

AMENDING THE LONELY RUNNER SPECTRUM CONJECTURE

HO TIN FAN[†] AND ALEC SUN

ABSTRACT. Let $\|x\|$ be the absolute distance from x to the nearest integer. For a set of distinct positive integral speeds v_1, \dots, v_n , we define its maximum loneliness to be

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|tv_i\|$$

The Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture, recently proposed by Kravitz [6], asserts that

$$\exists s \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{s}{sn + 1} \text{ or } \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

We disprove the Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture for $n = 4$ and propose an alternative conjecture. We confirm the amended conjecture for $n = 4$ if any pair of speeds share a common factor of at least 3 and also prove some related results.

1. INTRODUCTION

A long-standing problem in Number Theory is the Lonely Runner Conjecture, first introduced by Wills in 1967 [11]. The conjecture focuses on the following scenario: Let n runners start on the same point and each run at a pairwise-distinct constant velocity on a circular unit-length race track, namely \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . At a particular moment in time, a runner is considered “lonely” if he or she is at least $\frac{1}{n}$ units of distance away from every other runner. The Lonely Runner asserts that all runners will sooner or later become lonely regardless of the speeds, possibly at different times.

Another popular reformulation of the problem arises when we focus on one runner’s frame of reference. Each runner’s velocity is subtracted by the chosen runner’s velocity, while the chosen runner remains fixed at the start point. We define the loneliness of n moving runners with nonzero velocities $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}$ as the maximum achievable distance L such that there exists a time when all n runners are L away from the start point. Let $\|x\|$ denote the absolute distance from x to the nearest integer, then the loneliness value can be more formally written as

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|tv_i\|$$

We further note that relative to one runner, the sign of other runners’ velocity is always irrelevant, so we can further restrict our discussion with only positive speeds. The Lonely Runner Conjecture for $n + 1$ runners thus asserts the following condition regarding the loneliness value.

Conjecture 1.1 (Wills, Cusick). *For any set of n nonzero positive speeds $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we guarantee*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n + 1}$$

We remark that if the Conjecture is to be true, then the above lower bound is sharp since there are known cases of equality. These cases are often referred as *tight speed sets*, and a trivial construction is setting $v_i = i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. However, there are more erratic cases of equality, as demonstrated by the work of Goddyn and Wong [5]. While the problem was first asked in relation to the field of Diophantine Approximation, it is connected to many other fields, including

[†]Corresponding author.

but not limited to: distance graphs' chromatic number [7], flows in graphs and matroids [1], and view-construction problems [4].

A natural focus is considering the near-equality cases when the loneliness value is between $\in [1/(n+1), 1/n)$. Assuming the Lonely Runner Conjecture is true, then this interval of loneliness value is made possible precisely by having all n moving runners. Otherwise, any subset of $n-1$ moving runners would lead to a loneliness value of at least $1/n$. Here, Kravitz questions whether the spectrum of achievable loneliness values within this interval is dense, to which he reveals that, contrary to expectation, it is discrete [6]. He then proposes the following Conjecture to further sharpen and formalize this observation.

Conjecture 1.2 (Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture [6]). *For any positive integers v_1, \dots, v_n , we have either*

$$\exists s \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{s}{ns+1} \text{ or } \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

Note that this Conjecture is strictly stronger than the original Lonely Runner Conjecture. In addition to providing an inductive approach toward proving the Lonely Runner Conjecture, the Conjecture also has applications in topics like computing the covering radius of a polytope [3]. Kravitz proved the conjecture for $n=3$. However, one of our paper's main results is that for n with greater values, there exists counter-cases like $\text{ML}(8, 3, 11, 19) = 7/30$ for $n=4$ and $\text{ML}(5, 6, 11, 17, 23, 28) = 8/51$ for $n=6$. Nonetheless, our experimental data indicate that the intuition of a discrete spectrum remains true. Thus we propose a new modified version of the Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture.

Conjecture 1.3 (Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture). *For any positive integers v_1, \dots, v_n , we have either*

$$\exists s, k \in \mathbb{N}, k \leq n, \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{s}{ns+k} \text{ or } \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

We hereby refer to Conjecture 1.2 as the ‘‘Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture’’ and Conjecture 1.3 as the ‘‘Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture.’’ We believe the modifications to the Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture are well-motivated because

- The proof presented in Kravitz's original paper relies on one key intuition – if we focus on only times in the form $t = h/(v_i + v_j)$ for some integer h and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ whilst guaranteeing certain conditions, the loneliness value is at least $\lfloor (v_i + v_j)/n \rfloor / (v_i + v_j)$. In other words, if we express the sum as $v_i + v_j = ns + k$ for some integer s and $0 \leq k < n$, then the loneliness value is at least $s/(ns+k)$. In other words, the intuition guarantees a loneliness value of at least $1/n$ with some rounding down wiggle room.
- We ran a computer algorithm on a substantial number of cases for $4 \leq n \leq 6$, and the modified conjecture so far holds true for all of those cases. However, we remark that the experimental data suggests an even sharper selection of the possible values of k , which we explore more in Section 5.

2. TOOLS AND PRELIMINARIES

We now present the preliminaries and assumptions that all subsequent discussions rely on. In addition, we lay the foundation for the main results by establishing a few commonly used techniques.

An important first step is to reduce our discussion from considering all positive real speeds to all positive rational speeds. Fortunately, this reduction has already been extensively studied, and we directly reference the following lemma from the work of Bohman, Holzman, and Kleitman [2].

Lemma 2.1 (Bohman, Holzman, and Kleitman [2]). *Let $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $\text{ML}(u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}) > \delta$ for all choices of positive real speeds u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} . Then for positive real speeds v_1, \dots, v_n , if there exists a pair of speeds such that their ratio is irrational, i.e. $\frac{v_i}{v_j} \notin \mathbb{Q}$, we have $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) > \delta$.*

This is helpful since the Lonely Runner Conjecture already guarantees a loneliness value of at least $1/n$ for $n - 1$ runners. Thus, we immediately derive a loneliness value of at least $1/n$ if the ratio of some pair is irrational. More formally, we propose the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Assuming that the Lonely Runner Conjecture holds for any $n - 1$ positive real speeds and the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture holds true for any n positive integral speeds, the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture holds true for any n positive real speeds.*

Proof. Consider the case when there is a pair of indices $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that v_i/v_j is not rational. Applying Lemma 2.1 with δ approaching $\frac{1}{n}$ from below yields

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

which satisfies the Amended Loneliness Spectrum. We now focus our attention when all ratios are rational. Let l be the least common multiple of the denominators of v_i/v_1 for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then we note that

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \text{ML}\left(l\frac{v_1}{v_1}, \dots, l\frac{v_n}{v_1}\right)$$

and that the RHS forms a set of positive integral values. By assumption, the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture already holds true for n positive integral speeds. \square

We further attempt to reduce the cases we need to check by establishing a ‘‘canonical form’’ and note the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *For nonzero real number k and 2 sets of positive integral speeds v_1, \dots, v_n and u_1, \dots, u_n such that the two sets are permutation of each other, we have*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \text{ML}(ku_1, \dots, ku_n)$$

We take advantage of this observation and assume that the greatest common factor of all speeds $\text{gcd}(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is henceforth 1.

Corollary 2.1. *Assuming the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture holds true for all positive integral speeds $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\text{gcd}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = 1$, then the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture holds true for all real speeds.*

Following our previous discussion, we have successfully restricted the general case of any real speeds to a much smaller subset of the original problem. Along the same vein, we aim to also restrict the values of time t we need to check to a smaller subset.

Lemma 2.2. [Kravitz [6]] *Let v_1, \dots, v_n be positive integers ($n \geq 2$) with $\text{gcd}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = 1$. Then every local maximum of the function*

$$f(t) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} ||tv_i||$$

occurs at a time of form

$$t_0 = \frac{m}{v_i + v_j}$$

where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and m is an integer.

The general gist of the proof is that there should be 2 runners equidistant to the origin approaching from different sides. Otherwise, we can perturb time to achieve a larger loneliness value. In other words, at the local maximum, there must exist some indices $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $tv_i \equiv -tv_j \pmod{1}$, which produces time values suggested by the lemma. This lemma reduces the time values we need to enumerate to quite a constrained discrete set given a fixed set of speeds.

2.1. Very Fast Runner(s). We now briefly shift our attention to a special class of setups that has been actively researched in past literature. These papers usually study the loneliness value when the set of speeds satisfies some lacunarity properties. Examples include several results by Tao when all speeds are small [10], and when the speeds grow at near-exponential rates [8]. Here, we focus on 2 of such conditions, where one or two of the runners are significantly faster than the rest.

Lemma 2.3 (One Very Fast Runner [6]). *Let $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_{n-1}$ be positive integers ($n \geq 2$) with $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}) = L$, and fix some $0 < \epsilon < L$. Then we have that $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq L - \epsilon$ whenever $v_n \geq (\frac{L-\epsilon}{\epsilon})v_{n-1}$.*

This lemma is useful in dealing with cases when $n - 1$ of the speeds are fixed or bounded. We can thus manually check a finite number of instances and use this lemma when the n -th speed is sufficiently large.

Remark 2.1. *However, for there to be a finite number of instances to check when $n - 1$ of the speeds are fixed, we need ϵ in Lemma 2.3 to be non-trivially greater than 0. If the $n - 1$ speeds form a tight speed set such that $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}) = 1/n$, then the Lemma is effectively useless if we want to ensure a loneliness value of at least $1/n$ since $\epsilon = 0$. On the other hand, if we assume the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture 1.3 holds true for $n - 1$ runners and v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} do not form a tight speed set, then $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ must be non-trivially greater than $1/n$ due to the discrete nature of the $[1/n, 1/(n - 1))$ region.*

In the same vein, we introduce a novel technique for dealing with 2 very fast runners.

Lemma 2.4 (Two Very Fast Runners). *Let $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_n$ be positive integers ($n \geq 4$) with $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-2}) \geq L$. Then $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$ if*

$$L - \frac{3v_{n-2}}{nv_{n-1}} \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

Proof. Choose a time t_0 such that $\|t_0v_i\| \geq L$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$. At this time, runner $n - 1$ is at most $\frac{1}{n}$ units of distance away from a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{n}$. We increase the time until runner $n - 1$ reaches the valid region. If runner n is already $\frac{1}{n}$ away from the origin, then the new time satisfies all the desired conditions. Otherwise, runner $n - 1$'s position must be between $[\frac{1}{n}, \frac{n-1}{n}]$, and runner n 's position must be between $(\frac{n-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$ in the modular sense. Since $v_{n-1} < v_n$ and the valid region has length $\frac{n-2}{n}$, which is larger than the invalid region of length $\frac{2}{n}$, runner n must be able to reach the valid region in one of the two directions while ensuring that runner $n - 1$ stays in the valid region, traversing at most $\frac{2}{n}$ units of distance. We denote this new time as t . In this construction, runner $n - 1$ moves at most $\frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} = \frac{3}{n}$ units away from its original position at t_0 , meaning that $|t - t_0| \leq \frac{3}{nv_{n-1}}$. This implies that the rest of the runners each could have traversed a distance of at most $\frac{3v_{n-2}}{nv_{n-1}}$. More formally,

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \dots, \|tv_n\|) \geq L - \frac{3v_{n-2}}{nv_{n-1}}$$

This concludes the proof. □

We now have a new tool when there are 2 fast runners that are of similar speeds such that we cannot apply Lemma 4.1. Though not useful for $n = 4$, we remark that a similar strategy can be applied to prove an analog of this lemma for m very fast runners if $n \geq 2m$

For the sake of completeness, we also include Kravitz's proof for the Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture when $n = 3$, which directly implies the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture for $n = 3$.

Theorem 2.2 (Kravitz [6]). *For any positive integers v_1, v_2, v_3 , we have either*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3) = \frac{s}{3s + 1} \text{ for some } s \in \mathbb{N} \text{ or } \text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3) \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

Finally, before we dive into the main results of this paper, we introduce one more technique called *pre-jump*, first employed by Bienia, Goddyn, Gvozdjak, and Tarsi [1].

Lemma 2.5 (Pre-jump [1]). *Given 2 positive integral speeds v_1 and v_2 . If they share a common factor of g , then for any real number time t and integral choices of h , we have*

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) = \min \left(\left\| \left(t + \frac{h}{g} \right) v_1 \right\|, \left\| \left(t + \frac{h}{g} \right) v_2 \right\| \right)$$

Proof. We first note the fact that $\|x+k\| = \|x\|$ for any integer k and $\|(t+h/g)v_1\| = \|tv_1+(h/g)v_1\|$. From the assumption, we know that v_1 is divisible by g , hence the second part is an integer, attaining the equality $\|(t+h/g)v_1\| = \|tv_1\|$. The same argument can be applied for v_2 , resulting in the min function taking in the same arguments on both sides of the equality. \square

This technique is especially effective when combined with the Pigeonhole Principle. We showcase its usage in the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2. *Given 3 positive integer speeds v_1, v_2, v_3 with $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3) = 1$. We assume the Lonely Runner Conjecture is true for $n = 2$. If any of the two speeds share a common factor of at least 2, then the Lonely Runner Conjecture holds true.*

Proof. Without the loss of generality, let $\gcd(v_1, v_2) = g \geq 2$. Since by assumption $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3) = 1$, we know that g is co-prime to v_3 . Applying the Lonely Runner Conjecture for $n = 2$, there exists a time t such that

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

We now apply the pre-jump technique and define a new time $t' = t + \frac{h}{g}$ for some integer $0 \leq h < g$. Since v_3 is co-prime to g , we know that

$$\{hv_3 \bmod g : 0 \leq h < g\}$$

must form the complete residue set. Thus the set of possible positions of $(t+h/g)v_3$ on the unit circle is g equidistantly spaced points shifted by an arbitrary amount. By the Pigeonhole principle, at least one point is at most $1/(2g)$ away from the $1/2$ midpoint. Hence, there must exist an integer h such that

$$\left\| \left(t + \frac{h}{g} \right) v_3 \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2g} \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

And we know that such a time $t' = t + h/g$ already guarantees a loneliness value of at least $1/3$ for the first two runners. Therefore, the overall loneliness value is at least $1/4$, as desired. \square

We remark that a similar argument can even be applied for more runners, although the usage of the Pigeonhole Principle is much more intricate when there is more than one runner. We discuss this further in Section 4, and specifically Lemma 4.1.

3. ACHIEVING THE EXCEPTIONS

One of our key results is disproving the original Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture through counter-cases. Since Kravitz proved the Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture for $n = 3$, we look at the next unproved case of $n = 4$. A bit of experimentation suggests an explicit construction of counter-cases for four moving runners that produces loneliness value of the form

$$\frac{s}{4s + 2}$$

for odd integer $s \geq 5$. Note that if s is even, the fraction reduces to the non-exceptional form, so we only focus on the odd case.

Corollary 3.1. *For $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and real number $t \in S$,*

$$\min(\|t\|, \|2t\|, \|3t\|) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

Proof. This is implied by the tight speed equality case $\text{ML}(1, 2, 3) = \frac{1}{4}$ of the Lonely Runner Conjecture. \square

Corollary 3.2. *For $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and real number $t \in S$,*

$$\min\left(\left\|t + \frac{1}{2}\right\|, \|2t\|, \left\|3t + \frac{1}{2}\right\|\right) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

Proof. This is implied by corollary 3.1 by substituting $t = u + \frac{1}{2}$. We can match the terms by subtracting 1 from $2t$ and $3t$. \square

Theorem 3.1. *For $n = 4$ and integer $s \geq 0$, we have*

$$\text{ML}(8, 4s + 3, 4s + 11, 4s + 19) = \frac{2s + 7}{8s + 30} = \frac{2s + 7}{4(2s + 7) + 2}$$

Proof. We define

$$L_{i,j} = L_{i,j}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \max_t \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|tv_i\|$$

for all t in the form described in lemma 2.2, aka

$$t = \frac{m}{v_i + v_j}$$

with some integer m . Moreover, we define $r_{i,j}$ as the nominator of the local maximum for $L_{i,j}$ if the denominator is $v_i + v_j$, i.e. $r_{i,j} = (v_i + v_j)L_{i,j}$. Then the overall loneliness is the maximum value of $L_{i,j}$ amongst the 6 pairs of runners. However, we can immediately eliminate 3 of the pairs whose sum is a multiple of another speed, yielding a loneliness value of 0.

$$v_1 + v_2 = 4s + 11 = v_3 \implies L_{1,2} = 0$$

Similarly

$$v_1 + v_3 = 4s + 19 = v_4 \implies L_{1,3} = 0$$

and

$$v_2 + v_4 = 8s + 22 = 2v_3 \implies L_{2,4} = 0$$

This leaves us with 3 possibly nonzero pairs to check.

$$L_{1,4} = \frac{r_{1,4}}{4s + 27} \quad L_{2,3} = \frac{r_{2,3}}{8s + 14} \quad L_{3,4} = \frac{r_{3,4}}{8s + 30}$$

We claim that $r_{3,4} = 2s + 7$ and that $L_{3,4} > L_{2,3}$ and $L_{3,4} > L_{1,4}$.

(1) We use proof by contradiction to prove $L_{3,4} > L_{1,4}$. We assume $L_{1,4} > L_{3,4}$, aka

$$\frac{r_{1,4}}{4s+27} > \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$$

We observe that $\frac{s+6}{4s+27} < \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$ by direct computation, thus $r_{1,4} \geq s+7$, which implies

$$\frac{r_{1,4}}{4s+27} \geq \frac{s+7}{4s+27} > \frac{1}{4}$$

However, we will show that this is impossible. Let the time that achieves the local maximum be

$$\frac{t}{4s+27}$$

then the loneliness value becomes

$$L_{1,4} = \min \left(\left\| \frac{8t}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(4s+3)}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(4s+11)}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(4s+19)}{4s+27} \right\| \right)$$

Since $\| -x \| = \| x \|$ and $\| x - 1 \| = \| x \|$, the equation above reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} &= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8t}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(-24)}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(-16)}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{t(8)}{4s+27} \right\| \right) \\ &= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8t}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{16t}{4s+27} \right\|, \left\| \frac{24t}{4s+27} \right\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Let $x = \frac{8t}{4s+27}$, then by Corollary 3.1, we have $L_{1,4} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, which contradicts our previous conclusion that $L_{1,4} > \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, $L_{3,4} > L_{1,4}$

(2) We again use proof by contradiction to prove $L_{3,4} > L_{2,3}$. We assume $L_{2,3} > L_{3,4}$, aka

$$\frac{r_{2,3}}{8s+14} > \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$$

We observe that $\frac{2s+3}{8s+14} < \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$ by direct computation, thus $r_{2,3} \geq 2s+4$, which implies

$$\frac{r_{1,4}}{8s+14} \geq \frac{2s+4}{8s+14} > \frac{1}{4}$$

However, we will show that this is impossible. Let the time that achieves the local maximum be

$$\frac{t}{8s+14}$$

Here we split into two cases depending on the parity of t .

(a) If t is even, let $t = 2m$. This produces the loneliness value

$$\min \left(\left\| \frac{8(2m)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(2m)(4s+3)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(2m)(4s+11)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(2m)(4s+19)}{8s+14} \right\| \right)$$

Again using similar algebraic techniques from proving $L_{3,4} > L_{1,4}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8m}{4s+7} \right\|, \left\| \frac{m(-4)}{4s+7} \right\|, \left\| \frac{m(4)}{4s+7} \right\|, \left\| \frac{m(12)}{4s+7} \right\| \right) \\ &= \min \left(\left\| \frac{4m}{4s+7} \right\|, \left\| \frac{8m}{4s+7} \right\|, \left\| \frac{12m}{4s+7} \right\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Let $x = \frac{4m}{4s+7}$, then by Corollary 3.1, we have $L_{2,3} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, which contradicts our previous conclusion that $L_{2,3} > \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, $L_{3,4} > L_{2,3}$ if t is even.

(b) If t is odd, let $t = 2m + 1$. This produces the loneliness value

$$= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(2m+1)(4s+3)}{8s+14} \right\|, \right. \\ \left. \left\| \frac{(2m+1)(4s+11)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(2m+1)(4s+19)}{8s+14} \right\| \right)$$

We can separate the $2m$ and 1 terms, and substitute the results from the even case

$$= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(4s+3) - 8m}{8s+14} \right\|, \right. \\ \left. \left\| \frac{(4s+11) + 8m}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{(4s+19) + 24m}{8s+14} \right\| \right)$$

We can also extract $\frac{1}{2}$ from the second to fourth terms

$$= \min \left(\left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{1}{2} - \frac{4+8m}{8s+14} \right\|, \right. \\ \left. \left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4+8m}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{12+24m}{8s+14} \right\| \right)$$

Using the fact that $\left\| \frac{1}{2} - x \right\| = \left\| \frac{1}{2} + x \right\|$, we get

$$= \min \left(\left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\|, \left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{12(2m+1)}{8s+14} \right\| \right)$$

Let $x = \frac{4(2m+1)}{8s+14}$, then by corollary 3.2, we have $L_{2,3} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, which contradicts our previous conclusion that $L_{2,3} > \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, $L_{3,4} > L_{2,3}$ when t is odd.

Combining the odd and even cases, we conclude that $L_{3,4} > L_{2,3}$.

It remains to prove our initial assumption that $L_{3,4} = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$. Using a similar argument of proving $L_{2,3} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ by doing casework based on the parity of t and applying a combination of corollary 3.1 and corollary 3.2, we claim that $L_{3,4} \leq \frac{1}{4}$. The exact details are omitted as they effectively repeat $L_{2,3}$'s proofs with different numerical values. This result implies that the largest possible value of $L_{3,4}$ is

$$L_{3,4} = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$$

This is always achievable for $\|tv_4\|$ since $v_4 = 4s + 19$ and $8s + 30$ are verifiably co-prime using the extended euclidean algorithm. Thus there must exist an integer u such that

$$uv_4 \equiv 2s + 7 \pmod{8s + 30}$$

Hence when $t = \frac{u}{8s+30}$, we have $\|tv_4\| = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$. It remains to check that $\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|, \|tv_3\|) \geq \frac{1}{4}$. A nice side-product from proving $L_{3,4} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ is the implication that all loneliness values must be in the following forms:

(a) If t is even:

$$L_{3,4} = \min \left(\left\| \frac{4m}{4s+15} \right\|, \left\| \frac{8m}{4s+15} \right\|, \left\| \frac{12m}{4s+15} \right\| \right)$$

In addition, the first term corresponds to $\|tv_4\| = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$. Direct computation shows that the next two terms are both greater than $\frac{1}{4}$

$$\left\| \frac{8m}{4s+15} \right\| = \|2tv_4\| = \left\| \frac{2s+7}{4s+15} \right\| > \frac{1}{4}$$

$$\left\| \frac{12m}{4s+15} \right\| = \|3tv_4\| = \left\| \frac{6s+21}{8s+30} \right\| > \frac{1}{4}$$

Thus the first term is the only value less than $\frac{1}{4}$, producing the overall loneliness of $\frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$ for even t .

(b) If t is odd:

$$L_{3,4} = \min \left(\left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\|, \left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\|, \left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{12(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\| \right)$$

Likewise, the first term corresponds to $\|tv_4\| = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$, then

$$\left\| \frac{4(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\| = \left\| \frac{2s+7}{8s+30} - \frac{1}{2} \right\| = \frac{2s+8}{8s+30}$$

$$\left\| \frac{8(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\| = \left\| 2(tv_4 - \frac{1}{2}) \right\| = \left\| \frac{2s+8}{4s+15} \right\| > \frac{1}{4}$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} + \frac{12(2m+1)}{8s+30} \right\| = \left\| 3(tv_4 - \frac{1}{2}) \right\| = \left\| \frac{2s+9}{8s+30} \right\| > \frac{1}{4}$$

Thus the first term is the only value less than $\frac{1}{4}$, producing the overall loneliness of $\frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$ for odd t .

This altogether implies that $L_{3,4} = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$ and is the greatest value, hence

$$\text{ML}(8, 4s+3, 4s+11, 4s+19) = L_{3,4} = \frac{2s+7}{8s+30}$$

as desired. \square

However, our construction assumes $s \geq 0$, which only covers odd numbers greater than 7. A construction for $ML = \frac{5}{22}$ is $(8, 1, 7, 15)$ (Note that this case is covered by our construction if $s = -1$ and we take the absolute value of v_2 , but the negative sign complicates the inequalities, so we isolate it as its own special case). Finally, we have not found any instances of $ML = \frac{3}{14}$. $ML = \frac{1}{6}$ does not exist as it violates the Lonely Runner Conjecture's $\frac{1}{5}$ lower-bound.

Another peculiar result is that we have not found instances of loneliness value $s/(4s+k)$ for $k \notin \{1, 2\}$. Under the Conjecture, there could potentially be instances of $k \in \{3, 4\}$, but none are present in cases where all speeds are at most 200. Thus we propose the following Conjecture.

Conjecture 3.1. *Given 4 positive integer speeds v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 , we have either*

$$\exists s, k \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \{1, 2\}, \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{s}{ns+k} \text{ or } \text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{1}{n+1}$$

We remark that this incomplete appearance of the values of k is not unique to $n = 4$, but some variant of it seems to also be true for at least $n = 5$ and $n = 6$. We explore this more in Section 5

4. LARGE COMMON FACTORS

In this section, we study the loneliness value when the speeds share a sufficiently large common factor. Specifically, we illustrate that in the case of four lonely runners satisfying certain conditions on common factors, the setup inherently produces a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$.

4.1. More Techniques and Tools. We first introduce a few more techniques and tools to help elucidate the proof.

Theorem 4.1. *Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 be positive integers with $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 1$. Then if any three of the speeds share a common factor $g \geq 2$,*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

Proof. Without the loss of generality, let $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3) = g$. Due to the assumption that the four speeds do not share a common factor, v_4 and g are co-prime. The Lonely Runner Conjecture for 3 runners dictates that there exists a time t such that

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|, \|tv_3\|) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

Subsequently, we apply the pre-jump technique, defining a new time

$$t' = t + \frac{h}{g}$$

Which should fix the positions of the first three runners while moving the fourth runner in $\frac{1}{g}$ intervals. By the Pigeonhole Principle, there exists an integer h such that

$$\left\| \left(t + \frac{h}{g} \right) v_4 \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2g} \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

Thus we conclude that $\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \geq \frac{1}{4}$, allowing us to restrict our focus on the case with at most 2 speeds sharing a common factor. \square

Another useful technique that we will repeatedly utilize throughout the paper arises when two speeds share a common factor $g \geq 6$ and satisfy a couple more conditions. This lemma is very powerful when combined with the technique of pre-jumps.

Lemma 4.1. *For real numbers $0 \leq a, b < 1$ and positive integers v_1, v_2, g . If $g \geq 6$, $\gcd(v_1, g) = 1$, $g \nmid v_2$, and $a \not\equiv \pm b \pmod{g}$ then there exists integer h such that*

$$\min \left(\left\| \frac{h}{g} v_1 + a \right\|, \left\| \frac{h}{g} v_2 + b \right\| \right) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

Proof. The pre-jump technique effectively transforms the problem into modular arithmetic for modulo g . Let $v_1 \equiv x \pmod{g}$ and $v_2 \equiv y \pmod{g}$. Furthermore, since v_1 is co-prime to g , there is a modular inverse u such that $ux \equiv 1 \pmod{g}$. We define $uy \equiv uv_2 \equiv z \pmod{g}$, then by assumption, $z \not\equiv \pm 1$, meaning that runner 2's speed is at least double that of runner 1's. We observe that for $\|x\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$, the region of valid x values has a length of exactly $1 - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$, a.k.a. the upper half of the unit circle. Thus, the number of values of h that satisfy the inequality is at least $\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor$. This implies that runner 1 sweeps a region of length $(\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor - 1)/g$ in the upper half of the unit circle. Since runner 2 is at least twice as fast, it sweeps a contiguous region of length $2 \cdot (\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor - 1)/g$, and by the Pigeonhole principle, if the region's length is at least $\frac{1}{2}$, the second runner must be in the upper desirable half of the unit circle at some point. More formally, the condition is equivalent to the inequality $2 \cdot (\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor - 1)/g \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Rewriting this for more conciseness yields

$$\left\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \geq \frac{g}{4}$$

which is true for all $g \geq 6$. \square

4.2. Proving Three Shifted Runners. A nice bonus that we get from applying the aforementioned techniques is proving the Shifted Lonely Runners Conjecture for four runners. The current existing proof involves a complicated setup of geometric lattices and the covering radius of a polytope, which is rather lengthy [3]. We instead invoke only elementary arithmetics to attain a more concise proof. This theorem actually comes in handy later in our other proofs as well.

Conjecture 4.1 (Lonely Runners with Individual Start Points). *Given pairwise distinct non-zero velocities $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}$ and arbitrary starting points $s_1, \dots, s_d \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a real number t such that for all $1 \leq j \leq d$, the distance of $s_j + tv_j$ to the nearest integer is at least $\frac{1}{d+1}$.*

We now present the proof of this conjecture for $d = 3$, a.k.a. the case with four runners.

Theorem 4.2. *Given distinct positive integers v_1, v_2, v_3 with $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3) = 1$ and arbitrary starting points $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a real number t such that for all $1 \leq j \leq 3$, the distance of $s_j + tv_j$ to the nearest integer is at least $\frac{1}{d+1}$*

Proof. If any two speeds, v_i and v_j , share a common factor $g > 1$, and the remaining third speed is v_k . A trivial lower-bound of $\frac{1}{2d}$ has already been proved for d moving runner's loneliness value [9], and thus there exists time t such that $\|tv_i + s_i\|$ and $\|tv_j + s_j\|$ are both at least $\frac{1}{4}$ as desired. We then apply the pre-jump technique, defining a new time for some integer h

$$t' = t + \frac{h}{g}$$

Since g and v_k are coprime by assumption, the new time fixes runner j and k while moving runner i in $\frac{1}{g}$ intervals. Finally, by the Pigeonhole Principle, there exists an integer h such that

$$\left\| \left(t + \frac{h}{g} \right) v_k + s_k \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2g} \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

We conclude that $\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ if any of the two speeds share a common factor. Now we focus on the case when the speeds are pairwise co-prime. Without the loss of generality, we assume $v_1 < v_2 < v_3$. We then try to restrict the positions of runners 2 and 3 by only focusing on time values t such that

$$(tv_2 + s_2) + (tv_3 + s_3) = n$$

for some integer n . Intuitively, this restricts runners 2 and 3 to always be symmetric in terms of their positions, so we can effectively ignore one of the runners (in this case runner 3). More formally

$$(tv_2 + s_2) = -(tv_3 + s_3) \pmod{1}$$

Simplifying the original condition gives

$$t(v_2 + v_3) = (n - s_2 - s_3) \implies t = \frac{(n - s_2 - s_3)}{v_2 + v_3} + \frac{h}{v_2 + v_3}$$

Without the loss of generality, let $v_1 < v_2 < v_3$. Consequently, $v_1 \not\equiv \pm v_2 \pmod{v_2 + v_3}$. So if $v_2 + v_3 \geq 6$, then the conditions of Lemma 4.1 are satisfied, yielding a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$. It remains to deal with the case when $v_2 + v_3 < 6$. We note that the only triple of speeds that fits this description is $(1, 2, 3)$. Using the same restriction technique again, but this time on runners 1 and 3, the formula produces time values of the form

$$t = \frac{n - s_1 - s_3}{4} + \frac{h}{4}$$

We note that the t value for $h = 2$ and $h = 1$ are exactly $\frac{1}{4}$ apart, meaning that for runner 2, the times' corresponding positions are $\frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 = \frac{1}{2}$ apart, thus one of them must produce a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ for runner 2 using the same Pigeonhole principle argument, which we denote as

h' . Finally, we can tweak h' by choosing whether or not to add 2. This does not change runner 2's position because $2 \cdot \frac{2}{4} = 1$, but it does change runner 1's position by $1 \cdot \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$, so one of h' and $h' + 2$ must produce a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ for runners 1 and 3, as desired. We finally conclude that three runners with distinct positive integral speeds starting at arbitrary positions have a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$. \square

4.3. Large Common Factor between Two Speeds. In the previous subsections, specifically Theorem 4.1, we proved that when three of the speeds share a common factor, the conjecture holds. In this section, we further prove the loneliness value is at least $\frac{1}{4}$ if any two speeds share a common factor $g > 3$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 be positive integers with $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 1$. Then if any two of the speeds share a common factor $g > 3$, we have*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

Proof. Without the loss of generality, let runners 1 and 2 share a common factor $g > 3$, then by the Lonely Runner Conjecture for 2 moving runners, there exists real number t such that

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

We apply the pre-jump technique with $t' = t + \frac{h}{g}$ and now have 3 cases:

- $g \leq 5$: We will deal with this case later, specifically when $g = 4$ and $g = 5$.
- $v_3 \not\equiv \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$ and $g \geq 6$. In this case, the requisite conditions are met for Lemma 4.1, so there exists integer h such that

$$\min\left(\left\|\left(t + \frac{h}{g}\right)v_3\right\|, \left\|\left(t + \frac{h}{g}\right)v_4\right\|\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

And due to the nature of the pre-jump technique, we have $\|(t + h/g)v_1\| = \|tv_1\|$ and $\|(t + h/g)v_2\| = \|tv_2\|$, both of which are at least $\frac{1}{4}$ by the assumptions of the value of t . Hence, we conclude that the loneliness values are at least $\frac{1}{4}$.

- $v_3 \equiv \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$ and $g \geq 6$. We focus on the case $v_3 \equiv v_4 \pmod{g}$ because if $v_3 \equiv -v_4 \pmod{g}$, we can simply flip the sign of v_4 to attain the desired conditions. Since the two runners move at the same speed when time increases in increments of $\frac{1}{g}$, the distance between the two runners remains constant regardless of the value of h/g . For g positions that are equidistant $\frac{1}{g}$ apart on a unit circle and arbitrarily shifted, the position between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ (aka the region of positions $\frac{1}{4}$ away from the origin) with the smallest value is at most $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{g}$. Otherwise, we can subtract $\frac{1}{g}$ to obtain a smaller reachable position. This implies that we can always fit a contiguous region between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ where the smaller end starts at one of the g positions if its length l meets the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{g} + l \leq \frac{3}{4}$$

Rearranging the terms gives us

$$l \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g}$$

In other words, we need to prove there exists time t such that

$$\|t(v_3 - v_4)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g}$$

Note the usage of the less than or equal sign, as opposed to the usual greater than or equal sign. We can convert it to the familiar form by shifting by 0.5

$$\|t(v_3 - v_4) + 0.5\| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g}\right) = \frac{1}{g}$$

Here we again have 2 cases. If $|v_3 - v_4| \neq v_1$ or v_2 , then we can use theorem 4.3, the Shifted Lonely Runner Conjecture for 3 moving runners, where the speeds are $(v_1, v_2, |v_3 - v_4|)$ and the starting positions are $(0, 0, 0.5)$. This immediately gives us a time t such that runners 1 and 2 are at least $\frac{1}{4}$ away from the origin, and runners 3 and 4 are at most $\frac{1}{4}$ apart, which is less than or equal to $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g}$ as desired. We now focus on the case when $|v_3 - v_4| = v_1$ or v_2 .

Without the loss of generality, let $|v_3 - v_4| = v_1$, then we need to prove there exists a real number t such that

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) \geq \frac{1}{4} \qquad \|tv_1 + 0.5\| \geq \frac{1}{g}$$

We assume the speeds have already been normalized, i.e., divided by their common factors, which in this case means $\gcd(v_1, v_2) = 1$. At time $t = \frac{1}{4v_1}$, we have $\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_1 + 0.5\|) = \frac{1}{4}$. Now, if $v_1 > 1$, we can again apply the pre-jump technique with $t' = t + \frac{h}{v_1}$. By the Pigeonhole Principle, there exists an integer h such that $\|(t + h/v_1)v_2\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$, as desired. The other case which we need to deal with is when $v_1 = 1$, a.k.a. speeds in the form of $(v_1, v_2, |v_3 - v_4|) = (1, v_2, 1)$. If v_2 is not a multiple of 4, $t = \frac{1}{4}$ yields the desired loneliness value. Otherwise, we assume that v_2 is a multiple of 4. If we satisfy the conditions for runners 1 and 3 by setting $t = \frac{1}{4}$, runner 2 would still be at the origin 0 and can reach the $\frac{1}{4}$ mark within $\frac{1}{4}/v_2$ units of time. This allows the distance between runner 3 to the origin to be at least

$$\left\| \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4v_2} \right) \cdot 1 + 0.5 \right\| = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4v_2} \geq \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{16} > \frac{1}{g}$$

Hence, we conclude that the loneliness value is always at least $\frac{1}{4}$ if $g > 5$. Now, we handle $g = 5$ and $g = 4$ separately.

- $g = 4$: First, the only possible pairs of remainders for v_3 and $v_4 \pmod{g}$ are $(1, 1)$, $(1, 3)$, $(3, 1)$, or $(3, 3)$, all of which satisfy $v_3 \equiv \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$, so we will borrow much of the same proof from the previous discussion. The proof for the case $|v_3 - v_4| \neq v_1$ or v_2 can be directly applied for $g = 4$, since it already gives the desired lower-bound $\frac{1}{4} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g} = \frac{1}{4}$. Thus, the only case we must take care of is when $|v_3 - v_4| = v_2$. The previous proof already gives a loneliness of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ if $v_2 = |v_3 - v_4| > g$, so we focus only on speeds satisfying the following conditions

$$(v_1, v_2, |v_3 - v_4|) = (g, v_2, g) \qquad v_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4g}$$

Transforming this setup back to the original sets of speed, we have the quadruple $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = (4, 16a, b + 4, b)$ for some positive integers a and b . If $b + 4 \geq 6$, we can focus on times of the form

$$t = \frac{k}{b + 4}$$

for some integer k . Since $v_1 = g$, it is co-prime to $v_3 = b + 4$, thus Lemma 4.1 applies (Note that because there are no shifts in this scenario, the case $v_1 \equiv \pm v_2 \pmod{v_3}$ doesn't actually matter as they would always share these same positions, so we can simply ignore one of the players), implying that there must exist integer k such that $\min\left(\left\|\frac{k}{v_3}v_1\right\|, \left\|\frac{k}{v_3}v_2\right\|\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}$.

We define this time as $t = \frac{k}{v_3}$. The intuition behind this construction is that runner 3 stays at the origin regardless of t , thus when we do the pre-jump technique of $t' = t + \frac{h}{4}$, there are three valid h values: 1, 2, 3. Since the positions are evenly spread out, there must be at least $4/2 = 2$ valid h values for runner 4. Because $2 + 3 = 5 > 4$, by the Pigeonhole principle, at least one of the h values is valid for both runners and, due to the definition of t and the pre-jump technique, also valid for the first two runners. Hence, we conclude that for $v_3 \geq 6$, the loneliness value is at least $\frac{1}{4}$. The only case not covered is when $v_3 < 6$, which is only possible for the following quadruple of speeds

$$(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = (4, 16a, 5, 1)$$

The loneliness value between $(1, 4, 5)$ is $\frac{1}{3}$, so by applying Lemma 2.3 with $L = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{12}$, we have $\text{ML}(4, 16a, 1, 5) \geq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{12} = \frac{1}{4}$, as desired.

- $g = 5$: First, we focus on when $v_3 = \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$. We utilize many of the same techniques from $g = 4$. Like with $g = 4$, most of the existing proofs already guarantee a distance of at most $\frac{1}{4}$, which is enough for the required upper bound $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g} = 0.3$. The only uncovered case is when $|v_3 - v_4| = v_2 = g$ and v_1 is a multiple of $4g$. Dividing the speeds by g , we get the following quadruple of speeds

$$(v_1, v_2, |v_3 - v_4|)/5 = (1, 4k, 1)$$

for some integer k . When k is sufficiently large, we can use a very similar strategy as Lemma 2.3 (Note that the two scenarios are not completely equivalent as two runners need to be $\frac{1}{4}$ away and the last runner needs to be 0.3 away) to prove there exists time t that guarantees $|v_3 - v_4| \leq 0.3$ if $k > 1$. We omit the exact details here as they are very redundant. So the only case left is $(1, 4, 1)$. Transforming this setup back to the original sets of speed, we have the quadruple $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = (5, 20, b + 5, b)$ for some positive integers b . Finally, when b is sufficiently large, we can apply Lemma 2.4 (Two Very Fast Runners) with $L = \text{ML}(5, 20) = \frac{2}{5}$ to attain a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ for $b \geq 100$. This finally reduces the uncovered quadruple of speeds to a finite set, which we manually verified with a computer-assisted algorithm.

It remains to prove the case when $v_3 \neq \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$. Without the loss of generality, we assume $v_3 > v_4$. We observe that Lemma 4.1 doesn't give the desired loneliness for $g = 5$ if only 2 out of the 5 values of h satisfy

$$\left\| \frac{h}{g} v_3 + a \right\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

If there are 3 valid positions, then runner 3 would traverse a distance of $\frac{2}{5}$. Since the other runner is at least twice as fast as runner 3, it would traverse a distance of $\frac{4}{5}$, exceeding the required one-half. Thus, we just need to prove there exists time t such that $\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ and the inequality $\left\| \left(\frac{h}{5} + t\right) v_1 \right\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ has at least 3 valid $0 \leq h < 5$ solutions. We achieve this by choosing times of the form

$$t = \frac{2k + 1}{4v_3} = \frac{k}{2v_3} + \frac{1}{4v_3}$$

This fixes runner 3's positions at either $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$, both yielding the desired 3 valid solutions for h . We know that from Lemma 4.1, there exists a solution for k as long as $2v_3 > 5$. However, the co-prime requirement between $2v_3$ and one of v_1 or v_2 is not necessarily satisfied. We can remedy this predicament by dividing $2v_3$ by its gcd with one of the speeds, which we now demonstrate must be less than 4. If the greatest common factor between v_3 and v_1 or v_2 is 4 or ≥ 6 , then we have already proven those cases in the previous discussion. If

the greatest common factor is 5, then v_3 , v_1 , and v_2 would share a common factor of 5, yielding a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ by Theorem 4.1. So the greatest common factors between v_3 and v_1 or v_2 is either 2 and 3. We further note that if $\gcd(v_1, v_2) > 1$, then $\gcd(v_3, v_1) \neq \gcd(v_3, v_2)$, or else this would imply $\gcd(v_2, v_3)$ is a multiple of either 2 or 3, contradicting the assumption that $\gcd(v_2, v_3) = g = 5$. Thus

$$\min(\gcd(2v_3, v_1), \gcd(2v_3, v_2)) \leq \min(3, 4) \leq 3$$

Remember that to apply Lemma 4.1, we need

$$\frac{2v_3}{\min(\gcd(2v_3, v_1), \gcd(2v_3, v_2))} \geq \frac{2v_3}{3} \geq 6 \implies v_1 \geq 9$$

We now do casework based on the value of v_3 for $1 \leq v_3 < 9$:

- $v_3 = 8$: Since the factor of 3 can't divide 8, at most one of the speeds can share a factor of 2, implying that v_3 is coprime with at least one of the speeds, satisfying the condition that $2v_3 = 16 \geq 6$.
- $v_3 = 7$: v_3 must be co-prime to both speeds, satisfying the condition that $2v_3 = 14 \geq 6$.
- $v_3 = 6$: The possible pairs of (v_4, v_3) are $(1, 6)$ – falls into the proven $v_3 \equiv \pm v_4$ case; $(2, 6)$ and $(4, 6)$ – the other two speeds can't share the factor of 2, and since at most one speed shares the factor of 3, the other speed has to be co-prime, satisfying the condition that $2v_3 = 12 \geq 6$; $(3, 6)$ – the same logic as the previous case. The other two speeds can't share the factor of 3, so one of the speeds must be co-prime to 6, satisfying the condition that $2v_3 = 12 \geq 6$; $(5, 6)$ – the three speeds v_1 , v_2 , and v_4 would share a common factor of 5, which is covered by Theorem 4.1.
- $v_3 = 5$: This would lead to three speeds sharing a common factor of 5, which is covered by Theorem 4.1.
- $v_3 = 4$: At most one of v_1 and v_2 can share the factor of 2, so the other speed must be co-prime to v_3 , satisfying the condition that $2v_3 = 8 \geq 6$.
- $v_3 = 3$: Here, the proof gets a bit tricky. While one of the speeds must be co-prime to 3, the other speed can be a multiple of 3 without incurring the already proven cases of $g = 4$ or $g \geq 6$. We first remark that (v_3, v_4) can't be $(2, 3)$ as it falls into the proven $v_3 \equiv \pm v_4$ case, so it can only be $(1, 3)$ as $v_4 < v_3$. Having 1 is very crucial, and we reserve the proof in the explanation for $v_3 = 2$ below.
- $v_3 = 2$: Since $v_3 > v_4$, the only possible set of speeds is $(v_4, v_3) = (1, 2)$. Thus for both $v_3 = 2$ or 3, we can guarantee $v_4 = 1$. Here, we abandon our original goal of ensuring there are 3 valid positions in the context of pre-jumping with $h/5$, and instead, we try to ensure there are 3 valid positions for runner 4, who has the speed 1. Direct computation reveals that this is true for

$$tv_4 = t \in \left[\frac{1}{20}, \frac{3}{20} \right] \pmod{\frac{1}{5}}$$

More formally, such a t ensures there are 3 valid h solutions for

$$\left\| \left(\frac{h}{5} + t \right) v_4 \right\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

as desired. We remark that the constraint on t can actually be rewritten as

$$\|5t\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

In other words, this is equivalent to the Lonely Runner Conjecture through the following setup

$$\exists t \in \mathbb{R}, \min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|, \|5t\|) \geq \frac{1}{4} \iff \text{ML}(v_1, v_2, 5) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

– $v_3 = 1$: By assumption $v_3 > v_4$, so this case cannot happen.

At last, we have discussed all of the cases and can conclude that if any two speeds share a common factor $g > 3$, the loneliness value is at least $\frac{1}{4}$. \square

4.4. Almost very lonely runners when $g = 3$. Experimental evidence suggests that a similar result of $\text{ML} \geq \frac{1}{4}$ should be achievable as with the case of the previous section for $g > 3$. However, there is one glaring family of speeds that defy such a conclusion, particularly those of the form

$$(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = (1, 2, 3, 12x)$$

for some integer x . One might recognize the pattern within this construction. It utilizes a tight set of speed for 3 runners $\text{ML}(1, 2, 3) = \frac{1}{4}$ and forces a lower loneliness value by finding value v_4 such that $\|tv_4\| = 0$ at the “local maximum times”, which in this case relies on $v_4 = 12x$. However, this family seems to also be the only exception to the rule. Therefore, in this subsection, we attempt to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $v_1 < v_2 < v_3 < v_4$ be positive integers with $\gcd(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = 1$. Then if any two of the speeds share a common factor $g = 3$,*

$$\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

unless $(v_1, v_2, v_3) = (1, 2, 3)$ and $v_4 = 12k$ for some natural number k .

Proof. We first forego the assumption that the speeds are strictly increasing. Then without the loss of generality, let $\gcd(v_1, v_2) = g = 3$. If either v_3 or v_4 share a common factor with g , then Theorem 4.1 dictates the loneliness value must be at least $\frac{1}{4}$. Hence, we focus on when v_3 and v_4 are both co-prime to g . Because $g = 3$, the following is always true.

$$v_3 \equiv \pm v_4 \pmod{g}$$

And per usual, we focus on $v_3 \equiv v_4 \pmod{g}$ since the other case can be achieved by simply flipping signs. Then, the pre-jump technique of $t' = t + \frac{h}{g}$ would always fix the distance between runners 3 and 4. Thus, like with the previous proofs, we need to bound the distance

$$\|t(v_3 - v_4)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{g} = \frac{1}{6}$$

In other words, we need to find a time t such that

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|) \geq \frac{1}{4} \qquad \|t(v_3 - v_4)\| \leq \frac{1}{6}$$

We first assume $|v_3 - v_4| \neq v_1$ or v_2 . We notice that v_1 , v_2 , and $|v_3 - v_4|$ are all multiples of g , so for the sake simplicity, we define $a = v_1/g$, $b = v_2/g$, and $c = |v_3 - v_4|/g$. We immediately have two cases

- $c \leq a + b$: We use the binding technique on runners 1 and 2, focusing on times of the form

$$t = \frac{lu}{a+b}$$

for some integers l and u such that $au = 1 \pmod{a+b}$. The following proof shares many similarities with Lemma 4.1, except, in this case the range of acceptable values for luc is only $\frac{a+b}{3}$ long instead of $\frac{a+b}{2}$. Here we again do casework on the value of $z = uc \pmod{a+b}$.

We focus on $z \leq \frac{a+b}{2}$ since the remaining case is symmetric. Furthermore, for the sake of convenience we define $m = a + b$.

- $z = 0$: in this case, $\|t(v_3 - v_4)\| = 0 \leq \frac{1}{6}$, so it's equivalent to the runners running by themselves.
- $z = 1$: this case is impossible since $c \leq a + b$ and $c \neq a$ or b .
- $2 \leq z \leq \frac{m}{3}$: For this interval, it's impossible for c to skip the acceptable interval of $\frac{m}{3}$ length. Runners 1 and 2 cover at least $\frac{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1}{m}$. Since $c \geq 2$, it is at least twice as fast, so it covers a region of $2 \cdot \frac{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1}{m}$. By the Pigeonhole principle, if this region is at least $\frac{2}{3}$, then it must pass through the $\frac{1}{3}$ desirable area at some point. Thus we attain the following inequality

$$2 \cdot \frac{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1}{m} \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

Solving gives that all values of $m = a + b \geq 8$ satisfy the inequality.

- $\frac{m}{3} < z < \frac{m}{2}$: We denote L_0 as the set of values of integer p such that $-\frac{m}{6} \leq p \leq \frac{m}{6} \pmod{m}$. This is the set of positions that we wish c would land in. We then consider the set of positions L_1 such that one more step of size z would cause the runner to land in I_0 . More formally, it is

$$L_1 = L_0 - z \pmod{m}$$

Note that since $z > \frac{m}{3}$, $L_0 \cap L_1 = \emptyset$. Moreover, it's obvious that $|L_0| = |L_1| \geq \lfloor \frac{m}{3} \rfloor$. There are at least $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ number of valid l positions such that $\frac{m}{4} \leq (lu)a = l(ua) = l \leq \frac{3m}{4}$, meaning that runners 1 and 2 are in the upper half valid region of the unit circle. As long as one of the first $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1$ positions of $(lu)c = l(uc) = lz$ is in L_0 or L_1 , all the desired conditions are satisfied. By the Pigeonhole principle, we derive the following inequality

$$\left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 > m - |L_0| - |L_1| \implies \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 > m - 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{m}{3} \right\rfloor$$

This is true for all $m \geq 18$

- $z = \frac{m}{2}$: Either $l = \lfloor \frac{a+1}{2} \rfloor$ or $l = \lfloor \frac{a+1}{2} \rfloor + 1$ should produce the desired $-\frac{1}{6} \leq lz \leq \frac{1}{6}$ value, since runner 3 basically oscillates between the 0 and $\frac{1}{2}$ point.

Thus combining all three cases, we see that when $a + b \geq c$, the desired conditions are always satisfied when $a + b \geq 18$. This bounds two of the speeds to be between $0 \leq a, b < 18 \implies 0 \leq v_1, v_2 < 54$. Without the loss of generality, we assume $v_3 < v_4$, so if v_3 is very large, we can apply Lemma 2.4 “Two Very Fast Runners.” Otherwise, if v_3 is small, but v_4 is very large, we can apply Lemma 2.3 “One Very Fast Runner.” This leaves us with a finite number of cases to check, which we manually verified with a computer algorithm. We note that this technique of bounding 2 speeds and using the “One/Two Very Fast Runner(s)” lemmas is quite prevalent in the latter part of the discussion as well. We will henceforth omit the details after bounding 2 speeds for the sake of minimizing redundancy.

- We now consider the case when $c \geq a + b$. We want $\|tc\| \leq \frac{1}{6}$, so we might as well set it to 0 by focusing on times of the form $t = \frac{k}{c}$ for some integer k . Hence we need to find k such that

$$\min \left(\left\| \frac{k}{c}a \right\|, \left\| \frac{k}{c}b \right\| \right) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

It's tempting to apply Lemma 4.1, but we cannot ensure a and b are co-prime to c . We can resolve this by dividing c by one of the greatest common factors. More formally,

$$\frac{c}{\min(\gcd(a, c), \gcd(b, c))} \geq 6$$

We first rewrite the equation as below

$$c = A \cdot \gcd(a, c) \qquad c = B \cdot \gcd(b, c)$$

Observe that $\gcd(a, c)$ is coprime to $\gcd(b, c)$ since $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. This implies B must be a multiple of $\gcd(a, c)$, thus $B \geq \gcd(a, c)$. Hence,

$$c = A \cdot \gcd(a, c) \leq A \cdot B$$

Assuming the conditions for Lemma 4.1 is not met, then $\max(A, B) \leq 5$, so the inequality above further implies

$$c \leq A \cdot B \leq 5 \cdot 5 = 25$$

This again gives us a bound for a and b as $a + b \leq 25$, so we use the same technique as the prior proof with ‘‘Very Fast Runners’’ Lemmas for large speeds and manually verify a finite number of small cases.

We now need to consider the case when $|v_3 - v_4| = v_1$ or v_2 . For the sake of simplicity, let $|v_3 - v_4| = v_1$, and $v_3 > v_4$. The central motivation for this case is that it's impossible to ensure $\|t(v_3 - v_4)\| \leq \frac{1}{6}$ and $\|tv_1\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ at the same time since they are directly contradictory. Thus, we alter our approach and fix the position of runner 3 between $[-\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12}] \bmod \frac{1}{3}$. This is equivalent to $\|t(3v_3) + 0.5\| \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Under this constraint, there are always 2 valid positions out of the 3 from $(t + h/g)v_3$ pre-jump. This allows us to sharpen the required distance between runners 3 and 4 to only $\frac{1}{3}$. We formalize these constructions into the following conditions for some real number t

$$\min(\|tv_1\|, \|tv_2\|, \|t(3v_3) + 0.5\|) \geq \frac{1}{4} \qquad \|t(v_3 - v_4)\| = \|tv_1\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

We focus on time values in the form of $t = \frac{k}{v_1} + p$ for some integer k and real number $p \in [\frac{1}{4v_1}, \frac{1}{3v_1}]$. This fixes $\frac{1}{4} \leq \|tv_1\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ as the conditions require. We define $a = v_1/g$, $b = v_2/g$, and $c = v_3$, transforming the original conditions as follow

$$\min(\|ta\|, \|tb\|, \|tc + 0.5\|) \geq \frac{1}{4} \qquad \|ta\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

Now, we again have three cases.

- c is a multiple of a : Note that $v_4 = v_3 - v_1 = c - 3a$, so v_4 is also a multiple of a . If $a > 2$, then v_1 , v_3 , and v_4 share a common factor greater than 1, yielding a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ by theorem 4.1.
- $c \not\equiv \pm b \pmod{a}$: We know that a and b are co-prime by definition, so if a is also at least 6, then the conditions for Lemma 4.1 are satisfied, yielding the desired loneliness value of $\frac{1}{4}$.
- $c \equiv \pm b \pmod{a}$: We focus on when $c = b \pmod{a}$ since the other case is symmetric. Furthermore, we assume $c \neq b$ since if they are equal, we can replace $c = v_3$ with $c = v_4$. This doesn't disrupt the generality of our assumption because $v_4 = v_3 + 3a \equiv v_3 \equiv \pm b \pmod{a}$. Since the difference between c and b are divisible by a and nonzero, $|c - b| \geq a$. We note back that the starting position of runner a can be anywhere between $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}]$, yielding a contiguous range of valid starting time $t \in [\frac{1}{4a}, \frac{1}{3a}]$ of length $\frac{1}{12a}$. This means that the value of $t(b - c) + 0.5$ changes by at least $\frac{1}{12a} \cdot |b - c| \geq \frac{1}{12a} \cdot a = \frac{1}{12}$. By the Pigeonhole Principle, there must exist time t such that $\|t(b - c) + 0.5\|$ is at least $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12}/2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{24}$. Using the

results from previous proofs, we know that for times of the form $\frac{h}{a}$, there always exists a valid h such that $\min(\|(t + \frac{h}{a})b\|, (t + \frac{h}{a})c + 0.5) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ if there exists time t

$$\|t(b - c) + 0.5\| \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{a}$$

Since we have bounded the norm below $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{24}$, this should be true for all $a \geq 24$.

Combining the three cases, we learn that if $a \geq 24$, the loneliness value is always at least $\frac{1}{4}$. This translates to a bound of $v_1 = 3 \cdot a \geq 72$. However, this approach only bounds one of the speeds, which is insufficient to invoke the ‘‘Very Fast Runners’’ Lemmas; thus, we now attempt to bound c . Here, we utilize the familiar technique of fixing runner 3 at $\frac{1}{4}$ by only checking times of the form

$$t = \frac{k}{c} + \frac{1}{4c}$$

This has the effect of expanding the acceptable range of value for $t(v_3 - v_4) = tv_1$ to $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}]$. We first ensure that the ‘‘pre-jump’’ k/c ’s denominator c is co-prime to a and b by dividing by their gcd, so instead we focus on times of the form

$$t = \frac{k}{\frac{c}{\gcd(a,c) \cdot \gcd(b,c)}} + \frac{1}{4c}$$

Note that $\gcd(a, c)$ and $\gcd(b, c)$ are both at most 2. Otherwise, if they are 3, then this would imply all 4 speeds are multiples of 3, contradicting the assumption, or if the gcd is at least 4, then it would fall into the previously proven $g > 3$ cases. Furthermore, $\gcd(a, c)$ is co-prime to $\gcd(b, c)$ since $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, so their product is at most $1 \cdot 2 = 2$. Hence, we get that

$$\frac{c}{\gcd(a, c) \cdot \gcd(b, c)} \geq \frac{c}{2}$$

We define this new value as d and claim that if d is sufficiently large, then the loneliness value is at least $\frac{1}{4}$. Let u be the modular inverse of b such that $ub = 1 \pmod{d}$, then we again need to do casework on the value of $1 \leq z = ua \pmod{d} \leq \frac{d}{2}$. We omit the case when $\frac{d}{2} < z < d$ as it is symmetric with trivial modification.

- $z = 1$: In this case, runners 1 and 2 are synchronized. Instead of fixing the runner 3 at $\frac{1}{4}$, we fix it at 0 with times of the form

$$t = \frac{k}{d}$$

This eliminates the $\frac{1}{4c}$ factor, so $\|tv_1\| = \|tv_2\|$ for all k . Under this new time, the valid range of positions for tv_1 is instead $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}]$. Hence, $k = u \cdot (\lfloor \frac{d}{4} \rfloor + 1) / d$ should satisfy both runners 1 and 2.

- $2 \leq z \leq \frac{d}{4}$: For this interval, it’s impossible for runner 1 to skip over the $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]$ interval. Runner 2 travels a contiguous region of length at least $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} - 1 \rfloor / d$. Since runner 1 is at least twice as fast as runner 2, it must travel a contiguous region of length at least $2 \cdot \lfloor \frac{d}{2} - 1 \rfloor / d$, and by the Pigeonhole Principle, if this quantity exceeds $\frac{3}{4}$, it must pass through the $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]$ interval at some point. Thus, we derive the following inequality

$$2 \cdot \frac{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1}{d} \geq \frac{3}{4}$$

This is true for all $d \geq 10$.

- $\frac{d}{4} < z < \frac{d}{2}$ but $z \neq \frac{d}{3}$: We denote L_0 as the set of $\frac{b}{d}$ such that $\frac{b}{d} \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}]$. This is the set of positions that we wish runner 1 would land in. We then consider the set of positions L_1 such that one more step of size z would cause the runner to land in I_0 . Since $z > \frac{d}{4}$, the two intervals of length $\frac{1}{4}$ are disjoint, so the intersection of the two sets is of length at most $\frac{3}{4} - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{1}{12}$. Hence we have

$$|L_0 \cup L_1| \geq 2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{d}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{12} \right\rfloor$$

There are at least $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$ number of valid positions for runner 2, and if one of the first $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$ positions is in either L_0 or L_1 , the desired conditions are met. Thus by the Pigeonhole Principle, we derive the following inequality

$$\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 > d - |L_0 \cup L_1| \implies \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 > d - \left(2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{d}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{12} \right\rfloor \right)$$

This is true for all $d \geq 36$.

- $z = \frac{d}{3}$ or $\frac{d}{2}$: These two edge-cases are special because it forces runner 1 to cycle around 2 or 3 points, thus defying the conditions needed for the Pigeonhole principle. However, these cases imply that b and a are both multiples of $\frac{d}{3}$ or $\frac{d}{2}$. So if $d \geq 6$, Theorem 4.1 would take care of the rest as it would imply three speeds share a common factor greater than 1.

Considering all of the cases, we attain a bound for $d < 36$, which translates to $v_3 < 72$. Furthermore, by assumption, we have $v_3 > v_4$, so this gives us bounds for 2 speeds. Combining this result with the previous bound of $v_1 < 72$, we have $v_1, v_3, v_4 < 72$. If v_2 is sufficiently large, we invoke the ‘‘Very Fast Runner’’ Lemma, and otherwise, we have a finite number of cases to manually verify with a computer algorithm. At last, we conclude that if two speeds share a common factor of 3, and the speeds are not in the form of $(1, 2, 3, 12k)$ for some integer k , then the loneliness value is at least $\frac{1}{4}$. \square

4.5. Why $(1, 2, 3, 12k)$ is an exception? Upon first glance, the proof from Subsection 4.4 does not directly answer why $(1, 2, 3, 12k)$ is an exception. But a closer inspection reveals the reasoning by recalling Remark 2.1. If we pass this family of speeds into our proof’s casework, we see that it falls into the case when $v_1, v_2, v_3 < 72$. The proof then invokes the ‘‘One Very Fast Runner’’ Lemma 2.3 to deal with the unbounded v_4 . However, a crucial assumption is that $\text{ML}(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ is strictly greater than $\frac{1}{4}$ by a non-trivial amount, producing a finite v_4/v_3 ratio of reasonable magnitude. However, $(v_1, v_2, v_3) = (1, 2, 3)$ happens to be a (and the only) tight speed set for $n = 3$, resulting in a division by 0 error. By the proven case of the Lonely Runner Spectrum Conjecture for 3 moving runners 2.2, the next smallest loneliness value after $\frac{1}{4}$ is $\frac{2}{7}$, which is indeed non-trivially greater than $\frac{1}{4}$. Finally, any scaling in the form of $(v_1, v_2, v_3) = k \cdot (1, 2, 3)$ for some integer $k > 1$ would immediately yield a loneliness value of at least $\frac{1}{4}$ due to Theorem 4.1. Hence $(1, 2, 3, 12k)$ remains the only possible family of exceptions to the case of $g = 3$, and thus rightfully not covered by our proof.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

5.1. Addressing the Discrete Spectrum. The discussions in this subsection will be more speculative than factual. Section 4’s proof does not directly address the discrete spectrum $[1/(n+1), 1/n)$ of the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture 1.3, but rather focuses on the $\text{ML}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq 1/n$ cases. Thus, we currently do not have a convincing argument for the seemingly incomplete selection of values of k for loneliness values $s/(sn+k)$ as demonstrated by Conjecture 3.1. Though this paper focused on the case of $n = 4$, a similar pattern also occurs in $n = 5$ and $n = 6$. For

instance, $n = 5$ seems to strictly follow the original Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture 1.2 where the only observed value is $k = 1$. Likewise, the only observed values for $n = 6$ are $k \in \{1, 3\}$. Further progress may require a more advanced and comprehensive understanding of why the discrete spectrum is formed in the first place, a question that if answered may unravel the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture itself.

5.2. Future Work. Throughout this paper, we have presented a number of questions, ideas, and future directions regarding the (Amended) Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture and its related results. We summarize them below:

- (1) Fully proving the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture for $n = 4$ following the results of Section 4. Can we complete the proof now that the speeds are almost pairwise co-prime?
- (2) Gaining a more refined understanding of the possible values of k by tackling Conjecture 3.1 and its analogs for higher n .
- (3) Extending the results of Section 3 and more closely study families of speeds in the form $(a, b, b + a, b + 2a, \dots)$.
- (4) Extending the idea of Lemma 4.1 to develop an analog for more runners.
- (5) What implications does the Amended Loneliness Spectrum Conjecture have on related fields, such as the covering radius of a polytope?

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Bienia, L. Goddyn, P. Gvozdzjak, A. Sebő, and M. Tarsi. Flows, view obstructions, and the lonely runner. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 72(1):1–9, 1998.
- [2] T. Bohman, R. Holzman, and D. Kleitman. Six lonely runners. *Electr. J. Comb.*, 8, 02 2001.
- [3] J. Cslovjecssek, R. D. Malikiosis, M. Naszódi, and M. Schymura. Computing the covering radius of a polytope with an application to lonely runners. *Combinatorica*, 02 2022.
- [4] T. Cusick. View-obstruction problems ii. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 84:25–28, 01 1982.
- [5] L. A. Goddyn and E. B. Wong. Tight instances of the lonely runner, 2006.
- [6] N. Kravitz. Barely lonely runners and very lonely runners: a refined approach to the lonely runner problem. *Combinatorial Theory*, 1, 2021.
- [7] D. D.-F. Liu. From rainbow to the lonely runner: a survey on coloring parameters of distance graphs. *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics*, 12(4):851 – 871, 2008.
- [8] R. Pandey. A note on the lonely runner conjecture. *Mathematica Bohemica*, 135, 01 2009.
- [9] I. Schoenberg. Extremum problems for the motions of a billiard ball ii. the l_∞ norm. *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, 79(3):263–279, 1976.
- [10] T. Tao. Some remarks on the lonely runner conjecture. *Contributions to Discrete Mathematics*, 13, 01 2017.
- [11] J. M. Wills. Zwei sätze über inhomogene diophantische approximation von irrationalzahlen. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 71:263–269, 1967.

(Ho Tin Fan) LEXINGTON HIGH SCHOOL
 Email address: `codetiger927@gmail.com`

(Alec Sun) CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY
 Email address: `sundogx@gmail.com`