

# Adaptive Manipulation using Behavior Trees

Jacques Cloete, Wolfgang Merkt, and Ioannis Havoutis

**Abstract**—Many manipulation tasks use instances of a set of common motions, such as a twisting motion for tightening or loosening a valve. However, different instances of the same motion often require different environmental parameters (e.g. force/torque level), and thus different manipulation strategies to successfully complete; for example, grasping a valve handle from the side rather than head-on to increase applied torque. Humans can intuitively adapt their manipulation strategy to best suit such problems, but representing and implementing such behaviors for robots remains an open question. We present a behavior tree-based approach for adaptive manipulation, wherein the robot can reactively select from and switch between a discrete set of manipulation strategies during task execution. Furthermore, our approach allows the robot to learn from past attempts to optimize performance, for example learning the optimal strategy for different task instances. Our approach also allows the robot to preempt task failure and either change to a more feasible strategy or safely exit the task before catastrophic failure occurs. We propose a simple behavior tree design for general adaptive robot behavior and apply it in the context of industrial manipulation. The adaptive behavior outperformed all baseline behaviors that only used a single manipulation strategy, markedly reducing the number of attempts and overall time taken to complete the example tasks. Our results demonstrate potential for improved robustness and efficiency in task completion, reducing dependency on human supervision and intervention.

**Note to Practitioners**—This work was motivated by the need for robots to be able to utilize distinctly different strategies for the same task depending on the particular task instance, and respond to visually unobservable deviations in task parameters by changing to a different strategy, much like humans can. Existing techniques for task and motion planning generally output only one solution, and can only account for visually-observable properties of the task instance, and thus do not consider other critical factors such as whether the robot will be able to apply sufficient torque to complete the task using the generated solution. We propose a behavior tree design that admits multiple strategies for completing a given task, each implemented as its own subtree. Using this design, the robot can select and switch between strategies in response to observations during task execution, all while collecting data and learning from previous attempts as well as preempting task failure before it occurs. Currently, each strategy must be implemented manually, though future work would investigate the automatic generation of new and distinct strategies for a given task instance, as well as more sophisticated criteria for selecting and switching between strategies. Our approach is easy to implement in practical settings and can be readily added to any behavior tree-based robot task planning system.

**Index Terms**—Robots, artificial intelligence, adaptive systems, task planning, manipulation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**S**ERVICE robots can revolutionize how entire service-oriented domains work, with potential applications including autonomous maintenance in – often remote – industrial facilities, such as oil rigs [1], or care robots in domestic environments [2]. To complete tasks effectively, robots must autonomously carry out task planning as well as generate and execute motion plans for manipulation tasks.

However, robots generally require highly controlled environments with known task parameters for reliable execution of manipulation tasks. Perception prior to manipulation can address visually observable changes, such as geometry, but not intrinsic parameters such as friction, which may affect the completion of tasks that require physical interaction. Although adaptive control schemes can help to alleviate this limitation, typical robot behaviors are generally not robust to unexpected deviations from test environments and to differences that are not visually observable, for example a valve handle that is much stiffer for a particular device instance due to exposure to elements, typically corrosion or rust. Lack of robustness results in a more frequent need for human supervision and intervention, remote or otherwise.

A *strategy* is the specific approach that a robot may take to carry out a task. For manipulation tasks, different strategies may involve grasping the object differently, or even using a tool to assist the manipulation. In many cases there exist a variety of potential manipulation strategies that could be employed, such as those depicted in Fig. 1 for twisting a needle valve.

Different strategies have different trade-offs; for example speed, complexity, available torque and power expenditure. However, with traditional robot behaviors it is unclear when to apply a particular strategy to suit a particular task instance, and how to rapidly adapt if the nature of the task instance changes. For example, a fast, simple low-torque manipulation strategy may be optimal when beginning to tighten a valve, but fail to provide the torque to finish tightening it, while a slow, complex high-torque manipulation strategy can fully tighten the valve despite being unnecessary for most of the tightening procedure. An adaptive behavior would allow the robot to reactively change the current strategy during a particular task to better suit the real environment, based on real-time observations such as force/torque (F/T) data from a wrist-mounted sensor. This would result in improved robustness and efficiency in task completion, and thus increase automation with reduced dependency on human supervision and intervention. As the robot re-attempts the task it could also recall and learn from past data for better-informed decision-making in future attempts of the same task instance.

The authors are with Dynamic Robot Systems (DRS) group, Oxford Robotics Institute, University of Oxford, UK.




Fig. 1. Possible strategies for manipulating a needle valve. (1a) Grasping the handle head-on and rotating the wrist joint (simple, fast but providing low torque). (1b) Grasping the handle from the side and performing a series of half-rotations (complex, slow but providing higher torque).

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. Task Planning - Finite State Machines and Behavior Trees

There is much work on task planning and autonomous decision-making in robotics, with the state of the art typically adopting one of two methods [3]. The ‘state-based’ approach uses a Finite State Machine (FSM), an abstract machine comprised of a finite number of states, each representing the state of the robot at a given stage in its behavior [4]. Each state dictates how the robot is to act in that state, as well as the next state into which the robot should transition depending on the observed outcomes from that state. FSMs can also be made fault-tolerant, with state transitions defined for different possible failure outcomes.

Meanwhile, the ‘task-based’ approach uses a Behavior Tree (BT), a hierarchical directed tree that controls the order of execution of all the tasks that the robot may perform, each represented as a leaf node [5]. Sub-trees representing simpler behaviors can be used to build more complex ones, giving BTs a very composable and modular structure. During normal operation a ‘tick’ signal is repeatedly propagated from the root of the tree to its leaves, with the active leaf node either returning *Success*, *Failure* or *Running*. This return signal determines which node is executed on the subsequent tick.

While FSMs are relatively straightforward and intuitive, they suffer from a complexity that grows exponentially with the number of states, especially in the case of fault-tolerant FSMs. Meanwhile, BTs are far more modular in structure and have a complexity that only grows linearly with the number of nodes [3], [6], since one only has to consider the chain of parents from the new node up to the root node. BTs also offer superior reactivity by allowing for the concurrent execution of different tree nodes that can interrupt each other if needed. Therefore, BTs have received significant growth in popularity as of late, and there are many examples demonstrating how BTs can be used to coordinate straightforward manipulation tasks [7]–[9] and even robot control [10]. Indeed, the reactivity of BTs is critical to the proposed adaptive behavior in this work.

### B. Adaptive Robot Behavior for Manipulation Tasks

The idea of adaptive robot behavior has existed in the literature for many years, taking the form of adaptive control. In 1987, *Slotine and Li* proposed an adaptive control algorithm wherein unknown manipulator and payload parameters were estimated online and devised estimation schemes for these parameters, for example using joint tracking errors and prediction errors in joint torque [11], [12]. Adaptive control schemes such as these allow the robot to adapt its control inputs to better track the reference trajectory in response to unexpected environmental parameters. However, adaptive control is still fundamentally limited in that it will continue to follow the original reference trajectory, when in many cases an entirely different reference trajectory is required for successful task completion, such as grasping and twisting a particularly stiff needle valve from the side rather than head-on. Thus, the adaptive behavior we seek must extend beyond the control level to the task and motion planning level.

A number of frameworks have been developed for combined task and motion planning (TAMP), such as that proposed by *Saoji et al.* [13]. *Verma et al.* propose the automatic generation of BTs from the output of a TAMP planner for the execution of robotic manipulation tasks [14]. TAMP can be used to generate feasible task and motion plans based on the task environment visually perceived by the robot prior to task execution, thus providing a method to allow robots to execute manipulation tasks in uncertain and changing environments. However, in pre-existing TAMP frameworks this adaptability is restricted to visually observable changes in the environment, such as for real-time collision avoidance; we seek a solution that can also consider unexpected deviations that are not visually observable, such as an unexpectedly stiff valve. Note that to discover such deviations requires the robot to attempt the task and change its strategy reactively, yet pre-existing TAMP frameworks provide no mechanism by which to reactively change behavior during task execution in this way, and thus the adaptability of such frameworks is very limited.

Furthermore, there is no system of learning or memory; for every attempt, the task is freshly re-planned from a TAMP approach with no stored knowledge of past observations.

Our proposed framework enables the robot to learn the most appropriate strategy for a particular task instance and recall this for future attempts.

*Wu et al.* [9] propose an automated BT error recovery framework that uses a Bayesian Network (BN) as a decision model for error recovery upon task failure, alongside a human-made Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) chart used to inform the network of possible sources of error (such as wrong pose, collision, or object not present) as well as the corresponding solutions. The FMEA chart and BN are used to determine the appropriate solution from a predetermined selection when task failure occurs. However, note that this does not permit preempting of task failure, only recovery once failure has already occurred. In contrast, we will consider reactive robot behavior that will adapt to best suit a particular task instance beyond failure recovery approaches, such as preemptive reactive behavior that interrupts the current attempt prior to failure.

*Moubarak et al.* [15] developed an optimization algorithm that allowed a robot to adapt the posture of its arm in response to a change in the magnitude of an external load during manipulation to prevent it from tipping over. The algorithm would be invoked whenever some stability assurance condition was broken, repositioning the robot with respect to the object to minimize the eccentricity of the external load and thus increase maximum payload capacity. In this way, the robot reactively responded to unexpected changes in the task instance and adapted the current strategy to optimize performance. While this is an excellent example of the type of behavior we would like to achieve, the solution proposed was highly problem-specific and only considered stability of the robot; in contrast we propose a general framework that can be readily applied to a wide range of manipulation tasks.

In light of the existing literature, the key contribution of our work is a simple framework for adaptive manipulation behavior, implemented as a BT, wherein the robot is able to reactively select from and switch between a discrete set of manipulation strategies. This framework readily facilitates the following functionalities:

- Selecting and switching between strategies to best suit a particular task instance based on task-related data, considering factors such as speed and maximum permitted torque.
- Learning from past attempts to optimize performance, for example learning the optimal strategy or sequence of strategies for different task instances.
- Preempting task failure to either change to a more feasible strategy or safely exit the task before catastrophic failure occurs.
- Straightforward integration as a subtree within any BT-based robot task planning system.

This framework is a powerful addition to the toolset for generating BT-based task plans both manually and automatically.

We first propose a simple yet effective behavior tree design for general adaptive behavior and then apply it in the context of manipulation. We then test it against baseline behaviors that can only use a single manipulation strategy.

### C. *BehaviorTree.CPP* - An Overview

*BehaviorTree.CPP* (BT.CPP) is a C++ library that provides a framework for creating BTs, designed to be fast, flexible and easy to use [16]. It has some key advantages over other implementations:

- BTs can be composed in an XML file and loaded into a BT runner program at runtime; this means that changes can be made to the BT structure without needing to recompile the code.
- New classes of the tree node derived from the core library can be statically linked to the existing library; this was used extensively to create new ROS-based tree nodes for this work.
- It supports asynchronous, non-blocking actions. This is of particular use to this work since it allows nodes to run concurrently and interrupt each other, leading to a reactive decision-making behavior.
- Scripting and precondition nodes allow for the use of simple arithmetic and logic operations, *if*-statements and *while*-loops within the structure of a BT, reducing the need for custom tree nodes for simple processes.

All BT nodes used in this work fall under the one of a set of categories represented in Fig. 2. A *ControlNode* controls the sequence of execution of its children; those used in this work are of type *Sequence*, *ReactiveSequence*, *Fallback* or *ReactiveFallback*.

A *Sequence* propagates the tick to its children from left to right, returning *Success* if and only if all their children return *Success*. When it receives *Running*, it returns *Running* and ticks the same child on the next tick, and when it receives *Failure*, it returns *Failure* and resets the sequence progress. A *ReactiveSequence* behaves similarly, but when it receives *Running*, it returns *Running* and ticks all children up to the current child on the next tick. Thus, all prior children are still checked for *Failure* whenever it is ticked; this allows for reactive behavior.

A *Fallback* propagates the tick to its children from left to right until one of them returns *Success*, at which point the *Fallback* stops and returns *Success*. When it receives *Running*, it returns *Running* and ticks the same child on the next tick. It returns *Failure* only if all children return *Failure*. A *ReactiveFallback* behaves similarly, but when it receives *Running*, it returns *Running* and ticks all children up to the current child on the next tick. Thus, all prior children are still checked for *Success* whenever it is ticked; this allows for reactive behavior much like in the case of a *ReactiveSequence*.

*ExecutionNodes* carry out commands, forming the leaves of the BT, and can be of type *ActionNode* or *ConditionNode*. An *ActionNode* performs a command, returning *Success* if the command is successfully completed, *Failure* if it has failed, or *Running* if it is ongoing. A *ConditionNode* checks a condition, returning *Success* if true or *Failure* if false. *DecoratorNodes* modify the return status of a single child node, for example forcing *Success* regardless of outcome.

BT.CPP allows for variables to be read from and written to the *Blackboard*, a shared database of stored variables accessible to all tree nodes. The input and output ports for




Fig. 2. Categories of BT tree node used in this work. From left to right; ControlNode (Sequence, ReactiveSequence, Fallback, ReactiveFallback), ExecutionNode (ActionNode, ConditionNode), DecoratorNode.




Fig. 3. Proposed behavior tree design for general adaptive robot behavior. (3a) This section chooses which strategy to execute, and selects the corresponding subtree for that strategy (by means of a switch statement). (3b) This section is a simple example of a subtree to carry out the chosen strategy, while concurrently monitoring all conditions corresponding to that strategy.

a particular type of tree node, in other words the arguments passed into and returned from that node, must be specified in the class definition for that node. These ports can be connected to the variables on the Blackboard.

### III. PROPOSED BEHAVIOR TREE DESIGN FOR GENERAL ADAPTIVE ROBOT BEHAVIOR

Figure 3 presents the proposed BT design. The BT returns *Success* if the task was completed successfully, and returns *Failure* if not, due to either no available strategies being feasible or running out of allowed attempts. The BT uses the *RetryUntilSuccessful* node to allow the robot to attempt the task for a number of times equal to the input variable *num\_attempts*. Each attempt begins by using the *SelectStrategy* node to select from a discrete set of available strategies using task-related data recorded up to the current time. Note that the total data will accumulate over repeated attempts and across repeated task instances, thus allowing the robot to learn as it re-attempts the task and recall what it has learned for future task instances.

*SelectStrategy* selects a feasible strategy given the data, returning the strategy ID. If no strategies are feasible given the data (for example, if the measured F/T requirements to loosen a valve exceed those permitted by any strategy),

*SelectStrategy* outputs a unique ‘no strategies’ strategy ID. Regardless, *SelectStrategy* always returns *Success*.

The BT then ticks the *StrategySwitchStatement*. This node acts as a traditional switch statement, executing the corresponding subtree for the selected strategy (and only that strategy). Note that the idea of a *SwitchStatement* node type is not present in the existing literature for BTs. Since this node will only ever tick one child, we classify it as a Decorator node type, but its actual implementation will depend on the BT library used. With BT.CPP, the desired functionality can be achieved using a *Sequence* node; each child is a subtree for a different strategy, preconditioned to be skipped unless the strategy ID matches that corresponding to the subtree. Note that a subtree must exist for every possible strategy ID provided by *SelectStrategy*; for the ‘no strategies’ case, the corresponding ‘subtree’ should simply return *Success*.

Figure 3b presents a simple example of a possible strategy subtree. The key idea is that a *ReactiveSequence* is used to concurrently tick each chosen condition node alongside the node (or subtree) that actually executes the strategy (returning *Running* while in progress and either *Success* or *Failure* when complete). These conditions use the current data to check whether to interrupt the current strategy; this may be the case if either the current strategy is no longer feasible, or a different strategy has become preferable. The strategy subtree

should return *Success* if the task is completed successfully or *Failure* if interrupted. In practice, the subtree structure for a given strategy may be far more complex than that shown, and vary significantly between strategies. In general, if the node (or subtree) that actually executes the strategy returns *Failure* this implies task failure, while if a condition node returns *Failure* this may imply the preemption of task failure. Thus, the robot can preempt task failure and either change to a more feasible strategy or safely exit the task before catastrophic failure occurs.

Once `RetryUntilSuccessful` receives *Success*, the BT ends the adaptive behavior by checking the strategy ID. If the strategy ID corresponds to a viable strategy, the BT returns *Success*, since the task was completed using that strategy. If the strategy ID corresponds to the ‘no strategies’ case, the BT returns *Failure*, since no strategies were viable for completing the task. In this way, the robot can safely exit the task as failed if it is known that there are no feasible strategies. If the BT runs out of allowed attempts, `RetryUntilSuccessful` returns *Failure*, causing the BT to return *Failure*.

On first glance, it may seem reasonable to simplify the proposed BT design by removing the final `ConditionNode` checking that the strategy ID corresponds to a feasible strategy (thus removing the need for the top-level `Sequence` node as well) and augmenting `SelectStrategy` such that it instead returns *Failure* when no feasible strategies are available. However, this would not be efficient in practice, since even if no feasible strategies are available, the BT will still repeatedly tick `SelectStrategy` (which will return *Failure* on each attempt) until `RetryUntilSuccessful` exhausts the number of allowed attempts. This would be especially problematic if `SelectStrategy` has a non-negligible cost to run and the number of allowed attempts is large. The proposed design avoids this inefficiency because it can exit `RetryUntilSuccessful` with no further re-runs if it is known that no feasible strategies are available given the data.

Note that very little has been assumed concerning the implementation of the `SelectStrategy` node, or any of the nodes and subtrees within each strategy subtree. The designer has total freedom in the implementation of `SelectStrategy`, as well as the structure and implementation of each strategy subtree (so long as there is a concurrent checking of condition nodes alongside the execution of the strategy). Thus, the proposed adaptive BT design can be applied to a wide range of different problems and satisfy all manner of specifications and constraints.

Note also that the proposed BT design can easily be added as a subtree within a greater BT structure, and is thus readily applicable to behavior-tree based robot task planning systems. The only required knowledge for adding the proposed design into a larger BT is that the subtree must be repeatedly ticked while *Running* and will return *Success* if the task was completed successfully and *Failure* otherwise.

#### IV. ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR FOR MANIPULATION

We will now consider the adaptive BT design in the context of manipulation tasks with an example wherein the robot must approach and tighten an articulated device (such as a

needle valve); task success occurs when the device handle has either been rotated by a specified angle or is considered tightened (based on measured F/T data). For the sake of this simple example we will assume that the manipulation procedure will consist of first identifying the pose of the device to be manipulated, then approaching, grasping, manipulating and finally retracting from that object.

Figure 4a presents the top-level subtree design used by all strategies. Note that in this simple example, all strategies use the same subtree design, but in general, each strategy could potentially use a completely different subtree design. The robot first looks up the pose of the device (including the articulated handle), and then executes subtrees for approaching, grasping and manipulating the device in sequence.

Note that in many cases, the handle of the device to be manipulated possesses some rotational symmetry, resulting in more than one possible choice for the device pose. Note also that in many cases it is physically impossible for the robot to continuously twist the device handle without periodically stopping and re-grasping the handle, much like humans do. We will see how the adaptive BT design facilitates this periodic stopping and re-grasping completely autonomously.

For each manipulation strategy, we can define a minimum and maximum angle between which the robot can safely continuously twist the device handle; once these safe limits are exceeded, the robot should stop and re-grasp. When the robot looks up the device pose, the device handle angle is rotated by an integer multiple of the angle of rotational symmetry until it is within the allowed limits for the selected strategy. For example, if an angle of  $310^\circ$  is measured for a device of rotational symmetry of order 3 (corresponding to  $120^\circ$ ) and maximum allowed manipulation angle of  $180^\circ$ , the measured angle will be reduced to the equivalent value of  $70^\circ$ . In this way, the robot autonomously decides at which orientation the end-effector will attempt to grasp the device handle in order for manipulation to be possible. This will work so long as the allowed range of angles is larger than the angle of rotational symmetry for the device handle (since the observed angle can then always be re-mapped to a value within this range).

The subtree for manipulation is presented in Fig. 4b, but note that the subtrees for approaching and grasping share a similar design. At each tick, the robot uses the current F/T data to check whether the device is tightened. If true, the `ReactiveFallback` returns *Success* and the robot executes the subtree for retraction. If not, the `ReactiveFallback` ticks a `ReactiveSequence` that first checks two feasibility conditions before ticking the `ManipulateTarget` node, which commands the robot to twist the device handle by the specified angle using the current strategy, returning *Running* while in progress and either *Success* or *Failure* when complete. Note that `ManipulateTarget` remembers how much the device handle has already been twisted when the task is re-attempted.

The first condition ensures that the current estimate for the device handle angle is within the safe limits for continuous twisting. This way, the robot will never over-extend itself by trying to manipulate a device beyond what its geometry and joint limits safely allow given how it is currently grasping the device handle; it will instead automatically re-grasp the




Fig. 4. Example strategy subtree design for adaptive robot behavior in the context of approaching and tightening an articulated device. (4a) This section coordinates first identifying the pose of the device (including the articulated handle) and then approaching, grasping and manipulating the device. (4b) This section coordinates the manipulation of the device while concurrently monitoring all conditions, such as whether the device is tightened and whether the selected strategy permits the current measured force/torque. Note the inclusion of fallback with a ForceFailure; this allows the robot to safely retract from the device even in the case of failure.

device handle by interrupting the current manipulation attempt and starting another. This behavior was given the name ‘smart twisting’.

The second condition checks the current F/T data against the permitted limits for the chosen strategy. If the limits are exceeded, the robot will interrupt the current attempt and select a different strategy that permits the current F/T data.

While there is no condition that checks the optimality of the current strategy against all other strategies, this could be added as another condition that returns *Failure* when a different strategy has become optimal given the data; the new optimal strategy would then be selected by SelectStrategy on the next manipulation attempt (assuming the same optimality criteria are used).

Note that the retraction procedure is required regardless of whether the manipulation was successful. To achieve retraction on manipulation failure, the ReactiveFallback is placed within a Fallback and followed by a duplicate of the subtree for re-

traction, decorated by a ForceFailure so that the manipulation subtree will still return *Failure*.

## V. IMPLEMENTATION

### A. Test Platform

A simulated ANYbotics ANYmal C quadruped<sup>1</sup> with mounted Kinova Jaco Gen1 robotic arm<sup>2</sup> was used as the test platform. The arm uses a Robotiq gripper<sup>3</sup> with a F/T sensor<sup>4</sup> added to the wrist; the sensor measures both force and torque in all three spatial dimensions.

ROS, the Robot Operating System, was used for the implementation of the proposed system as well as communication with hardware [17].

<sup>1</sup><https://www.anybotics.com/robotics/anymal/>

<sup>2</sup><https://assistive.kinovarobotics.com/product/jaco-robotic-arm>

<sup>3</sup><https://robotiq.com/products/2f85-140-adaptive-robot-gripper>

<sup>4</sup><https://robotiq.com/products/ft-300-force-torque-sensor>

## B. Behavior Tree

BT.CPP 4.0 was used to construct the BTs tested in this work. The ActionNode types specific to this work take the form of ROS action and service clients. The request or goal is sent when the node is first ticked, and the action or service status is checked and feedback processed on subsequent ticks. The node returns *Success* if the action or service was successful, *Failure* if failed, or *Running* otherwise. These nodes were implemented as derived classes of the *StatefulActionNode* from the BT.CPP core library; this node type explicitly supports asynchronous actions and is recommended for this use case. Note that BT.CPP does not have ROS integration in the core library, and so this was added in the derived classes using the ROSCPP library.

The *SelectStrategy* node estimates the optimal manipulation strategy. As a simple proof of concept for the proposed adaptive BT design, *SelectStrategy* finds the maximum recorded F/T from the manipulation data for a particular device instance, and selects the strategy with the lowest permitted F/T that still permits this measurement. This works under the (very heavy) assumption that F/T allowance is negatively correlated with speed of task completion, which is true for the test case considered in this work. This way, the robot will always select the faster low-torque strategy until measured F/T rises to the point that it must swap to the slower high-torque strategy to continue manipulation.

Note that there are many possible approaches to optimal strategy selection; for example, Bayesian inference could be used to model device stiffness by using past data to estimate a F/T profile as a function of task progress for each known device instance. One would provide *SelectStrategy* with a loss function for each known strategy as a function of F/T; a fast, low-torque strategy may have low loss for low F/T (since it is fast) yet very high loss for high F/T (since it cannot provide high torque), meanwhile a slow, high-torque strategy may have higher loss for low F/T but much lower loss for high F/T. These loss functions could be used to compute the expected loss for each strategy given the estimated F/T profile and the task to be completed, and the strategy of lowest expected loss for the current task progress is selected as optimal. However, since this work focuses on the efficacy of the adaptive BT design, this idea is left as a suggestion for future work.

*SelectStrategy* and the condition nodes require knowledge of past and present manipulation F/T data; this is measured using a F/T sensor in the robot's wrist and recorded in a database for future reference. Note that the data was also indexed by task instance (in this case, the ID of the particular device), since two different instances of the same task may have different environmental characteristics and therefore the data from one would not apply to the other.

## C. Motion Planning

This work uses a whole-body motion planner made using EXOTica, the EXtensible Optimisation Toolset [18]. Bespoke timed end-effector pose trajectories were manually developed for the grasp, manipulate and retract stages of the manipulation task for each strategy, defined relative to some target pose

(in this case, the pose of the device handle). The approach stage does not require an end-effector pose trajectory, only specifying a goal pose for the end-effector.

For particularly complex manipulation sequences, the motion planner would occasionally get caught in a local minimum, resulting in planning failure, and the *ManipulateTarget* node would output *Failure* in these cases, interrupting the current sequence. This was one cause for the failures that would occasionally occur during testing as seen in section VI. Re-attempting the manipulation sequence on failure, as is done naturally by the proposed BT design, typically resolved this.

## D. Control

This work uses the standard PID controllers provided for the simulated ANYmal C and Jaco Gen1 arm. Despite some further tuning to improve performance, these controllers are by no means perfect, and in practice there was often non-negligible deviation between the true end-effector pose and that in the motion plan, especially when the arm was outstretched. To ensure safe operation, this deviation would be monitored during each manipulation sequence, and the *ManipulateTarget* node would output *Failure* in cases where the deviation was beyond an acceptable tolerance. This was another cause for the failures that would occasionally occur during testing as seen in section VI; re-attempting the manipulation sequence on failure typically resolved this.

## E. Simulation

For simulation, this work uses Gazebo, the ROS-compatible open-source 3D robotics simulator [19]. The ANYmal C and Jaco Gen1 arm are both packaged with extensive support for simulation in Gazebo, and it is straightforward to combine the two into a legged manipulator. The physics settings used were the standard values for the ANYmal Gazebo environments.

In order to test the robot's ability to complete manipulation tasks, the simulator needs to accurately simulate articulated devices for the robot to manipulate. This proved to be challenging, since there exists no standard method for simulating such a device in Gazebo. The approach taken in this work was to simulate each device in the same way that a robot is simulated, defining robot links, joints and controllers so that the 'robot' mimics the characteristics of the real device, including dynamic properties such as friction and tightening. The simulated devices are highly accurate to their real-world equivalents, and allow for testing in simulation to closely reflect testing on hardware. They were developed in a GitHub repository that will soon be made available to the public<sup>5</sup>.

## VI. TESTS PERFORMED AND RESULTS

An accompanying video for the tests performed can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dQ-v09HNj6g>.

<sup>5</sup>[https://github.com/ori-drs/manipulation\\_playground](https://github.com/ori-drs/manipulation_playground)





Fig. 5. Twisting a needle valve using the (5a) low-torque and (5b) high-torque strategies. The adaptive behavior can reactively select between these strategies.

TABLE I  
RESULTS FROM TWISTING NEEDLE VALVE BY 7 RADIANs.

Attempt No.	1 (Cumulative)	2 (Cumulative)	3 (Cumulative)	4 (Cumulative)	5 (Cumulative)	Fastest Time (s)
Low-Torque	9 (9)	1 (10)	0 (10)	0 (10)	0 (10)	83
High-Torque	7 (7)	2 (9)	1 (10)	0 (10)	0 (10)	306

#### A. Smart Twisting

The purpose of this test is to demonstrate how the proposed BT design enables the robot to reactively interrupt the current attempt and re-attempt the task when instructed by a condition node. In particular, we will see how the robot is able to automatically stop and re-grasp the device when safe device handle angle limits for continuous twisting are exceeded. In this test, the robot is instructed to twist a needle valve handle by a specified angle in simulation, in this case 7 radians (which corresponds to just over one full rotation). Two manipulation strategies for the needle valve were developed; the faster, simpler ‘low-torque’ strategy grasps the handle head-on while the slower, more complex ‘high-torque’ strategy grasps it from the side. Fig. 5 demonstrates these strategies.

The dynamic properties of the simulated needle valve were turned off for this test, with the exception of some minor static friction to stop the handle spinning freely when not being twisted.

The robot was commanded to perform the manipulation task 10 times. A maximum of 5 attempts was permitted, ignoring failures triggered as part of re-grasping when device handle angle limits were exceeded. The robot was tested with both a ‘low-torque’ behavior and a ‘high-torque’ behavior, where in both cases SelectStrategy can only select the associated strategy (if feasible). Table I records the number of successful task completions at (and by, as a cumulative value) a given attempt number, as well as fastest time taken for task completion.

The robot was able to complete the task in all attempts, periodically stopping and re-grasping the device whenever the

handle angle exceeded the safe limits. The robot was also able to interrupt and re-attempt the task in a safe, controlled manner in rare cases where *Failure* was triggered during manipulation as a result of the true end-effector pose deviating from the motion plan beyond the permitted tolerance. Thus, these results demonstrate the efficacy and reactivity of the proposed BT design.

Note that the low-torque strategy enabled task completion in a significantly shorter time than the high-torque strategy, and was also less prone to failures in motion planning and control. Thus, for optimal performance the robot should generally use this strategy whenever feasible. However, from preliminary testing the high-torque strategy was able to reliably sustain around 5 N m of torque about the needle valve while the low-torque strategy could only manage around 0.5 N m before the gripper fingers began to bend and slip in simulation. Therefore, the high-torque strategy is required for high-torque tasks. An adaptive behavior wherein the robot defaults to the low-torque strategy but reactively switches to the high-torque strategy when required torque is high would be able to exploit the strengths of both strategies to improve performance.

#### B. Adaptive Behavior Between Two Strategies

The purpose of this test is to demonstrate how the proposed BT design enables the robot to reactively switch between different strategies during a task so as to improve performance. The adaptive behavior was tested in simulation against baseline non-adaptive behaviors, which is equivalent to the robot only being able to select a single strategy as in the previous



TABLE II  
RESULTS FROM TWISTING THE NEEDLE VALVE UNTIL TIGHTENED USING THE LOW- AND HIGH-TORQUE BEHAVIORS AS WELL AS THE ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Attempt No.	1 (Cumulative)	2 (Cumulative)	3 (Cumulative)	4 (Cumulative)	5 (Cumulative)	Fastest Time (s)
Low-Torque	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	52 (Fail)
High-Torque	6 (6)	2 (8)	1 (9)	1 (10)	Complete (10)	175
Adaptive	8 (8)	1 (9)	1 (10)	Complete (10)	Complete (10)	130

test. In this test, the robot is instructed to twist a needle valve handle until the F/T measurements indicate that the device is tightened. The strategies used here are the same as those described in the previous test, with there being a ‘low-torque’ strategy and a ‘high-torque’ strategy. The adaptive behavior can reactively select between them, with SelectStrategy having both strategies in its database.

The low-torque strategy was given a torque limit of 0.5 N m since this was the limit beyond which the gripper fingers began to bend in simulation. For the same reason, the high-torque strategy was given a torque limit of 5 N m. The reactive torque at which the valve is considered tightened was chosen to be 1.5 N m. The dynamic properties of the simulated needle valve were turned on for this test, with the joint effectively acting as a damped spring while being twisted. For this test the joint limits of the needle valve were also changed from infinite to  $\pm 3$  radians, simulating the valve being fully tightened; since the handle is not be able to twist further, it is at this point that the measured reactive torque rapidly increases to exceed 1.5 N m, informing the robot that the device is fully tightened.

The robot was commanded to repeatedly perform the manipulation task 10 times using the baseline behaviors of low-torque only and high-torque only as well as the adaptive behavior. A maximum of 5 attempts was permitted for each trial, ignoring failures triggered as part of changing strategy and re-grasping when device handle angle limits were exceeded. The manipulation data was reset upon each trial of the manipulation task so that the robot could not learn from previous trials. Table II records, for each behavior, the number of successful task completions at (and by, as a cumulative value) a given attempt number, as well as fastest time taken for task completion. Figure 6 illustrates the fastest times taken and whether the task was completed successfully.

The low-torque behavior was unable to fully tighten the needle valve; this is because task completion requires application of torque beyond that possible when using the low-torque strategy. Meanwhile, the high-torque behavior was able to fully tighten the needle valve. However, not only did the adaptive behavior also result in successful task completion, but it did so faster and with fewer number of failures compared to always using the high-torque strategy; indeed, in the majority of cases, the robot completed the entire task without any failures (beyond those triggered for changing strategy). This is because the adaptive behavior is able to use the low-torque strategy when measured F/T is low; this is beneficial since the low-torque strategy is faster, taking less time to approach and twist the needle valve handle, and it is also simpler, reducing the likelihood of getting caught in local minima when planning as well as making it easier for the PID controllers to command




Fig. 6. Fastest time taken to successfully twist the needle valve until tightened using the low- and high-torque behaviors as well as the adaptive behavior. If no trials were successful, the fastest time for failure is presented. Note the adaptive behavior is the fastest successful behavior.

the true robot to track the motion plan without exceeding the permitted tolerance for end-effector deviation from the target. However, when the measured F/T exceeded 0.5 N m, the robot preempted failure using this strategy, stopping and re-attempting the task but now selecting the high-torque strategy when SelectStrategy is called since the recent F/T data now suggests that the low-torque strategy is no longer feasible.

These results demonstrate the potential for adaptive manipulation behavior to improve robustness and efficiency in task completion, outperforming both baseline non-adaptive behaviors that can only use a single manipulation strategy.

It is important to note that there would typically be some cost associated with switching between strategies; in this case, it is the overhead resulting from the robot retracting and then re-grasping the device. Indeed, if the task instance were such that the robot could only apply the low-torque strategy for a very brief proportion of the total manipulation procedure, it may very well be the case that the overhead cost of switching nullifies any gains made from having started with the low-torque strategy, and it would have been more optimal to have started with the high-torque strategy. However, this is highly dependent on the particular task instance, and demonstrates the importance of learning from past interactions with a particular device to make better decisions in future trials.

### C. Learning to Use Different Strategies for Different Instances

The purpose of this test is to demonstrate how the proposed BT design enables the robot to learn to use different strategies for different task instances. In this test, the robot is instructed

TABLE III  
RESULTS FROM TWISTING TWO DIFFERENT NEEDLE VALVES EACH BY ONE QUARTER ROTATION USING THE LOW- AND HIGH-TORQUE BEHAVIORS AS WELL AS THE ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR.

Device	Trial	Initial Strategy	Final Strategy	Time (s)
Low-Torque Behavior				
Normal	1	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	27
	2	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	28
Stiff	1	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	26 (Fail)
	2	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	2 (Fail)
High-Torque Behavior				
Normal	1	High-Torque	High-Torque	91
	2	High-Torque	High-Torque	91
Stiff	1	High-Torque	High-Torque	91
	2	High-Torque	High-Torque	93
Adaptive Behavior				
Normal	1	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	26
	2	Low-Torque	Low-Torque	26
Stiff	1	Low-Torque	High-Torque	103
	2	High-Torque	High-Torque	91

to twist two needle valve handles by one quarter of a rotation. While both needle valves are geometrically identical, one is much stiffer than the other, requiring much more applied torque for the same rotation. The strategies used here are the same as those described in the previous tests. Again, the adaptive behavior was tested in simulation against baseline non-adaptive behaviors, which is equivalent to the robot only being able to select a single strategy.

The torque limits of the strategies were the same as in the previous test; 0.5 N m for the low-torque strategy and 5 N m for the high-torque strategy. The dynamic properties of the simulated needle valves were turned on for this test, with the joint effectively acting as a damped spring while being twisted. However, for the normal needle valve, the reactive torque never exceeds 0.5 N m for the quarter rotation, while for the stiff needle valve, the reactive torque does exceed 0.5 N m but never exceeds 1.5 N m. Note that the quarter rotation is within the safe limits for continuous twisting for both strategies, and therefore this will never be a cause of attempt failure in this test.

The robot was commanded to manipulate the normal needle valve and the stiff needle valve for two trials each. The test considered the baseline behaviors of low-torque only and high-torque only as well as the adaptive behavior. Note that the manipulation data was retained for the second trial of the manipulation task so that the robot could learn from the first trial, but the data recorded while twisting one needle valve was not used to inform decisions for the other needle valve. Table III records, for each behavior, the device being manipulated, the trial number, the initial and final strategies used when completing the task, and the time taken for task completion. Figure 7 illustrates the times taken and whether the task was completed successfully.

In this test, the overhead cost of switching strategy has a higher impact than the faster initial speed when starting with the low-torque strategy for the stiff valve. Thus, an optimal policy would use the fast low-torque strategy to twist the normal valve handle and use the slow high-torque strategy to twist the stiff valve handle. Predictably, the low-torque

behavior always uses the low-torque strategy, resulting in task failure when trying to twist the stiff valve, and the high-torque behavior always uses the high-torque strategy, resulting in suboptimal time taken when twisting the normal valve. Meanwhile, the adaptive behavior always uses the low-torque strategy to twist the normal valve, but learns to use the high-torque strategy for the stiff valve, switching from low-torque to high-torque in the first trial and remembering to use the high-torque strategy for the second trial. Thus, the proposed BT design has allowed the robot to learn the optimal policy for this task.

Note that the low-torque behavior only takes a couple seconds attempting the task for the stiff valve on the second trial; this is because it is able to recognize that task completion is not possible based on previous F/T data at the strategy selection stage and thus immediately returns task failure without attempting the task.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

### A. Conclusion

In this work we proposed a simple behavior tree design for general adaptive robot behavior wherein the robot can reactively select from, interrupt and switch between strategies to optimize performance, with potential for learning from past interactions to better inform future ones. We used this to create an adaptive BT for tightening an articulated device, with two distinct manipulation strategies permitted. The adaptive manipulation behavior outperformed the non-adaptive baseline behaviors during testing, with the robot using the faster low-torque strategy to tighten the needle valve most of the way before switching to the slower high-torque strategy to provide enough torque to complete the tightening. The reactivity of the proposed design also allowed the robot to automatically stop and re-grasp the device whenever the device handle angle exceeded the safe limits for continuous twisting. The robot was able to preempt task failure when using the low-torque strategy on the stiff valve and change to the high-torque strategy before catastrophic failure occurred. The robot was also able to learn the optimal strategy to use for twisting each of two different needle valves.

These results suggest that the proposed BT design has significant potential to improve automation and reduce dependency on human supervision and intervention for robots in both industrial and domestic environments. The proposed BT design can also be easily added as a subtree within a greater BT structure, and is thus readily applicable to behavior tree-based robot task planning systems.

### B. Future Work

There are plenty of possible avenues for future work. A clear direction is the investigation of a variety of more intelligent, learning-based approaches to both selecting the optimal strategy and deciding when to change to a different strategy, such as the use of Bayesian inference to determine the strategy of lowest expected loss given the data as described in section V-B.




Fig. 7. Time taken to twist the normal and stiff needle valves each by one quarter rotation using the low- and high-torque behaviors as well as the adaptive behavior. Note that the adaptive behavior matches the high speed of the low-torque strategy for the normal needle valve while matching the speed of the high-torque strategy for the stiff needle valve, successfully completing the task in both cases.

Stochastic BTs (SBTs) have recently been proposed as a method of representing probabilistic performance measures of a given tree, such as *Success/Failure* probabilities and execution times [20]. There is potential in using the SBT framework to estimate the performance measures for each strategy subtree and select the option of lowest expected loss. Data from past attempts could be employed to inform these measures, shaping these estimates over time to better represent the real environment.

The strategy selection and switching problem can be very neatly framed in a classic reinforcement learning (RL) setting, where the agent must learn the best action to take for each system state so as to maximize some reward. Thus, the means by which the robot decides how to select the optimal strategy and when to change to a different strategy could be solved using RL-based analysis.

A key limitation is that the proposed BT design assumes a discrete set of known, manually-crafted strategies, each with their own bespoke subtrees. Thus, there would be great value in the automatic synthesis of distinct strategies; there exists work demonstrating the potential for automatic generation of BTs for manipulation tasks [14], [21], which could be used to achieve this. It may also be possible to parameterize strategies over one or more continuous parameters, reducing optimal strategy selection to optimization over these parameters given the data.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Gehring, P. Fankhauser, L. Isler, R. Diethelm, S. Bachmann, M. Potz, L. Gerstenberg, and M. Hutter, "Anyman in the field: Solving industrial inspection of an offshore hvdc platform with a quadrupedal robot," in *Field and Service Robotics*, ser. Springer Proceedings in Advanced Robotics, G. Ishigami and K. Yoshida, Eds. (Springer, Singapore), 2021, vol. 16, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9460-1\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9460-1_18).
- [2] T. Yamamoto, K. Terada, A. Ochiai, F. Saito, Y. Asahara, and K. Murase, "Development of Human Support Robot as the research platform of a domestic mobile manipulator," *Robomech J*, vol. 6, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40648-019-0132-3>.
- [3] R. Ghzouli, S. Dragule, T. Berger, E. Johnsen, and A. Wasowski, "Behavior trees and state machines in robotics applications," 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.04211>.
- [4] R. Balogh and D. Obdrzalek, "Using finite state machines in introductory robotics," in *Robotics in Education*, ser. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, W. Lepuschitz, M. Merdan, G. Koppensteiner, R. Balogh, and D. Obdrzalek, Eds. (Springer, Cham), 2018, vol. 778, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97085-1\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97085-1_9).
- [5] M. Iovino, E. Scukins, J. Styurd, P. Ogren, and C. Smith, "A survey of Behavior Trees in robotics and AI," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 154, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.robot.2022.104096>.
- [6] M. Iovino, J. Forster, P. Falco, J. Chung, R. Siegwart, and C. Smith, "On the programming effort required to generate behavior trees and finite state machines for robotic applications," 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2209.07392>.
- [7] Z. Yang and A. Curtis, "Let's handle it: Generalizable manipulation of articulated objects," 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2202.11792>.
- [8] M. Iovino, F. Doğan, I. Leite, and C. Smith, "Interactive disambiguation for behavior tree execution," 2022, doi: [10.48550/ARXIV.2203.02994](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.02994).
- [9] R. Wu, S. Kortik, and C. Santos, "Automated behavior tree error recovery framework for robotic systems," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021, pp. 6898–6904, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA48506.2021.9561002>.
- [10] D. Domínguez, M. Iannotta, J. Stork, E. Schaffernicht, and T. Stoyanov, "A stack-of-tasks approach combined with behavior trees: a new framework for robot control," 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2209.08619>.
- [11] J.-J. E. Slotine and W. Li, "On the adaptive control of robot manipulators," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 49–59, 1987.
- [12] —, "Adaptive robot control: A new perspective," in *26th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, vol. 26, 1987, pp. 192–198.
- [13] S. Saoji and J. Rosell, "Flexibly configuring task and motion planning problems for mobile manipulators," in *2020 25th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*, vol. 1, 2020, pp. 1285–1288, doi: [10.1109/ETFA46521.2020.9212086](https://doi.org/10.1109/ETFA46521.2020.9212086).
- [14] P. Verma, M. Diab, and J. Rosell, "Automatic generation of behavior trees for the execution of robotic manipulation tasks," in *2021 26th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*, 2021, pp. 1–4, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ETFA45728.2021.9613583>.
- [15] P. M. Moubarak and P. Ben-Tzvi, "Adaptive manipulation of a hybrid mechanism mobile robot," in *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Robotic and Sensors Environments (ROSE)*, 2011, pp. 113–118.
- [16] D. Faconti, "Behaviortree.cpp," <https://www.behaviortree.dev/>, Last accessed on 4/12/2023.
- [17] M. Quigley, B. Gerkey, K. Conley, J. Faust, T. Foote, J. Leibs, E. Berger, R. Wheeler, and A. Ng, "Ros: an open-source robot operating system," in *Proc. of the IEEE Intl. Conf. on Robotics and Automation (ICRA) Workshop on Open Source Robotics*, Kobe, Japan, may 2009.
- [18] V. Ivan, Y. Yang, W. Merkt, M. Camilleri, and S. Vijayakumar, "Exotica: An extensible optimization toolset for prototyping and benchmarking motion planning and control," in *Robot Operating System (ROS)*, ser.

Studies in Computational Intelligence, A. Koubaa, Ed. (Springer, Cham), 2018, vol. 778, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91590-6\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91590-6_7).

- [19] N. Koenig and A. Howard, "Design and use paradigms for gazebo, an open-source multi-robot simulator," in *2004 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)(IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37566)*, vol. 3. IEEE, 2004, pp. 2149–2154.
- [20] M. Colledanchise, A. Marzotto, and P. Ogren, "Performance analysis of stochastic behavior trees," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2014, pp. 3265–3272, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2014.6907328>.
- [21] E. Scheide, G. Best, and G. Hollinger, "Behavior tree learning for robotic task planning through monte carlo dag search over a formal grammar," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021, pp. 4837–4843, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA48506.2021.9561027>.



**Jacques Cloete** received the M.Eng. degree in Engineering Science from the University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K., in 2023. He is currently a DPhil student for the Autonomous Intelligent Machines and Systems Centre for Doctoring Training at the University of Oxford, working in the Oxford Robotics Institute.

His research interests include using learned and model-based methods for task and motion planning in robotics, with a particular interest in manipulation and techniques for adaptive robot behavior.



**Wolfgang Merkt** received the B.Eng.(Hns) degree in mechanical engineering with management and the M.Sc.(R) and Ph.D. degrees in robotics and autonomous systems from the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, U.K., in 2014, 2015 and 2019, respectively.

He is currently a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Oxford Robotics Institute, University of Oxford. During his Ph.D., he worked on trajectory optimization and warm starting optimal control for high-dimensional systems and humanoid robots under the supervision of S. Vijayakumar. His research interests include fast optimization-based methods for planning and control, loco-manipulation, and legged robots.



**Ioannis Havoutis** received the M.Sc. in artificial intelligence and Ph.D. in Informatics degrees from the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, U.K. He is an Associate Professor in Robotics at the University of Oxford.

He is part of the Oxford Robotics Institute and a co-lead of the Dynamic Robot Systems group. His focus is on approaches for dynamic whole-body motion planning and control for legged robots in challenging domains, with a particular interest in machine learning methods. Previously, he was a postdoc at the Robot Learning and Interaction Group, at the Idiap Research Institute; and a senior postdoc at the Dynamic Legged System lab the Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia.