alternative formulae for $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$. These imply that $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = 0$ unless (I, \leq, κ) satisfies some strong restrictions. This will be essential in §8, where we use it to show that certain sums have only finitely many nonzero terms. Here is some notation.

Definition 7.18. Let I be a finite set, and \mathcal{E} a set of subsets of I. We say that \mathcal{E} separates I if whenever $i \neq i' \in I$, there exists $A \in \mathcal{E}$ such that exactly one of i, i' lie in A.

With this, we give new formulae for $U_{st}^{b}, U_{ss}^{b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$.

Theorem 7.19. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category, and Z a slope function on \mathcal{A} with phase θ . Let (I, \leq, κ) be A-data, and define

$$E_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \left\{ A : A \text{ is an } (I, \preceq) \text{ s-set, } A \neq \emptyset, I, \ \theta \circ \kappa(A) \geqslant \theta \circ \kappa(I) \right\}, \quad (62)$$

$$E_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \{A : A \text{ is an } (I, \preceq) \text{ s-set, } A \neq \emptyset, I, \theta \circ \kappa(A) > \theta \circ \kappa(I) \}.$$
(63)

Then

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{E} \subseteq E_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta):\\ \mathcal{E} \text{ separates } I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{E}|}, \qquad U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{E} \subseteq E_{\rm ss}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta):\\ \mathcal{E} \text{ separates } I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{E}|}.$$
(64)

In particular, $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, U_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = 0$ unless $E_{\mathrm{st}}, E_{\mathrm{ss}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ separates I.

Proof. First suppose |I| = 1. Then $E_{st}, E_{ss}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = \emptyset$, so the only possibility for \mathcal{E} in each sum in (64) is \emptyset , which does separate I. Thus both sides of each sum in (64) are 1, proving (64) when |I| = 1.

So suppose |I| > 1. Definitions 7.12 and 7.16 give

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J \text{ surjective:} \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}, \\ \text{let } \lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)), \\ \text{then } (J, \lesssim, \lambda) \text{ is } \theta \text{-stable}}} N(I, \preceq, J, \psi).$$
(65)

Applying Proposition 6.8 with $K = \{0\}$ and noting that $\phi : I \to \{0\}$ is not a bijection as |I| > 1 yields

$$0 = \sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes} \\ \text{of finite sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J \text{ surjective:} \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}}} N(I, \preceq, J, \psi).$$
(66)

Thus, subtracting (66) from (65) gives

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = -\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J \text{ surjective:}\\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable, } \leq =\mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi),\\ \text{let } \lambda : J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)),\\ \text{then } (J, \lesssim, \lambda) \text{ is not } \theta \text{-stable}}} N(I, \preceq, J, \psi).$$
(67)

Let J, ψ, \leq, λ be as in (67). Then (J, \leq, λ) is not θ -stable, so by Definition 7.1 there exists a (J, \leq) s-set B with $\emptyset \neq B \neq J$ and $\theta(\lambda(B)) \geq \theta(\lambda(J))$. Let $A = \psi^{-1}(B)$. Then A is an (I, \leq) s-set with $\emptyset \neq A \neq I$, and $\theta(\kappa(A)) = \theta(\lambda(B))$, $\theta(\kappa(I)) = \theta(\lambda(J))$, so that $\theta(\kappa(A)) \geq \theta(\kappa(I))$. Hence $A \in E_{\rm st}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ by (62). Conversely, if $A \in E_{\rm st}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ and $A = \psi^{-1}(B)$ for B a (J, \leq) s-set, then (J, \leq, λ) is not θ -stable.

For J, ψ, \leq, λ as in (67), define \mathcal{D} to be the set of $A \in E_{\text{st}}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ such that $A = \psi^{-1}(B)$ for some (J, \leq) s-set B. Then $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$, as (J, \leq, λ) is not θ -stable. It is easy to show that $\sum_{\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}: \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{|\mathcal{E}|} = -1$. Substituting this into (67) and rearranging gives:

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{E} \subseteq E_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta):\\ \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{E}|} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J \text{ surjective:} \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable,} \\ \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi), \\ \text{if } A \in \mathcal{E} \text{ then } A = \psi^{-1}(B) \\ \text{for some } (J, \leq) \text{ s-set } B \end{cases}$$
(68)

Here the condition [if $A \in \mathcal{E}$ then $A = \psi^{-1}(B)$ for some (J, \leq) s-set B] is equivalent to $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Fix $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{E} \subseteq E_{\mathrm{st}}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$. Define an equivalence relation $\sim_{\mathcal{E}}$ on I by $i \sim_{\mathcal{E}} i'$ if for all $A \in \mathcal{E}$ either $i, i' \in A$ or $i, i' \notin A$. Write $[i]_{\mathcal{E}}$ for the $\sim_{\mathcal{E}}$ equivalence class of $i \in I$. Define $K_{\mathcal{E}} = \{[i]_{\mathcal{E}} : i \in I\}$ and $\phi_{\mathcal{E}} : I \to K_{\mathcal{E}}$ by $\phi_{\mathcal{E}}(i) = [i]_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Now $(I, \leq, K_{\mathcal{E}}, \phi_{\mathcal{E}})$ is allowable. Also, if (I, \leq, J, ψ) is allowable with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \leq, J, \psi)$ then the condition [if $A \in \mathcal{E}$ then $A = \psi^{-1}(B)$ for some (J, \leq) s-set B] holds if and only if $\phi_{\mathcal{E}} = \xi_{\mathcal{E}} \circ \psi$ for some $\xi_{\mathcal{E}} : J \to K_{\mathcal{E}}$, which is then unique. Hence we may rewrite (68) as

$$U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{E} \subseteq E_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta):\\ \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{E}|} \cdot \left[\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.} \\ \text{classes} \\ \text{of finite} \\ \text{sets } J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi : I \to J, \ \xi_{\mathcal{E}} : J \to K_{\mathcal{E}} \\ \text{surjective, } \phi_{\mathcal{E}} = \xi_{E} \circ \psi: \\ (I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable}}} \right].$$
(69)

Proposition 6.8 shows that the bracketed term $[\cdots]$ in (69) is 1 if $\phi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a bijection, and 0 otherwise. But $\phi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a bijection if and only if $i \sim_{\mathcal{E}} i'$ implies i = i', that is, if and only if \mathcal{E} separates I, by Definition 7.18. Hence (69) reduces to the first sum of (64), with the additional condition that $\mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$. But \emptyset does not separate I as |I| > 1, so we can drop this additional condition. This proves the first sum of (64). The second sum is proved in the same way, using $E_{\rm ss}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ instead of $E_{\rm st}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$. The last part is immediate, as if $E_{\rm st}, E_{\rm ss}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ do not separate I then the sums (64) are empty.

Note that combining Theorems 7.17 and 7.19 gives alternative formulae for $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, U_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \tilde{\theta})$, and then substituting these into (45) and (46) gives alternative formulae for $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \preceq, \kappa, L, \xi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$.

8 Transforming between slope functions

Now suppose \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 5.2, and Z, \tilde{Z} are permissible slope functions on \mathcal{A} with respect to $X \in \mathcal{A}$ in the sense of Definition 5.4, with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. We shall write the functions $\delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ in terms of push-forwards of $\delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(*, \theta)$. We first show how to write $\delta_{all}(*)$ in terms of $\delta_{ss}(*, \theta)$.

Theorem 8.1. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (J, \leq, λ) with $\lambda(J) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \psi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } A-data,\\ \psi: I \to J \text{ is surjective,}\\ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J,\\ \text{if } i, i' \in I \text{ with } \psi(i) \neq \psi(i') \text{ then}\\ i \preceq i' \text{ if and only if } \psi(i) \lesssim \psi(i'),\\ (\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ totally } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J} \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi))$$

$$(70)$$

Only finitely many functions $\delta_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in this sum are nonzero.

Proof. By Proposition 5.5 with J, \leq, λ in place of I, \leq, κ , there is a finite set $P \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ such that if I, \leq, κ, ψ are as in (70) with $\mathcal{M}_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) \neq \emptyset$, then $\kappa(i) \in P$ for all $i \in I$. It easily follows that there are only finitely many I, \leq, κ, ψ in (70) with $\delta_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ nonzero.

Let $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$. Define $X^j = \sigma(\{j\})$ for $j \in J$. Theorem 2.10 then yields a unique filtration $0 = A_0^j \subset A_1^j \subset \cdots \subset A_{n^j}^j = X^j$ with $S_k^j = A_k^j / A_{k-1}^j \ \theta$ -semistable for $k = 1, \ldots, n^j$. Put $I^j = \{j\} \times \{1, 2, \ldots, n^j\}$ with $(j, i) \preceq^j (j, i')$ if $i \leq i'$, and define $\kappa^j : I^j \to K(\mathcal{A})$ by $\kappa(j, i) = [S_i^j]$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n^j$. Then $(I^j, \preceq^j, \kappa^j)$ is \mathcal{A} -data, and Theorem 2.10 gives

$$\theta \circ \kappa^{j}(j,1) > \theta \circ \kappa^{j}(j,2) > \cdots > \theta \circ \kappa^{j}(j,n^{j}),$$

as $\theta \circ \kappa(j,i) = \theta([S_i^j])$. Hence $(I^j, \preceq^j, \kappa^j)$ is totally θ -reversing.

Applying [5, Cor. 4.4] to $0 = A_0^j \subset A_1^j \subset \cdots \subset A_n^j = X^j$ then yields an $(I^j, \preceq^j, \kappa^j)$ -configuration $(\sigma^j, \iota^j, \pi^j)$, unique up to canonical isomorphism, with $\sigma^j(I^j) = \sigma(\{j\})$ and $\sigma^j(\{(j,i)\}) \cong S_i^j$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n^j$. Hence $\sigma^j(\{(j,i)\})$ is θ -semistable.

Apply Theorem 4.8 |J| times to substitute $(\sigma^j, \iota^j, \pi^j)$ into (σ, ι, π) at j for all $j \in J$. This gives \mathcal{A} -data (I, \preceq, κ) , where $I = \coprod_{j \in J} I^j \subset J \times \mathbb{N}$, and $\kappa|_{I^j} = \kappa^j$ for $j \in J$, and $(j, i) \preceq (j', i')$ if either j = j' and $i \leq i'$, or $j \neq j'$ and $j \leq j'$. It also gives an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ unique up to canonical isomorphism, whose (I^j, \preceq^j) -subconfiguration is $(\sigma^j, \iota^j, \pi^j)$ for $j \in J$, and if $\psi : I \to J$ is the surjective map with $\psi(j, i) = j$, then the quotient (J, \leq) -configuration of $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$ from ψ is (σ, ι, π) .

Now I, \leq, κ, ψ satisfy all the conditions in (70). Conversely, let $\hat{I}, \hat{\leq}, \hat{\kappa}, \hat{\psi}$ satisfy the conditions in (70), and $Q(\hat{I}, \hat{\leq}, J, \leq, \hat{\psi}) : [(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})] \mapsto [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ for some $(\hat{I}, \hat{\leq}, \hat{\kappa})$ -configuration $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$. Choose $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$ in its isomorphism class such that (σ, ι, π) is its quotient (J, \leq) -configuration from $\hat{\psi}$.

Set $\hat{I}^j = \hat{\psi}^{-1}(j)$, and let $(\hat{\sigma}^j, \hat{\iota}^j, \hat{\pi}^j)$ be the $(\hat{I}^j, \underline{\hat{\prec}})$ -subconfiguration of $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$ for $j \in J$. Then $\hat{\sigma}^j(\hat{I}^j) = \sigma(\{j\})$, as (σ, ι, π) is the quotient (J, \leq) -configuration from $\hat{\psi}$. Using uniqueness up to isomorphism in [5, Cor. 4.4] and the conditions on $\hat{I}, \underline{\hat{\prec}}, \hat{\kappa}, \hat{\psi}$, we find that $(\hat{I}^j, \underline{\hat{\prec}}, \hat{\kappa})$ and $(\hat{\sigma}^j, \hat{\iota}^j, \hat{\pi}^j)$ are canonically isomorphic to $(I^j, \underline{\hat{\prec}}^j, \kappa^j)$ and $(\sigma^j, \iota^j, \pi^j)$.

This gives 1-1 correspondences $\hat{I}^{j} \cong I^{j}$ identifying $\dot{\preceq}|_{\hat{I}^{j}}$ with \preceq^{j} for $j \in J$. Putting these together gives a 1-1 correspondence $\hat{I} \cong I$, which identifies $\dot{\preceq}$ with \preceq by the conditions in (70). Uniqueness in Theorem 4.8 then shows that $(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\iota}, \hat{\pi})$ is canonically isomorphic to $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})$.

We have proved that for each $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ there is, up to canonical isomorphism, *exactly one* set of data I, \leq, κ, ψ satisfying the conditions in (70) with *one* point $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \in \mathcal{M}_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ with $Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi)$: $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \mapsto [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)].$

However, this does *not* mean that $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ lies in the image of only one $Q(I, \preceq, J, \leq, \psi)$ in (70), as the sum is not over isomorphism classes of $(I, \preceq, \kappa, \psi)$, but instead over isomorphism classes of I, followed by a sum over all (\preceq, κ, ψ) . Suppose $p: I \to I$ is a *permutation*, satisfying $\psi \circ p = \psi$ and $p_*(\preceq) = \preceq$. As $\psi \circ p = \psi$ we see that p takes $I^j \to I^j$. But $\preceq |_{I^j}$ is a *total order*, and so has no nontrivial automorphisms. Thus $p = \operatorname{id}_I$.

Hence the stabilizer of \preceq , ψ in Aut(I) is {id_I}. Therefore, regarding I as fixed as in the first sum of (70), applying Aut(I) to (\preceq, κ, ψ) and $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ gives |I|!distinct sets of data (\preceq, κ, ψ) and $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})]$ with $Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi) : [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \mapsto$ $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. So $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ lies in the image of exactly |I|! distinct $Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi)$ in (70), each taking one point to $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$.

We can now deduce (70). For each $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)] \in \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ there is one set I and |I|! triples (\leq, κ, ψ) in the sum (70) such that there exists a unique $[(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \in \mathcal{M}_{ss}(I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ with $Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi) : [(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\iota}, \tilde{\pi})] \mapsto [(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. As $Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi)$ is injective, each of the |I|! adds 1/|I|! to the l.h.s. of (70) evaluated at $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$. Thus (70) holds at all $[(\sigma, \iota, \pi)]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$.

By substituting (17) and (18) into (70) we write $\delta_{\text{all}}(*), \delta_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(*)$ in terms of $\delta_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(*,\theta), \delta_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(*,\theta)$. In (71)–(74), by $(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa)$ we mean $(\psi^{-1}(\{j\}), \preceq|_{\psi^{-1}(\{j\})}, \kappa|_{\psi^{-1}(\{j\})})$, where $\psi^{-1}(\{j\}) \subseteq I$ is an (I, \preceq) f-set.

Theorem 8.2. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (J, \leq, λ) with $\lambda(J) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{iso, \ classes\\ of finite\\ sets \ I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\substack{\Delta, \kappa, \psi: \ (I, \preceq, \kappa) \ is \ A-data, \\ \psi: \ I \to J \ is \ surjective, \\ i \leq i' \ implies \ \psi(i) \lesssim \psi(i'), \\ \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \ for \ j \in J, \\ (\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa) \ is \ \theta \text{-reversing}, \ j \in J \\ \end{pmatrix}$$

Only finitely many $\delta_{ss}^{b}, \delta_{st}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in these sums are nonzero.

Proof. Substituting (17) into (70) with \leq in place of \leq gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \, \leq, \, \kappa, \, \psi: \, (I, \, \leq, \, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A} \text{-data,}\\ \qquad \leq \text{ dominates } \leq, \\ \psi: I \to J \text{ is surjective,} \\\kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)) = \lambda(j) \text{ for } j \in J, \\\text{if } i, i' \in I \text{ with } \psi(i) \neq \psi(i') \text{ then} \\i \leq i' \text{ if and only if } \psi(i) \leq \psi(i'), \\(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \, \kappa) \text{ totally } \theta \text{-reversing, } j \in J} CF(Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi))$$

$$(75)$$

 $\text{using } \operatorname{CF}(Q(I,\trianglelefteq,J,\lneq,\psi))\circ\operatorname{CF}(Q(I,\preceq,\trianglelefteq))=\operatorname{CF}(Q(I,\preceq,J,\lneq,\psi)).$

Suppose $I, \leq, \leq, \kappa, \psi$ are as in (75). Since $(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa)$ is totally θ -reversing for all $j \in J$, if $\psi(i) = \psi(i')$ then $i \leq i'$ if and only if $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \geq \theta \circ \kappa(j)$. But if $\psi(i) \neq \psi(i')$ then $i \leq i'$ if and only if $\psi(i) \leq \psi(i')$. Hence the partial order \leq on I is uniquely determined by I, κ, ψ and \leq . Thus there is no need to sum over \leq , and we can just sum over I and \leq, κ, ψ as in (71).

The binary relation \leq defined by this recipe is a partial order if and only if $\theta \circ \kappa(i) \neq \theta \circ \kappa(i')$ for $i \neq i' \in I$ with $\psi(i) = \psi(j)$, which follows from $(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa)$ strictly θ -reversing for $j \in J$ in (71). The other conditions on \leq in (71) are equivalent to \leq dominates \leq . Thus (75) gives (71). Equation (72) follows from (71) by the method of Theorem 6.6.

Next we prove (73). Substituting (18) into (70) with K, \leq, μ, ξ in place of I, \leq, κ, ψ respectively gives

$$\delta_{\mathrm{all}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{of finite}\\\mathrm{sets } K}} \frac{1}{|K|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{of finite}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{iso, classes}\\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{sets } I}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{if} | I| \\\mathrm{sets } I \\\mathrm{set$$

using $\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi)) = \operatorname{CF}(Q(K, \trianglelefteq, J, \lesssim, \xi)) \circ \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi))$, and

setting $\psi = \xi \circ \phi$. The next two paragraphs explain how we have rewritten the sums in (76).

In the second sum in the third line we combine $[i \leq i' \text{ implies } \phi(i) \leq \phi(i')]$ and $[k \leq k' \text{ implies } \xi(k) \leq \xi(k')]$ to deduce $[i \leq i' \text{ implies } \psi(i) \leq \psi(i')]$. In the fourth line of (76) we use the fact that $\mu(k) = \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k))$ determines μ given κ , so there is no need to sum over μ . The condition $[(\xi^{-1}(j), \leq, \mu) \text{ totally } \theta\text{-reversing},$ $j \in J]$ can only hold if $[k \neq k' \in K, \xi(k) = \xi(k') \text{ implies } \theta \circ \mu(k) \neq \theta \circ \mu(k')]$, which we put in the fourth line.

With this assumption, the conditions $[(\xi^{-1}(j), \leq, \mu) \text{ totally } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J]$ and $[\text{if } k, k' \in K, \xi(k) \neq \xi(k') \text{ then } k \leq k' \text{ if and only if } \xi(k) \leq \xi(k')]$ hold for a unique partial order \leq on K, which we define in the fourth line. Thus there is no need to sum over \leq . With this definition of \leq , the condition $[i \leq i' \text{ implies} \phi(i) \leq \phi(i')]$ holds if and only if $(\psi^{-1}(j), \leq, \kappa)$ is $\theta\text{-reversing for } j \in J$, so we put this in the third line of (76). Finally, (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data implies (K, \leq, μ) is \mathcal{A} -data, so we omit this assumption. This proves (76).

Let I, \leq, κ, ψ be as in the third line of (76). We shall show that the bracketed term on the last line of (76) is 1, which proves (73). Suppose K, ϕ, ξ are as in the fourth line of (76). Define an *equivalence relation* \sim on I by $i \sim i'$ if $\phi(i) = \phi(i')$. If $i \sim i'$ then $\phi(i) = \phi(i')$, so $\psi(i) = \psi(i')$ as $\psi = \xi \circ \phi$. Also $\theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]$ gives $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta \circ \kappa(i')$.

If $i \not\sim i'$ and $\psi(i) = \psi(i')$ then setting $k = \phi(i)$, $k' = \phi(i')$ gives $\xi(k) = \xi(k')$, and so $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta \circ \mu(k) \neq \theta \circ \mu(k') = \theta \circ \kappa(i')$, using $\theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]$ and $[k \neq k' \in K, \xi(k) = \xi(k') \text{ implies } \theta \circ \mu(k) \neq \theta \circ \mu(k')]$. This proves that

$$i \sim i'$$
 if and only if $\psi(i) = \psi(i')$ and $\theta \circ \kappa(i) = \theta \circ \kappa(i')$. (77)

Now (77) is *independent* of the choice of K, ϕ, ξ . Taking (77) as the *definition* of \sim , write [i] for the \sim -equivalence class of $i \in I$, and set $K' = \{[i] : i \in I\}$, and $\phi' : I \to K'$ by $\phi'(i) = [i]$, and $\xi' : K' \to J$ by $\xi'([i]) = \psi(i)$. Then K', ϕ', ξ' are well-defined and satisfy the conditions on the last line of (76), and any K, ϕ, ξ which do are canonically isomorphic to K', ϕ', ξ' .

Thus, any K, ϕ, ξ in the last line have |K| = |K'|. The first sum on the last line selects a unique set K with |K| = |K'|. There are then |K|! distinct bijections $b: K \to K'$, each of which give a pair $\phi = b^{-1} \circ \phi', \xi = \xi' \circ b$ in the second sum in the last line. These |K|! pairs ϕ, ξ are distinct, and the only possibilities. So the bracketed term on the last line of (76) is $(1/|K|!) \cdot |K|! = 1$, which proves (73). Finally, (74) follows from (73) by the method of Theorem 6.6.

To invert the identities of Theorem 8.2 we will need the following *finiteness* result, analogous to Proposition 5.5.

Proposition 8.3. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with phase θ , and let (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data with $\kappa(I) = [X]$. Then there exists a finite subset $Q \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ such that whenever (σ, ι, π) is an (I, \preceq, κ) -configuration in \mathcal{A} with $\sigma(I) = X$, and $Y = \sigma(\{i\})$ for some $i \in I$, and $0 \neq S \subset Y$ is a subobject with $\theta([S]) \ge \theta([Y])$, then $[S] \in Q$.

Proof. Let $P \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ be as in Proposition 5.5. Let $(\sigma, \iota, \pi), i, Y$ and S be as in the proposition. Let $W \in \mathcal{A}$ represent the quotient object Y/S, so that $[W] = [Y] - [S] = \kappa(i) - [S]$. By choosing Q to contain $\kappa(I)$ the condition $[S] \in Q$ is automatic if $W \cong 0$, so suppose $W \not\cong 0$. Then $\theta([S]) \ge \theta([Y])$ implies $\theta([Y]) \ge \theta([W])$. Also, if $\theta(Y) = 1$ then S is automatically θ -semistable with $\theta([S]) = 1$, and it follows from the proof of Proposition 5.5 that $[S] \in P$. So by choosing Q to contain P we can suppose $\theta([Y]) < 1$.

Let the θ -semistable factors of Y in the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of Theorem 2.10 be T_1, \ldots, T_m , and of W be U_1, \ldots, U_n . Then $m, n \ge 1$, and Proposition 5.5 gives $[T_m] \in P$. But T_m is the nonzero quotient object of Y of least phase. As W and U_n are both nonzero quotient objects of Y, we see that

$$0 < \min_{\alpha \in P} \theta(\alpha) \leq \theta([T_m]) \leq \theta([U_n]) \leq \theta([U_j]) \leq 1 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$
(78)

But we also have $\operatorname{Im} Z([U_i]) \ge 0$ and

$$\operatorname{Im} Z([U_1]) + \dots + \operatorname{Im} Z([U_n]) = \operatorname{Im} Z([W]) \leq \operatorname{Im} Z([Y]),$$

$$\operatorname{Re} Z([U_1]) + \dots + \operatorname{Re} Z([U_n]) = \operatorname{Re} Z([W]) \geq \min(\operatorname{Re} Z([Y]), 0),$$

where $\operatorname{Re} Z([W]) \ge \min(\operatorname{Re} Z([Y]), 0)$ as $\theta([Y]) \ge \theta([W])$. These inequalities imply that $Z([U_1]), \ldots, Z([U_n])$ lie in a *bounded* subset of \mathbb{C} . That is, there exists R' > 0 depending only on $\mathcal{A}, Z, (I, \preceq, \kappa)$ and P such that $|Z([U_j])| \le R'$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

Definition 5.4 then gives a *finite* subset $P' \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ depending only on $\mathcal{A}, Z, (I, \leq, \kappa)$ and P such that $[U_j] \in P'$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Now

$$0 < \min_{\alpha \in P} \theta(\alpha) \leqslant \theta([T_m]) \leqslant \theta([W]) \leqslant \theta([Y]) \leqslant \max_{i \in I: \theta \circ \kappa(i) < 1} \theta \circ \kappa(i) < 1,$$

as W is a quotient object of Y, and

$$0 \leq \operatorname{Im} Z([W]) \leq \operatorname{Im} Z([Y]) \leq \max_{i \in I} \operatorname{Im} Z(\kappa(i)).$$

Hence Z([W]) also lies in a bounded region of \mathbb{C} . That is, there exists R'' > 0 depending only on $\mathcal{A}, Z, (I, \leq, \kappa)$ and P such that $|Z([W])| \leq R''$.

Combining $[U_j] \in P'$ with P' finite, $[U_1] + \cdots + [U_n] = [W], |Z([W])| \leq R''$, and (78), shows that there are only finitely many possibilities for n and $[U_1], \ldots, [U_n]$. Thus there are only finitely many possibilities for [W] and for [S] = [Y] - [W], and we can choose Q satisfying the conditions.

Next we show how to write $\delta^{\,\rm b}_{\rm st}(*,\theta), \delta^{\,\rm b}_{\rm ss}(*,\theta)$ in terms of $\delta^{\,\rm b}_{\rm all}(*)$. Note that in the last part we specify $\delta_{\rm all}(*)$ although the sums involve $\delta^{\,\rm b}_{\rm all}(*)$. This is all right, as $\delta^{\,\rm b}_{\rm all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ nonzero implies $\delta_{\rm all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ is nonzero.

Theorem 8.4. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data

 $(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$ with $\mu(K) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\\classes\\of finite\\sets J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\leq,\lambda,\xi: \ (J,\leq,\lambda) \ is \ A-data,\\(J,\leq,K,\xi) \ is \ allowable,\\\Delta(\xi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \ for \ k \in K}} U^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(J,\leq,\lambda,K,\xi,\theta) \cdot CF(Q(J,\leq,K,\leq,\xi))$$

$$CF(Q(J,\leq,K,\leq,\xi)) \quad \delta^{\rm b}_{\rm all}(X,J,\leq,\lambda) = \delta^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(X,K,\leq,\mu,\theta),$$

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\\classes\\of \ finite\\sets \ J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\leq,\lambda,\xi: \ (J,\leq,\lambda) \ is \ A-data,\\(J,\leq,K,\xi) \ is \ allowable,\\\leq = \mathcal{P}(J,\leq,K,\xi),\\\lambda(\xi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \ for \ k \in K}} U^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(J,\leq,\lambda,K,\xi,\theta) \cdot CF(Q(J,\leq,K,\leq,\theta))$$

$$CF(Q(J,\leq,K,\xi,\theta)) \quad CF(Q(J,\leq,K,\leq,\xi)) \quad \delta^{\rm b}_{\rm all}(X,J,\leq,\lambda) = \delta^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(X,K,\leq,\mu,\theta).$$

$$(80)$$

There are only finitely many terms in each sum with $U_{st}^{b}, U_{ss}^{b}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ and $\delta_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ both nonzero.

Proof. We begin with the last part. Let $Q \subset K(\mathcal{A})$ be the finite subset given by Proposition 8.3 with (K, \leq, μ) in place of (I, \leq, κ) . Suppose J, \leq, λ, ξ are as in (79) with $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{all}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ both nonzero. Write $J_k =$ $\xi^{-1}(k)$ for $k \in K$. Then $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta) \neq 0$ for all $k \in K$ by (60). Theorem 7.19 therefore shows that $E_{\mathrm{st}}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$ separates J_k for all $k \in K$.

Suppose $k \in K$ and $A \in E_{st}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$. Then A is a (J_k, \leq) s-set with $\emptyset \neq A \neq J_k$, and $\theta \circ \lambda(A) \geq \theta \circ \lambda(J_k) = \theta \circ \mu(k)$. As $\delta_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ is nonzero we can choose $(\sigma', \iota', \pi') \in \mathcal{M}_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$. Let (σ, ι, π) be the quotient (K, \leq) -configuration from ξ . Set $Y = \sigma(\{k\})$, and let $S \subset Y$ be the subobject represented by $\iota'(A, J_k) : \sigma'(A) \to \sigma'(J_k) = \sigma(\{k\}) = Y$. Then $\theta([S]) = \theta \circ \lambda(A)$ and $\theta([Y]) = \theta \circ \mu(k)$, so $\theta([S]) \geq \theta([Y])$ by definition of $E_{st}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$. Proposition 8.3 thus shows that $\lambda(A) = [S] \in Q$.

Hence, for all $k \in K$ and $A \in E_{\rm st}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$, we have $\lambda(A) \in Q$, a finite set. Since $E_{\rm st}(J_k, \leq, \lambda, \theta)$ separates J_k and $\lambda(J_k) = \mu(k)$ is fixed, it is not difficult to see that there are only finitely many possibilities, up to isomorphism, for J_k and $\lambda|_{J_k}$, and hence for J, λ . Therefore there are only finitely many terms in (79) with $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ and $\delta_{\rm all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ both nonzero. The same proof also works for (80).

Substituting (74) into the left hand side of (79) and using (45) with K, ϕ, ξ, θ in place of $L, \xi, \zeta, \tilde{\theta}$, we find that the left hand side of (79) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\,\kappa,\,\phi:\ (I,\,\preceq,\,\kappa) \text{ is }\mathcal{A}\text{-data},\\(I,\,\preceq,\,K,\,\phi) \text{ is allowable},\\\varphi = \mathcal{P}(I,\,\preceq,\,K,\,\phi),\\\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K}} T^{\text{b}}_{\text{st}}(I,\,\preceq,\,\kappa,K,\phi,\theta,\theta).$$
(81)

Here as $\phi = \xi \circ \psi$ and (I, \preceq, J, ψ) is allowable with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi)$, by Lemma 6.5 we see that (I, \preceq, K, ϕ) is allowable with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \phi)$ if and only if (J, \leq, K, ξ) is allowable with $\leq = \mathcal{P}(J, \leq, K, \xi)$.

We should also consider the question of whether the sums involved in proving (81) are all finite sums, for if rearranging sums involving infinitely many nonzero terms were involved, that would invalidate the proof. From above, there are only finitely many terms in (79) with $U_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ and $\delta_{\rm all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ both nonzero. For each of these J, \leq, λ , only finitely many $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ are nonzero in (74), by Theorem 8.2.

Considering the quotient map $Q(I, \leq, \kappa, J, \leq, \psi)$, we see that $\delta_{st}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ nonzero implies $\delta_{all}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ is nonzero. Hence, when we substitute (74) into the left hand side of (79) there are only finitely many possibilities for $I, \leq, \kappa, J, \leq, \lambda, \psi, \xi$ with $\delta_{st}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ and $U_{st}^{b}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ both nonzero. Therefore, restricting to (I, \leq, κ) with $\delta_{st}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ nonzero in (81), and to $J, \leq, \lambda, \psi, \xi$ with $U_{st}^{b}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ nonzero in (45), we see that the proof of (81) involves only finite sums of nonzero terms, and so is valid.

Now Theorem 7.14 shows that $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \theta) = 1$ if ϕ is a bijection and 0 otherwise. If ϕ is a bijection then |I| = |K|. The first sum in (81) fixes a unique set I with |I| = |K|, and there are then |I|! bijections $\phi : I \to K$. For each of these we must have $\leq = \phi^{-1}(\leq)$ and $\kappa = \mu \circ \phi$, and then $\operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \leq, K, \leq, \phi))\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = \delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, K, \leq, \mu, \theta)$. Cancelling factors of |I|!, equation (81) reduces to $\delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, K, \leq, \mu, \theta)$, which proves (79). To prove (80) we substitute (72) into the left hand side of (80), use (46) with K, ϕ, ξ, θ in place of $L, \xi, \zeta, \tilde{\theta}$, and proceed in the same way.

Finally, we prove the main result of this section, which writes $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ in terms of $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, \delta_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(*, \theta)$, a transformation law from Z, θ to $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\theta}$.

Theorem 8.5. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z, \tilde{Z} be permissible slope functions on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (K, \leq, μ) with $\mu(K) = [X]$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\\classes\\of finite\\sets I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\kappa,\phi: \ (I, \preceq,\kappa) \ is \ A-data,\\(I, \preceq, K, \phi) \ is \ allowable,\\\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \ for \ k \in K}} T^{b}_{st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta}).$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \triangleleft, \phi))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \triangleleft, \phi))$$

$$\delta^{b}_{st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) =$$

$$\delta^{b}_{st}(X, K, \triangleleft, \mu, \tilde{\theta}),$$

$$T^{b}_{ss}(I, \preceq, K, \varphi, \theta, \theta)$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \triangleleft, \phi))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \neg, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \neg, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \varphi, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \varphi, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \varphi, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \neg, \theta))$$

$$CF(Q(I, \preceq, K, \neg, \theta))$$

$$\delta^{b}_{ss}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) =$$

$$\delta^{b}_{ss}(X, K, \triangleleft, \mu, \tilde{\theta}).$$

$$(83)$$

There are only finitely many terms in each sum with $T_{st}^{b}, T_{ss}^{b}(I, \leq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\delta_{st}^{b}, \delta_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ both nonzero.

Proof. Substituting (74) into the left hand side of (79) with $\hat{\theta}$ in place of θ gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\text{classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \phi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data,}\\(I, \preceq, K, \phi) \text{ is allowable,}\\\exists = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, K, \phi),\\\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K}} \operatorname{CF}\left(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)\right)$$

$$\left[\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\text{classes}\\\text{of finite}\\\text{sets }J}} \frac{1}{|J|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi: I \to J, \ \xi: \ J \to K \text{ surjective, } \phi = \xi \circ \psi:\\(I, \preceq, J, \psi) \text{ is allowable, } \lesssim = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq, J, \psi),\\\text{let } \lambda: \ J \to K(\mathcal{A}) \text{ be } \lambda(j) = \kappa(\psi^{-1}(j)),\\(\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J}\right] = \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu, \tilde{\theta}),$$

$$\left[\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\psi^{-1}(j), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\psi: I \to J, \ \xi: \ J \to K \text{ surjective, } \phi = \xi \circ \psi:\\(\eta^{-1}(j), \preccurlyeq, \kappa) \text{ is } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J}} \operatorname{CF}\left(Q(I, \preceq, K, \triangleleft, \phi, \phi)\right)$$

$$\left[\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\\psi^{-1}(j), \preccurlyeq, \kappa \text{ is } \theta\text{-reversing, } j \in J}} \operatorname{CF}\left(Q(I, \preceq, K, \triangleleft, \phi, \phi)\right)\right]$$

 $\text{using } \operatorname{CF}(Q(J, \lesssim, K, \trianglelefteq, \xi)) \circ \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, J, \lesssim, \psi)) = \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi)).$

Theorem 8.4 shows that there are only finitely many J, \leq, λ, ξ in (84) with $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{all}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ both nonzero. For each of these, there are only finitely many I, \leq, κ, ψ in (84) with $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ nonzero, by Theorem 8.2. Considering $Q(I, \leq, J, \leq, \psi)$ shows that if $\delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ is nonzero then $\delta_{\mathrm{all}}(X, J, \leq, \lambda)$ is nonzero. Hence there are only finitely many possibilities for $I, \leq, \kappa, \phi, J, \psi, \xi$ in (84) with $U_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(J, \leq, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta), \delta_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ both nonzero.

Now by (45), the bracketed term $[\cdots]$ in (84) is $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$. Thus (84) reduces to (82), as we have to prove. Clearly, $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ is nonzero only if some $U^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(J, \lesssim, \lambda, K, \xi, \theta)$ in $[\cdots]$ is nonzero. So there are only finitely many terms in (82) with $T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\delta^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ both nonzero. For (83) we substitute (72) into the left hand side of (80) with $\tilde{\theta}$ in place of θ , and use (46) in the same way.

9 Invariants and their transformation laws

We define *invariants* of \mathcal{A}, X by taking *Euler characteristics* of moduli spaces.

Definition 9.1. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2. Suppose $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and Z is a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X, with phase θ . Let (I, \preceq, κ) be \mathcal{A} -data with $\kappa(I) = [X]$. Then $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ is a *complex quasi-projective variety*, and $\mathcal{M}_{all}^{b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$, $\mathcal{M}_{st}, \mathcal{M}_{st}, \mathcal{M}_{st}^{b}, \mathcal{M}_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ are *constructible subsets* of $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa)$ by Theorem 5.10(i), (iii), (v). Define

$$I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \chi \big(\mathcal{M}_{\rm st}, \mathcal{M}_{\rm ss}, \mathcal{M}_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, \mathcal{M}_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \big), \qquad (85)$$

and
$$I_{\text{all}}, I_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa) = \chi(\mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa))$$
 respectively. (86)

By Definitions 3.8 and 5.8 we see that we can write $I_{st}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ as a weighted Euler characteristic by

$$I_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \chi \big(\mathcal{M}_{\rm all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa), \delta_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) \big), \tag{87}$$

and similarly for $I_{ss}, I_{st}^{b}, I_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$. If (I, \leq, κ) is \mathcal{A} -data and (I, \leq, K, ϕ) is allowable then Definition 5.9 defines $Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi) : \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) \to$ $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, K, \triangleleft, \mu)$, which is a morphism of varieties by Theorem 5.10(ii). So by (87) and Corollary 3.10 we see that

$$I_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \chi\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\rm all}(X, K, \trianglelefteq, \mu), \operatorname{CF}(Q(I, \preceq, K, \trianglelefteq, \phi))\delta_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)\Big),$$
(88)

and similarly for $I_{ss}, I_{st}^{b}, I_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ and $I_{all}, I_{all}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$. By taking weighted Euler characteristics of both sides of the identities involving $\delta_{\rm st}, \delta_{\rm ss}, \delta_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, \delta_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ in §5.3, §6 and §8 and using (87) and (88) we immediately obtain identities between the $I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ and $I_{\text{all}}, I_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$. Equations (15)–(17) of Theorem 5.11 and (21)–(23) of Theorem 6.3 give:

Theorem 9.2. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on A with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all A-data $(I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa)$ with $[X] = \kappa(I)$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \ \preceq \ on \ I: \\ \trianglelefteq \ dominates \ \preceq}} I^{\rm b}_{\rm all}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = I_{\rm all}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa), \tag{89}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \leq on \ I: \\ \lhd \ dominates \ \prec}} I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{\rm st}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta), \tag{90}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{o.s \leq on \ I:}} I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{\rm ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta), \tag{91}$$

 $p.o.s \preceq on I:$ $\triangleleft dominates \prec$

p.

$$\sum_{\substack{p.o.s \preceq \text{ on } I: \\ \trianglelefteq \text{ dominates } \preceq}} n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) I_{\text{all}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa) = I_{\text{all}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa), \tag{92}$$

$$\sum_{o.s \prec on I:} n(I, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) I_{\rm st}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(X, I, \trianglelefteq, \kappa, \theta), \tag{93}$$

$$\leq dominates \leq \sum_{n, \rho, s, \prec, q, n} n(I, \leq, \leq) I_{ss}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta).$$
(94)

$$\begin{array}{c} p.o.s \preceq on \ I: \\ \trianglelefteq \ dominates \preceq \end{array}$$

Treating identities (18), (24) and (33) of Theorems 5.12, 6.6 and 6.10 the same way and relabelling proves:

Theorem 9.3. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on A with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all A-data $(K, \trianglelefteq, \mu)$ with $[X] = \mu(K)$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\phi:\\ 0 \neq I \to K \text{ is surjective,}\\ i \leq j \text{ implies } \phi(i) \leq \phi(j),\\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K,\\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]}} I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = \left(95\right)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ \text{classes}\\ of \text{ finite}\\ \text{sets } I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\phi:\\ (I, \preceq,\kappa,\phi) \text{ is } A\text{-data,}\\ (I, \preceq,K,\phi) \text{ is } allowable,}} I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq,\kappa,\theta) = \left(1, \pm, \kappa, \theta\right), \\ \alpha \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]} I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, K, \leq \mu, \theta), \quad (96)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso.}\\ (I, \preceq,K,\phi) \text{ is } allowable,}\\ \text{sets } I} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\leq,\kappa,\phi:\\ (I, \preceq,\kappa,\phi) \text{ is } A\text{-data,},\\ \theta \circ \mu \circ \phi \equiv \theta \circ \kappa : I \to (0, 1]}} N(I, \preceq, \kappa, \phi) I_{\text{ss}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, K, \leq \mu, \theta), \quad (97)$$

Only finitely many $I_{\mathrm{st}}^{\mathrm{b}}, I_{\mathrm{ss}}^{\mathrm{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ in these sums are nonzero.

As in (35), we have constructed seven transformations between the four families of invariants $I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$. The equation numbers giving the transformations are displayed below.

$$I_{\rm st}(*,\theta) \underbrace{\begin{array}{c}(93)\\I_{\rm st}(*,\theta)\end{array}}_{(90)} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c}(96)\\I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*,\theta)\end{array}}_{(97)} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c}(95)\\(91)\\I_{\rm ss}(*,\theta)\end{array}}_{(94)} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c}(93)\\I_{\rm ss}(*,\theta)\end{array}}_{(98)}$$

By combining these equations one can also write down the other five transformation rules. These show that knowing any one of the four families of invariants $I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ completely determines the other three.

Treating equations (70) of Theorem 8.1, (71)–(74) of Theorem 8.2 and (79)–(80) of Theorem 8.4 the same way and relabelling, we deduce transformations between $I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ and $I_{\rm all}, I_{\rm all}^{\rm b}(*)$.

Theorem 9.4. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z be a permissible slope function on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phase θ . Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (K, \leq, μ) with $[X] = \mu(K)$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{iso. classes}\\ \text{of finite}\\ \text{sets }I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq, \kappa, \phi: (I, \preceq, \kappa) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-data}, \\ \phi: I \to K \text{ is surjective}, \\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \text{ for } k \in K, \\ \text{if } i, i' \in I \text{ with } \phi(i) \neq \phi(i') \text{ then} \\ i \leq i' \text{ if and only if } \phi(i) \leq \phi(i'), \\ (\phi^{-1}(k), \preceq, \kappa) \text{ totally } \theta\text{-reversing, } k \in K \end{cases}} I_{\text{ss}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta) = I_{\text{all}}(X, K, \triangleleft, \mu),$$

$$(99)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\ classes\\ of finite\\ sets I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\kappa,\phi:\ (I,\preceq,\kappa)\ is\ A-data,\\ \phi:\ I\to K\ is\ surjective,\\ i\leq i'\ implies\ \phi(i)\ \leq\ \phi(i'),\\ \kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k)\ for\ k\in K,\\ (\phi^{-1}(k), = \mu(k)\ for\ k\in K,\\ (\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k)\ for\ k\in K,\\ (\phi^{-1}$$

In (99)–(103), only finitely many I_{ss} , I_{st}^{b} , $I_{ss}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ are nonzero. In (104)–(105), only finitely many terms in each sum have U_{st}^{b} , $U_{ss}^{b}(I, \leq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta)$ and $I_{all}^{b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ both nonzero.

In the same way, from Theorem 8.5 we deduce transformation laws from $I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \theta)$ to $I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*, \tilde{\theta})$ for permissible Z, \tilde{Z} with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$.

Theorem 9.5. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy Assumption 5.2, let $X \in \mathcal{A}$, and Z, \tilde{Z} be permissible slope functions on \mathcal{A} with respect to X with phases $\theta, \tilde{\theta}$. Then for all \mathcal{A} -data (K, \leq, μ) with $[X] = \mu(K)$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\\classes\\off finite\\sets I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\kappa,\phi: \ (I, \preceq,\kappa) \ is \ A-data,\\(I, \preceq,K,\phi) \ is \ allowable,\\ \leq = \mathcal{P}(I, \preceq,K,\phi),\\\kappa(\phi^{-1}(k)) = \mu(k) \ for \ k \in K}} T^{\rm b}_{\rm st}(I, \preceq,\kappa,K,\phi,\theta,\tilde{\theta}).$$
(106)

$$\sum_{\substack{iso.\\classes\\of finite\\sets I}} \frac{1}{|I|!} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\preceq,\kappa,\phi: \ (I,\leq,\kappa) \ is \ \mathcal{A}-data,\\(I,\leq,K,\phi) \ is \ allowable,\\sets I}} T^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(I,\leq,\kappa,K,\phi,\theta,\tilde{\theta}) \cdot I^{\rm b}_{\rm ss}(X,I,\leq,\kappa,\theta) = (107)$$

There are only finitely many terms in each sum with $T_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, T_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(I, \leq, \kappa, K, \phi, \theta, \tilde{\theta})$ and $I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(X, I, \leq, \kappa, \theta)$ both nonzero.

9.1 Conclusions

Now we have defined our invariants I_{st} , I_{ss} , I_{st}^{b} , I_{sl} , I_{all} , $I_{all}^{b}(*)$, and found lots of pretty identities relating them, we should ask the question: what are these invariants good for? Why are they interesting?

Actually, the author regards these invariants primarily as an easier introduction before tackling the invariants we will introduce in [6], which come from moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(I, \leq, \kappa)$ of (I, \leq, κ) -configurations (σ, ι, π) in \mathcal{A} where we do not fix $\sigma(I) = X$ for some $X \in \mathcal{A}$. Since this involves lots of rather difficult questions on the structure of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{all}(I, \leq, \kappa)$, we prefer to handle the combinatorial issues in this paper for the easier $\mathcal{M}_{all}(X, I, \leq, \kappa)$ spaces, and then concentrate on moduli space questions for $\mathcal{M}_{all}(I, \leq, \kappa)$ in [6].

However, the invariants above do have some interest of their own. For example, let $\mathcal{A}, X, Z, \theta$ be as above, let $(\{0\}, \leqslant)$ be the one point poset, and define $\kappa(0) = [X]$. Then $I_{\text{st}}, I_{\text{ss}}(X, \{0\}, \leqslant, \kappa, \theta)$ are 1 if X is θ -(semi)stable, and 0 otherwise. Hence, if we know the invariants $I_{\text{st}}^{\text{b}}(X, I, \preceq, \kappa, \theta)$ for all (I, \preceq, κ) and one fixed slope function Z, θ , then using Theorems 9.2, 9.3 and 9.5 we can calculate whether or not X is $\tilde{\theta}$ -(semi)stable for all other permissible slope functions \tilde{Z} w.r.t. X with phase $\tilde{\theta}$. More generally, we can calculate the classes in $K(\mathcal{A})$ of the $\tilde{\theta}$ -semistable factors S_1, \ldots, S_n of X given by Theorem 2.10.

Moreover, the identities of Theorems 9.2–9.5 have a universal character. The invariants we define in [6] will satisfy exactly the same identities, although they are defined using different moduli spaces. In [6] we shall also explain how to introduce more complicated invariants which keep track not just of Euler characteristics of moduli spaces, but also of virtual Hodge polynomials, or classes of moduli spaces in $K_0(\text{Var}_{\mathbb{C}})$.

Then the invariants $I_{\rm st}, I_{\rm ss}, I_{\rm st}^{\rm b}, I_{\rm ss}^{\rm b}(*)$ take values in a ring rather than \mathbb{Z} , but they still satisfy the identities above. The author expects the identities of Theorems 9.2–9.5 to hold for invariants defined by 'counting' configurations in all kinds of situations, even those quite remote from the moduli spaces over \mathbb{C} considered here and in [6].

References

 T. Bridgeland, Stability conditions on triangulated categories, math.AG/0212237, version 2, 2003.

- [2] S.I. Gelfand and Y.I. Manin, *Methods of Homological Algebra*, second edition, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [3] G. Harder and M.S. Narasimhan, On the Cohomology Groups of Moduli Spaces of Vector Bundles on Curves, Math. Ann. 212 (1975), 215–248.
- [4] R. Hartshorne, Algebraic Geometry, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 52, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [5] D.D. Joyce, Configurations in abelian categories. I. Basic properties, math.AG/0312190, 2003.
- [6] D.D. Joyce, Configurations in abelian categories. III. Stability conditions and invariants, in preparation, 2004.
- [7] D.D. Joyce, in preparation, 2004.
- [8] G. Kennedy, MacPherson's Chern classes of singular algebraic varieties, Communications in Algebra 18 (1990), 2821–2839.
- R.D. MacPherson, Chern classes for singular algebraic varieties, Ann. Math. 100 (1974), 423–432.
- [10] D. Mumford, The Red Book of Varieties and Schemes, second edition, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1358, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [11] N. Popescu, Abelian Categories with Applications to Rings and Modules, L.M.S. Monographs 3, Academic Press, London, 1973.
- [12] A. Rudakov, Stability for an Abelian Category, Journal of Algebra 197 (1997), 231–245.
- [13] C. Sabbah, Quelques remarques sur la géométrie des espaces conormaux, Asterisque 130 (1985), 161–192.
- [14] C.S. Seshadri, Space of unitary vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface, Ann. Math. 85 (1967), 303–336.
- [15] O.Y. Viro, Some integral calculus based on Euler characteristic, pages 127– 138 in Topology and Geometry – Rohlin seminar, editor O.Y. Viro, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1346, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.