

Impossibility of Self-Organized Aggregation without Computation

Roy Steinberg* and Kiril Solovey*

Abstract—In their seminal work, Gauci et al. (2014) studied the fundamental task of aggregation, wherein multiple robots need to gather without an a priori agreed-upon meeting location, using minimal hardware. That paper considered differential-drive robots that are memoryless and unable to compute. Moreover, the robots cannot communicate with one another and are only equipped with a simple sensor that determines whether another robot is directly in front of them. Despite those severe limitations, Gauci et al. introduced a controller and proved mathematically that it aggregates a system of two robots for any initial state. Unfortunately, for larger systems, the same controller aggregates empirically in many cases but not all. Thus, the question of whether a controller exists that aggregates for any number of robots remains open. In this paper, we show that no such controller exists by investigating the geometric structure of controllers. In addition, we disprove the aggregation proof of the paper above for two robots and present an alternative controller alongside a simple and rigorous aggregation proof.

I. INTRODUCTION

Diverse species, from ants to birds, fish, and mammals, exhibit swarm intelligence, wherein relatively simple mechanisms deployed by individuals lead to an emergent collective behavior. Taking inspiration from the natural world, research on swarm robotics seeks to develop low-cost robots that can collectively execute complex tasks only by relying on simple and local control laws and without explicit communication. This includes collective decision-making between robots and animals [1], robots building complex structures [2], and particle assembly via global control [3].

A fundamental emergent behavior is aggregation (also known as gathering), where the robots must reach sufficiently close to one another without a priori agreeing upon a predefined meeting location. In recent years, various approaches have been introduced towards swarm aggregation, from genetic programming [4], to settings with limited sensing abilities [5], [6], and algorithms relying on potential functions [7], [8]. Although some approaches guarantee aggregation, they usually require complex computational abilities and memory.

The distributed computation community has also considered aggregation (see, e.g., [9]–[11]) where solutions that guarantee aggregation for any number of robots have been developed by relying on geometric control laws (e.g., moving towards the center of gravity of the robots). However, the proposed methods rely on strong assumptions such as knowledge of the locations of all the robots and the absence of kinematic motion or collision avoidance constraints, making them unsuitable in practice.

Aggregation under a far less restrictive set of assumptions has been studied in [12], where the authors considered a memoryless controller for a group of homogeneous differential-drive (DD) robots. Here, the robots can obtain information about other robots through a binary sensor indicating whether another robot is in front of them. Considering those constraints, the controller of a given robot is *bimodal*, as it specifies a robot’s action depending on whether there is another robot in front of it. In particular, a bimodal controller is a four-dimensional vector specifying the speed of each of the two robot wheels for every mode.

To find an aggregating bimodal controller, the authors of [12] empirically obtained the controller $u_{prev} := (-0.7, -1, 1, -1)$ through an exhaustive search of the four-dimensional control space. This controller yields a backward circular motion of the robot when no other robot is in sight, and a rotation on the spot otherwise. The paper provided a theoretical proof for aggregating two robots using the controller. However, no proof has been shown for a larger robot number $n > 2$. Instead, simulations and hardware experiments using ‘e-puck’ DD robots [13] have demonstrated that aggregation occurs within the allotted time budget in most cases.

The idea that u_{prev} leads to aggregation for any $n \geq 2$ has recently been challenged. The paper [14] has shown a counterexample consisting of initial robot locations in which no aggregation would occur for any $n \geq 4$. In particular, by placing pairs of robots facing directly away from each other, deadlocking can occur (see Fig. 3a), as each robot attempts to move backward but is blocked by its partner. This causes each pair to stagnate. Interestingly, it is demonstrated empirically in [14] that some levels of noise (with respect to sensor and motion models) can help in escaping deadlocks for u_{prev} , but too much noise can be detrimental for aggregation. Unfortunately, no theoretical analysis is provided. The question posed by the authors of [12] whether there exists an aggregating controller for any $n \geq 2$ remains open.

Contribution. In this paper, we answer the above question in the negative for a general number of robots, alongside strengthening the understanding of the case of two robots. Our contributions are as follows. **(i)** We identify an implicit (and unreasonable) assumption made in the aggregation proof for two robots using u_{prev} in [12], which deems the proof incomplete. **(ii)** We present an alternative controller alongside a simple and rigorous aggregation proof for two robots. **(iii)** We prove that no bimodal controller can achieve aggregation for *all* $n > 2$. **(iv)** We mathematically prove

* Electrical & Computer Engineering, Technion, Haifa, Israel. {roysteinberg@campus., kirilsol@}technion.ac.il

that for some controller types, initial robot states that lead to nonaggregation do not have to be singular. That is, we show that when the initial states are chosen at random, the probability of nonaggregation is strictly larger than zero. (v) Finally, we empirically demonstrate that our 2-robot controller outperforms the controller u_{prev} , and test the effect of noise and slippage on nonaggregation.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

We consider a system of homogeneous disk-shaped DD robots operating in an obstacle-free environment. The left and right wheel speeds of a given robot are individually controlled and denoted by v_l and v_r , respectively. A robot's state space is $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1$, where a state consists of the (x, y) coordinates of the robot's center, and its orientation θ . The kinematic constraints of a robot are given as the ODE $\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{\theta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ v_r \end{pmatrix}$, where $v = \frac{v_l + v_r}{2}$ is the tangential speed, $\omega = \frac{v_r - v_l}{d_{iw}}$ is the angular velocity, with inter-wheel diameter $d_{iw} > 0$ [15].¹

Each robot is equipped with a binary sensor, which determines whether there is another robot along the infinite ray emanating from the ego robot's center, with orientation θ . If there is no robot in sight, the output is '0', and '1' otherwise.

Before proceeding to the problem statement, we state four assumptions. (1) Following [12], the robots are memoryless and cannot communicate. Next, we introduce several assumptions to make the analysis tractable. (2) The robots cannot push each other upon collision (i.e., all collisions are purely plastic, and no momentum is conserved). (3) No noise in the motion model or sensor measurements is present. (4) There is no tire slippage.

Considering that the robots cannot communicate or compute, a controller is of the form $(v_{l,0}, v_{r,0}, v_{l,1}, v_{r,1})$, where v_l and v_r are the controls for the left and right wheels respectively, with the subscripts 1 and 0 indicating that another robot is in the line of sight (LoS) or not, respectively. The controls are normalized by dividing the speed of each wheel by the maximum speed. We denote the space of all bimodal controllers by \mathcal{U} . Note that as the robots are homogeneous, they all use the same bimodal controller.

We are interested in designing bimodal controllers that lead to aggregation, which is defined as follows. Given that the state space of an individual robot is $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1$, the state space of the multi-robot system can be described as $\mathcal{X}^n := \mathcal{X} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}$, where $n \geq 2$ is the number of robots. For a given multi-robot (MR) state $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$ we use $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ to denote the i th robot state, where $1 \leq i \leq n$. We denote by $\mathcal{X}_f^n \subset \mathcal{X}^n$ the free space, i.e., for any $x \in \mathcal{X}_f^n$ and any two robots $i \neq j$ it holds that $\|x_i - x_j\| \geq 2r$.

We denote by $\mathcal{X}_a^n \subset \mathcal{X}_f^n$ the set of aggregated MR states. In particular, a MR state $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is in \mathcal{X}_a^n if and only if the set $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{r+\rho}(x_i)$ is *connected* in \mathbb{R}^2 , where $\mathcal{D}_{r+\rho}(x_i)$ is a $(r + \rho)$ -disc centered at x_i for some user-defined value

¹In our calculation, we use the dimensions of the e-puck robot [13]. The robots are disc-shaped of radius $r = 3.7$ [cm], inter-wheel diameter $d_{iw} = 5.1$ [cm], and maximum wheel speed $v_i = 12.8$ $\left[\frac{\text{cm}}{\text{s}}\right]$ each.

$\rho \geq 0$.² Our definition of aggregation is weaker than the one considered in [14], where the discs are required to form a *compact* set. As a result, our impossibility proofs are more general, as they also apply for the compact setting.

Denote by $\pi_{x_0, u} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ the trajectory describing the motion of the robots over time from an initial state $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^n$ (i.e., $\pi_{x_0, u}(0) = x_0$) for a given (bimodal) controller $u \in \mathcal{U}$. We are ready to define our problem, which is designing a bimodal controller that leads to aggregation.

Problem 1. Find a bimodal controller $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for any number of robots $n \geq 2$ and initial MR state $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^n$ the system aggregates. That is, for every $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^n$ there exists $t \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\pi_{x_0, u}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_a^n$.

III. AGGREGATION FOR TWO ROBOTS

In this section, we consider the most simple setting of two robots ($n = 2$). We first point out an issue in the proof a previous work [12] which claimed to have found an aggregating controller for this case. Then, we provide an alternative controller and formally prove that it aggregates.

A. Issue in a previous proof and a possible remedy

A proof was provided for the aggregation of two robots using the aforementioned $u_{prev} = (-0.7, -1, 1, -1)$ in [12]. The motion of the DD robots using this controller is divided into two parts. For every robot i , when no other robot is in its LoS a backwards, clockwise circular motion is followed. The center of this rotation is referred to as the instantaneous center of rotation (ICR), and the radius of the circle is denoted as R . If another robot is in the LoS, the ego robot rotates clockwise on the spot.

The proof proceeds as follows. When robot j enters the LoS of robot i , it starts rotating on the spot, and as its ICR is located at a fixed distance and angle in relation to i , it moves closer towards robot j . While the distance between the ICR of the robots during their motion could not be solved analytically, an expression was found that, when solved numerically, led to a solution depending on the initial distance between the two robots and the angle of robot j .

An implicit assumption is made that if at time t the distance between the two robots satisfies $d \leq 2(R + r)$, then aggregation is assured at time $t' > t$. This assumption is sound for a scenario in which the two robots can see one another at some point in time, and begin their aggregation. However, the two robots can be positioned such that this distance is satisfied, yet the robots do not aggregate (see Fig. 1).

To circumvent this issue, we suggest to revise u_{prev} into a controller of the form $(-a, -b, 1, -1)$ for $b > a > 0$ such that the resulting radius of circular motion \tilde{R} is small enough that the two robots cannot simultaneously inhabit the same perimeter of circle with radius \tilde{R} . In other words, if $\tilde{R} \leq r$ then both robots will eventually see one another and thus ultimately aggregate. For instance, consider the controller

²For simplicity, in our proofs we set the padding parameter zero, but they can be generalized to any value of $\rho \geq 0$.




Fig. 1. An example of a no-sensing scenario with two moving robots which violates an assumption made in the aggregation proof for two robots [12]. Both robots move along the dashed circle of radius R centered around the ICR with the same speed and never see one another or aggregate.

$\tilde{u}_{prev} := (-0.18, -1, 1, -1)$, which yields the radius $\tilde{R} = 3.67$ [cm]. Unfortunately, we do not have a formal proof to show that the revised controller \tilde{u}_{prev} aggregates. We did evaluate this claim experimentally where \tilde{u}_{prev} aggregated for all initial states (see Sec. VI), in contrast to u_{prev} which fails in a significant number of test.

B. An alternative provably-aggregating controller

We introduce an alternative bimodal controller u^* and formally prove that it aggregates. The controller u^* rotates the robot on the spot in a clockwise manner while no robot is not in the LoS and moves straight forward otherwise.

Lemma 1. *The bimodal controller $u^* = (-a, a, b, b)$, where $a, b \in (0, 1]$ is aggregating for $n = 2$.*

Proof. We apply the controller u^* where both robots are at an arbitrary initial MR state $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^2$ at time $t = 0$. We partition the proof into three cases.

(C1): If both robots see one another at time t then they move in a straight line along their LoS. We prove that if this occurs, the robots will eventually aggregate while maintaining a LoS throughout the motion. Without loss of generality, we assume that at time t the heading of robot 0 is the x-axis $\theta_0(t) = 0$, and its position is $(x_0(t), y_0(t)) = (0, 0)$. As robot 1 is in the LoS of robot 0, its y coordinate $y_1(t)$ must be in the range $[-r, r]$. Also denote $(x, y) := (x_1(t), y_1(t))$. Denote by $v_0, v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the rays corresponding to the headings of robot 0 and 1, respectively, at time t , which begin at the robots' locations at time t (notice that the orientation or origin of the rays is fixed with respect to time t). Denote by $v_i(\tilde{t})$ the location along v_i robot i would reach in time $\tilde{t} \geq t$ had it been moving forward along it from time t (see Fig. 2).

Denote by $(\ell, 0) := v_0(t')$ the first intersection point of v_0 with the boundary of robot 1 for some time $t' \geq t$. Similarly, denote by $(x'', y'') := v_1(t'')$ the first intersection point of v_1 with the boundary of robot 0, and notice that $y'' \in [-r, r]$. Without loss of generality, assume that $t' \leq t''$ and denote $(x', y') := v_1(t')$ (otherwise, we switch the roles between the two robots and transform the system accordingly). Next, we show that if both robots follow v_0 and v_1 from time t they will maintain visibility until colliding. Observe that robot 1 will remain visible to robot 0 since $y, y'' \in [-r, r]$. From symmetry, robot 0 will remain visible for robot 1.




Fig. 2. Illustration for Case 1 in the Lemma 1 proof. Robot 0 and 1 are in blue and red, respectively, with corresponding rays v_0, v_1 as dashed lines.

It remains to show that robots 0 and 1 will eventually collide with one another as they proceed along v_0 and v_1 , respectively. For the proof below, we allow the robots to overlap and pass each other as they move along v_0 and v_1 , which implies aggregation at an earlier time. As robot 1 reaches (x', y') before (x'', y'') , we have that $y' \in [-r, r]$ as well. Next, notice that if $x' > \ell$ then the two robots must be in collision in time t as $(x', y') \in \mathcal{D}_r(x, y)$, which implies that $\|(\ell, 0)\| = \|(x', y') - (x, y)\| < r$. Thus, $x' \leq \ell$. Since the x coordinate of robot 0 monotonically increases between time t and t' along v_0 from the values 0 to ℓ , and the x coordinate of robot 1 monotonically decreases along v_1 between time t and t' from the values x to x' , where $0 \leq x'$ and $x' \leq \ell$, there must be a time t^* , where $t \leq t^* \leq t'$, such that x coordinates of both robots are the same. As their y coordinates cannot be more than r apart, the robots are in collision. This implies that at an earlier time than t^* , the robots aggregated.

(C2) Now suppose that only one of the robots (without loss of generality, robot 0) sees the other (robot 1) at time t . Thus, robot 0 starts moving in a straight line while robot 1 rotates on the spot. If robot 0 reaches robot 1 before the latter sees him, then aggregation occurs. Otherwise, if both robots see each other, then we transfer to C1, which also yields aggregation.

(C3): In the final case, none of the robots sees the other at time t and thus rotates in place. Consequently, after a finite $t' > t$, at least one of the robots will see the other, which leads to either C1 or C2. To conclude, for any initial state, the resulting trajectory goes through each of the three cases at most once. \square

We note that a time bound can be obtained for the suggested controller by looking at the worst case scenarios for each of the three cases. By summing the individual time bounds for each case we receive a bound for the aggregation of two robots using u^* .

IV. IMPOSSIBILITY OF AGGREGATION FOR $n > 2$ ROBOTS

While we have shown that there exists at least one controller which aggregates for $n = 2$ robots, we now prove that no controller aggregates for all $n \geq 2$.

Theorem 1. *For any bimodal controller $u \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists a robot number $n_u \geq 2$ and an initial MR state $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^{n_u}$ such that u does not aggregate.*

Proof. We categorize the various types of movement that a robot makes, and the corresponding controllers. A bimodal controller is defined by one constant controller (A) when a robot is not in sight and a second constant controller (B) otherwise. All possible mode controllers are described in the following table, with the values $a, b \in (0, 1]$, where $a \neq b$, representing normalized wheel controls.

Movement type	Control input
Straight Forwards (SF)	(a, a)
Straight Backwards (SB)	$(-a, -a)$
Circular Forwards (CF)	(a, b)
Circular Backwards (CB)	$(-a, -b)$
Rotate on Spot (RS)	$(\pm a, \mp a)$
Stand Still (SS)	$(0, 0)$

We have 36 different possible categories of bimodal controllers. We identify a specific category by concatenating the labels of the A controller and the B controller. E.g., the label SF-CB represents bimodal controllers moving straight forward without a robot in sight, and circularly backward otherwise. XX denotes any of the controllers for A or B.

Next, we consider all bimodal controller categories, for which we provide counterexamples (numbers in the parentheses indicate the additional controllers types eliminated).

CB-RS (1). For this type of controller, deadlocking scenarios have been shown to guarantee nonaggregation [14] for any $n_u \geq 4$, as we discussed in Sec. I. Although no-slippage is one of the assumptions we make, which allows to guarantee that deadlocking persists, we provide a slightly more complex counterexample robust to slippage (see Sec. VI). A ring of robots, facing outwards radially, are placed in a ring centered on the origin, while one robot is placed on the origin (see Fig. 3b). The outside robots attempt to move backwards, as another robot is not currently in sight, but are blocked by their neighbors and thus cannot move. The robot situated on the origin always has another robot in its LoS, and thus continues to rotate on the spot. As such, we can guarantee that aggregation will not occur.

SS-SS, SS-XX, XX-SS (11). Any controller, including a stationary controller in either control scheme, trivially, cannot promise aggregation, even for $n_u = 2$ robots. We place the robots such that they are all looking at one another (for the XX-SS scenario) or that none of the robots see another (for SS-XX), ensuring the robots will be frozen in place.

XX-SF, XX-CF (10). We reuse the deadlocking scenario, but this time the robots in each pair face each other. This scenario promises nonaggregation independent of control scheme A, as the robots cannot move from their initial, nonaggregated, positions.

XX-SB (5). If control scheme B is purely backwards, nonaggregation can be promised by having two robots face each other initially. As the LoS is infinite, both robots will drive backwards eternally, regardless of control scheme A. We can continue adding more pairs of robots situated horizontally to existing pairs. As the robots move on the same line, their LoS




Fig. 3. Counterexamples for bimodal controllers. (a) Based on [14], each robot equipped with an {SB,CB}-XX has no other robot in sight and is blocked by another robot from behind. (b) A different counterexample for a CB-RS controller, where the center robot is stuck continuously rotating. (c) A XX-CB controller causes all peripheral robots to be stuck, as they attempt to move backwards but are blocked by their neighbor.

always includes another robot, promising that they continue their movement and never aggregate.

XX-CB (5). We expand on the CB-RS counterexample, and develop a counterexample where $n - 1$ robots are oriented in a ring, with another robot in the middle. The robots in the ring are positioned such that each robot sees its neighbor to the right, and due to their arrangement they maintain their states, and consequently the ring structure, throughout the controller execution (see Fig. 3c). Thus, the robot in the middle always maintains visibility with one of the robots encircling it. Now, if the size of the ring is small enough with respect to the radius R of the circle of motion induced by the CB controller, the lone robot could eventually reach the ring robots, which would result in an aggregation. Thus, we specify the ring of robots to be large enough such that no aggregation occurs. In particular, for a given radius R we can determine geometrically a minimal number of robots to form a bounding ring.

XX-RS (4). An RS-RS controller is trivially nonaggregating. For {SB,CB}-RS, we have shown for CB-RS controllers (Fig. 3b) that when the ring robots are initially orientated outwards radially, these robots are blocked by their neighbors. Finally, for a {SF,CF}-RS controller we can place each robot in an orientation very similar to the XX-CB controller case, but this time the robots just barely miss each other and do not shift to control B. As they attempt to move forwards they are blocked by the neighbor in front, in the same manner that an XX-CB controller is blocked from behind. \square

V. NONSINGULARITY OF NONAGGREGATING STATES

The counterexamples for nonaggregation of $n > 2$ robots so far require a particular configuration of the initial robot states. Applying random perturbations, which slightly alter the robots' positions and orientations, might result in aggregation. In this section we consider the question of whether all nonaggregating initial states are singular states, that is, the probability of choosing those states is equal to zero, when the robots' states are sampled uniformly at random from a finite domain. We first answer this question in the negative for a specific subset of the controller group CB-XX which includes the controller u_{prev} .

Theorem 2. Consider a CB-XX controller $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that control A induces a circular motion of radius $R > 1.707r$. Fix an even number of robots $n \geq 4$. Then the probability of nonaggregation of π_{u,x_0} over the uniform random choice of the initial MR state x_0 from a large enough workspace is strictly positive.

Proof. We are looking for a family of MR states $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_f^n$, such that the robots are grouped into pairs, and the following conditions are satisfied: (i) No pair of robots will see another pair at any time. (ii) No pair of robots will be seen by another pair at any time. (iii) All pairs will end up individually deadlocked.

To answer the first item, we wish to find an initial configuration that ensures no robot will see more than a quarter of its visible plane during its motion. As every pair of robots must arrive in a deadlock, we start by looking at the possibilities of deadlocking the first two robots 0 and 1. Consider an initial scenario in which the ICR of robots 0 and 1 are situated at $(-R, 0)$, $(R, 0)$, respectively. If placed at opposite initial orientations and ignoring collisions, the two robots reach the origin at time t . At this time, the distance between each robot and the origin is zero, and the overlap between the two is their entire area—a circle with a radius of r . As we are excluding collisions, the two robots will stop before reaching this point, but this does demonstrate that if at time t there exists an overlap between the two robots (if ignoring collisions), then a deadlock must have occurred at time $t' < t$.

To ensure that no more than an eighth of the plane is visible during the motion between time 0 to t , we set the initial position of robot 0 to $(x_0, y_0) = \left(-R \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \frac{R}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$, or an eighth of an arc backwards from the point of deadlocking (see Fig. 4). Specifically, robot 0 can see points (x, y) that satisfy $\{\max(x, -x - y) \leq 0\}$. As robot 1 is set to the same arc, its position is simply $(x_1, y_1) = -(x_0, y_0)$. Similarly, this robot sees the set $\{\max(-x, y + x) \leq 0\}$ from time 0 to t . The radii R which enable this are all $R > \frac{r}{2 - \sqrt{2}} > 1.707r$, as the distance between the initial robots 0 and 1 states must be at least $2r$. Using this, the starting orientations of robots 0 and 1 are $\theta_0 := \frac{3\pi}{4}$ and $\theta_1 := -\frac{\pi}{4}$, respectively and with respect to the positive x-axis.

Next, we define a maximal perturbation $\varepsilon^* = (\varepsilon_x^*, \varepsilon_y^*, \varepsilon_\theta^*)$ applied to the initial states of robots 0 and 1, which will be subsequently also applied to the initial states of the following robots. In particular, robot i 's initial configuration is updated to be $\mathbf{x}_i := (x_i, y_i, \theta_i) + (\varepsilon_{i,x}, \varepsilon_{i,y}, \varepsilon_{i,\theta})$, where the perturbations are chosen $\varepsilon_{i,x} \in (-\varepsilon_x^*, \varepsilon_x^*)$, $\varepsilon_{i,y} \in (-\varepsilon_y^*, \varepsilon_y^*)$, $\varepsilon_{i,\theta} \in (-\varepsilon_\theta^*, \varepsilon_\theta^*)$ uniformly at random, and independently between the robots. We choose the values ε^* such that (1) each robot arrives at time t to a position that is at distance at most $r/2$ from the origin (while ignoring collisions), (2), along their motion robot 0 and 1 see at most the points $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that satisfy $\{\max(\tan(\frac{7\pi}{8})(x + 2r), \tan(\frac{3\pi}{8})(x - r) - y) \leq 0\}$ and $\{y + \max(-\tan(-\frac{\pi}{8})(x - 2r), -\tan(\frac{3\pi}{8})(x + r)) \leq 0\}$,




Fig. 4. Motion of the first pair of robots in Theorem 2. [left] The robots meet at a deadlock at the origin if placed without perturbations. [right] With added perturbations, the two robots see no more than the highlighted area.

respectively (see Fig. 4). In particular, by fixing

$$\varepsilon^* = \left(\frac{r}{8}, \frac{r}{8}, \min \left\{ \frac{\pi}{8}, \arccos \left(1 - \frac{64r^2 - r^2}{64R^2(2 - \sqrt{2})} \right) \right\} \right),$$

those conditions are satisfied. This ensures that the robots are still in collision at time t , which implies that they stopped after meeting each other at time $0 < t' < t$. Moreover, this would allow us to position additional robots in the areas not visible by the first two robots, and reuse the same arguments.

While we omit the technical details for obtaining ε^* we provide some intuition. We choose ε_x^* and ε_y^* such that the location of each robot is at a distance of at most $r/4$ from the origin at time t , assuming that $\varepsilon_\theta^* = 0$. Next, we increase ε_θ^* such that the distance from the origin increases from $r/4$ to at most $r/2$. Here we note that the additional translation to the position in time t by setting ε_θ^* to be nonzero is expressed by a series of rotation and translation matrices, given by $T(\mathbf{x}_i) R(\varepsilon_\theta^*) T(-\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{d}$, where $T(\mathbf{v})$ are spatial translations dictated by the vector \mathbf{v} , $R(\phi)$ are anti-clockwise rotations of the origin by an angle of ϕ , \mathbf{x}_i is the unperturbed initial position of robot i , and $\mathbf{d} = (0, 0, 1)^T$ is the origin.

The change in the orientation of the robots due to the introduction of ε_θ^* is obtained by padding range of orientations without perturbation with ε_θ^* . Thus, each robot covers a portion of orientations which is at most $\frac{\pi}{4} + 2\varepsilon_\theta^*$. As we want each robot to see no more than a quarter of the plane, this value must be bound by $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so that $2\varepsilon_\theta^* < \frac{\pi}{4}$.

We now proceed to position robots 2 and 3 in a similar manner. For simplicity, we rotate the entire plane anti-clockwise around the origin by an angle of ε_θ^* , to ensure that the visibility of robots 0 and 1 is limited to the upper-left and bottom-right quarters respectively (see Fig. 4). We place the next two robots in the same manner as the first pair, by choosing a 'shifted origin' (s_o, s_o) for their overlap, situating the ICR of the robots at $(-R + s_o, s_o)$ and $(R + s_o, s_o)$, respectively, and choosing their initial positions at an eighth of an arc backwards on their circles with an addition of perturbation sampled according to ε^* , and by an additional angle of ε_θ^* so as to coincide with the rotated plane. By choosing the value s_o to be large enough (but bounded), we can ensure that none of the robots 0 and 1 crosses to the




Fig. 5. A plot demonstrating the effect of various noise sources and slippage on the aggregation percentage in the bot-in-the-middle scenario.

visibility region of robots 2 and 3, and vice versa. Moreover, for large enough s_o no collision between a robot $i \in \{0, 1\}$ with a robot $j \in \{2, 3\}$ would occur.

This construction can be repeated for any number of robot pairs, as we ensure that the next pair can be positioned in an unseen quarter of a plane, assuming that the workspace S is large enough. Thus, the probability of sampling a nonaggregating MR state is at least $\left(\frac{2\pi r/A}{|S|} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon_\theta^*}{2\pi}\right)^n$, where $|S|$ is the volume of S . \square

Discussion. We believe that similar proofs can be obtained for other types of controllers. For instance, for the XX-SS controller (and similarly for SS-XX), one can perturb the counterexample presented in Sec. IV and still ensure that each robot sees another, and so the robots stand still without aggregating. Similarly, perturbing the counterexamples for XX-SF or XX-CF leads to nonaggregation.

In contrast, for XX-SB our counterexample from Sec. IV breaks when perturbations are included, as pairs of robots would lose their lines of sight, unless their headings are aligned. Counterexamples that involve a ring structure, such as for XX-CB and XX-RS require more careful examination, which we leave for future work. We do consider empirically the effect of perturbations on the ring structure for the CB-RS controller in Sec. VI.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We present experimental results. We first compare our new controller u^* for $n = 2$ with u_{prev} and \tilde{u}_{prev} . Next, we consider our 'bot-in-the-middle' counterexample for the XX-CB controller and test its resilience to perturbations, slippage, and control noise. The evaluation was performed using our Python environment where DD robot kinematics and slippage dynamics are simulated. A padding value ρ of $1/20$ of the robot's radius was used throughout.

A. Aggregation for $n = 2$

In Sec. III we suggested the controller \tilde{u}_{prev} to remedy issues with u_{prev} from [12]. Here we compare its performance against our provably-aggregating u^* , as well as with the faulty u_{prev} . We simulate the dynamics of two robots, with their initial states sampled uniformly within a

square of dimensions $\frac{200}{\sqrt{2}} \times \frac{200}{\sqrt{2}}$ [cm²], where there are 10^4 initial MR states in total. As expected due to Lemma 1, the robots aggregated for all initial states using the controller u^* . Interestingly, \tilde{u}_{prev} achieved a 100% success rate as well, which suggests that it could be provably aggregating. In contrast, u_{prev} failed to aggregate on 4.24% of the tests (either due to the robots performing periodic motions after a certain period of time, or exceeding a time budget of 5×10^3 seconds).

B. Nonaggregation for $n > 2$ robots

Our theoretical analysis in Theorem 1 assumes that no slippage or control noise are present. However, we conjecture that this result can be generalized even when those factors are introduced, at least for some forms of bimodal controllers. Here, we test this claim empirically specifically for a XX-CB controller and the bot-in-the-middle counterexample.

Before we proceed to tackle those questions, we first test whether this setting is also resilient to perturbations. We show that for small perturbations a substantial number of the initial states will not aggregate for the \tilde{u}_{prev} controller. First, assuming no controller noise, we simulate a ring with 6 to 11 robots, with an additional robot in the middle of the ring. From this initial configuration we first move each peripheral robot $\frac{r}{2}$ radially outwards, and then we perturb each robot spatially by $\pm \frac{r}{4}$ in both x and y direction, and its orientation by $\pm \frac{\pi}{32}$. The center robot is perturbed similarly with respect to the origin.

Next, we describe our tests for control noise and slippage. We consider a 'static' controller noise, in which the speed of every wheel individually is slightly changed according to a random number sampled in a 'high' (0.02) or 'low' (0.01) setting. Three different scenarios were evaluated: (i) The left wheel was given a high amount of noise, while the right wheel was given a low amount, (ii) the opposite of the previous scenario with respect to each wheel, and (iii) both wheels were given a high amount of noise. Additionally, we integrate slippage by simulating conservation of momentum, and adding a variable controlling the percentage of the momentum being conserved, with 0% being purely plastic collisions, and 100% being purely elastic collisions. For slippage also, three scenarios were evaluated, with percentages of $\{10, 50, 90\}$ % being tested.

Fig. 5 shows the probability of aggregation for each of the settings mentioned above, where for each robot number 10^3 scenarios (or runs) were generated. Most importantly, for all scenarios aggregation was not promised, with the percentage of aggregating scenarios generally falling with the increase in the number of robots. Interestingly, as we approach purely elastic collisions, we see that less scenarios aggregate. We believe this is due to the rings forming more evenly when slippage is allowed, and thus the center robot is fully enclosed inside the ring faster and more often in these scenarios.

VII. FUTURE WORK

Our work mathematically proves that constructing an aggregating controller for a large number of robots is an impossible task. Moreover, our empirical work, as well as that in previous work [14], suggest that the addition of more accurate robot dynamics (e.g., slippage) and noise do not improve the situation. This implies that stronger robot capabilities are necessary to achieve the goal. In the future, we wish to explore the opposite direction, i.e., understanding the robot capabilities necessary to execute a given task. Towards this end, we plan to explore the theory of knowledge in distributed systems [16], which, in our context, characterizes the information that should be known to the robots to execute a task. This may help determining both the type of sensors needed and the controller structure for a given task.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Idit Keidar, Yoram Moses, and Itai Panasoff for fruitful discussions, and to Avishav Engle for proofreading.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Halloy, G. Sempo, G. Caprari, C. Rivault, M. Asadpour, F. Tâche, I. Saïd, V. Durier, S. Canonge, J. M. Amé, C. Detrain, N. Correll, A. Martinoli, F. Mondada, R. Siegwart, and J. L. Deneubourg, "Social integration of robots into groups of cockroaches to control self-organized choices," *Science*, vol. 318, no. 5853, pp. 1155–1158, 2007.
- [2] J. Werfel, K. Petersen, and R. Nagpal, "Designing collective behavior in a termite-inspired robot construction team," *Science*, vol. 343, no. 6172, pp. 754–758, 2014.
- [3] P. Blumberg, A. Schmidt, and A. T. Becker, "Computing motion plans for assembling particles with global control," in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2023, pp. 7296–7302.
- [4] V. Trianni, R. Groß, T. H. Labella, E. Şahin, and M. Dorigo, "Evolving aggregation behaviors in a swarm of robots," in *Advances in Artificial Life*. Springer, 2003, pp. 865–874.
- [5] A. Barel, T. Dagès, R. Manor, and A. M. Bruckstein, "Probabilistic gathering of agents with simple sensors," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 620–640, 2021.
- [6] D. Dovrat and A. M. Bruckstein, "On gathering and control of unicycle a (ge) nts with crude sensing capabilities," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 40–46, 2017.
- [7] V. Gazi, "Swarm aggregations using artificial potentials and sliding-mode control," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1208–1214, 2005.
- [8] R. Cohen and D. Peleg, "Convergence properties of the gravitational algorithm in asynchronous robot systems," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 1516–1528, 2005.
- [9] Y. Oasa, I. Suzuki, and M. Yamashita, "A robust distributed convergence algorithm for autonomous mobile robots," in *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics.*, vol. 1, 1997, pp. 287–292.
- [10] M. Cieliebak, P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, and N. Santoro, "Distributed computing by mobile robots: Gathering," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 829–879, 2012.
- [11] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, N. Santoro, *et al.*, "Distributed computing by mobile entities," *Current Research in Moving and Computing*, vol. 11340, no. 1, 2019.
- [12] M. Gauci, J. Chen, W. Li, T. J. Dodd, and R. Groß, "Self-organized aggregation without computation," *International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 1145–1161, 2014.
- [13] F. Mondada, M. Bonani, X. Raemy, J. Pugh, C. Cianci, A. Klaptocz, S. Magnenat, J.-C. Zufferey, D. Floreano, and A. Martinoli, "The e-puck, a robot designed for education in engineering," in *Conference on Autonomous Robot Systems and Competitions*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2009, pp. 59–65.
- [14] J. J. Daymude, N. C. Harasha, A. W. Richa, and R. Yiu, "Deadlock and noise in self-organized aggregation without computation," in *International Symposium on Stabilizing, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems*. Springer, 2021, pp. 51–65.
- [15] G. Klancar, A. Zdesar, S. Blazic, and I. Skrjanc, *Wheeled mobile robotics: from fundamentals towards autonomous systems*. Butterworth-Heinemann, 2017.
- [16] Y. Moses, "Knowledge in distributed systems," in *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, 2016, pp. 1051–1055.