### Lonely Runner Conjecture

Bartłomiej Jachowicz

23 April 2020

Bartłomiej Jachowicz

### Table of Contents

- Conjecture Statement
- 2 Known Results
  - 3 Contexts
- 4 LRC for 3 runners proof
- 5 Bibliography

One of number theory open problem is the *Lonely Runner Conjecture*. It is interesting for several reasons. First the conjecture is relatively intuitive to grasp and easy to state. This conjecture can be find in two different contexts: as a problem in Diophantine's approximation and as a geometric view obstruction problem. What is more, the difficulty of proving the Lonely Runner Conjecture may seem to increase exponentially with the number of runners. I present statement of the conjecture and known partial results.

イロト 不同下 イヨト イヨト

#### Definition 1.1

Consider k runners on a circular track of unit length. At time t = 0, all runners are at the same position and start to run. Runners have pairwise distinct speed. A runner is said to be lonely at time t if he is at a distance of at least 1/k from every other runner at time t.

#### Definition 1.2

Consider k runners on a circular track of unit length. At time t = 0, all runners are at the same position and start to run. Runners have pairwise distinct speed. A runner is said to be lonely at time t if he is at a distance of at least 1/k from every other runner at time t.

#### Conjecture 1.1

For any given runner there is a time t at which that runner is lonely.

## Lonely Runner Conjecture



E

イロト イヨト イヨト

#### Problem 1.1

Is Lonely Runner Conjecture true for every number of runners?

Bartłomiej Jachowicz

# The Lonely Runner Conjecture was originally presented by J. M. Wills in 1967.

臣

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト

runners	year	proved by
1	-	-
2	-	-
3	-	-
4	1972	Betke and Wills
5	1984	Cusick and Pomeranc
6	2001	Bohman, Holzman and Kleitman
7	2008	Barajas and Serra

Ξ

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

Trivial, it works for any t, for example t = 0.



E

・ 何 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Proof for LRC with 2 runners is quite simple. Due to the fact that runners speeds are not equal there is a time when runners are on opposite ends of some diameter.



Proofs for more runner are significantly harder. The first proof of six runners was almost fifty pages, presented by a group of mathematicians from MIT. Different argument by the French mathematician Jerome Renault help to proved the case of six runners in about ten pages. More recently two Spanish mathematicians proved the case for seven runners.

A = A = A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A
A

In 2011 Dubickas presented article proving the Lonely Runner Conjecture under specified assumptions.

< 回 ト < 三 ト < 三 ト

In 2011 Dubickas presented article proving the Lonely Runner Conjecture under specified assumptions.

#### Theorem 2.1

Conjecture hold for n > 16342 runners under assumption that the speeds of the runners are integer numbers and satisfy  $\frac{v_{j+1}}{v_j} > 1 + \frac{33logn}{n}$  where  $v_1 < v_2 < \ldots < v_n$ .

A much stronger statement was proved for runners with random speeds.

#### Theorem 2.2

Let k be a fixed positive integer and let  $\epsilon > 0$  be fixed real number. Let  $S \subseteq \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  be a k-element subset chosen uniformly at random. Then the probability that exist time  $t_i$  when no other runner is at distance of at least  $\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$  for every runner i tends to 1 with  $n \to \infty$ .

A much stronger statement was proved for runners with random speeds.

#### Theorem 2.3

Let k be a fixed positive integer and let  $\epsilon > 0$  be fixed real number. Let  $S \subseteq \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  be a k-element subset chosen uniformly at random. Then the probability that exist time  $t_i$  when no other runner is at distance of at least  $\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$  for every runner i tends to 1 with  $n \to \infty$ .

Proof of this theorem uses Fourier analytic methods.

The Lonely Runner Conjecture was originally formulated as a Diophantine Approximation problem.

## Theorem 3.1 For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , $\kappa(n) \ge \frac{1}{n+1}$

#### Where:

$$\begin{split} \kappa(n) &= \inf_{\substack{a \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ a \in \mathbb{R}^n}} \lambda_n(a) \\ \lambda_n(a) &= \sup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \mu(q, a) = \min_{\substack{1 \leq i < n}}} \|qa_i\| \end{split}$$

< 3 > 4 3 >

In 1971, a few years after Wills results were released, Thomas W. Cusick gave an equivalent reformulation of Lonely Runner Conjecture as a conjecture in view-obstruction.

View-obstruction problems intuitively is to characterize the vector of numbers  $\alpha$  that obstruct all rays with vector r of directions in a given dimension.



20 / 31

Ξ

< ロト < 団ト < 巨ト < 巨ト</p>

Let's define this problem in a formal way:

Let  $E_n$  denote the region in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  where all coordinates are positive, so any  $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in E_n$  has  $0 < x_i < \infty$  where i = 1, 2, ..., n. Suppose that C is a closed convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and which contains the origin as an interior point.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Let's define this problem in a formal way:

Let  $E_n$  denote the region in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  where all coordinates are positive, so any  $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in E_n$  has  $0 < x_i < \infty$  where i = 1, 2, ..., n. Suppose that C is a closed convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and which contains the origin as an interior point.

For each  $\alpha \ge 0$ , define  $\alpha C$  to be the set of all  $(\alpha x_1, ..., \alpha x_n)$ , where  $(x_1, ..., x_n)$  is a point in C; hence  $\alpha C$  is the scale of C with the magnification of  $\alpha$ . Define  $C + (m_1, ..., m_n)$  to be the translation of C by the point  $(m_1, ..., m_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

# Define the set of points $\Delta(C, \alpha)$ by $\Delta(C, \alpha) = \{\alpha C + (m_1 + \frac{1}{2}, ..., m_n + \frac{1}{2}) : m_i \in \mathbb{N}, i = 1, ..., n\}.$

#### Problem 3.1

Find the constant K(C) defined to be the lower bound of those numbers  $\alpha$  for which every ray  $r(t) = (a_1t, ..., a_nt)$  where  $a_i > 0, t \in [0, \infty)$ , intersects  $\Delta(C, \alpha)$ .

Define K(C) as infimum of all such  $\alpha$  where  $\Delta(C, \alpha)$  intersects every such ray and  $K_n = K(C_n)$ .

#### Theorem 3.2

The lonely runner conjecture is equivalent to finding K(C).

Proof of this theorem goes by finding relation between  $K_n$  and  $\kappa(n)$ . Let  $s = (s_1, ..., s_n) \in \mathbb{N}$  so that's is the direction of the ray  $r(t) = (s_1 t, ..., s_n t)$ . The closest distance, in the product metric from ray to the nearest point of  $A = \{(m_1 + \frac{1}{2}, ..., m_n + \frac{1}{2}) : m_i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is  $l = \min_{t \in [0,1]} \max_{i \leq n} ||r_i t - \frac{1}{2}||$ . Then with a few substitutions and calculations we get  $K_n = 1 - 2\kappa(n)$ .

#### Theorem 4.1

 $K_2 = 1/3$  and this proves Lonely Runner Conjecture for three runners.

Bartłomiej Jachowicz



э

トイヨトイヨト

Proof: We refer to the following picture in the proof



臣

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

The squares are centered at half-integers and have side length of  $\frac{1}{3}$ , so the squares represent the set  $\Delta(C_2, \frac{1}{3})$  (denote  $\Delta_2$ ). The two top rays have slopes of 2 and  $\frac{1}{2}$  respectively while the bottom ray has a slope of  $\frac{1}{5}$ .

The rays  $y = \theta x$  with  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 2$  intersect the square with center  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ , so this slope is obstruct.

For rays with slope  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  any of them have a chance two pass through the gap of two consecutive squares with centers  $(\frac{1}{2} + n, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $(\frac{1}{2} + n + 1, \frac{1}{2})$ . That is due to the fact we can calculate the minimal slope of a line to pass unobstructed is  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We can observe that on picture with line of a slope  $\frac{1}{5}$ .

By symmetry,  $\Delta_2$  obstructs all views with slope  $\theta > 2$  if it obstructs all slopes with  $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Thus the set  $\Delta_2$  obstructs all views. From the above figure it is also evident that  $\frac{1}{3}$  is the smallest number  $\alpha$  such that  $\Delta(C_2, \alpha)$  obstructs all views: for the top lines with slopes 2 and  $\frac{1}{2}$  only pass through the corners of squares in  $\Delta_2$ , as indicated by the points along those lines. Hence  $K_2(C) = \frac{1}{3}$  and this proves the Lonely Runner Conjecture for three runners.  $\Box$ 



Clayton L. Barnes, II THE LONELY RUNNER CONJECTURE, 2012

- Arturas Dubickas THE LONELY RUNNER PROBLEM FOR MANY RUNNERS, 2011
- Sebastian Czerwiński, *Random numbers are very lonely*, 2012
- 🔋 Open Problem Garden

# The end

Bartłomiej Jachowicz

31 / 31

Ξ

< ロト < 団ト < 巨ト < 巨ト</p>