

# Optimal View Angle in Collective Dynamics of Self-propelled Agents

Bao-Mei Tian<sup>1</sup>, Han-Xin Yang<sup>1</sup>, Wei Li<sup>2,\*</sup>, Tao Zhou<sup>1,3,†</sup>, Wen-Xu Wang<sup>4</sup>, and Bing-Hong Wang<sup>1,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Fribourg, Chemin du Muse 3, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Electronic Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-5706, USA*

(Dated: May 29, 2019)

We study a system of self-propelled agents in which each agent has a part of omnidirectional or panoramic view of its sensor disc, the field of vision of the agent in this case is only a sector of a disc bounded by two radii and the included arc. The inclination of these two radii is characterized as the view angle. Contrary to our intuition, we find that, the non-omnidirectional-view for swarm agents with periodic boundary conditions in noiseless Vicsek model can accelerate the transient process of the emergence of the ordered state. One consequent implication is that, there are generally superfluous communications in the Vicsek Model, which may even obstruct the possible fast swarm emergence. This phenomenon may invoke further efforts and attentions to explore the underlying mechanism of the emergence in self-propelled agents.

PACS numbers: 87.19.St, 89.75.Hc, 02.50.Le, 05.60.Cd

Recently, the emergence behaviors of swarms have attracted much attention [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Generally, there are no leader(s) or central control or global information sharing in the swarm, and the emergence results from the spontaneous self-organization. A particularly simple and popular model to describe such behaviors was proposed by Vicsek *et al* [9], which has been intensively investigated in recent years [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

In the Vicsek model (VM) [9],  $N$  agents move synchronously in a square shaped cell of linear size  $L$  with the periodic boundary conditions. The initial directions and positions of the agents are randomly distributed in this cell. Agent  $i$  and agent  $j$  are neighbors at time step  $k$  if and only if  $\|\vec{X}_i(k) - \vec{X}_j(k)\| \leq R$ , where  $\vec{X}_i(k)$  denotes the position of agent  $i$  on a 2-dimensional (2D) plane at time step  $k$ ,  $R$  is the sensor radius and the discrete time interval  $\Delta t = 1$ . Each agent has the same absolute velocity  $v_0$  but takes the average moving direction of its neighbors at each time step, as:

$$\theta_i(k+1) = \langle \theta_i(k) \rangle_R + \Delta\theta, \quad (1)$$

where the notation  $\langle \theta_i(k) \rangle_R$  denotes the average direction of agent  $i$ 's neighbors (include itself),  $\Delta\theta$  denotes noise (here we do not consider noise without special mention). To be more specific, let  $\Gamma_i(k)$  be the set of neighbors of agent  $i$  at time step  $k$ , the VM is then described as [16, 17]:

$$\vec{X}_i(k+1) = \vec{X}_i(k) + v_0 e^{i\theta_i(k)} \Delta t, \quad (2)$$

$$\theta_i(k+1) = \text{angle}\left(\sum_{j \in \Gamma_i(k+1)} e^{i\theta_j(k)}\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $e^{i\theta_i(k)}$  is the unitary complex directional vector of agent  $i$ ,  $e^{i\theta_i(k)} = \cos(\theta_i(k)) + i \sin(\theta_i(k))$ ,  $\theta_i(k) \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Here the function  $\text{angle}(\cdot)$  returns the angle of a complex number.  $\theta_i(k+1)$  is the moving direction of agent at time step  $k+1$ , which is the average direction of agents in the neighbor set  $\Gamma_i(k+1)$ .  $v_0 e^{i\theta_i(k)}$  represents the velocity of agent  $i$  at time step  $k$  with constant speed  $v_0$  and direction  $\theta_i(k)$ .

In VM and most other models of self-propelled particles, the field of vision for every agent is a complete disc (2D case) or a sphere (3D case) characterized by its sensor radius  $R$ . Figure 1(a) illustrates the omnidirectional view of agent  $i$  in 2D case. In nature, however, it may be more reasonable that the agents have their limited view angles, instead of the omnidirectional views.

In this paper, we investigate the VM in which agents have limited view angles  $\omega$ , namely the field of vision of every agent is only a sector of a sensor disc bounded by two radii and the included arc. As illustrated in Fig. 1(b), the left and right boundaries (radii) of the field of vision of agent  $i$  have inclination  $\omega$ ,  $\omega \in (0, 2\pi]$ ; the left (right) boundary of vision and the heading of agent  $i$  have inclination  $\omega/2$ , that is, for every agent, the field of view is symmetric about its current moving direction. Only the agents in the field of vision of agent  $i$  are  $i$ 's neighbors. Thus rule (3) in the VM can be modified as the following:

$$\theta_i(k+1) = \text{angle}\left(\sum_{j \in \Gamma_i(k+1, \omega)} e^{i\theta_j(k)}\right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\Gamma_i(k+1, \omega)$  denotes the neighbor set of agent  $i$  with view angle  $\omega$ . Obviously, for all agent  $i$  and time step  $k$ , the neighbor sets  $\Gamma_i(k, \omega) \subseteq \Gamma_i(k)$ . When  $\omega = 2\pi$ , the rule (4) degenerates to the original Vicsek model (3).

Generally, one may tend to think that, the omnidirectional view endows every agent with the largest field of

\*Electronic address: wei@sjtu.org

†Electronic address: zhutou@ustc.edu(corresponding-author)

‡Electronic address: bhwang@ustc.edu.cn




FIG. 1: (color online) (a) Illustration of the omnidirectional view of agent  $i$  at time step  $k+1$  in 2D plane. The circle with sensor radius  $R$  denotes the omnidirectional field of view of agent  $i$ . The agents in this field are the neighbors of agent  $i$ . (b) The field of vision of agent  $i$  with view angle  $\omega$  at time step  $k+1$ , the vision is symmetric about the heading of agent  $i$ . The inclination  $\omega$  of the left and right boundaries of the vision is called view angle of agent  $i$ . The neighbor set in this case is denoted as  $\Gamma_i(k+1, \omega)$ .

view and the most possible local information of its neighbors in  $\Gamma_i(k)$  (given the sensor radius  $R$ ) which leads to the most sufficient communications and interactions of the system, and thus is preferable for the large-scale emergence of the system with a relatively short transient process. However, our results show that it is not the case.

To give a quantitative discussion, we define the order parameter

$$\Phi(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N e^{i\theta_i(k)} \right|, 0 \leq \Phi(k, \omega) \leq 1 \quad (5)$$

for the system (4) at time step  $k$  with view angle  $\omega$ ,  $0 \leq \Phi(k, \omega) \leq 1$ .

Figure 2 shows the effect of view angle  $\omega$  on the transient process of the swarm emergence. In Fig. 2(a), the system reaches the stable emergence faster when the view angle  $\omega = 3\pi/2$ , compared with  $\omega = 2\pi$  and  $\omega = 5\pi/6$ . Figure 2(b) shows the transient time step  $\tau$  as a function of  $\omega$ , where  $\tau$  is defined as the time step when the order parameter reaches 0.99 for the system (4) in noiseless case [19]. Actually, there is a certain view angle  $\omega$  that renders the system to reach the stable emergence in the least time steps. Such view angle  $\omega$  is called the optimal view angle  $\omega_{opt}$  in this paper.

Figure 3 further shows the optimal view angle  $\omega_{opt}$  as the function of the swarm parameters: the density, the interaction radius  $R$  and the absolute velocity  $v_0$ , respectively. The optimal view angle  $\omega_{opt}$  decreases with increasing  $N$  and  $v_0$ , and converges to its minimum when  $N$  or  $v_0$  is large enough.  $\omega_{opt}$  increases along with the sensor radius  $R$ .


Does the swarm need more communications between its agents for its relatively fast emergence when the view angle is not omnidirectional (i.e.,  $\omega < 2\pi$ )? Figure 4 answers this question. Let the notation  $n_i(k, \omega)$  be the number of the neighbors in the neighbor set  $\Gamma_i(k, \omega)$  of agent  $i$ . Define the *average number of neighbors*  $\langle n(k, \omega) \rangle$  of all the swarm agents at different time step  $k$  and different  $\omega$  as:

$$\langle n(k, \omega) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N n_i(k, \omega). \quad (6)$$


Combining Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 4, it's interesting to find that, the agents with optimal view angle  $\omega = 3\pi/2$  has relatively a small average number of neighbors in the transient process and a least average number of neighbors in the steady state, compared with  $\omega = 2\pi$  and  $\omega = 5\pi/6$ . This unexpected result indicates an important implication that, *there are generally superfluous communications in the VM, which may even have counteractions for the speed of the swarm emergence*, although the deeply underlying mechanism is still unknown now.

However, when the noise is introduced to the view angle model, as:

$$\theta_i(k+1) = \text{angle} \left( e^{i\xi} \sum_{j \in \Gamma_i(k+1, \omega)} e^{i\theta_j(k)} \right), \quad (7)$$



(a)



(b)

FIG. 2: (color online) The effect of view angle  $\omega$  on the transient process of emergence. All the results are averaged over 500 realizations with fixed lattice size  $L=10$ . (a) The order parameter  $\Phi(k, \omega)$  as a function of time step  $k$  for different values of view angle  $\omega$ . Here  $N=400$ ,  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0 = 0.04$ . (b)  $\tau$  as a function of  $\omega$ . The symbols correspond to  $\blacksquare$ :  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0 = 0.02$ ,  $N=400$ ;  $\star$ :  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0 = 0.04$ ,  $N=400$ ;  $\blacktriangle$ :  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0 = 0.04$ ,  $N=500$ ;  $\blacktriangledown$ :  $R=0.8$ ,  $v_0 = 0.04$ ,  $N=400$ .

where the moving direction of each agent is perturbed by a random number  $\xi$  chosen with a uniform probability from the interval  $[-\eta, \eta]$ , the behaviors of swarm do not have such optimal view angles. Figure 5 shows that the stable order parameter  $\Phi$  increases along with  $\omega$  if the noise is kept constant. That is, the omnidirectional view  $\omega = 2\pi$  is preferable for the large-scale emergence in noise case.

In conclusion, we have studied numerically the effect of




FIG. 3: (color online) The optimal view angle  $\omega_{opt}$  as the function of the swarm number  $N$ , sensor radius  $R$  and absolute velocity  $v_0$  respectively. For left panel:  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0=0.04$ ; for middle panel:  $v_0=0.04$ ,  $N=400$ ; for right panel:  $R=0.6$ ,  $N=400$ . All the results are averaged over 500 realizations. The lattice size is fixed as  $L = 10$ .




FIG. 4: (color online) The average number of neighbors  $\langle n(k, \omega) \rangle$  as the time evolves for different view angle  $\omega$ . Here the parameters  $N$ ,  $L$ ,  $R$  and  $v_0$  are the same with the parameters in Fig. 2(a). All the results are averaged over 500 realizations.

view angle in a group of mobile agents, showing that there exists a proper view angle for agents in the swarm moving with periodic boundary conditions in noiseless case that can accelerate the transient process of the emergence of ordered state. The swarm needs a relatively small optimal view angle  $\omega_{opt}$  for smaller number of agents moving at a larger velocity with shorter sensor radius. But for the swarm that can evolve on the whole 2D plane (with-




FIG. 5: (color online) The order parameter  $\Phi$  as the function of  $\omega$  for different noise. Here  $\Phi = \frac{1}{500} \sum_{k=2501}^{3000} \Phi(k, \omega)$ ,  $N=400$ ,  $L=10$ ,  $R=0.6$ ,  $v_0 = 0.04$ . All the results are averaged over 300 realizations.

out periodic boundary conditions), the result is consistent with our intuition, the degree of its emergence re-

duces when the view angle is shortened. And our findings may help to deeply investigate the onset and transient process of the emergence of swarm by indicating that there are generally superfluous communications in the VM. The result may be applicable in many other systems of self-propelled particles such as swarms or flocks with attractive and repulsive interactions between agents, and the qualitative and quantitative features in these systems need further investigations.

There are also many open questions remain unsolved in the practical perspective. For example, how to design the least (or optimal) communizations between agents while keeping the basic features of neighboring rule in VM for large-scale emergence is a very challenging question in the future. Such optimized communizations will be very useful in designing the man-made swarms such as autonomous mobile robots with limited distance sensors.

We thank Hai-Tao Zhang for his valuable comments. This work is funded by the National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program No.2006CB705500), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10635040, 10532060, 10472116), and the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China.

- 
- [1] J. K. Parrish, *Science* 284, 99 (1999).
  - [2] H. Levine, W. J. Rappel, and I. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. E* 63, 017101 (2000).
  - [3] I. D. Couzin, J. Krause, R. James, G. D. Ruxton, and N. R. Franks, *J. Theor. Biol.* 218, 1 (2002).
  - [4] I. D. Couzin, J. Krause, N. R. Franks, and S. A. Levin, *Nature (London)* 433, 513 (2005).
  - [5] J. Buhl, D. J. T. Sumpter, I. D. Couzin, J. J. Hale, E. Despland, E. R. Miller, and S. J. Simpson, *Science* 312, 1402 (2006).
  - [6] M. R. D'Orsogna, Y. L. Chuang, A. L. Bertozzi, and L. S. Chayes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 104302 (2006).
  - [7] D. Grunbaum, *Science* 312, 1320 (2006).
  - [8] A. Kolpas, J. Moehlis, and I. G. Kevrekidis, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 104, 5931 (2007).
  - [9] T. Vicsek, A. Czirok, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 1226 (1995).
  - [10] L. Moreau, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control* 50, 169 (2005).
  - [11] F. Cucker and S. Smale, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control* 52, 852 (2007).
  - [12] G. Gregoire and H. Chate, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 025702 (2004).
  - [13] C. Huepe and M. Aldana, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 168701 (2004).
  - [14] M. Aldana, V. Dossetti, C. Huepe, V. M. Kenkre, and H. Larralde, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 98, 095702 (2007).
  - [15] M. Nagy, I. Daruka, and T. Vicsek, *Physica A* 373, 445 (2007).
  - [16] W. Li and X. F. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* 75, 021917 (2007).
  - [17] W. Li, H. T. Zhang, M. Z. Q. Chen, and T. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. E* 77, 021920 (2008).
  - [18] H. Chaté, F. Ginelli, G. Grégoire, and F. Raynaud, *Phys. Rev. E* 77, 046113 (2008).
  - [19] According to the analyses [10], the moving directions of all the agents in the system will eventually reach consensus in the parameters in this figure, that is, the order parameter  $\Phi(k, \omega)$  can reach 1 when the time step  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .