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# 1. Abstract

In this paper we examine the predator-prey swarming model published by Vladimir Zhdakin and J. C. Sprott in 2010. Firstly, we explain the model and mention all of its variations. Then we compare the results that got published in the paper mentioned above to the new created results to check if the new implementation fits the one made by V. Zhdakin and J. C. Sprott.

Next we discuss how each parameter of the model influences the results, how the parameters should be interpreted and there is an explanation of how they relate to each other.

Another important point is the question which parameters deliver the most realistic results. We determine what range the parameters should be chosen to create a simulation as close to the real world as the model allows.

At last we discuss which aspects of swarming and hunting behaviours of fishes are fulfilled and which are not.

# 2. Individual contributions

Vladimir Zhdakin

J. C. Sprott

# 3. Introduction and Motivations

A fish swarm that is under attack by sharks are spectacular to watch. It moves as a unit to minimize every fish’s risk of getting killed. There are many models that try to describe and examine the movement of the swarm and the predators. One of it is an agent-based model by Vladimir Zhdakin and J. C. Sprott that tries to reproduce the movement by using forces between the agents and friction between every agent and the environment. The model is kept simple at the expense of making it as realistic as possible. There are only a few parameters to make it possible to explore most of the variations in reasonable expenditure of time. Another reason for this simple model is to keep the simulation of swarming independent of specific organisms, which would need to include also organism specific parameters and properties.

# 4. Description of the Model

The model consists of two agents, predators and preys. They are simulated on a two dimensional Cartesian plane. Because the model will be kept as simple as possible the agents do only interact with the environment via a friction.

All forces between the agents are directed radially from the agents. Prey pairs interact with long range attractive and short range repulsive forces with each other to model the behaviour in a swarm as the single members try to stay at a certain distance from each other. Predator – prey pairs both interact with an anti-Newtonian force.

This model will use three different forces between predator pairs which all occur in nature. First there is no interaction between predators what will simulate attackers which do not hunt or interact with each other. Second is an attractive force between the predators so they can form a group of predators to chase the swarm. Thirdly this paper will explore a repulsive force between the predators. This could be a model of predators trying to attack a swarm from different sides to confuse them. Because the anti-Newtonian force is non conservative the system is able to stay indefinitely in motion.

The long-range and short-range force , between agent due to agent are given by:

(1)

(2)

(3)

Where is the distance between agent , and , are the force parameters for long-range attractive and short-range repulsive force respectively. The model will use since this will result in the most realistic swarming behaviour. Long range force will only be used for attraction and short range for repulsion.

The resulting force for the motion of a prey is:

(4)

Where is the mass of a prey and the coefficient of the friction. The subscript denotes parameters of prey agents whereas denotes parameters of predators.

An additional restriction to the above formula is . The first sum adds all forces acting on prey due to all other preys, except itself. It accounts the attractive and repulsive forces between the preys that form the swarm. The second summation adds all forces acting on prey due to all predators, which is responsible for the anti-Newtonian. The last term is the friction of the prey and the environment, which is proportional to the velocity of the prey.

Next three forces between predators are considered.

(5)

In this formula there is no interaction between the predators. The summation over all preys is responsible for the force directed in direction of the preys. The last term is the friction, which is the product of the predators’ coefficient and it’s velocity.

(6)

By choosing a minus or a plus in the first summation considers a repulsion or attraction between the predators respectively. Additional in the repulsive case of predators the short range repulsive force is not essential.

At the beginning of the simulation the predators and preys are distributed randomly in a certain interval on the on the plane. This should approximate a swarm which is unorganised at the beginning.

The choices of the parameters in the model are essential of the behaviour of the swarm. Some of the choices as seen below will give a more realistic behaviour whereas others give odd, not swarming typical behaviour.

# 5. Implementation

# 6. Interpretation of the parameters

Here we discuss the different parameters that appear in the model. We figure out how to interpret them and how to choose them to get a realistic simulation.

**6.1 The motion parameters**

These two parameters define two of the forces that apply to the agents. defines the attractive force and defines the repulsive force. In this section we always look at the force between two preys.

The first thing to notice is that they have to be negative. To understand why, we have a look at two agents. It is clear that both, attractive and repulsive, forces between these two preys have to be strong when they are close together, i.e. is small, and they have to be weak when they are far apart, i.e. is big. To achieve this, we can simply choose negative motion parameters.

The next observation is that has to be smaller than . This follows from the fact that the agents should swarm. The attractive force has to be stronger than the repulsive force when agents are far apart. But when the agents get too close the opposite situation has to appear, i.e. the repulsive force is stronger than the attractive force. This prevents agents from swimming into each other. Choosing to be smaller than and using them as exponents on the distance between the agents creates this exact situation. In this case, when the distance between the agents gets smaller than , the repulsive force becomes stronger than the attractive force.

To find out how to choose the motion parameters to get a realistic result we examine two properties between them.
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Figure 1: Shows the total force on an agent due to another agent in relation to their distance

The first property is the difference between and . The effect of this difference can be seen on figure 1. It shows the total force on an agent due to another agent in relation to their distance. When the difference becomes larger, the peak of the force curve increases and the curve becomes less flat. This leads to a faster stabilization of the system. For realistic results we found a difference of to be best because it provides the most continuous movement.
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Figure 2: Shows the total force on an agent due to another agent in relation to their distance

Now that we know the difference between and we investigate the second property, which is the value of . The effect of changing the value of can be seen on figure 2. It shows the total force on an agent due to another agent in relation to their distance, just like figure 1. The most noticeable effect of changing the value of is that for distances greater the total force becomes stronger when becomes greater. For most realistic results we choose and , because in our simulation a distance of between the agents appears quite often, so we need enough force on the prey for a natural movement. This is not given for , as we can see on figure 2. If we choose the total force becomes too strong, especially for distances greater than .

**6.2 The Mass**

In this model the mass has just one function. It defines the inertia of an agent. The total force on an agent divided by the mass gives the acceleration of this agent. If the mass becomes too big, the acceleration becomes too slow and the agent more inert. And then the simulation becomes too slow and it stabilizes too fast, which is unrealistic. On the other side if the mass becomes very small, the opposite happens. The simulation becomes too fast and it stabilizes very slowly. This is also unrealistic, because it leads to agents jumping around.

For most realistic results we found to be perfect.

**6.3 The Friction**

In this model the main function of the friction is, that agents do not swim away too far. The friction stops agents that swim away from the swarm with high speed. It holds the swarm together and is essential for a swarming behaviour. The value of the friction is dependent on how many agents there are. If there are more agents, the friction needs to be stronger, because it has to neutralize bigger forces. This is because if there are more agents, the total force applying on an agent is bigger and there will occur greater accelerations. This leads to greater speeds and therefore the friction has to be stronger.

The best value is hard to determine generally, but it has shown that is good for a simulation with agents

# 7. Simulation Results and Discussion

In all our simulations and . The reason for this is explained in the section above.

**7.1 Trivial case, no predator**
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Figure 3: Shows one equilibrium that can appear when only using preys

In this case the equation for motion of the preys is simplified to:

(7)

Since there are no predators there is no need to take them into account.

In this trivial case with preys, and , the preys eventually form a stationary equilibrium depicted in the figure 3. Further it is to note that there exist different stationary equilibriums for only preys. The only case where they do not form a stationary equilibrium is when the friction is removed in the above equation i.e. the term . That follows from the fact that the energy is conserved which implies that there is no stable equilibrium anymore.

The results obtained in this case equal the results of the paper proposed the model.

**7.2. Single predator**
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Figure 4: Shows one equilibrium that can appear when using one predator and seven preys

This case uses the equation (x) for preys and (y) for predators. In general there is no stable equilibrium anymore like in case 1 with no predators. However, with the configuration , , and the predator gets trapped in the middle of the preys. The situation is depicted in figure 4. This is an unrealistic result and therefore is not discussed further in this paper. Nevertheless it is the same result as in paper [1]. A lot of configurations in the single predator case result in an unrealistic behaviour of the swarm.

Analysis of the parameters in the section above and several test with those parameters we found out that the parameters of figure (x) are the most realistic in case of a single predator. The predator follows the swarm and split it mostly into two parts. As soon as the predator is some distance away from the preys, he again meet each other and build a swarm. This increases the chance of survive of the preys as they try to stay close together. Sometimes the predator is able to chase a prey away from the swarm but instead trying to chase the prey further away, as it mostly would appear in nature, the predator turns into the direction of the swarm. This is caused by the multiple preys having a stronger attractive force on the predator as a single prey. It is not possible to change this behaviour of the predator without changing the model, since the predator always gets attracted by the most predators. This also could be seen as the case where the predator is able to eat/kill a prey and turning around to chase more preys in the swarm.

**7.3. Multiple predators**

This scenario is the most complicated one, because the equation of the predator needs to be considered as well. Therefore this part is divided into three subsections: First of all the situation with no force between the predators will be considered. Secondly this paper will consider an attractive force between the predators and thirdly the case with a repulsive force.

In all of the parts mentioned above the equation (x).will be used for the preys.

In the first case with no interaction between the predators the equation (x) is used to compute the force of the predators.

This scenario corresponds to the case where the predators do not interact with each other. In the most of the configurations the predators have a chaotic trajectory. When two predators come close to each other they often behave the same. The reason for this is that once they come close enough together the acting forces on them will be nearly the same. Nevertheless they normally split after a while.

The next option is an attractive force between the predators which is expressed in the equation (x). In contrary to the above case where the predators sometimes behave exactly the same, they stay at least at a certain distance due to the near distance repulsive force.

With a configuration of bx = 0.1, mx = 1, b0 = 0.5, m0 = 0.5, three predators and seven preys, it first looks that the predator do some random walk with the preys in the middle. But after some time the predators form a group and circulate together around the prey swarm in their middle which is depicted in figure x.

Another interesting behaviour is given by the configuration mx = 0.2, bx = 0.2, b0 = 0.2, m0 = 0.1, 2 predators and 7 preys. This is more realistic scenario in which the predators try to stay together, but after a while mostly chase the preys alone. They do often separate the swarm and go after some preys which lost the connection to the swarm. Anyway after a while the swarm again finds together and the scenario starts from the beginning.

The last option is to choose a repulsive force between the predators which leads to the equation x. In this scenario the predators avoid each other. With this kind of interaction they often attack the swarm from different sides what is close to realistic behaviour, where the predators tries to surround the preys. The predators often rush through the swarm and divide them for a short time into multiple smaller swarms until the swarm eventually finds together. This outcome can be observed with the following configuration: mx = 0.3, bx = 0.2, m0 = 0.1 and b0 = 0.2. Also remarkable in this configuration is that the swarm finds together relatively quickly after a predator divided them into two parts. In contrast to a configuration: mx = 0.2, bx = 0.2, m0 = 0.1 and b0 = 0.2 where the preys need a long time to find together when they got separated. In some cases the latter configuration leads to separated swarms chased by the predators.

**8. Discussion of the results**

The results obtained in the above section where there is no predator end up in a stable equilibrium except the case where the friction is removed. This is clearly not a realistic result of swarming behaviour which makes the model useless for swarming behaviour without predators.

In the case of a single predator there are several configurations which lead to a more realistic behaviour of the swarm. Nevertheless the parameters have to be chosen careful. The change of just one a parameter can result in an unrealistic behaviour of the swarm for example to fast moving agents. Further there exist some configurations which end up in a periodic movement of all agents which also is not realistic behaviour. If the parameters are chosen carefully the simulations lead to a realistic and contiguous movement of the agents. On the other hand there are several configurations which lead to a contiguous movement of the agents and behaviours which approximately simulate a realistic swarm attacked by a predator.

With multiple predators there need to be considered three subcases, which differs in the forces between the predators. The difference between the simulations with no force and with attractive force is small. The most remarkable difference is that the predators in the attractive force model do not come as close as in the model with no force. This follows form the repulsive force in the attractive case, when predators are too close by each other.

Predators with a repulsive force between each other result in a simulation which differ the most from the other cases with multiple predators. Here the predators normally surround the swarm of preys and rush into several times. This behaviour is probably caused of the repulsive force between predators, which cause them keeping distance from each other and on the other hand they are attracted by preys.

# 9. Summary and Outlook

One of the advantages of the model used in this paper is its simplicity. There are only few parameters to choose and the swarming is modelled by only using friction and central forces. The anti-Newtonian force keeps the system in movement despite loss of energy due to friction. The computation is also not that complex and therefore does not cost a lot of computation time per step which can be done in a reasonable amount of time. Our model uses the Euler method to solve the differential equations. This could be replaced by a more accurate method like Runge Kutta but we considered Euler as precise enough. However, too much agents added to the simulation will slow down the computation. On the other hand too much agents make it hard to explore the behaviour of individuals.

The swarming simulation of the model can reproduce the basic behaviour of a swarm when the right parameters are chosen. Some of the simulations approximate the behaviour of swarming observed in nature like a fish swarm attacked by a predator, although the simulations in the paper are not in the three dimensional Cartesian plane. To do the computations in the 3 dimensional plane could possibly improve the behaviour of the swarm.

The interaction of the preys as a group but also as an autonomous individual is also a remarkable result of this model. When the swarm of preys gets split into several parts, all those little swarms try to stay together and eventually connect to another swarm. This can be interpreted as an optimal behaviour of a swarm since it also occurs in nature.

When a prey gets scatted away from the swarm it acts autonomous and tries to go back to the swarm. It is possible to interpret this behaviour as a predator catch a prey directly.

Clearly the model is too simple to capture the exact behaviour of swarming observed in nature. To adjust this problem it would help to add more parameters to the model. For example a prey could consider a predator at a certain distance not as a danger or simply add a range of influence to every agent. Randomness or noise which certainly occurs in nature could also be added to the model to allow agents making error in their behaviour. The angle of vision or the direction of the wind is also a parameter which is important in nature, so the predator can sneak up undetected to the swarm from a certain direction.

Another disadvantage is that the predators do not have a specific hunt tactic as for example lions do have in nature. The model distinguishes between three forces between the predator which approximates such behaviour but does not follow an explicit strategy. To adjust such a behaviour more involved and organism specific computations have to be done. In such a case it would be necessary to first study the behaviour of a certain species from a biological point of view and then develop a specific model.

In spite of everything the model used in this paper gives a good approximation of basic swarming behaviour. The described simulations and result do reflect roughly the natural behaviour of swarming.

It is hard to analyse what behaviour of preys and what kind of shape is the best for preys attacked by a predator. Certainly the found configurations are close to the optimum since the behaviour described by the simulation is approximately the one observed in nature. If it would not be optimal then in course of time the behaviour would have been wiped out. Predator prey behaviour is a interplay between both parties.

Accurate swarming models can be used in a lot of technical applications. For example for controlling unmanned vehicles for military purposes or controlling robots within the body for killing viruses or cancer. Certainly the models need to be adapted to a certain application but the model described in this paper gives a flavour of how this can be achieved.
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