

# CATEGORICAL RESOLUTIONS OF CURVES AND BRIDGELAND STABILITY

NICOLÁS VILCHES

ABSTRACT. Categorical resolutions of singularities are a replacement of resolution of singularities within the realm of triangulated categories. They allow the study of the derived category of a singular variety  $X$  via a triangulated category that behaves like the derived category of a smooth variety.

We follow these ideas to study the bounded derived category of a singular, reduced curve  $C$  (with arbitrary singularities and number of components). We start by describing an explicit categorical resolution of singularities, specializing a general construction of Kuznetsov and Lunts. We prove the existence of Bridgeland stability conditions on these categories. As a consequence, we get the existence of proper, good moduli spaces of semistable objects. If the curve  $C$  is irreducible, then we relate these moduli spaces to the moduli of slope-semistable torsion-free sheaves on  $C$ , and to the moduli of slope-semistable vector bundles on the (geometric) resolution  $\tilde{C}$ . This extends classical constructions by Oda and Seshadri, Bhosle and many others.

Finally, we use these results to give explicit descriptions of the moduli of torsion-free sheaves on a curve with a single node, cusp, or tacnode.

## CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction  | 1  |
| 2. Non-rational loci of curves and conductors                  | 5  |
| 3. Generalized Auslander algebras for zero-dimensional schemes | 8  |
| 4. Categorical resolution                                      | 10 |
| 5. Stability conditions  | 16 |
| 6. Existence of moduli spaces                                  | 22 |
| 7. Comparison  | 25 |
| 8. Nodes and cusps   | 29 |
| 9. Tacnodes  | 36 |
| References   | 43 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Moduli spaces of vector bundles on curves are one of the most studied objects in algebraic geometry. Given a smooth, projective curve  $C$ , there is a moduli space  $M_C(r, d)$  parametrizing (S-equivalence classes of) slope-semistable vector bundles on  $C$  with rank  $r$  and degree  $d$ . Their basic structure is well understood: for  $(r, d)$  coprime and  $g \geq 2$ , they are smooth, projective moduli spaces of dimension  $r^2(g - 1) + 1$ . We refer to [Ses82] for a discussion on their basic properties.

The situation varies significantly if  $C$  is allowed to have singularities, as the moduli space of semistable vector bundles becomes non-projective. Instead, we consider the moduli space of pure dimension one sheaves. And although the resulting moduli spaces  $M_C(r, d)$  are projective, they are no longer smooth (even in the case  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ ), and they can have multiple components (cf. [AIK77, TiB91]).

Nevertheless, much progress has been made to unveil the structure of the moduli spaces  $M_C(r, d)$ . The basic strategy is to relate torsion-free sheaves on  $C$  with vector bundles on the resolution  $s: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ , plus some additional gluing data. This has been extensively studied when  $C$  has nodes; see for example [Ses82, OS79, TiB91, BB14, FB21].

Our goal is to discuss a different approach from the point of view of derived categories. The first technical issue that arises is that  $D^b(\tilde{C})$  is inadequate to study  $D^b(C)$ , as the pullback  $Ls^*: D^b(C) \rightarrow D^-(\tilde{C})$  is not fully faithful.

One way of circumventing this difficulty is to use a *categorical resolution of singularities*: a smooth dg-category  $\mathcal{D}$  endowed with functors  $R\pi_*: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow D(C)$ ,  $L\pi^*: D(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  satisfying  $R\pi_* \circ L\pi^* = \text{id}$ . We refer to [Lun01, Lun10, KL15, KK15, BD11, BDG01] for various discussions of this notion, and to Subsection 4.5.

For singular curves, a small modification of the general procedure of [KL15] gives a categorical resolution of singularities  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$ , depending on the choice of a *non-rational locus*  $T \subset C$ . This is a subscheme of  $C$ , supported at  $\text{Sing}(C)$ , that measures the difference between  $C$  and its resolution  $\tilde{C}$ . We point out that the scheme-theoretic support of  $\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} / \mathcal{O}_C$  is contained in any non-rational locus. We also fix some integer  $e$  such that  $I^e = 0$ , where  $I$  is the radical of  $T$ .

From here, we wish to find an adequate replacement of slope semistability on the categorical resolution. The most natural option is to look for a Bridgeland stability condition on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ . Not only this gives a notion of semistability for objects on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ ; it also gives us the existence of moduli spaces. In our case, we get the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $C$  be a reduced, projective curve, and let  $T, e$  be as above.*

- (1) *There exists a categorical resolution of singularities  $D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  is a sheaf of non-commutative algebras on  $C$  depending on  $T$  and  $e$ .*
- (2) *We have that  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{2n+me}$ , where  $n$  is the number of irreducible components of  $C$ , and  $m$  the number of singular points. There is a distinguished basis of  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})^\vee$  denoted by  $E \mapsto \deg_k(E), \text{rk}_k(E), \ell_{ij}(E)$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n, 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq e$ .*
- (3) *There is a heart of a bounded  $t$ -structure  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq D^b(\mathcal{R})$  and an open, connected subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{3n+me}$  satisfying the following. For any  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij}) \in \Omega$ , the pair  $\sigma = (\mathcal{C}, Z)$  defines a Bridgeland stability condition on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ , where  $Z$  is given by the formula*

$$Z(E) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^e \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) - \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k \deg_k(E) + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \text{rk}_k(E) + i \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \text{rk}_k(E).$$

- (4) *For any  $\sigma$  as in (3) and any  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$ , there is an algebraic stack  $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$  parametrizing  $\sigma_t$ -semistable objects with numerical class  $v$ , admitting a proper, good moduli space  $M_\sigma(v)$ .*

*Proof.* Part (1) is Subsection 4.5; part (2) is Subsection 5.1; part (3) follows from Corollary 5.14; part (4) is Theorem 6.1.  $\square$

We point out that  $C$  is allowed to have arbitrary singularities. In particular,  $C$  does not need to have locally planar singularities.

One should think of the moduli spaces  $M_\sigma(v)$  as “interpolating” between moduli spaces of torsion-free sheaves on  $C$  and moduli spaces of vector bundles on  $\tilde{C}$ . One justification for this philosophy is given by the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $C$  be a reduced, irreducible, projective curve. Fix  $T, e$  as above.*

- (1) *There exists a connected, open subset  $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^{me}$ , and a continuous map  $\Sigma: \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \text{Stab}(\mathcal{R})$ , mapping  $\Delta = (\delta_{ij}) \in \tilde{\Omega}$  to the stability condition  $\sigma = \sigma_\Delta$  with central charge*

$$Z_\Delta(E) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^e \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) - \deg(E) + i \text{rk}(E).$$

*Now, fix  $v$  be a numerical vector with  $\text{rk}(v) > 0$ . Assume that  $v$  is primitive.*

- (2) *There are finitely many walls for  $v$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , and each one of them defines a (non-zero) hyperplane in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . In particular, for  $\sigma \in \tilde{\Omega}$  outside of these hyperplanes, we have that an object  $E$  with numerical class  $v$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable if and only if it is  $\sigma$ -stable.*
- (3) *If  $0 < \delta_{ij} \ll 1$  for all  $i, j$ , then there is a proper map  $M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ .*
- (4) *If  $0 < 1 - \delta_{ie} \ll 1$  for all  $i$ , then there is a proper map  $M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$ , where  $\bar{d} = d + r(p_a(C) - g) - \sum_i \ell_{ie}$ .*
- (5) *Assume that  $v = v(L\pi^*E)$ , where  $E$  is a vector bundle on  $C$ . Then, the map  $M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$  constructed above is an isomorphism over the locus of  $M_C(r, \bar{d})$  parametrizing vector bundles.*

*Proof.* Part (1) is a consequence of Theorem 1.1; see also the discussion at the beginning of Subsection 7. The rest is Theorem 7.2.  $\square$

This result gives us a clear strategy to describe the moduli space  $M_C(r, \bar{d})$ . First, we set  $v = v(L\pi^*E)$ , where  $E \in M_C(r, \bar{d})$ . This way, we look at the moduli spaces  $M_\sigma(v)$ , as we vary  $\sigma \in \tilde{\Omega}$ . Parts (2) and (4) of Theorem 1.3 relate these moduli spaces with  $M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  and  $M_C(r, \bar{d})$ , respectively. From here, we need to carefully describe the modifications at each wall.

We give two sample applications of these ideas. The first one involves a curve with a single node. This recovers classical descriptions, cf. [OS79; Ses82, Chapter 8; Bho96].

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $C$  be an irreducible curve of genus  $g \geq 1$  with a single node or cusp. Let  $D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  be the categorical resolution of singularities from Theorem 1.1. Then there exists a path  $(\sigma_t)_{t \in (0,1)}$  of stability conditions on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  satisfying the following.*

*Fix  $v$  a primitive numerical vector with  $r = \text{rk}(v) > 0$ . Denote  $d = \deg(v)$ ,  $\ell = \ell(v)$ . For each  $t$ , we let  $M_t(v) = M_{\sigma_t}(v)$ .*

- (1) *As we vary  $t \in (0, 1)$ , the moduli spaces  $M_t(v) = M_{\sigma_t}(v)$  are birational. Moreover, for all but finitely many values of  $t$ , we have that  $M_t(v)$  is smooth, projective of dimension  $r^2(g - 1) + 1 + \ell(2r - \ell)$ .*
- (2) *For  $t$  close to zero, we have a proper map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ . If  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ , this map is a  $\text{Gr}(2r, \ell)$ -bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology.*

- (3) For  $t$  close to 1, we have a proper map  $R\pi_*: M_t(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, d+r-\ell)$ . If  $\ell = r$ , this map is birational.
- (4) In the special case  $r = \ell = 1$ , the moduli space  $M_t(v)$  is independent of  $t$ ; the map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle; and the map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_C(1, d)$  is birational.
- (5) In the special case  $r = \ell = 2$  and  $d$  odd, there is a single wall at  $t = 1/2$ . The two moduli spaces  $M_\epsilon(v)$  and  $M_{1-\epsilon}(v)$  are related by replacing a  $\mathbb{P}^g$ -bundle  $P \rightarrow M_{1/2}(u) \times M_{1/4}(u)$  with a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+1}$ -bundle  $P' \rightarrow M_{1/2}(u) \times M_{1/4}(w)$ , where  $M_{1/2}(u), M_{1/2}(w)$  are  $g$ -dimensional tori. The induced map  $M_{1-\epsilon}(v) \dashrightarrow M_\epsilon(v)$  is a standard flip.

*Proof.* See Theorems 8.1 and 8.9.  $\square$

Our second application involves a curve with a *tacnode*: a singularity of the form  $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]/(y^2 - x^4)$ . Contrary to the scenario for nodes, the non-rational locus in this situation is non-reduced, cf. Subsection 2.2.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $C$  be an irreducible curve of genus  $g \geq 1$  with a single tacnode. Let  $D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  be the categorical resolution of singularities from Theorem 1.1. We let  $\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$  be the stability conditions from Theorem 1.3, for  $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2 < 1$ .*

*Fix  $v$  a primitive numerical vector with  $r = \text{rk}(v) > 0$ . Denote  $d = \deg(v)$ ,  $\ell = \ell(v)$ . We denote by  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) = M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(v)$ .*

- (1) *We have  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) = \emptyset$  unless  $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq 2r$ ,  $0 \leq \ell_2 \leq 4r$ ,  $0 \leq \ell_2 - \ell_1 \leq 2r$ .*

*From now on, we assume that  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \neq \emptyset$  for some  $\sigma$ .*

- (2) *There are finitely many  $v$ -walls. If  $\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$  and  $\sigma_{\delta'_1, \delta'_2}$  are outside of the walls, then  $M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(v)$  and  $M_{\sigma_{\delta'_1, \delta'_2}}(v)$  are birational.*
- (3) *For  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \ll 1$ , the map  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  is a bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology, with fiber*

$$\{(V_1, V_2) : V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 2r}, V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 4r}, V_1 \times \{0\} \subset V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{2r} \times V_1, \dim(V_i) = \ell_i\}.$$

- (4) *Assume that  $v = (1, d, 1, 2)$ . Then, the moduli space  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$  is independent of  $(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ . We have a diagram*

$$M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d) \xleftarrow{a_*} M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \xrightarrow{R\pi_*} M_C(1, d),$$

*where the map  $a_*$  is an  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -bundle, and the map  $R\pi_*$  is birational.*

- (5) *Assume that  $v = (2, d, 2, 4)$  with  $d$  odd. Then, there is a diagram*

$$M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d) \leftarrow M_1 \dashrightarrow M_2 \dashrightarrow M_3 \dashrightarrow M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, d),$$

*where  $M_1 \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$  is a bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology;  $M_i \dashrightarrow M_{i-1}$  is a standard flip over a  $2g$ -dimensional torus; and  $M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, d)$  is birational.*

*Proof.* See Lemma 9.8 and Theorem 9.1.  $\square$

**1.1. Structure of the paper.** We will devote the first five sections to the construction of the stability conditions of Theorem 1.1. We start by reviewing the notion of a non-rational locus in Section 2, and relating it to the *conductor* of a singular curve.

The next two sections will construct a categorical resolution of  $D^b(C)$ , adapting the argument of [KL15]. We first recall the construction of a generalized Auslander

algebra in Section 3, which provides a categorical resolution of a zero-dimensional scheme. We use this to construct the categorical resolution of  $D^b(C)$  in Section 4.

We finish the first part by constructing the stability conditions in Section 5. The existence of moduli spaces is proven in Section 6.

The last three sections are focused on applications. We prove general comparison results in Section 7, including the proof of Theorem 1.3. We specialize to the case of a curve with a node or cusp in Section 8, and of a curve with a tacnode in Section 9.

**1.2. Conventions.** We work over the complex numbers. If  $V$  is a vector space of dimension  $b$ , and  $1 \leq a \leq b$ , we denote by  $\mathrm{Gr}(V, a)$  the Grassmannian of  $a$ -dimensional *quotients* of  $V$ .

If  $C$  is an irreducible projective curve, we write  $M_C(r, d)$  for the moduli space of pure dimension one sheaves on  $C$  with rank  $r$  and degree  $d$ .

**1.3. Acknowledgements.** I am deeply thankful to my PhD advisor, Giulia Saccà, for her guidance and constant support during all these years. I am grateful of discussions with Arend Bayer, Amal Mattoo, Saket Shah, Sofia Wood, and Fan Zhou about various pieces of this project. I am especially thankful to Emanuele Macrì for sparking my interest in categorical resolutions, and to Angela Ortega for pointing out the reference [BRH21].

This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation (grant number DMS-2052934) and by the Simons Foundation (grant number SFI-MPS-MOV-00006719-09).

## 2. NON-RATIONAL LOCI OF CURVES AND CONDUCTORS

In this section we discuss the notion of a *non-rational locus*, following [KL15, §6.1]. We first recall its definition in Subsection 2.1. In the case of curves, we relate this notion to the *conductor* of a curve. After that, we compute explicit examples of non-rational loci for curves in Subsection 2.2.

### 2.1. Generalities.

**Definition 2.1** ([KL15, Definition 6.1]). Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a proper, birational morphism. A subscheme  $T \subseteq Y$  is a *non-rational locus* of  $Y$  with respect to  $f$  if the canonical morphism  $I_T \rightarrow Rf_*(I_{f^{-1}(T)})$  is an isomorphism, where  $f^{-1}(T)$  is the scheme-theoretic preimage of  $T$ .

Note that non-rational loci are not unique. For example, if  $f$  is an isomorphism, then any subscheme is a non-rational locus. We also point out that being a non-rational locus is Zariski-local on  $Y$ .

*Remark 2.2* ([KL15, Remark 6.2]). If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a resolution of singularities, then  $Y$  has rational singularities if and only if  $T = \emptyset$  is a non-rational locus for  $f$ . In particular, if  $C$  is a singular curve and  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  its resolution, then  $T = \emptyset$  is *never* a non-rational locus of singularities.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $C$  be a reduced curve. A *non-rational locus* of  $C$  is a non-rational locus for the normalization map  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $C$  be a reduced curve, and let  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  be its normalization. Then there is a non-rational locus  $T \subset C$  whose set-theoretic support equals  $\mathrm{Sing}(C)$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\rho$  is a blow-up of  $C$  at a subscheme  $T_0 \subset C$  set-theoretically supported at  $\text{Sing}(C)$ , e.g. by [Har77, Exercise II.7.11(c)]. The argument of [KL15, Lemma 6.3] ensures that an infinitesimal thickening of  $T_0$  is a non-rational locus for  $\rho$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.5.* Let  $C$  be a reduced curve,  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  be its resolution of singularities, and let  $T$  be a non-rational locus for  $C$ . If  $S = \rho^{-1}(T)$  is its scheme-theoretic preimage, then we have a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \rho_* I_S \rightarrow \rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} \rightarrow \rho_* \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow 0$ . Using that  $T$  is a non-rational locus gives us the diagram

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & I_T & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \rho_* I_S & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_C & \longrightarrow & \rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} & \longrightarrow & Q \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_T & \longrightarrow & \rho_* \mathcal{O}_S & \longrightarrow & Q \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

In particular, we point out that  $\mathcal{O}_C$  is the kernel of a map  $\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} \rightarrow Q$ ; the isomorphism  $Q \cong \rho_* \mathcal{O}_S / \mathcal{O}_T$  ensures that the scheme-theoretic support of  $Q$  is contained in  $T$ .

Let us finish up this section by relating this notion with the conductor of a curve. Recall that *conductor* of a reduced curve  $C$  is the ideal  $J = \text{Ann}_C(\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} / \mathcal{O}_C)$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $C$  be a reduced curve. If  $T$  is a non-rational locus for  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ , and  $I = I(T)$  is the ideal corresponding to  $T$ , then  $I \subseteq J$ . Moreover, we have that  $J$  is a non-rational locus.*

In other words, this lemma ensures that the closed subscheme determined by  $J$  is the smallest non-rational locus for  $C$ .

*Proof.* For the first part, note from (2.1) that we have the isomorphism  $\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} / \mathcal{O}_C = \rho_* \mathcal{O}_S / \mathcal{O}_T$ . The latter is scheme-theoretically supported at  $T$ , and so  $I(T) \subseteq \text{Ann}_C(\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} / \mathcal{O}_C)$ . The second part follows from the well-known fact that  $J$  is also an ideal in  $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}$ .  $\square$

**2.2. Local description.** Let  $C$  be a reduced curve, and let  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  be its resolution. We have shown that there exists a non-rational locus of  $C$  with respect to  $\rho$ , supported set-theoretically on  $\text{Sing}(C)$ . It is convenient to have an explicit description of a non-rational locus in terms of the singularities of  $C$ .

Up to shrinking  $C$ , we may assume that  $C = \text{Spec } A$  is affine, and that  $p$  is the only singular point of  $C$ . We use the following key observation.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $C$  be an affine curve with  $q \in C$  its only singular point. Denote by  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  the resolution of  $C$ ,  $C_q$  the completion of  $C$  at  $q$ , and  $\rho_p: \tilde{C}_q \rightarrow C_q$  the base change.*

Given a closed subscheme  $T \subseteq C$  supported set-theoretically at  $p$ , we have that  $T$  is a non-rational locus for  $C$  if and only if the corresponding subscheme  $T_q \subseteq C_q$  is a non-rational locus for  $\rho_q$ .

*Proof.* Denote by  $\phi: C_q \rightarrow C$  the completion. We have that  $\phi^* I_T = I_{T_q}$ , and similarly for the preimages. The result follows immediately from the fact that the completion functor is faithfully flat.  $\square$

As a direct corollary, non-rational loci depend only on the germ of the singularity. This helps greatly in calculations.

**Example 2.8** (Ordinary  $n$ -uple points). Recall that an *ordinary  $n$ -uple point* is the germ of the curve  $C = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, y]/((y - \lambda_1 x) \dots (y - \lambda_n x))$  at the origin, where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  are pairwise distinct.

Note that  $\tilde{C} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, t]/(t - \lambda_1) \dots (t - \lambda_n)$ . This way, we quickly check that the conductor of  $C$  is  $(x, y)^{n-1}$ .

**Example 2.9** ( $A_k$  singularities). Recall that an  $A_k$  singularity is the germ of  $C = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, y]/(y^2 - x^{k+1})$  at the origin. To compute its conductor, we separate in cases:

- If  $k$  is even, then the curve has a single branch at the origin. The normalization is given by  $\mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow C$ ,  $t \mapsto (t^2, t^{k+1})$ . From here, one quickly checks that  $(x^{k/2}, y)$  is the conductor.
- If  $k$  is odd, then the curve has two branches at the origin. The normalization is  $\mathbb{A}_s^1 \sqcup \mathbb{A}_t^1 \rightarrow C$ ,  $s \mapsto (s, s^{(k+1)/2})$  and  $t \mapsto (t, -t^{(k+1)/2})$ . We directly verify that  $(x^{(k+1)/2}, y)$  is the conductor.

Putting everything together, we get that  $I = (x^{\lfloor (k+1)/2 \rfloor}, y)$  is the conductor.

We have summarized our computations in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Conductors of some planar singularities.

| Singularity              | Local equation                    | Conductor                          |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Node                     | $xy$                              | $(x, y)$                           |
| Cusp                     | $y^2 - x^3$                       | $(x, y)$                           |
| Ordinary $n$ -uple point | $\prod_{i=1}^n (y - \lambda_i x)$ | $(x, y)^n$                         |
| $A_k$                    | $x^{k+1} + y^2$                   | $(x^{\lfloor (k+1)/2 \rfloor}, y)$ |

**Example 2.10.** (Union of coordinate axes) Let  $C$  be the curve obtained as the union of the  $n$  coordinate axis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . We will check in Proposition 2.11 that  $T = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$  is a non-rational locus for  $C$ .

**2.3. Small non-rational locus.** Let us finish by classifying which singular curves  $C$  admit  $\text{Sing}(C)$  with its reduced structure as a non-rational locus. Note by Lemma 2.6, this is the same as asking that  $\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}} / \mathcal{O}_C$  is scheme-theoretically supported at  $\text{Sing}(C)$ .

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $C$  be a reduced curve with a single singular point  $q \in C$ , and let  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  be its resolution of singularities. Assume that  $\{q\}$  (with its reduced*

structure) is a non-rational locus of  $C$ . If  $S = \rho^{-1}(q)$  is a subscheme supported at  $s$  points with lengths  $e_1, \dots, e_s$ , then

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,p} \cong \frac{\mathbb{C}[[x_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq s, e_i \leq j \leq 2e_i - 1]]}{(\{x_{i,j}^{j'} - x_{i,j'}^j\}_{e_i \leq j, j' \leq 2e_i - 1}, \{x_{i,j} x_{i',j'}\}_{i \neq i'})}.$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  the preimages of  $q \in C$ . This way, we can write the scheme-theoretic preimage  $\rho^{-1}(q)$  as  $\bigcup_{i=1}^s \{e_i p_i\}$  for some  $e_i \geq 1$ .

Let us write  $A = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,q}$ , and let  $\tilde{A} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{C},\rho^{-1}(q)}$ . Here  $\tilde{A} = \prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{C}[[t_i]]$ , as  $\tilde{C}$  is smooth and  $\rho^{-1}(q)$  consists of  $s$  points. This way, the diagram (2.1) gives us the Cartesian square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & A/I_q \cong \mathbb{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}[[t_i]] & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^s \mathbb{C}[[t_i]]/(t_i^{e_i}) \end{array}$$

We get that  $A \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}[[t_i]]$  embeds  $A$  into the subring

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{ij} t_i^j : a_{0,1} = \dots = a_{0,n}, a_{i,j} = 0 \text{ if } 0 < j < e_j \right\}.$$

As the map  $A \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}[[t_i]]$  is a ring homomorphism, this also determines the ring structure on  $A$ . The claimed result follows immediately by picking generators  $x_{i,j} = t_i^j$ .  $\square$

Note that the isomorphism class of a singularity  $q \in C$  as in Proposition 2.11 depends only on the tuple  $(e_1, \dots, e_s)$  of multiplicities, up to rearrangement. For instance, the tuples  $(1, 1)$  and  $(2)$  correspond to a node and a cusp, respectively. Similarly, the tuple  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$  corresponds to the singularity formed by taking the coordinate axes in  $\mathbb{C}^s$ .

If  $q \in C$  is a singularity with multiplicity tuple  $(e_1, \dots, e_s)$ , the description (2.2) ensures that the embedding dimension of  $C$  at  $q$  is  $\sum_{i=1}^s e_i$ . In particular, the only planar singularities that arise in this fashion are the node and the cusp.

### 3. GENERALIZED AUSLANDER ALGEBRAS FOR ZERO-DIMENSIONAL SCHEMES

Following [KL15, §5], we recall the construction of a (generalized) Auslander algebra in Subsection 3.1. We later describe various functors in Subsection 3.2.

**3.1. Auslander algebras and their modules.** Our setup is the following. We let  $Z$  be a zero-dimensional affine scheme. We fix an ideal  $I$  on  $Z$ , and an integer  $n \geq 1$  such that  $I^n = 0$ . (Note that we are *not* requiring that  $I^{n-1} \neq 0$ .)

**Definition 3.1** ([KL15, pp. 4579–80]). Set  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{S,I,n}$  to be the sheaf of algebras over  $Z$  described as

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}_Z & I & I^2 & \dots & I^{n-1} \\ \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-1} & \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-1} & I/I^{n-1} & \dots & I^{n-2}/I^{n-1} \\ \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-2} & \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-2} & \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-2} & \dots & I^{n-3}/I^{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{O}_Z/I & \mathcal{O}_Z/I & \mathcal{O}_Z/I & \dots & \mathcal{O}_Z/I \end{pmatrix},$$



where the algebra structure is given as a subset of  $\text{End}_Z(\mathcal{O}_Z \oplus \mathcal{O}_Z/I^{n-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{O}_Z/I)$ .

We let  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  be the category of (right)  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules that are coherent over  $Z$ .

**Lemma 3.2** ([KL15, Lemma A.9]). *The category of coherent  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules is equivalent to the following category.*

*Objects are tuples  $(M_1, \dots, M_n, \alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})$ , where the  $M_i$  are sheaves on  $Z$ ,  $\alpha: M_i \rightarrow M_{i+1}$ , and  $\beta_k: M_i \otimes I^k \rightarrow M_{i-k}$ . We impose the following compatibility conditions.*

(1) *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & M_1 \otimes I & \xrightarrow{\alpha \otimes \text{id}} & M_2 \otimes I & \xrightarrow{\alpha \otimes \text{id}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\alpha \otimes \text{id}} & M_n \otimes I \\
 & \swarrow & \downarrow \times & \searrow \beta_1 & \downarrow \times & \searrow \beta_1 & & \searrow \beta_1 & \downarrow \times \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & M_2 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & M_n
 \end{array}$$

*commutes, where  $\times$  is the multiplication map.*

(2) *We have that  $\beta_k \beta_\ell = \beta_{k+\ell}$ . More precisely, we have that the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M_i \otimes I^k \otimes I^\ell & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \times} & M_i \otimes I^{k+\ell} \\
 \beta_k \otimes \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_{k+\ell} \\
 M_{i-k} \otimes I^\ell & \xrightarrow{\beta_\ell} & M_{i-k-\ell}
 \end{array}$$

*commutes.*

*Morphisms are given by maps  $\phi_i: M_i \rightarrow M'_i$  compatible with the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta_k$ .*

We point out that condition (2) ensures that the maps  $\beta_k, k \geq 2$  are determined by  $\beta_1$ , as  $I^k \otimes I^\ell \rightarrow I^{k+\ell}$  is surjective. Compare to [KL15, Definition A.8(2)].

We will drop the maps  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , and simply write  $M = (M_1, \dots, M_n)$  for an object of  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ .

**3.2. Functors.** In this subsection we will construct various functors on the category of coherent  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules. To start, we define the *resolution* functors as follows.

**Definition 3.3** ([KL15, p. 4615]). We define functors  $\mu_Z^*: \text{Coh}(Z) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mu_{Z*}: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(Z)$  via the formulas

$$\mu_{Z*}(M_1, \dots, M_n) = M_n, \quad \mu_Z^*(N) = (N \otimes_Z I^{n-1}, N \otimes_Z I^{n-2}, \dots, N),$$

where the maps  $\alpha$  are induced by inclusions, and the maps  $\beta$  by the multiplication of elements of  $I$ .

Note from the definition that  $\mu_{Z*}$  is exact, while  $\mu_Z^*$  is right exact. Moreover, the adjunction  $\mu_Z^* \dashv \mu_{Z*}$  holds.

**Definition 3.4** ([KL15, p. 4614]). Assume that  $n \geq 2$ , and denote by  $Z'$  the closed subscheme corresponding to  $I^{n-1}$ . Set  $e_*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z', I, n-1}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z, I, n})$  and  $e^!: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z, I, n}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z', I, n-1})$  via the formulas

$$e_*(M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}) = (M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, M_{n-1}),$$

where  $\alpha: M_{n-1} \rightarrow M_{n-1}$  is the identity and  $\beta_1: M_{n-1} \otimes_Z I \rightarrow M_{n-1}$  is the multiplication; and

$$e^!(M_1, \dots, M_n) = (M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}).$$

Here both  $e^!$  and  $e_*$  are exact. Moreover, we have the adjunction  $e_* \dashv e^!$ .

**Definition 3.5** ([KL15, p. 4614]). Let  $Z_0 \subseteq Z$  be the closed subscheme corresponding to  $I$ . Define  $i^*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(Z_0)$  and  $i_*: \text{Coh}(Z_0) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$  via the formulas

$$i^*(M_1, \dots, M_n) = \text{coker}(\alpha: M_{n-1} \rightarrow M_n), \quad i_*(N) = (0, \dots, 0, N).$$

Note that  $\text{coker}(\alpha: M_{n-1} \rightarrow M_n)$  is in fact a module over  $Z_0$  (instead of merely  $Z$ ), as the multiplication map  $M_n \otimes I \rightarrow M_n$  factors through  $\alpha$ . We point out that we have the adjunction  $i^* \dashv i_*$ , that  $i_*$  is exact, and that  $i^*$  is right exact.

**Definition 3.6** ([KL15, §5.2]). Let  $f: Z \rightarrow W$  be a morphism of zero-dimensional schemes. Let  $I \subset \mathcal{O}_Z$ ,  $J \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be nilpotent ideals such that  $f^{-1}(J) \subseteq I$ . Pick  $k$  such that  $I^k = J^k = 0$ .

We define functors  $f_*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,k}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{W,J,k})$  and  $f^*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{W,J,k}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,k})$  via the formulas

$$f_*(M_1, \dots, M_n) = (f_*M_1, \dots, f_*M_n), \quad f^*(N_1, \dots, N_k) = (f^*N_1, \dots, f^*N_k).$$

**3.3. Derived category.** Given  $S, I, n$  as before, we consider the bounded derived category  $D^b(\mathcal{A})$  of  $\text{Coh } \mathcal{A}$ . In this subsection we will review some of its properties, following [KL15, §5.3–4].

Let us start by discussing how to extend the functors of Subsection 3.2 to the derived category. In Definition 3.3, the functor  $\mu_Z^*$  gives a left derived functor  $L\mu_S^*: D^-(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D^-(Z)$ , while  $\mu_{Z*}$  descends directly to the (bounded or unbounded) derived category. In Definition 3.5, the functor  $i^*$  can be left derived at the level of *bounded* derived categories, cf. [KL15, pp. 4588–9]. In Definition 3.6, the functor  $f_*$  is exact (as  $f$  is affine), while  $f^*$  requires to be left derived.

These functors can be used to effectively describe the derived category  $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ , as the following result shows.

**Proposition 3.7** ([KL15, Proposition 5.14]). *Let  $n \geq 2$ . There is a semi-orthogonal decomposition  $D^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n}) = \langle i_*(D^b(Z_0)), e_*(D^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z',I,n-1})) \rangle$ .*

**Corollary 3.8** ([KL15, Corollary 5.15]). *The derived category  $D^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$  admits a semi-orthogonal decomposition with  $n$  components equivalent to  $D^b(Z_0)$ .*

#### 4. CATEGORICAL RESOLUTION

In this section we discuss categorical resolutions of singularities. We refer to [Lun01, KL15, KK15] for constructions of categorical resolutions of singularities in greater level of generality. Our goal is to describe a categorical resolution of singularities for a reduced curve  $C$ , following the approach of [KL15].

**4.1. Setup.** Let us fix some notation for the remainder of the section. We let  $C$  be a reduced curve, with irreducible components  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ , and let  $\text{Sing}(C) = \{q_1, \dots, q_m\}$  be the set of singular points. We denote by  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  the normalization of  $C$ . The corresponding irreducible components are  $\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_n$ .

Fix a non-rational locus  $T \subset C$  for the morphism  $\rho$ , set-theoretically supported at  $\text{Sing}(C)$ . (Its existence is guaranteed by Lemma 2.4.) Denote by  $S = \rho^{-1}(T)$  its scheme-theoretic preimage. Let  $I$  be the ideal of  $\{q_1, \dots, q_m\} \subset T$ , and  $J$  the ideal of  $\rho^{-1}(\{q_1, \dots, q_m\}) \subset S$ . Also, fix some exponent  $e$  such that  $I^e = 0$ .

*Remark 4.1.* Note from Lemma 2.6 that we can take  $T$  to be subscheme associated to the conductor of  $C$ .

For each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we let  $T_i$  be the irreducible component of  $T$  supported at  $q_i$ , and  $S_i = \rho^{-1}(T_i)$  its scheme-theoretic preimage. Denote by  $J_i$  the ideal of  $q_i \in T_i$ , and  $I_i$  the ideal of  $S_i^\circ := \rho^{-1}(q_i) \subset S_i$ .

We let  $j: T \rightarrow C$  and  $i: S \hookrightarrow \tilde{C}$  be the inclusions. We abuse notation by using  $\rho: S \rightarrow T$  the induced morphism. These maps fit in the following diagram of Cartesian squares:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} S_i^\circ & \hookrightarrow & S_i & \hookrightarrow & S & \xrightarrow{i} & \tilde{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \rho \\ \{q_i\} & \hookrightarrow & T_i & \hookrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{j} & C. \end{array}$$

Finally, we write  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{T,I,e}$  for the sheaf of algebras from Subsection 3.1.

#### 4.2. An abelian category.

**Definition 4.2.** We let  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  be the category whose objects are triples  $\mathcal{F} = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$ , where  $F \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ ,  $\bar{F} \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , and  $\phi: \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S)) \rightarrow \bar{F}$ .

The notation here is chosen as one can see this category as the category of coherent modules over a sheaf of non-commutative algebras on  $C$ , cf. [KL15, §5.1]. In particular, we point out that  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  is an abelian category.

Note that the morphism  $\phi: \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S)) \rightarrow \bar{F}$  can be equivalently described as morphisms  $\phi_i: \rho_*(F|_S \otimes_S I^{e-i}) \rightarrow M_i$ , such that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_*(F|_S \otimes_S I^{e-i}) & \longrightarrow & \rho_*(F|_S \otimes_S I^{e-(i+1)}) \\ \phi_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi_{i+1} \\ M_i & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & M_{i+1} \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_*(F|_S \otimes_S I^{e-(i+1)} \otimes_S I) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \times} & \rho_*(F|_S \otimes_S I^{e-i}) \\ \phi_{i+1} \otimes \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi_i \\ M_{i+1} \otimes_S I & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & M_i \end{array}$$

commute.

*Remark 4.3.* Suppose that  $T = \{q_1, \dots, q_m\}$  with its reduced structure is a non-rational locus for  $C$ . (These cases were classified in Subsection 2.3.) We have that  $I = 0$ , and so we can take  $e = 1$ . Under this assumption, the category  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  reduces to  $\{(F, \bar{F}; \phi) : F \in \text{Coh}(C), \bar{F} \in \text{Coh}(T), \phi: \rho_*(F|_S) \rightarrow \bar{F}\}$ .

**4.3. Functors.** In this subsection we will construct some functors relating  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  to  $\text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$  and  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , and their extensions to the respective derived categories.

We start by constructing some functors between  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  and  $\text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ . To start, set  $a^*: \text{Coh}(\tilde{C}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  and  $a_*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$  given by the formulas  $a^*(M) = (M, \rho_*(\mu_S^*(M|_S)); \text{id})$  and  $a_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = F$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *The functor  $a_*$  is exact, and the functor  $a^*$  is right exact. Additionally, we have the adjunction  $a^* \dashv a_*$ .*

*Proof.* The exactness of  $a_*$  is clear. For  $a^*$ , it follows directly from composition of right-exact functors.

Now, consider  $M \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ ,  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi) \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ . Here  $\text{Hom}(a^*(M), (F, \bar{F}; \phi))$  consists of morphisms  $M \rightarrow F$  and  $\rho_*(\mu_S^*)(M|_S) \rightarrow \bar{F}$  making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_*(\mu_S^*)(M|_S) & \longrightarrow & \rho_*(\mu_S^*)(F|_S) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \phi \\ \rho_*(\mu_S^*)(M|_S) & \longrightarrow & \bar{F} \end{array}$$

commute. This way, we have that

$$\text{Hom}(a^*(M), (F, \bar{F}; \phi)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\tilde{C}}(M, F) = \text{Hom}(M, a_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi)).$$

This shows the required adjunction.  $\square$

As a direct consequence, the functor  $a_*$  descends directly to the (bounded) derived categories. However, to construct  $La^*$  some extra care must be taken. Let us recall the following well-known result.

**Proposition 4.5** ([Har66, Corollary 5.3.β-γ]). *Let  $F: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be a right exact additive functor between abelian categories. Assume that there is a class of objects  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfying the following properties:*

- (1) *Given any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , there is a surjection  $\bar{B} \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$  with  $\bar{B} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ .*
- (2) *Given any short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow B' \rightarrow B''$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $B'' \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ , we have that  $B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$  if and only if  $B' \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ .*
- (3) *The functor  $F$  preserves short exact sequences in  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ .*

*Then the left derived functor  $LF: D^-(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D^-(\mathcal{C})$  exists, and  $LF(E) = F(E)$  for any bounded above complex with elements in  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ .*

*Moreover, assume that condition (1) is replaced by*

- (1') *There is a positive integer  $r$  such that any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  admits a resolution  $0 \rightarrow B^{-r} \rightarrow B^{-r+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B^0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$ , with  $B^i \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ .*

*Then the functor  $LF$  is defined at the level of unbounded categories, and it satisfies  $LF(D(\mathcal{B})^{[i,j]}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{C})^{[i-r,j]}$  for all  $i \leq j$ . In particular,  $LF$  maps  $D^b(\mathcal{B})$  to  $D^b(\mathcal{C})$ .*

Of course, a dual version of Proposition 4.5 also holds, guaranteeing the existence of right derived functors.

**Lemma 4.6.** *The functor  $a^*$  preserves short exact sequences of locally free sheaves in  $\tilde{C}$ . As a consequence, the left derived functor  $La^*: D^b(\tilde{C}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})$  exists. Finally, we have the adjunction  $La^* \dashv a_*$ .*

*Proof.* If  $0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence of locally free sheaves in  $\tilde{C}$ , then the restriction  $0 \rightarrow E|_S \rightarrow E'|_S \rightarrow E''|_S \rightarrow 0$  is exact. Exactness is preserved after tensoring with  $I^k$  (as the  $E|_S$  are locally free on  $S$ ), and so after applying  $\mu_S^*(-)$ . As  $\rho_*$  is exact, this immediately gives us the first part.

Now, note that the class of locally free sheaves in  $\tilde{C}$  satisfy conditions (1') (with  $r = 1$ ) and (2) in Proposition 4.5. This immediately gives us the second part. The third part follows directly from the adjunction  $a^* \dashv a_*$ .  $\square$

Let us now construct functors relating  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  with  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ . We start by considering the functors  $b^*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  and  $b_*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{Y})$  given by the formulas  $b^*(N) = (0, N; 0)$  and  $b_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \bar{F}$ . It is easy to see that  $b^*$ ,  $b_*$  are

exact and  $b^* \dashv b_*$ . This way, they immediately induce exact functors at the level of derived categories, while also preserving the adjunction.

**Lemma 4.7.** *The functor  $b^*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  admits a left adjoint  $b_!$ , given by  $b_!(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \text{coker } \phi$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{F} = (F, \bar{F}; \phi) \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  and  $N \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  be given, and let us compute  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, b^*N)$ . By definition, these are given by maps  $f: F \rightarrow 0$  and  $g: \bar{F} \rightarrow N$  making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} r_*F|_Z & \xrightarrow{r_*f|_Z} & 0 \\ \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \\ \bar{F} & \xrightarrow{g} & N \end{array}$$

commute. In other words, these corresponds to maps  $g: \bar{F} \rightarrow N$  such that  $g \circ \phi = 0$ . These are uniquely determined by a morphism  $\text{coker } \phi \rightarrow N$ , proving the required statement.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *The left derived functor  $Lb_!: D^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D^b(Y)$  exists, and we have the adjunction  $Lb_! \dashv b^*$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the class

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{P} = \{(F, \bar{F}; \phi): F \text{ locally free, } \ker \phi = 0\}.$$

(If  $\tilde{C}$  has multiple components, then  $F$  is allowed to have different rank on each component; even  $F = 0$  is allowed.) We will prove that  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies properties (1') (with  $r = 2$ ), (2) and (3) of Proposition 4.5. From here, the existence of the left derived functor is immediate. Finally,  $Lb_! \dashv b^*$  follows from  $b_! \dashv b^*$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8, (1').* Let  $\mathcal{F} = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  be an element in  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ . Pick a resolution  $0 \rightarrow E^{-1} \rightarrow E^0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ , with  $E^{-1}, E^0$  locally free. This way, if  $\mathcal{E}^0 = (E_0, \rho_*(\mu_S^*(E_0|_S)) \oplus \bar{F}; \text{id} \oplus \psi)$ , we get a surjection  $\mathcal{E}^0 \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , whose kernel is of the form  $(E^{-1}, K; \eta)$ . Here  $\mathcal{E}^0$  lies on  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Now, note that we have a surjection

$$\mathcal{E}^{-1} = (E^{-1}, \rho_*(\mu_S^*(E^{-1}|_S)) \oplus K; \text{id} \oplus \eta) \rightarrow (E^{-1}, K; \eta) \rightarrow 0,$$

where the map  $\rho_*(\mu_S^*(E^{-1}|_S)) \oplus K \rightarrow K$  is  $(0, \text{id})$ . The kernel of this surjection is  $\mathcal{E}^{-2} = (0, \rho_*(\mu_S^*(E^{-1}|_S)); 0)$ , which clearly lies in  $\mathcal{P}$ . This gives us the claimed resolution.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8, (2).* Consider a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ . Write  $\mathcal{F} = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  and similar for  $\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}''$ . We get a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow F' \rightarrow F'' \rightarrow 0$  in  $\tilde{C}$ , with  $F''$  locally free. Here  $F$  is locally free if and only if  $F'$  is. Under this assumption, the restriction to  $S$  and tensoring with  $I^k$  is exact, and we get the commutative diagram

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S)) & \longrightarrow & \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F'|_S)) & \longrightarrow & \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F''|_S)) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \phi' & & \downarrow \phi'' \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{F} & \longrightarrow & \bar{F}' & \longrightarrow & \bar{F}'' \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By assumption the kernel of  $\phi''$  is trivial. Thus, we get that  $\ker \phi \cong \ker \phi'$  by the snake lemma, which allows us to conclude immediately.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8, (3).* We keep the notation of the previous proof. By assumption we have the diagram (4.3), with  $\ker \phi'' = 0$ . The snake lemma gives us the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow b_! \mathcal{F} \rightarrow b_! \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow b_! \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

#### 4.4. Semi-orthogonal decomposition.

**Proposition 4.9.** *There are semi-orthogonal decompositions*

$$(4.4) \quad D^b(\mathcal{R}) = \langle b^* D^b(\mathcal{A}), La^* D^b(\tilde{C}) \rangle, \quad D^-(\mathcal{R}) = \langle b^* D^-(\mathcal{A}), La^* D^-(\tilde{C}) \rangle.$$

*Proof.* We will prove the result for  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ ; the other one is analogous. Given  $M \in D^b(Y)$  and  $N \in D^b(\tilde{C})$ , we have  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(La^* M, b^* N) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\tilde{C}}(M, a_* b^* N) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\tilde{C}}(M, 0) = 0$  by direct computation. This shows the vanishing of Homs.

Now, let  $\mathcal{F} \in D^b(\mathcal{A})$  be given. Up to a quasi-isomorphism, we may replace  $\mathcal{F}$  with a bounded complex  $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$  with  $\mathcal{E}^i = (E^i, \bar{E}^i; \phi^i) \in \mathcal{P}$ , thanks to property (2) in the proof of Lemma 4.8. Set  $\mathcal{G}^i = (E^i, \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S)); \mathrm{id})$  and  $\mathcal{H}^i = (0, \mathrm{coker} \phi^i; 0)$ . We get short exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^i \rightarrow 0$ . The differential of  $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$  gives differentials on the  $\mathcal{G}^i$  and  $\mathcal{H}^i$ , and so we get a short exact sequence of complexes:

$$(4.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^\bullet \rightarrow 0.$$

To conclude, note that  $\mathcal{G}^\bullet = La^*(E^\bullet)$  and  $\mathcal{H}^\bullet = b^*(\mathrm{coker} \phi^\bullet)$ . This way, the short exact sequence (4.5) gives us a triangle  $A \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^\bullet \rightarrow B \rightarrow A[1]$  with  $B \in b^* D^b(\mathcal{A})$  and  $A \in La^* D^b(\tilde{C})$ , as required.  $\square$

Various consequences can be obtained directly from the semi-orthogonal decomposition (4.4). For instance, the unit  $\mathrm{id} \rightarrow b^* Lb_!$  and the counit  $La^* a_* \rightarrow \mathrm{id}$  give the triangles  $La^* a_*(E) \rightarrow E \rightarrow b^* Lb_!(E) \rightarrow La^* a_*(E)[1]$  of the semi-orthogonal decomposition. Another important consequence is the fact that  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  is a *geometric non-commutative scheme* in the sense of [Orl16, Definition 4.3].

**Corollary 4.10.** *The category  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  is equivalent to an admissible subcategory of  $D^b(X)$ , for some smooth, projective scheme  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Follows directly from the semi-orthogonal decomposition of Proposition 4.9 and by [Orl16, Theorem 4.15].  $\square$

**4.5. Categorical resolution.** In this subsection we will show that  $D(\mathcal{R})$  is a categorical resolution of  $D(C)$ , in the sense of [KL15]. To do so, we start by describing functors relating  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  with  $\mathrm{Coh}(C)$ . We will use these to produce a semi-orthogonal decomposition at the unbounded level, which will be restricted to a Verdier quotient at the bounded level.

**Theorem 4.11.** *The (unbounded) derived category  $D(\mathcal{R})$  is a categorical resolution of singularities of  $D(C)$ . This is, there exists functors  $R\pi_*: D(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D(C)$ ,  $L\pi^*: D(C) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{R})$ , satisfying the following.*

- (1)  $D(\mathcal{R})$  is a smooth, cocomplete, compactly generated triangulated category.
- (2)  $R\pi_* \circ L\pi^* = \mathrm{id}$ .
- (3)  $L\pi^*$  and  $R\pi_*$  commute with arbitrary direct sums.
- (4)  $R\pi_*$  maps compact objects to  $D^b(C)$ .

We will omit the technical details of the proof, as they follow from the general construction of [KL15]. Instead, we will focus on the construction of the functors  $R\pi_*$  and  $L\pi^*$ .

First, set  $\pi_*: \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(C)$  as  $\pi_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \ker(\rho_* F \rightarrow \bar{F}_e)$ , where the map is induced by  $\phi$ . Second, we define  $\pi^*: \text{Coh}(C) \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  via  $\pi^*(M) = (\rho^* M, \text{coker}(\mu_T^*(M|_T) \rightarrow \rho_* \mu_S^*(\rho^* M|_S))); \text{res})$ , where the restriction map is induced by the unit  $\text{id} \rightarrow \rho_* \rho^*$ .

**Lemma 4.12.** *We have that  $\pi^* \dashv \pi_*$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M \in \text{Coh}(C)$  and  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi) \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  be given. By definition, the set  $\text{Hom}_C(M, \pi^*(F, \bar{F}; \phi))$  is the same as morphisms  $f: M \rightarrow \rho_* F$  such that the composition

$$M|_T \xrightarrow{f|_T} (\rho_* F)|_T \rightarrow \bar{F}_e$$

is zero. By adjunction, this is the same as maps  $g: \rho^* M \rightarrow F$  such that

$$M|_T \rightarrow \rho_*((\rho^* M)|_S) \rightarrow \rho_*(F|_S) \rightarrow \mu_{Z*}(\bar{F})$$

is zero. Once again by adjunction, this is the same as a pair of morphisms  $g: \rho^* M \rightarrow F$  and  $h: \rho_* \mu_S^*((\rho^* M)|_S) \rightarrow \bar{F}$  such that the composition

$$\mu_T^*(M|_T) \rightarrow \rho_* \mu_S^*((\rho^* M)|_S) \rightarrow \bar{F}$$

vanishes. This gives us the claimed description.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.13.** *The functors  $\pi^*$  and  $\pi_*$  induce derived functors  $L\pi^*: D^-(C) \rightarrow D^-(\mathcal{R})$  and  $R\pi_*: D^-(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^-(C)$ . The functors  $L\pi^*$  and  $R\pi_*$  are adjoint, and the composition  $R\pi_* \circ L\pi^*$  is isomorphic to the identity.*

*Proof.* First, note that  $\pi^*$  preserves short exact sequences of locally free sheaves on  $C$ . In fact, note that  $\rho^*$  is exact in short exact sequences of locally free sheaves. The exactness of the cokernels is a consequence of the snake lemma. This immediately gives us the existence of  $L\pi^*$ , thanks to Proposition 4.5.

For the second part, consider the class  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  consisting of objects  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $\rho_* F \rightarrow \bar{F}_e$  surjective. Let us show that  $\mathcal{Q}$  satisfy the (dual of the) properties (1'), (2), (3) from Proposition 4.5.

- (1') Given  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi) \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , we take some sheaf  $E^0 \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$  with a surjection  $E^0|_T \rightarrow \bar{F}_e$ . This gives us a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (F, \bar{F}; \phi) \rightarrow (F \oplus E^0, \bar{F}; \psi) \rightarrow (E^0, 0; 0) \rightarrow 0,$$

and so a resolution  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow 0$  with  $\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{E}^1$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

- (2) This is a direct application of the snake lemma: take the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \rho_* F & \longrightarrow & \rho_* F' & \longrightarrow & \rho_* F'' \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{F}_e & \longrightarrow & \bar{F}'_e & \longrightarrow & \bar{F}''_e \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

and look at the induced sequence at the level of cokernels.

- (3) Given an element  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , consider the map  $\psi: \rho_* F \rightarrow \bar{F}_e$  whose kernel corresponds to  $\pi_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi)$ . Our assumption ensures that the cokernel of this map is trivial.

This way, if  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence with elements in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the snake lemma applied to the maps  $\psi, \psi', \psi''$  defined as above gives us the short exact sequence on the kernels. This is, a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{F}'' \rightarrow 0$ .

This shows that  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  is defined and preserves boundedness. Moreover, the functor  $R\pi_*$  also exists as a functor from  $D^-(\mathcal{R})$  to  $D^-(C)$ , cf. [Stacks, Tag 07K7]. Note that the adjointness  $L\pi^* \dashv R\pi_*$  follows immediately.

It remains to prove that  $R\pi_* \circ L\pi^*(E) \cong E$ , for which we may assume that  $E$  is a bounded above complex of locally free sheaves. But in this case  $R\pi_* \circ L\pi^*(E) = \pi_* \pi^*(E)$ . The result follows from (2.1) after tensoring by  $E$ .  $\square$

From Lemma 4.13 we have  $D^-(\mathcal{R}) = \langle \ker R\pi_*, L\pi^* D^-(C) \rangle$ . In particular, the functor  $R\pi_*: D^-(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^-(C)$  identifies  $D^-(C)$  with the Verdier quotient  $D^-(\mathcal{R})/\ker R\pi_*$ . We will now adapt this result to the bounded derived categories.

**Lemma 4.14.** *The functor  $R\pi_*$  preserves boundedness, and the restricted functor  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  is essentially surjective.*

*Proof.* The first part follows by Proposition 4.5 together with the proof of Lemma 4.13. These two guarantee that  $R^i \pi_*(E) = 0$  for  $i > 2$  if  $E \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ . This way, if  $F \in D^b(\mathcal{R})$  is given, the spectral sequence

$$(4.6) \quad E_2 = R^p \pi_*(H^q(F)) \Rightarrow R^{p+q} \pi_* F$$

converges at the  $E_2$  page.

Now, let  $E \in D^b(C)$  be given, say  $E \in D(C)^{[k, \ell]}$ . By Lemma 4.13, we have that  $E \cong R\pi_* F$  with  $F = L\pi^* E \in D(\mathcal{R})^{(-\infty, \ell]}$ . By the degeneration of the spectral sequence above we get that  $E \cong R\pi_* \tau^{[k-1, \ell]} F$ .  $\square$

To further analyze the functor  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  we follow the strategy in [KKS22, p. 479]. Let us recall the key technical lemma.

**Lemma 4.15** (Verdier, [Ver77, Théoremè 4–2, p. 20]). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a triangulated category,  $\mathcal{D}'$  a full subcategory, and  $\mathcal{N}$  a thick triangulated category. Assume that any of the following conditions hold:*

- (b.ii) *For each  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  with  $X \in \mathcal{D}'$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{N}$ , we have that  $f$  factors through an object of  $\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}'$ .*
- (b.ii') *For each  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  with  $X \in \mathcal{D}'$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{N}$ , we have that  $f$  factors through an object of  $\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}'$ .*

*Then, the canonical functor  $\mathcal{D}'/(\mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}/\mathcal{N}$  is fully faithful.*

**Proposition 4.16.** *The functor  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  realizes  $D^b(C)$  as a Verdier quotient of  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  by  $\ker R\pi_*$ .*

*Proof.* Let us verify Verdier's criterion to  $\mathcal{D}' = D^b(\mathcal{R})$ ,  $\mathcal{D} = D^-(\mathcal{R})$  and  $\mathcal{N} = \ker R\pi_*$ . To do so, consider a morphism  $f: F \rightarrow G$  with  $F \in \ker R\pi_*$  and  $G \in D^b(\mathcal{A})$ . Given  $N$ , note that both  $\tau^{\leq -N} F$  and  $\tau^{> -N} F$  lie in  $\ker R\pi_*$ , by the degeneration of the spectral sequence (4.6). For  $N \gg 0$ , we have that  $\text{Hom}(\tau^{\leq -N} F, G) = 0$ , and so  $f$  factors through  $\tau^{> -N} F \in \ker R\pi_* \cap D^b(\mathcal{R})$ . This shows that  $R\pi_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(C)$  is fully faithful; essential surjectivity follows from Lemma 4.14.  $\square$

## 5. STABILITY CONDITIONS

In this section we will produce stability conditions on the category  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ . To do so, we will start by describing the numerical Grothendieck group of  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  in Subsection 5.1. We will then produce a heart of a bounded t-structure on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  in Subsection 5.2, and a family of central charges on it in Subsection 5.3.



The remaining work is to prove the support property. To do so, we will first give some constraints on the  $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}$ -semistable objects in Subsection 5.4. We will use this to prove various inequalities towards the support property in Subsection 5.5. Finally, we will show the support property in Subsection 5.6.

We work under the setup of Subsection 4.1, but now assuming that  $C$  is projective. This also guarantees that  $\tilde{C}$  is projective.

**5.1. Grothendieck groups.** Recall that for a triangulated category  $\mathcal{D}$ , we have the following two constructions.

- (1) The *Grothendieck group*  $K(\mathcal{D})$  is the abelian group generated by the objects of  $\mathcal{D}$ , subject to the relation  $[B] = [A] + [C]$  for each triangle  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A[1]$ .
- (2) Assume that  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear, with a Serre functor, and that  $\bigoplus_i \text{Hom}(A, B[i])$  is a finite dimensional  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{D}$ . In this case we have the *Euler pairing*  $\chi(A, B) = \sum_i (-1)^i \dim \text{Hom}(A, B[i])$ . We set the *numerical Grothendieck group*  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{D})$  to be quotient of  $K(\mathcal{D})$  by the kernel of the Euler pairing.

**Proposition 5.1.** *The numerical Grothendieck group of  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  is free of rank  $2n + me$ . A basis of its dual is given by the maps that assign to  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  the following:*

- (1) for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the map  $\deg_k(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \deg(F|_{\tilde{C}_k})$ ;
- (2) for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the map  $\text{rk}_k(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \text{rk}(F|_{\tilde{C}_k})$ ;
- (3) for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and each  $1 \leq j \leq e$ , the map  $\ell_{ij}(F, \bar{F}; \phi) = \ell((\bar{F}_j)|_{q_i})$ .

*Proof.* Recall from Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 3.8 that we have semi-orthogonal decompositions

$$D^b(\mathcal{R}) = \langle b^*D^b(\mathcal{A}), La^*D^b(\tilde{C}) \rangle, \quad D^b(\mathcal{A}) = \langle D^b(T_0), D^b(T_0), \dots, D^b(T_0) \rangle.$$

Here  $T_0 = \text{Sing}(C)$  is the set-theoretic support of  $C$ , and so  $D^b(\mathcal{A})$  admits a semi-orthogonal decomposition with  $me$  factors isomorphic to  $D^b(pt)$ . Similarly, we have that  $D^b(\tilde{C}) = \bigoplus_k D^b(\tilde{C}_k)$ . This shows that

$$K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \cong \bigoplus_k K^{\text{num}}(\tilde{C}_k) \oplus \bigoplus_{m,e} K^{\text{num}}(D^b(pt)),$$

cf. [AK25, Proposition 2.8(ii)]. This shows that  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  is free of rank  $2n + me$ .

For the second part, note that the maps  $\deg_k, \text{rk}_k, \ell_{ij}$  induce a linear map  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{2n+me}$ . (The fact that these maps descend to  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  follows immediately from the computations in [AK25, Proposition 2.8(ii)].) This way, it suffices to show that this map is surjective, which can be checked in appropriately chosen objects (such as  $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}_k}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_p$ , and so on).  $\square$

**5.2. Heart.** The next step towards constructing a pre-stability condition is to provide a heart on  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$ . To find it we will tilt the standard heart  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \{(T, \bar{T}; \phi) : T \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C}), \bar{T} \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}), \phi \text{ surjective}\}, \\ \mathcal{F} &= \{(0, \bar{F}; 0) : \bar{F} \in \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 5.2.** *The pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  is a torsion pair on  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $\mathcal{T} = (T, \bar{T}; \phi) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = (0, \bar{F}; 0) \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have that  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  consists on pairs  $f: T \rightarrow 0$  and  $g: \bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{F}$  making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_* \mu_S^*(T|_S) & \xrightarrow{\rho_* \mu_S^*(f|_S)} & 0 \\ \phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bar{T} & \xrightarrow{g} & \bar{F} \end{array}$$

commute. Here  $f$  is the zero map, and the surjectivity of  $\phi$  ensures that  $g$  is the zero map as well. This proves that  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ .

Now, given  $\mathcal{E} = (E, \bar{E}; \phi)$  an element of  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , it fits into the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow (E, \text{im } \phi; \phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (0, \text{coker } \phi; 0) \rightarrow 0$ . The first term lies in  $\mathcal{T}$ , while the second one is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . This proves the claimed statement.  $\square$

This way, we perform the tilt of the torsion pair to produce a heart

$$\mathcal{C} = \{E \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A}) : H^{-1}(E) \in \mathcal{F}, H^0(E) \in \mathcal{T}, H^i(E) = 0 \text{ otherwise}\}.$$

**Lemma 5.3.** *The functor  $R\pi_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(C)$  restricts to an exact functor  $R\pi_*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Coh}(C)$ . Similarly,  $a_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$  restricts to an exact functor  $a_*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $E \in \mathcal{C}$ , we consider the exact triangle  $H^{-1}(E)[1] \rightarrow E \rightarrow H^0(E)$ . Here  $R\pi_*(H^0(E)) = \pi_*(H^0(E))$  by the proof of Lemma 4.13. Also, note that  $\pi_*(H^{-1}(E)) = 0$ , and so  $R\pi_*(H^{-1}(E)) = R^1\pi_*(H^{-1}(E))[-1]$ . The first part follows immediately. A similar argument applies for the second part.  $\square$

For later reference, we will need the following fact.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Consider the exact triple  $\text{D}^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$  induced by the semi-orthogonal decomposition (4.4). We have that the heart  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  is obtained by recollement (cf. [BBD82, Théorème 1.4.10]) of the standard hearts  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})[1] \subseteq \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\text{Coh}(\tilde{C}) \subseteq \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that the functor  $b^*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  maps  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})[1]$  into  $\mathcal{C}$ , and that  $a_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$  maps  $\mathcal{C}$  onto  $\text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ . This way, it suffices to show that  $La^* \circ a_*$  is left t-exact, cf. [BBD82, Proposition 1.4.12]. This follows directly by the fact that  $a_*$  is t-exact, and that  $La^*$  can be computed by resolving using locally free sheaves.  $\square$

**5.3. Central charge.** The next ingredient we need is a central charge. Pick  $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ ,  $\beta = (\beta_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ ,  $\gamma = (\gamma_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$  and  $\delta = (\delta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq e}$  real numbers.

**Condition 5.5.** For all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq e$ , we impose the following:

- (1)  $\alpha_k > 0, \gamma_k > 0$ ;
- (2)  $\delta_{ij} > 0$ ;
- (3)  $\sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_p) \delta_{ij} < \gamma_k$  for all  $p \in \tilde{C}_k \cap \rho^{-1}(q_i)$ .

We point out that the condition is non-vacuous: take  $\alpha_k = 1$ ,  $\beta_k = 0$ ,  $\gamma_k = 1$ , and  $\delta_{ij} = \epsilon$  for some  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ .

Under these assumptions, set  $Z = Z_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}: K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  via the formula

$$Z(E) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^e \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) - \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k \deg_k(E) + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k \text{rk}_k(E) + i \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \text{rk}_k(E).$$

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $0 \neq E \in \mathcal{C}$  be given. Then  $Z(E)$  lies in the upper half-space.*

*Proof.* Note that for any  $E \in \mathcal{C}$ , we have that

$$\mathrm{rk}_k(E) = \mathrm{rk}_k(H^0(E)) \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Equality holds only if  $a_*H^0(E)|_{\tilde{C}_k}$  is torsion. This immediately gives us that  $\mathrm{Im} Z_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}(E) \geq 0$ , and equality holds when  $a_*H^0(E)$  is torsion.

This way, assume now that  $\mathrm{Im} Z_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}(E) = 0$ , so that  $a_*H^0(E)$  is torsion. We will divide this case into four small steps.

- (1) Assume that  $E = H^{-1}(E)[1]$ . In this case, we have that  $\ell_{ij}(E) \leq 0$  for all  $i, j$  and that the other terms are zero. This way,  $\sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) \leq 0$ . Equality holds only for  $\ell_{ij}(E) = 0$  for all  $i, j$ , i.e. for  $E = 0$ .
- (2) Assume that  $E = (\mathcal{O}_x, \bar{F}; \phi)$  for some  $x \in \tilde{C}_k$ . Our assumption ensures that  $\phi$  is surjective. So, if  $\rho(x) \notin \mathrm{Sing}(C)$ , then  $\bar{F} = 0$ , and  $Z(E) = -\gamma_k < 0$ . Otherwise, we have that  $\rho(x) = q_i$  for some  $i$ , and so

$$Z(E) = -\gamma_k + \sum_j \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) \leq -\gamma_k + \sum_j \delta_{ij} \ell(I^{e-j}|_x) < 0,$$

thanks to the surjectivity.

- (3) Assume that  $E = H^0(E)$ . Here  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $F$  torsion, so we induct in the length of  $F$ . The case  $\ell(F) = 1$  was done in the previous point. For the induction step, we pick a subsheaf  $F' \subset F$  of length 1, and use the subobject  $(F', \phi(\mu_S^*(F'|_S)); \mathrm{id})$  of  $E$ , which is a subobject both in  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  and in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The induction step allows us to conclude.
- (4) For the general case, note that  $E$  fits in a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow H^{-1}(E)[1] \rightarrow E \rightarrow H^0(E) \rightarrow 0$ . We conclude directly by the previous points.

This proves that  $Z(E)$  lies in the upper half-space, as claimed.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.7.** *Assume that  $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij}$  are all rational numbers satisfying Condition 5.5. Then, the pair  $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} = (Z_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, \mathcal{C})$  is a pre-stability condition.*

*Proof.* Our assumption guarantees that  $Z_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}$  has discrete image. Moreover, the set  $\{E \in \mathcal{C} : \mathrm{Im} Z(E) = 0\}$  consists of objects  $E$  with  $H^0(E) = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  having  $F$  torsion. This way, we immediately verify that the set is both Noetherian and Artinian. The existence of Harder–Narasimhan filtrations is now standard, cf. [MS17, Lemma 4.10].  $\square$

**5.4. Semistable objects.** In this subsection we fix  $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij}$  rational numbers satisfying Condition 5.5. This way, we have a pre-stability condition  $\sigma = \sigma_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}$  as proven in Corollary 5.7. We start by describing the  $\sigma$ -stable objects of phase 1.

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  be a  $\sigma$ -stable object of phase 1. Then  $E$  satisfies one of the following three options.*

- (1) We have  $E = (\mathcal{O}_x, 0; 0)$  for some  $x \in \tilde{C} \setminus S$ .
- (2) We have  $E = (\mathcal{O}_p, \bar{F}; \phi)$ , for some  $p \in \rho^{-1}(q_i)$ , and  $\bar{F}$  is supported at  $q_i$  with  $\ell(\bar{F}_j) \leq \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i})$ .
- (3) We have  $E = (0, \bar{F}; 0)[1]$  for some  $\bar{F}$ .

*Proof.* Follows from the proof of Lemma 5.6.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  be a  $\sigma$ -stable object of phase smaller than 1. Then  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  is an element of  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , with  $F$  a locally free sheaf.*

*Proof.* For the first part, note that we have the short exact sequence

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

in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Here  $H^{-1}(E)[1]$  must be zero, as otherwise it will be a subobject with phase 1. Let us write  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$ .

We claim that  $F$  must be locally free. Otherwise, the torsion subobject  $F_{\text{tors}}$  will induce a destabilizing subobject  $(F_{\text{tors}}, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_{\text{tors}}|_S)); \phi)$ . It follows that  $F_{\text{tors}} = 0$ , and so  $F$  is locally free.  $\square$

**5.5. Inequalities.** The goal of this subsection is to produce various inequalities that will help us proving the support property. To do so, we endow  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  with the norm  $\|v\|^2 = \sum_k |\deg_k(v)|^2 + \sum_k |\text{rk}_k(v)|^2 + \sum_{i,j} |\ell_{ij}(v)|^2$ .

Let us start by bounding  $\sigma$ -stable objects  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  with phase 1. We omit the proof, as it follows by a direct computation together with Lemma 5.8.

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  be a  $\sigma$ -stable object of phase 1.*

- (1) *If  $E = (\mathcal{O}_x, 0; 0)$ , for some  $x \in \tilde{C}_k \setminus S$ , then  $\|E\| = 1$  and  $|\text{Re } Z(E)| = |\gamma_k|$ .*
- (2) *If  $E = (\mathcal{O}_p, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $\rho(p) = q_i$  and  $p \in \tilde{C}_k$ , then*

$$\|E\|^2 \leq 1 + \sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i})^2, \quad |\text{Re } Z(E)| \geq \gamma_k - \sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i}) \delta_{ij}.$$

- (3) *If  $E = (0, \bar{F}; 0)[1]$ , then*

$$\|E\|^2 = \sum_{ij} \ell(\bar{F}^j|_{p_i})^2, \quad |\text{Re } Z(E)| = \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\bar{F}^j|_{p_i}).$$

We will now focus on the case when  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -stable object with phase smaller than 1. From Lemma 5.9, we have that  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  for some  $F \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$  locally free. We write  $F = \bigoplus_k F_k$ , where each  $F_k$  is a locally free sheaf on  $\tilde{C}_k$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  be a  $\sigma$ -stable object of phase smaller than 1, and let  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then, the inequality*

$$\gamma_k |\deg_k(E)| \leq \frac{\text{Im } Z(E)}{\alpha_k} \left( \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})) + |\beta_k| \right) + |\text{Re } Z(E)|$$

*holds.*

*Proof.* Let us assume first that  $\deg_k(E) \geq 0$ . Consider the short exact sequence of sheaves  $0 \rightarrow (F_k, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi) \rightarrow E \rightarrow (F/F_k, \bar{F}/\phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi) \rightarrow 0$ , which is also a short exact sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The fact that  $E$  is  $\sigma$ -stable gives us the inequality

$$\frac{-\text{Re } Z(F_k, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi)}{\text{Im } Z(F_k, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi)} \leq \frac{-\text{Re } Z(E)}{\text{Im } Z(E)}.$$

Expanding the left hand side, and using that  $F_k$  is supported on  $\tilde{C}_k$ , gives us

$$\frac{-\sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell_{i,j}(F_k, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi) + \gamma_k \deg_k(E) - \beta_k \text{rk}_k(E)}{\alpha_k \text{rk}_k(E)} \leq \frac{-\text{Re } Z(E)}{\text{Im } Z(E)}.$$

The surjectivity of  $\phi$  ensures that

$$\ell_{i,j}(F_k, \phi(\mu_S^*(F_k|_S)); \phi) \leq \ell(\rho_*(F_k|_S \otimes I^{e-j})) \leq \text{rk}_k(F) \cdot \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})),$$

and so

$$\frac{-\mathrm{rk}_k(E) \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})) + \gamma_k \deg_k(E) - \beta_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E)}{\alpha_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E)} \leq \frac{-\mathrm{Re} Z(E)}{\mathrm{Im} Z(E)}.$$

We now rearrange terms and use that  $\deg_k(E) \geq 0$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma_k \deg_k(E) \\ & \leq \left| -\mathrm{Re} Z(E) \cdot \frac{\alpha_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E)}{\mathrm{Im} Z(E)} + \mathrm{rk}_k(E) \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})) + \beta_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E) \right| \\ & \leq |\mathrm{Re} Z(E)| \cdot \left| \frac{\alpha_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E)}{\mathrm{Im} Z(E)} \right| + \left( \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})) + |\beta_k| \right) |\mathrm{rk}_k(E)|. \end{aligned}$$

We now use that  $0 \leq \alpha_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E) \leq \mathrm{Im} Z(E)$  to conclude. The case  $\deg_k(E) < 0$  is handled similarly.  $\square$

**5.6. Quadratic forms.** In this subsection we will prove the full support property for the pre-stability conditions constructed in Corollary 5.7. Let us start with the following bound of semistable objects of phase 1.

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij}$  rational numbers satisfying Condition 5.5. Let  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  be a  $\sigma$ -stable object of phase 1. Then, we have that  $\|E\|^2 \leq P_0 |\mathrm{Re} Z(E)|^2$ , where  $P_0 = P_0(\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij})$  is given by*

$$P_0 = \max \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \right)_k, \left( \frac{1 + \sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_j})^2}{(\gamma_k - \sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_{ij}}) \delta_{ij})^2} \right)_{i,k:q_i \in \rho(\tilde{C}_k)}, \left( \frac{1}{\delta_{ij}^2} \right)_i \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Follows immediately from the description in Lemma 5.8.  $\square$

The next step is the following inequality for semistable objects of phase smaller than 1.

**Lemma 5.13.** *Let  $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_i$  rational numbers satisfying Condition 5.5. If  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -semistable object of phase smaller than 1, then  $\|E\|^2 \leq Q_1 |\mathrm{Im} Z(E)|^2 + P_1 |\mathrm{Re} Z(E)|^2$ , where*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= m \sum_{j=1}^e \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \frac{\ell(\rho_* \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\tilde{C}_k \cap S} \otimes I^{e-j})}{\alpha_k} \right)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2} \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{2 \left( \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell(\rho_*(\mathcal{O}_S \otimes I^{e-j})) + |\beta_k| \right)^2}{\alpha_k^2 \gamma_k^2}, \\ P_1 &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\|E\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n |\deg_k(E)|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n |\mathrm{rk}_k(E)|^2 + \sum_{i,j} |\ell_{ij}|^2$ . Let us bound each term independently.

- We have that  $0 \leq \alpha_k \mathrm{rk}_k(E) \leq \mathrm{Im} Z(E)$ . This gives us that  $|\mathrm{rk}_k(E)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2} |\mathrm{Im} Z(E)|^2$ .

- From Lemma 5.11, we have that  $|\deg_k| \leq A |\operatorname{Re} Z(E)| + B |\operatorname{Im} Z(E)|$  for some functions  $A, B$ . We square both sides and use that  $(x+y)^2 \leq 2x^2 + 2y^2$ .
- From the proof of Lemma 5.11, we have

$$0 \leq \ell_{ij} \leq \sum_k \operatorname{rk}_k(F) \cdot \ell(\rho_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}_k \cap S} \otimes I^{e-j}).$$

We square this expression and use the bound on the rank.

Putting everything together gives us the claimed inequality.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.14.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{3n+me}$  be the open subset of tuples  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \delta_{ij})$  satisfying Condition 5.5. There exists continuous functions  $P, Q: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that the following holds: if  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$ -stable object, with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  rational, then*

$$\|E\|^2 \leq P(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) |\operatorname{Re} Z_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}(E)|^2 + Q(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) |\operatorname{Im} Z_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}(E)|^2.$$

*In particular, we get stability conditions  $\sigma = \sigma_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$  for all  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* The first part is immediately from the previous computation, taking  $P = \max\{P_0, P_1\}$  and  $Q = Q_1$ . If  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  are all rational, this shows that the pre-stability condition  $\sigma_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$  from Corollary 5.7 satisfies the support property. The extension to  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  real is standard, cf. [Tod14, §5.1].  $\square$

## 6. EXISTENCE OF MODULI SPACES

So far, we have constructed a categorical resolution of singularities  $D^b(\mathcal{R})$  of  $D^b(C)$ , and stability conditions  $\sigma = \sigma_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$ . In this section we will investigate the existence of moduli spaces of  $\sigma$ -semistable objects with a fixed numerical vector  $v$ .

Let us fix some notation. By Corollary 4.10, there exists a smooth, proper variety  $X$ , together with a fully faithful functor  $D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(X)$  with left and right adjoints. This way, if  $\sigma$  is one of the stability conditions of Corollary 5.14, and  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  are given, we consider the assignment  $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$  as follows. For each  $\mathbb{C}$ -scheme  $S$ , set  $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)(S)$  to be

$$\{E \in D_{S-\text{perf}}(S \times X) : E|_s \text{ is } \sigma\text{-semistable of class } v, \text{ for all } s \in S\}$$

This defines a subfunctor of the stack  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{pug}}(X)$  of perfect, universally gluable objects from [Lie06]. The goal of this section is to prove the following result.

**Theorem 6.1.** *For each  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$ , the assignment  $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$  is a finite type algebraic stack admitting a proper good moduli space  $M_\sigma(v)$ .*

*Proof.* We follow the discussion from [AHLH23, Example 7.29] (cf. [BM23, §2.1; AS25, §2.10]). To prove the claimed result, it suffices to show that (i) for each  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$ , the collection of  $\sigma$ -semistable objects with class  $v$  is *bounded*; and (ii) the heart  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq D^b(\mathcal{R})$  satisfies *generic flatness*.

We will prove boundedness in Subsection 6.1, and generic flatness in Subsection 6.2. This way, the discussion in [AHLH23, Example 7.29] will immediately imply the claimed result.  $\square$

*Remark 6.2.* We will prove later that for nodes and tacnodes the moduli spaces  $M_\sigma(v)$  are actually *projective*, cf. Theorems 8.1 and 9.1. See also the discussion in [BM23, Theorem 2.4].

**6.1. Boundedness.** Recall that a collection of objects  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $D^b(X)$  is said to be *bounded* if there exists a scheme  $T$  and a family  $\mathcal{E} \in D_{T-\text{perf}}(T \times X)$  such that each  $F \in \mathcal{S}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{E}|_t$  for some  $t \in T$ . The goal of this subsection is to prove the following result.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $\sigma = \sigma_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$  and  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(X)$  be given. The collection of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  that are  $\sigma$ -semistable with numerical vector  $v$  is bounded.*

The proof will rely in the following two tools. First, we will use the well-known fact that on a curve, the collection of semistable vector bundles of fixed rank and degree is bounded.

**Lemma 6.4** (cf. [HL10, Theorem 3.3.7]). *Let  $\Gamma$  be a smooth, projective curve; let  $r > 0$ , and let  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  be an integer. Then, the collection of locally free sheaves in  $\Gamma$  that are slope-semistable of rank  $r$  and degree  $d$  is bounded.*

The second fact we will use is that boundedness is preserved under extensions.

**Lemma 6.5** ([Tod08, Lemma 3.16]). *Let  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$  be three collections of objects in  $D^b(X)$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  are bounded. Suppose that each object  $E \in \mathcal{S}_3$  fits into a distinguished triangle  $A \rightarrow E \rightarrow B \rightarrow A[1]$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{S}_1$  and  $B \in \mathcal{S}_2$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}_3$  is bounded as well.*

We are ready to start with the proof of Proposition 6.3. Recall that any object  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  has  $\text{rk}_k(E) \geq 0$  (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.6). This way, we assume that  $\text{rk}_k(v) \geq 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . We will divide the proof in two cases, depending on whether  $\text{rk}_k(v) = 0$  for all  $k$  or not.

*Proof of Proposition 6.3,  $\text{rk}_k(v) = 0$  for all  $k$ .* Assume that  $v$  satisfies  $\text{rk}_k(v) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . This way, we have that  $\text{Im } Z(v) = 0$ , and so the objects with numerical class  $v$  all have phase 1.

Now, we classified the *stable* objects of phase 1 in Lemma 5.8. For a fixed  $v$ , each of the three families described there are bounded:

- (1) The collection of objects  $\{(\mathcal{O}_x, 0; 0)\}_{x \in \tilde{C} \setminus Z}$  is bounded: take  $\tilde{C} \setminus Z$ , and the structure sheaf of the diagonal.
- (2) The collection  $\{(\mathcal{O}_q, \overline{F}; \phi)\}$  is bounded. In fact, we have finitely many options for  $p$ , while the  $\ell(\overline{F}^j)$  are determined by  $v$ . Once those are fixed, the object  $\overline{F}$  is determined as a vector space; the module structure and the maps  $\alpha, \beta$  give a finite dimensional vector space, and the compatibility conditions cut out a closed subscheme on it.
- (3) The collection  $\{(0, \overline{F}; 0)[1]\}$  is bounded, by an argument similar to the one in the previous point.

Lastly, note that there are finitely many decompositions of  $v$  as a sum of numerical classes in (1)–(3). An application of Lemma 6.5 ensures that the collection  $\{E \in \mathcal{C} : v(E) = v, E \text{ semistable}\}$  is finite.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.3,  $\text{rk}_k(v) > 0$  for some  $k$ .* Assume that  $v$  satisfies  $\text{rk}_k(v) > 0$  for some  $k$ . This way, we have that  $\text{Im } Z(v) > 0$ , so that the objects with numerical class  $v$  have phase smaller than 1.

Let  $E$  be one of such objects. By Lemma 5.9, we have that  $E = (F, \overline{F}; \phi)$  is an element of  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , with  $F$  a locally free sheaf on  $\tilde{C}$ . Write  $F = \bigoplus_k F_k$ , where each  $F_k$  is a locally free sheaf supported on  $\tilde{C}_k$ .

We claim that for each  $k$ , and for each quotient of sheaves  $F_k \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$ , the slope  $\deg(G)/\mathrm{rk}(G)$  is bounded below. To show this, note that we have a quotient in  $\mathcal{C}$ :  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi) \rightarrow (G, \phi(G); \phi) \rightarrow 0$ . Using that  $(F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable yields

$$-\frac{\mathrm{Im} Z(v)}{\mathrm{Re} Z(v)} \leq -\frac{\mathrm{Im} Z(G, \phi(G); \phi)}{\mathrm{Re} Z(G, \phi(G); \phi)} \leq \frac{\gamma_k}{\alpha_k} \cdot \frac{\deg(G)}{\mathrm{rk}(G)} - \frac{\beta_k}{\alpha_k}.$$

A similar argument shows that for each  $k$ , and each subsheaf  $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow F_k$ , the slope  $\deg(H)/\mathrm{rk}(H)$  is bounded above.

From here, it follows that there are finitely many Harder–Narasimhan filtrations for each  $F_k$  (with respect to the slope  $\deg/\mathrm{rk}$ ). Using Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.5, we get that the collection

$$\{F \in \mathrm{Coh}(\tilde{C}) : \exists E \in \mathcal{C}, v(E) = v, \text{ semistable}, E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)\}$$

is bounded. Using that the collection  $\{(0, \bar{F}; 0)[1]\}$  with lengths determined by  $v$  is bounded, another application of Lemma 6.5 ensures that the collection of  $\sigma$ -semistable objects with numerical vector  $v$  is bounded.  $\square$

**6.2. Generic flatness.** Let us start by recalling some definitions. Given an admissible subcategory  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(X)$ , where  $X$  is a smooth, projective variety, we have a semi-orthogonal decomposition  $\mathrm{D}^b(X) = \langle \mathcal{D}, {}^\perp \mathcal{D} \rangle$ . This way, the main result of [Kuz11] gives us a base change  $\mathrm{D}^b(S \times X) = \langle \mathcal{D}_S, {}^\perp \mathcal{D}_S \rangle$ . If  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{D}$  is the heart of a bounded t-structure on  $\mathcal{D}$ , by [Pol07] (cf. [AP06]) there is a heart  $\mathcal{H}_S \subset \mathcal{D}_S$ .

Following [AP06, Problem 3.5.1], we say that  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies *generic flatness* if for any  $S$  and any  $E \in \mathcal{H}_S$ , there exists an open dense subset  $U \subset S$  such that  $E|_s \in \mathcal{H}$  for each  $s \in U$ . For the standard heart of  $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$ , this holds by the usual version of generic flatness. The goal of this subsection is to prove the following statement.

**Proposition 6.6.** *The heart  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  satisfies generic flatness.*

The key ingredient is the following proposition, which says that generic flatness is preserved under recollement.

**Lemma 6.7** ([BRH21, Lemma 4.27]). *Let  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(X)$  be an admissible subcategory. Assume that  $\mathcal{D}$  admits a semi-orthogonal decomposition  $\mathcal{D} = \langle \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \rangle$ , and fix hearts of bounded t-structures  $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}_i$ . If each  $\mathcal{H}_i$  satisfies generic flatness, and if  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{D}$  is obtained by recollement, then  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies generic flatness.*

*Proof of Proposition 6.6.* Recall from (4.4) that  $\mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  admits a semi-orthogonal decomposition  $\mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}) = \langle b^* \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}), La^* \mathrm{D}^b(\tilde{C}) \rangle$ . We also proved in Lemma 5.4 that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a recollement of the hearts  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A})[1] \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathrm{Coh}(\tilde{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(\tilde{C})$ . By Lemma 6.7 it suffices to show that  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A})$  satisfies generic flatness.

To show that  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{T,I,e}) \subseteq \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}_{T,I,e})$  satisfies generic flatness, we proceed by induction on  $e$ . The case  $e = 0$  is immediate, as here  $T$  is smooth, and  $\mathcal{A}_{T,I,0} = \mathrm{Coh}(T)$ . For the induction step, we use the exact triple

$$\mathrm{D}^b(Z_0) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n}) \xrightarrow{e^!} \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z',I,n-1}).$$

Here  $e_* e^! : \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n}) \rightarrow \mathrm{D}^b(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$  is clearly t-exact with respect to  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$ . It follows that  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$  is a recollement of  $\mathrm{Coh}(Z_0)$  and  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z',I,n-1})$  by [BBD82, Proposition 1.4.12(i)]. The induction assumption, together with Lemma 6.7, shows that  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{Z,I,n})$  satisfies generic flatness.  $\square$



## 7. COMPARISON

Let us assume from now on that  $C$  is an irreducible, reduced curve. We follow the notation of Subsection 4.1; in particular, we are fixing a non-rational locus  $T$  of  $C$ , and an exponent  $e \geq 1$ .

Let us specialize the results of Theorem 1.1 to our setting. We have constructed an abelian category  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , a heart  $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$ , and stability conditions  $\sigma$  depending on  $3 + me$  parameters. We fix  $\alpha = \gamma = 1$  and  $\beta = 0$ , and let

$$(7.1) \quad \tilde{\Omega} = \left\{ (\delta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq e} : \delta_{ij} > 0, \sum_j \ell(I^{e-j}|_p) \delta_{ij} < 1 \forall p \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C}) \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{me}.$$

This way, Theorem 1.1 gives us stability conditions  $\sigma_\Delta$  with central charge

$$Z_\Delta(E) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^e \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}(E) - \deg(E) + i \text{rk}(E)$$

for any  $\Delta = (\delta_{ij}) \in \tilde{\Omega}$ , varying continuously on  $\Delta$ .

*Remark 7.1.* Note that (7.1) is non-empty: taking  $0 < \delta_{ij} \ll 1$  satisfies it. Also, taking  $0 < 1 - \delta_{ie} \ll 1$  and  $0 < \delta_{ij} \ll 1$  for all  $j < e$  also lies in (7.1).

We now fix a numerical vector  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$ . We have a *wall-and-chamber* decomposition on  $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{R})$ : a collection of locally finite, locally closed submanifolds of real codimension 1, called *walls*, dividing  $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{R})$  into *chambers*. By pulling back these walls to  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , we get an induced wall-and-chamber decomposition.

The goal of this section is twofold. First, we will prove finiteness of the walls with respect to  $v$  on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . Second, we will use this to compare the moduli spaces  $M_\sigma(v)$  with moduli spaces of slope-semistable sheaves on  $\tilde{C}$  and  $C$ .

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $v = (r, d, (\ell_{ij})_{ij})$  be a numerical vector with  $r > 0$ . Assume that  $v$  is primitive.*

- (1) *There are finitely many walls for  $v$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , and each one of them defines a (non-zero) hyperplane in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . In particular, for  $\sigma \in \tilde{\Omega}$  outside of these hyperplanes, we have that an object  $E$  with numerical class  $v$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable if and only if it is  $\sigma$ -stable.*
- (2) *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that the functor  $a_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$  induces a proper map  $a_*: M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  for any  $\Delta \in \tilde{\Omega}$  with  $\delta_{ij} < \epsilon$  for all  $i, j$ .*
- (3) *There exists  $\epsilon' > 0$  such that the functor  $R\pi_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(C)$  induces a proper map  $R\pi_*: M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$  for any  $\Delta \in \tilde{\Omega}$  with  $\delta_{ie} > 1 - \epsilon'$  for all  $i$ , where  $\bar{d} = d + r(p_a(C) - g) - \sum_i \ell_{ie}$ .*
- (4) *Assume that  $v = v(\pi^*E)$  for some  $E \in M_C(r, \bar{d})$ . If  $R\pi_*: M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$  is the map from (3), we have that the map is an isomorphism over the locus of  $M_C(r, \bar{d})$  parametrizing vector bundles.*

In general, it is difficult to give a precise description of the maps from Theorem 7.2. As we will see in Section 8, the map  $R\pi_*$  is in general not surjective. In special cases however, one can make the maps  $a_*$  and  $R\pi_*$  more explicit. We will return to this point in later sections.

The proof of Theorem 7.2 relies on a basic description of the  $\sigma$ -semistable objects of phase smaller than 1. We will analyze these objects in Subsection 7.1, and will use this to prove Theorem 7.2 in Subsection 7.2.

**7.1. Semistable objects of phase not 1.** The goal of this subsection is to give a basic description of the  $\sigma$ -semistable objects of phase smaller than 1. We fix  $\Delta \in \tilde{\Omega}$ , and  $v$  a numerical class with  $\text{rk}(v) > 0$ . We recall from Lemma 5.9 that if  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable with class  $v$ , then  $H^{-1}(E) = 0$ , and  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $F$  locally free. As a consequence, we get the following observation.

**Corollary 7.3.** *Assume that  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  is strictly semistable, fitting into a exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow E \rightarrow E'' \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $E', E''$  semistable of the same phase. Then  $\text{rk}(E'), \text{rk}(E'') < \text{rk}(E)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $E' = (F', \bar{F}'; \phi')$  and  $E'' = (F'', \bar{F}''; \phi'')$ . This way, the short exact sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$  is also a short exact sequence in  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , and it induces a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow F' \rightarrow F \rightarrow F'' \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$ . In particular, this shows that  $\text{rk}(F') + \text{rk}(F'') = \text{rk}(F)$ . As  $F', F''$  must have positive rank, we get the claimed inequality.  $\square$

**7.2. Proof of Theorem 7.2.** In this subsection we will prove Theorem 7.2. We start by proving the first statement, for which we need to describe the walls associated to  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$ .

Let us recall that a *numerical wall* corresponding to a decomposition  $v = v' + v''$  is given by the preimage of the set

$$\{W \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}), \mathbb{C}) : \text{Re } W(v) \cdot \text{Im } W(v') = \text{Re } W(v') \cdot \text{Im } W(v)\}$$

under the forgetful map  $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}), \mathbb{C})$ . This way, the preimage in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is given by  $\Delta \in \tilde{\Omega}$  such that  $\text{Re } Z_{\Delta}(v) \cdot \text{Im } Z_{\Delta}(v') = \text{Re } Z_{\Delta}(v') \cdot \text{Im } Z_{\Delta}(v)$ .

Let us spell this out. Write  $v = (r, d, \ell_{ij})$  and  $v' = (r', d', \ell'_{ij})$ , so that the numerical wall is given by

$$(7.2) \quad r \left( \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell'_{ij} - d' \right) = r' \left( \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij} - d \right).$$

Note that by Corollary 7.3, it suffices to look at those walls with  $0 < r' < r$ .

*Claim 7.4.* If  $v$  is primitive, then the equation (7.2) is not zero. Otherwise, we will have that  $d'/r' = d/r$  and  $\ell'_{ij}/r' = \ell_{ij}/r$  for all  $i, j$ . But by assumption we have that there are integers  $a, b, c_{ij}$  such that  $ar + bd + \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \ell_{ij} = 1$ . This way, we get that  $ar' + bd' + \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \ell'_{ij} = r'/r$ , a contradiction with  $r' < r$ .

We can rewrite (7.2) as  $\sum_{i,j} (\ell_{ij}/r - \ell'_{ij}/r') \delta_{ij} = d/r - d'/r'$ . Given  $0 < r' < r$ , there are finitely many choices for  $\ell'_{ij}$ , as we need surjectivity of  $\phi$ . For each one of these choices, there are finitely many options of  $d$  such that the hyperplane has a non-empty intersection with  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , as  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is bounded. This finishes the proof of the first part in Theorem 7.2.

Let us turn our attention to the second part of Theorem 7.2. Fix a numerical class  $v = (r, d, \ell_{ij})$  with  $r > 0$ . Set  $\epsilon = (r^2 \cdot \sum_{i,j} \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i}))^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $\Delta \in \tilde{\Omega}$  be a class with  $\delta_{ij} < \epsilon$  for all  $i, j$ . If  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  is a  $\sigma$ -semistable object of phase smaller than 1, then  $F \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C})$  is slope-semistable.*

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. Assume that  $F$  is not slope-semistable, and let  $F' \subset F$  be a destabilizing vector bundle. This induces a subobject  $E' = (F', \phi(\mu_S^*(F'|_S)); \phi)$  of  $E$ . Denote by  $(r', d', \ell'_{ij})$  the numerical vector of  $E'$ .

As  $E$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable, we have that

$$\frac{d - \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}}{r} \geq \frac{d' - \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \ell'_{ij}}{r'}.$$

By the surjectivity, we have that  $\ell'_{ij} \leq r' \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i})$ . This, together with our choice of  $\epsilon$ , gives us

$$\frac{d}{r} \geq \frac{d' - \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \ell'_{ij}}{r'} \geq \frac{d'}{r'} - \epsilon \frac{r'}{r} \sum_{ij} \ell(I^{e-j}|_{q_i}) > \frac{d'}{r'} - \frac{1}{r!}.$$

This shows that  $1/r^2 > d'/r' - d/r > 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

This lemma shows that the functor  $a_*: D^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow D^b(\tilde{C})$  maps  $\sigma$ -semistable objects of phase  $v$  to slope-semistable sheaves of rank  $r$  and degree  $d$ , provided that  $\delta_{ij} < \epsilon$  for all  $i, j$ . In particular, we get a well-defined map  $a_*: \mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  at the level of stacks. This immediately descends to a morphism  $a_*: M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  of the corresponding good moduli spaces (e.g. by [Alp13, Theorem 6.6]). This map is proper, as both sides are proper. This proves the second part of Theorem 7.2.

The proof of the last part of Theorem 7.2 follows the same ideas. We fix  $v = (r, d, \ell_{ij})$  with  $r > 0$ , and set  $\epsilon' = (2r^2 \sum_{ij} (I^{e-j}|_{q_i}))^{-1}$ . If  $E$  is a  $\sigma$ -semistable object with numerical vector  $v$ , then  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $E$  locally free. By construction, we have

$$R\pi_*(E) = \pi_*(E) = \ker(\rho_* F \rightarrow \bar{F}_e),$$

cf. Subsection 4.5 (and the proof of Lemma 4.13). In particular, we have that  $\pi_*(E)$  has rank  $r$  and degree  $\bar{d} := d + r(p_a(C) - g) - \sum_i \ell_{ie}$ .

**Lemma 7.6.** *Assume that  $\delta_{ie} > 1 - \epsilon'$  for all  $i$ . Then, we have that  $R\pi_*(E)$  is a slope-semistable pure dimension 1 sheaf in  $C$ .*

*Proof.* As before, we argue by contradiction. We assume that  $R\pi_*(E) = \pi_* E$  is not slope-semistable, and we let  $G \in \text{Coh}(C)$  be a saturated, destabilizing subsheaf.

By adjunction, the inclusion  $G \rightarrow \pi_* E$  corresponds to  $\pi^* G \rightarrow E$ . Now, the left hand side is of the form  $\pi^* G = (H, \bar{H}; \eta)$ , where  $H$  might have torsion (over  $S$ ). We let  $B' = H_{tf}$  the quotient of  $H$  by its torsion subsheaf, and  $\bar{B}' = \eta(\mu_S^*(H_{tf}|_S))$ . We point out that the map  $\pi^* G \rightarrow E$  factors through  $A = (B', \bar{B}'; \eta)$ . Moreover, the induced map  $A \rightarrow E$  is a monomorphism in the category  $\mathcal{C}$ . This way, if  $v(A) = (r', d', \ell'_{ij})$ , then we get the inequality

$$\frac{d - \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \ell_{ij}}{r} \geq \frac{d' - \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \ell'_{ij}}{r'}.$$

Our choice of  $\epsilon'$  allows us to bound the left hand side as

$$\geq \frac{d' - \sum_i \ell'_{ie}}{r'} - \frac{\sum_i \sum_{j < e} \delta_{ij} \ell'_{ij}}{r'} \geq \frac{d' - \sum_i \ell'_{ie}}{r'} - \epsilon'.$$

Similarly, the left hand side can be bounded above by  $(d - \sum_i \ell_{ie})/r + \epsilon'$ .

Finally, note that the natural map  $G \rightarrow \pi_* A$  is generically an isomorphism; thus, the cokernel is supported at points. In particular, it has to be an isomorphism, as

$G \rightarrow \pi_* A \rightarrow \pi_* E$  is a saturated subsheaf. We conclude as above, noting that  $\deg G = d' - \sum_i \ell'_{ie} + r(p_a(C) - g)$  and similar for  $\pi_* A$ .  $\square$

As in the second part, this shows that  $R\pi_*$  induces a morphism  $R\pi_*: \mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_C(r, \bar{d})$ , and so a morphism at the level of good moduli spaces. To prove the last statement of Theorem 7.2, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.7.** *If  $E \in M_C(r, \bar{d})$ , then  $\pi^* E$  is  $\sigma$ -semistable.*

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction; so that there exists a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \pi^* E \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  destabilizing  $E$ . As before, we may assume that  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$  lie in  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , and that the corresponding component in  $\text{Coh}(\bar{C})$  is locally free. This way, we apply  $R\pi_*$  by directly evaluating  $\pi_*$ , cf. the proof of Lemma 4.13. We get the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{F} \rightarrow E \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\text{Coh}(C)$ .

Now, the fact that  $E$  is slope-semistable gives us the inequality

$$\frac{\deg(\pi_* \mathcal{F})}{\text{rk}(\pi_* \mathcal{F})} < \frac{\deg E}{\text{rk} E} \implies \frac{\deg(\pi_* \mathcal{F})}{\text{rk}(\pi_* \mathcal{F})} + \frac{1}{r^2} \leq \frac{\deg E}{\text{rk} E}.$$

We now use that  $\deg(\pi_* \mathcal{F}) = \deg F + \text{rk}(F)(p_a(C) - g) - \sum_i \ell_{ie}(F)$ , together with the fact that  $\mathcal{F}$  destabilizes  $\pi^* E$ , to reach a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.2, (4).* We let  $U \subset M_C(r, \bar{d})$  be the open subset parametrizing vector bundles. We have a twisted universal family  $\mathcal{E} \in \text{D}^b(U \times C, \alpha \boxtimes 1)$ , for some Brauer class  $\alpha$ . (See [HL10, §4.6] and the references therein.)

Assume first that  $\alpha = 0$ , so that  $\mathcal{E} \in \text{D}^b(U \times C)$ . We apply  $L\pi^*$  to get  $(1 \times L\pi^*)(\mathcal{E})$  in  $\text{D}^-(\mathcal{R})_U$ . By flat base change, we have that over each point  $p \in U$ , the object  $(1 \times L\pi^*)(\mathcal{E})$  restricts to  $L\pi^* E = \pi^* E$ , where  $E$  is the vector bundle corresponding to  $U$ . In particular, this shows that  $(1 \times L\pi^*)(\mathcal{E}) \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})_U$ . Moreover, by Lemma 7.7, we have that this is a family of  $\sigma$ -semistable objects. This way, the family  $(1 \times L\pi^*)\mathcal{E}$  defines a map  $U \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$ , and so a map  $s: U \rightarrow M_\sigma(v)$  by composition. By construction, we get that the induced composition  $U \rightarrow M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$  is the identity on  $U$ , and so  $s$  is a section of  $R\pi_*: M_\sigma(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, \bar{d})$  over  $U$ .

To conclude, we need to show that  $(R\pi_*)^{-1}(U) = s(U)$ ; i.e., that there are no other objects in  $M_\sigma(v)$  mapping to  $U$ . We argue by contradiction: denote by  $\mathcal{F} \in M_\sigma(v)$  an object satisfying  $f: E \cong \pi_* \mathcal{F} \in M_C(r, \bar{d})$ . By adjunction, the map  $f$  induces a map  $f': \pi^* E \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . By assumption, we have that  $v(\pi^* E) = v(\mathcal{F})$ .

We claim that  $f'$  is an isomorphism. To show this, let us write  $\pi^* E = (G, \bar{G}; \psi)$  and  $\mathcal{F} = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$ . The map  $G \rightarrow F$  is generically an isomorphism, as  $f$  is an isomorphism. As  $G$  is torsion-free, and that  $G, F$  have the same degree and rank, we conclude that the map  $G \rightarrow F$  is an isomorphism. The surjectivity of  $\psi$  ensures that the kernel of  $\bar{G} \rightarrow \bar{F}$  is trivial; thus, it is also an isomorphism as  $v(\bar{G}) = v(\bar{F})$ . We get that  $f'$  is an isomorphism, as required. This finishes the proof of Theorem 7.2, under the assumption that  $\alpha = 0$ .

For the general case, pick an étale cover  $\{V_i \rightarrow U\}$  representing  $\alpha$ , so that  $\mathcal{E}|_{V_i} \in \text{D}^b(V_i \times C)$ . By construction, the restrictions of  $\mathcal{E}|_{V_i}$  and  $\mathcal{E}|_{V_j}$  to  $V_{ij} = V_i \times_U V_j$  are isomorphic, and the isomorphism is induced by an element  $\lambda_{ij} \in \Gamma(V_{ij}, \mathcal{O}^\times)$ . The previous constructions gives étale-local sections  $V_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$  that differ by  $\lambda_{ij}$ , and

so the induced sections  $V_i \rightarrow M_\sigma(v)$  agree in the intersections. By descent, we get an honest section  $U \rightarrow M_\sigma(v)$ .  $\square$

## 8. NODES AND CUSPS

In this section we will specialize to the case when  $C$  is an irreducible curve with a single node or a cusp. We modify the notation of Subsection 4.1 accordingly: denote  $q \in C$  the singular point of the curve, and  $S \subset \tilde{C}$  its set-theoretic preimage, which is a subscheme of length 2. We also let  $g$  be the genus of  $\tilde{C}$ , so that  $C$  has arithmetic genus  $g+1$ . For the sake of simplicity we will assume  $g \geq 1$ ; see Remark 8.10 for some comments about  $g = 0$ .

Let us start by specializing Theorem 1.1. In this case, we have seen in Proposition 2.11 that  $T = \{q\}$ , endowed with its reduced structure, is a non-rational locus for  $C$ . This way, the abelian category  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$  from Subsection 4.2 can be written as

$$\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(F, \bar{F}; \phi) : F \in \text{Coh}(\tilde{C}), \bar{F} \in \text{Coh}(q), \phi: \rho_* F|_S \rightarrow \bar{F}\}.$$

The functors of Subsection 4.3 specialize to

$$\begin{aligned} a_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) &= F, & a^*(M) &= (M, \rho_*(M|_S); \text{id}); \\ b_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) &= \bar{F}, & b^*(N) &= (0, N; 0). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the two functors of Subsection 4.5 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_*(F, \bar{F}; \phi) &= \ker(\rho_* F \rightarrow \rho_*(F|_S) \xrightarrow{\phi} \bar{F}), \\ \pi^*(M) &= (\rho^* M, \text{coker}(M|_T \rightarrow (\rho_* \rho^* M|_T)); \text{res}). \end{aligned}$$

This way, the category  $\text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  has  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^3$ , induced by the maps  $\deg(-)$ ,  $\text{rk}(-)$ ,  $\ell(-)$  from Subsection 5.1. We use them to identify  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  with a triple  $v = (r, d, \ell)$ .

We constructed in Subsection 5.2 a heart  $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$ . An object  $E \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  lies in  $\mathcal{C}$  if  $H^{-1}(E) = (0, \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus n}; 0)$ ,  $H^0(E) = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  with  $\phi$  surjective, and  $H^i(E) = 0$  otherwise. Lastly, we proved in Corollary 5.14 that the central charge

$$Z(E) = \delta \ell(E) - \gamma \deg(E) + \beta \text{rk}(E) + i\alpha \text{rk}(E)$$

defines a stability condition on  $\mathcal{C}$ , for  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  real numbers subject to the restrictions  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\gamma > \delta > 0$ . We will focus on the case  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\gamma = 1$ , and  $\delta = t$ , for  $t \in (0, 1)$ . This defines a path  $(\sigma_t)_{t \in (0, 1)}$  in the stability manifold  $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{R})$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** *Let  $r > 0$  and  $d, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  be given, and assume that  $v = (r, d, \ell)$  is primitive. For each  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we let  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v) = \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_t}(v)$  be the moduli stack of  $\sigma_t$  semistable objects with numerical class  $v$ , and let  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v) \rightarrow M_t(v)$  be the corresponding good moduli space.*

- (1) *For all but finitely many values of  $t$ , the moduli space  $M_t(v)$  parametrizes only stable objects.*

*Denote by  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N < 1$  the finitely many values of  $t$  for which  $M_t(v)$  parametrizes some strictly semistable objects.*

- (2) *If  $t_i < t, t' < t_{i+1}$ , the two moduli spaces  $M_t(v), M_{t'}(v)$  are isomorphic.*
- (3) *For all  $t, t'$ , the two moduli spaces  $M_t(v), M_{t'}(v)$  are birational.*
- (4) *For  $t \neq t_i$ , the moduli space  $M_t(v)$  is smooth, projective of dimension  $r^2(g-1) + 1 + \ell(2r - \ell)$ , and the map  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v) \rightarrow M_t(v)$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe.*

- (5) For  $0 < t < t_1$ , the functor  $a_*$  induces a morphism  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ . If  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ , the map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  is a  $\mathrm{Gr}(2r, \ell)$ -bundle. (In particular,  $M_t(v)$  is irreducible for all  $t$ .)
- (6) For  $t_N < t < 1$ , the functor  $R\pi_*$  induces a morphism  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, d + r - \ell)$ . If  $\ell = r$ , then the map is birational.

*Proof.* Parts (1) and (2) are Lemma 8.4 and Corollary 8.5. (The projectivity follows by [BM23, Theorem 2.4], which applies as  $M_t(v)$  is smooth.) Part (3) is Proposition 8.6. For part (4), the smoothness is Corollary 8.3, the dimension is a consequence of Lemma 8.2, while the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe follows from (1). Part (5) is proven in Subsection 8.3, and part (6) follows from the discussion in Subsection 8.4.  $\square$

**8.1. Basic properties.** In this subsection we will give some basic properties of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  corresponding to  $\sigma_t$ -semistable objects of phase smaller than 1, for some  $t$ . By Lemma 5.9, we have that such objects are of the form  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$ , with  $F$  locally free.

**Lemma 8.2.** *Let  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  and  $E' = (F', \bar{F}'; \phi')$  be two objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $F, F'$  locally free. Denote  $r = \mathrm{rk}(E)$ ,  $d = \deg(E)$  and  $\ell = \ell(E)$ , and similarly  $r', d', \ell'$ . We have the following properties.*

- (1) *There is a distinguished triangle  $La^*F \rightarrow E \rightarrow b^*\mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus 2r-\ell}[1]$ .*
- (2) *We have  $\mathrm{Hom}^i(E, E') = 0$  unless  $i = 0, 1$ .*
- (3) *We have  $\chi_{\mathcal{R}}(E, E') = d'r - dr' + rr' - rr'g - 2r\ell' + \ell\ell'$ .*
- (4) *Assume that  $\mathrm{Hom}(E, E) = \mathbb{C}$ . Then  $\dim \mathrm{Hom}^1(E, E) \leq r^2g + 1$ , with equality only if  $\ell = r$ .*

*Proof.* (1) There is a canonical map  $La^*F \rightarrow E$ . Using that  $\phi$  is surjective, it follows that  $La^*F \rightarrow E$  is a surjection in  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , and its kernel is isomorphic to  $(0, \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus 2r-\ell}; 0)$ . The result follows immediately.

- (2) We take the long exact sequences induced by the triangle in the first part. The result follows immediately by noting the following:

- $\mathrm{Hom}_{\tilde{C}}^i(F, F') = 0$  for  $i \neq 0, 1$ , as  $\tilde{C}$  is smooth.
- $\mathrm{Hom}^i(La^*F, b^*\mathcal{O}_q) = 0$  for all  $i$ , by (4.4).
- $\mathrm{Hom}^i(b^*\mathcal{O}_q, La^*F) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ , by adjunction.
- $\mathrm{Hom}_Y^i(\mathcal{O}_q, \mathcal{O}_q) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ .

- (3) Follows directly from the (1) and by Riemann–Roch on  $\tilde{C}$ .

- (4) From (3) we get that  $\dim \mathrm{Hom}^1(E, E) = r^2(g - 1) + 1 + \ell(2r - \ell)$ . Here  $0 \leq \ell \leq 2r$ , from where the result follows immediately.  $\square$

A direct application of Lemma 5.9 ensures that  $E$  satisfies the condition of Lemma 8.2 if  $E$  is  $\sigma_t$ -semistable of phase smaller than 1 for some  $t$ .

**Corollary 8.3.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell)$  be a numerical class. The moduli stack  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v)$  is smooth. Moreover, if  $E$  is stable, then the good moduli space  $M_t(v)$  is smooth at the point corresponding to  $E$ .*

*Proof.* If  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is semistable with numerical class  $v$ , then Lemma 8.2 ensures that  $\mathrm{Hom}^2(E, E) = 0$ . But by [Lie06], the deformation functor  $\mathrm{Def}_E$  has an obstruction theory with values in  $\mathrm{Hom}^2(E, E)$ . The two results follow immediately.  $\square$

**8.2. Walls.** The goal of this subsection is to discuss the following result.

**Lemma 8.4.** *Let  $(r, d, \ell) \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  be a numerical vector, with  $r > 0$  and  $\gcd(r, d, \ell) = 1$ . There are finitely many values of  $t$ , say  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N < 1$ , for which the moduli stack  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v)$  parametrizes some strictly semistable objects.*

Note that, as written, this is a direct consequence of Theorem 7.2. For applications however, it is useful to give an explicit formula for the possible walls.

To do so, fix  $r, d, \ell$  as above. Let  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  be an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $F$  locally free, with  $\text{rk}(E) = r$ ,  $\deg(E) = d$ ,  $\ell(E) = \ell$ . Assume that for some  $t \in (0, 1)$ , there is a proper subobject  $E' = (F', \bar{F}'; \phi')$  of  $E$  (in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) such that the  $\sigma_t$ -phase of  $E$  and  $E'$  agree. The condition that  $E$  and  $E'$  have the same phase is:

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{-\text{Im } Z_t(E)}{\text{Re } Z_t(E)} = \frac{-\text{Im } Z_t(E')}{\text{Re } Z_t(E')} &\iff \frac{-t\ell + d - \beta r}{r} = \frac{-t\ell' + d' - \beta r'}{r'} \\ &\iff t \left( \frac{\ell'}{r'} - \frac{\ell}{r} \right) = \frac{d'}{r'} - \frac{d}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

Note from Theorem 7.2 that there are finitely many walls. Thus, there is at most one value of  $t$  for which (8.1) holds, namely  $t = (d'r - dr')/(\ell'r - \ell r')$ . This can be used to compute the walls explicitly in examples. We will go back to this idea in Subsection 8.6.

**Corollary 8.5.** *Under the previous assumptions, the moduli stacks  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v)$ ,  $\mathfrak{M}_{t'}(v)$  agree if  $t_i < t, t' < t_{i+1}$ .*

**Proposition 8.6.** *Let  $(r, d, \ell) \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  be a numerical vector satisfying  $r > 0$  and  $\gcd(r, d, \ell) = 1$ . For any  $t, t' \in (0, 1)$ , we have that  $M_t(v)$  and  $M_{t'}(v)$  are birational.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any  $t \in (t_i, t_{i+1})$ , the maps  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{t_i}(v)$ ,  $M_{t_{i+1}}(v)$  are birational. To do so, we will bound compute the dimension of the strictly semistable loci.

First of all, note that there are finitely many decompositions  $v = u + w$  corresponding to the walls passing through  $\sigma_{t_i}$ . This way, it suffices to bound the dimension of the locus of  $M_t(v)$  that becomes strictly semistable at  $\sigma_{t_i}$  with a fixed decomposition  $u = v + w$ . Denote by  $Z \subseteq M_t(v)$  such locus.

Let  $E$  be a  $\sigma_t$ -stable object, that becomes strictly semistable at  $\sigma_{t_i}$ , fitting in an extension  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow E \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$ . Assume that  $A$  and  $B$  have all the same phase with respect to  $\sigma_{t_i}$ , and write  $u = [A] = (r', d', \ell')$ ,  $w = [B] = (r'', d'', \ell'')$ .

If  $\eta \in T_{Z, [E]} \subseteq \text{Ext}^1(E, E)$  is a tangent vector on  $Z$ , we have that  $\eta$  can be extended into a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & A[1] \\ \vdots & & \downarrow \eta & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ A[1] & \longrightarrow & E[1] & \longrightarrow & B[1] & \longrightarrow & A[2]. \end{array}$$

This way, the induced map  $A \rightarrow B[1]$  must be zero. In other words, we must have that  $\eta$  is in the kernel of the map  $\Theta: \text{Ext}^1(E, E) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(A, B)$  obtained by composing with the two maps  $A \rightarrow E$  and  $E \rightarrow B$ .

Note that  $\Theta$  is surjective, as  $\text{Ext}^2(E, A) = \text{Ext}^2(B, B) = 0$  by Lemma 8.2. This way, it suffices to show that  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(A, B) > 0$ . We can compute this dimension

using that  $\text{Hom}(A, B) = 0$  and Lemma 8.2 once again, yielding

$$\dim \text{Ext}^1(A, B) = r'r''(g-1) + d'r'' - d''r' + \ell''(2r' - \ell').$$

Now, we use that  $A, B, E$  have all the same phase at  $t_i$ , so that  $(-t_i\ell' + d')/r' = (-t_i\ell'' + d'')/r'' = (-t\ell + d)/r$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \text{Ext}^1(A, B) &= r'r''(g-1) + t_i r' \ell'' - t_i \ell'' r' + 2r' \ell'' - \ell' \ell'' \\ &\geq t_i r'' \ell' - t_i \ell'' r' + 2r' \ell'' - \ell' \ell'', \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $g \geq 1$ . An elementary argument shows that the right hand side is greater than zero, unless  $\ell' = \ell'' = 0$  or  $\ell' = 2r'$ ,  $\ell'' = 2r''$ . These cases are excluded by (8.1), as otherwise  $v$  will not be primitive. This shows that  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(A, B) > 0$ , hence the destabilized locus has non-zero codimension.  $\square$

**8.3. Comparison at zero.** Fix  $v = (r, d, \ell)$  with  $r > 0$  and  $\gcd(r, d, \ell) = 1$ , and fix  $0 < t < t_1$ , where  $t_1$  is the first  $v$ -wall (as described in Subsection 8.2). The goal of this subsection is to compare the moduli spaces  $M_t(v)$  and  $M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ .

We proved in Section 7 that the functor  $a_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\tilde{C})$  induces a map  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  for  $t \ll 1$ . By the wall-and-chamber decomposition, it suffices to assume that  $t < t_1$ . We get an induced map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  between the corresponding good moduli spaces. Note that the morphism is proper, as  $M_t(v)$  and  $M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  are proper.

**Lemma 8.7.** *Assume that  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ . We have that  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  is a  $\text{Gr}(2r, \ell)$ -bundle for the Zariski topology.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be a slope-stable vector bundle on  $\tilde{C}$  of rank  $r$  and degree  $d$ . Given any surjection  $\phi: \rho_*(F|_S) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus \ell}$ , we claim that the corresponding object  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi) \in \mathcal{C}$  is  $\sigma_t$ -stable for  $t < t_1$ . The proof follows the same lines of Lemma 7.5.

This way, we get that for any  $F \in M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ , the fiber over  $F$  is isomorphic to the collection of surjections  $\rho_*(F|_S) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus \ell}$  up to isomorphism. This agrees with the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(\rho_*(F|_S), \ell)$ .

We can globalize the previous description. If  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Coh}(M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d) \times \tilde{C})$  is a universal family<sup>1</sup>, consider the relative Grassmannian  $G = \text{Gr}(\rho_*(\mathcal{F}|_S), \ell)$  over  $M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ . We get a universal family  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})_G$ , the base change of  $\text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  over  $G$ , whose fiber over  $\phi: \rho_*(F|_S) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus \ell}$  is the object  $(F, \mathcal{O}_q^{\oplus \ell}; \phi)$ . The previous discussion ensures that the induced map  $G \rightarrow M_t(v)$  is bijective on closed points, and we directly check that is bijective on tangent spaces. By construction, the composition  $G \rightarrow M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  agrees with the bundle map  $G \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$ .

Finally, note that  $M_t(v)$  is smooth, as it parametrizes only stable objects. This way, the map  $G \rightarrow M_t(v)$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

*Remark 8.8.* Note that Lemma 8.7 implies that  $M_t(v)$  is irreducible if  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ . Together with Proposition 8.6, we get  $M_t(v)$  are irreducible for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ .

**8.4. Comparison at one.** Fix  $v = (r, d, \ell)$  with  $r > 0$  and  $\gcd(r, d, \ell) = 1$ . Fix  $t_N < t < 1$ , where  $t_N$  is the last  $v$ -wall (as described in Subsection 8.2). In this subsection we will compare the moduli spaces  $M_t(v)$  and  $M_C(r, d + r - \ell)$ .

To start, note that by Theorem 7.2, the derived functor  $R\pi_*$  defines a morphism  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_C(r, d + r - \ell)$ . Now, note that if  $E$  is a vector bundle on  $C$ ,

<sup>1</sup>See [Ses82, Théorème 18, p. 22; HL10, Corollary 4.6.6] for the existence of such family.



then  $v(\pi^*E) = (r, d, r)$ . This way, in the case that  $r = \ell$ , we get that the map  $R\pi_*: (R\pi_*)^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$  is an isomorphism, where  $U \subset M_C(r, d)$  is the open subset parametrizing vector bundles.

From here, note that  $\dim U = r^2(p_a(C) - 1) + 1 = \dim M_t(v)$ . Using Proposition 8.6 and Lemma 8.7, we know that  $M_t(v)$  is irreducible. This way, the map  $R\pi_*$  is birational.

**8.5. Rank one.** In this subsection we wish to analyze the moduli spaces  $M_t(1, d, \ell)$  for all  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ . We will then relate the description for  $\ell = 1$  with the compactified Jacobian of  $C$ , as discussed by Oda–Seshadri.

Let us start with  $\ell = 0$ . For general  $t$ , the moduli space  $M_t(1, d, 0)$  is a smooth, projective variety of dimension  $g$ , thanks to Theorem 8.1. For  $t \ll 1$ , we have an induced map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$ , which is an isomorphism by Lemma 8.7.

Now, note that there are no walls for  $t$ , thanks to the explicit description in Subsection 8.2. In fact, the only (numerical) walls for the vector  $(r', d', \ell')$  must have  $r' < 1$ , hence  $r' = 0$ . But this is impossible, as  $\text{Im } Z_t(0, d', \ell') = 0$ . It follows that the moduli space  $M_t(1, d, 0)$  is independent of  $t$ .

Note that the map  $M_t(1, d, 0) \rightarrow M_C(1, d+1)$ , factors through  $M_C^0(1, d+1)$ , the set of non-vector bundles in  $C$ . This way, the two maps induced by  $a_*$  and  $R\pi_*$  fit in the diagram

$$M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d) \xleftarrow[\cong]{a_*} M_t(1, d, 0) \xrightarrow{R\pi_*} M_C^0(1, d+1) \subset M_C(1, d+1).$$

The argument goes almost verbatim for  $\ell = 2$ : there are no walls, and the two maps  $a_*$ ,  $R\pi_*$  are isomorphisms. We get the description:

$$M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d) \xleftarrow[\cong]{a_*} M_t(1, d, 2) \xrightarrow[\cong]{R\pi_*} M_C^0(1, d-1) \subset M_C^0(1, d-1).$$

The most interesting case is for  $\ell = 1$ . In this case, the map  $M_t(1, d, 1) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle. The map  $M_t(1, d, 1) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is birational, and an isomorphism over  $M_{\tilde{C}}^1(1, d)$ .

$$M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d) \xleftarrow[\mathbb{P}^1]{a_*} M_t(1, d) \xrightarrow[\text{bir}]{R\pi_*} M_C(1, d).$$

This recovers the description in [OS79, p. 83].

**8.6. Rank two.** Our last goal is to compare the moduli spaces  $M_C(2, d)$  and  $M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$  for  $d = 2k + 1$  odd. To do so, we consider the moduli spaces  $M_t(2, d, 2)$  for  $t \in (0, 1)$ , together with the results of Theorem 8.1.

Let us start by computing the walls. The discussion of Subsection 8.2 gives us a way to compute the  $v$ -walls for  $v = (2, 2k + 1, 2)$ . We need to look at vectors  $v' = (1, d', \ell')$  for  $\ell' = 0, 1, 2$ . The formula  $t = (d'r - dr')/(\ell'r - \ell r')$ , together with the fact that  $t \in (0, 1)$ , shows that the only wall corresponds to the decomposition  $v = u + w$  with  $u = (1, k, 0)$ ,  $w = (1, k + 1, 2)$ . This wall has  $t = 1/2$ .

This way, there are three distinct moduli spaces  $M_t(v)$ , for  $t \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $1/2$ , and  $(1/2, 1)$ . We pick a value of  $t$  on each interval, say  $t = 1/4$  and  $t = 3/4$  respectively. Here, the two inclusions  $\mathfrak{M}_{1/4}(v), \mathfrak{M}_{3/4}(v) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{1/2}(v)$  induce (proper) morphisms

$$M_{1/4}(v) \rightarrow M_{1/2}(v) \leftarrow M_{3/4}(v)$$

on the corresponding good moduli spaces.

Let us describe the destabilized loci. If  $E \in M_{1/4}(v)$  is strictly semistable at  $t = 1/2$ , it must fit in a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow E \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,

with  $U \in M_t(u)$  and  $W \in M_t(w)$ . Using Lemma 8.2, together with the fact that  $\text{Hom}(U, W), \text{Hom}(W, U) = 0$ , we get that  $\text{Hom}^1(B, U)$  is  $g$ -dimensional.

Similarly, the objects  $E' \in M_{3/4}(v)$  that are strictly semistable at  $t = 1/2$  fit into a sequence  $0 \rightarrow W \rightarrow E' \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $U \in M_t(u)$  and  $W \in M_t(w)$ . A similar computation shows that  $\dim \text{Hom}^1(U, W) = g - 2$ .

We can globalize the previous description, as follows. Pick universal families  $\mathcal{U} \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})_{M_t(u)}$  and  $\mathcal{W} \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})_{M_t(w)}$ . Thanks to Subsection 8.5, the two moduli spaces  $M_t(u)$ ,  $M_t(1, k + 1, 0)$  are smooth of dimension  $g$ . We pullback the two universal families to  $\text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})_{M_t(u) \times M_t(w)}$ , take the relative Hom, and take the pushforward to  $\text{D}^b(M_t(u) \times M_t(w))$ . We get  $\mathcal{E} = R\rho_* R\mathcal{H}om(\text{pr}_2^* \mathcal{W}, \text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{U})$ , where  $R\rho_*: \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})_{M_t(u) \times M_t(w)} \rightarrow \text{D}^b(M_t(u) \times M_t(w))$ , and  $\text{pr}_1, \text{pr}_2$  are induced by the projections from  $M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$ .

By cohomology and base change, we have that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a locally free sheaf of rank  $g$  on  $M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$ . This way, we take  $P$  to be the projectivization of  $\mathcal{E}$ , which is a  $\mathbb{P}^{g-1}$ -bundle over  $M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$ . Moreover, it carries a universal family  $\mathcal{P} \in \text{D}^b(\mathcal{A})_P$ , parametrizing all extensions  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow E \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$  up to isomorphism. This universal family induces a closed embedding  $P \hookrightarrow M_{1/4}(v)$ , corresponding to the destabilized loci. We point out that  $P$  has dimension  $(g - 1) + g + g = 3g - 1$ .

The same construction applies for the other extensions: the projectivization of  $\mathcal{E}' = R\rho_* R\mathcal{H}om(\text{pr}_1^* \mathcal{U}, \text{pr}_2^* \mathcal{W})$  gives us a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+1}$ -bundle  $P' \rightarrow M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$  parametrizing extensions  $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow E' \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$ . This induces an embedding  $P' \hookrightarrow M_{3/4}(v)$ , corresponding to the destabilized loci at  $t = 1/2$ . Here  $P'$  has dimension  $3g + 1$ .

Finally, let us compare the two moduli  $M_{1/4}(v)$ ,  $M_{3/4}(v)$  with the corresponding  $M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$ ,  $M_C(2, d)$ . The map  $a_*: M_{1/4}(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$  is a  $\text{Gr}(4, 2)$ -bundle, while  $R\pi_*: M_{3/4}(v) \rightarrow M_C(2, d)$  is birational. We point out that  $M_t(v)$  has dimension  $4g + 1$ . Putting all together, we have proven the following description.

**Theorem 8.9.** *Let  $d = 2k + 1$  be an odd integer, and denote  $v = (2, d, 2)$ . For  $t \neq 1/4$ , the moduli spaces  $M_t(v)$  only parametrize stable objects. For  $t < 1/2$ , the map  $a_*: M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$  is a  $\text{Gr}(4, 2)$ -bundle over  $M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d)$ . For  $t > 1/2$ , the map  $R\pi_*: M_t(v) \rightarrow M_C(2, d)$  is birational, and an isomorphism over  $M_C^0(2, d)$ .*

*Lastly, for  $t = 1/2$  there is a wall corresponding to the decomposition  $v = u + w$ , where  $u = (1, k, 0)$  and  $w = (1, k + 1, 2)$ . For  $t < 1/2$ , the map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{1/2}(v)$  contracts a  $\mathbb{P}^{g-1}$  bundle  $P \rightarrow M_{1/2}(u) \times M_{1/2}(w)$  to its base. For  $t > 1/2$ , the map  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{1/2}(v)$  contracts a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+1}$  bundle  $P' \rightarrow M_{1/2}(u) \times M_{1/2}(w)$  to its base. In particular, the maps  $M_t(v) \rightarrow M_{1/2}(v)$  are birational, and so is the map  $M_{1/4}(v) \dashrightarrow M_{3/4}(v)$ .*

The moduli spaces described in Theorem 8.9 fit in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 P & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^{g-1}} & M_{1/2}(u) \times M_{1/2}(w) & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{P}^{g+1}} & P' \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 M_{1/4}(v) & \xleftarrow{\text{bir}} & M_{1/2}(v) & \xrightarrow{\text{bir}} & M_{3/4}(v) \\
 \swarrow \text{Gr}(4,2) & & \downarrow & & \searrow \text{bir} \\
 M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d) & & M_{1/2}(v) & & M_C(2, d)
 \end{array}$$

*Remark 8.10.* Let us say a few words about the  $g = 0$  case. Here,  $\mathfrak{M}_{1/4}(v) = \emptyset$ , due to the fact that  $M_{\tilde{C}}(2, d) = \emptyset$ . As a consequence, we get that  $M_{3/4}(v) \cong P'$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . We point out that in this case  $M_{1/4}(v)$  and  $M_{3/4}(v)$  are birational.

**8.7. Higher rank.** Let us finish our exposition with a few words on the higher rank moduli spaces. Given  $(r, d)$  coprime, we would like to relate  $M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  with  $M_C(r, d)$  as in Theorem 8.9. Our main obstruction is that for  $r \geq 3$ , the walls might involve destabilizing subobjects corresponding to triples  $(r', d', \ell')$  that are not primitive. Thus, the moduli spaces  $M_t(r', d', \ell')$  might parametrize strictly semistable objects.

Let us say that a wall  $v = u + w$  is *simple* if  $u$  and  $w$  are primitive. The following two examples show that non-simple walls exist; moreover, it is possible that neither  $u$  nor  $w$  are primitive.

**Example 8.11.** (1) For  $v = (4, 1, 4)$ , there is a wall at  $t = 1/4$ , corresponding to the decomposition  $(2, 1, 4) + 2(1, 0, 0)$ .  
 (2) For  $v = (23, 5, 23)$ , there is a wall at  $t = 4/23$ , corresponding to the decomposition  $3(3, 1, 5) + 2(7, 1, 4)$ .

The second type of phenomenon that can occur is having multiple walls for the same value of  $t$ . In Table 2 we described the walls for  $v = (6, 1, 6)$ . Note that for  $t = 1/2$  there are two walls. One could overcome this difficulty by deforming our path  $\sigma_t$  inside the stability manifold  $\text{Stab}(\mathcal{R})$ . The table is computed using (8.1). (The last column of the table will be explained after Proposition 8.12.)

TABLE 2. Walls for  $v = (6, 1, 6)$ .

| $t$ | Decomposition             | Simple? | Flipped locus   |
|-----|---------------------------|---------|---|
| 1/6 | $(3, 1, 6) + 3(1, 0, 0)$  | No      | N/A   |
| 1/4 | $(3, 1, 5) + (3, 0, 1)$   | Yes     | $\mathbb{P}^{9g-6} \rightarrow * \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{9g+12}$ |
| 1/3 | $(2, 1, 4) + 2(2, 0, 1)$  | No      | N/A   |
| 1/2 | $(3, 1, 4) + (3, 0, 2)$   | Yes     | $\mathbb{P}^{9g-3} \rightarrow * \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{9g+3}$  |
|     | $(3, 2, 6) + (3, -1, 0)$  | Yes     | $\mathbb{P}^{9g-1} \rightarrow * \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{9g+17}$ |
| 2/3 | $2(2, 1, 3) + (2, -1, 0)$ | No      | N/A   |
| 3/4 | $(3, 2, 5) + (3, -1, 1)$  | Yes     | $\mathbb{P}^{9g} \rightarrow * \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{9g+6}$    |
| 5/6 | $3(1, 1, 2) + (3, -2, 0)$ | No      | N/A   |

The description of the wall-crossing at  $t = 1/2$  from Theorem 8.9 generalizes almost verbatim to simple walls.

**Proposition 8.12.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell)$  be a primitive numerical vector with  $r > 0$ . Assume that for some  $t \in (0, 1)$  there is a single simple wall  $v = u + w$ , with  $u = (r_1, d_1, \ell_1)$  and  $w = (r_2, d_2, \ell_2)$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\ell_1/r_1 < \ell_2/r_2$ . Then, the birational map  $M_{t+\epsilon}(v) \dashrightarrow M_{t-\epsilon}(v)$  is a standard flip, obtained by replacing a  $\mathbb{P}^{b-1}$ -bundle over  $M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$  with a  $\mathbb{P}^{c-1}$ -bundle over the same base, where  $b = d_1r_2 - d_2r_1 + r_1r_2(g-1) + 2r_1\ell_2 - \ell_1\ell_2$  and  $c = d_2r_1 - d_1r_2 + r_1r_2(g-1) + 2r_2\ell_1 - \ell_1\ell_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let us start by determining the local structure of the good moduli space  $M_t(v)$  at a point  $p$  corresponding to a strictly semistable object. Write  $p = [U \oplus W]$ ,

where  $U, W$  are  $\sigma_t$ -stable objects of class  $u, w$  respectively. By Corollary 8.3, the moduli stack  $\mathfrak{M}_t(v)$  is smooth at  $p$ . Together with [CPZ24, Lemma 2.7], we have

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{M,p} = \mathbb{C}[[\mathrm{Ext}^1(U \oplus W, U \oplus W)]]^{\mathrm{Aut}(U \oplus W, U \oplus W)}.$$

Let us compute all the terms involved in the previous formula. We have that  $\mathrm{Aut}(U \oplus W, U \oplus W) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ , as there are no morphisms between  $U$  and  $W$ . We also have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(U \oplus W, U \oplus W) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1(U, U) \oplus \mathrm{Ext}^1(W, W) \oplus \mathrm{Ext}^1(U, W) \oplus \mathrm{Ext}^1(W, U).$$

The respective dimensions can be computed with Lemma 8.2, giving us  $a_1 = r_1^2(g-1) + 1 + \ell_1(2r_1 - \ell_1)$ ,  $a_2 = r_2^2(g-1) + 1 + \ell_2(2r_2 - \ell_2)$ ,  $b = d_1r_2 - d_2r_1 + r_1r_2(g-1) + 2r_1\ell_2 - \ell_1\ell_2$ , and  $c = d_2r_1 - d_1r_2 + r_1r_2(g-1) + 2r_2\ell_1 - \ell_1\ell_2$ , respectively. Note that the automorphism group acts by weights  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, -1)$ ,  $(-1, 1)$ , respectively.

This way, we can pick bases  $\{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq a_1+a_2}$ ,  $\{y_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq b}$ ,  $\{z_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq c}$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{M,p} &\cong \mathbb{C}[[x_i, y_j, z_k]]^{(\mathbb{C}^*)^2} \\ &\cong \mathbb{C}[[x_i, y_j z_k : 1 \leq i \leq a_1 + a_2, 1 \leq j \leq b, 1 \leq k \leq c]]. \end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to the contraction of the standard flip at  $([U], [W]) \in M_t(u) \times M_t(w)$ .

From the construction, we get that the fiber of the map  $M_{t+\epsilon}(v) \rightarrow M_t(v)$  over  $p$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}^{b-1}$ , while the fiber of  $M_{t-\epsilon}(v) \rightarrow M_t(v)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}^{c-1}$ . It is also clear that the two maps correspond to the two small resolutions of  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{M,p}$ .

To conclude, we have that

$$b - c = 2d_1r_2 - 2d_2r_1 + 2r_1\ell_2 - 2r_2\ell_1 = 2r_1r_2(1-t) \left( \frac{\ell_2}{r_2} - \frac{\ell_1}{r_1} \right) > 0,$$

as  $\ell_2/r_2 > \ell_1/r_1$  by assumption. This shows that  $b > c$ , and so the map  $M_{t+\epsilon}(v) \dashrightarrow M_{t-\epsilon}(v)$  is the standard flip.  $\square$

In Table 2 we have computed the dimensions of the fibers of the flipped locus  $M_{t-\epsilon}(v) \rightarrow M_t(v) \leftarrow M_{t+\epsilon}(v)$ , denoted by  $\mathbb{P}^{c-1} \rightarrow * \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^{b-1}$ .

## 9. TACNODES

In this section we will specialize to the case when  $C$  is a projective, a irreducible curve with a single  $A_3$  singularity, also known as a *tacnode*. This is, we assume that there is a point  $q \in C$  such that  $C \setminus \{q\}$  is smooth, and  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{C,q} \cong \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]/(y^2 - x^4)$ . We let  $\rho: \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$  be its normalization, and we get  $g$  be the genus of  $\tilde{C}$ . Denote by  $p_1, p_2$  the two preimages of  $q$ .

To start, note that in this case that  $\{q\}$  with its reduced structure is *not* a non-rational locus for  $\rho$ . Instead, we take  $T = V(x^2, y)$ , the first-order thickening of  $q \in C$  along the unique tangent direction of  $C$  at  $q$ . By the description in Table 1, we have that this is a non-rational locus for  $\rho$ . We point out that in this case  $S = \rho^{-1}(T)$  has length 2 at each point  $p_i$ .

Let us specialize Theorem 1.1 to our setting. The categorical resolution from Subsection 4.2 is

$$\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(F, \bar{F}; \phi): F \in \mathrm{Coh}(\tilde{C}), \bar{F} \in \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_T), \phi: \rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S)) \rightarrow \bar{F}\},$$

where  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_T) = \text{Coh}(\mathcal{A}_{T,m,2})$  is the Auslander resolution as in Subsection 3.1. The discussion of Subsection 5.1 allows us to identify  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^4$ , via the maps  $\text{rk}, \deg, \ell_1, \ell_2$ . Thus, we write  $v \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  as a tuple  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$ .

Denote by  $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{D}^b(\mathcal{R})$  the heart from Subsection 5.2. As a consequence of Corollary 5.14 (cf. the discussion at the beginning of Section 7), we get central charges

$$Z_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(E) = \delta_1 \ell_1(E) + \delta_2 \ell_2(E) - \deg(E) + i \text{rk}(E),$$

for any  $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$  satisfying  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 < 1$ .

**Theorem 9.1.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  be a vector with  $r > 0$ ,  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq 2r$ ,  $0 \leq \ell_2 - \ell_1 \leq 2r$ . Given  $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$  with  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 < 1$ , we denote by  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) := M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(v)$ .*

- (1) *There are finitely many  $v$ -walls. If  $\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$  and  $\sigma_{\delta'_1, \delta'_2}$  are outside of the walls, then  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$  and  $M_{\delta'_1, \delta'_2}(v)$  are birational.*
- (2) *For  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \ll 1$ , the map  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{C}}(r, d)$  is a bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology, with fiber*

$$\{(V_1, V_2) : V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 2r}, V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 4r}, V_1 \times \{0\} \subset V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{2r} \times V_1, \dim(V_i) = \ell_i\}.$$

- (3) *Assume that  $v = (1, d, 1, 2)$ . Then, the moduli space  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$  is independent of  $(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ . We have a diagram*

$$M_{\mathcal{C}}(1, d) \xleftarrow{a_*} M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \xrightarrow{R\pi_*} M_C(1, d),$$

*where the map  $a_*$  is an  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -bundle, and the map  $R\pi_*$  is birational.*

- (4) *Assume that  $v = (2, d, 2, 4)$  with  $d$  odd. Then, there is a diagram*

$$M_{\mathcal{C}}(2, d) \leftarrow M_1 \dashrightarrow M_2 \dashrightarrow M_3 \dashrightarrow M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, d),$$

*where  $M_1 \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{C}}(2, d)$  is a bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology; each  $M_i \dashrightarrow M_{i-1}$  is a standard flip; and  $M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, d)$  is birational.*

*Proof.* Part (1) is a consequence of Theorem 7.2 and Proposition 8.6; part (2) is Lemma 9.11; part (3) follows from the discussion of Subsection 9.5; part (4) is proven in Subsection 9.6.  $\square$

We will start by discussing some general properties of the Auslander resolution of  $\mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$  in Subsection 9.1. We will use this description to describe basic properties of the semistable objects in Subsection 9.2. We will then specialize Theorem 7.2 to give a formula for the walls in Subsection 9.3. Finally, we will describe carefully the situation for rank one and two in Subsections 9.5 and 9.6, respectively.

**9.1. The Auslander resolution.** In this section we will describe carefully the category of modules over  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{T,m,2}$ , for  $T = \mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$ . We recall from Lemma 3.2 that  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  can be identified with the collection of tuples  $(N_1, N_2, \alpha, \beta)$ , where  $N_1, N_2$  are in  $\text{Coh}(T)$ ,  $\alpha: N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ ,  $\beta: N_2 \otimes_T I \rightarrow N_1$ , and these maps fit into the diagram

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & N_1 \otimes_T I & \xrightarrow{\alpha \otimes \text{id}} & N_2 \otimes_T I & \\ & \downarrow \times & \swarrow \beta & \downarrow \times & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & N_2. \end{array}$$

**Lemma 9.2** (cf. [KL15, Example 5.3]). *The category  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  is equivalent to the category of triples  $(N_1, N_2; \alpha, \beta)$ , where  $N_1, N_2$  are finite dimensional  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector spaces,  $\alpha: N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ ,  $\beta: N_2 \rightarrow N_1$ , subject to  $\beta\alpha = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let us look at the diagram (9.1) carefully. Note from the commutativity of the leftmost triangle that the multiplication map  $N_1 \otimes_T I \rightarrow N_1$  is zero. Thus,  $N_1$  can be identified with a coherent module over  $\mathcal{O}_q$ , i.e. a vector space.

On the other hand, note that the map  $\beta: N_2 \otimes_T I \rightarrow N_1$  is determined by  $\bar{\beta} = \beta(- \otimes \epsilon): N_2 \rightarrow N_1$ . Here, the commutativity of the rightmost triangle shows that

$$\epsilon n = \alpha(\beta(n \otimes \epsilon)) = \alpha\bar{\beta}(n),$$

for any  $n \in N_2$ . Thus, the  $T$ -module structure is determined by  $\beta$  (together with the  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space structure). Finally, the middle triangle gives us the relation  $\bar{\beta}\alpha = 0$ . The process can clearly be reversed.  $\square$

*Claim 9.3.* The category  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  has global dimension  $\leq 2$ . In fact, a more general result is shown in [KL15, Proposition A.14].

Our next goal is to describe the Euler pairing in  $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ . To do so, we will use the following observation.

*Claim 9.4.* Note that the modules

$$P^1 = (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}; \text{id}, 0), \quad P^2 = (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^2; (1, 0)^T, (0, 1))$$

are projective. In fact, a fast computation shows that  $\text{Hom}(P^1, N) \cong N_1$  and  $\text{Hom}(P^2, N) \cong N_2$  canonically, where  $N = (N_1, N_2; \alpha, \beta)$ .

We also note that  $P^2$  is an injective module. In fact, one quickly checks that  $N_2^\vee \rightarrow \text{Hom}(N, P^2)$ ,  $\psi \mapsto (\psi \circ \alpha, (\psi, \psi \circ \alpha \circ \beta))$  is an isomorphism.

**Proposition 9.5.** *We have that  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ , via  $N \mapsto (\ell_1(N), \ell_2(N))$ , where  $\ell_i(N) = \ell(N_i)$ . The Euler pairing is given by the formula*

$$\chi(N, N') = 2\ell_1\ell'_1 - \ell_1\ell'_2 - \ell_2\ell'_1 + \ell_2\ell'_2,$$

where we denoted by  $\ell_i = \ell_i(N)$ ,  $\ell'_i = \ell_i(N')$ .

*Proof.* The first fact is a consequence of the discussion of Subsection 5.1. For the second one, note that the Euler pairing is determined by its values on a basis of  $K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{A})$ . It is clear that  $P^1, P^2$  provide such a basis; the description of Claim 9.4 allows us to compute directly.  $\square$

The next lemmas will be used in future sections.

**Lemma 9.6.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer and let  $K \subset P_2^{\oplus n}$  be a submodule. We have that  $\text{Ext}^i(K, -) = 0$  for all  $i \geq 2$ , and that  $\text{Ext}^1(K, P_2) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q = P_2^{\oplus n}/K$ . The first part follows directly from the long exact sequence associated to  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow P_2^{\oplus n} \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0$ , together with the fact that  $\text{Ext}^i(Q, -) = 0$  for  $i \geq 3$ . For the second claim, note that  $\text{Ext}^1(-, P_2) = 0$  as  $P_2$  is injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.7.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer and let  $K \subset P_2^{\oplus n}$  be a submodule. Then  $\ell_1 = \ell_1(K)$ ,  $\ell_2 = \ell_2(K)$  satisfy the inequalities  $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq n$ ,  $0 \leq \ell_2 - \ell_1 \leq n$ .*

*Moreover, for any  $\ell_1, \ell_2$  satisfying these inequalities, there exists a submodule  $K \subset P_2^{\oplus n}$  with  $\ell_1 = \ell_1(K)$  and  $\ell_2 = \ell_2(K)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $P_2^{\oplus n} \cong (\mathbb{C}^n, \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n; \text{id} \oplus 0, (0, I))$ . This way, if  $K = (K_1, K_2; \alpha, \beta)$  is a subobject, we must have the commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & K_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{C}^n & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \oplus 0} & \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} K_2 & \xrightarrow{\beta} & K_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n & \xrightarrow{(0, \text{id})} & \mathbb{C}^n. \end{array}$$

Note that  $\ell_1 \leq n$ ,  $\ell_2 \leq 2n$  are automatic. The first diagram implies that  $\alpha$  is injective, and so  $\ell_1 \leq \ell_2$ . A simple diagram chasing on the left diagram shows that  $\text{coker } \alpha \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ , and so  $\ell_2 - \ell_1 \leq n$ .

Now, assume that  $\ell_1, \ell_2$  satisfy the given conditions. If  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , take  $K_1$  to be the span of  $e_1, \dots, e_{\ell_1}$ , and  $K_2$  to be the span of  $e_1 \oplus 0, \dots, e_m \oplus 0, 0 \oplus e_1, \dots, 0 \oplus e_{m'}$ , where  $m = \max\{\ell_1, \ell_2 - \ell_1\}$  and  $m' = \min\{\ell_1, \ell_2 - \ell_1\}$ .  $\square$

**9.2. Basic properties.** In this subsection we describe some basic properties of the  $\sigma$ -semistable objects of phase smaller than 1, in the same spirit of Subsection 8.1.

**Lemma 9.8.** *Let  $E = (F, \bar{F}; \phi)$  and  $E' = (F', \bar{F}'; \phi')$  be two objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $F, F'$  locally free. Write  $v(E) = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  and  $v(E') = (r', d', \ell'_1, \ell'_2)$ .*

- (1) *There is a distinguished triangle  $La^*F \rightarrow E \rightarrow b^*K[1]$ , where  $K$  is a submodule of  $\rho_*(\mu_S^*(F|_S))$  with  $\ell_1(K) = 2r - \ell_1$ ,  $\ell_2(K) = 4r - \ell_2$ . In particular, we have  $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq 2r$  and  $0 \leq \ell_2 - \ell_1 \leq 2r$ .*
- (2) *We have  $\text{Hom}^i(E, E') = 0$  unless  $i = 0, 1$ .*
- (3) *We have  $\chi_{\mathcal{R}}(E, E') = d'r - dr' + rr'(1 - g) - 2r\ell'_2 + 2\ell_1\ell'_1 - \ell_1\ell'_2 - \ell_2\ell'_1 + \ell_2\ell'_2$ .*

*Proof.* We follow the same ideas of Lemma 8.2, with the following changes.

- (1) The canonical map  $La^*F \rightarrow E$  is a surjection in  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$ , and the kernel is a submodule of  $\rho_*\mu_S^*(F|_S) \cong P_2^{\oplus 2r}$ .
- (2) We use the vanishing results proven in Lemma 9.6.  $\square$
- (3) We use Proposition 9.5.

**Corollary 9.9.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  be a numerical class. The moduli stack  $\mathfrak{M}_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$  is smooth. Moreover, if  $E$  is stable, then the good moduli space  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$  is smooth at the point corresponding to  $E$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of Corollary 8.3 applies verbatim.  $\square$

**9.3. Walls.** In this section we will give a basic description of the walls corresponding to a primitive vector  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  with  $r > 0$ , in the same spirit of Subsection 8.2. To start, note that we have finitely many walls thanks to Theorem 7.2.

It is useful to describe an explicit formula for the walls. Given  $w = (r', d', \ell'_1, \ell'_2)$ , the condition that  $v$  and  $w$  have the same  $Z_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$ -slope is

$$(9.2) \quad \iff \delta_1 \left( \frac{\ell_1}{r} - \frac{\ell'_1}{r'} \right) + \delta_2 \left( \frac{\ell_2}{r} - \frac{\ell'_2}{r'} \right) = \frac{d}{r} - \frac{d'}{r'}.$$

**Proposition 9.10.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2) \in K^{\text{num}}(\mathcal{R})$  be a primitive numerical vector satisfying  $r > 0$ . Let  $\sigma_{\delta_1 \delta_2}$  and  $\sigma_{\delta'_1 \delta'_2}$  be two stability conditions not contained in any wall. Then  $M_{\sigma_{\delta_1 \delta_2}}(v)$  and  $M_{\sigma_{\delta'_1 \delta'_2}}(v)$  are birational.*

*Proof.* We follow the same argument of Proposition 8.6. We fix a decomposition  $v = u + w$ , with  $u = (r', d', \ell'_1, \ell'_2)$ ,  $w = (r'', d'', \ell''_1, \ell''_2)$ . Assume that there is a pair  $(\delta_1, \delta_2)$  in the wall, satisfying  $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2$ ,  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 < 1$ , and  $M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(u), M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(w) \neq \emptyset$ . As in the proof of Proposition 8.6, it suffices to show that  $\text{Ext}^1(u, w) = -\chi(u, w) > 0$ .

To prove this, we use Lemma 9.8 to compute  $-\chi(u, w)$ . Elementary manipulations show that

$$\frac{\dim \text{Ext}^1(u, w)}{r' r''} = (g-1) + \delta_1(A_1 - B_1 + 2) + \delta_2(A_1 - B_1 + A_2 - B_2 + 4) - A_1 B_1 - A_2 B_2,$$

where  $A_1 = \ell'_1/r' - 2$ ,  $A_2 = (\ell'_2 - \ell'_1)/2 - 2$ ,  $B_1 = \ell''_1/r''$ , and  $B_2 = (\ell''_2 - \ell''_1)/r''$ . Here  $-2 \leq A_1, A_2 \leq 0$  and  $0 \leq B_1, B_2 \leq 2$ . As  $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ , we get that the right hand side is  $\geq (g-1)$ , and equality holds only if  $A_1 - B_1 + 2$ ,  $A_1 + A_2 - B_1 - B_2 + 4$ ,  $A_1 B_1$ ,  $A_2 B_2$  are all zero. This implies that  $\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell''_1, \ell''_2$  are all zero. But this cannot happen thanks to (9.2).  $\square$

**9.4. Comparison at zero.** Fix  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  a primitive numerical vector. By Theorem 7.2, there exists a morphism  $a_*: M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  for  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \ll 1$ . The goal of this section is to describe this map in the case  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ .

**Lemma 9.11.** *Let  $v = (r, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$  be a primitive numerical vector, and assume that  $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ . Then, the map  $a_*: M_{\sigma}(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(r, d)$  is a bundle whose fibers are isomorphic to the flag variety*

$$F = \{(V_1, V_2) : V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 2r}, V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 4r}, V_1 \times \{0\} \subset V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{2r} \times V_1, \dim(V_i) = \ell_i\}.$$

*Moreover, this bundle is locally trivial in the Zariski topology.*

*Proof.* Let us describe the fiber of a point  $F \in M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$ . This consists of objects  $E$  fitting in a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow b^*K \rightarrow La^*F \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0$ , where  $K$  has  $\ell_1(K) = 2n - \ell_1$ ,  $\ell - 2(K) = 4n - \ell_2$ . Here, the object  $K$  corresponds to the choice of two subspaces  $K_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 2n}$ ,  $K_2 \oplus \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 4n}$ , satisfying  $K_1 \times \{0\} \subset K_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times K_1$ . This gives the description of the proposition on a fiber. The description globalizes in the same way as in Lemma 8.7.  $\square$

Let us point out that the variety constructed in Lemma 9.11 can be described as follows. Consider the Grassmannian  $G = \text{Gr}(r, r - \ell_1)$ , and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the tautological subbundle, of rank  $\ell_1$ . Then there is a forgetful map  $F \rightarrow G$ , mapping  $(V_1, V_2)$  to  $V_1$ . Over each  $p = [V_1]$ , the fiber is described by an  $\ell_2 - \ell_1$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathcal{O}_G^{2r} \times \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{U} \times \{0\}$ ; and so  $F \cong \text{Gr}(\mathcal{O}_G^{2r} \times \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{U} \times \{0\}, 2r - (\ell_2 - \ell_1))$ .

**9.5. Rank one.** In this subsection we consider the moduli spaces of  $\sigma$ -semistable objects for a numerical vector  $v = (1, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$ . As this vector has  $r = 1$ , there are no walls; thus, we simply write  $M(v)$ . We also have that this moduli space is smooth, thanks to Corollary 9.9.

Assume that  $E \in M(v)$  is a  $\sigma$ -stable object with vector  $v = (1, d, \ell_1, \ell_2)$ . We write  $E$  fitting into the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow b^*K \rightarrow La^*F \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{R})$ , where  $K$  is an object of  $\text{Coh}(\mathcal{A})$  with  $\ell_1(K) = 2 - \ell_1$ ,  $\ell_2(K) = 4 - \ell_2$ .

By construction, we have that  $K$  is a subobject of  $b_*La^*F \cong P_2^{\oplus 2}$ . This way, Lemma 9.8 gives us nine possible options for  $\ell_1, \ell_2$ . We have collected them in Table 3, together with the value of  $\text{Ext}^1(E, E)$  computed by Lemma 9.8.



TABLE 3. Possible values for  $(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ .

|                                   |     |       |     |       |       |       |     |       |     |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| $\ell_1$                          | 0   | 0     | 0   | 1     | 1     | 1     | 2   | 2     | 2   |
| $\ell_2$                          | 0   | 1     | 2   | 1     | 2     | 3     | 2   | 3     | 4   |
| $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(E, E)$ | $g$ | $g+1$ | $g$ | $g+1$ | $g+2$ | $g+1$ | $g$ | $g+1$ | $g$ |

Note that the description of Lemma 9.11 applies in this situation. We have three situations.

- If  $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(E, E) = g$ , then the map  $M(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is an isomorphism.
- If  $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(E, E) = g+1$ , then the map  $M(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology.
- If  $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(E, E) = g+2$ , then the map  $M(v) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(1, d)$  is an  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology, where  $\mathbb{F}_2$  is the Hirzebruch surface.

**Proposition 9.12.** *Let  $v = (1, d, 1, 2)$ . The map  $R\pi_*: M(v) \rightarrow M_C(1, d)$  from Theorem 7.2 is birational.*

*Proof.* Note from Theorem 7.2 that  $R\pi_*$  is an isomorphism over the locus of line bundles in  $C$ . Now, the fact that  $a_*: M(v) \rightarrow M_C(1, d)$  is a  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -bundle implies in particular that  $M(v)$  is irreducible. This implies that  $R\pi_*$  is birational.  $\square$

**9.6. Rank two.** In this subsection we will focus ourselves in describing the moduli spaces  $M_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(v)$ , where  $v = (2, 1, 2, 4)$ . Note that this is the numerical vector of  $L\pi^*F$ , where  $F$  is a vector bundle of rank 2 and degree 1 in  $\tilde{C}$ . We will assume that  $g \geq 1$ , so that  $M_{\tilde{C}}(2, 1) \neq \emptyset$ .

We start by computing the walls using (9.2). We get four walls  $W_1, \dots, W_4$ , corresponding to the decompositions  $v = u + w$  shown in Table 4.

 TABLE 4. Walls for  $v = (2, 1, 2, 4)$ .


| Wall  | $u$             | $w$            | Equation                    |
|-------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| $W_1$ | $(1, -1, 0, 0)$ | $(1, 2, 2, 4)$ | $2\delta_1 + 4\delta_2 = 3$ |
| $W_2$ | $(1, 0, 0, 0)$  | $(1, 1, 2, 4)$ | $2\delta_1 + 4\delta_2 = 1$ |
| $W_3$ | $(1, 0, 0, 1)$  | $(1, 1, 2, 3)$ | $2\delta_1 + 2\delta_2 = 1$ |
| $W_4$ | $(1, 0, 0, 2)$  | $(1, 1, 2, 2)$ | $2\delta_1 = 1$             |

These four walls determine five chambers in the region  $\{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2} : 0 < \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2 < 1\}$ . We have depicted all four walls in Figure 1.

For each wall  $W_i$  associated to the decomposition  $v = u + w$ , we need to compute which chambers have  $\phi(u) < \phi(w)$ , and the dimensions of  $\operatorname{Ext}^1(u, w)$ ,  $\operatorname{Ext}^1(w, u)$ . We have summarized this information in Table 5.

TABLE 5. Dimensions and chambers for the walls.

| Wall  | $\dim M(u)$ | $\dim M(w)$ | $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(u, w)$ | $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(w, u)$ | $\phi(u) < \phi(w)$  |
|-------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| $W_1$ | $g$         | $g$         | $g+4$                             | $g+2$                             | $R_1, R_2, R_3, R_5$ |
| $W_2$ | $g$         | $g$         | $g+6$                             | $g$                               | $R_1$                |
| $W_3$ | $g+1$       | $g+1$       | $g+3$                             | $g+1$                             | $R_1, R_2$           |
| $W_4$ | $g$         | $g$         | $g+2$                             | $g+4$                             | $R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4$ |

FIGURE 1. Walls and chambers of  $v = (2, 1, 2, 4)$ .

**Theorem 9.13.** *For each  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , set  $M_i = M_{\sigma_i}(v)$ , where  $\sigma_i = \sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$  for some  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in R_i$ .*

- (1) *Each of the moduli spaces  $M_i$  is smooth, projective, irreducible, of pure dimension  $4g + 5$ .*
- (2) *The map  $a_*: M_1 \rightarrow M_{\bar{C}}(2, 1)$  from Theorem 7.2 is an bundle whose fibers are isomorphic to the variety*

$$F = \{(V_1, V_2) : V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 2}, V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\oplus 4}, V_1 \times \{0\} \subset V_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times V_1, \dim(V_i) = \ell_i\}.$$

*The bundle  $a_*$  is locally trivial in the Zariski topology.*

- (3) *Given  $R_i, R_j$  two adjacent chambers, we let  $M_{ij} = M_{\sigma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}(v)$  for a general point  $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \overline{R_i} \cap \overline{R_j}$ . Then, the natural maps  $M_i \rightarrow M_{ij} \leftarrow M_j$  are a standard flip diagram.*
- (4) *The moduli spaces  $M_1, \dots, M_5$  are birational.*
- (5) *The morphism  $R\pi_*: M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, 1)$  from Theorem 7.2 is birational.*

*Proof.* The proof follows the same ideas of Subsection 8.6.

- (1) Smoothness follows immediately from Corollary 9.9, while the dimension can be computed using Lemma 9.8. Irreducibility will follow from (2) and (3).
- (2) Follows from Lemma 9.11.
- (3) The proof of Proposition 8.12 applies verbatim.
- (4) We only need to check that the flipped loci have dimension smaller than  $4g + 5$ . This follows immediately from the computations in Table 5.
- (5) The proof of the previous point ensures that  $M_5$  is irreducible of dimension  $4g + 5$ . By Theorem 7.2, we know that a  $4g + 5$ -dimensional open subset of  $M_5$  is isomorphic to an open subset of  $M_C(2, d)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 9.14.** *The moduli space  $M_C(2, 1)$  is birational to an  $F$ -bundle over  $M_{\bar{C}}(2, 1)$ . More explicitly, we have a factorization*

$$M_{\bar{C}}(2, 1) \leftarrow M_1 \dashrightarrow M_2 \dashrightarrow M_3 \dashrightarrow M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, 1),$$

*described as follows:*

- (1) The map  $M_1 \rightarrow M_{\tilde{C}}(2, 1)$  is an  $F$ -bundle, locally trivial in the Zariski topology.
- (2) The map  $M_1 \dashrightarrow M_2$  is a standard antiflip, replacing a  $\mathbb{P}^{g-1}$ -bundle over  $M(u_2) \times M(w_2)$  with a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+5}$ -bundle.
- (3) The map  $M_2 \dashrightarrow M_3$  is a standard antiflip, replacing a  $\mathbb{P}^g$ -bundle over  $M(u_3) \times M(w_3)$  with a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+2}$ -bundle.
- (4) The map  $M_3 \dashrightarrow M_4$  is a standard antiflip, replacing a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+1}$ -bundle over  $M(u_1) \times M(w_1)$  with a  $\mathbb{P}^{g+3}$ -bundle.
- (5) The map  $M_4 \rightarrow M_C(2, 1)$  is birational.

## REFERENCES

- [AP06] Dan Abramovich and Alexander Polishchuk, *Sheaves of  $t$ -structures and valuative criteria for stable complexes*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **590** (2006), 89–130, DOI 10.1515/CRELLE.2006.005. MR2208130
- [AK25] Valery Alexeev and Alexander Kuznetsov, *Augmentations, reduced ideal point gluings and compact type degenerations of curves*, posted on 2025, 31 pp., DOI 10.48550/arXiv.2509.12429, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.12429>.
- [Alp13] Jarod Alper, *Good moduli spaces for Artin stacks*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **63** (2013), no. 6, 2349–2402, DOI 10.5802/aif.2833 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3237451
- [AHLH23] Jarod Alper, Daniel Halpern-Leistner, and Jochen Heinloth, *Existence of moduli spaces for algebraic stacks*, Invent. Math. **234** (2023), no. 3, 949–1038, DOI 10.1007/s00222-023-01214-4. MR4665776
- [AIK77] Allen B. Altman, Anthony Iarrobino, and Steven L. Kleiman, *Irreducibility of the compactified Jacobian*, Real and complex singularities (Proc. Ninth Nordic Summer School/NAVF Sympos. Math., Oslo, 1976), Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1977, pp. 1–12. MR0498546
- [AS25] Enrico Arbarello and Giulia Saccà, *Singularities of Bridgeland Moduli spaces for  $K3$  categories: an update*, Perspectives on Four Decades of Algebraic Geometry, Volume 1, Progr. Math., vol. 351, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2025, pp. 1–42, DOI 10.1007/978-3-031-66230-0\_1. MR4866833
- [BBD82] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981), Astérisque, vol. 100, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982, pp. 5–171 (French). MR0751966
- [BM23] Arend Bayer and Emanuele Macrì, *The unreasonable effectiveness of wall-crossing in algebraic geometry*, ICM—International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. 3. Sections 1–4, EMS Press, Berlin, 2023, pp. 2172–2195. MR4680313
- [Bho96] Usha N. Bhosle, *Generalized parabolic bundles and applications. II*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. **106** (1996), no. 4, 403–420, DOI 10.1007/BF02837696. MR1425615
- [BB14] Usha N. Bhosle and Indranil Biswas, *Brauer group and birational type of moduli spaces of torsionfree sheaves on a nodal curve*, Comm. Algebra **42** (2014), no. 4, 1769–1784, DOI 10.1080/00927872.2012.749263. MR3169670
- [BRH21] Dominic Bunnnett and Alejandra Rincón-Hidalgo, *Moduli of Bridgeland semistable holomorphic triples*, posted on 2021, 30 pp., DOI 10.48550/arXiv.2102.04995, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.04995>.
- [BD11] Igor Burban and Yuriy Drozd, *Tilting on non-commutative rational projective curves*, Math. Ann. **351** (2011), no. 3, 665–709, DOI 10.1007/s00208-010-0585-4. MR2854109
- [BDG01] I. Burban, Yu. Drozd, and G.-M. Greuel, *Vector bundles on singular projective curves*, Applications of algebraic geometry to coding theory, physics and computation (Eilat, 2001), NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., vol. 36, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2001, pp. 1–15. MR1866891
- [CPZ24] Huachen Chen, Laura Pertusi, and Xiaolei Zhao, *Some remarks about deformation theory and formality conjecture*, Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez. VII Sci. Mat. **70** (2024), no. 3, 761–779, DOI 10.1007/s11565-024-00500-0. MR4767547

- [FB21] Filippo F. Favale and Sonia Brivio, *On vector bundles over reducible curves with a node*, Adv. Geom. **21** (2021), no. 3, 299–312, DOI 10.1515/advgeom-2020-0010. MR4283591
- [Har66] Robin Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64; With an appendix by P. Deligne. MR0222093
- [Har77] ———, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. No. 52, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. MR0463157
- [HL10] Daniel Huybrechts and Manfred Lehn, *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. MR2665168
- [KK15] D. Kaledin and A. Kuznetsov, *Refined blowups*, Math. Res. Lett. **22** (2015), no. 6, 1717–1732, DOI 10.4310/MRL.2015.v22.n6.a9. MR3507258
- [KKS22] Joseph Karmazyn, Alexander Kuznetsov, and Evgeny Shinder, *Derived categories of singular surfaces*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **24** (2022), no. 2, 461–526, DOI 10.4171/jems/1106. MR4382477
- [Kuz11] Alexander Kuznetsov, *Base change for semiorthogonal decompositions*, Compos. Math. **147** (2011), no. 3, 852–876, DOI 10.1112/S0010437X10005166. MR2801403
- [KL15] Alexander Kuznetsov and Valery A. Lunts, *Categorical resolutions of irrational singularities*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **13** (2015), 4536–4625, DOI 10.1093/imrn/rnu072. MR3439086
- [Lie06] Max Lieblich, *Moduli of complexes on a proper morphism*, J. Algebraic Geom. **15** (2006), no. 1, 175–206, DOI 10.1090/S1056-3911-05-00418-2. MR2177199
- [Lun01] Valery A. Lunts, *Coherent sheaves on configuration schemes*, J. Algebra **244** (2001), no. 2, 379–406, DOI 10.1006/jabr.2001.8866. MR1857751
- [Lun10] ———, *Categorical resolution of singularities*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), no. 10, 2977–3003, DOI 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2009.12.023. MR2609187
- [MS17] Emanuele Macri and Benjamin Schmidt, *Lectures on Bridgeland stability*, Moduli of curves, Lect. Notes Unione Mat. Ital., vol. 21, Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 139–211. MR3729077
- [OS79] Tadao Oda and C. S. Seshadri, *Compactifications of the generalized Jacobian variety*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **253** (1979), 1–90, DOI 10.2307/1998186. MR0536936
- [Orl16] Dmitri Orlov, *Smooth and proper noncommutative schemes and gluing of DG categories*, Adv. Math. **302** (2016), 59–105, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2016.07.014. MR3545926
- [Pol07] A. Polishchuk, *Constant families of  $t$ -structures on derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Mosc. Math. J. **7** (2007), no. 1, 109–134, 167, DOI 10.17323/1609-4514-2007-7-1-109-134 (English, with English and Russian summaries). MR2324559
- [Ses82] C. S. Seshadri, *Fibrés vectoriels sur les courbes algébriques*, Astérisque, vol. 96, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1982 (French). Notes written by J.-M. Drezet from a course at the École Normale Supérieure, June 1980. MR0699278
- [Stacks] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, 2025.
- [TiB91] Montserrat Teixidor i Bigas, *Moduli spaces of (semi)stable vector bundles on tree-like curves*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991), no. 2, 341–348, DOI 10.1007/BF01459249. MR1109638
- [Tod08] Yukinobu Toda, *Moduli stacks and invariants of semistable objects on K3 surfaces*, Adv. Math. **217** (2008), no. 6, 2736–2781, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2007.11.010. MR2397465
- [Tod14] ———, *Stability conditions and birational geometry of projective surfaces*, Compos. Math. **150** (2014), no. 10, 1755–1788, DOI 10.1112/S0010437X14007337. MR3269467
- [Ver77] Jean-Louis Verdier, *Catégories dérivées: quelques résultats (état 0)*, Cohomologie étale, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 569, Springer, Berlin, 1977, pp. 262–311 (French). MR3727440

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 2990 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, NY 10027, USA

Email address: nivilches@math.columbia.edu