

The lonely runner conjecture holds for nine runners

Matthieu Rosenfeld*

LIRMM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France

December 2, 2025

Abstract

We prove that the lonely runner conjecture holds for nine runners. Our proof is based on a couple of improvements of the method we used to prove the conjecture for eight runners.

1 Introduction

The lonely runner conjecture, first stated by Wills in 1967 [21,22], is a well-known open problem in combinatorial number theory with several applications and equivalent formulations [14]. The conjecture can be stated as follows.

Conjecture 1 (Lonely Runner Conjecture). *For all integer $k \geq 1$, every set of distinct integers v_1, \dots, v_{k+1} , and for all i , there exists a real number t such that for every j , we have*

$$\|tv_i - tv_j\| \geq \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

This conjecture is still wide open in general, but has been established for small values of k :

- $k = 3$ the first non-trivial value [2, 7–9],
- $k = 4$ first resolved with computer aid [10] and later simplified [3],
- $k = 5$ [6, 16],
- $k = 6$ [1],
- $k = 7$ was recently solved with computer assistance by the author of the current article [18].

For a more detailed introduction to the lonely runner conjecture, we refer the reader to our previous article [18] or the recent survey by Perarnau [14]. In the current article we adapt our techniques from [18] to prove the case of nine runners. Note that a couple of days before the submission of the current article as a preprint, Trakulthongchai independently announced a proof for the cases of nine and ten runners [20]. The result of [20] also adapts the proof from [18].

The organization of the article is as follows. In Section 2, we recall the core of the argument from [18]. In Section 3, we provide our main lemma and use it to prove the lonely runner conjecture for nine runners. We discuss in Section 4 some implementation details of the computer verification. Finally, in the conclusion, we discuss possible improvement, we discuss an attempt of using Sat-solver, and we provide a short comparison with [20].

*This research was funded, in whole or in part, by the French National Research Agency (ANR) under grant agreement No. ANR-24-CE48-3758-01. In accordance with the objective of open access dissemination, the author applies a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license to any accepted article or manuscript (AAM) resulting from this submission.

2 The core of the argument from [18]

The core of our argument relies on the following bound by Malikiosis, Santos and Schymura [13].

Theorem 1 ([13, Theorem A]). *If the lonely runner conjecture holds for k , then it holds for $k + 1$ for all k -tuple v_1, \dots, v_k such that $\gcd(v_1, \dots, v_k) = 1$, and*

$$\sum_{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}} \gcd(\{v_i : i \in S\}) > \binom{k+1}{2}^{k-1}.$$

In [18], we used the following corollary to bound the product of the speeds in any minimal counter-example for k runners.

Corollary 2 ([18]). *If the lonely runner conjecture holds for k , then it holds for $k + 1$ for all k -tuple v_1, \dots, v_k such that $\gcd(v_1, \dots, v_k) = 1$, and*

$$\prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} v_i \geq \left[\frac{\binom{k+1}{2}^{k-1}}{k} \right]^k.$$

Now the proof relies on finding many small prime divisors of the product of the speeds in any minimal counterexample for k runners. With enough such divisors, we get a lower bound on the product that is larger than the upper bound given in Corollary 2, implying that there is no such counterexample. The following lemmas from [18] allow to find such divisors.

Lemma 3 ([18]). *Let $k \geq 3$ be an integer such that the lonely runner conjecture holds for $k - 1$. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ be a positive integer such that for all $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \{0, \dots, (k + 1)p - 1\}$ with*

- (i) *for all subset $S \in \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ of size $k - 1$, we have $\gcd(S \cup \{(k + 1)p\}) = 1$,*
- (ii) *for all i , v_i is not divisible by p ,*

there exists $t \in \{0, \dots, (k + 1)p - 1\}$ such that for all i ,

$$\left\| \frac{tv_i}{(k + 1)p} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{k + 1}.$$

Then for any set of k distinct integers $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ that does not have the LR property, we have

$$p \text{ divides } \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} v_i.$$

For each prime p , a finite computation can be used to verify the condition of this lemma. Since, many primes happen to satisfy this condition when $k = 7$, we can verify the existence of many prime that must divide the product of the speed of a minimal counterexample. With enough such primes, one can contradict the upper bound on the product of the speeds given by Corollary 2 and prove the lonely runner conjecture for $k + 1$ runners.

This proof of this lemma relied on the following lemma (the same idea was already used in [3]).

Lemma 4 ([18]). *Let $k \geq 3$ be an integer such that the lonely runner conjecture holds for $k - 1$. Let v_1, \dots, v_k be a set of integers with $\gcd(\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}) = 1$ but $\gcd(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}) \neq 1$. Then v_1, \dots, v_k has the LR property.*

For the current article, we will use a stronger version of Lemma 5 given in Lemma 6. For this, we provide a version of Lemma 4 tailored for the case $k = 8$ with more general conditions. Hence, Lemma 6 is also tailored to the case $k = 8$ which allows a weaker condition (i.e., we have fewer k -uples to verify). At the same time, we also generalize a bit the conditions of the lemma by adding a coefficient c that allows to apply our lemma to powers of small primes as well.

3 Proof of the lonely runner conjecture for nine runners

We now provide our version of Lemma 4 tailored for $k = 8$. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4 given in [18].

Lemma 5. *Let $k \geq 3$ be an integer such that the lonely runner conjecture holds for all $k' < k$. Let v_1, \dots, v_8 be a set of integers with $\gcd(\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}) = 1$ then*

- *if at least 6 of the v_i are divisible by 3, then $\{v_1, \dots, v_9\}$ has the LR property,*
- *if at least 5 of the v_i are divisible by 9, then $\{v_1, \dots, v_9\}$ has the LR property.*

Proof. We start with the first item, and we assume that at least 6 of the v_i are divisible by 3. By the gcd condition at least one of the v_i is not divisible by 3 and by Lemma 4, if exactly one of them is not divisible by 3 then the set has the LR property, so the only remaining case is when exactly 6 of the v_i are divisible by 3. By reordering the v_i , we can assume that v_1, \dots, v_6 are divisible by 3 and v_7 and v_8 are not divisible by 3. Let t be a lonely runner solution for $\{v_1, \dots, v_6\}$, that is, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$,

$$\|v_i \cdot t\| \geq \frac{1}{7} > \frac{1}{9}.$$

Hence, for all $t' \in \{t, t + 1/3, t + 2/3\}$ and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$,

$$\|v_i \cdot t'\| = \|v_i \cdot t\| > \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

On the other hand, for $i \in \{7, 8\}$, $\gcd(v_i, 3) = 1$, and we have

$$\{\|v_i \cdot (t + j/3)\| : j \in \{0, 1, 2\}\} = \{\|v_i \cdot t + j/3\| : j \in \{0, 1, 2\}\}.$$

For each $i \in \{7, 8\}$, this set corresponds to 3 points evenly spaced out in the unit circle, hence for each $i \in \{7, 8\}$ at most one of this point is such that $\|v_i \cdot (t + j/3)\| < 1/9$ (this corresponds to an interval of size $2/9 < 1/3$). That is at most two of the three choices of $t' \in \{t, t + 1/3, t + 2/3\}$ are such that $\|v_i \cdot t'\| < 1/9$ for some $i \in \{7, 8\}$ and the remaining one is such that $\|v_i \cdot t\| > \frac{1}{9}$ for all i as desired.

The argument for the second item is similar. From the first item, we only need to take care of the case where exactly 5 of the v_i are divisible by 9, and the others are not divisible by 3. That is, up to reordering the v_i , v_1, \dots, v_5 are divisible by 9, and v_6, v_7, v_8 are not divisible by 3. As previously, we let t be a lonely runner solution for v_1, \dots, v_5 , and we consider the set $S = \{t, t + 1/9, \dots, t + 8/9\}$. For any $t' \in S$ and any $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $\|v_i t'\| = \|v_i t\| \geq 1/6 > 1/9$. On the other hand, for $i \in \{6, 7, 8\}$, $\gcd(v_i, 9) = 1$, and we have

$$\{\|v_i \cdot (t + j/9)\| : j \in \{0, \dots, 8\}\} = \{\|v_i \cdot t + j/9\| : j \in \{0, \dots, 8\}\}.$$

Again for each $i \in \{6, 7, 8\}$ the corresponding 9 points are evenly spaced out on the unit circle and the forbidden interval is an open interval of size $2/9$ so at most two such points are forbidden for each i . That is, at least 3 of the choices of $t' \in S$ are such that $\|v_i \cdot t'\| < 1/9$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$ as desired. \square

We are now ready to prove our main lemma.

Lemma 6. *Suppose that $d, c \in \mathbb{N}$ are positive integers such that for all $v_1, \dots, v_8 \in \{0, \dots, 9cd - 1\}$ with*

- (i) *for all subset $S \in \{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ of size 7, we have $\gcd(S \cup \{9cd\}) = 1$,*
- (ii) *at most 5 of the v_i are divisible by 3,*

(iii) at most 4 of the v_i are divisible by 9,

(iv) $\prod_{i=1}^8 v_i$ is not divisible by d ,

there exists $t \in \{0, \dots, 9cd - 1\}$ such that for all i ,

$$\left\| \frac{tv_i}{9cd} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{9}.$$

Then for any set of 8 distinct integers $\{w_1, \dots, w_8\}$ that does not have the LR property, we have

$$d \text{ divides } \prod_{i=1}^8 w_i.$$

Proof. Let d, c be as in the theorem statement and let $\{w_1, \dots, w_8\}$ be a set of 8 distinct integers without the LR property. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\gcd(\{w_1, \dots, w_8\}) = 1$, otherwise we can divide every w_i by $\gcd(w_1, \dots, w_8)$, this new set does not have the LR property either and the product of the speed divides the previous product.

For all i , let v_i be the remainder of the euclidean division of w_i by $9cd$. Since the set $\{w_1, \dots, w_8\}$ does not have the LR property, we have by Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 that

- for all subset $S \in \{w_1, \dots, w_8\}$ of size 7, we have $\gcd(S) = 1$, so in particular $\gcd(S \cup \{9cd\}) = 1$,
- at most 5 of the w_i are divisible by 3,
- at most 4 of the w_i are divisible by 9,

Since each v_i is obtained by reducing w_i modulo $9cd$, the same properties hold for the v_i , that is we have (i), (ii) and (iii) from our Theorem hypothesis.

Now, suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\prod_{i=1}^8 w_i$ is not divisible by d , then $\prod_{i=1}^8 v_i$ is not divisible by d either which implies (iv). By our theorem hypothesis there exists $t \in \{0, \dots, 9cd - 1\}$ such that for all i ,

$$\left\| \frac{tv_i}{9cd} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{9}.$$

For all i , $w_i \equiv v_i \pmod{9cd}$ implies,

$$\left\| \frac{tw_i}{9cd} \right\| = \left\| \frac{tv_i}{9cd} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{9},$$

which contradicts the fact that $\{w_1, \dots, w_8\}$ does not have the LR property. Hence, d divides $\prod_{i=1}^8 w_i$, as desired. \square

Using this lemma, and a computer program that verifies the condition, we can find many integers d that divide the product of the speeds in any minimal counterexample for 9 runners. In particular, let

$$S = \{64, 81, 25, 121, 169, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47, 53, 59, 61, 67, 71, 73, 79, 83, 89, 97, 101, 103, 107, 109, 113, 127, 131, 137, 139, 149, 151, 157, 163, 167, 173, 179, 181, 191\},$$

and for all $d \in S$, let c_d be such that¹

$$c_d = \begin{cases} 5 & \text{if } d = 25, \\ 3 & \text{if } d = 17 \text{ or } 19, \\ 2 & \text{if } d \in \{64, 23, 29, 41\}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

¹These values are simply the smallest values of c for which our program was able to verify the conditions of Lemma 6.

Our program verified that for all $d \in S$, the pair (d, c_d) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 6. Note that S contains a power of every prime number not larger than 191 other than 7 (it is not hard to prove that 7 must divide the product, but it does no help and on the other hand with $p = 49$, if there is a c_p that respects the condition of our lemma it is at least 5 and the verification is more expensive than the one for 191). This provides enough divisors to reach the bound given by Corollary 2 and prove the lonely runner conjecture for 9 runners.

Proof of the lonely runner conjecture for nine runners. For the sake of contradiction suppose there exists a set $\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ of 8 distinct integers without the LR property. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\gcd(\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}) = 1$. We let

$$\mathcal{P} = \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}} v_i.$$

By Corollary 2, we have

$$\mathcal{P} \leq \left\lceil \frac{\binom{9}{2}^7}{8} \right\rceil^8 \approx 8.47657 \times 10^{79} < 9 \times 10^{79}. \quad (1)$$

Our implementation of Lemma 6, can be used to verify that \mathcal{P} is divisible by d , for all $d \in S$ where

$$S = \{64, 81, 25, 121, 169, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47, 53, 59, 61, 67, 71, 73, 79, 83, 89, 97, 101, 103, 107, 109, 113, 127, 131, 137, 139, 149, 151, 157, 163, 167, 173, 179, 181, 191\}.$$

Note that the elements of S are pairwise co-prime (as each is a power of a distinct prime). Hence, \mathcal{P} is divisible by

$$\text{lcm}(S) = \prod_{d \in S} d \approx 9.09778 \times 10^{79} > 9 \times 10^{79}.$$

Since \mathcal{P} is a positive integer this contradicts (1). Therefore, there does not exist such a set $\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ of 8 distinct integers without the LR property. This concludes the proof of the lonely runner conjecture for nine runners. \square

4 Implementation details

Following the approach of [18], before discussing the implementation details, we first reformulate the condition of Lemma 6 in a formulation closer to set-cover.

Given integers c and d , we say that $v \in \{1, \dots, 9cd - 1\}$ covers $j \in \mathbb{N}$ if $\left\| \frac{vj}{9cd} \right\| < \frac{1}{8}$. We then say that a set $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ covers a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ if any $s \in S$ is covered by at least one of the v_i . Intuitively, if $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ does not cover j , then the time $\frac{j}{9cd}$ is a suitable time to verify the LR property for $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$.

For all positive integers i, j, t , $\left\| \frac{ij}{t} \right\| = \left\| \frac{(t-i)j}{t} \right\|$. This means that if v_i covers j , then v_i covers $9cd - j$, and $9cdv_j$ covers j and $9cd - j$. Using this notion of cover and these symmetries², Lemma 6 can be reformulated equivalently as follows.

Lemma 7. *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ be positive integers. Suppose that there exists no 8-uple $v_1, \dots, v_8 \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor 9cd/2 \rfloor\}$ with*

- (i) *for all subset $S \subseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ of size 7, we have $\gcd(S \cup \{9cd\}) = 1$,*

²Another obvious symmetry that we do not exploit is that if i covers j , then j covers i .

- (ii) at most 5 of the v_i are divisible by 3,
- (iii) at most 4 of the v_i are divisible by 9,
- (iv) $\prod_{i=1}^8 v_i$ is not divisible by d ,
- (v) v_1, \dots, v_k covers $\{1, \dots, \lfloor 9cd/2 \rfloor\}$.

Then the conclusion of Lemma 6 holds, that is, for any set of 8 distinct integers $\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ without the LR property, we have

$$d \text{ divides } \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}} v_i.$$

That is, we need to verify that there exists a set cover (property (v)) with some extra divisibility constraints (properties (i) to (iv)). Our program implements basic backtracking techniques to exhaustively search for a "bad" cover for a selected pair c and d .

The implementation is not so different from the one used in [18] for 7 runners, but a few extra tricks improve the running time significantly.

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor (k+1)p/2 \rfloor\}$ the set of positions covered by i is precomputed and stored as vectors of bits (`bitsets` in C++), which allow us to rely on really efficient bitwise operations.

We construct a cover element by element, and for each partial cover $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$, before adding a new element we verify some necessary conditions for the cover to be completable. If these conditions are not met, we know that we can backtrack, and otherwise we try to add a new element to the cover. Our conditions are based on computing how many new integers can be covered by the best choice of integers among the remaining available integers. More precisely, we choose one of the uncovered integers u to be special, and for every integer x that covers u , we compute the largest number s of new integers that can be covered by adding some integers x' to the partial cover $\{v_1, \dots, v_i, x\}$. If this number s multiplied by the number of integers that can be added to the partial cover (that is $8 - i - 1$) is smaller than the number of integers that are not covered yet by $\{v_1, \dots, v_i, x\}$, then there is no way to complete the cover to a full cover satisfying property (v) of Lemma 7, and we know that x should not be added to the cover³. Our pruning strategy is the main difference with the implementation of [18], and it makes a big difference in performance.

Since the order of the elements in the cover does not matter, given a partial solution $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$, we can ask v_{i+1} to cover u where u is the integer that can be covered by the fewest integer (thus minimizing the number of possible choices for v_{i+1}).

Finally, whenever we finish the backtracking over a partial cover $\{v_1, \dots, v_i, v_{i+1}\}$, we remember for all future completion of $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$, that there is no reason to try to add v_{i+1} (since we already know that no valid cover contains $\{v_1, \dots, v_i, v_{i+1}\}$), so we eliminate it from the remaining available integers for the completions of the partial cover $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$.

The implementation is available in the git repository linked with this article [17]. This implementation is experimentally much faster than the one used in [18] even for 7 runners. The run time for $k = 7$, $d = 163$ and $c = 1$ which was the worst case and took 32 hours is reduced to 50 minutes on the same machine. Moreover, Lemma 6 means, we would only need to go to smaller prime than 163 for the case of 7 runners, making this proof even faster as well.

We provide in figure 1 the running time of our implementation for various values of $d \cdot c$. The running time seems to grow roughly as $O((d \cdot c)^{5.7})$ (the curve $x^{5.7}/(5 \times 10^7)$ is also plotted for comparison). Note that the few points that are far below the line correspond to cases where $d \cdot c$ has many divisors (51, 81, 125, 128). We also provide in Table 1 the running time for each d used in our proof.

³Choosing x and then X' , might seem overly complicated compared to simply choosing x' directly, but this allows for slightly more efficient partial pre-computations.




Figure 1: Runtime of our implementation for various values of $d \cdot c$ along with the curve $x^{5.7}/(5 \times 10^7)$.

5 Conclusion

As suggested in [18], it required small optimizations to push the technique used for 8 runners to solve the 9 runners case. As our technique can be applied for every number of runners from 3 to 9, it seems reasonable to expect that it could theoretically be used for any particular number of runners. In practice, the computational cost grows fast with the number of runners, and with the size of the primes we need to consider.

Other implementations, including SAT-solvers based ones. In [18], we raised the idea of using state-of-the-art solvers instead of our ad-hoc implementation to improve the running time. However, based on the result of the 2025 PACE contest, the best approach to solve set cover instances seems to be to rely directly on SAT-solvers [18]. Since our computation is really close to a set cover problem, it seems natural to try to encode our problem as a SAT instance and use a state-of-the-art SAT solver to verify the condition of Lemma 7. The transformation of set-cover to SAT is pretty straightforward, and the other constraint we have concern the cardinality of some sets, so we use a SAT-solver that allow cardinality constraint.

We provide with our implementation a program that generates such an encoding for any choice of k and d^4 . This program generates an encoding to verify the condition of Lemma 7 with Cardinality-CDCL [15] or with Minicard [12] (which are respectively cardinality constraints extensions of the SAT-solvers Cadical [4] and Minisat [11]). Running any of these two solvers is experimentally much slower than our ad-hoc implementation. For instance with $k = 5$ and $d = 31$, our implementation takes roughly 0.02 seconds, while Cardinality-CDCL and Minicard take respectively 220 seconds and 59 seconds to conclude that the formula is unsatisfiable.

David Silver [19] also implemented the Sat-solver approach to verify the condition of Lemma 7 using Kissat [5]. He reaches the same conclusions that the SAT-solver approach is not competitive with our ad-hoc implementation. We do not claim to be able to provide a theoretical explanation of this phenomenon, but our problem is quite different from "typical" Sat instances for which these solvers are optimized (it is monotone SAT, with really large clauses that behave in a "pseudo-random" manner, together with extra cardinality constraints).

These sat-solver based implementations can still be used to verify some of the smallest values of d and k , but even the case $k = 5$ seems out of reach for the sat-solver based approach.

⁴Note that our implementation does not allow to choose the value of c which is 1.




Figure 2: Runtime of our implementation for $k = 9$ and $c = 1$ for various values of d along with the curve $x^{6.5}/(8 \times 10^7)$. Based on the similar plot for $k = 8$ (Figure 1), it seems to be a reasonable estimation of the running time for larger values of d .

Towards 10 runners. The bound given by Corollary 2 for 10 runners is roughly 2.77408×10^{110} , which means that we would need to consider many more primes (or prime powers) than for 9 runners, and larger primes as well. This means that one would need to be able to verify the condition of (a variant of) Lemma 6 for primes up to roughly 263 (depending slightly on the prime powers used for small primes). It is relatively simple to adapt the lemma and our code for the 10 runner case. Running our implementation for the primes between 37 and 71 we can try to interpolate the running time for larger primes (see Fig. 2). Based on this rough estimation, it seems that verifying the condition for $p = 263$ would take roughly two years on a single processor core with our current implementation (but we also need to run this for all smaller primes). It is certainly doable (and it is easily parallelizable), but probably not worth the effort. It seems that some extra ideas are needed to make this computation more reasonable. This is what was done by Trakulthongchai in [20] to solve the case of 10 runners.

One of the improvement here and in [20] is to generalize Lemma (from [18]) by replacing $k + 1$ by any multiple $c(k + 1)$ of $k + 1$ (see Lemma 6). The other main improvements that we use here were the following:

- considering powers of small primes instead of only primes, which allow us to consider fewer and smaller primes in general,
- finding some extra divisibility conditions based on Lemma 5 that help to reduce the number of cases to verify,
- improving the implementation used in [18] as discussed in Section 4.

In comparison, [20] uses a clever sieving approach to make the verification much faster (based on what is reported in [20] they do seem to be faster by a factor of order 100). Some of the improvements that we used could be combined with the sieving approach of [20] to further improve the verification time (in particular, being able to consider power of small primes).

References

- [1] J. Barajas and O. Serra. The Lonely Runner with Seven Runners. *Electron. J. Combin.*, page R48, 2008.

- [2] U. Betke and J. M. Wills. Untere Schranken für zwei diophantische Approximations-Funktionen. *Monatsh. Math.*, 76(3):214–217, 1972.
- [3] W. Bienia, L. Goddyn, P. Gvozdzjak, A. Sebő, and M. Tarsi. Flows, View Obstructions, and the Lonely Runner. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 72(1):1–9, 1998.
- [4] A. Biere, T. Faller, K. Fazekas, M. Fleury, N. Froleyks, and F. Pollitt. CaDiCaL 2.0. In A. Gurfinkel and V. Ganesh, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 36th International Conference, CAV 2024, Montreal, QC, Canada, July 24-27, 2024, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 14681 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 133–152. Springer, 2024.
- [5] A. Biere, T. Faller, K. Fazekas, M. Fleury, N. Froleyks, and F. Pollitt. CaDiCaL, Gimsatul, IsaSAT and Kissat entering the SAT Competition 2024. In M. Heule, M. Iser, M. Järvisalo, and M. Suda, editors, *Proc. of SAT Competition 2024 – Solver, Benchmark and Proof Checker Descriptions*, volume B-2024-1 of *Department of Computer Science Report Series B*, pages 8–10. University of Helsinki, 2024.
- [6] T. Bohman, R. Holzman, and D. Kleitman. Six Lonely Runners. *Electron. J. Combin.*, page R3, 2001.
- [7] T. W. Cusick. View-Obstruction Problems. *Aequationes Math.*, 9:165–170, 1973.
- [8] T. W. Cusick. View-obstruction problems in n-dimensional geometry. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 16(1):1–11, 1974.
- [9] T. W. Cusick. View-obstruction problems. ii, 1982.
- [10] T. W. Cusick and C. Pomerance. View-obstruction problems, III. *J. Number Theory*, 19(2):131–139, 1984.
- [11] N. Eén and N. Sörensson. An extensible sat-solver. In *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, pages 502–518, 2004.
- [12] M. H. Liffiton and J. C. Maglalong. A cardinality solver: More expressive constraints for free. In *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing – SAT 2012*, pages 485–486, 2012.
- [13] R. D. Malikiosis, F. Santos, and M. Schymura. Linearly-exponential checking is enough for the Lonely Runner Conjecture and some of its variants. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [14] G. Perarnau and O. Serra. The Lonely Runner Conjecture turns 60. *Computer Science Review*, 58:100798, 2025.
- [15] J. E. Reeves, M. J. H. Heule, and R. E. Bryant. From clauses to klauses. In *Computer Aided Verification: 36th International Conference, CAV 2024, Montreal, QC, Canada, July 24-27, 2024, Proceedings, Part I*, page 110–132, 2024.
- [16] J. Renault. View-obstruction: a shorter proof for 6 lonely runners. *Discrete Math.*, 287(1):93–101, 2004.
- [17] M. Rosenfeld. The lonely runner conjecture. <https://gite.lirmm.fr/mrosenfeld/nine-runners>, 2025.
- [18] M. Rosenfeld. The lonely runner conjecture holds for eight runners. *arXiv*, Sept. 2025.
- [19] D. H. Silver. A sat-based encoding for the lonely runner conjecture: Performance analysis. <https://github.com/silverdavi/lonely-SAT>, 2025. Paper: <https://github.com/silverdavi/lonely-SAT/blob/main/paper/paper.pdf>.

- [20] Tanupat and Trakulthongchai. Nine and ten lonely runners. *arXiv*, Nov. 2025.
- [21] J. Wills. *Zwei Probleme der inhomogenen diophantischen Approximation*. PhD thesis, TU Berlin, 1965.
- [22] J. M. Wills. Zwei Sätze über inhomogene diophantische Approximation von Irrationalzahlen. *Monatsh. Math.*, 71(3):263–269, 1967.

A Table of the running times

p	c	Running time (seconds)
17	3	16
19	3	164
23	2	47
25	5	5974
29	2	220
31	1	8
37	1	29
41	2	1067
43	1	39
47	1	78
53	1	71
59	1	223
61	1	215
64	2	4115
67	1	432
71	1	370
73	1	896
79	1	872
81	1	351
83	1	1394
89	1	1523
97	1	2617
101	1	4071
103	1	4566
107	1	4185
109	1	6284
113	1	6174
121	1	11170
127	1	15367
131	1	17263
137	1	23409
139	1	25232
149	1	38621
151	1	40566
157	1	58429
163	1	75059
167	1	78611
169	1	79241
173	1	104496
179	1	117250
181	1	134716
191	1	196571

Table 1: Table of the running times for each pair (p, c) used to prove the lonely runner conjecture for 9 runners with the implementation available at the git repository [17].