**Summary**

This paper contains some interesting results on shape control of a robot swarm. However, the paper has major flaws. It is unorganized, containing list of various descriptions without a clear theme and sufficient justification of the method used and the results collected. Reviewers are questioning the technical correctness of the algorithms and the soundness of technical approaches due to the lack of clarity.

**We are grateful for the detailed feedback from our reviewers, who have been instrumental in making this a much stronger paper.**

**Restructured paper with related work in section II, after the intro. The introduction now explains the classes of robots that are modeled by eqn. 1, from magnetically steered particles, to systems where the only control input the orientation of a global velocity. Examples include systems driven by flow, by magnetic fields, by the location of a distant light source. The unifying theme of this paper is controllability results for systems with these motion models and efficient techniques for shaping the swarm in bounded workspaces.**

**To focus the paper, we removed the emphasis on closed-loop controllers and replaced these with analytical results that match our hardware assumptions and hardware experiments.**

**Review 1**:

This paper presents algorithms for controlling a swarm of robots to take a shape by using uniform global inputs and boundary friction forces. Shaping a swarm of robots is a significant problem for a widely applications. There exist many research results about it. In the section VI, this paper writes that “The techniques in this paper are inspired by fluid-flow techniques and artificial force- fields” .

1.) However, in section II, how to understand (10) and figure 4(c)?

**We grounded equation 1 with physical examples, updated 10 to use a linear boundary layer model (adding reference ##), and an explanation of 4c.**

2.)The paper is organized well. However, reviewer still suggests that the section VI should be moved to the front of the paper and

**We agree, and moved Section VI to the front to relate these techniques to the appropriate robotics disciplines.**

3.) the main contributions of the paper should be described more clearly in the introduction. The multimedia video shows abundant simulation and experiment results.

**TO better explain the contributions we rewrote the introduction.**

**Review 3:**

The paper deals with an interesting topic of controlling the shape of a swarm of weak controllable robots. The robots can only response to uniform global inputs and have infinite friction forces with boundary walls. Two kinds of shaping are introduced, one is to move individuals to certain locations and the other is to obtain certain variances as a swarm. The simulations of shaping robots to certain locations look interesting. In robotic applications, weak capability is often accompanied by huge quantity. As the population increasing, the total moves are almost exponentially increasing. It is probably unbearable to many potential applications, such as nano-robots to cure human disease. My impression of such robots is the huge number of members. Also, the friction between the robot and boundary wall is assumed to be infinite. In real world, a robot can hardly keep his position with a large force paralling with the wall. Although the situation can be alleviated by taking actions, it is not clear whether it will be uncontrollable when total moves increase. Although as a type of shaping, it seems to me that adjusting the variances of the swarm is isolated with changing locations. The controlling in III.(c) is expected to be related to II.(a). I would appreciate more analysis details about their connection, for example, why the swarm should pushed into left or bottom when the \sigma\_\*^2 is larger or smaller than expected, how and how much it should move, instead of "swarm pushed into the \*\* wall untill \*\*". In addition, it is better to describe more about the scenarios of variance controlling. Shiva: I agree. We didn’t tell why we did the covariance control, and we didn’t fully describe it. I will go ahead and add some description.

**You are correct. For clarity of explanation, we have replaced this with analytical results using boundary layer friction, and calculated the maximum correlation possible. We then compare using frictional forces with the “Using boundaries for stable configurations” in Sec 3.**

I guess a minor issue is presented in Eqn.(4), x-\bar{x}. Shiva: I corrected that

**Thank you for catching this – we have fixed Eqn 4.**

**Review 4:**

The manuscript presents algorithms that form a particle swarm in a desired shape using a shared control input in a closed workspace. For a particle swarm to aggregate in a desired form, the manuscript first introduces a framework with constant force acting on the swarm and then applies wall friction to the swarm. The algorithms are validated in simulations and experiments.

The ideas of swarming a group of robots, presented in the manuscript, sound interesting, but the clarity of their presentation in the manuscript is not very good. In fact, the way of presenting ideas often raises questions. I recommend the rejection of the manuscript. Detailed comments follow.

1)\* Symbols x,y,u\_x,u\_y in Equation (1) are not introduced at all.

Shiva: I added a description, HOWEVER, we are wrong about u as a velocity. This is the next reviewer’s problem.

2) \* In Pg. 1, Sect. I, line 8-9: Are (1) and (2) items in a list or Do they refer to Equations (1) and (2)? Shiva: Deleted them

3) \* The Introduction section does not well explain the problem the authors are dealing with and does not even review any relevant existing work from which we can guess the main ideas of the manuscript.

Thankyou ! We rewrote the introduction and moved the related work from the end to Section II.

4) \* In Pg. 1, Sect. II.A, line 4-6: The mean, covariance and correlation of a swarm in the x and y components are used here. Since x and y are not introduced when Equation (1) is introduced, it is unclear what they are. Are x and y probabilities of something?

Shiva: I have added that x and y are positions, so it should be resolved.

5)\* In Pg 2, line 7-8: What is the range of A? From Figs. 2 and 3, I could find out A ranges from 0 to 1, but it was not clear in the main context.

Excellent catch -- Shiva: I added the range to the description of A.

6)\* How theories in Sect. II are applied in Sect. III is not clear. For example, which part in Alg. 1 or 2 relates to wall friction? \* How does DriftMove() work? It is not explained.

Shiva: I think this part needs more explanation. Like: telling why we didn’t just use the corners, and then we used the wall friction. Also telling

**Review 5:**

This paper presents a shaping control algorithm for swarming of multiple robots that use global inputs in the closed area. The global inputs in this paper mean all the robots have the same velocity command in the 2-D plane.

The main point of the paper is to determine velocity command for polygonal shapes. Authors propose two algorithms: open-loop and closed-loop algorithms. First of all, motivation of this research is weakened due to the type of global inputs. Motivated by small size robots lack of on-board computation, this work uses identical control input to all the robots.

Rewrote the introduction.

**Better, in intro: These system dynamics represent particle swarms in low-Reynolds number environments, where viscosity dominates inertial forces and so velocity is proportional to input forces [cite Purcell, life at low Reynolds numbers]. In this regime, the input force command $\mathbf{u}$ controls the velocity of the robots. The same model can be generalized to particles moved by fluid flow where the vector direction of fluid flow $\mathbf{u}$ controls the velocity of particles, or for robots that move at a constant speed [kilobots cite] in a direction specified by a global input $\mathbf{u}$.**

However, the identical control input of the paper is velocity command that requires on-board computation. For example, the reference [1] of previous work [2] in the paper needs the voltage of an actuator to drive a micro robot. The voltage command cannot be generated from velocity command without on-board computation. Using acceleration command is fit for your research.

The original paper was unclear. The introduction has been rewritten to address this misunderstanding. Shiva: We are using acceleration for the simulation, we are just controlling the direction and have a constant speed for the kilobots. We need to tell both.

The proposed open-loop algorithm called Algorithm 2 has critical error. Since there is no restriction on choosing initial and ending position of robots, consider two robots in the 2-D plane; the first robot is located at (3,4), and the second robot is located at (2,4). Assume the ending position of the first robot is (5,4), the ending position of the second robot is (7,4), and the wall length is 7. At the line 8 in the algorithm, the first robot would be at (7,4), and the second robot at (6,4). And then algorithm keeps changing the y-axis position with epsilon value because of line 15, but x-axis positions of the robots are fixed. The algorithm has infinite loop with remaining that the x-axis positions of two robots never change because there is no stopping criteria. This shows that the algorithm does not work for all the potential cases.

**Thank you for this catch! Rewriting this algorithm was challenging by the many corner cases, but your catch led to a more beautiful and concise algorithm.**

For closed-loop algorithm, global inputs keep generated until covariance and variance of the swarm reach desired certain values. However, the algorithm does not control the mean position of the swarm.

**To better focus the paper, we removed the emphasis on closed-loop controllers and replaced these with analytical results that match our hardware assumptions and hardware experiments.**

**Our paper on mean control of a swarm is [##]**

Although the paper says that mean position of swarm is moved to the center of the workspace, there is no evidence of the mean position at the center of the workspace. In addition, any control law and logic are not described for controlling the mean position of the swarm in the closed-loop algorithm. This paper insists that the algorithm is robust. However, several simulations and 100 robots experiments does not provide us with the robustness of your algorithm. Your algorithm depends on the size of closed area and the number of robots. If the closed area is packed with many robots, your algorithm may not be work.

**Quite right. We have rewritten the algorithms to make clear that all analytical results are functions of the workspace size and the size of the particle swarm.**

The abstract of your paper says your algorithm enables the stable swarm. However, this paper does not show any stability and convergence proof.

**“Stability” was ambiguous. In this paper, a stable configuration of a swarm under a constant global input, is the minimum energy solution. To clarify this distinction, we changed the title of II.A. “Using Boundaries: Fluid Settling In a Tank” to “A. Using Boundaries: stable configurations of a swarm”**

Equations (5) and (6) are wrong. Equation (5) is 10\*sqrt(2)/6\*sqrt(-A\*tan(beta)). Equation (6) is 10\*sqrt(2)/6\*sqrt(-A\*cot(beta)). Since A is positive, mean position is imaginary, which means both equations are wrong.

**Excellent catch. This was an unfortunate conversion to LaTeX. This is changed to “the mean when $R$ is a triangular region in the lower-left corner is:”**

**And equation 5 was changed to**

**\frac{\int\_0^{\sqrt{2 A \tan (\beta)}} \left(\int\_0^{\cot (\beta) \left(\sqrt{2 A \tan (\beta)}-x\right)} x \, dy\right) \, dx}{A}**

**And equation 5 was changed to**

**\frac{\int\_0^{\sqrt{2 A \tan (\beta)}} \left(\int\_0^{\cot (\beta) \left(\sqrt{2 A \tan (\beta)}-x\right)} y \, dy\right) \, dx}{A}**

This paper does not follow IEEE format. IEEE Editorial system manual tells us that there is no symbol in front of section description. For example, § should not be used before section number.

**Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The symbol was removed throughout.**

This paper has a significant number of ambiguous expressions.

1)What is gravity pointing? Your robot moves in the 2-D plane where no gravity affects the motion of the robot.

This was ambiguous, our 2D plane workspace could be oriented in any direction, so an external force(such as gravity) pulls in the direction \beta. The paper now says “they move inside a square workspace under the influence of a force pulling in direction \beta”.

3)What do you mean they flow like water?

This was also ambiguous. We said they move to a side of the workspace and form a polygonal shape.

4)What do mean Equation (9) is not position dependent friction? You already said friction is infinite, which means no dependency of position.

**Friction is a function of distance from boundary walls. The infinite friction model is infinite only at the boundary.**

5)What is region R?

6.) What is a constant area A?

6)In addition, the style of reference is not consistent. In the introduction of the paper, [1],[2],[3],[4],[5],[6], or [7] are written. In the related work section, [1, 21, 22] are written. Please use one reference style.

**We are now doing the condensed style.**

In terms of multimedia, video quality is good overall, but irrelevant video clips in your video weaken your contribution. The first clip shows kilobot robots programmed to move toward a bright light. This clip cannot tell your problem or support your algorithm based on global input because individual kilobot has its own micro controller that enables on-board computation. Further, reference [3] related to kilobot already achieved the various shape similar to your work.

There are several key distinctions. Our work in [3] used small populations swarms ranging in size from 1 to 3. Ref [26] showed several demonstrations with human controllers, while this paper presents analytical models on shape control, uses boundary friction, has numerous automated hardware experiments, and has relevance for future work. The position control technique in [26] relied on a restrictive obstacle model, while biological and engineered structures often have boundary layer friction that can be esploited.

References [15] and [16] used kilobots that communicated, had autonomy, used a map, and moved only a small fraction of the swarm at a time. This paper investigates large particles swarms (102—10^8) with no inter-robot communication, no autonomy, no maps (on the robots), and moves the entire swarm with a shared control input.

The second clip shows your previous work. This does not show your current work.

Other video clips well present your work.

Thank you. We added audio commentary to explain how the short clip near the beginning motivated this research. We also added a caption showing that this short clip refers to our previous work in [26] with human-steered swarms.