FUJITA’S CONJECTURE FOR QUASI-ELLIPTIC SURFACES
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ABSTRACT. We will show that Fujita’s conjecture holds for quasi-elliptic surfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \(X\) be a smooth projective variety and \(A\) be an ample line bundle. The classical problem is to understand whether the adjoint linear system \(K_X + A\) is base point free or very ample. Thanks to Serre’s theorem, we know that \(K_X + mA\) is very ample for \(m\) sufficiently large, and there is a great interest in understanding the smallest value of \(m\) for which this holds. In [Fujita87], Fujita raised the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.1 (Fujita).** Let \(X\) be a smooth projective variety of dimension \(n\) and \(A\) be an ample line bundle. Then \(K_X + kA\) is base point free (resp. very ample) whenever \(k \geq n+1\) (resp. \(k \geq n+2\)).

**Remark 1.2.** In the conjecture, \(n+1\) (resp. \(n+2\)) is optimal when \(X = \mathbb{P}^n\) and \(A = O(1)\).

For the curve case, this conjecture follows from the Riemann-Roch theorem. For the surface case in characteristic zero, the conjecture follows from Reider’s theorem, which utilizes the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem. But in positive characteristic, this approach fails since Raynaud gave a counterexample to the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing in [Raynaud78]. However, Shepherd-Barron showed in [SB91] that the conjecture still holds for surfaces if \(X\) is not quasi-elliptic or of general type.

In this paper, we will show the following.

**Theorem 1.3.** Fujita’s conjecture holds for quasi-elliptic surfaces \(X\). That is, given a quasi-elliptic surface \(X\) and any ample divisor \(A\) on \(X\), we have

1. \(K_X + kA\) is base point free for \(k \geq 3\); and
2. \(K_X + kA\) is very ample for \(k \geq 4\).

To prove this result, we follow the ideas of [DCF15] and a careful case by case study. Note that, in [DCF15], it is proved that, when \(p = 3\), \(K_X + kA\) is base point free for \(k \geq 4\) and it is very ample for \(k \geq 8\); and when \(p = 2\), \(K_X + kA\) is base point free for \(k \geq 5\) and it is very ample for \(k \geq 19\).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Hodge Inequality.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \(X\) be a smooth projective surface over an algebraically closed field \(k\) and \(N\) a nef divisor on \(X\). Then for any divisor \(D\) on \(X\), we have the following

\[N^2D^2 \leq (N.D)^2.\]

Moreover, if \(N\) is ample, then the equality holds only when \(D\) is numerically proportional to \(N\).
Proof. Since we can approximate nef divisors by ample \( \mathbb{Q} \)-divisors and the desired inequality is homogeneous, we can reduce to the case when \( N \) is ample.

Now let’s consider \( E = (N.D)N - N^2D \). Notice that \( E.N = 0 \). Then by the Hodge index theorem, we have \( E^2 \leq 0 \) and we get the desired inequality. Moreover, the equality holds only when \( E \equiv 0 \). That is, \( D \) is numerically proportional to \( N \). \( \square \)

2.2. Unstability. In this section we recall some classical results about smooth surfaces in positive characteristic.

Definition 2.2. A rank-two vector bundle \( \mathcal{E} \) on \( X \) is unstable if it fits into a short exact sequence

\[
0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \cdot \mathcal{O}_X(D_2) \longrightarrow 0
\]

where \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are effective Cartier divisors such that \( D' := D_1 - D_2 \) is big and \( (D')^2 > 0 \) and \( Z \) is an effective 0-cycle on \( X \).

Definition 2.3. A big divisor \( D \) on a smooth surface \( X \) with \( D^2 > 0 \) is \( m \)-unstable for a positive integer \( m \) if either

- \( H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) = 0 \); or
- \( H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \neq 0 \) and there exists a nonzero effective divisor \( E \) such that
  - \( mD - 2E \) is big;
  - \( (mD - E).E \leq 0 \).

In [Bog78], Bogomolov showed that, in characteristic zero, every rank-two vector bundle \( \mathcal{E} \) on a smooth surface with \( c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) > 4c_2(\mathcal{E}) \) is unstable. Also, in positive characteristic, there is a result related to the unstability of vector bundles.

Theorem 2.4 (Bogomolov). Let \( \mathcal{E} \) be a rank-two vector bundle on a smooth projective surface \( X \) over a field of positive characteristic such that Bogomolov’s inequality \( c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) \leq 4c_2(\mathcal{E}) \) does not hold (that is, such that \( c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) > 4c_2(\mathcal{E}) \)). Then there exists a reduced and irreducible surface \( Y \) contained in the ruled threefold \( \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \) such that

- the restriction \( \rho : Y \to X \) is \( p^e \)-purely inseparable for some \( e > 0 \).
- \( (F^e)^* \mathcal{E} \) is unstable.

Moreover, we have

\[
K_Y \equiv \rho^* \left( K_X - \frac{p^e - 1}{p^e} D' \right)
\]

where

\[
0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D_1) \longrightarrow F^e* \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \cdot \mathcal{O}_X(D_2) \longrightarrow 0
\]

is a unstablizing sequence for \( (F^e)^* \mathcal{E} \) and \( D' = D_1 - D_2 \).

Proof. See [SB91, Theorem 1].

Remark 2.5. If \( H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \neq 0 \), \( D^2 > 0 \), and \( D \) is big, then \( D \) is \( p^e \)-unstable for some \( e > 0 \).

Indeed, from the assumption, there exists a non-split short exact sequence

\[
0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D) \longrightarrow 0
\]

given by a nonzero element of \( \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D), \mathcal{O}_X) \cong H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \), where \( \mathcal{E} \) is a vector bundle of rank two.
Note that $c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - 4c_2(\mathcal{E}) = D^2 > 0$. By Theorem 2.4 we have the following diagram.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X & \rightarrow & (F^e)^*\mathcal{E} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{I}_Z \cdot \mathcal{O}_X(D_2) & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow g_1 & & \downarrow f_2 & & \downarrow f_1 & & \\
0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(D_1) & \rightarrow & \tau & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(p^eD) & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

We would like to claim that $\tau = g_2 \circ f_1$ is not zero. Indeed, if $\tau = 0$, then $f_1 = g_1 \circ \tau'$ where $\tau'$ is a nonzero map from $\mathcal{O}_X(D_1)$ to $\mathcal{O}_X$. That means $-D_1$ is linearly equivalent to an effective divisor. Since $D_1 - D_2$ is big, we have $-D_2$ is also big. Now notice that $D_1 + D_2 \equiv c_1((F^e)^*\mathcal{E}) \equiv p^eD$ is big and intersection of any big divisor and ample divisor is positive. Thus, for any ample divisor $H$, we have

$$
0 < p^eD.H = (D_1 + D_2).H = -(-D_1).H - (-D_2).H < 0,
$$

which is impossible.

Hence, we may assume that $\tau \neq 0$ and so $D_2 \equiv c_1((F^e)^*\mathcal{E}) - D_1 \equiv p^eD - D_1$ is effective. So $p^eD - 2D_2 \equiv D_1 - D_2$ is big and

$$
(p^eD - D_2).D_2 = D_1.D_2 = c_2((F^e)^*\mathcal{E}) - \deg Z = -\deg Z \leq 0.
$$

Also $D_2 \neq 0$ since otherwise the vertical exact sequence

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X & \rightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_X(D) & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

splits, which is a contradiction.

To sum up, $D$ is $p^e$-unstable. $\square$

2.3. **Bend and Break.** We recall a well-known result in birational geometry.

**Theorem 2.6 (Bend-and-Break).** Let $X$ be a variety over an algebraically closed field and let $C$ be a smooth, projective, and irreducible curve with a morphism $h : C \rightarrow X$ such that $X$ has only local complete intersection singularities along $h(C)$ and $h(C)$ intersects the smooth locus of $X$. Assume $K_X.C < 0$, then for every point $x \in h(C)$, there exists a rational curve $C_x$ in $X$ passing through $x$ such that we have an algebraically equivalence

$$
h_*(C) \approx k_0[C_x] + \sum_{i \neq 0} k_i[C_i]
$$

with $k_i \geq 0$ for all $i$ and $-K_X.C_x \leq \dim X + 1$.

For a reference, see [Kol13, Theorem II.5.14, its proof, Remark II.5.15, and Theorem II.5.7].
3. Proof

Recall that if $X$ is a quasi-elliptic surface over an algebraically closed field $k$, then the characteristic of $k$ is 2 or 3. From now on, $X$ and $Y$ are quasi-elliptic surfaces and $A$ is an ample divisor on $X$. Also let $p \in \{2, 3\}$ be the characteristic of the base field.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $X$ be a quasi-elliptic surface and $D$ a big divisor on $X$ with $D^2 > 0$. Then $D$ is $p$-unstable. Moreover, if $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \neq 0$, we have

- $(3D - 2E).F = 1$ when $p = 3$
- $(D - E).F = 1$ when $p = 2$

where $E$ is a non-zero effective divisor associated to the $p$-unstability of $D$ and $F$ is a general fiber of the canonical fibration on $X$.

**Proof.** Assume that $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D)) \neq 0$. Then any non-zero element of $H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-D))$ gives a non-split extension

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X \to E \to \mathcal{O}_X(D) \to 0.$$ 

By Theorem 2.4, $(F^e)^*E$ is unstable for some $e > 0$ and $\rho : Y \to X$ be the $p^e$-purely inseparable morphism. Following Remark 2.5, we want to show that $e = 1$.

Let $F$ be the general fiber of the canonical fibration $f : X \to B$, $C = \rho^*F$, and $g = f \circ \rho$. Note that $F$ is rational and

$$-K_Y.C = \rho^* \left( \frac{p^e - 1}{p^e} D' - K_X \right).C$$
$$= \rho^* \left( \frac{p^e - 1}{p^e} (p^e D - 2E) - K_X \right).C$$
$$= p^e \left( \frac{p^e - 1}{p^e} (p^e D - 2E) - K_X \right).F$$
$$= (p^e - 1)(p^e D - 2E).F > 0$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 2.4, the second follows from $D' \equiv p^e D - 2E$ in Remark 2.5, the fourth follows since the arithmetic genus of $F$ is 1, and the last inequality follows from bigness of $p^e D - 2E$ and $F$ being a fiber. More precisely, $p^e D - 2E \sim_Q A + \text{(effective)}$, $A.F > 0$, and $\text{(effective)}.F \geq 0$ since $F$ is a fiber.

Now because $Y$ is defined via a quasi-section of $\mathbb{P}((F^e)^*E)$, it has hypersurface singularities along $C$. By applying Theorem 2.6 for any general point $y$, there exists a rational curve $C_y$ passing through $y$ such that

$$-K_Y.C_y \leq 3 \text{ with } C \approx k_0[C_y] + \sum_{i \neq 0} k_i[C_i]$$

By exercise II.4.1.10 in [Kol13], we know that every curve $C_i$ on the right hand side of the equivalence above is in the fiber of $g$. Note that any general fiber of $g$ is irreducible. So each $C_i$ and $C_y$ is algebraically equivalent to $C$. Thus, we have $-K_Y.C \leq 3$.

This gives

$$3 \geq -K_Y.C = (p^e - 1)(p^e D - 2E).F > 0$$

When $p = 3$, we have $\text{RHS} \geq 3^e - 1 \geq 8$ if $e \geq 2$, which is impossible.

\(^1\text{See the proof of Theorem 2.4 which is [SB91], Theorem 1.}\)
When $p = 2$, we have $\text{RHS} = 2(2^e - 1)(2^{e-1}D - E).F \geq 2(2^e - 1) \geq 6$ if $e \geq 2$, which is impossible.

Thus, $e$ must be 1 and $D$ is $p$-unstable.

When $p = 3$, we have

$$(p^e - 1)(p^e D - 2E).F = (3D - 2E).F$$

which is a positive even integer less than 3. So, $(3D - 2E).F = 1$.

When $p = 2$, we have

$$(p^e - 1)(p^e D - 2E).F = (2D - 2E).F$$

which is a positive even integer less than 3. So, $(D - E).F = 1$.

□

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $\pi : Y \to X$ be a birational morphism between two smooth surfaces and let $\tilde{D}$ be a big Cartier divisor on $Y$ such that $\tilde{D}^2 > 0$. Assume there is a non-zero effective divisor $\tilde{E}$ such that

- $\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}$ is big and
- $(\tilde{D} - \tilde{E}).\tilde{E} \leq 0$.

Set $D = \pi_* \tilde{D}$, $E = \pi_* \tilde{E}$ and $\alpha = D^2 - \tilde{D}^2$. If $D$ is nef and $E$ is a nonzero effective divisor, then

- $0 \leq D.E < \alpha/2$
- $D.E - \alpha/4 \leq E^2 \leq (D.E)^2/D^2$.

**Proof.** See [Sak90, Proposition 2].

**Corollary 3.3.** Let $\pi : Y \to X$ be a birational morphism between two smooth surfaces and let $\tilde{D}$ be a big Cartier divisor on $Y$ such that $\tilde{D}^2 > 0$. Assume that

- $H^1(X, O_X(-\tilde{D})) \neq 0$;
- $\tilde{D}$ is $m$-unstable for some $m > 0$.

That means, there exists a nonzero effective divisor $\tilde{E}$ such that

- $m\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}$ is big.
- $(m\tilde{D} - \tilde{E}).\tilde{E} \leq 0$.

Set $D = \pi_* \tilde{D}$, $E = \pi_* \tilde{E}$ and $\alpha = D^2 - \tilde{D}^2$. If $D$ is nef and $E$ is a nonzero effective divisor, then

- $0 \leq D.E < m\alpha/2$
- $mD.E - m^2\alpha/4 \leq E^2 \leq (D.E)^2/D^2$.

**Proof.** Write $\tilde{B} = m\tilde{D}$. Since $\tilde{D}$ is $m$-unstable, $\tilde{B}$ is 1-unstable. Thus, we can use Proposition 3.2 above. Note that $\alpha_B = B^2 - \tilde{B}^2 = m^2\alpha_D$. □

**Proof (Proof of Theorem 1.3).** We divide the proof into several steps. Recall that for any quasi-elliptic surfaces $X$, the characteristic $p$ of the base field is 2 or 3.

- Base point freeness.
  - (a) Let $D = kA$ and assume that $|K_X + D|$ has a base point at $x \in X$. Let $\pi : Y \to X$ be the blow-up at $x$. Since $x$ is a base point, we have that
    $$H^1(X, O_X(K_X + D) \otimes m_x) = H^1(Y, O_Y(K_Y + \pi^*D - 2E_x)) \neq 0$$
where $E_x$ is the exceptional divisor of $\pi$. Let $\tilde{D} = \pi^*D - 2E_x$.
In order to apply Proposition 3.1, we need to check $\tilde{D}$ is big and $\tilde{D}^2 > 0$.
Note that
\[
h^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(\ell(\pi^*D - 2E_x))) = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(\ell D) \otimes m_x^{2\ell}) \\
\geq \frac{D^2}{2} \ell^2 + O(\ell) - \left(\frac{2\ell + 1}{2}\right) \\
= \frac{k^2A^2 - 4}{2} \ell^2 + O(\ell)
\]
So $\tilde{D}$ is big whenever $k \geq 3$. Also note that $\tilde{D}^2 = D^2 - 4 = k^2A^2 - 4 \geq 5$.
By Proposition 3.1 on $Y$ and $\tilde{D}$, we have that $\tilde{D}$ is $p$-unstable. So there is a
nonzero effective divisor $\tilde{E}$ such that $p\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}$ is big and $(p\tilde{D} - \tilde{E}).\tilde{E} \leq 0$.
This implies that $\tilde{E}$ is not a positive multiple of the exceptional divisor and so $E = \pi_\ast\tilde{E}$ is a non-zero effective divisor. Also $\pi_\ast\tilde{D} = D = kA$ is ample
and $\alpha = D^2 - \tilde{D}^2 = 4$. Hence, by Corollary 3.3, we have
\[
0 \leq kA.E < 2p \leq 6 \\
pkA.E - p^2 \leq E^2 \leq (A.E)^2/A^2
\]
So we get $0 < A.E < \frac{6}{k} \leq 2$. Thus, $A.E = 1$ and so $E$ is an irreducible curve. The second inequality becomes
\[
(1)
\]
(b) If $p = 2$, then $2 \leq 2k - 4 \leq E^2 \leq 1$, which is impossible.
(c) If $p = 3$, then $3k - 9 \leq E^2 \leq 1$. This only happens when $k = 3$ and $E^2 = 0$
or $1$.
Now, by Proposition 3.1, we have
\[
(2)
(3\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}).F = (9A - 2E).F = 1 \text{ because } F \text{ is a general fiber.}^2
\]
Since $F$ is nef and $A$ is ample, we get $9A.F \geq 9$ and so, by (2), we have
\[
E.F \geq 4.
\]
By an easy computation, we have that $E + F$ is nef.
(d) If $E^2 = 1$, then $A^2 = 1$ by equation (1) and $A$ is numerically equivalent to $E$ by Theorem 2.3.1 Thus, from (2), we have $7A.F = 1$, which is impossible.
(e) So $E^2 = 0$. Now by Theorem 2.3 applied to $9A - 2E$ and $E + F$, we have
\[
(9A - 2E)^2(E + F)^2 \leq ((9A - 2E).(E + F))^2.
\]
Thus, by an easy computation, we have
\[
(81A^2 - 36)(2F.E) \leq (9A.E + (9A - 2E).F)^2.
\]
Since $A.E = 1$ and $(9A - 2E).F = 1$, the right hand side equals to 100 and so
\[
5 \leq 9A^2 - 4 \leq \frac{100}{18(F.E)} \leq \frac{100}{18 \times 4} \leq 2, \text{ which is impossible.}
\]
Hence, we have shown the freeness part of Fujita’s conjecture.

---

^2By abuse of notation, $F$ denotes a general fiber of $X$ and $Y$. 
• Very ampleness.
  (a) Let $D = kA$. We want to show $|K_X + D|$ separates points and tangents. Assume that $|K_X + D|$ doesn’t separate points $x$ and $y$ (resp. doesn’t separate tangents at $x$). Thus, it suffices to show that

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + D) \otimes m_x \otimes m_y) = H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \pi^*D - 2E_x - 2E_y)) \neq 0$$

resp.

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + D) \otimes m^2_x) = H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y + \pi^*D - 3E_x)) \neq 0$$

is impossible where $\pi : Y \to X$ is the blow-up of $X$ at $x$, $y$ and $E_x, E_y$ are the exceptional divisor (resp. $\pi : Y \to X$ is the blow-up of $X$ at $x$ and $E_x$ is the exceptional divisor.)

Now let $\tilde{D} = \pi^*D - 2E_x - 2E_y$ (resp. $\tilde{D} = \pi^*D - 3E_x$). By the above argument, $\tilde{D}$ is big and $\tilde{D}^2 > 0$ whenever $k \geq 4$.

Applying Proposition 3.1 to $Y$ and $\tilde{D}$, we have that $\tilde{D}$ is $p$-unstable. So there is a nonzero effective divisor $\tilde{E}$ such that $p\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}$ is big and $(p\tilde{D} - \tilde{E}) \cdot \tilde{E} \leq 0$.

This implies that $\tilde{E}$ is not a sum of multiples of the exceptional divisors and so $E = \pi_*\tilde{E}$ is a non-zero effective divisor. Also $\pi_*\tilde{D} = D = kA$ is ample and $\alpha = D^2 \geq 0$ whenever $k \geq 4$.

Then we get

$$(3\tilde{D} - 2\tilde{E}) \cdot F = 1$$

If $k$ is even, then the left hand side is $\geq 2$, which is impossible.

(c) If $k$ is odd, using (4), we get

$$0 < kA.E < \frac{3}{2}\alpha \leq \frac{27}{2}$$

and $3kA.E - \frac{4}{2}\alpha \leq E^2 \leq (A.E)^2/A^2$

Then we have $A.E = 1$ or 2 since $A.E < \frac{27}{2k} \leq \frac{27}{10} < 3$. If $A.E = 2$, then we have

$$9 < 6k - \frac{81}{4} \leq E^2 \leq 4/A^2 \leq 4$$

which is impossible.

Thus $A.E = 1$ and so $E$ is an irreducible curve. Also, from (6), we have

$$3k - \frac{81}{4} \leq k - \frac{9\alpha}{4} \leq E^2 \leq \frac{1}{A^2} \leq 1.$$

Thus $k$ is 5 or 7 and

$$-5 \leq E^2 \leq 1.$$

Using (5) again, we have $1 + 2E.F = 3kA.F \geq 15$. So

$$E.F \geq 7$$

and $E + F$ is nef.

---

3See [Har77, Proposition II.7.3].
Now by Theorem 2.1 applied to $3kA - 2E$ and $E + F$, we have

$$(3kA - 2E)^2(E + F)^2 \leq ((3kA - 2E). (E + F))^2$$

Note that the left hand side

$$(3kA - 2E)^2(E + F)^2 = (9k^2A^2 - 12k + 4E^2)(E^2 + 2E.F)$$

$$\geq (4E^2 + 141)(E^2 + 2E.F)$$

$$\geq (4E^2 + 141)(E^2 + 14)$$

where the first inequality comes from $A^2 \geq 1, 5 \leq k \leq 7$, and nefness of $E + F$; and the second inequality comes from (7) and (5). And the right hand side

$$((3kA - 2E). (E + F))^2 = (1 + 3k - 2E^2)^2$$

$$\leq (2E^2 - 22)^2$$

where the equality comes from (5) and (7) and the inequality comes from $k \leq 7$. Thus, by an easy computation, we get $E^2 \leq -6$, which contradicts to (7).

(d) Now we deal with $p = 2$. The inequalities (1) becomes

$$0 < kA.E < \alpha \leq 9$$

$$2kA.E - \alpha \leq E^2 \leq (A.E)^2/A^2$$

Hence, $A.E = 1$ or $2$.

(e) If $A.E = 2$, then we have $7 \leq 4k - \alpha \leq E^2 \leq 4/A^2 \leq 4$, which is impossible.

(f) Thus we have $A.E = 1$ and so $E$ is an irreducible curve. Then

$$2k - 9 \leq 2k - \alpha \leq E^2 \leq 1/A^2 \leq 1.$$ 

So $k = 5$ and $E^2 = 1$; or $k = 4$ and $-1 \leq E^2 \leq 1$. Now again by Proposition 3.1 we have $(kA - E). F = 1$. So $E.F \geq 3$. Thus, $E + F$ is nef.

Applying Theorem 2.1 to $kA - E$ and $E + F$, we get

$$(kA - E)^2(E + F)^2 \leq ((kA - E). (E + F))^2.$$ 

(g) If $k = 5$ and $E^2 = 1$, then $A \equiv E$. But

$$1 = (5A - E). F = 4A.F$$

which is impossible.

(h) Thus $k = 4$.

When $E^2 = 1$, then by the above argument, this case is impossible.

When $E^2 = 0$, from (2), we have

$$2A^2 - 1 \leq \frac{25}{16(E.F)} \leq \frac{25}{16 \times 3} < 1,$$

which is impossible.

When $E^2 = -1$, from (9), we have

$$(16A^2 - 9)(2E.F - 1) \leq 36$$
Since $E.F \geq 3$, we have $A^2 = 1$. Thus $E.F = 3$ and so $A.F = 1$ from $(4A - E).F = 1$. However, it is also impossible since, by Theorem 2.1, we have
\[5 = A^2(E + F)^2 \leq (A.(E + F))^2 = 4.\]

\[\square\]
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