



Adaptive-network models of swarm dynamics

Cristián Huepe^{1,3}, Gerd Zschaler², Anne-Ly Do² and Thilo Gross²

Published 14 July 2011 • IOP Publishing and Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft

New Journal of Physics, Volume 13, July 2011

cristian@northwestern.edu

¹ 614 N Paulina Street, Chicago, IL 60622-6062, USA

² Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nöthnitzer Straße 38, 01187 Dresden, Germany

³ Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

Received 17 March 2011

Published 14 July 2011

Cristián Huepe *et al* 2011 *New J. Phys.* **13** 073022

<https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/13/7/073022>

Buy this article in print

Abstract

We propose a simple adaptive-network model describing recent swarming experiments. Exploiting an analogy with human decision making, we capture the dynamics of the model using a low-dimensional system of equations permitting analytical investigation. We find that the model reproduces several characteristic features of swarms, including spontaneous symmetry breaking, noise- and density-driven order–disorder transitions that can be of first or second order, and intermittency. Reproducing these experimental observations using a non-spatial model suggests that spatial geometry may have less of an impact on collective motion than previously thought.

Export citation and abstract

[BibTeX](#)

[RIS](#)

GENERAL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY

Introduction and background. To understand how groups of self-propelled individuals (such as bird flocks, fish schools or insect swarms) make collective decisions, simple, low-dimensional descriptions of population-level behaviour are highly desirable. In closely related research on human decision making, analytically tractable modelling approaches based on network theory are used.

Main results. We introduce a simple adaptive-network model describing swarming experiments by Buhl *et al* (2006 *Science* **312** 1402–6), where groups of locusts march freely in a ring-shaped arena. At low insect densities, no ordered collective motion is observed, whereas at high insect densities a common persistent marching direction emerges. Our model captures these two regimes and identifies the swarming transition as a (subcritical or supercritical) pitchfork bifurcation. It also reproduces an intermittent switching of direction displaying memory effects. These results are obtained analytically and numerically and do not require an underlying geometrical space.

Wider implications. By likening swarming to opinion formation in humans, we connected two areas of research usually considered separately. Our analysis unveils the essential elements required to reproduce the observed collective behaviour. Given the generality of the model, we expect it to be applicable to a large class of systems.

1. Introduction

'More is different', a central observation in complex systems research, is in few areas as evident as in collective decision making. Recent studies on groups of self-propelled agents, such as bird flocks, fish schools, insect swarms and herds of quadrupeds, show that these can often make better choices in groups than individually [1–3]. Effective collective action, which has given rise to the popular notion of *swarm intelligence*, appears to follow from universal organizing principles [4]. The ease and elegance with which, for example, a school of fish finds its way and avoids predators can be appreciated even more if one compares it, for instance, to political decision making in humans.

It is interesting to note that, although regarded as collective decision-making processes, swarming behaviour and collective motion are modelled differently from decision making in human populations. Theoretical studies of collective motion have mostly focused on agent-based simulations of self-propelled particles [5–10] and fluid-like models that treat them as continuous media [11, 12]. By contrast, studies of decision making and opinion formation in social systems typically represent the system as a network, emphasizing the discrete nature of interactions [13–15]. One of the reasons for this difference in modelling approaches is that for swarm systems, spatial embedding is assumed to

be of central importance, whereas social interactions are thought to be less constrained by physical space. Furthermore, in collective motion it cannot be neglected that an agent's decision to move in a certain direction will determine the agents with whom it will interact next. However, a similar feedback of individual decisions on future interaction partners was also studied in recent works on opinion formation [16–23]. The resulting models incorporate both an opinion formation process on the network and a dynamic update of the network topology and thus fall into the class of adaptive networks (ANs) [24, 25].

In this paper, we propose a non-spatial AN model of swarming behaviour. Reproducing characteristic observations for swarm systems, we find that spatial geometry might play a less central role than has been assumed. Our approach highlights the analogy between swarming and social consensus, thus building a bridge between two areas of research that have so far been considered separately.

2. An adaptive-network model for a swarming experiment

We focus on the swarming experiments of Buhl *et al* [26]. In their setup, groups of 5–120 locusts were placed in a ring-shaped arena and left to march freely for 8 h while a digital camera captured their positions and orientations. At low insect number, no ordered collective motion arises; the system displays no clear clockwise or counter-clockwise flow of locusts around the arena. At intermediate insect numbers, locusts start aligning, generating long periods of collective rotational motion during which most agents are marching in the same direction. These periods of coherent motion are interrupted by rapid spontaneous changes in their collective heading direction. Finally, at high insect number this spontaneous direction switching is no longer observed and agents rapidly adopt a common and persistent marching direction, either clockwise or counter-clockwise. Buhl *et al* reproduced these experimental results qualitatively in simulations using a one-dimensional agent-based model of self-propelled particles, also investigating the effect of inherent noise in a subsequent study [26, 27].

Here, we model this experiment using a different approach, trying to address the mechanism leading to the observed collective dynamics with the help of a simple low-dimensional description that lends itself to analytical treatment. To that end, we consider the system of interacting agents as a complex network. Each node represents an insect, and nodes are linked if the corresponding locusts are mutually aware of each other through any interaction mechanism. As in [26], we distinguish only two directions of motion: every node can be in an R or L state, representing an agent that marches clockwise (a *right-goer*) or counter-clockwise (a *left-goer*), respectively. We refer below to pairs of nodes (agents) in the same state as *equal-goers* and to those in different states as *opposite-goers*.

The proposed model only takes into account the agents' headings and contact network while neglecting all other information, including insect positions. The evolution of the network is modelled by a set of stochastic processes. As locusts advance in the experimental system, non-interacting

opposite-goers eventually meet and start sensing each other. We model this by randomly introducing R–L links at a rate of a_o per node. In addition, interacting opposite-goers will eventually lose contact, which is modelled by the random deletion of R–L links at a rate of d_o per link. Likewise, equal-goers can start or stop interacting as they approach or separate from each other due to marching speed differences or lateral displacements. This is represented by also introducing for equal-goers the attachment rate per node a_e and deletion rate per link d_e . Using these conventions, all rates are defined as intensive quantities. The state dynamics of each node is given by a stochastic process that depends on its topological neighbours. We assume that each node switches direction with probability w_2 for every R–L link it has to an opposite-goer. To account for nonlinear three-agent interactions, we introduce an additional probability w_3 of the central node switching direction for every L–R–L and R–L–R chain. Finally, noise is represented by a constant probability q of an agent spontaneously switching direction.

3. Analytical description

In order to study the collective dynamics of the AN model, we define convenient observables, the so-called *moments*, given by the densities of various subgraphs in the network [28, 29]. Each subgraph can be classified by its order, i.e. the number of links it contains. Zeroth-order moments are given by the right- and left-goer densities ($[R]$ and $[L]$, respectively). First-order moments are the per-capita densities of R–R, R–L and L–L links ($[RR]$, $[RL]$ and $[LL]$). Second-order moments correspond to the densities of A–B–C triplets $[ABC]$, with $A, B, C \in \{R, L\}$. The moment dynamics is captured by balance equations containing the variables of interest together with densities of larger subgraphs.

The zeroth-moment equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt}[R] = q([L] - [R]) + w_3([RLR] - [LRL]), \quad (1)$$

and the symmetric expression for $[L]$, obtained by interchanging R and L. The first-moment equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}[RR] = & q([LR] - 2[RR]) + w_2([LR] + 2[RLR] - [RRL]) + w_3(2[RLR] + 3[^RL_R^R] - [^RL_L^L]) \\ & + a_e[R]^2 - d_e[RR], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and the symmetric expression for $[LL]$. Here, we use $[^ABC_D]$ to denote the density of third-order motifs with a central node in state $B \in \{L, R\}$ linked to three nodes in states $A, C, D \in \{L, R\}$. Finally, rather than writing an equation for $[LR]$, we note that the *total* first-moment link dynamics depends only on the link creation and deletion processes through

$$\frac{d}{dt}([LR] + [RR] + [LL]) = a_o[L][R] - d_o[LR] + a_e([R]^2 + [L]^2) - d_e([LL] + [RR]). \quad (3)$$

The ODE system (1)–(3) can now be closed using a *pair-approximation* [28–30], where triplets and quadruplets are given by

$$[\text{RLR}] = \kappa \frac{[\text{LR}]^2}{2[\text{L}]}, \quad [\text{RRL}] = 2\kappa \frac{[\text{LR}][\text{RR}]}{[\text{R}]}, \quad (4)$$

$$[\text{RLR}] = \kappa^2 \frac{[\text{LR}]^3}{6[\text{L}]^2}, \quad [\text{RRL}] = \kappa^2 \frac{[\text{LR}]^2[\text{RR}]}{[\text{R}]^2}, \quad (5)$$

and symmetric expressions. The factor $\kappa = (\langle k^2 \rangle - \langle k \rangle) / \langle k \rangle^2$ relates the second and first moments of the degree distribution. Because our network dynamics will yield an unknown, randomly evolving topology, we use a random graph approximation, setting $\kappa=1$ as in [18, 21, 28–30].

For $a_e=d_e=0$, the stationary solutions of this ODE system decouple, with equations (1) and (3) solved independently. We obtain analytically a mixed-phase solution branch ($[\text{R}]=[\text{L}]=1/2$) that becomes unstable in a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation at $a_o^* = 2d_o\sqrt{2q/(\kappa w_3)}$, giving rise to the two collective-motion solution branches $[\text{R}]_{\pm} = (1/2) \pm \sqrt{1 - 8qd_o^2/(\kappa w_3 a_o^2)}/2$. For $a_e \neq 0$ and $d_e \neq 0$, the stationary solutions can be computed numerically by solving the corresponding system of algebraic equations. Here, we also find a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation for small a_e , as shown in figure 1 (top). But for higher values of a_e , the transition occurs through a subcritical pitchfork bifurcation (figure 2, right-column insets). This yields a bistable phase where ordered and disordered states coexist, highlighted in figure 1 (bottom).




Figure 1. Top: bifurcation diagram of the density of right-goers $[\text{R}]$ versus link creation rate a_o . Solutions of the ODE system of equations (1)–(3) (solid line) yield a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation in excellent agreement with the results from numerical network simulations (circles).

Bottom: phase diagram showing the bifurcation point as a function of the link creation rates a_o and a_e . In the bistable region (grey), the pitchfork bifurcation becomes subcritical. Parameters: $N=10^4$ nodes, $d_o=0.25$, $d_e=0.1$, $w_2=w_3=0.2$, $q=0.1$ and (top only) $a_e=0.2$.

 Standard

 Export PowerPoint slide




Figure 2. Degree distributions of four different stationary solutions obtained through AN simulations. The top (bottom) row shows cases in the disordered (ordered) phase, with insets displaying their location in the bifurcation diagram. The left (right) column shows cases with a supercritical (subcritical) pitchfork bifurcation. Different curves display the connectivity of left-goers (L), of right-goers (R), of left-goers only to left-goers (LL) or only to right-goers (LR), etc. Parameters: the same as in figure 1, except when noted on plots.

 Standard

 Export PowerPoint slide

We note that a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation, given by $[R]_{\pm} = (1/2) \pm \sqrt{1 - 4q/w_3}/2$, could already be observed in a simpler approximation in which the system is closed at the zeroth order. However, the pair approximation is more accurate when compared with stochastic simulations of the network. Moreover, it allows for the new class of subcritical solutions that we discuss below.

4. Results

In figure 1 (top), we show that the ODE system solutions are in excellent agreement with individual-based stochastic simulations of the network dynamics. We verified that the small remaining discrepancy is due to the $\kappa=1$ assumption and not other factors such as finite-size effects.

We now compare the results of our AN model with the locust experiments in [26]. The bifurcation diagram in figure 1 uses the encounter rate between opposite-goers a_o as the control parameter, which is proportional to the experimental agent density in the current framework. We can thus compare our results directly with the behaviour observed experimentally at different agent numbers. For a low association rate a_o , the network exhibits no order or symmetry breaking. This corresponds to the disordered mix of left- and right-goers showing no collective motion obtained in experiments at low insect number.

For high a_o , the system must be in one of the two solution branches, with a majority of nodes in either state (R or L). This is the ordered collective marching state found at high insect number [26]. A similar pitchfork bifurcation is also observed when using the noise intensity, q , instead of a_o as the control parameter, as was done in most of the previous numerical works [5, 6, 9].

Let us emphasize that the presence of this transition in the AN model implies that very few elements of the agent dynamics are required in order to obtain such swarming behaviour. In particular, we did not choose any specific interaction rule but only required that it drive agents to head in the same direction. By contrast, we find that three-body interaction processes are required in order to break the symmetry and obtain swarming solutions. Furthermore, a subcritical bifurcation, giving rise to hysteresis or sudden polarization, is possible in the AN model only if a_e and d_e are non-zero. This qualitative result could shed light on the current controversy over the order of the swarming transition [5, 6, 31–33]. Indeed, a first-order transition (stemming from the subcritical pitchfork bifurcation) is only possible here if groups of equal-goers can associate or dissociate while heading in the same direction. It would be very interesting to explore whether a similar effect is present in agent-based simulations and experiments.

Figure 2 shows the degree distributions obtained in the ordered and disordered phases for the supercritical and subcritical cases. Both display similar connectivities. In the disordered states (top), most agents have very few links to equal-goers and no links to opposite-goers. This is also observed in agent-based simulations and experiments [9, 26], where the disordered regime develops no large clusters and, therefore, small connectivity.

In the ordered (right-going) state (bottom), R–R links are strongly favoured. This corresponds to the formation of large right-going groups in the agent-based dynamics. The number of L–R links also increases, which corresponds to encounters between a few left-goers and these large right-going clusters. The typical number of all other links decreases.

In previous experiments and simulations, it was observed that there is an intermittent regime where the swarm is polarized but can switch the marching direction spontaneously [26, 34]. This behaviour is also captured by the AN model. The intermittent regime occurs at intermediate densities, i.e. at a_o

values close to the bifurcation, in the ordered phase, where a low nucleation barrier allows for stochastic switching between the two branches.

Figure 3 shows the cumulative distributions of residence times (lasting τ or longer) in which the network resides in a majority R state before switching to a majority L state, or vice versa. In the disordered phase, this distribution decays exponentially as expected, since it results from memoryless stochastic fluctuations about the stationary state. As a_o approaches its critical value, the distribution develops a long tail approximating a power law with exponent $-1/2$, providing evidence for a switching process with memory. We note that a power-law distribution of switching times with the *same* exponent was observed in previous spatial models [9, 34]. The experimental locust dynamics also display intermittency at intermediate densities, but the available time series are not long enough to characterize its statistics [26].




Figure 3. Cumulative distribution of residence times in a majority L or majority R state for the AN dynamics at various values of a_o . When we increase a_o , the system becomes more ordered, switching direction less often, and the distribution becomes broader. For $a_o > 0.6$, a preferred residence time appears at large $\tau \sim 10^3$ due to finite-size effects. Insets show the density of right-goers $[R]$ versus time for $a_o = 0.1$ (bottom left) and $a_o = 1.0$ (top centre). Parameters: the same as in figure 1 (top) but for 100 nodes.

Standard

Export PowerPoint slide

For $a_o \geq 0.8$ finite-size effects produce a preferred residence time at large $\tau \sim 10^3$ that grows with the system size, appearing as a plateau in the cumulative distributions. This corresponds to the typical escape time from highly polarized states where the system gets trapped when system-wide connectivity is reached within the finite network.

5. Conclusions

In summary, we have proposed an AN model of a swarm experiment that captures much of its characteristic collective behaviour and likens it to an opinion-formation process. In particular, our model displays a transition from a disordered to an ordered phase with increasing insect density. Furthermore, an intermittent regime is observed close to the transition point, where a fat-tailed distribution of residence times emerges.

We emphasize that in the proposed model these characteristics of swarming systems are recovered without an explicit spatial representation of the system. This suggests that the spatial context of swarming may not be of central importance for many phenomena. By contrast, three-body processes and an increased probability of interaction between agents with intersecting trajectories are found to be essential in our model.

Further work is certainly necessary in order to test whether the experimentally observed transition is caused by the same mechanism that is at work in our non-spatial model. In order to improve our understanding of the role of spatial dynamics in swarms, detailed network- and agent-based simulations should therefore be compared. We postulate that the same dynamics will be followed by point-like agents, which are well described by the nodes in our model, but not by spatially extended agents, where jamming must play an important role.

In this paper, we have used a modelling approach originally proposed for social networks. We believe that the analogies we have drawn between swarming phenomena and opinion formation processes could be fruitfully exploited in further studies, thus building a bridge between the two fields.

Acknowledgments

The work of CH was supported by the National Science Foundation through grants DMS-0507745 and PHY-0848755.

References

- [1] Couzin I D, Krause J, Franks N R and Levin S A 2005 *Nature* **433** 513–6
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)

- [2] Couzin I 2007 *Nature* **445** 715
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)

- [3] Cucker F and Huepe C 2008 *Maths In Action* **1** 1–25
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)

- [4] Bonabeau E, Dorigo M and Theraulaz G 1999 *Swarm Intelligence: from Natural to Artificial Systems* (*Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity*) (New York: Oxford University Press)

- [5] Vicsek T, Czirók A, Ben-Jacob E, Cohen I and Shochet O 1995 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** 1226–9
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [6] Chaté H, Ginelli F, Grégoire G and Raynaud F 2008 *Phys. Rev. E* **77** 046113
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [7] Romanczuk P, Couzin I D and Schimansky-Geier L 2009 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** 010602
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [8] Mach R and Schweitzer F 2007 *Bull. Math. Biol.* **69** 539–62
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [9] Huepe C and Aldana M 2008 *Physica A* **387** 2809–22
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [10] Sumpter D, Buhl J, Biro D and Couzin I 2008 *Theory Biosci.* **127** 177–86
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [11] Toner J and Tu Y 1998 *Phys. Rev. E* **58** 4828–58
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [12] Topaz C M and Bertozzi A L 2004 *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **65**
[Google Scholar](#)
- [13] Holley R A and Liggett T M 1975 *Ann. Probab.* **3** 643–63
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [14] Liggett T M 1999 *Stochastic Interacting Systems: Contact, Voter and Exclusion Processes* (Berlin: Springer) ISBN 3-540-65995-1
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [15] Sood V and Redner S 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 178701
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [16] Holme P and Newman M E J 2006 *Phys. Rev. E* **74** 056108
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [17] Gil S and Zanette D 2006 *Phys. Lett. A* **356** 89–94
[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)
- [18] Vazquez F, Eguíluz V M and Miguel M S 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 108702
[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)

- [19] Nardini C, Kozma B and Barrat A 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 158701
Crossref PubMed Google Scholar
- [20] Benczik I J, Benczik S Z, Schmittmann B and Zia R K P 2008 *Euro. Phys. Lett.* **82** 48006
IOPscience (<https://iopscience.iop.org/0295-5075/82/4/48006>) Google Scholar
- [21] Kimura D and Hayakawa Y 2008 *Phys. Rev. E* **78** 016103
Crossref Google Scholar
- [22] Böhme G A and Gross T 2011 *Phys. Rev. E* **83** 035101
Crossref Google Scholar
- [23] Demirel G, Prizak R, Reddy P N and Gross T 2011 *Eur. Phys. J. B* at press
Google Scholar
- [24] Gross T and Blasius B 2008 *J. R. Soc. Interface* **5** 259–71
Crossref PubMed Google Scholar
- [25] Gross T and Sayama H (ed) 2009 *Adaptive Networks: Theory, Models and Applications (Understanding Complex Systems)* (Heidelberg: Springer)
Crossref Google Scholar
- [26] Buhl J, Sumpter D J T, Couzin I D, Hale J J, Despland E, Miller E R and Simpson S J 2006 *Science* **312** 1402–6
Crossref PubMed Google Scholar
- [27] Yates C A, Erban R, Escudero C, Couzin I D, Buhl J, Kevrekidis I G, Maini P K and Sumpter D J T 2009 *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106** 5464–9
Crossref PubMed Google Scholar
- [28] Keeling M J, Rand D A and Morris A J 1997 *Proc. R. Soc. B* **264** 1149–56
Crossref Google Scholar
- [29] Gross T, D'Lima C J D and Blasius B 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 208701
Crossref PubMed Google Scholar
- [30] Zschaler G, Traulsen A and Gross T 2010 *New J. Phys.* **12** 093015
IOPscience (<https://iopscience.iop.org/1367-2630/12/9/093015>) Google Scholar
- [31] Nagy M, Daruka I and Vicsek T 2007 *Physica A* **373** 445–54
Crossref Google Scholar
- [32] Aldana M, Dossetti V, Huepe C, Kenkre V M and Larralde H 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 095702

[33] Pimentel J A, Aldana M, Huepe C and Larralde H 2008 *Phys. Rev. E* **77** 061138

[Crossref](#) [Google Scholar](#)

[34] Huepe C and Aldana M 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** 168701

[Crossref](#) [PubMed](#) [Google Scholar](#)

Export references:

[BibTeX](#)

[RIS](#)

Related content

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Majority rule on heterogeneous networks

A homoclinic route to asymptotic full cooperation in adaptive networks and its failure

Collective motion dynamics of active solids and active crystals

Role of particle conservation in self-propelled particle systems

Exploring the adaptive voter model dynamics with a mathematical triple jump

Coexistence of opposite opinions in a network with communities