ABSTRACT

Emergent behavior of particles on a lattice has been analyzed extensively in mathematics with possible analogies to physical phenomena such as clustering in colloidal systems. While there exists a rich pool of interesting results, most are yet to be explored physically due to the lack of experimental validation. Here we show how the individual moves of robotic agents are tightly mapped to a discrete algorithm and the emergent behaviors such as clustering are as predicted by the analysis of this algorithm. Taking advantage of the algorithmic perspective, we further designed robotic controls to manipulate the clustering behavior and show the potential for useful applications such as the transport of obstacles.

Introduction

Self-organizing collective behaviors are found throughout nature, including shoals of fish aggregating to intimidate predators [1], fire ants forming rafts to survive floods [2], and bacteria forming biofilms to share nutrients when they are metabolically stressed [3, 4]. Inspired by such systems, researchers in swarm robotics and active matter have used many approaches towards enabling ensembles of simple, independent units to cooperatively accomplish complex tasks [5].

Both control theoretic and distributed computing approaches have also achieved success, but works often rely critically on robots computing and communicating complex state information, requiring relatively sophisticated hardware that can be prohibitive at small scales. Alternatively, statistical physics approaches model swarms as systems being driven away from thermal equilibrium by the interactions and movements of individual robots (see, e.g., [6, 7]). Tools from statistical physics such as the Langevin and Fokker–Planck equations can then be used to analyze the mesoscopic and macroscopic system behaviors [8]. Current approaches present inherent tradeoffs, especially as individual robots
become smaller and have limited functional capabilities \[9\] or approach the thermodynamic limits of computing \[10\] and power \[11\].

The problems of \textit{dynamic free aggregation}, where robots gather together without preference for a specific aggregation site (see Section 3.2.1 of \[12\]), and \textit{dispersion}, its inverse, have been widely studied, but not much effort has been focused on understanding the underlying computational models or the formal algorithmic underpinnings of interacting particles. Some works in self-actuated systems take inspiration from emergent behavior in social insects, but either lack rigorous mathematical foundations explaining the generality and limitations of the resulting algorithms as sizes scale (see, e.g., \[13\][14][15]) or rely on long-range signaling, such as microphones or line-of-sight sensors \[16\][17][18][19]. This suggests a new integration of the fields of distributed algorithms and granular physics that navigates a translation from theoretical abstraction to practice, utilizing methodologies inherent to both fields.

\section*{Results and Discussion}

\subsection*{Aggregation algorithm}

While many systems use interparticle attraction and sterical exclusion to achieve system-wide aggregation and interparticle repulsion to achieve dispersion, these methods typically use some long-range sensing and tend to be nonrigorous. To better understand these collective behaviors, we use an abstract model known as a self-organizing particle system (SOPS) that allows us to define a formal distributed algorithm and rigorously quantify long-term behavior. Particles in a SOPS exist on the nodes (or vertices) of a lattice, with at most one particle per node, and move between nodes along lattice edges. Each particle is anonymous (unlabeled), interacts only with particles occupying adjacent lattice nodes, and does not have access to any global information such as a coordinate system or the total number of particles.

Figure 1: (A) A particle moves away from a node where it has \(n\) neighbors with probability \(\lambda^{-n}\), where \(\lambda > 0\). Thus, moves from locations with more neighbors are made with smaller probability than those with fewer (e.g., in the insets, \(p_1 = \lambda^{-3} < p_2 = \lambda^{-2} < p_3 = 1\)). (B) Time evolution of a simulated SOPS with 1377 particles for \(\lambda = 7.5\) showing progressive aggregation (Movie S1). The bulk of the largest connected component is shown in orange and its periphery is shown in black. (C) Time evolution of \(N_{MC}\), the size of the largest connected component, showing dispersion for \(\lambda = 1.5\) and aggregation for \(\lambda = 12\). (D) Phase change in \(\lambda\)-space for the aggregation metric \(A_{MC} = N_{MC}/(k_0 P_{MC} \sqrt{N})\), where \(k_0\) is a scaling constant, \(P_{MC}\) is the number of robots on the periphery of the largest component, and \(N\) is the total number of robots. This phase change is qualitatively invariant to the system’s size.
In earlier work, Cannon et al. [20] analyzed a distributed SOPS algorithm for aggregation and dispersion under the assumption that the particle system remained simply connected. This SOPS algorithm defines a finite Markov chain with local moves that connect the state space consisting of all simply connected configurations of particles. Moves are defined so that each particle, when activated by its own Poisson clock, chooses a random neighboring node and moves there with a probability that is a function of the number of neighbors in the current and new positions provided the node is unoccupied and the move satisfies local conditions that guarantee the configuration stays simply connected. In particular, for configurations $\sigma$ and $\tau$ differing by the move of a single particle $p$ along a lattice edge, the transition probability is defined as $P(\sigma, \tau) \propto \min(1, \lambda^{|\sigma' - \tau'|})$, where $n$ is the number of neighbors of $p$ in $\sigma$ and $n'$ is the number of neighbors of $p$ in $\tau$. These probabilities arise from the celebrated Metropolis–Hastings algorithm [21, 22] and are defined so that the Markov chain converges to a unique Boltzmann distribution $\pi$ such that $\pi(\sigma)$ is proportional to $\lambda^{E(\sigma)}$, where $E(\sigma)$ is the number of nearest neighbor pairs in $\sigma$ (i.e., those pairs that are adjacent on the lattice) and $\lambda > 0$ is a bias parameter that is an input to the algorithm.

It was shown in [20] that the connected SOPS ensemble provably aggregates into a compact conformation with high probability when $\lambda > 3.42$ and expands to a conformation with nearly maximal (linear) perimeter when $\lambda < 2.17$. However, while this algorithm provides a rigorous distributed algorithm for both aggregation and dispersion, it has several notable drawbacks that make it infeasible for direct implementation in a physical system of simple robots. In particular, two main challenges with implementing the original SOPS algorithm are the connectivity requirement, which tethers the particles together, and the “look ahead” requirement, used to calculate transition probabilities to ensure that the state space converges to the desired Boltzmann distribution.

To address these issues, we define a modified aggregation and dispersion algorithm $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}$ where particles can disconnect and moves rely only on the current state. Here, particles occupy nodes of a finite region of the triangular lattice, again moving stochastically and favoring configurations with more pairs of neighboring particles. Each particle has its own Poisson clock and, when activated, chooses a random adjacent lattice node. If that node is unoccupied, the particle moves there with probability $\lambda^{-n}$, where $n$ is the number of current neighbors of the particle, for bias parameter $\lambda > 0$. Thus, rather than biasing particles towards nodes with more neighbors, we instead discourage moves away from nodes with more neighbors, with larger $\lambda$ corresponding to a stronger ferromagnetic attraction between particles (Fig. 1A). This new chain converges to the same ferromagnetic Boltzmann distribution over the state space of particle configurations where $\pi(\sigma) \propto \lambda^{E(\sigma)}$, for any configuration $\sigma$. Details of the proofs can be found in the Materials and Methods.

Let $\Omega$ be the set of configurations with $N$ particles on our lattice region. We will use the following definition to quantify aggregation for particles that can be disconnected, capturing both the size and compactness of aggregates.

**Definition 1.** For $\beta > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, a configuration $\sigma \in \Omega$ is $(\beta, \delta)$-aggregated if there is a subset $R$ of lattice nodes such that:

1. At most $\beta \sqrt{n}$ edges have exactly one endpoint in $R$;
2. The density of particles in $R$ is at least $1 - \delta$; and
3. The density of particles not in $R$ is at most $\delta$.

Here $\beta$ is a measure of how small the boundary between $R$ and its complement $\overline{R}$ must be, measuring the compactness of the aggregated particles, and $\delta$ is a tolerance for having unoccupied nodes within the cluster $R$ or occupied nodes outside of $R$. We say that a configuration is dispersed if no such $(\beta, \delta)$ exist.

By carefully analyzing the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}$, which is just the desired Boltzmann distribution, we establish conditions that provably yield aggregation when the particles are confined to a nice, compact region of the triangular lattice (Fig. 1B). The proof uses arguments outlined in [23]; see the Materials and Methods section for details.

**Theorem 2.** Let configuration $\sigma$ be drawn from the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}$ on a bounded, compact region of the triangular lattice, when the number of particles $N$ is sufficiently large. If $\lambda > 5.66$, then with high probability there exist $\beta > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1/2$ such that $\sigma$ will be $(\beta, \delta)$-aggregated. However, when $0.98 < \lambda < 1.02$, the configuration $\sigma$ will be dispersed with high probability.

Varying values of $\lambda$ in simulation gives strong indication that dispersion persists for larger values of $\lambda$ and the aggregation algorithm undergoes a phase transition whereby the macroscopic behavior of the system suddenly changes from dispersion to aggregation (Fig. 1C,D, Movie S1). Nonetheless, our proofs demonstrate that our system has two distinct phases of behavior for different ranges of $\lambda$ for any system with a sufficiently large number of interacting particles, which is enough for our purposes.

---

1Note that this behavior mimics the fixed magnetization ferromagnetic Ising model which motivated our Markov chain algorithm.
BOBbots: a model active granular matter system

Next, to test whether the lattice-based equilibrium system can be used to control a real-world swarm (in which there are no guarantees of detailed balance or Boltzmann distributions), we introduce a collective of active granular robots which we name BOBbots (Fig. 2A–C) — Behaving, Organizing, Buzzing Robots — whose design physically embodies the aggregation algorithm. Driven granular media provide a useful soft matter system to integrate features of the physical world into the toolkit for programming collectives. This builds upon three decades of work understanding how forced collections of simple particles interacting locally can lead to remarkably complex and diverse phenomena, not only mimicking solids, fluids, and gasses [24] — i.e., in pattern formation [25], supercooled and glassy phenomena [26, 27], and shock waves [28] — but also displaying phenomena characteristic of soft matter systems such as stress chains [29] and jamming transitions [30].

The movement and interactions between BOBbots were designed to capture the salient features of the abstract stochastic algorithm while replacing all sensing, communication, and probabilistic computation with physical morphology and interactions. Each BOBbot has a cylindrical chassis with a base of elastic “brushes” that are physically coupled to an off-center eccentric rotating mass vibration motor (ERM). The vibrations caused by the rotation of the ERM are converted into locomotion by the brushes. Due to asymmetry in this propulsion mechanism, the BOBbots traverse predominantly circular trajectories [31] that are randomized through their initial conditions but — unlike the SOPS particles — are inherently deterministic with some noise and occur at a constant speed per robot distributed almost uniformly over 2–8 cm/s. See Materials and Methods for further details.

Analogous to the modified transition probabilities in the aggregation algorithm that discourage particles from moving away from positions where they have many neighbors, each BOBbot has loose magnets housed in shells around its
periphery that always reorient to be attractive to nearby BOBbots (Fig. 2D). The probability that a BOBbot detaches from its neighbors is negatively correlated with the attractive force from the number of engaged magnets, approximating the movement probabilities given by the algorithm which scale inversely and geometrically with the number of neighbors. We subsequently verify this assertion experimentally. The strength of the magnets determines whether the system aggregates or disperses at long times (analogous to $\lambda$ in the algorithm).

To allow for study of larger BOBbot ensembles and more comprehensive sweeps of parameter space, we also performed Discrete-Element Method (DEM) simulations of the BOBbots (see Fig. 2E–G and Materials and Methods for more details). The motion of an individual BOBbot is modeled as a set of over-damped Langevin-type equations governing both its translation and rotation subject to its diffusion, drift as seen in [72], the magnetic attraction, and sterical exclusion with the other robots. The translational drift corresponds to the speed from the equilibrium of the drive force and the drag and the rotational drift corresponds to the circular rotation. Similar methods have been used to understand macro-scale phenomena emerging from collectives of microscopic elements [8] and to model particle motion in active matter [33].

Mitigating the effects of the fixed boundary in both experiments and simulations presents a significant design challenge. Robots can become stuck along the boundary or persist in corners, affecting the overall analysis of system dynamics. To address these issues, uniform airflow was employed to gently repel BOBbots away from the boundary, and similar effects were implemented in simulation. More details about the experimental protocol can be found in Materials and Methods.

Clustering dynamics explained by algorithm analysis

Since the critical elements of the SOPS algorithm can be physically embodied by robots as simple as our BOBbots, to test if the SOPS model could quantitatively capture collective dynamics, we next investigated the degree to which collectives of BOBbots aggregate as a function of their peripheral magnet strength $F_{M0}$ in both robotic experiments and DEM simulations. The experimental protocol begins with placing magnets of a particular strength $F_{M0}$ into the BOBbots’ peripheral slots. The BOBbots are positioned and oriented randomly in a rectangular arena and are then actuated uniformly for a fixed time during which several aggregation metrics are tracked (Fig. 3A, B, S3). These trials are conducted for several $F_{M0}$ values with repetition. We followed the same protocol in simulations.

In experiment and DEM simulation, we observe an abrupt, rapid rise and then saturation in the maximum cluster size $N_{MC}$ as the magnetic attraction $F_{M0}$ increases (Fig. 3C). These curves resemble those in Fig. 1D, with the magnetization $F_{M0}$ playing a role analogous to the parameter $\lambda$. Given this correspondence, we explored whether the equilibrium SOPS model could be used to make quantifiable predictions in the robot experiments. First, we designed a test to gauge how force and $\lambda$ scale. Recall that in the SOPS algorithm, the force acting on each particle is proportional to $\lambda^n$, where $n$ is the particle’s current number of neighbors. In the experiments, particles do not have the ability to count neighbors, but the magnets are expected to provide a similar force that also increases geometrically when more magnets are engaged.

To estimate the relationship between force and $\lambda$, we investigate the rate at which a BOBbot loses or gains neighbors over a fixed amount of time. Viewing a BOBbot’s completion of half its circular motion as analogous to a particle moving to a new lattice node in the SOPS algorithm and using this time interval to evaluate the transition, the simulation data shows that a BOBbot’s transition probability from having a higher number of neighbors $n$ to a lower number $n'$ closely follows the algorithm’s $P(\sigma, \tau) \propto \min(1, \lambda^{n'-n})$ transition probabilities (Fig. 4A). Further, we evaluated the BOBbots’ effective bias parameter $\lambda_{\text{eff}}$ as a function of $F_{M0}$ and found the exponential relation $\lambda_{\text{eff}} = \exp(\beta F_{M0})$, where $\beta$ is a constant particular to the system of interest (Fig. 4B). The BOBbots’ transition probabilities can then be written $P(\sigma, \tau) = \exp(-\beta(\epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n'}))$, where $\beta$ is the inverse temperature of the system and $\epsilon_n = n \cdot F_{M0}$ can be interpreted as the energy contributed by a BOBbot’s $n$ neighbors.

With the relation between $F_{M0}$ and $\lambda_{\text{eff}}$ established, we next compare the clustering behaviors exhibited by the SOPS algorithm and the BOBbot algorithm to see how the algorithm helps understand the collective behavior of BOBbots. Fig. 3C shows the fraction of particles/BOBbots in the largest cluster $N_{MC}/N$ and the aggregation metric $A_{MC}$ observed in both the SOPS algorithm and BOBbot simulations after converting with respect to $\lambda_{\text{eff}}$; the algorithm does indeed capture the maximum cluster fraction observed in the simulations. Notably, the aggregated and dispersed regimes in $\lambda$-space established by Theorem 2 provide a rigorous understanding of these BOBbot collective behaviors. For instance, the proven dispersed regime $0.98 < \lambda < 1.02$ gives a clear explanation for why agents will not aggregate even in the presence of mutual attraction. Further, it also helps establish exactly how much attraction is needed to saturate the aggregation.

\footnote{For convenience, $F_{M0}$ is normalized by the gravity of Earth $g = 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$ when using the unit of gram.}
We additionally test the SOPS prediction that the maximum cluster should not only be large but also compact, occupying a densely packed region. The results from [23] that we apply here for aggregation suggest the following relationship between the size of the largest component $N_{MC}$ and its perimeter $P_{MC}$. In dispersed configurations, $P_{MC}$ should scale linearly with $N_{MC}$, meaning that most BOBbots lie on the periphery of their components. In aggregated configurations, however, $P_{MC}$ should scale as $O(\sqrt{N_{MC}})$, approximating the optimal circle packing where the majority of BOBbots lie in the interior of the component. We validate these scaling relationships in simulation for a variety of system sizes ranging from 100–400 BOBbots (Fig. 4D,E) and find that the theory’s predictions hold. To make a quantitative comparison with the physical system, we track $A_{MC} = N_{MC} / (k_0 P_{MC} \sqrt{N})$, where $k_0$ is a scaling constant, $P_{MC}$ is the number of BOBbots on the periphery of the largest component, and $N$ is the total number of BOBbots. The scaling constant $k_0$ is defined such that $A_{MC} = 1$ when the system is optimally aggregated, as in the circle packing. Physically, $A_{MC}$ is reminiscent of surface tension for which energy minimization leads to a smaller interface (in our setting, smaller perimeter $P_{MC}$), yielding an $A_{MC}$ closer to 1. We computed this metric for both the DEM simulation representing the physical system and the SOPS simulation for the algorithm. The results match well with each other and thus validate the theoretical prediction from the SOPS (Fig. 4C).
Enhancing clustering via local stress sensing

Thus far, we have demonstrated that the BOBbot system mimics a lattice model that can provably aggregate for large enough $\lambda$, corresponding physically to highly attractive interaction that favors large components with small perimeter. We now ask whether we can achieve rudimentary collective intelligence determining, for example, how robots could tune their responses to enhance or dampen aggregation, thereby achieving a more tightly clustered or dispersed state. In particular, we explore whether such tuning can help counteract some ways the system deviates from the theory, such as variations in the BOBbots’ speeds and magnetic attraction, to attempt to improve the fidelity to the original algorithm. While we are still unable to count neighbors or estimate the Gibbs probabilities directly, as prescribed by the algorithm, we take advantage of physical effects of our system to “program” the robots without using any traditional computation.

The first effect relies on observations that for a fixed magnet strength, the size of the largest connected component $N_{MC}$ decreases with increasing robot speed $v_0$ (Fig. S8). We further observe that $N_{MC}$ scales linearly with $z$, the average number of neighbors per BOBbot at equilibrium (Fig. 5A, inset). Thus, BOBbot speed $v_0$ is inversely correlated with the average number of neighbors per BOBbot $z$. This arises from $v_0$ being a proxy for $\beta^{-1}$ in the effective attraction

A full investigation of the behavior of BOBbot collectives at varying uniform speeds will be the subject of a separate study.
Without adapting a BOBbot’s speed based on its number of neighbors, a BOBbot collective actuated uniformly at a speed $v$ converges to an average of $z_{std}(v)$ neighbors per BOBbot at equilibrium (Fig. 5A, red); any point in speed-neighbor space deviating from $z_{std}(v)$ is transient. To enhance aggregation, we engineer reduced speeds $v_{eng}(z)$ that a BOBbot should adapt to when it has $z$ neighbors (Fig. 5A, blue). These slowed speeds pull the collective away from its steady-state behavior, allowing it to then converge with a larger number of average neighbors per BOBbot (Fig. 5A, arrows). This feedback between the engineered speeds $v_{eng}$ and the steady-state average number of neighbors $z_{std}$ iterates until reaching the fixed point in speed-neighbor space where the steady-state and engineered behaviors meet as $z = z_{std}(v_{eng}(z))$.

While adapting speeds based on numbers of neighbors would be relatively straightforward to implement in more complex robots capable of counting neighbors (e.g., optically as in [13, 34, 35]), implementing such a scheme in the deliberately simple BOBbots is challenging given their lack of such sensing. Here we utilize a second physical effect: inspired by the correlation of particle density and stress on individual particles in granular systems [36], we propose that monitoring local contact stress can function as a proxy for counting numbers of neighbors. An immediate benefit of such a scheme is that it can be implemented on the existing robots via custom, low-cost, analog surface stress sensors (see Fig. 5B and Materials and Methods for details). The implemented stress sensors function such that for sufficiently large stress (e.g., when in a cluster), motor speed is decreased by 70% (Fig. 5C).

Figure 5: Experimental realization of enhancing aggregation via stress sensing. (A) The effect of the engineered, adaptive speeds (blue) on the steady-state average number of neighbors per BOBbot at equilibrium (point $i$). With the adaptive, engineered speeds, an average of $z_i$ neighbors per BOBbot causes the average speed to slow ($i \rightarrow 1$) which in turn enables convergence to the steady-state response with more neighbors per BOBbot ($1 \rightarrow 2$). This feedback iterates until the steady-state and engineered responses coincide at point $f = (v_f, z_f)$, where $v_f < v_i$ and $z_f > z_i$. Inset: The mapping between maximum cluster size $N_{MC}$ and the average number of neighbors per BOBbot $z$ indicates the stress-sensing control strategy will increase cluster sizes. (B) Picture of a BOBbot equipped with a stress sensor and the schematic top-view sketch of the triggered and not-triggered states. (C) The BOBbot’s response to stress. Top: the speed of a BOBbot when it is not-triggered and triggered. Bottom: The rate of being triggered as function of the stress applied. (D) The distribution of a BOBbot’s number of contacts over 6 x 10 minute experiments. Each sample is an average of number of contacts over 1 second. The data uses six 10-minute experiments. Inset: Simulation results using the same conditions as the experiment.
To evaluate whether adapting speed based on stress sensing as a proxy for neighbor-counting effectively enhances aggregation, we implemented this “physical algorithm” on 10 BOBbots enclosed in a circular region (Movie S6). In experiments, we observe a significant increase in the average number of neighbors per BOBbot when stress sensing is employed (Fig. 5D); simulations using the same arena and stress-mediated response reproduce the experimental results (Fig. 5D, inset). Further, there is a quantitative match in the final average number of neighbors per BOBbot between the experiments and the fixed points predicted in Fig. 5A, validating our control strategy for enhancing aggregation. The use of stress sensing opens an interesting avenue for collectives of rudimentary robots to incorporate higher-order information without complex vision systems; further, contact stress provides insights (e.g., closeness to a jamming transition) that could be valuable in densely packed clusters [37].

Object transport in the aggregated phase

Encouraged by the close connections between the physical system and the underlying theoretical model, along with the successful control scheme for enhanced aggregation using force sensing, we sought to test whether aggregated BOBbots could collectively accomplish a task. In particular, could an aggregated BOBbot collective recognize the presence of a non-robot impurity in its environment and cooperatively expel it from the system? Typically, such collective transport tasks — e.g., the cooperative transport of food by ants [38] — either manifest from an order-disorder transition or rely heavily on conformism between agents for concerted effort and alignment of forces. With our BOBbot collectives, we instead aim to accomplish transport via simple mechanics and physical interactions controlling global behavior without any complex control, communication, or computation.

By maintaining a high magnetic attraction $F_{M0}$, we remain in the aggregated regime where most BOBbots connect physically and can cumulatively push against untethered impurities (e.g., a box or disk) introduced in the system (Movie S7). The BOBbot collective’s constant stochastic reconfiguration grants it the ability to envelop, grasp, and dislodge impurities as their individual forces additively overcome the impurities’ friction, leading to large displacement in the aggregated regime (Fig. 6A, right; see Fig. S9 for the distribution) with a median displacement of 7.9 cm over 12 minutes. On the contrary, we find that systems with weak magnetic attraction (i.e., those in the dispersed regime) can typically only achieve small impurity displacement (Fig. 6A, left; see Fig. S9 for the distribution) with a median displacement of 0.9 cm over 12 minutes. We observe infrequent anomalies in which dispersed collectives achieve larger displacement than aggregated ones, but these outliers arise from idiosyncrasies of our rudimentary robots (e.g., an aggregated cluster of BOBbots may continuously rotate in place without coming in contact with an impurity due to the BOBbots’ individual orientations in the aggregate; see Movie S7).

Characterizing the impurity’s transport dynamics as mean-squared displacement over time $\langle r^2(t) \rangle = vt^\alpha$ reveals further disparities between the aggregated and dispersed regimes (Fig. 5D). On a log-log plot, the intercept indicates $\log(v)$, where $v$ is the characteristic speed of the impurity’s transport; we observe that in all but one fringe case the strongly
attractive collectives achieve transport that is orders of magnitude faster than those of the weakly attractive ones. The slope of each trajectory indicates the exponent $\alpha$ that characterizes transport as subdiffusive ($\alpha < 1$), diffusive ($\alpha = 1$), or superdiffusive ($\alpha > 1$). While all the strongly attractive collectives immediately achieve nearly ballistic transport (with $\alpha = 1.85 \pm 0.11$ for $\tau < 20$ s) indicating rapid onset of cluster formation and pushing, the weakly attractive collectives initially exhibit mostly subdiffusive transport (with $\alpha = 0.89 \pm 0.56$ for $\tau < 20$ s) caused by intermittent collisions from the dispersed BOBbots (Fig. 6C). When the slight heterogeneous distribution of the dispersed BOBbots remains unchanged for a sufficiently long time, the accumulation of displacement in a persistent direction can cause a small drift, leading to ballistic transport at a longer time scale. Nonetheless, its transport speed is much slower than that of the strongly attractive collectives. The two-stage transport dynamics are in accord with a simple model combining subdiffusive motion and small drift (Fig. S10).

**Conclusion and discussion**

In this paper, we use mathematical ideas from distributed computing and statistical physics to create task-oriented granular media composed of simple interacting BOBbots. As predicted by the theory, the BOBbots aggregate compactly with stronger magnets (corresponding to large bias parameter $\lambda$) and disperse with weaker magnets (or small $\lambda$). Simulations capturing the physics governing the BOBbots' motions and interactions further confirms the predicted phase change with larger numbers of BOBbots. The collective transport task further demonstrates the utility of the aggregation algorithm.

There are several noteworthy aspects of these findings. First, the theoretical framework of the underlying SOPS model can be generalized to allow many types of relaxations, provided they remain reversible and model a system at thermal equilibrium. For example, noting that the probability that a robot with $n$ neighbors detaches may not scale precisely as $\lambda^{-n}$ as suggested by the Boltzmann weights, we can generalize the SOPS model to be more sensitive to small variations in these weights: the proofs establishing the two distinct phases can be shown to extend to this setting, provided the probabilities $p_n$ of detaching from $n$ neighbors satisfy $c_1 \lambda^{-n} \leq p_n \leq c_2 \lambda^{-n}$, for constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

The robustness of the local, stochastic algorithms makes the macro-scale behavior of the collective resistant to many types of errors inherent in the BOBbots, including bias in the directions of their movements, the continuous nature of their trajectories, and nonuniformity in their speeds and magnet strengths. Moreover, our algorithms are inherently self-stabilizing due to their memoryless, stateless nature, always converging to a desired system configuration — overcoming faults and other perturbations in the system — without the need for any human or external intervention. In our context, the algorithm will naturally continue to aggregate, even as some robots may fail or the environment is perturbed.

Moreover, we find that the nonequilibrium dynamics of the BOBbots still capture many features of the theoretical models that we analyze at thermal equilibrium. For example, in addition to visually observing the phase change as the magnetic strengths increase, we are able to test precise predictions about the size and perimeter of the largest connected components based on the formal definitions of aggregation and dispersion from the SOPS model. We additionally use simulations to study the transition probability of a BOBbot from having $n$ neighbors to having $n'$ neighbors to see if the magnetic interactions conform to the theory, and indeed we see a geometric relation decrease in the probability of moving as we increase the number of neighbors, as predicted. The resultant correspondence between the magnetic attraction and effective bias in the algorithm confirms a qualitative connection between the physical world and the abstract algorithm. We additionally use simulations to study the transition probability of a BOBbot from having $n$ neighbors to having $n'$ neighbors to see if the magnetic interactions conform to the theory, and indeed we see a geometric relation decrease in the probability of moving as we increase the number of neighbors, as predicted. The resultant correspondence between the magnetic attraction and effective bias in the algorithm confirms a quantitative connection between the physical world and the abstract algorithm.

The framework presented here using provable distributed, stochastic algorithms to inspire the design of robust, simple systems of robots with limited computational capabilities seems quite general. It also allows one to leverage the extensive amount of work on distributed and stochastic algorithms, and equilibrium models and proofs in guiding the tasks of inherently out of equilibrium robot swarms. Preliminary results show that we likely can achieve other basic tasks such as alignment, separation (or speciation), and flocking through a similar principled approach. We note that exploiting physical embodiment with minimal computation seems a critical step in scaling collective behavior to encompass many cutting edge settings, including micro-sized devices that can be used in medical applications and cheap, scalable devices for space and terrestrial exploration. Additionally, we plan to further study the important interplay between equilibrium and nonequilibrium dynamics to better solidify these connections and to understand which relaxations remain in the same universality classes.
Materials and Methods

Details of the SOPS algorithm and proofs

The discrete SOPS algorithm $M_{\text{AGG}}$ for aggregation and dispersion is given in Algorithm 1. The algorithm is given as a Markov chain, but could easily be modified to function as a distributed algorithm executed by each particle independently and concurrently as shown in [20, 23].

**Algorithm 1** Markov chain $M_{\text{AGG}}$ for aggregation and dispersion in SOPS

Beginning at any configuration of $N$ particles in a bounded region, fix $\lambda > 1$ and repeat:
1: Choose a particle $P$ uniformly at random; let $\ell$ be the lattice node it occupies.
2: Choose an adjacent lattice node $\ell'$ and $q \in (0,1)$ each uniformly at random.
3: if $\ell'$ is empty and $q < \lambda^{-n}$, where $n$ is the number of neighbors $P$ has at $\ell$ then $P$ moves to $\ell'$.
4: else $P$ remains at $\ell$.

Recall that Theorem 2 analyzes the stationary distribution $\pi$ of the Markov chain $M_{\text{AGG}}$ for aggregation and dispersion. In particular, Theorem 2 was shown in [23] to hold for $\pi(\sigma) \propto \lambda^{-b(\sigma)} \propto \lambda^{\ell(\sigma)}$, where $b(\sigma)$ is the number of “boundary edges” of the lattice that have exactly one endpoint occupied by a particle. So it remains to show that $M_{\text{AGG}}$ converges to this stationary distribution $\pi$.

**Lemma 3.** The unique stationary distribution of $M_{\text{AGG}}$ is $\pi(\sigma) = \lambda^{-b(\sigma)} / Z$, where $Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-b(\sigma)}$ is a normalizing constant.

**Proof.** Let $\sigma$ and $\tau$ be any two configurations with $\sigma \neq \tau$ such that $\Pr(\sigma, \tau) > 0$, implying that $\tau$ can be reached from $\sigma$ by a single move of some particle $P$. Suppose $P$ has $n$ neighbors in $\sigma$ and has $n'$ in $\tau$. We must show the detailed balance condition holds with respect to the transition probabilities:

$$\Pr(\sigma, \tau) \pi(\sigma) = \Pr(\tau, \sigma) \pi(\tau)$$

The algorithms in [20, 23] were designed using the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm [22] in which the transition probability $\Pr(\sigma, \tau) = \min\{\pi(\tau) / \pi(\sigma), 1\}$ to capture the ratio between stationary weights of the current and proposed configurations. So we have that $\pi(\tau) / \pi(\sigma) = \lambda^{n'} - n$. It is then easy to see that this ratio is unchanged by the modified transition probabilities where $\Pr(\sigma, \tau) = \lambda^{-n}$ and $\Pr(\tau, \sigma) = \lambda^{-n'}$, and thus detailed balance is satisfied:

$$\frac{\Pr(\sigma, \tau)}{\Pr(\tau, \sigma)} = \frac{\lambda^{-n}}{\lambda^{-n'}} = \lambda^{n' - n} = \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\sigma)}$$

Therefore, since $\pi$ satisfies detailed balance and $M_{\text{AGG}}$ is an ergodic finite Markov chain, we conclude that $\pi$ is the unique stationary distribution of $M_{\text{AGG}}$.

We conclude by outlining the proof of Theorem 2 that shows $M_{\text{AGG}}$ achieves aggregation when $\lambda$ is large enough and dispersion when $\lambda$ is close to one. Our proof is a series of information-theoretic arguments about the stationary distribution $\pi$. We use ideas similar to Peierls arguments, which are often used in statistical physics to study phase changes in behavior space for infinite systems [39]. In [23] it was shown that, for finite systems, particles of two different colors could either separate into monochromatic clusters or integrate, indifferent to color. This separation algorithm can be applied to the setting where a bounded region of the lattice is completely filled with particles that move by “swapping” places with their neighbors. By viewing particles of one color as “empty space” and particles of the other color as our particles of interest, the swap moves in the separation algorithm correspond to particle moves within a bounded area. These are precisely the moves used in our aggregation algorithm, where separation corresponds to aggregation and integration corresponds to dispersion. Thus, it is straightforward to leverage the arguments for separation and integration in [23] to show aggregation and dispersion in a bounded region.

For large enough bias $\lambda$, we prove aggregation occurs with high probability as follows. Using techniques introduced in [40], we define a map from any configuration without an aggregate to a configuration with an aggregate by (i) choosing some scattered particles in a systematic way and (ii) rearranging them as an aggregate in a carefully chosen location. We then show that no aggregate configuration has too many preimages under this map because of the careful way we remove scattered particles. On the other hand, we show that applying this map to a dispersed configuration leads to a large increase in its stationary probability. Provided $\lambda$ is large enough that the probability gain outweighs the number of preimages, these two facts imply that aggregated configurations are much more likely to occur in the stationary distribution than dispersed ones. More formally, the above argument shows that the stationary probability
of being in a dispersed configuration is at most \((c_1/\lambda)^{c_2\sqrt{N}}\), where \(c_1, c_2 > 0\) are constants that depend on the map described above. Thus, provided \(\lambda\) is large enough, this probability of being in a dispersed configuration is very small, proving that aggregation is achieved with high probability.

When the bias \(\lambda\) is close to one, we can prove that dispersion occurs with high probability. We show that there exist polynomially many events such that if aggregation occurs, then at least one of these events must also occur. These events correspond to certain regularly-shaped subregions of the lattice being almost entirely occupied by particles. We then use a Chernoff-type bound to show that each of these events is exponentially unlikely when \(\lambda\) is close to one. This implies that the stationary probability for aggregated configurations is at most the sum of polynomially many terms that are each exponentially small, so dispersion must occur with high probability for this range of \(\lambda\).

**BOBbot design**

The BOBbot mechanical design is developed in SolidWorks, and its skeleton is 3D printed in ABS plastic by a Stratsys UPrint SE Plus printer at a layer resolution of 0.010 inches and sparse density (Fig. S1). Each BOBbot contains a lithium ion polymer battery (Adafruit Industries) that is equipped with Qi wireless charging for recharging between experiments (Adafruit Industries). The brushbot design is implemented using an ERM (BestTong) for vibrations and two Pienoy dog toothbrush heads as feet, yielding noisy circular trajectories (Movie S2). The BOBbot’s motor circuitry is assembled on a Printed Circuit Board (PCB) designed in EagleCAD (Fig. S2). The PCBs are printed at the Georgia Tech Interdisciplinary Design Commons makerspace and outsourced from JLCPCB. This circuitry is switched and modulated by a phototransistor (Adafruit Industries), which acts as a proportional controller for motor speed. Grade N42 neodymium magnets (K&J Magnetics) are housed in the BOBbot chassis for inter-robot attraction, and can be swapped for magnets of different strengths to modulate the BOBbots’ cohesion. A complete list of BOBbot components can be found in Table S1.

To achieve stress sensing, each BOBbot is equipped with four triggers that mechanically deform and close the circuit upon collisions to sense the locally exerted stress (Figs. S3, S2). These triggers are positioned radially in front of the permanent magnets in the chassis. The stress sensors function such that a robot decreases its motor speed for sufficiently large stress (Fig. S5C). The analog circuit is designed to reduce the motor’s current in a manner proportional to the total number of contacts, starting with about 66% reduction for a single triggered sensor (Fig. S5C, top). In a cluster multiple sensors are triggered and a BOBbot’s speed is practically negligible.

**Simulations**

To simulate the SOPS, we execute the algorithm on a hexagonal lattice. The size of the lattice in Fig. 1 is chosen to be sufficiently large so that boundary effects are mitigated. The size of the lattice for Fig. 4 is chosen to match the area density and the number of agents in the physical evolution and algorithm.

To determine the constant \(k_0\) in the aggregation metric \(A_{MC} = N_{MC}/(k_0 P_{MC} \sqrt{N})\), we consider a hexagon with area \(N_{MC} = \frac{3}{4} \ell^2 \cdot 6\) and perimeter \(P_{MC} = 6 \ell\), setting \(k_0\) so that \(A_{MC} = 1\). This gives \(k_0 = 1/\sqrt{8\sqrt{3}}\).

In the DEM simulation, besides the information mentioned in the main text, it is worth noting that a physical BOBbot houses its loose magnets in four orthogonal slots in its periphery, resulting in a patchy magnetic interaction as the magnets move freely in their slots. The simulated BOBbots have these same slots, each housing a loose magnetized sphere with exponential decay force field. Attraction between two simulated BOBbots is calculated based on these magnetic spheres’ strength and the minimum physical separation between any interacting pair, which depends on the relative position and orientation of the two BOBbots. We measure the physical parameters of the BOBbots and validate our simulations using experiments with physical BOBbots designed to isolate individual physical parameters.

We use the Euler-Maruyama method with a time step of 1 ms to integrate the following Newton equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m} \vec{r} & = F_D \vec{u} - \eta \vec{\dot{r}} + \vec{F}_{env}(\vec{r}, \varphi) + \vec{\xi}(t) \quad (1) \\
I \dot{\varphi} & = \tau_D - \eta \varphi \dot{\varphi} + \tau_{env}(\vec{r}, \varphi) + \xi_{\varphi}(t) \quad (2)
\end{align*}
\]

As the agents are in the over-damped regime that \(|m \vec{r}| \ll \eta |\vec{\dot{r}}|\), the Newton equations are equivalent to the Langevin equations for active Brownian particles by taking the limit \(m, I \to 0\).

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\vec{r}} & = v_0 \vec{u} + \vec{F}_{env}(\vec{r}, \varphi)/\eta + \vec{\xi}(t)/\eta \\
\dot{\varphi} & = \omega_0 + \tau_{env}(\vec{r}, \varphi)/\eta \varphi + \xi_{\varphi}(t)/\eta \varphi
\end{align*}
\]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m$ BOBbot mass</td>
<td>0.060 kg</td>
<td>0.060 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_0$ BOBbot radius</td>
<td>0.030 m</td>
<td>0.030 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$ BOBbot moment of inertia</td>
<td>$2.7e-5$ kg·m$^2$</td>
<td>$2.7e-5$ kg·m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_C$ radius of the regular circular motion</td>
<td>$25 \pm 5$ mm</td>
<td>$25 \pm 5$ mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{Bo}$ radius of the magnetic bead</td>
<td>2.3 mm</td>
<td>2.0 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_S$ thickness of the magnet cavity shell</td>
<td>2.0 mm</td>
<td>2.0 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_B$ effective radius of the magnetic bead</td>
<td>4.3 mm</td>
<td>4.0 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_0$ Saturated speed</td>
<td>$48.4 \pm 20.2$ mm/s</td>
<td>$60.0$ mm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_0$ saturated angular velocity of the orbit</td>
<td>$1.94 \pm 0.81$ rad/s</td>
<td>$2.40$ rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_D$ translational drive</td>
<td>0.07 N</td>
<td>0.06 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_D$ rotational drive (torque)</td>
<td>$5e-4$ N·m</td>
<td>$7e-4$ N·m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$ translational drag coefficient</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ kg/s</td>
<td>1.0 kg/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_\phi$ rotational drag coefficient</td>
<td>$\leq 3e-4$ N·m·s</td>
<td>$2.3e-4$ N·m·s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{M0}$ magnetic force on contact</td>
<td>3-35 gf</td>
<td>3-35 gf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_0$ magnetic force decay length</td>
<td>1.5 mm</td>
<td>1.5 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$ bot-bot friction coefficient</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_W$ bot-wall friction coefficient</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: List of parameters used in physical simulations.

As we see from the reduced equations, in the steady state, a BOBbot will perform a circular motion with a saturated speed $v_0 = F_D/\eta$ with a frequency of $\omega_0/2\pi = \tau_D/\eta_\phi$. This suggests that we can control the speed of the BOBbot $v_0$ by changing the motor vibration strength to vary $F_D$.

The initial placement of the BOBbots is achieved by a greedy algorithm, sequentially placing BOBbots in random positions that do not overlap with the previously placed BOBbots.

A cell list search method is used to speed up the simulation’s computation by subdividing the simulated arena into square cells so that, when integrating forces for a given BOBbot, only interactions with BOBbots from the same or adjacent cells are considered. The size of the cells is chosen such that the relative error caused by this approximation is within $10^{-3}$. To realize this so that there is no miscount or over-count in the code, we consider only the cells in the east, north, north-east, and north-west directions for each cell.

The parameters used in the DEM simulations are listed in Table 1. Most parameters such as the mass and dimensions of each BOBbot are directly measured. Some of the other parameters requires less straightforward experiments. For instance, to avoid possible system errors such as in-plane friction to measure the magnetic force, we conducted experiments to find the minimum force to overwhelm magnetic force in vertical direction (Fig. S4). Other indirect measurements involve the translational and rotational drag. The key ingredient is to use the known force (Earth’s gravity) to calibrate these intricate forces. The details can be found in Section 3 of the SI.
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Supporting Information

S1. BOBbot design and manufacturing

Fig. 7 depicts various cross-sectional views of a BOBbot’s design and corresponding skeletal structure. Fig. 8 shows the PCB design and assembly. Table 2 lists all components used in BOBbot manufacturing.

Figure 7: Cross-sectional views of the BOBbot mechanical design. SolidWorks designs and assembled versions of (A) the BOBbot shell and magnet slots, (B) the battery slot, and (C) the brush slots and wireless QR charge receiver.

Figure 8: BOBbot circuitry. (A) The analog PCB design, made in EagleCAD. (B) The printed and assembled PCB.

S2. Experimental arena

Fig. 9 shows the design and details of the experimental platform.

S3. Calibration experiments

The DEM simulation parameters are calibrated to match the physical BOBbot experiments. Many parameters such as the mass and dimensions of each BOBbot are easily measured. However, other parameters are better calculated by conducting simple experiments. The first such experiment (Fig. 10) calculates the magnetic force $F_{M0}$ between two magnets when their BOBbots’ shells are touching. The first magnet is placed in a BOBbot shell attached to a rigid stand; a second shell is then tethered beneath the first by placing the second magnet inside it. Thus, the second shell falls once its weight exceeds $F_{M0}$. To leverage this insight, a cup is tethered to the second shell and BBs are added to the cup one-by-one until the second shell falls (Fig. 10A). The weight of the shell, cup, and BBs are then measured to obtain a value of $F_{M0}$ that is precise up to 0.1 g, the weight of a single BB (Fig. 10B).
Figure 9: **Experimental platform design and details.** (A) The experimental platform is composed of a T-slot base supporting the foam board, aluminum, and particle board layers. (B) Levelling screws in the T-slot framing allow for incline adjustment. (C) A leaf blower with a multi-pronged tygon tubing attachment provide airflow to the PVC pipe boundary to mitigate boundary effects.

![Experimental platform design](image)

\[ F_M = F_M C \cdot e^{-d/r_0} \]

\( r_0 = 1.5 \text{ mm} \)

Manufacturer's measurement

![Calibration experiment](image)

Figure 10: **Calibration experiment for calculating magnet force** \( F_{M0} \). (A) The experimental setup for calculating \( F_{M0} \). (B) Measuring the weight of the tethered apparatus once it falls gives a close approximation of \( F_{M0} \). (C) The magnetic force’s decay with the separation \( d \) between two magnetic beads.

![Calibration experiment](image)
Table 2: List of BOBbot components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Product Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERM Motor</td>
<td>BestTong</td>
<td>DC 3.7V 9500RPM Vibrating Coreless Brushed Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushes</td>
<td>Pienoy</td>
<td>Double-Headed Pet Toothbrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnets</td>
<td>K&amp;J Magnetics</td>
<td>S2 and S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Lithium Ion Polymer Battery 3.7V 500mAh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Module</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Micro-Lipo Charger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi Transmitter</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Universal Qi Wireless Charging Transmitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi Receiver</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Universal Qi Wireless Receiver Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red/Black Wiring</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Solid-Core Wire Spool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>KingSo</td>
<td>500pcs LED Diode Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phototransistor</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Photo Transistor Light Sensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistors</td>
<td>Vishay/Dale</td>
<td>Metal Film Resistor 1/10 Watt 50 Ohm 0.1% 50ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transistors</td>
<td>ON Semiconductor</td>
<td>General Purpose Bipolar Transistor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switches</td>
<td>Pololu</td>
<td>Mini Slide Switch 3-Pin, SPDT, 0.3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Block</td>
<td>Pololu</td>
<td>Screwless Terminal Block: 2-Pin, 0.1° Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button Snaps</td>
<td>Adafruit Industries</td>
<td>Sewable Snaps, 5mm Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking Tape</td>
<td>Daigger</td>
<td>DAI-T34-27-C Assorted Label Tape Pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumper Cables</td>
<td>Anezus</td>
<td>700pcs Jumper Wire Kit Breadboard Wires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each BOBbot’s position \( \vec{r} \) and orientation \( \varphi \) changes at a constant rate subject to noise. A BOBbot’s constant translational speed \( v_0 \) comes from the competing driving force \( F_D \vec{u} \) and the translational drag \( -\eta \vec{r} \). Similarly, each BOBbot’s constant rotational speed \( \omega_0 \) comes from the competing driving torque \( \tau_D \) and the rotational drag \( -\eta_\varphi \varphi \). The steady-state speeds therefore follow \( v_0 = F_D / \eta \) and \( \omega_0 = \tau_D / \eta_\varphi \). We again use simple experiments to determine the drive and drag. To measure the translational drag \( \eta \), we compare a BOBbot’s trajectory when it is on a 0° incline versus a tilted incline. In the former, the BOBbot circles regularly with some noise; in the latter, this regular circling is stretched towards the direction of gravity on the incline (Fig. 11, top). Using the known gravitational force on the BOBbot, we can calculate the translational drag force and coefficient \( \eta \). We then simulate a BOBbot’s motion using different translational drag coefficients; the one that produces the trajectory most closely matching those in the experiments is chosen as the simulation \( \eta \) (Fig. 11). The measurement of the rotational drag \( \eta_\varphi \) exploits its balance with the driving torque. To measure the rotational torque exerted on a BOBbot, a very light rigid straw is attached across the diameter of a BOBbot (Fig. 12). We then let the BOBbot use the straw to push objects at various arm lengths. For a given obstacle to push, the rotational torque is obtained by finding the largest torque of friction on an obstacle to balance. We decrease the arm length from a large value to a point the BOBbots can just push the obstacle. Given the measured saturated angular velocity \( \omega_0 \), the rotational drag can be inferred as \( \eta_\varphi = \tau_D / \omega_0 \).

Many of our preliminary experiments were adulterated by boundary effects that caused small groups of BOBbots to collect at the edges and corners of the arena, affecting steady state properties. We mitigate these effects using airflow-based boundary repulsion. To characterize these airflow effects, a BOBbot is placed close to the boundary and its trajectory is tracked with and without airflow (Fig. 13). The corresponding simulation parameters are then chosen to match the average characteristics of these experimental trajectories. The airflow force profile is chosen to match the decay length observed in the example experiment (which is \( R_A = 6R_0 \)). The resting speed of the bot used in this experiment is \( v_0 = 3 \) cm/s. Please note that the decay length chosen in the simulation runs throughout our study is \( 2R_0 \) and \( v_0 = 6 \) cm/s.
Figure 11: Calibration experiment for calculating translational drag coefficient $\eta$. When a BOBbot is driven on a level plane, it circles regularly with some noise. When placed on a tilted incline, its trajectory is stretched towards the direction of gravity on the incline. Using this known force, we measure the drag force by simulating BOBbot trajectories on a tilted incline using different drag coefficients, comparing each trajectory’s stretch to that of the experiment. The correct drag produces a close approximate of the experimental trajectory. We find that viscosity varies between BOBbots, implying that their speeds also vary. The first three trajectories are from a BOBbot with relatively slow velocity $v_0$; the last is from a fast BOBbot.
Figure 12: Calibration experiment for calculating rotational drag coefficient $\eta_{\phi}$. (A) The experimental setup and (B) the corresponding force diagram, where $f_{\text{max}}$ denotes the largest frictional torque that the driving torque $\tau_D$ can balance.

Figure 13: Boundary airflow effects in experiment and simulation. Movie S6 further details BOBbot trajectories with and without airflow effects.
S4. Dependence of maximum cluster size on BOBbot speed

To investigate the effect of the BOBbots’ individual speeds on the size of the maximum cluster, we run simulations for $F_{M0} = 3$ g with 20 repetitions for 8 speeds equally-spaced in range $v_0 = 1–8$ cm/s. Fig. 14 shows how the maximum cluster size $N_{MC}$ decreases as the BOBbots’ individual speed is increased.

Figure 14: The effect of the BOBbots’ individual speeds $v_0$ on the maximum cluster size $N_{MC}$. The statistics shows the ensemble average from 20 simulations for each data point.

S5. Object transport by BOBbot collectives

Fig. 15 shows the displacement of the box impurity over time for weakly attractive and strongly attractive BOBbot collectives.

While nearly all experimental runs with strongly attractive collectives exhibit rapid and large displacement, some of the weakly attractive collectives exhibit two-stage transport dynamics that start with very little displacement and eventually achieve larger displacement. We posit that the weakly attractive collectives’ two-stage dynamics are composed of subdiffusion and a very small drift. The subdiffusion arises from the BOBbots’ collisions while the small drift is caused by the persistent heterogeneity of the BOBbots around the obstacle. To validate this hypothesis, we developed a toy
model in MATLAB where the subdiffusion $r_H(t)$ such that $MSD(r_H) = \langle |r_H(t+\tau) - r_H(t)|^2 \rangle_t = C t^{2H} (H < 1/2)$ is generated by the fractional Brownian motion generator (from the MATLAB Wavelet Toolbox) and is added to a drift motion $r_D(t) = v_D t$. When the drift is small $|v_D| = 0.005$, we observe two-stage transport dynamics similar consistent with the experiments ($H = 0.1, C = 2.8$, Fig. 16 magenta). On the other hand, when the drift is dominant over the subdiffusion ($|v_D| = 0.5$, as for the strongly attractive collectives), the toy model reproduces the nearly ballistic trajectories observed in experiment (Fig. 16 blue). The relative magnitude difference between the subdiffusion and drift is chosen to match the experiments.

In fact, the MSD of this composed motion, $MSD(r_H + r_D)$, is related to the pure subdiffusion $MSD(r_H)$ as

\[ MSD(r) = \langle |r(t + \tau) - r(t)|^2 \rangle = \langle |r_H(t + \tau) + r_D(t + \tau) - r_H(t) - r_D(t)|^2 \rangle \]

\[ = \langle |(r_H(t + \tau) - r_H(t)) - v_D t|^2 \rangle \]

\[ = \langle |(r_H(t + \tau) - r_H(t))|^2 + 2v_D \cdot (r_H(t + \tau) - r_H(t)) + |v_D|^2 t^2 \rangle \]

\[ = MSD(r_H) + 2v_D \cdot \langle (r_H(t + \tau) - r_H(t)) \rangle_t + |v_D|^2 t^2 \]

\[ = Ct^{2H} + |v_D|^2 t^2 \]

where $\langle (r_H(t + \tau) - r_H(t)) \rangle_t$ vanishes due to the isotropy of subdiffusion.

Eq. 10 shows how the subdiffusive power can be dominated by the ballistic power 2 when the drift speed $|v_D|$ is large.

---

Figure 16: Toy model for object transport. Both trajectories include subdiffusive motion and drift. The blue curve has large drift while the magenta curve has small drift, representing transport by the strongly and weakly attractive BOBbot collectives, respectively. This model produces a qualitative match with the experiments, demonstrating the origin of the different types of mean-squared displacement over time in the transport experiments.