



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Automated Reverse Engineering of Agent Behaviors

Wei Li

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Automatic Control and Systems Engineering
The University of Sheffield

30th September 2015

Abstract

This thesis concerns the automated reverse engineering of agent behaviors. It proposes a metric-free coevolutionary approach—*Turing Learning*, which allows a machine to infer the behaviors of agents (simulated or physical ones), in a fully automated way.

Turing Learning consists of two populations. A population of models competitively coevolves with a population of classifiers. The classifiers observe the models and agents. The fitness of the classifiers depends solely on their ability to distinguish between them. The models, on the other hand, are evolved to mimic the behavior of the agents and mislead the judgment of the classifiers. The fitness of the models depends solely on their ability to ‘trick’ the classifiers into categorizing them as agents. Unlike other methods for system identification, *Turing Learning* does not require any predefined metrics to quantitatively measure the difference between the models and agents.

The merits of *Turing Learning* are demonstrated using three case studies. In the first case study, a machine automatically infers the behavioral rules of a group of homogeneous agents through observation. A replica, which resembles the agents under investigation in terms of behavioral capabilities, is mixed into the group. The models are executed on the replica. This case study is conducted with swarms of both simulated and physical robots. In the second and third case studies, *Turing Learning* is applied to infer deterministic and stochastic behaviors of a single agent through controlled interaction, respectively. In particular, the machine is able to modify the environmental stimuli that the agent responds to. In the case study of inferring deterministic behavior, the machine can construct static patterns of stimuli that facilitate the learning process. In the case study of inferring stochastic behavior, the machine needs to interact with the agent on the fly through dynamically changing patterns of stimuli. This allows the machine to explore the agent’s hidden information and thus reveal its entire behavioral repertoire. This interactive approach proves superior to learning only through observation.

Acknowledgments

I consider the process of pursuing my PhD as a journey to learn not only about science, but also about life. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Roderich Groß and Prof. Stephen A. Billings for their support in this journey. The special thanks would be given to Dr. Roderich Groß. He helped me from toddling to walking on the pathway in this research field by motivating, teaching and passing his professional experience to me without any reservation. He is always very patient to discuss with me and give me professional suggestions. His passion for pursuing science and rigorous attitude in research have deeply influenced me.

Second, many people have contributed to this journey, especially people in the Natural Robotics Lab: Melvin Gauci, Jianing Chen, Yuri K. Lopes, Christopher Parrott, Fernando Perez Diaz, Stefan Trenkwalder, Gabriel Kapellmann Zafra, Matthew Doyle, and Shen-Chiang Chen, who make the lab a warm, supportive and fun environment. Special thanks to Melvin Gauci and Jianing Chen. To Melvin, I considered myself very lucky that I met him from the start of this unforgettable journey. I have learned much from him on doing research and life. We not only had many collaborations on research, but we also shared the experience outside science. To Jianing, I appreciate his help for sharing his knowledge with me and providing valuable feedback when I did my experiments.

Outside the research group, there are also a number of people who helped me during my stay in Sheffield, especially Xiao Chen and Yuzhu Guo. This journey would not be completed without their encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. To my parents, thank you for giving me a free environment to grow up and always supporting me without any hesitation. To my wife, Yifei, thank you for always accompanying and encouraging me, which makes me maintain a positive attitude for life.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation and Objectives	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Contributions	5
1.4 Publications	6
1.5 Thesis Outline	7
2 Background and Related Work	11
2.1 Background	11
2.1.1 The Development of AI and Robotics	11
2.1.2 Introduction of Automation Science	14
2.2 Evolutionary Computation	15
2.2.1 Biological Evolution	15
2.2.2 Introduction of Evolutionary Computation	16
2.2.2.1 Principles	16
2.2.2.2 Strengths	20
2.2.2.3 Weaknesses	21
2.2.3 Applications of Evolutionary Computation	22
2.2.3.1 Black Box Optimization	23
2.2.3.2 Evolutionary Robotics	25
2.2.3.3 System Identification	27
2.3 Combining AI/Robotics and Animal Behavior	30
2.3.1 Animal Behavior in Nature	30

2.3.2	Swarm Optimization and Swarm Robotics	32
2.3.2.1	Swarm Optimization	32
2.3.2.2	Swarm Robotics	33
2.3.3	Contribution of AI/Robotics to Ethology	35
2.3.3.1	Learning from Synthesis	35
2.3.3.2	Robot–Animal Interaction	37
3	Reverse Engineering Swarm Behaviors Through Turing Learning	39
3.1	Methodology	40
3.1.1	Turing Learning	41
3.1.1.1	Models	41
3.1.1.2	Classifiers	41
3.1.1.3	Optimization Algorithm	42
3.1.1.4	Fitness Calculation	44
3.1.1.5	Termination Criterion	45
3.1.2	Case Studies	45
3.1.2.1	Problem Formulation	45
3.1.2.2	Aggregation	47
3.1.2.3	Object Clustering	48
3.2	Simulation Platform and Setups	49
3.2.1	Simulation Platform	49
3.2.2	Simulation Setups	50
3.3	Simulation Results	50
3.3.1	Analysis of Evolved Models	50
3.3.2	Coevolutionary Dynamics	55
3.3.3	Analysis of Evolved Classifiers	58
3.3.3.1	Using a Single Classifier	58
3.3.3.2	Using a Classifier System	61
3.3.4	Observing Only a Subset of Agents	64
3.3.5	Evolving Control and Morphology	65
3.3.6	Evolving Other Behaviors	67
3.3.7	Noise Study	68
3.4	Summary	69

4	A Real-World Validation of Turing Learning	75
4.1	Physical Platform	76
4.1.1	Robot Arena	76
4.1.2	Robot Platform and Sensor Implementations	77
4.1.2.1	Robot Platform	77
4.1.2.2	Sensor Implementations	77
4.2	Motion Capture and Video Processing	79
4.2.1	Motion Capture	79
4.2.2	Video Processing	80
4.3	Coevolution with Physical Robots	81
4.3.1	PC Program	82
4.3.2	Replica Program	83
4.3.3	Agent Program	84
4.4	Experimental Setup	84
4.5	Results	85
4.5.1	Analysis of Evolved Models	85
4.5.2	Analysis of Evolved Classifiers	91
4.6	Analysis of Sensitivity for Individual Failure	93
4.7	Summary	95
5	Inferring Individual Behaviors Through Interactive Turing Learning	97
5.1	Introduction	97
5.2	Methodology	98
5.2.1	Models	98
5.2.2	Classifiers	99
5.2.3	Optimization Algorithm	100
5.2.4	Fitness Calculation	100
5.3	Case Study One	101
5.3.1	Deterministic Behavior	101
5.3.2	Simulation Setup	103
5.3.3	Results	104
5.3.3.1	Analysis of Evolved Models	104
5.3.3.2	Coevolutionary Dynamics	106
5.3.3.3	Analysis of Evolved Classifiers	108

5.3.3.4	Noise Study	113
5.3.3.5	Using a Single-Population Evolutionary Algorithm . . .	114
5.3.3.6	Coevolution of Inputs and Models	116
5.4	Case Study Two	117
5.4.1	Stochastic Behavior	117
5.4.2	Simulation Setup	119
5.4.3	Results: Two States	120
5.4.3.1	Analysis of Evolved Models	120
5.4.3.2	Analysis of Evolved Classifiers	121
5.4.4	Results: Three States	122
5.4.4.1	Analysis of Evolved Models	122
5.4.4.2	Analysis of Evolved Classifiers	123
5.5	Summary	123
6	Conclusion	131
6.1	Summary of Findings	131
6.2	Future work	132

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and Objectives

Over the last 50 years, robotic and automation systems have transformed our world and greatly enhanced the quality of our daily life. With the development of science and technology, many intelligent systems that integrate machines, electronics, control and information technologies have emerged. Such systems can accomplish numerous tasks originally performed by humans and often prove superior in terms of precision, speed and cost. They can replace humans in the tasks that require repetitive and monotonous operations. For example, in the automotive industry, robotic and automation systems have been widely used for machining, welding, painting and assembling. From an industrial perspective, these systems have lowered the product cost and improved the efficiency of production, thus greatly increasing the speed of industrialization.

Robotic and automation systems also contribute to scientific research. For example, in outdoor environments such as those that may be beyond humans' capabilities of reach, robots can be sent to collect samples or conduct experiments. For example, two robots—*Spirit* and *Opportunity* were sent to Mars in 2004 by NASA in a mission to explore the geology of this planet [1]. The primary goal of this mission was to analyze the rocks and soils on Mars and explore the activity of water in the past. In the indoor laboratories, robotic and automation systems have also played an important role. With the help of these systems, researchers can collect data much faster than ever before. For instance, high-throughput screening (HTS) systems [2], which are widely used in drug discovery, allow the researchers to conduct millions of experiments in a very short time. Such systems consist of several components, including sensing units, robotic manipulator, control system, etc. Besides data collection, robotic and automation systems can also

1 Introduction

help analyze the data using intelligent software, which provides an effective tool for data analysis in scientific research and frees researchers from the tedious and monotonous process of data analysis if done manually. This accelerates the development of scientific research to a great extent.

A particular scientific area in which robotic and automation systems play a significant role is *ethology*—the study of animal behavior [3]. There are four types of questions to be investigated in ethology: questions concerning causes, functions, development and evolution [3]. Causes refer to the mechanisms of animals that are innate as well as the external/internal stimuli that affect such behavior. Functions concern what is the purpose of this behavior such as mating, aggregation or foraging. The development of animal behavior concerns how animals learn such behavior during their life and how such behavior is affected by experience, while evolution relates to how the behavior changes over generations in the course of natural evolution. Over centuries, these four questions have been investigated by ethologists primarily in well-controlled (indoor) laboratories or outdoor environments. Ethology is pursued not only because it is a subject of interest in itself, but also because the knowledge gained from it has several practical applications. For instance, models of animal decision-making can be used to predict their behavior in novel environments, which can help in making ecological conservation policy [4]. Knowledge about animal behavior has also been applied for solving computational problems [5], and for constructing biologically-inspired robotic agents [6].

Before the emergence of computers, ethologists needed to observe the animals and analyze the data manually. They also needed to learn how to control the environmental conditions in a meaningful way to extract most of the information from the animals under investigation. Such process of analysis sometimes is time-consuming and tedious. With the help of intelligent and automation systems, nowadays researchers can conduct experiments much more efficiently. However, these systems are often secondary, and in most of the cases they are merely accomplishing mechanical and repetitive work. The question is whether we can build a machine/system that can accomplish the whole process of scientific investigation and automatically analyze experimental data, search for correlations between different elements, generate new hypotheses and devise new experimental conditions to be investigated. In other words, can we build a system that is able to automatically conduct scientific research without (or with minimal) human

intervention? Recently, the development of “robot scientists” shows that such systems may be within reach [7, 8, 9]. Following this motivation, this thesis aims to pave the way for further development in science automation [8], especially in the area of ethology. The ultimate goal of this thesis is to contribute to the study of animal behavior through developing an automated system identification/modeling method.

System identification is a process of modeling natural or artificial systems with observed data. It has drawn a large interest among researchers for decades [10, 11]. One application of system identification is the reverse engineering of agent behavior (biological organisms or artificial agents). Many studies have investigated how to deduce rules of agent behavior using system identification techniques based on various models [12], one of which is an agent-based model [13], which simulates the complex behavior of a group of agents with relatively simple behavioral rules. The global behavior emerging from interaction within agents and between agents and environments is used for refining the model. Evolutionary computation which draws inspiration from biological evolution has proven to be a powerful method to automate the generation of models, especially for behaviors that are hard to formulate [14, 15, 16]. Evolutionary computation also provides a potential realization for automation science, as models evolve in an autonomous manner. It is the main technique that is investigated in this thesis for performing system identification.

A limitation of existing system identification methods is that they rely on predefined metrics, such as the sum of squared error, to measure the difference between the output of the models and that of the system under investigation. Model optimization then proceeds by minimizing the measured differences. However, for complex systems, defining a metric can be non-trivial and case-dependent. It may require significant prior information about the systems. Moreover, an unsuitable metric may not well distinguish between good and bad models, or even bias the identification process. This thesis aims to overcome the limitation by introducing a metric-free system identification method that allows a machine to infer agent behavior automatically.

1.2 Problem Statement

The investigated (agent) behaviors in this thesis are simulated by a computer or physical robots. The agent to be studied is put in an environment. Its behavior depends on interaction with the environment and with other agents in a group (if any). The machine will observe the agent's motion. It is assumed that it is possible to track the position and orientation of the agent at discrete steps in time. In general, one could monitor a range of variables including the agent's motion, heart rate, morphology, body temperature, etc. Furthermore, the machine can control environmental stimuli that the agent may respond to. The system identification task is to infer the observed behavior, in other words, the agent's behavioral rules.

Three case studies are presented in this thesis. The first case study is about inferring swarm behaviors, which are emergent behaviors that arise from the interactions of numerous simple individuals [17]. Learning about behaviors that are exhibited in a collective manner is particularly challenging, as the individuals not only interact with the environment but also with each other. Typically their motion appears stochastic and is difficult to predict [18]. For instance, given a swarm of simulated fish, one would have to evaluate how close its behavior is to that of a real fish swarm, or how close the individual behavior of a simulated fish is to that of a real fish. Comparing behaviors at the level of the swarm (i.e., emergent behaviors) is challenging [19]. It may require domain-specific knowledge and not discriminate among alternative individual rules that exhibit similar collective dynamics [20]. Comparing behaviors at the level of individuals is also difficult, as even the same individual fish in the swarm is likely to exhibit a fundamentally different trajectory every time it is being looked at. In this case study, the machine observes the motion of each individual in the swarm and needs to automatically infer the behavioral rules of the swarming agents.

The second case study is about inferring the deterministic behaviors of a single agent, and investigating how the agent responds to the environmental stimuli. The machine has full control over the environmental stimuli that the agent may respond to, and at the same time observes the agent's motion. We investigate a particular type of agent behavior; from the perspective of system identification, the agent behavior has low observability. That is, randomly generated sequences of inputs (stimuli) are not sufficient to extract

all the hidden information of the agent and thus infer its behavior. Instead, in order to reveal all the agent’s behavioral repertoire, the machine needs to construct complex patterns of stimuli in particular ways that facilitate the learning process.

In the third case study, we investigate how to infer the stochastic behaviors of a single agent. The agent still responds to the environmental stimuli; however, its behavior is not only determined by the environmental stimuli but also by probability. In other words, constructing a fixed sequence of stimuli may not trigger all the agent’s behavioral repertoire as mentioned in the second case study. To reveal the agent’s hidden behavior, the machine needs to interact with the agent during the experimental process and dynamically change/control the environmental stimuli based on the agent’s observed motion. Inferring such stochastic behaviors is challenging, as given the same sequence of stimuli, the agent is likely to exhibit different behaviors.

1.3 Contributions

The main contribution of this thesis is a novel system identification approach—*Turing Learning*—which allows a machine to infer agent behavior in an autonomous manner. *Turing Learning* uses a coevolutionary algorithm comprising two populations. A population of models competitively coevolves with a population of classifiers. The classifiers observe the models and agents. The fitness of the classifiers depends solely on their ability to discriminate between them. Conversely, the fitness of the models depends solely on their ability to ‘trick’ the classifiers into categorizing them as agents. Unlike other system identification methods, *Turing Learning* does not rely on predefined metrics to gauge the difference between the behaviors of agents and models.

The specific contributions are as follows:

- 1) A metric-free approach to automatically infer the behavioral rules of a group of homogeneous agents. Both the inferred model parameters and emergent global behaviors closely matched those of the original system.
- 2) A metric-free approach to automatically produce a classifier (system) that can be used for detecting abnormal behaviors (e.g., faulty agents in a swarm). This was validated by both simulated and physical robot swarms.

- 3) A physical system for performing metric-free system identification in an autonomous manner. The system was validated through successfully inferring the behavioral rules of a physical robot swarm. Both the inferred model parameters and emergent global behaviors closely matched those of the original system.
- 4) A metric-free approach to automatically infer deterministic behavior of a single agent. The machine actively constructs complex patterns of inputs (stimuli) to extract the agent's entire behavioral repertoire.
- 5) A metric-free approach to automatically infer stochastic behavior of a single agent through controlled interaction. The machine changes the environmental stimulus depending on the output of the agent under observation on the fly.

1.4 Publications

This thesis presents the author's own work. Some parts of the thesis have been published. A preliminary version of Chapter 3 was orally presented in a conference by the author:

- **W. Li**, M. Gauci and R. Groß, "Coevolutionary learning of swarm behaviors without metrics," *Proceedings of 2014 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO 2014)*. ACM Press, Vancouver, Canada, 2014, pp. 201–208.

A preliminary version of Chapter 5 was orally presented in a conference by the author of this thesis:

- **W. Li**, M. Gauci and R. Groß, "A coevolutionary approach to learn animal behavior through controlled interaction," *Proceedings of 2013 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO 2013)*. ACM Press, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2013, pp. 223–230.

Preliminary versions of Chapters 3 and 4 have been included in a paper submitted to the following journal:

- **W. Li**, M. Gauci, J. Chen and R. Groß, "Reverse Engineering Swarm Behaviors Through Turing Learning," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, under review.

Apart from the work presented in this thesis, the author has also contributed to other projects. This led to the following publications:

- M. Gauci, J. Chen, **W. Li**, T. J. Dodd, and R. Groß, “Self-organized aggregation without computation,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 1145–1161, 2014.
- J. Chen, M. Gauci, **W. Li**, A. Kolling and R. Groß, “Occlusion-based cooperative transport with a swarm of miniature mobile robots.” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 307–321, 2015.
- M. Gauci, J. Chen, **W. Li**, T. J. Dodd, and R. Groß, “Clustering objects with robots that do not compute,” in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2014)*. IFAAMAS Press, Paris, France, 2014, pp. 421–428.

During his PhD studies, the author has also been a Marie Curie Research Fellow with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Western Ontario, Canada, where he contributed to a project on Mechanical Cognitization. This led to the following publication:

- G. Avigad, **W. Li**, A. Weiss, “Mechanical Cognitization: A kinematic system proof of concept” *Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 155–170, 2015.

1.5 Thesis Outline

This thesis is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 describes the background of the thesis as well as the related work presented in the literature.
- Chapter 3 introduces a metric-free system identification method—*Turing Learning*. It is applied to learn two swarm behaviors (self-organized aggregation [21] and self-organized object clustering [22]) through observation. Section 3.1 describes the implementation of *Turing Learning* and the two swarm behaviors. Section 3.2

introduces the simulation platform and setups for performing coevolution runs. Section 3.3 presents the results obtained from the two case studies. In particular, Section 3.3.1 analyzes the evolution of models, objectively measuring their quality in terms of local and global behaviors. Section 3.3.2 investigates the coevolutionary dynamics. Section 3.3.3 investigates the evolution of classifiers, showing how to construct a robust classifier system to potentially detect abnormal behaviors in the swarm. Section 3.3.4 studies the effect of observing only a subset of agents in the swarm. Section 3.3.5 presents a study where an aspect of the agents' morphology (their field of view) and brain (controller) are inferred simultaneously. Section 3.3.6 shows the results of using *Turing Learning* to learn other swarm behaviors. Section 3.3.7 presents a study showing the method's sensitivity to noise. Section 3.4 summarizes the findings in this chapter.

- Chapter 4 presents a real-world validation of *Turing Learning* to infer the behavior of a swarm of physical robots. Section 4.1 introduces the physical platform, which includes the robot arena, the robot platform and the sensors implementation. Section 4.2 details the tracking system, including motion capture and video processing. Section 4.3 describes the programs executed by each component (machine, agent and replica) during the coevolutionary learning process. Section 4.4 describes the experimental setup. Section 4.5 discusses the results obtained. This includes the analysis of the evolved models and the analysis of the evolved classifiers. Section 4.6 analyzes the sensitivity of *Turing Learning* for individual failure during the experimental process. Section 4.7 summarizes the results obtained and discusses the findings in this chapter.
- Chapter 5 investigates how to infer the deterministic and stochastic behaviors of an agent through *Turing Learning* with interaction. The machine not only observes the behavior of the agent but also interacts with it through changing the stimulus that influences the agent's behavior. This chapter is organized as follows. Section 5.2 describes the methodology, illustrating how *Turing Learning* is extended to have interactive capability. The deterministic and stochastic behaviors under investigation are presented as two case studies (Sections 5.3 and 5.4). Section 5.3.1 describes the deterministic behavior. Section 5.3.2 presents the simulation setup. Section 5.3.3 presents the results of inferring the deterministic behavior. Section 5.4.1 describes the stochastic behavior (using a state machine) for the general

case. Section 5.4.2 presents the simulation setup for inferring the stochastic behavior. Sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 present the obtained results for the case of 2 states and 3 states, respectively. Section 5.5 summarizes the chapter.

- Chapter 6 concludes the thesis and discusses the future work.

Bibliography

- [1] J. P. Grotzinger, “Habitability, taphonomy, and the search for organic carbon on mars,” *Science*, vol. 343, no. 6169, pp. 386–387, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/343/6169/386.short>
- [2] R. P. Hertzberg and A. J. Pope, “High-throughput screening: new technology for the 21st century,” *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 445 – 451, 2000. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1367593100001101>
- [3] J. Bolhuis and L. Giraldeau, *The behavior of animals: mechanisms, function, and evolution*. USA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.
- [4] W. J. Sutherland, “The importance of behavioural studies in conservation biology,” *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 801–809, 1998.
- [5] D. Floreano and C. Mattiussi, *Bio-Inspired Artificial Intelligence: Theories, Methods, and Technologies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.
- [6] J.-A. Meyer and A. Guillot, “Biologically inspired robots,” in *Springer Handbook of Robot.*, ser. Springer Handbooks, B. Siciliano and O. Khatib, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2008, pp. 1395–1422.
- [7] R. King, J. Rowland, S. G. Oliver, and M. Young, “The automation of science,” *Science*, vol. 324, no. 5923, pp. 85–89, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/324/5923/85.abstract>
- [8] J. Evans and A. Rzhetsky, “Machine science,” *Science*, vol. 329, no. 5990, pp. 399–400, 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/329/5990/399.short>

- [9] D. Waltz and B. G. Buchanan, “Automating science,” *Sci.*, vol. 324, no. 5923, pp. 43–44, 2009.
- [10] L. Ljung, “Perspectives on system identification,” *Annu. Reviews in Control*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2010.
- [11] S. A. Billings, *Nonlinear system identification: NARMAX methods in the time, frequency, and spatio-temporal domains*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2013.
- [12] S. M. Henson and J. L. Hayward, “The mathematics of animal behavior: An interdisciplinary dialogue,” *Notices of the AMS*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 1248–1258, 2010.
- [13] E. Bonabeau, “Agent-based modeling: Methods and techniques for simulating human systems,” *PNAS*, vol. 99, no. 10, pp. 7280–7287, 2002.
- [14] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Nonlinear system identification using coevolution of models and tests,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Computation*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 361–384, 2005.
- [15] —, “Automated reverse engineering of nonlinear dynamical systems,” *PNAS*, vol. 104, no. 24, pp. 9943–9948, 2007.
- [16] G. D. Ruxton and G. Beauchamp, “The application of genetic algorithms in behavioural ecology, illustrated with a model of anti-predator vigilance,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, vol. 250, no. 3, pp. 435–448, 2008.
- [17] S. Camazine, J.-L. Deneubourg, N. R. Franks, *et al.*, *Self-Organization in Biological Systems*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- [18] D. Helbing and A. Johansson, “Pedestrian, crowd and evacuation dynamics,” in *Extreme Environmental Events*, R. A. Meyers, Ed. Springer, 2011, pp. 697–716.
- [19] J. Harvey, K. Merrick, and H. A. Abbass, “Application of chaos measures to a simplified boids flocking model,” *Swarm Intell.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 2015.
- [20] W. S, B. S, F. R, *et al.*, “Modeling collective animal behavior with a cognitive perspective: a methodological framework,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no. 6, 2012, e38588.

- [21] M. Gauci, J. Chen, W. Li, T. J. Dodd, and R. Groß, “Self-organized aggregation without computation,” *The Int. J. of Robot. Research*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 1145–1161, 2014.
- [22] ———, “Clustering objects with robots that do not compute,” in *Proc. 2014 Int. Conf. Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Syst.*, IFAAMAS Press, Paris, France, 2014, pp. 421–428.
- [23] H. Schildt, *Artificial intelligence using C*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [24] E. Charniak, *Introduction to artificial intelligence*. Reading, MA, USA: Addison-Wesley, 1985.
- [25] D. B. Fogel, *Evolutionary computation: toward a new philosophy of machine intelligence*. Street Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley-IEEE Press, 1995.
- [26] M. L. Minsky, “Logical versus analogical or symbolic versus connectionist or neat versus scruffy,” *AI magazine*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 34–51, 1991.
- [27] A. Turing, “Computing machinery and intelligence,” *Mind*, vol. 59, no. 236, pp. 433–460, 1950.
- [28] P. Jackson, *Introduction to expert system*. Boston, MA, USA: Addison-Wesley, 1998.
- [29] J. H. Connell, *Minimalist Mobile Robotics*. Burlington, MA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1990.
- [30] R. K. Lindsay, B. G. Buchanan, E. A. Feigenbaum, and J. Lederberg, “Dendral: A case study of the first expert system for scientific hypothesis formation,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 209 – 261, 1993. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/000437029390068M>
- [31] P. Salvaneschi, M. Cedei, and M. Lazzari, “Applying ai to structural safety monitoring and evaluation,” *IEEE Expert*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 24–34, Aug 1996.
- [32] L. Zadeh, “Fuzzy sets,” *Information and Control*, vol. 8, pp. 338–353, 1965.

- [33] A. Cully, J. Clune, D. Tarapore, and J.-B. Mouret, “Robots that can adapt like animals,” *Nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 503–507, 2015.
- [34] N. J. Nilsson, “Shakey the robot,” SRI International Technical Note, Tech. Rep., 1984.
- [35] V. Dimitrov, M. DeDonato, A. Panzica, S. Zutshi, M. Wills, and T. Padir, “Hierarchical navigation architecture and robotic arm controller for a sample return rover,” in *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*, Oct 2013, pp. 4476–4481.
- [36] R. Brooks, “A robust layered control system for a mobile robot,” *Robotics and Automation, IEEE Journal of*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 14–23, Mar 1986.
- [37] B. G. Buchanan and E. H. Shortliffe, *Rule Based Expert Systems: The Mycin Experiments of the Stanford Heuristic Programming Project (The Addison-Wesley Series in Artificial Intelligence)*. Boston, MA, USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1984.
- [38] R. A. Brooks, “A robot that walks; emergent behaviors from a carefully evolved network,” Cambridge, MA, USA, Tech. Rep., 1989.
- [39] M. Steinlechner and W. Parson, “Automation and high through-put for a dna database laboratory: development of a laboratory information management system,” *Croatian medical journal*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 252–255, 2001.
- [40] A. Persidis, “High-throughput screening,” *Nature biotechnology*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 488–493, 1998.
- [41] K. E. Whelan and R. D. King, “Intelligent software for laboratory automation,” *Trends in Biotechnology*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 440–445, 2004.
- [42] N. Gauld and Gaston., “Driving miss daisy: The performance of an automated insect identification system,” *Hymenoptera: evolution, biodiversity and biological-control*, pp. 303–311, 2000.
- [43] N. MacLeod, M. Benfield, and P. Culverhouse, “Time to automate identification,” *Nature*, vol. 467, no. 7312, pp. 154–55, 2010. [Online]. Available: http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v467/n7312/full/467154a.html?type=access_denied

- [44] C. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*. England: Dover Publications, 1859.
- [45] D. M. M. and F. D. S., “Beneficial mutationselection balance and the effect of linkage on positive selection,” *Genetics*, vol. 176, no. 3, pp. 1759–1798, 2007.
- [46] L. S. Russell, “Body temperature of dinosaurs and its relationships to their extinction,” *Journal of Paleontology*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. pp. 497–501, 1965. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1301720>
- [47] B. Li and L. Tusheng, “Comments on coevolution in genetic algorithms,” *Computer Science*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 34–63, 2009.
- [48] J. H. Holland, *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems*. Boston, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992.
- [49] M. J. W. Lawrence J. Fogel, Alvin J. Owens, *Artificial Intelligence through Simulated Evolution*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 1966.
- [50] I. Rechenberg, *Evolutionsstrategie: Optimierung technischer Systeme nach Prinzipien der biologischen Evolution*. Stuttgart: Fromman-Hozlboog Verlag, 1994.
- [51] H.-P.Schwefel, *Evolution and Optimum Seeking*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, 1995.
- [52] J. Koza, *Genetic Programming*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1992.
- [53] A. E. Eiben and J. Smith, “From evolutionary computation to the evolution of things,” *Nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 467–482, 2015.
- [54] C. Rosin and R. Belew, “New methods for competitive coevolution,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 1–29, 1997.
- [55] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Nonlinear system identification using coevolution of models and tests,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 361–384, 2005.
- [56] Z. Hong and W. Jian, “A cooperative coevolutionary algorithm with application to job shop scheduling problem,” in *Service Operations and Logistics, and Informatics, 2006. SOLI '06. IEEE International Conference on*, June 2006, pp. 746–751.

- [57] K. C. Tan, Q. Yu, and J. H. Ang, “A coevolutionary algorithm for rules discovery in data mining,” *International Journal of Systems Science*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 835–864, 2006.
- [58] R. Dawkins and J. R. Krebs, “Arms races between and within species,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B. Biological Sciences*, vol. 205, no. 1161, pp. 489–511, 1979. [Online]. Available: <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/205/1161/489.abstract>
- [59] J. Cartlidge and S. Bullock, “Combating coevolutionary disengagement by reducing parasite virulence,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 193–222, 2004.
- [60] P. J. Angeline and J. B. Pollack, “Competitive environments evolve better solutions for complex tasks,” *Bibliometrics*, vol. 155, no. 18, pp. 1–5, 1993.
- [61] L. Panait and S. Luke, “A comparative study of two competitive fitness functions,” in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. Boston, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2002, pp. 567–573.
- [62] T. Tan and J. Teo, “Competitive coevolution with k-random opponents for pareto multiobjective optimization,” in *Natural Computation, Third International Conference on*, 2007, pp. 63 – 67. [Online]. Available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=?doi=10.1.1.38.3029>
- [63] D. B. Fogel, “The advantages of evolutionary computation,” in *Biocomputing and Emergent Computation: Proceedings of BCEC97*. World Scientific Press, 1997, pp. 1–11.
- [64] H. GS, L. JD, and L. DS, “Computer-automated evolution of an x-band antenna for nasa’s space technology 5 mission,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2011.
- [65] R. Groß, K. Albrecht, W. Kantschik, and W. Banzhaf, “Evolving chess playing programs,” in *GECCO 2002*, no. LSRO-CONF-2008-037. Morgan Kaufmann, 2002.

- [66] O. E. David, H. J. van den Herik, M. Koppel, and N. S. Netanyahu, “Genetic algorithms for evolving computer chess programs,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 779–789, 2014.
- [67] H. Juille and J. B. Pollack, “Coevolving the ”ideal” trainer: Application to the discovery of cellular automata rules,” in *University of Wisconsin*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1998, pp. 519–527.
- [68] C. Wang, S. Yu, W. Chen, and C. Sun, “Highly efficient light-trapping structure design inspired by natural evolution,” *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2013.
- [69] I. Loshchilov and T. Glasmachers. (2015) Black box optimization competition. [Online]. Available: <http://bbcomp.ini.rub.de/>
- [70] M. Gauci, “Swarm robotic systems with minimal information processing,” Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK, 2014.
- [71] R. Bellman, *Dynamic Programming and Lagrange Multipliers*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- [72] N. Hansen, S. Muller, and P. Koumoutsakos, “Reducing the time complexity of the derandomized evolution strategy with covariance matrix adaptation (cma-es),” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–18, March 2003.
- [73] J. J. E. Dennis and J. J. Mor, “Quasi-newton methods, motivation and theory,” *SIAM Review*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 46–89, 1977.
- [74] J. R. Shewchuk, “An introduction to the conjugate gradient method without the agonizing pain,” Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Tech. Rep., 1994.
- [75] C. M. Fonseca and P. J. Fleming, “An overview of evolutionary algorithms in multiobjective optimization,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 1995.
- [76] S. Doncieux, N. Bredeche, J.-B. Mouret, and A. G. Eiben, “Evolutionary robotics: What, why, and where to,” *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2015. [Online]. Available: http://www.frontiersin.org/evolutionary_robotics/10.3389/frobt.2015.00004/abstract

- [77] A. Eiben, “Grand challenges for evolutionary robotics,” *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 1, no. 4, 2014. [Online]. Available: http://www.frontiersin.org/evolutionary_robotics/10.3389/frobt.2014.00004/full
- [78] D. Floreano and S. Nolfi, “Adaptive behavior in competing co-evolving species,” in *The 4th European Conference on Artificial Life*. MIT Press, 1997, pp. 378–387.
- [79] D. Floreano, P. Drr, and C. Mattiussi, “Neuroevolution: from architectures to learning,” *Evolutionary Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 47–62, 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12065-007-0002-4>
- [80] K. O. Stanley and R. Miikkulainen, “Evolving neural networks through augmenting topologies,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 99–127, 2002. [Online]. Available: <http://nn.cs.utexas.edu/?stanley:ec02>
- [81] A. L. Nelson, G. J. Barlow, and L. Doitsidis, “Fitness functions in evolutionary robotics: A survey and analysis,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 345 – 370, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889008001450>
- [82] D. Floreano and F. Mondada, “Evolution of homing navigation in a real mobile robot,” *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, and Cybernetics, Part B: Cybernetics*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 396–407, 1996.
- [83] S. Nolfi and D. Floreano, *Evolutionary robotics: The biology, intelligence, and technology of self-organizing machines*. MIT press, 2000.
- [84] B. D.M. and O. C., “Understanding evolutionary potential in virtual cpu instruction set architectures,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 8, no. 12, p. e83242, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://nn.cs.utexas.edu/?stanley:ec02>
- [85] B. Batut, D. P. Parsons, S. Fischer, G. Beslon, and C. Knibbe, “In silico experimental evolution: a tool to test evolutionary scenarios,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Research in Computational Molecular Biology (RECOMB) Satellite Workshop on Comparative Genomics*. BioMed Central Ltd, 2013, pp. 1–6.
- [86] J.-M. Montanier and N. Bredeche, “Surviving the Tragedy of Commons: Emergence of Altruism in a Population of Evolving Autonomous Agents,” in

- European Conference on Artificial Life*, Paris, France, Aug. 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00601776>
- [87] W. M, F. D, and K. L, “A quantitative test of hamilton’s rule for the evolution of altruism,” *PLoS Biology*, vol. 9, no. 5, p. e1000615, 2011.
 - [88] D. Floreano, S. Mitri, S. Magnenat, and L. Keller, “Evolutionary conditions for the emergence of communication in robots,” *Current Biology*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 514 – 519, 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982207009281>
 - [89] A. JE and B. JC, “Environmental influence on the evolution of morphological complexity in machines,” *PLoS Computational Biology*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. e1003399, 2014.
 - [90] D. Cliff and G. F. Miller, “Co-evolution of pursuit and evasion ii: Simulation methods and results,” *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 92, no. 2, pp. 101–106, 1995.
 - [91] D. Floreano, “Evolutionary robotics in behavior engineering and artificial life,” in *Evolutionary Robotics: From Intelligent Robots to Artificial Life. Applied AI Systems, 1998. Evolutionary Robotics Symposium*. AAI Books, 1998.
 - [92] N. Jakobi, P. Husbands, and I. Harvey, “Noise and the reality gap: the use of simulation in evolutionary robotics,” in *Advances in Artificial Life: Proc. 3rd European Conf. Artificial Life*. Springer-Verlag, 1995, pp. 704–720.
 - [93] S. Koos, J.-B. Mouret, and S. Doncieux, “The transferability approach: Crossing the reality gap in evolutionary robotics,” *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 122–145, Feb 2013.
 - [94] S. Koos, A. Cully, and J. Mouret, “Fast damage recovery in robotics with the t-resilience algorithm,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1302.0386, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.0386>
 - [95] P. J. O’Dowd, M. Studley, and A. F. T. Winfield, “The distributed co-evolution of an on-board simulator and controller for swarm robot behaviours,” *Evol. Intell.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 95–106, 2014.

- [96] G. Hornby, M. Fujita, S. Takamura, T. Yamamoto, and O. Hanagata, “Autonomous evolution of gaits with the sony quadruped robot,” in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, vol. 2. Citeseer, 1999, pp. 1297–1304.
- [97] V. Zykov, J. Bongard, and H. Lipson, “Evolving dynamic gaits on a physical robot,” in *Proc. 2004 Genetic and Evol. Computation Conf.* ACM Press, Seattle, WA, 2004, pp. 4722–4728.
- [98] R. Watson, S. Ficiej, and J. Pollack, “Embodied evolution: embodying an evolutionary algorithm in a population of robots,” in *Evolutionary Computation, 1999. CEC 99. Proceedings of the 1999 Congress on*, vol. 1, 1999, pp. –342 Vol. 1.
- [99] A. Eiben, E. Haasdijk, and N. Bredeche, “Embodied, On-line, On-board Evolution for Autonomous Robotics,” in *Symbiotic Multi-Robot Organisms: Reliability, Adaptability, Evolution.*, ser. Series: Cognitive Systems Monographs, S. K. E. P. Levi, Ed. Springer, 2010, vol. 7, pp. 361–382. [Online]. Available: <https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00531455>
- [100] A. Eiben, S. Kernbach, and E. Haasdijk, “Embodied artificial evolution,” *Evolutionary Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 261–272, 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12065-012-0071-x>
- [101] A. Eiben, N. Bredeche, M. Hoogendoorn, J. Stradner, J. Timmis, A. Tyrrell, A. Winfield, *et al.*, “The triangle of life: Evolving robots in real-time and real-space,” *Advances in Artificial Life, ECAL*, pp. 1056–1063, 2013.
- [102] A. Eiben, “In vivo veritas: Towards the evolution of things,” in *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature PPSN XIII*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, T. Bartz-Beielstein, J. Branke, B. Filipi, and J. Smith, Eds. Springer International Publishing, 2014, vol. 8672, pp. 24–39. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10762-2_3
- [103] J. R. Tumbleston, D. Shirvanyants, N. Ermoshkin, R. Januszewicz, A. R. Johnson, D. Kelly, K. Chen, R. Pinschmidt, J. P. Rolland, A. Ermoshkin, E. T. Samulski, and J. M. DeSimone, “Continuous liquid interface production of 3d

- objects,” *Science*, vol. 347, no. 6228, pp. 1349–1352, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/347/6228/1349.abstract>
- [104] L. Ljung, “System identification: Theory for the user,” *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall*, 1999.
- [105] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Nonlinear system identification using coevolution of models and tests,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 361–384, 2005.
- [106] D. B. Fogel, *System identification through simulated evolution: a machine learning approach to modeling*. Needham, MA, USA: Ginn Press, 1991.
- [107] D. Ljungquist and J. G. Balchen, “Recursive prediction error methods for on-line estimation in nonlinear state-space models,” in *Decision and Control, 1993., Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE Conference on*, Dec 1993, pp. 714–719 vol.1.
- [108] E. J. Vladislavleva, G. F. Smits, and D. Den Hertog, “Order of nonlinearity as a complexity measure for models generated by symbolic regression via pareto genetic programming,” *Trans. Evol. Comp*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 333–349, Apr. 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TEVC.2008.926486>
- [109] A. Eiben and J. E. Smith, *Introduction to evolutionary computing*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [110] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Automated damage diagnosis and recovery for remote robotics,” in *Proc. 2004 IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. and Autom.*. IEEE Computer Society Press, New Orleans, LA, 2004, pp. 3545–3550.
- [111] —, “Automated robot function recovery after unanticipated failure or environmental change using a minimum of hardware trials,” in *Proc. 2004 NASA/DoD Conf. Evolvable Hardware*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 2004, pp. 169–176.
- [112] S. Koos, J. Mouret, and S. Doncieux, “Automatic system identification based on coevolution of models and tests,” in *Proc. 2009 IEEE Congr. Evol. Computation*. IEEE Press, Trondheim, Norway, 2009, pp. 560–567.

- [113] M. Mirmomeni and W. Punch, “Co-evolving data driven models and test data sets with the application to forecast chaotic time series,” in *Proc. 2011 IEEE Congr. Evol. Comput.* IEEE Press, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2011, pp. 14–20.
- [114] D. Le Ly and H. Lipson, “Optimal experiment design for coevolutionary active learning,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Computation*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 394–404, 2014.
- [115] B. Kouchmeshky, W. Aquino, J. C. Bongard, and H. Lipson, “Co-evolutionary algorithm for structural damage identification using minimal physical testing,” *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 1085–1107, 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nme.1803>
- [116] M. Mirmomeni and W. Punch, “Co-evolving data driven models and test data sets with the application to forecast chaotic time series,” in *2011 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*. Auburn University, New Orleans, LA, 2011, pp. 14–20.
- [117] J. Bongard, V. Zykov, and H. Lipson, “Resilient machines through continuous self-modeling,” *Sci.*, vol. 314, no. 5802, pp. 1118–1121, 2006.
- [118] S. Koos, J. B. Mouret, and S. Doncieux, “The transferability approach: Crossing the reality gap in evolutionary robotics,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Computation*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 122–145, Feb 2013.
- [119] P. J. O’Dowd, M. Studley, and A. F. T. Winfield, “The distributed co-evolution of an on-board simulator and controller for swarm robot behaviours,” *Evol. Intell.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 95–106, 2014.
- [120] B. Hedwig and J. F. A. Poulet, “Complex auditory behaviour emerges from simple reactive steering,” *Nature*, vol. 430, no. 7001, pp. 781–785, 2004.
- [121] E. Baird, M. J. Byrne, J. Smolka, E. J. Warrant, and M. Dacke, “The dung beetle dance: An orientation behaviour?” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. e30211, 01 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0030211>
- [122] M. D. M. Byrne, “Visual cues used by ball-rolling dung beetles for orientation,” *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology*, vol. 189, no. 6, pp. 411–418, 2003.

- [123] E. G. Matthews, "Observations on the ball-rolling behavior of *canthon pilularius*," *Psyche*, pp. 75–93, 1963.
- [124] I. Rano, "A steering taxis model and the qualitative analysis of its trajectories," *Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 197–211, 2009.
- [125] S. Garnier, J. Gautrais, and G. Theraulaz, "The biological principles of swarm intelligence," *Swarm Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–31, 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11721-007-0004-y>
- [126] C. W. Reynolds, "Flocks, herds, and schools: A distributed behavioral model," *Computer Graphics*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 25–34, 1987.
- [127] R. Jeanson, C. Rivault, J.-L. Deneubourg, S. Blanco, R. Fournier, C. Jost, and G. Theraulaz, "Self-organized aggregation in cockroaches," *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 169 – 180, 2005. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347204002428>
- [128] C. R. Carroll and D. H. Janzen, "Ecology of foraging by ants," *Annu. Review of Ecology and Systematics*, vol. 4, pp. 231–257, 1973.
- [129] J. E. Lloyd, "Bioluminescent communication in insects," *Annual Review of Entomology*, vol. 16, pp. 97–122, 1971.
- [130] O. H. Bruinsma, "An analysis of building behaviour of the termite *macrotermes subhyalinus* (rambur)," Ph.D. dissertation, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 1979.
- [131] M. Dorigo and L. Gambardella, "Ant colony system: a cooperative learning approach to the traveling salesman problem," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 53–66, 1997.
- [132] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart, "Particle swarm optimization," in *Neural Networks, 1995. Proceedings., IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 4, Nov 1995, pp. 1942–1948 vol.4.
- [133] M. Dorigo, M. Birattari, C. Blum, M. Clerc, T. Stützle, and A. Winfield, *Ant Colony Optimization and Swarm Intelligence: 6th International Conference*,

- ANTS 2008, Brussels, Belgium, September 22-24, 2008, Proceedings.* Springer, 2008, vol. 5217.
- [134] O. Holland and C. Melhuish, “Stigmergy, self-organization, and sorting in collective robotics,” *Artificial Life*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 173–202, 1999.
- [135] G. Di Caro and M. Dorigo, “Antnet: Distributed stigmergetic control for communications networks,” *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 317–365, Dec. 1998. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1622797.1622806>
- [136] K. Socha, “Aco for continuous and mixed-variable optimization,” in *Ant Colony Optimization and Swarm Intelligence*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, M. Dorigo, M. Birattari, C. Blum, L. Gambardella, F. Mondada, and T. Sttze, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, vol. 3172, pp. 25–36. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-28646-2_3
- [137] J. Bjercknes and A. T. Winfield, “On fault tolerance and scalability of swarm robotic systems,” in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*, ser. Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013, vol. 83, pp. 431–444.
- [138] J. Chen, M. Gauci, W. Li, A. Kolling, and R. Gros, “Occlusion-based cooperative transport with a swarm of miniature mobile robots,” *Robotics, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 307–321, April 2015.
- [139] M. Gauci, J. Chen, T. Dodd, and R. Groß, “Evolving aggregation behaviors in multi-robot systems with binary sensors,” in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*, ser. Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014, vol. 104, pp. 355–367.
- [140] E. ahin, “Swarm robotics: From sources of inspiration to domains of application,” in *Swarm Robotics*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, E. ahin and W. Spears, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, vol. 3342, pp. 10–20. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30552-1_2
- [141] C. Blum and R. Groß, “Swarm intelligence in optimization and robotics,” in *Handbook of Computational Intelligence*, J. Kacprzyk and W. Pedrycz, Eds. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015, pp. 1293–1311.

- [142] B. Gerkey and M. Mataric, “Sold!: auction methods for multirobot coordination,” *Robotics and Automation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 758–768, Oct 2002.
- [143] A. F. T. Winfield, “Distributed sensing and data collection via broken ad hoc wireless connected networks of mobile robots,” in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 4*, L. Parker, G. Bekey, and J. Barhen, Eds. Springer Japan, 2000, pp. 273–282. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-67919-6_26
- [144] V. Trianni, R. Gro, T. Labella, E. ahin, and M. Dorigo, “Evolving aggregation behaviors in a swarm of robots,” in *Advances in Artificial Life*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. Banzhaf, J. Ziegler, T. Christaller, P. Dittrich, and J. Kim, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003, vol. 2801, pp. 865–874. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-39432-7_93
- [145] S. Garnier, C. Jost, J. Gautrais, M. Asadpour, G. Caprari, R. Jeanson, A. Grimal, and G. Theraulaz, “The embodiment of cockroach aggregation behavior in a group of micro-robots,” *Artificial Life*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 387–408, Oct. 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/artl.2008.14.4.14400>
- [146] A. Howard, M. J. Matarić, and G. S. Sukhatme, “Mobile sensor network deployment using potential fields: A distributed, scalable solution to the area coverage problem,” in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 5*. Springer, 2002, pp. 299–308.
- [147] J. McLurkin and J. Smith, “Distributed algorithms for dispersion in indoor environments using a swarm of autonomous mobile robots,” in *in 7th International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS)*. Citeseer, 2004.
- [148] K. Fujibayashi, S. Murata, K. Sugawara, and M. Yamamura, “Self-organizing formation algorithm for active elements,” in *Reliable Distributed Systems, 2002. Proceedings. 21st IEEE Symposium on*, 2002, pp. 416–421.
- [149] J. Chen, M. Gauci, M. J. Price, and R. Groß, “Segregation in swarms of e-puck robots based on the brazil nut effect,” in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems - Volume 1*, ser. AAMAS '12. Richland, SC: International Foundation for

- Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2012, pp. 163–170. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2343576.2343599>
- [150] A. Turgut, H. elikkanat, F. Gke, and E. ahin, “Self-organized flocking in mobile robot swarms,” *Swarm Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 2-4, pp. 97–120, 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11721-008-0016-2>
- [151] E. B. C.R. Kube, “Collective robotics: from social insects to robots,” *Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 189–218, 1993.
- [152] C. Kube and E. Bonabeau, “Cooperative transport by ants and robots,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 85 – 101, 2000. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889099000664>
- [153] R. Gross and M. Dorigo, “Towards group transport by swarms of robots,” *Int. J. Bio-Inspired Comput.*, vol. 1, no. 1/2, pp. 1–13, Jan. 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJBIC.2009.022770>
- [154] 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.
- [155] S. Camazine, *Self-organization in biological systems*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [156] B. Webb, “What does robotics offer animal behaviour?” *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 545 – 558, 2000. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347200915148>
- [157] —, “Using robots to model animals: a cricket test,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 16, no. 2134, pp. 117 – 134, 1995. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0921889095000445>
- [158] A. Popov and V. Shuvalov, “Phonotactic behavior of crickets,” *J. of Comparative Physiology*, vol. 119, no. 1, pp. 111–126, 1977.
- [159] A. M. Farah and T. Duckett, “Reactive localisation of an odour source by a learning mobile robot,” in *In Proceedings of the Second Swedish Workshop on Autonomous Robotics*. SWAR Stockholm, Sweden, 2002, pp. 29–38.

- [160] A. Lilienthal and T. Duckett, “Experimental analysis of smelling braitenberg vehicles,” in *In Proceedings of the ieee international conference on advanced robotics*. Coimbra, Portugal, 2003, pp. 58–63.
- [161] T. Balch, F. Dellaert, A. Feldman, A. Guillory, C. Isbell, Z. Khan, S. Pratt, A. Stein, and H. Wilde, “How multirobot systems research will accelerate our understanding of social animal behavior,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 94, no. 7, pp. 1445–1463, 2006.
- [162] J. Chappell and S. Thorpe, “Ai-inspired biology: Does ai have something to contribute to biology?” *Proceedings of the International Symposium on AI Inspired Biology: A Symposium at the AISB 2010 Convention, Leicester, UK*, 2010.
- [163] J. Faria, J. Dyer, R. Clément, *et al.*, “A novel method for investigating the collective behaviour of fish: Introducing ‘robofish’,” *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 1211–1218, 2010.
- [164] J. Halloy, F. Mondada, S. Kernbach, *et al.*, “Towards bio-hybrid systems made of social animals and robots,” in *Biomimetic and Biohybrid Systems*, ser. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2013, vol. 8064, pp. 384–386.
- [165] J. Halloy, G. Sempo1, G. Caprari, *et al.*, “Social integration of robots into groups of cockroaches to control self-organized choices,” *Sci.*, vol. 318, no. 5853, pp. 1155–1158, 2007.
- [166] T. Schmickl, S. Bogdan, L. Correia, *et al.*, “Assisi: Mixing animals with robots in a hybrid society,” in *Biomimetic and Biohybrid Systems*, ser. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2013, vol. 8064, pp. 441–443.
- [167] R. Vaughan, N. Sumpter, J. Henderson, *et al.*, “Experiments in automatic flock control,” *Robot. and Autonomous Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 109–117, 2000.
- [168] J. Krause, A. F. Winfield, and J.-L. Deneubourg, “Interactive robots in experimental biology,” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 369–375, 2011.

- [169] S. G. Halloy J., “Social integration of robots into groups of cockroaches to control self-organized choices,” *Science*, vol. 318, no. 5853, pp. 1155–1158, 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/sci;318/5853/1155>
- [170] J. Krause, A. F. Winfield, and J.-L. Deneubourg, “Interactive robots in experimental biology,” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 369 – 375, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534711000851>
- [171] V. Kopman, J. Laut, G. Polverino, *et al.*, “Closed-loop control of zebrafish response using a bioinspired robotic-fish in a preference test,” *J. of The Roy. Soc. Interface*, vol. 10, no. 78, pp. 1–8, 2013.
- [172] R. Vaughan, N. Sumpter, A. Frost, and S. Cameron, “Robot sheepdog project achieves automatic flock control,” *The fourth international conference on Autonomous agents*, pp. 489–493, 1998. [Online]. Available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=?doi=10.1.1.38.3029>
- [173] A. Gribovskiy, J. Halloy, J.-L. Deneubourg, H. Bleuler, and F. Mondada, “Towards mixed societies of chickens and robots,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2010 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*. Boston, Massachusetts: MIT press, 2010, pp. 4722 –4728.
- [174] A. M. Turing, “Computing machinery and intelligence,” *Mind*, vol. 59, no. 236, pp. 433–460, 1950.
- [175] S. Harnad, “Minds, machines and turing: The indistinguishability of indistinguishables,” *J. Logic, Language and Inform.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 425–445, 2000.
- [176] J. L. Elman, “Finding structure in time,” *Cognitive Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 179–211, 1990.
- [177] H.-G. Beyer and H.-P. Schwefel, “Evolution strategies - a comprehensive introduction,” *Natural Computing*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–52, 2002.
- [178] X. Yao, Y. Liu, and G. Lin, “Evolutionary programming made faster,” *IEEE Trans. on Evol. Comput.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 82–102, 1999.

- [179] F. Mondada, M. Bonani, X. Raemy, *et al.*, “The e-puck, a robot designed for education in engineering,” in *Proc. 9th Conf. on Autonomous Robot Systems and Competitions*, vol. 1. IPCB: Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco, 2009, pp. 59–65.
- [180] S. Magnenat, M. Waibel, and A. Beyeler, “Enki: The fast 2D robot simulator,” <http://home.gna.org/enki/>, 2011.
- [181] R. L. Graham and N. J. A. Sloane, “Penny-packing and two-dimensional codes,” *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 1990.
- [182] P. Levi and S. Kernbach, *Symbiotic Multi-Robot Organisms: Reliability, Adaptability, Evolution*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2010.
- [183] B. Eldridge and A. Maciejewski, “Limited bandwidth recognition of collective behaviors in bio-inspired swarms,” in *Proc. 2014 Int. Conf. Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Syst.* IFAAMAS Press, Paris, France, 5 2014, pp. 405–412.
- [184] G. Bradski and A. Kaehler, *Learning OpenCV: Computer Vision with the OpenCV Library*. Sebastopol, CA: O’Reilly Media, 2008.
- [185] M.-K. Hu, “Visual pattern recognition by moment invariants,” *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 179–187, 1962.
- [186] W. Li, M. Gauci, J. Chen, and R. Groß, “Online supplementary material,” <http://naturalrobotics.group.shef.ac.uk/supp/2014-006/>, 2014.
- [187] R. D. King, J. Rowland, *et al.*, “The automation of science,” *Sci.*, vol. 324, no. 5923, pp. 85–89, 2009.
- [188] M. Schmidt and H. Lipson, “Distilling free-form natural laws from experimental data,” *Sci.*, vol. 324, no. 5923, pp. 81–85, 2009.
- [189] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Active coevolutionary learning of deterministic finite automata,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 6, pp. 1651–1678, 2005.
- [190] E. Martin, *Macmillan Dictionary of Life Sciences (2nd ed.)*. London: Macmillan Press, 1983.

Bibliography

- [191] M. Dacke, M. J. Byrne, C. H. Scholtz, and E. J. Warrant, “Lunar orientation in a beetle,” *Proc. of the Roy. Soc. of London. Series B: Biological Sci.*, vol. 271, no. 1537, pp. 361–365, 2004.
- [192] E. Baird, M. J. Byrne, J. Smolka, E. J. Warrant, and M. Dacke, “The dung beetle dance: an orientation behaviour?” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. e30211, 2012.
- [193] L. Grossman, “Computer literacy tests: Are you human?” June 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1812084,00.html>