

Controlling noisy herds

Tuhin Chakraborty¹ and Saad Bhamla¹

¹Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

*saadb@chbe.gatech.edu

ABSTRACT

The wisdom of the crowd breaks down in small groups. While large flocks exhibit swarm intelligence to evade predators, small groups display erratic behavior, oscillating between unity and discord. We investigate these dynamics using small groups of sheep controlled by shepherd dogs in century-old sheepdog trials, proposing a two-parameter stochastic dynamic framework. Our model employs pressure (stimulus intensity) and lightness (response isotropy) to simulate herding and shedding behaviors. Light sheep rapidly achieve a stable herding state, while heavy sheep exhibit intermittent herding and orthogonal alignment to the dog. High response isotropy enhances group cohesion but complicates group splitting. We construct a unified phase diagram for sheep behavior, identifying three regimes—fleeing, flocking, and grazing—based on group size and stimulus specificity. Increasing stimulus specificity shifts small group behavior from grazing to fleeing, while larger groups exhibit flocking. This transition underscores the challenge of controlling small indecisive collectives. Introducing the Indecisive Collective Algorithm (ICA), we show that deliberate indecisiveness and stochasticity improve control efficiency. ICA outperforms traditional averaging-based algorithms in high-noise settings and excels in tasks requiring group splitting. Our study offers a foundational framework for controlling small, indecisive groups, applicable to biochemical reactions, cell populations, and opinion dynamics.

Predator and Prey Dynamics

Prey-predator interactions represent an evolutionary tug of war. Prey defense mechanisms vary based on whether they are solitary or in a group. Solitary animals typically employ flight, deception, and intimidation, to survive¹⁻⁷, while animals in large groups exhibit complex collective behaviors to confuse and intimidate predators⁸⁻¹³. For example, a solitary wildebeest might flee or intimidate a cheetah, but in a large group, it moves toward the center, exhibiting selfish herd behavior¹⁴. This behaviour switch is seen in many socially flexible animals, including humans¹⁵⁻¹⁸. Predators have developed strategies to counter these defenses¹⁹⁻²³. For instance, cheetahs leverage their speed to target lone wildebeests but isolate vulnerable individuals in a group²⁴. Despite extensive research on collective predator avoidance strategies, the predator-prey dynamics in small groups, where animals indecisively switch between solitary and selfish herd behaviors and become unpredictable, remains an open question.

Sheep-dog Trials

Shepherds have understood small-group predator-prey dynamics since 1700 BC, utilizing herding dogs to manage farm animals (see Figure 1a, SI Section 1)²⁵. When a solitary sheep faces a threat, it flees, but in large groups, sheep exhibit selfish herd behavior. In small groups, sheep struggle to choose a survival strategy, switching between solitary and collective behaviors, creating unpredictability (Figure 1b and SI Video 1). This unpredictability led to the creation of sheep-dog trials, a 100-year-old sport testing a dog's ability to control small sheep groups ($N \leq 5$)²⁶. In these trials, handlers and dogs perform tasks such as herding, moving sheep cohesively (Fig 1c-e), and shedding, splitting the group into subgroups (Fig 1f-h), showcasing the dog's skill in managing unpredictable small groups (see SI Section 2)²⁷.

We utilize the sheep-dog trials competition to systematically investigate the dynamics of unpredictable small-size collectives under external control. This sport offers a wealth of qualitative knowledge from generations of dog trainers and shepherds about sheep and dog behavior. Key terminologies such as "pressure" and "lightness" describe these interactions: pressure denotes the threat perceived by sheep from dog actions like moving toward, barking, or staring, while lightness describes the sheep's responsiveness. Trained dogs use pressure to herd or shed sheep effectively, with handlers also applying pressure through body posture during shedding. Light sheep respond to minimal pressure but can panic under high pressure, while heavy sheep resist unless the pressure is high and applied from the front. Assessing sheep lightness early in trials is essential for effective control.

To convert this nuanced qualitative knowledge into a quantitative framework, we recognize that herding and shedding involve two steps: initially nudging stationary sheep gently to induce directional change without causing panic, followed by intensifying pressure to prompt movement (see SI Video 2)²⁷. Our focus is on the initial step, disregarding spatial dynamics and only considering sheep orientation. Sheep behavior depends on whether the dog is within their visual field, allowing us to categorize orientations into 4 directions relative to the dog: directly facing, perpendicular left, perpendicular right, and facing away. This model treats sheep as stationary pointers that dynamically reorient among these states, providing a simplified yet effective approach to studying their collective behavior (Figure 2a and SI Video 3). Pressure and lightness in this framework can be interpreted as the strength of the external stimulus and isotropy of responsiveness of an individual to the stimulus, respectively.




Figure 1. Human-Dog-Sheep Interaction in Small Groups **a** A Bronze Age rock art panel at Valhaug on Jæren in southwestern Norway showing a shepherd herding a small group of sheep with the help of a dog (Photo Credit: Paul G. Keil)²⁷. **b** Transition from single sheep response to large group response: While a single sheep flees under threat, sheep in a large group show selfish herd behavior. Sheep in small groups are highly indecisive and show a stochastic transition between the two behaviors, making the groups unpredictable. **c-e** Dynamics of herding in real sheep-dog system (SI video 2). **f-h** Dynamics of shedding in real sheep-dog system (SI video 2).


Modeling Indecisive Sheep Behavior

To model the indecisiveness in sheep behavior, we use a stochastic choice model for N_s individual sheep. Sheep reorient according to 3 rules: they get scared by the dog (or handler) and turn away at a rate α_{ik} (where i represents the initial orientation and k the dog (or handler)'s position), they copy the orientation of other sheep at a rate γ , or they spontaneously reorient without a specific stimulus at a rate ϵ (noise) (Figure 2b). Assuming the dog is always positioned in the South (S) and the handler in the North (N), sheep can reorient in 4 possible directions: N, S, East (E), and West (W) (Figure 2a). Unlike conventional approaches that average these influences at each time step²⁸, our model allows sheep to be influenced by one factor at a time, stochastically switching between them, extending individual-based binary-choice models^{29,30}.

Pressure ($P_k = \alpha_{kk}/\gamma$) is the influence of external stimuli (dog/handler) on a sheep facing the stimulus compared to the influence of other sheep, while lightness ($L = \alpha_{jS}/\alpha_{SS}$) is the isotropy of the sheep's response, defined as the influence of the dog on a sheep oriented perpendicular (E/W) to it compared to facing it (S). Here k is the position of the stimulus ($k = \{S, N\}$ for {dog, handler}), and j is the direction perpendicular to S. The parameter P_k ranges from 0 to P_{max} , the

maximum pressure at which sheep remain stationary. Beyond this pressure, sheep move. Lightness L ranges from 0 to 1; for light sheep ($L = 1$), the dog's threat is independent of orientation, while for heavy sheep ($L = 0$), those oriented perpendicular to the dog ignore its presence (Figure 2c).

By incorporating these definitions, the rates α_{ij} are $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{jj}$ if $i = j = \{S, N\}$, $\alpha_{ij} = L\alpha_{jj}$ if $i = \{E, W\}$ and $j = \{S, N\}$, and $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. We summarize the model with the following reaction scheme:



where x_i is a sheep oriented in the i^{th} direction. The total number of sheep is conserved ($X = \sum_i x_i = \text{constant}$). When influenced by an external stimulus, a sheep chooses a direction not facing the stimulus, and stimuli have no effect on sheep oriented away from them ($\alpha_{NS} = \alpha_{SN} = 0$).

The master equation for the transitions between different directions is³¹:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{P}(\bar{x}, t) = \sum_{\bar{x} \neq \bar{x}'} \text{Tr}(\bar{x}|\bar{x}') \mathcal{P}(\bar{x}') - \text{Tr}(\bar{x}'|\bar{x}) \mathcal{P}(\bar{x}) \quad (2)$$

where \bar{x} represents the number of sheep in the four orientations, \mathcal{P} is the probability of finding the system in state \bar{x}




Figure 2. Quantitative Framework for Modeling Sheep Behavior in the Presence of a Dog and Handler We simplify the model by making two assumptions: **a.** We only consider the orientation of the sheep and we bin the 2D space in 4 directions, allowing us to model sheep as stationary pointers that can reorient in 4 possible directions. **b.** Transition rules describe how a sheep changes its direction when influenced by dog, other sheep, or spontaneously due to random noise with rates α_{ij} , γ , and ϵ , respectively. The parameter α_{ij} represents the threat from the dog present in direction j on the sheep oriented in direction i . **c.** Definition of lightness and responsiveness of sheep. Light sheep ($L = 1$) respond to the dog irrespective of their orientation. Heavy sheep only respond if they are facing the dog. **d.** Description of herding and shedding processes in our model. In herding, the goal is to align all the sheep away from the dog, whereas in shedding, the goal is to divide the group into two subgroups as required (typically into 3 and 2). Shedding involves both the handler and the dog.

at time t , and $Tr(\bar{x}|\bar{y})$ are the transition rates derived in SI Section 3.

Dynamics of Herding and Shedding Sheep

Using our stochastic model and Gillespie’s algorithm³² to simulate sheep dynamics using Eqn (2), we investigate herding (orient sheep in N) and shedding (divide sheep in E&W) behaviors, focusing on a small group size of $N_s = 5$ (Figure 2d). Our model predicts distinct behaviors for light and heavy sheep under threat. Light sheep quickly reach a herding state and remain there, influenced only by random noise ϵ (Figure 3a Top). Heavy sheep exhibit intermittent herding and alignment orthogonally to the dog (Figure 3c Top). This behavior parallels noise-induced switching observed in other small-scale systems^{29,33,34}. Our model suggests that isotropic

response benefits herding, which is reinforced by comparing with real herding dynamics from sheep-dog trials video analysis (Figure 3a,c Bottom, SI Video 6 and 7).

In shedding, light sheep frequently reorient due to isotropic responsiveness (panicking), showing no discernible pattern (Figure 3b Top). However, heavy sheep align orthogonally to the dog and handler, switching synchronously between East and West due to their selective responsiveness (Figure 3d Top). Video analysis of real shedding behavior confirms our model predictions (Figure 3b,d Bottom, SI Video 8 and 9). Our simple model captures nuanced behavioral differences between light and heavy sheep during herding and shedding, demonstrating its validity against real system observations (see SI Video 4, and Table S1).

To assess which sheep are easier to control, we quantify




Figure 3. Dynamics of Sheep Herding and Shedding. **a,b Top:** Simulated time-series of the herding and shedding processes of a group of 5 sheep with $P = 1$ and $L = 0.9$. **Bottom:** Extracted transition time series from observed videos. **c,d** Herding and shedding process for heavy sheep. **Top:** Simulated time-series of the herding and shedding processes of a group of 5 sheep $P = 1$ and $L = 0.1$. **Bottom:** Extracted transition time series from observed videos. The red vertical lines represent shedding events. Obtaining a shedding event in light sheep is difficult because they panic and randomly reorient when sandwiched between the handler and the dog. However, heavy sheep synchronously switch between E and W, providing narrow windows for the dog-handler teams to perform the shed. **f,g** Effect of pressure and lightness on τ_{stay} and τ_{reach} for herding and shedding, respectively. **e,h** Ease of herding (E_h) and ease of shedding (E_s) as functions of pressure and lightness. The result shows that it is easier to herd light sheep but easier to shed a group with an intermediate lightness ($L \approx 0.1$).

herding and shedding success using reaching time (τ_{reach}) and staying time (τ_{stay}). Reaching time measures the duration for sheep to reach the desired orientation while staying time

indicates how long they remain there. Given the time-sensitive nature of sheep-dog trials, the optimal condition maximizes τ_{stay} and minimizes τ_{reach} , defining ease of herding (shedding)

$$E_{h(s)} = \tau_{\text{stay}} / \tau_{\text{reach}}.$$

Simulations reveal that in herding, τ_{reach} decreases with increased pressure or lightness, while τ_{stay} depends solely on noise ε (Figure 3f and SI Section 4). This indicates that the dog can apply pressure to align the sheep but cannot control the staying time in the desired orientation. Our analysis of E_h demonstrates that it is easier to herd light sheep than heavy sheep due to their uniform responsiveness to pressure (Figure 3e).

For shedding, the dog and handler create a transient split in the group, resulting in very short τ_{stay} . Here, τ_{reach} decreases with pressure but increases with lightness (Figure 3g). Our E_s analysis indicates that shedding both very heavy and very light sheep is particularly challenging (Figure 3h). In sheep-dog trials, shedding tasks push the capabilities of the dog-handler team to their limits, as the dog must counteract the sheep’s selfish herd behavior. The model also predicts the optimal pressure (P_{max}) for both herding and shedding, beyond which sheep flee uncontrollably (Figure 3e,h). In practice, dogs must apply precise pressure adjustments due to sheep heterogeneity and dynamic changes in lightness during tasks, underscoring the complexity of controlling indecisive collectives.

Bio-inspired Control of Indecisive Groups

To understand how shepherd dogs control indecisive sheep in small groups, we develop an Indecisive Collective Algorithm (ICA). A controller (dog) moves agents (sheep) toward a target location. In ICA, agents reorient continuously from $-\pi$ to π rather than in discrete directions (N, S, E, W) and move deterministically away from controllers. Orientation updates are triggered by repulsion from controllers (α), alignment with other agents (γ), or random estimate of their target location ε (see SI Section 5). Unlike standard averaging-based algorithms (ASA), where agents average the effects of all factors^{28,35–37}, ICA agents switch stochastically between influencing factors (Figure 4a,b).

Analysis of herding videos reveals that shepherd dogs control sheep by applying time-varying pressure, pausing, laying down, and waiting until the sheep are in a preferred orientation before moving them. Integrating this critical insight, our simulations qualitatively match real dog-herding behaviors, indicating that effective control of indecisive collectives requires independent regulation of movement and orientation. Simulations show that without this independent control, herding agents to a target is impossible due to their random movements (SI Video 5).

In herding, ASA agents maintain orientation but are noise-corrupted, while ICA agents alternate between epochs of perfect herding and random reorientation (Figure 4c). Using the ease of herding metric E_h under varying pressure ($P = \alpha/\gamma$), we find that ASA excels in low-noise conditions (ε/γ), but ICA performs better in high-noise regimes (Figure 4e). For shedding, ASA fails as agents do not split, leading to ICA consistently outperforming ASA (Figure 4d,f). Introducing indecisiveness and stochasticity improves control for complex

tasks involving both herding and splitting.

Recent interest in bio-inspired swarm robotics has highlighted the challenges of decentralized control³⁸. Systematically controlling a swarm and orchestrating divisions on demand are notably difficult. Simple control algorithms exist for singling out robots from swarms^{39,40}, but these approaches are heuristic. Our results show that deliberate indecisiveness can improve controllability, providing a general framework for swarm control.

Unifying Phase Diagram of Sheep Behavior

Our model, designed for small groups ($N_s \leq 5$), explains that indecisive collective behavior dissipates in larger groups, where selfish herd behavior predominates under threat. This shift hinges on the perceived threat from the dog, linking the parameters α and γ . Large groups lack the orientational alignment found in smaller groups. By incorporating the interdependence of α and γ and generalizing sheep-sheep interactions, we propose a unified phase diagram for sheep behavior (see SI Section 6). The heatmap in Figure 5 illustrates the probability fractions of sheep being influenced by controlling stimuli α , other sheep γ , and non-specific stimuli ε (noise). Given the dependency of α and γ , pressure ($P = \alpha/\gamma$) is not a linear function of α . We examine behavior transitions as a function of group size (N_s) and stimulus specificity (α/ε).

Our phase diagram reveals three behavioral regimes: fleeing (blue), dominated by α ; flocking (red), dominated by γ ; and grazing (green), dominated by ε . In small groups, increasing α/ε shifts behavior from grazing to fleeing. Larger groups predominantly exhibit flocking behavior.

We validate our model using existing studies. King et al.¹⁴ (circle) demonstrated that intermediate groups (50 sheep) exhibit selfish herd behavior under threat, with herding dogs inducing cohesion. Toulet et al.⁴¹ (square) found that intermediate groups (8 to 32 sheep) reach a consensus when a trained sheep departs or stops, despite lower stimulus specificity than in King et al. Ginelli et al.⁴² and Gomez-Nava et al.⁴³ (star and triangle) investigated dynamics without external stimuli. Ginelli focused on large groups (100 sheep), while Gomez-Nava studied small groups (4 sheep). Both observed intermittent flocking and grazing epochs, suggesting evolutionary anticipation of stimuli as a defense mechanism. These studies fall on the grazing-flocking transition line. Our model (red line) shows that increasing external stimulus shifts behavior from grazing to uncontrolled fleeing through a narrow flocking phase, underscoring the challenge of controlling small indecisive collectives.

Concluding Remarks

This study demonstrates that despite numerous variables influencing the complex behavior of individual sheep, a simplified stochastic framework using pressure and lightness effectively predicts the qualitative dynamics of small sheep groups under threat. Our analysis highlights the challenges of controlling noisy, indecisive collectives. Lightness, interpreted as the isotropy of an agent’s responsiveness to external stimuli,




Figure 4. Comparison of ASA and ICA in Herding and Shedding Tasks **a,b** Schematic representations of Averaging-Based Swarm Algorithm (ASA) and Indecisive Collective Algorithm (ICA). ASA agents average the influence of all factors to update their orientation, while ICA agents stochastically switch between single influencing factors. **c-d** Time series showing the dynamics of a swarm under ASA and ICA during herding and shedding processes for $\alpha = \gamma = \epsilon = 0.1$. **e,f** Evaluation of ease of herding (E_h) and ease of shedding (E_s) for both algorithms. ASA performs better in herding under high pressure and low relative noise, but ICA excels in high-noise conditions. For shedding, ICA consistently outperforms ASA, as ASA fails to split the swarm.

shows that while high isotropy aids group cohesion, it complicates group splitting, suggesting a preference for lower isotropy in such cases.

There is growing interest in designing robots and drones to herd farm animals, potentially replacing herding dogs⁴⁴.

These systems require significant leaps in cognitive capabilities. Successful dog-handler teams operate as distributed cognitive networks, combining the dog's instinctive sheep response prediction with command obedience from the handler²⁷. Studying these interactions could enhance swarm




Figure 5. Unifying Phase Diagram of Sheep Behavior. Qualitative phase diagram for sheep behavior as a function of group size (N_s) and specificity of external stimulus (α/ϵ). The distinct regimes - fleeing (blue, α dominated), flocking (blue, γ dominated), and grazing (green, ϵ dominated) - are shown. Black shapes represent literature results for different N_s and stimulus specificity (α/ϵ). The ● indicates King et al.'s¹⁴ finding that intermediate groups (50 sheep) exhibit selfish herd behavior under threat. The ■ represents Toulet et al.'s⁴¹ study of consensus in intermediate (8 to 32 sheep) following a trained sheep. The ★ and ▲ denote Ginelli et al.'s⁴² and Gomez-Nava et al.'s⁴³ findings of intermittent flocking and grazing epochs in large (100 sheep) and small groups (4 sheep), respectively. The red line shows the behavior range in sheepdog trials, transitioning from grazing to uncontrolled fleeing through a narrow flocking phase, highlighting the difficulty of managing small indecisive groups of sheep.

robotic control by implementing distributed cognitive mechanisms among diverse agents, such as drones, quadruped robots, and human or AI operators.

Without external stimuli (dog/handler), our model extends a general stochastic framework commonly applied to various systems, including auto-catalytic biochemical reactions⁴⁵, heterogeneous cancer cell populations⁴⁶, collective animal movement^{29,33,34}, and human opinion dynamics⁴⁷. By integrating the concept of an external handler (shepherd), our

model offers a foundational framework for controlling noisy, indecisive groups across various domains.

1 Acknowledgements

We thank Ceri S. Rundle for allowing us to use the data of the sheepdog trials "A way with the dogs" on her YouTube channel CSJ Specialist Canine Feeds. We express our gratitude to Doyle Ivie of Woodsend Stock Dogs for sharing his expertise on sheepdog trials and dog training. We also thank Matthew Bull, Benjamin Seleb, Atanu Chatterjee, Pankaj Rohilla, and Ishant Tiwari for the discussions and feedback on the manuscript. M.S.B. acknowledges funding support from NIH MIRA Grant R35GM142588; NSF Grants PHY-2310691; CMMI-2218382; CAREER iOS-1941933; and the Open Philanthropy Project.

2 Author contributions

T.C. and M.S.B. conceptualized the study. T.C. derived the mathematical models, performed the simulations, and analyzed the data. Both the authors contributed to writing the manuscript. M.S.B. supervised the project.

3 Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

4 Materials & Correspondence

For materials and correspondence, please contact Saad Bhamla.

References

1. Clucas, B., Owings, D. H. & Rowe, M. P. Donning your enemy's cloak: ground squirrels exploit rattlesnake scent to reduce predation risk. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **275**, 847–852 (2008).
2. Corcoran, A. J., Barber, J. R. & Conner, W. E. Tiger moth jams bat sonar. *Science* **325**, 325–327 (2009).
3. C. D. FitzGibbon & J. H. Fanshawe. Stotting in thomson's gazelles: An honest signal of condition. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **23**, 69–74 (1988).
4. Leal, M. Honest signalling during prey-predator interactions in the lizard anolis cristatellus. *Anim. Behav.* **58**, 521–526 (1999).
5. Stuart-Fox, D., Moussalli, A. & Whiting, M. J. Predator-specific camouflage in chameleons. *Biol. Lett.* **4**, 326–329 (2008).
6. Stachowicz, J. J. & Hay, M. E. Geographic variation in camouflage specialization by a decorator crab. *Am. Nat.* **156**, 59–71 (2000).
7. Domenici, P., Blagburn, J. M. & Bacon, J. P. Animal escapology i: theoretical issues and emerging trends in escape trajectories. *J. Exp. Biol.* **214**, 2463–2473 (2011).

8. Ruxton, G. D. *et al.* *Living in groups* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
9. Hamilton, W. D. Geometry for the selfish herd. *J. theoretical Biol.* **31**, 295–311 (1971).
10. Papadopoulou, M., Hildenbrandt, H., Sankey, D. W., Portugal, S. J. & Hemelrijk, C. K. Self-organization of collective escape in pigeon flocks. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **18**, e1009772 (2022).
11. Storms, R., Carere, C., Zoratto, F. & Hemelrijk, C. Complex patterns of collective escape in starling flocks under predation. *Behav. ecology sociobiology* **73**, 1–10 (2019).
12. Doran, C. *et al.* Fish waves as emergent collective antipredator behavior. *Curr. Biol.* **32**, 708–714 (2022).
13. Kastberger, G., Schmelzer, E. & Kranner, I. Social waves in giant honeybees repel hornets. *PLoS One* **3**, e3141 (2008).
14. King, A. J. *et al.* Selfish-herd behaviour of sheep under threat. *Curr. Biol.* **22**, R561–2 (2012).
15. Harrison, R. A., van Leeuwen, E. J. C. & Whiten, A. Chimpanzees' behavioral flexibility, social tolerance, and use of tool-composites in a progressively challenging foraging problem. *iScience* **24**, 102033 (2021).
16. Dannenberg, A. & Khachatryan, E. A comparison of individual and group behavior in a competition with cheating opportunities. *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.* **177**, 533–547 (2020).
17. Mazzei, R., Soares, M. C. & Bshary, R. Social organization variation and behavioural flexibility in the facultative cleaning goby *elacatinus prochilos*. *Anim. Behav.* **174**, 187–195 (2021).
18. Schoepf, I. & Schradin, C. Differences in social behaviour between group-living and solitary african striped mice, *rhabdomys pumilio*. *Anim. Behav.* **84**, 1159–1167 (2012).
19. de Alcantara Viana, J. V., Vieira, C., Duarte, R. C. & Romero, G. Q. Predator responses to prey camouflage strategies: a meta-analysis. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **289**, 20220980 (2022).
20. Pembury Smith, M. Q. R. & Ruxton, G. D. Camouflage in predators. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **95**, 1325–1340 (2020).
21. Greco, G. & Pugno, N. M. How spiders hunt heavy prey: the tangle web as a pulley and spider's lifting mechanics observed and quantified in the laboratory. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **18**, 20200907 (2021).
22. David Mech, L., Smith, D. W. & MacNulty, D. R. *Wolves on the Hunt* (University of Chicago Press, 2015).
23. Scheel, D. & Packer, C. Group hunting behaviour of lions: a search for cooperation. *Anim. Behav.* **41**, 697–709 (1991).
24. The Hunt, BBC Earth. <https://www.bbcearth.com/shows/the-hunt>.
25. Grandin, T. *Livestock handling and transport* (Cabi, 2019).
26. History of the ISDS. <https://www.isds.org.uk/the-isds/history-of-the-isds/>. Accessed: 2024-3-16.
27. Keil, P. G. Human-sheepdog distributed cognitive systems: An analysis of interspecies cognitive scaffolding in a sheepdog trial. *J. Cogn. Cult.* **15**, 508–529 (2015).
28. Ranganathan, A., Heyde, A., Gupta, A. & Mahadevan, L. Optimal shepherding and transport of a flock. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04352* (2022).
29. Biancalani, T., Dyson, L. & McKane, A. J. Noise-induced bistable states and their mean switching time in foraging colonies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 038101 (2014).
30. Dyson, L., Yates, C. A., Buhl, C. & McKane, A. J. Onset of collective motion in locusts is captured by a minimal model. *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 052708 (2015).
31. Erban, R. & Chapman, S. J. Stochastic modelling of reaction–diffusion processes: algorithms for bimolecular reactions. *Phys. biology* **6**, 046001 (2009).
32. Asmussen, S. & Glynn, P. W. *Stochastic simulation: algorithms and analysis*, vol. 57 (Springer, 2007).
33. Jhavar, J. & Guttal, V. Noise-induced effects in collective dynamics and inferring local interactions from data. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **375**, 20190381 (2020).
34. Buhl, J. *et al.* From disorder to order in marching locusts. *Science* **312**, 1402–1406 (2006).
35. Go, C. K., Koganti, N. & Ikeda, K. Solving the shepherding problem: Imitation learning can acquire the switching algorithm. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 1–7 (IEEE, 2021).
36. Strömbom, D. *et al.* Solving the shepherding problem: heuristics for herding autonomous, interacting agents. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **11**, 20140719 (2014).
37. Long, N. K., Sammut, K., Sgarioto, D., Garratt, M. & Abbass, H. A comprehensive review of shepherding as a bio-inspired Swarm-Robotics guidance approach. *IEEE Transactions on Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.* .
38. Long, N. K., Sammut, K., Sgarioto, D., Garratt, M. & Abbass, H. A. A comprehensive review of shepherding as a bio-inspired swarm-robotics guidance approach. *IEEE Transactions on Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.* **4**, 523–537 (2020).
39. Deng, Y., Ogura, M., Li, A. & Wakamiya, N. Shepherding control for separating a single agent from a swarm. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* **55**, 217–222 (2022).
40. Arques, P., Aznar, F., Pujol, M. & Rizo, R. Obtaining emergent behaviors for swarm robotics singling with deep reinforcement learning. *Adv. Robotics* **37**, 702–717 (2023).

41. Toulet, S., Gautrais, J., Bon, R. & Peruani, F. Imitation combined with a characteristic stimulus duration results in robust collective decision-making. *PloS one* **10**, e0140188 (2015).
42. Ginelli, F. *et al.* Intermittent collective dynamics emerge from conflicting imperatives in sheep herds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 12729–12734 (2015).
43. Gómez-Nava, L., Bon, R. & Peruani, F. Intermittent collective motion in sheep results from alternating the role of leader and follower. *Nat. Phys.* **18**, 1494–1501 (2022).
44. King, A. J. *et al.* Biologically inspired herding of animal groups by robots. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **14**, 478–486 (2023).
45. Togashi, Y. & Kaneko, K. Transitions induced by the discreteness of molecules in a small autocatalytic system. *Phys. review letters* **86**, 2459 (2001).
46. Sardanyés, J. & Alarcón, T. Noise-induced bistability in the fate of cancer phenotypic quasispecies: a bit-strings approach. *Sci. reports* **8**, 1027 (2018).
47. Caligiuri, A. & Galla, T. Noisy voter models in switching environments. *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 044301 (2023).