

An Extended Convergence Result for Behaviour Tree Controllers

Christopher Iliffe Sprague

Petter Ögren

Abstract—Behavior trees (BTs) are an optimally modular framework to assemble hierarchical hybrid control policies from a set of low-level control policies using a tree structure. Many robotic tasks are naturally decomposed into a hierarchy of control tasks, and modularity is a well-known tool for handling complexity, therefore behavior trees have garnered widespread usage in the robotics community. In this paper, we study the convergence of BTs, in the sense of reaching a desired part of the state space. Earlier results on BT convergence were often tailored to specific families of BTs, created using different design principles. The results of this paper generalize the earlier results and also include new cases of cyclic switching not covered in the literature.

Index Terms—Hybrid Logical/Dynamical Planning and Verification; Behavior-Based Systems; Motion Control; Behavior Trees.

I. INTRODUCTION

Behavior trees (BTs) are a way to assemble a hierarchical hybrid control policy (HCP) from a set of low-level control policies using a tree structure. They can be analysed at any level of hierarchy — low-level control policies at the lowest level and modules of control policies (forming HCPs) at subsequently higher levels of hierarchy. At every level of hierarchy, these modules interface with each other in an identical functional way. These aspects allow individual control policies and modules to be developed and tested independently of others.

The modular development that BTs allow is, in fact, the reason they were conceived in the first place in the video game industry [1]. In the virtual context of video games, where the world is predictable by design, the design of low-level control policies is often trivial, and therefore, game designers found themselves looking for a modular way to compose a large set of low-level control policies into rich behaviors.

In contrast, the robotics community faces far more challenges in the design of low-level control policies, as the real world can only be approximated by models, and tasks such as grasping are important research fields of their own. Thus, while focusing on creating control policies for solving fundamental interaction problems, robotics researchers felt less of a need for a hierarchical modular framework for combining many of such control policies. However, with the surge in collaborative development brought forth by open-source platforms such as the Robotic Operating System (ROS), the increasingly ubiquitous presence of robots in society, and the rise of control-policy synthesis through machine learning [2], large sets of low-level control policies are becoming




Fig. 1: An example of how the operating regions Ω_i and domains of attraction B_i can be arranged to make the state reach one of the desired goal regions G_6, G_7 from a wide variety of starting states.

increasingly available for many robotic systems. As a result, in recent years, the robotics community has begun to feel the same need for a modular framework as the video game industry.

A popular choice for representing HCPs has been hybrid automata (HA). However, the discrete states of HAs are modeled by finite-state machines (FSMs), which rely on state transitions. As such, the development of individual control policies or modules in an FSM of N states requires taking into account the $N(N-1)$ possible state transitions between the N states. In contrast, modules in BTs rely on a common functional interface, with return values representing current progress as either Success, Failure or Running (see below), at every level of hierarchy, allowing each module at any level of hierarchy in any subtree to be developed individually — the explicit transitions of a FSM are thus implicitly encoded in the functional interface of BTs [3]. For this reason, BTs have been shown to be optimally modular [4], while at the same time equally as expressive as FSMs [5].

In the past years, BTs have garnered an increasing use in the robotics community, with over 100 papers in recent surveys [6] and software by innovative companies such as Boston Dynamics¹, Nvidia², and Google’s Intrinsic.AI³.

Christopher Iliffe Sprague and Petter Ögren are with the Robotics, Perception and Learning Lab., School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden, sprague@kth.se

¹https://dev.bostondynamics.com/docs/concepts/autonomy/missions_service

²https://docs.nvidia.com/isaac/packages/behavior_tree/doc/behavior_trees.html

³<https://intrinsic.ai/blog/posts/introducing-intrinsic-flowstate/>

Several BT design principles have been proposed, e.g. implicit sequences [3] and backchaining [7], [8], to create HCPs that are directed at achieving some top-level goals. These designs qualitatively resemble the notion of “sequential composition” from [9] — the composition of low-level control policies in such a way as to enlarge the system’s domain of attraction (DOA) to a goal state, as described in [3].

Relatively few works have *formally* investigated the convergence properties of BT designs [3], [8], [10], and out of these, none cover the case where there are cycles in the execution of control policies.

Contributions: The three main contributions of this paper are as follows.

- 1) We present the first general convergence theorem that allows cycles in the execution of sub-BTs and the execution of sub-BTs outside their DOA (Theorem 1).
- 2) We show how this theorem also generalizes earlier proofs in [3], [8], [10], in detail: [3, Lemma 2, p.7] is covered by Corollary 3, [3, Lemma 3, p.8] is covered by Corollary 4, [10, Theorem 4, p.6] is covered by Corollary 5, [8, Theorem 1, p.7] is covered by Corollary 6.
- 3) Finally, the result also encompasses the recent conference paper [11] on combining black box controllers, created by i.e., reinforcement learning, with model-based designs without losing formal guarantees on safety and goal convergence.

The organization of this letter is as follows. First, we describe related work in Section II, then Section III provides a fairly detailed background on a formal description of BTs that will be used for the convergence analysis. The main result can be found in Section IV, followed by the conclusions in Section V.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we will describe related work in three different categories.

Hybrid dynamical system representations: A hybrid dynamical system (HDS) is a dynamical system that has both continuous and discrete dynamics. Among the most popular ways to represent HDSs is hybrid automata (HA), where continuous behavior is given by ordinary differential equations and discrete behavior is given by finite-state machines (FSMs). However, in recent years, BTs have become a popular way to represent HDSs due to their modularity [3], [12], [13]. This modularity allows different dynamics to be inserted into the HDS without having to take into account the myriad of transitions entailed by FSMs. BTs have also been theoretically proven to be optimally modular reactive control architectures [4]. *The modularity of BTs is the main motivation behind the contributions of this letter.*

BTs have been informally compared to HDSs several times [3], [12], [13]. The first formal comparison of BTs to HDSs was given in [10], where BTs were formulated as discontinuous dynamical systems (DDSs), a subclass of HDSs. *In this paper, we use the DDS formalism of [10] to analyse convergence.*

Sequential composition: As mentioned before, BTs are a way to compose together multiple different control policies. This concept is well-represented in the literature [3], [9], [14]–[16], and is rooted in so-called sequential composition [9]. The main idea is that the execution of a control policy should lead the system’s state into the domain of attraction (DOA) of another control policy. If a set of such pairs of control policies can be “backchained” from a goal region, then the overall system can be stabilized to the goal starting within the DOA of any control policy in the set. The collection of all such chains induces a so-called “prepares graph”, which represents all the possible transitions between control policies in discrete space. As noted in [14], this representation functions as a finite-state machine (FSM), which, when factoring in the continuous behavior between discrete states, functions as a hybrid automaton [17]. But, as noted above, BTs have advantages over FSMs in terms of modularity [4]. Luckily, BTs were shown to generalize sequential composition in [3]. *But, unlike [3], in this paper, we show how sequential composition can be induced by BTs with the DDS formalism of [10], which allows the application of existence and uniqueness results of DDSs [18].*

A commonality among many works that deal with sequential composition is that the control policies used to create the composition all have some indication of which other control policy they can “switch” to, based on their DOA. A notion of composing together control policies that do not necessarily have such an indication is given in [19], in the context of specific BT designs, where probabilities of “uncontrolled switches” were analyzed. *Unlike [19], we analyze uncontrolled switches in general BT designs.*

Stability: In many cases, BTs are used to model hybrid control policies (HCPs), which when imparted into a given continuous dynamical system, renders a HDS. Formal guarantees of stability is a key subject in HDSs [20]–[23] because it states what the system will do (i.e. through stability to a goal region) and what it will not do (i.e. through set-invariance within an obstacle-free region). Typically, when executing a BT as a HCP, one seeks to stabilize the system to the so-called success region, i.e. some desired region of the statespace. The stability (or convergence) of BTs has been studied in several works [3], [8], [19], [24]. However, these works only consider specific BT designs, not general ones. In [10], stability was analyzed for general BT designs using the DDS formalism, but did not allow for cycles. *In this paper, we show how the presented theorem (Theorem 1) generalizes the stability theorems of [3, Lemma 2, p.7], [3, Lemma 3, p.8], [10, Theorem 4, p.6], and [8, Theorem 1, p.7].*

III. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will summarize the formal description of BTs presented in [10]. As BTs can be seen as ordered trees we first review some key notation and concepts from that area, and then move on to the actual BTs.

A. Ordered trees

A BT is structurally represented by an ordered tree [25], a rooted tree in which, in addition to an ordering between an-

cestors (parents, grandparents, and so on), there is a specified ordering between siblings (children of the same parent) [10].

One way to specify these orderings is by designating *two* sets of edges in the directed-graph formalism. Given a finite set of vertices V , we would then specify a set of edges from children to parent $E_P \subset V^2$ and from sibling to sibling $E_S \subset V^2$. If (V, E_S) is a directed acyclical graph (DAG), (V, E_P) is a rooted tree (also a DAG), and $E_P \cap E_S = \emptyset$ (parents cannot be siblings with children), then (V, E_P, E_S) is an ordered tree, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Note that the drawing of a tree (V, E_P) on paper implicitly creates a sibling order (with e.g., siblings ordered from left to right), but this order is not present in (V, E_P) itself.




Fig. 2: An ordered tree written as two DAGs, with children-to-parent edges, E_P , indicated by single stroke lines and sibling-to-sibling edges, E_S , indicated by double-stroked lines.

Another way to specify these orderings can be created using *partial orders*. Following [10], a partial order can be obtained from the reflexive-transitive closure of a DAG's edges. Thus, by doing so on the edges, E_P and E_S , we obtain a *parent order* $\leq_P \subset V^2$ and a *sibling order* $\leq_S \subset V^2$, respectively (also known as reachability relations on E_P and E_S). An ordered tree could then be defined as (V, \leq_P, \leq_S) , a set of vertices, and two partial orders.

Again, looking at the example in Fig. 2 we have that $B \leq_P E$ since there is an edge in E_P from E to B . Similarly, we have that $A \leq_P B$ and $A \leq_P C$ and so on. But we also have $A \leq_P E$ due to the transitive closure (see below), even though $(A, E) \notin E_P$ and $A \leq_P A$ due to the reflexive closure (see below), even though $(A, A) \notin E_P$. Similarly, for the sibling order we get $B \leq_S C \leq_S D$, $E \leq_S F$ and so on.

Formally, a partial order \leq on a set V (such that $\leq \subset V^2$) is a homogeneous binary relation (if $(i, j) \in \leq$ we write $i \leq j$) that is *reflexive* ($\forall i \in V : i \leq i$), *antisymmetric* ($\forall i, j \in V : (i \leq j) \wedge (j \leq i) \implies i = j$), and *transitive* ($\forall i, j, k \in V : (i \leq j) \wedge (j \leq k) \implies i \leq k$). It is “partial” because there can exist pairs $(i, j) \in V^2$ for which neither $i \leq j$ nor $j \leq i$, in which case such pairs are *incomparable*. If a pair is not comparable, then it is *comparable*. If all pairs in V are comparable, then the partial order \leq is more specifically a *total order*.

A subset of V for which all pairs are comparable (resp. incomparable) with \leq is a *chain* (resp. *antichain*) with respect to \leq . A chain (resp. antichain) is *maximal* if it is not a proper subset of any other chain (resp. antichain).

Thus, in Fig. 2 we have that A, B, E is a maximal chain with respect to \leq_P , and B, C is a chain (but not maximal) with respect to \leq_S . Furthermore, B, G are not comparable, using either one of \leq_P and \leq_S .

Where convenient, we will also use the corresponding *converse relation* (\geq) and *strict orders* ($<$ and $>$) of the relations above. If $i \leq j$, we can write $j \geq i$. If $i \leq j$ and $i \neq j$, we can write $i < j$ or $j > i$.

The parent and sibling orders allow us to make the following distinctions. For any $i, j \in V$, if $i <_P j$ (resp. $i >_P j$), then i is said to be an *ancestor* of j (resp. *descendant*); if $i <_S j$ (resp. $i >_S j$), then i is said to be a *left-sibling* (resp. *right-sibling*) of j . Their strict orders are *complementary* to each other, meaning that if (i, j) is comparable with $<_S$ (resp. $<_P$) then it is incomparable with $<_P$ (resp. $<_S$).

Other orders can be created through *compositions*. The composition of two relations is defined as

$$\leq_A \circ \leq_B := \{(i, k) \in V^2 \mid \exists j : (i \leq_A j) \wedge (j \leq_B k)\}.$$

Some composition orders that will be useful in the following are the left-uncle order $<_{LU} := \leq_S \circ \leq_P$, the right-uncle order $>_{RU} := \geq_S \circ \geq_P$, the left-to-right order $<_{LR} := \geq_P \circ <_{LU}$, and the right-to-left order $>_{RL} := \geq_P \circ >_{RU}$, which are illustrated in Fig. 3, and used e.g. Equation (15) below.




Fig. 3: Illustrations of the left-uncle order $<_{LU}$ (a) and the right-uncle order $>_{RU}$ (b), where the edges represent their reflexive-transitive reduction.

These compositions yield strict partial orders; we define their corresponding partial orders as their reflexive closure, denoted by: \leq_{LU} , \leq_{RU} , \leq_{LR} , and \leq_{RL} .

Apart from the orders defined above, the parent map $p(i) := \sup_{\leq_P} \{j \mid j <_P i\}$ will also be used.

In Fig. 3 we illustrate the composite orders, given the ordered tree in Fig. 2. As can be seen, we have that $B <_{LU} H$, but since the non-strict \leq_P is part of the definition of $<_{LU}$ we also have that $G <_{LU} H$. Furthermore, regarding the left-to-right order we have that $E <_{LR} G <_{LR} H <_{LR} D$, but any pair that is comparable using \leq_P are not comparable using $<_{LR}$, such as e.g. A, C .

B. Behavior Trees

We will now provide the formal description of BTs, following [10]. Throughout this paper, let \mathbb{R}^n be the state space, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a state, and \mathbb{R}^m be the control space with $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Definition 1 (Behavior Tree). A function $\mathcal{T}_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \times \{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}\}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_i(x) := (u_i(x), r_i(x)) \quad (1)$$

where $i \in V$ is an index in an ordered tree, $u_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a controller, and $r_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}\}$ is a metadata function, describing the progress of the controller in terms of the outputs: running (\mathcal{R}), success (\mathcal{S}), and failure (\mathcal{F}). Define the metadata regions as the running, success, and failure regions:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i &:= \{x : r_i(x) = \mathcal{R}\}, \\ S_i &:= \{x : r_i(x) = \mathcal{S}\}, \quad F_i := \{x : r_i(x) = \mathcal{F}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

respectively, which are pairwise disjoint and cover \mathbb{R}^n .

Note that in an ordered tree, every vertex $i \in V$ can be seen as the root of a subtree, consisting of all its descendants $\{j : i <_p j\}$. Thus, as above, $i \in V$ can also be seen as an index of a (sub)tree. As such, let us designate the *root BT* as $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{T}_i$ (has index 0) such that $\{j : j <_p i\} = \emptyset$, and *sub BTs* as all other BTs \mathcal{T}_j such that $i \neq 0$.

The intuition of the metadata regions (2) is as follows. If $x \in S_i$, then \mathcal{T}_i has either succeeded in achieving its goal (e.g. opening a door) or the goal was already achieved (the door was already open). Either way, it might make sense to execute another BT in sequence to achieve another goal (perhaps a goal that is intended to be achieved after opening the door).

If $x \in F_i$, then \mathcal{T}_i has either failed (the door to be opened turned out to be locked), or has no chance at succeeding (the door is impossible to reach from the current position). Either way, it might make sense to execute another BT as a fallback (either to open the door in another way or to achieve a higher-level goal in a way that does not involve opening the door).

If $x \in R_i$, then it is too early to determine if \mathcal{T}_i will succeed or fail. In most cases, it makes sense to continue executing \mathcal{T}_i , but it could also be reasonable to execute another BT if some other goal is more important (e.g. low battery levels indicate the need to recharge).

Above, we use the term “execution” to mean the use of a BT’s controller u_i in some underlying *autonomous dynamical system*, e.g. a robot. Thus, we have the following definition of a *BT execution*.

Definition 2 (BT execution). Given an autonomous dynamical system $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that is to be controlled, the BT execution of \mathcal{T}_i is given in continuous-time as

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u_i(x)), \quad (3)$$

and for discrete-time as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + f(x_k, u_i(x_k)). \quad (4)$$

In both cases, u_i is given by (1).

As shown in [10], the continuous-time BT execution (3) can be characterized by a *discontinuous dynamical system*

(DDS) defined over a finite set of so-called *operating regions* [10, Theorem 2, p.5], with corresponding results regarding existence and uniqueness of its solutions [10, Theorem 3, p.6]. These operating regions (with identical definitions for both continuous and discrete time dynamics found below) arise from the switching among BTs invoked by *BT compositions*, of which there exist two fundamental types: *Sequences* and *Fallbacks*.

A *Sequence* is a BT that composes together sub-BTs that are to be executed in a sequence where each one requires the success of the previous. It will succeed only if all sub-BTs succeed, whereas, if any one sub-BT fails, it will fail. This behavior is formalized in terms of the sub-BT’s metadata regions in the following definition.

Definition 3 (Sequence). A functional that composes an arbitrarily finite sequence of $M \in \mathbb{N}$ BTs into a new BT:

$$\text{Seq}[\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_M](x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}_M(x) & \text{if } x \in S_1 \cap \dots \cap S_{M-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{T}_2(x) & \text{else-if } x \in S_1 \\ \mathcal{T}_1(x) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

If $\mathcal{T}_i = \text{Seq}[\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_M]$, then $j, k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ are the children of i , such that $p(j) = i$, and are related as siblings, by $j \leq_S k$ if $j \leq k$.

A *Fallback*, on the other hand, is a BT that composes together sub-BTs that are to be executed as a fallback to one another, where each one is only executed in the case of a failure of the previous. It will fail only if all sub-BTs fail, whereas, if any one sub-BT succeeds, it will succeed. This behavior is formalized in terms of the sub-BT’s metadata regions in the following definition.

Definition 4 (Fallback). A functional that composes an arbitrarily finite sequence of $M \in \mathbb{N}$ BTs into a new BT:

$$\text{Fal}[\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_M](x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}_M(x) & \text{if } x \in F_1 \cap \dots \cap F_{M-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{T}_2(x) & \text{else-if } x \in F_1 \\ \mathcal{T}_1(x) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

If $\mathcal{T}_i = \text{Fal}[\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_M]$, then $j, k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ are the children of i , such that $p(j) = i$, and are related as siblings, by $j \leq_S k$ if $j \leq k$.

Lemma 1. The metadata regions of a *Sequence* \mathcal{T}_i can be computed from the children’s metadata regions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i &= \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(R_j \bigcap_{k <_S j} S_k \right), \\ S_i &= \bigcap_{p(j)=i} S_j, \quad F_i = \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(F_j \bigcap_{k <_S j} S_k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Proof. See [10, Lemma 1, p.4]. \square

Lemma 2. *The metadata regions of a Fallback \mathcal{T}_i can be computed from the children metadata regions as follows*

$$\begin{aligned} R_i &= \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(R_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} F_k \right), \\ S_i &= \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(S_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} F_k \right), \quad F_i = \bigcap_{p(j)=i} F_j. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Proof. See [10, Lemma 2, p.4]. \square




Fig. 4: A BT controlling the eating activities of an agent. Fallbacks are indicated by question marks and sequences by arrows. The parental ordering is indicated by lines. The sibling order is not illustrated by arrows, but implicitly given by the ordering of the drawing.

To illustrate the concepts above, we provide an example below, and to avoid getting into details about state space and implementation of individual control policies, we pick a high-level example that is hopefully familiar to most readers.

Example 1. *Consider the eating policy of an agent as depicted in Fig. 4. The root node is a Fallback, indicated by the question mark. It is labeled Eat since it first tries to eat an apple, and if that fails tries to eat a banana. Thus it has two children: Eat apple and Eat banana. The latter in turn is a Sequence, indicated by an arrow. It is labeled Eat peeled banana, since it first tries to peel a banana and then, if that succeeds, tries to eat the banana. Thus it has two children: Peel banana and Eat banana. Eat peeled banana is a Sequence, since it only makes sense to progress to Eat banana if Peel banana succeeded. Eat on the other hand, is a fallback, since it (assuming only one fruit is needed) first tries to eat the apple, and only progresses to the banana if Eat apple fails.*

Now let's look at what Lemma 1 and 2 implies. First, we apply Lemma 1 to Eat and peel banana (shortened EPB) which is a Sequence. From (7) we get,

$$R_{EPB} = \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(R_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} S_k \right) = R_{peel} \cup (S_{peel} \cap R_{eat\ banana}) \quad (9)$$

$$S_{EPB} = \bigcap_{p(j)=i} S_j = S_{peel} \cap S_{eat\ banana}, \quad (10)$$

$$F_{EPB} = \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(F_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} S_k \right) = F_{peel} \cup (S_{peel} \cap F_{eat\ banana}). \quad (11)$$

Thus, the running region R_{EPB} is the states where either the agent is currently peeling the banana, or states where the agent has succeeded in peeling and is currently eating. The success region S_{EPB} includes states where the agent has succeeded in both peeling and eating the banana, and finally, the failure region F_{EPB} includes states where either the peeling failed, or the peeling succeeded, and the eating failed.

Given the above, we can look at the root of the tree, which is a Fallback. When we apply Lemma 2 and Equation (8) to Eat we get,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{Eat} &= \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(R_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} F_k \right) = R_{eat\ apple} \cup (F_{eat\ apple} \cap R_{EPB}), \\ &= R_{eat\ apple} \cup (F_{eat\ apple} \cap (R_{peel} \cup (S_{peel} \cap R_{eat\ banana}))), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{Eat} &= \bigcup_{p(j)=i} \left(S_j \bigcap_{k < s_j} F_k \right) = S_{eat\ apple} \cup (F_{eat\ apple} \cap S_{EPB}), \\ &= S_{eat\ apple} \cup (F_{eat\ apple} \cap (S_{peel} \cap S_{eat\ banana})), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Eat} &= \bigcap_{p(j)=i} F_j = F_{eat\ apple} \cap F_{EPB} \\ &= F_{eat\ apple} \cap (F_{peel} \cup (S_{peel} \cap F_{eat\ banana})). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Thus, the running region R_{Eat} includes states where the agent is either eating the apple, or failed in eating the apple and is currently peeling the banana, or failed in eating the apple, succeeded in peeling and is currently eating the banana. The success region S_{Eat} includes states where the agent either succeeded in eating the apple, or failed in eating the apple, but succeeded in peeling and eating the banana. Finally, the failure region F_{Eat} includes states where the agent failed with eating the apple and either failed to peel the banana, or succeeded in peeling but failed in eating the banana.

Now, we will define the aforementioned operating regions in terms of the BT compositions above. Operation regions Ω_i are subsets of the statespace for which $x \in \Omega_i$ is a sufficient condition to conclude that $\mathcal{T}_0(x) = \mathcal{T}_i(x)$. That is, if the state is in the operating region of a sub-BT then that sub-BT is being executed in (3) or (4) for \mathcal{T}_0 . Within this sufficient condition, there is also a necessary condition characterized by the influence regions.

Influence regions $I_i \supseteq \Omega_i$ are subsets of the statespace for which $x \in I_i$ is a necessary condition to conclude that $\mathcal{T}_0(x) = \mathcal{T}_i(x)$. Informally, they can be seen as the regions where the design of \mathcal{T}_i influences the execution, (3) or (4) for \mathcal{T}_0 , either by returning success so another BT is executed in sequence,

by returning failure so another BT is executed as a fallback, or by itself being executed (returning running). Formally, the influence regions are defined in terms of the BT compositions, the strict left-uncle order, and the parent map, as follows.

Definition 5 (Influence Region). *A subset of the statespace defined for \mathcal{T}_i as*

$$I_i := \bigcap_{\substack{j <_{LU}^i \\ \mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Seq}}} S_j \cap \bigcap_{\substack{j <_{LU}^i \\ \mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Fal.}}} F_j \quad (15)$$

As can be seen from (15), if the state is in the influence region of a BT, then it is also in the success and failure regions of various other left-uncle BTs, but not their running regions. Thus, if the state is in both the influence region and running region of a BT, it is sufficient to conclude that the BT is being executed in (3) and returning running to the root. However, additional conditions are needed to conclude that a BT is being executed when it returns success or failure.

Example 2. *Looking at the same BT as above, depicted in Fig. 4. We have the following influence region for Eat banana.*

$$I_{\text{eat banana}} = \bigcap_{\substack{j <_{LU}^i \\ \mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Seq}}} S_j \cap \bigcap_{\substack{j <_{LU}^i \\ \mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Fal.}}} F_j = F_{\text{eat apple}} \cap S_{\text{peel}}. \quad (16)$$

Thus, eating the banana is only considered if eating the apple failed, and peeling the banana succeeded.

A BT can return success (resp. failure) to the root if there does not exist a right-sibling of either itself or any of its ancestors whose parent is a Sequence (resp. Fallback). The set of all sub-BTs that satisfy these conditions is given by the *success and failure pathways* in terms of the BT compositions and strict right-uncle order, as follows.

Definition 6 (Success and failure pathways). *Subsets of the vertices defined as*

$$\mathfrak{S} := \{i \in V \mid \exists j \in V : (j >_{RU} i) \wedge (\mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Seq})\} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathfrak{F} := \{i \in V \mid \exists j \in V : (j >_{RU} i) \wedge (\mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Fal})\}, \quad (18)$$

respectively.

As can be seen by (17) (resp. (18)), if a BT is in the success pathway (resp. failure pathway) then there does not exist another BT that will execute if it succeeds (resp. fails). Thus, if the state is in both the influence region and success region (resp. failure region) of a BT, and the BT is in the success pathway (resp. failure pathway), then it is sufficient to conclude that the BT is being executed in (3) or (4) for \mathcal{T}_0 . The operating regions are defined in terms of these sufficient conditions, as follows.

Definition 7 (Operating Region). *A subset of the statespace defined for \mathcal{T}_i as*

$$\Omega_i := \begin{cases} I_i \cap (R_i \cup S_i \cup F_i) = I_i & \text{if } i \in \mathfrak{S} \cap \mathfrak{F} \\ I_i \cap (R_i \cup S_i) & \text{else-if } i \in \mathfrak{S} \\ I_i \cap (R_i \cup F_i) & \text{else-if } i \in \mathfrak{F} \\ I_i \cap R_i & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

With (19), we know exactly when a BT will be executed in (3); namely if $x \in \Omega_i$ then $\mathcal{T}_0(x) = \mathcal{T}_i(x)$, and hence $u_0(x) = u_i(x)$. We will use these operating regions to analyze the convergence of (3) or (4) for \mathcal{T}_0 in the following section.

Example 3. *Looking once more at the same BT, depicted in Fig. 4. We have the following*

$$\mathfrak{S} = \{i \in V \mid \exists j \in V : (j >_{RU} i) \wedge (\mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Seq})\} \quad (20)$$

$$= \{\text{Eat apple, Eat banana, Eat and peel banana, Eat}\}$$

$$\mathfrak{F} = \{i \in V \mid \exists j \in V : (j >_{RU} i) \wedge (\mathcal{T}_{p(j)} \text{ is Fal})\}, \quad (21)$$

$$= \{\text{Peel banana, Eat banana, Eat and peel banana, Eat}\}$$

Thus, if eating the apple or the banana succeeds, the entire BT will succeed, and the same holds for the non-leaves Eat and peel banana, and just Eat. Similarly, if peeling or eating the banana fails, the entire BT will fail. Note that the last two are only executed when eat apple has already failed. The same holds for the non-leaves Eat and peel banana, and just Eat.

IV. MAIN RESULT

In this section, we will present a general BT convergence theorem (Section IV-A) and show how it generalizes previous proofs (Section IV-B).

A. Convergence

In this section we will present a general convergence theorem for BTs, inspired by the idea of sequential composition in [9]. The theorem is based on the concept of a Domain of Attraction (DOA), a region of the statespace $B_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ that is positively invariant with respect to the execution of a sub-BT, (3) or (4) for \mathcal{T}_i , meaning that if the state starts in the region $x(0) \in B_i$, then the execution's maximal solution will stay in the region $x(t) \in B_i$. Additionally, we will assume below that if the state starts in the DOA of a sub-BT, the sub-BT's execution will make the state converge to some goal region $G_i \subseteq B_i$ in finite time. We will assume that all BTs have a DOA that is contained in the running and success regions and that the goal region is contained in the success region. We formalize this in the following definition and assumption.

Definition 8 (Finite-time successful). *We call a BT \mathcal{T}_i finite-time successful if there exists a positively invariant region $B_i \subseteq R_i \cup S_i$ (called the Domain of Attraction, DOA), a positively invariant goal region $G_i \subseteq B_i \cap S_i$, and a finite time $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $x(0) \in B_i$ implies $x(t') \in G_i$ in some smaller finite time $t' \in [0, \tau_i]$ (depending on the starting state $x(0)$) for solutions to the BT execution in Def. 2.*

Note that the definition allows the DOA of a sub-BT to be empty ($B_i = \emptyset$), thereby accommodating sub-BTs that do not inherently have a DOA. This could be the case, for example, in a sub-BT that uses a black-box control policy, such as a neural network (as in [11]).

One way to guarantee finite-time success, is via *exponential stability*, following [3].




Fig. 5: A copy of Fig. 1 provided for convenience. An example of how the operating regions Ω_i and domains of attraction B_i can be arranged to make the state reach one of the two desired goal regions G_6, G_7 from a wide variety of starting states. Outside the domains of attraction B_i , we have no guarantees on solution behavior.

Lemma 3 (Exponential stability). *A BT \mathcal{T}_i , for which $x_i \in G_i$ is a locally exponentially stable equilibrium on B_i for the execution (3) is finite-time successful.*

Proof. The system (3) is locally exponentially stable about $x_i \in G_i$ on $B_i \subseteq R_i \cup S_i$ if there exists $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, if $x(0) \in B_i$ then $\|x(t) - x_i\| \leq \|x(0) - x_i\| \alpha_i e^{-\beta_i t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The stability of $x_i \in B_i \cap S_i$ implies that there must exist a maximal $\varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and minimal $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\|x(\tau_i) - x_i\| \leq \|x(0) - x_i\| \alpha_i e^{-\beta_i \tau_i} < \varepsilon_i$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - x_i\| \leq \varepsilon_i\} \subseteq S_i$. A similar argument holds for the discrete-time case of (4). \square

To provide intuition for the main result (Theorem 1), and its proof, we consider the example of Fig. 1 that is repeated in Fig. 5 for convenience. Looking at Fig. 5 we see that the vector fields indicate that transitions from B_3 to B_2 are likely. Similarly, transitions are likely from B_2 to B_1 to B_4 to B_7 . From B_7 it might either go to the goal region G_7 , or possibly to B_8 and then B_9 and B_6 , followed by the goal at G_6 . Finally, if it starts in B_5 it will also move to B_6 . There is however a potential problem: B_4 extends into Ω_5 , so the execution of u_4 might lead to the execution of u_5 outside of B_5 and then we do not know what will happen.

To analyze the system we will partition every Ω_i into tree sets $\Omega_i = v_a(i) \cup v_b(i) \cup v_c(i)$, using the B_i and G_i from Definition 8. The first set is all states outside the DOA, $v_a(i) = \Omega_i \setminus B_i$. The second is the states in the DOA, but outside the goal, $v_b(i) = \Omega_i \cap (B_i \setminus G_i)$, and the third set is the states in the goal, which is inside the DOA, $v_c(i) = \Omega_i \cap G_i$.

Given the above we can now create the prepares graph Γ (see Section II) shown in Fig. 6. Each of the vertices of the graph represents one of the sets mentioned above, as indicated in the figure. This graph is formally defined in Definition 11




Fig. 6: The prepares graph Γ corresponding to the operating regions and DOAs in Fig. 1. The bolded vertices represent the analysis set V'_Γ .

below, but intuitively we note that the edges correspond to possible transitions between the sets. We have no knowledge of the vector field outside B_i , so the possible transitions out of the set $v_a(i)$ are given by all neighboring sets, so the vertex $v_a(2)$ has edges to $v_a(1), v_a(3), v_b(1), v_b(2)$. The potential problem with B_4 identified above can be seen in terms of a bidirectional edge between $v_b(4)$ and $v_a(5)$.

If there are no cycles in the prepares graph we can draw some conclusions regarding convergence, in a way that is similar to our discussion on the sets B_i above. If there are cycles however, we convert the graph to a so-called condensed prepares graph Γ_* (see Definition 12 below) where we merge all vertices that are mutually reachable. Starting from Fig. 6 we get Fig. 7. We see two merged vertices: $\{v_b(1), v_b(4), v_a(5), v_b(2)\}$ and $\{v_a(1), v_a(2), v_a(3), v_a(4), v_a(6), v_a(7), v_a(8), v_a(9)\}$. As can be seen, starting from e.g., $v_a(1)$ all other vertices in the merged vertex can be reached in a series of transitions. Any cycle is by definition mutually reachable, so the condensed prepares graph Γ_* is guaranteed to have no cycles. The formal definition of Γ_* can be found in Definition 12.

Now, looking at $\Gamma_* = (V_*, E_*)$ in Fig. 7, we can draw conclusions regarding convergence. First, we note that the only sinks (vertices without outgoing edges) are the two goal vertices, $\{v_c(6)\}, \{v_c(7)\}$. By definition, we will never leave those. Now, if we pick some subset of the vertices $V'_* \subseteq V_*$ such that there are no outgoing edges from V'_* , and all vertices in V'_* , except the goal vertices, are such that we will leave them in finite time, we know that any state starting in $\bigcup V'_*$ (the union of all the sets inside the union of some collections of sets) will end up in a goal state in finite time.

Again, looking at Fig. 7, we see that including several of the $v_b(i)$ vertices in V'_* is probably a good idea, since they correspond to DOAs that are likely to lead to a transition. We have less knowledge of merged vertices containing cycles,




Fig. 7: The condensed prepares graph Γ_* corresponding to the operating regions and DOAs in Fig. 1. The bolded vertices represent a possible choice of analysis set V'_Γ .

and/or $v_a(i)$, but sometimes we know that a cycle will not execute forever, for example when a lawnmower robot goes to recharge regularly (creating a cycle) but will eventually have finished the whole lawn, or when a data-driven controller is added to an existing design, such as in Section IV-D. In such cases, a merged vertex can also be included in V'_Γ . Without any knowledge of the cycles of the merged vertices, we can at least conclude that V'_Γ is such that any state starting in the set $\bigcup \bigcup V'_\Gamma$ will reach one of the goal sets $v_c(6), v_c(7)$ in finite time.

We will now present formal results, corresponding to the informal discussion above. But, we must first pick a set of nodes in the BT such that their operating regions Ω_i together cover the entire state space, as illustrated in Fig. 5.

Definition 9 (Abstraction). *An abstraction of a BT is a subset of the vertices $P \subseteq V$ such that $\{\Omega_i\}_{i \in P}$ is a partition of the statespace \mathbb{R}^n . That is $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$ and $\bigcup_{i \in P} \Omega_i = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Note that we cannot pick all nodes of the BT, as each child node has an operating region that is a subset of its parent's (see [10, Lemma 3, p.5]). However, many options remain. All the leaves of a BT is a valid abstraction, and so is the single root node.

Assumption 1 (Finite-time successful). *All BTs \mathcal{T}_i rooted in the vertices of P are finite-time successful.*

In the following we need to handle both the cases of continuous- and discrete-time executions, corresponding to (3) and (4). Therefore we make the following definition of when subsets of the statespace are close enough to enable a transition of the state from one set to the other without entering any other sets.

Definition 10 (Neighboring sets). *The definition is a bit different for continuous-time and discrete-time executions. In*

the case of continuous-time execution (3) we say that two sets $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are neighboring, if $\partial \Sigma_0 \cap \partial \Sigma_1 \neq \emptyset$.

In the case of discrete-time execution (4), we let $\delta = \sup_{x,u} \|f(x,u)\|$, i.e. an upper bound on the size of the state transition in a single time step. Then we say that two sets $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset X$ are neighboring, if $\inf_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0, \sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1} \|\sigma_0 - \sigma_1\| \leq \delta$.

We are now ready to define the prepares graph, with vertices $v_a(i), v_b(i), v_c(i)$ and edges where transitions are possible.

Definition 11 (Prepares graph). *Let*

$$v_a(i) = \Omega_i \setminus B_i \quad (22)$$

$$v_b(i) = \Omega_i \cap (B_i \setminus G_i) \quad (23)$$

$$v_c(i) = \Omega_i \cap G_i \quad (24)$$

for $i \in P$. By slight abuse of notation, let these sets be vertices of the prepares graph

$$\Gamma := (V_\Gamma, E_\Gamma) \quad (25)$$

$$V_\Gamma := \bigcup_{i \in P} \{v_a(i), v_b(i), v_c(i)\}, \quad (26)$$

where E_Γ is a set of directed edges given by

$$E_\Gamma := \left\{ (v_a(i), v_a(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_a(i), v_a(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge i \neq j \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (v_a(i), v_b(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_a(i), v_b(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (v_a(i), v_c(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_a(i), v_c(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (v_b(i), v_a(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_b(i), v_a(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge B_i \cap v_a(j) \neq \emptyset \\ \wedge i \neq j \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (v_b(i), v_b(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_b(i), v_b(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge B_i \cap v_b(j) \neq \emptyset \\ \wedge i \neq j \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (v_b(i), v_c(j)) \mid \begin{array}{l} v_b(i), v_c(j) \text{ are neighboring} \\ \wedge B_i \cap v_c(j) \neq \emptyset \\ \wedge (i, j) \in P^2 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

Furthermore, let \leq_Γ be the reachability relation of the prepares graph Γ (given by the reflexive-transitive closure of E_Γ).

Note that we have edges going to all neighbors of the $v_a(i)$ vertices since we know nothing of the vector fields there. But for $v_b(i)$ we know that the set B_i is invariant, so for those outgoing edges we also need B_i to overlap with the neighboring set.

As noted above Γ may contain cycles, and then we want to create another graph Γ_* where all vertices in a cycle in Γ are merged into a single vertex, leaving Γ_* without cycles.

To do this we use the reachability relation \leq_Γ induced by the vertices of Γ to define the following equivalence relation $\leq_\Gamma \cap \geq_\Gamma = \{(i, j) \in V_\Gamma^2 \mid (i \leq_\Gamma j) \wedge (i \geq_\Gamma j)\}$, of vertices that are mutually reachable, and thus parts of cycles.

$\Sigma'_0 \in \Sigma_0$ and $\Sigma'_1 \in \Sigma_1$, which is exactly the edges created in (30). Thus the statement holds also for Γ_* . \square

A key prerequisite of the general convergence result below is the following assumption, stating that we will leave all vertices V_* , except the sinks \bar{V}_* , in finite time.

Assumption 2 (Non-infinite cycles). *The execution of (3) and (4) is such that there exists an upper time bound T such that for every starting state $x(0) \in \bigcup \Sigma$ for $\Sigma \in V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*$ there exists a time T' smaller than the bound, $T' < T$, such that $x(T') \notin \bigcup \Sigma$.*

We are now ready to state the general convergence theorem.

Theorem 1 (General convergence). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold for some T , then there is a $T'' \leq |V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*|T$ such that $x(T'') \in \bigcup \bar{V}_*$, that is the state will reach the sinks \bar{V}_* (goal regions) in finite time upper bounded by $|V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*|T$, where $|V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*|$ is the cardinality (size) of $V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*$.*

Proof. We know by Lemma 4 above that all possible transitions are represented as edges in Γ_* . We also know that for vertices in V'_* , all these transitions will happen within time T , since we know that the state will leave each set $\Sigma \in V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*$ corresponding to each non-sink vertex in finite time. The fact that there are no cycles in Γ_* thus implies that after time $|V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*|T$ the state must have reached one of the sinks in \bar{V}_* . \square

Remark 1. *Note that the bound above can be made less conservative by finding the longest path in V'_* , which might be shorter than $|V'_* \setminus \bar{V}_*|$, and using this length for the upper bound. Furthermore, one could also find different time bounds for the different sets, instead of one bound T for all, as in Assumption 2.*

Corollary 1. *If Theorem 1 holds, then the whole BT \mathcal{T}_0 is finite time successful (Definition 8) with $\tau_0 = |V'_*|T$, $B_0 = \bigcup \bar{V}_*$ and $G_0 = \bigcup (\bar{V}_* \cap V'_*)$.*

Proof. A straightforward application of Theorem 1. \square

Remark 2. *Note that Corollary 1 enables the iterative application of Theorem 1 on larger and larger BTs.*

Looking at the example of Fig. 7 we see that if we pick V'_* to be all bold vertices (all except the bottom one) there are no edges leaving V'_* . Furthermore we have $\bar{V}_* = \{\{v_c(6)\}, \{v_c(7)\}\}$ as the sinks. The theorem now says that if the state leaves all non-sink vertices within some time that is smaller than T , after starting somewhere in V'_* , it will reach the sinks within some time that is smaller than $|V'_*|T = 9T$. Similarly, if we pick $V'_* = \{\{v_b(5)\}, \{v_b(6)\}, \{v_c(6)\}\}$, the theorem holds for this smaller set, and we start somewhere in V'_* , we will reach the sinks within $|V'_*|T = 3T$ (since we are closer to the goal).

Example 4. *The BT in this example is following the so-called backward chained design principle, see [7] for details. In the BT in Fig. 9, a robot is tasked with surveying a given path. However, the path is long, and the robot will need to go and recharge a number of times before completing the survey. Thus, there will be a cycle as shown in Fig. 10. However,*




Fig. 9: A BC-BT for a mobile surveying robot. In this BT there exist cycles.




Fig. 10: The prepares graph Γ (top) and the condensed prepares graph Γ_* (bottom) corresponding to the BT in Fig. 9 and Example 4. Note how *Follow Path* might lead to either the battery being below 20%, or the path being surveyed.

*we know that eventually the path will be surveyed and, for each charging session, eventually the battery will be full. First, we pick the abstraction to be all the leaves of the tree that are actions (not the oval conditions that have $\Omega_i = \emptyset$), i.e., $P = \{8, 9, 17, 18, 19\}$. Then, if Assumption 1 holds for this set, i.e., *Go Home* will achieve *At Home* in finite time and so on, we get the Γ depicted in Fig. 10. Note that in this example we also assume that $v_a(i) = \emptyset$, i.e., the actions always achieve their objectives, *Go Home* will never fail to achieve *At Home*.*

Let the set corresponding to the cycle in Γ be $\Sigma_0 = \{v_b(8), v_b(9), v_b(17), v_b(18)\}$. Then, if the path is of finite length, and sufficiently close to the charging station, the robot will at some point manage to survey all of it. Thus, there exists $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $x(0) \in \bigcup \Sigma_0 = (\Omega_8 \cap B_8) \cup (\Omega_9 \cap B_9) \cup (\Omega_{17} \cap B_{17}) \cup (\Omega_{18} \cap B_{18})$ implies that there exists some $T' < T$ such that $x(T') \notin \Sigma_0$. Theorem 1 can now be applied, and states that there is a $T'' \leq |V'_|T = 3T$ such that $x(T'') \in \bigcup \bar{V}_* = v_c(19)$, i.e. the path is surveyed, the battery is above 20% and the robot is successfully idling.*

If there are no cycles in Γ , the two graphs Γ and Γ_* are isomorphic and contain the same information. Furthermore, we get the following special case of the theorem above.

Corollary 2 (Acyclical convergence). *If $|V_*(i)| = 1$ for all $V_*(i) \in V_\Gamma'$ there are no cycles in Γ . Then Assumption 2 holds by Assumption 1. Furthermore, if Theorem 1 holds there will be no more than $|V_*|$ transitions between operating regions.*

Proof. It is clear that $|V_*(i)| = 1$ implies the absence of cycles, as each cycle leads to an equivalence class with more than one element, i.e. $|V_*(i)| > 1$. The absence of cycles further more implies the upper bound of $|V_*|$ on the number of transitions. Finally, Assumption 1 says that all vertices in P are finite time successful, with an execution that reaches some state $x' \in G_i$ in a time bounded by τ_i . If this state $x' \in G_i \cup \Omega_i$ we have either transitioned, or reached a sink before τ_i , and if $x' \in G_i \setminus \Omega_i$ a transition will be made before reaching x' , within time τ_i . Either way, Assumption 2 is satisfied. \square

B. Generalizations

In this section, we will show how the theorems presented in Section IV-A generalize previous proofs in the literature: [3, Lemma 2, p.7] (Corollary 3 below), [3, Lemma 3, p.8] (Corollary 4 below), [10, Theorem 4, p.6] (Corollary 5 below), [8, Theorem 1, p.7] (Corollary 6 below).

The following two Corollaries will cover the Lemmas of Colledanchise et al. for sequences (5) and fallbacks (6) (also called “implicit sequences” in the context of convergence).

Corollary 3 ([3, Lemma 2, p.7]). *If $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ are finite-time successful, $\mathcal{T}_0 = \text{Seq}[\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2]$ and $S_1 = B_2$, then \mathcal{T}_0 is finite-time successful with $B_0 = B_1 \cup B_2$.*

Proof. According to (19), the leaf operating regions are given by $\Omega_1 = R_1 \cup F_1$ and $\Omega_2 = S_1 \cap (R_2 \cup S_2 \cup F_2) = S_1$, but since $S_1 = B_2$, we must have that the second sub-BT’s operating region is fully composed of its DOA, i.e. $\Omega_2 = B_2$. Thus, according to (27), we must have $(v_b(2), v_b(1)) \notin E_\Gamma$ and $(v_b(2), v_c(2)) \in E_\Gamma$. Additionally, since the first sub-BT’s goal region is in the success region of its DOA, i.e. $G_1 \subseteq B_1 \cap S_1$ (which is contained in Ω_2), we must have $(v_b(1), v_c(1)) \notin E_\Gamma$ and $(v_b(1), v_b(2)) \in E_\Gamma$.

Thus, $V_\Gamma' = \{v_b(1), v_b(2), v_c(2)\}$ is a valid analysis set. Furthermore, if Corollary 2 holds, then by Corollary 1, Assumption 1 holds for the whole BT \mathcal{T}_0 with $B_0 = B_1 \cup B_2$ and $\tau_0 = \tau_0 + \tau_1$. \square

Corollary 4 ([3, Lemma 3, p.8]). *If $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ are finite-time successful, $\mathcal{T}_0 = \text{Fal}[\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2]$, $B_1 = R_1 \cup S_1$, and $S_2 \subseteq B_1$ then \mathcal{T}_0 is finite-time successful with $B_0 = B_1 \cup B_2$.*

Proof. According to (19), the leaf operating regions are given by $\Omega_1 = R_1 \cup S_1$ and $\Omega_2 = F_1 \cap (R_2 \cup S_2 \cup F_2) = F_1$, but $S_2 \subseteq B_1$, thus $\Omega_2 = F_1 \cap (R_2 \cup F_2)$. Also, we have that $\Omega_1 = B_1$, thus $(v_b(1), v_b(2)) \notin E_\Gamma$ and $(v_b(1), v_c(1)) \in E_\Gamma$. Since the goal region of the second sub-BT is contained in the success part of its DOA, i.e. $G_2 \subseteq B_2 \cap S_2$ (which is contained in Ω_1), we must have $(v_b(2), v_c(2)) \notin E_\Gamma$ and $(v_b(2), v_b(1)) \in E_\Gamma$.

Thus, $V_\Gamma' = \{v_b(2), v_b(1), v_c(1)\}$ is a valid analysis set with a corresponding condensed analysis set $V_*' =$

$\{\{v_b(1)\}, \{v_b(2)\}, \{v_c(2)\}\}$. Thus, if Corollary 2 holds, then by Corollary 1, Assumption 1 holds for the whole BT \mathcal{T}_0 with $B_0 = B_1 \cup B_2$ and $\tau_0 = \tau_0 + \tau_1$. \square

For the results of Sprague et al. [10, Theorem 4, p.6] to be covered by Theorem 1, we need to add Assumption 1, since this aspect was dealt with slightly differently in [10].

Corollary 5 ([10, Theorem 4, p.6]). *If Assumption 1 holds, there exists a subset $L \subseteq P$ and a partial order $\leq_f \subseteq L^2$ such that the region*

$$\Lambda_i := \bigcup_{j \geq_f i} \Omega_j \setminus F_0 \quad (38)$$

is invariant under $f(x, u_i(x))$ for all $i \in L$, and there exists a finite time $\tau_i > 0$, such that if $x(t) \in \Omega_i \setminus S_0$ then $x(t + \tau_i) \notin \Omega_i \setminus S_0$ for all $i \in L$, then there exists a maximum number of transitions $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a maximum duration $t' > 0$, such that if $x(0) \in \Lambda_i$ for any $i \in L$, then $x(t) \in S_0$ in bounded time $t \leq t'$ within N transitions.

Proof. The abstraction P is the same in the two papers (obeying Definition 9), and L corresponds to the analysis set V_Γ' . We will first show that the statements above imply that Γ has no cycles.

The definition of Λ_i above implies that $\Lambda_i \subseteq \Lambda_j$ if $i \geq_f j$. The fact that all Λ_i are invariant implies that if $i \geq_f j$ there can only be a transition from Ω_j to Ω_i and not the other way around. Therefore Γ cannot have any cycles.

Furthermore, S_0 is the global success region, corresponding to the sinks \bar{V}_* . The fact that the state always leaves $\Omega_i \setminus S_0$ in finite time implies that Assumption 2 holds.

Now, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 imply that there are no more than $|V_*|$ transitions and $x(T'') \in \bigcup \bar{V}_*$ for some bounded time T'' . Furthermore, it is clear that \leq_Ω (Definition 14) would be a partial order and isomorphic to \leq_f . \square

C. Backchaining

In this section, we will show how the presented theorem generalizes the theorem on so-called backchained BTs [8, Theorem 1, p.7]. A *backchained BT* (BC-BT) [7], [8] is a BT that is automatically generated from a set of *action* and *condition* BTs, where each action BT has a set of *preconditions* that need to be satisfied in order for the action to work, see Table I, and each condition has a set of actions that achieves it, see Table II. With this, we formalize the concept of *action* and *condition libraries*, as follows.

Definition 15 (Action and condition libraries). *Mutually disjoint finite index sets, A and C , respectively, that satisfy the following.*

Action library A : For all $i \in A$, there exists a FTS BT \mathcal{T}_i (Def. 1) and a minimal totally ordered subset (C_i, \leq_{C_i}) , such that $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j = B_i$ and $\{C_i\}_{i \in A}$ is pairwise disjoint. The subset $C_i \subseteq C$ is the preconditions of action $i \in A$; it is minimal because we do not want to have to satisfy extra unneeded conditions.

Condition library C : For all $i \in C$, there exists a BT \mathcal{T}_i with $R_i = \emptyset$ (a condition) and a maximal totally ordered subset




Fig. 12: The BT resulting from applying Equation (39) to the action Idle of Table I, if Table II was empty (resulting in no recursive calls in (39)). Note the similarity to the top part of Fig. 11. If the top-level goals of being in the safe area and having the object at the goal are satisfied, the robot can idle. However, this small BT has no actions for achieving those goals. To add those, Table II needs to be non-empty, leading to more steps in the recursion being executed.

where $R_{p(j)}, F_{p(j)}$ refers to condition sub-BTs. A condition sub-BT's ($\mathcal{T}_{p(i)} : i \in C$) metadata regions are

$$\begin{aligned} R_{p(i)} &= \bigcup_{j \in A_i} \left(R_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{A_i} j} (F_i \cap F_{p(k)}) \right) \\ S_{p(i)} &= S_i \\ F_{p(i)} &= F_i \bigcap_{j \in A_i} F_{p(j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $R_{p(j)}, F_{p(j)}, F_{p(k)}$ refers to action sub-BTs. A mutual recursion is formed by (40) and (41).

Proof. For an action ($i \in A$) we have that $\mathcal{T}_{p(i)}$ (action sub-BT) is a Sequence with $\{p(j) : j \in C_i\} \cup \{i\}$ as its set of children, where $\mathcal{T}_{p(j)}$ are condition sub-BTs. The metadata regions of a Sequence is given in terms of its children's' metadata regions in (7). This gives the running, success, and failure regions for an action sub-BT as

$$\begin{aligned} R_{p(i)} &= \left(R_i \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_{p(j)} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in C_i} \left(R_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{C_i} j} S_{p(k)} \right) \right) \\ S_{p(i)} &= S_i \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_{p(j)} \\ F_{p(i)} &= \left(F_i \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_{p(j)} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in C_i} \left(F_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{C_i} j} S_{p(k)} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

respectively.

For a condition ($i \in C$) we have that $\mathcal{T}_{p(i)}$ (condition sub-BT) is a Fallback with $\{i\} \cup \{p(j) : j \in A_i\}$ as its set of children, where $\mathcal{T}_{p(j)}$ are action sub-BTs. The metadata regions of a Fallback are given in terms of its children's' metadata regions in (8). This gives the running, success, and

failure regions for a condition sub-BT as

$$\begin{aligned} R_{p(i)} &= R_i \bigcup_{j \in A_i} \left(R_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{A_i} j} (F_i \cap F_{p(k)}) \right) \\ S_{p(i)} &= S_i \bigcup_{j \in A_i} \left(S_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{A_i} j} (F_i \cap F_{p(k)}) \right) \\ F_{p(i)} &= F_i \bigcap_{j \in A_i} F_{p(j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

respectively.

By Def. 15, we have the following. For all $i \in C$, we have that $R_i = \emptyset$ implies $R_{p(i)} = \bigcup_{j \in A_i} (R_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{A_i} j} F_{p(k)})$ and $\bigcup_{j \in A_i} S_j \subseteq S_i$ implies $S_{p(i)} = S_i$. For all $i \in A$, we have that $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j = B_i$ and $B_i \subseteq R_i \cup S_i$ imply $F_{p(i)} = \bigcup_{j \in C_i} (F_{p(j)} \bigcap_{k <_{C_i} j} S_{p(k)})$. Thus, we have (40) and (41). \square

The BC-BT defined in (39) is such that the success region of its actions is within the success region of their postconditions, i.e. $\bigcup_{j \in A_i} S_j \subseteq S_i$. Similarly, the success regions of preconditions for a particular action equals its DOA, i.e. $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j = B_i$. Thus, the expected behavior in a BC-BT is that actions will execute one by one, where the satisfaction of one action's postcondition also satisfies one of another action's preconditions. If the postcondition of action i satisfies a precondition of an action k we say that they are "linked". The pair of actions, together with the condition are called a "link". Examples of such links include (Goto object, Near object, Grasp object) and (Grasp object, Object in gripper, Place object).

In detail, if there are two actions $(i, k) \in A^2$ such that there exists a condition $j \in C$ such that $i \in A_j$ (\mathcal{T}_j is the postcondition of \mathcal{T}_i) and $j \in C_k$ (\mathcal{T}_j is a precondition of \mathcal{T}_k), then we say that i and k are linked and that $(i, j, k) \in \lambda$ is a "link", where $\lambda \subseteq A \times C \times A$ is the set of all such links.

These links induce a partial order of actions $\leq_\lambda \subseteq A^2$ called a "link order". These concepts are formalized in the following definition.

Definition 17 (Links). *The set of all links is*

$$\lambda := \{(a, b, c) \in A \times C \times A \mid (a \in A_b) \wedge (b \in C_c)\} \quad (44)$$

and

$$\leq_\lambda := \{(a, c) \in A^2 \mid \exists b \in C : (a, b, c) \in \lambda\}^{\text{=,+}} \quad (45)$$

is a partial order of actions, where =,+ is the reflexive-transitive closure operation. Furthermore, the set of action-condition-action triplets defined for an action ($i \in A$) is

$$\lambda_i := \{(a, b, c) \in \lambda \mid i \leq_\lambda a\}. \quad (46)$$

Thus we have that e.g. $\lambda_{\text{Goto object}}$ includes (Grasp object, Object in gripper, Place object).

In the remainder of this section, we will use the ideas above to compute the operating regions within a BC-BT. Before doing so, we will make the following assumption to simplify the analysis and align more closely to [8, Theorem 1, p.7].

Assumption 3. Given a BC-BT $\Pi[i]$ for $i \in A$, assume $\lambda_i = \emptyset$. In other words, there are no postconditions for the top-level action to satisfy, and there are no other actions that have such postconditions as their preconditions. Additionally, for all $i \in C$, assume $|A_i| = 1$ (there is one action per postcondition), and for all $i \in C$ such that $A_i = \emptyset$, assume $F_i = \emptyset$ (conditions that are not the postcondition for any action cannot fail).

Looking at Fig. 11 the above assumption is satisfied as Idle does not satisfy any postconditions and conditions such as Safe area reachable and Object reachable never fail (if they do, there is nothing that can be done about it).

We will now give a more detailed example, illustrating the concepts described so far in relation to Fig. 11.

Example 6. The set of actions and conditions in the BC-BT $\Pi[14]$ (shown in Fig. 11) are given by

$$C = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}, \quad A = \{9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}, \quad (47)$$

respectively. The preconditions of actions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_9 &= \{2\}, & C_{10} &= \{6\}, & C_{11} &= \{5\} \\ C_{12} &= \{8\}, & C_{13} &= \{4, 7\}, & C_{14} &= \{1, 3\} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The actions for postconditions is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{9\}, & A_2 &= \emptyset, & A_3 &= \{13\}, & A_4 &= \{11\}, \\ A_5 &= \{10\}, & A_6 &= \emptyset, & A_7 &= \{12\}, & A_8 &= \emptyset. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The links are given by

$$\lambda = \{(9, 1, 14), (10, 5, 11), (11, 4, 13), (12, 7, 13), (13, 3, 14)\}. \quad (50)$$

The link order is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \leq_\lambda &= \{(9, 9), (9, 14), \\ & (10, 10), (10, 11), (10, 13), (10, 14), \\ & (11, 11), (11, 13), (11, 14), \\ & (12, 12), (12, 13), (12, 14), \\ & (13, 13), (13, 14), (14, 14)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

For $i = 12$ (bolded in Fig. 11), we have

$$\lambda_{12} = \{(12, 7, 13), (13, 3, 14)\}. \quad (52)$$

In the following lemma, we will show that if an action executes, it will not make the entire BT return Failure, $\Omega_i \cap F_i = \emptyset$ and it will not make the entire BT return success if it has a link, $\lambda_i \neq \emptyset \implies \Omega_i \cap S_i = \emptyset$. The latter implies that in the example of Fig. 11, the BT returns success only when Idle (all objectives achieved) returns success. Finally, the conditions never return running, as expected, i.e. for $i \in C$, we have that $\Omega_i = \emptyset$.

Lemma 6 (Backchained operating regions). For all $i \in A$ we have that $\Omega_i \cap F_i = \emptyset$, and for all $i \in A$ such that $\lambda_i \neq \emptyset$ we have that $\Omega_i \cap S_i = \emptyset$. For all $i \in C$, we have that $\Omega_i = \emptyset$.

Proof. First, observe that the only node that will be in the success pathway \mathfrak{S} is the action $i \in A$ that defines the BC-BT $\Pi[i]$ (where $\lambda_i = \emptyset$ by Assumption 3). This is because all other nodes in the BC-BT have right uncles whose parents

are sequences, see (17) and Fig. 11. Second, observe that all actions $i \in A$ will be in the failure pathway $i \in \mathfrak{F}$. This is because all actions do not have any right uncles whose parents are fallbacks, see (18) and Fig. 11. Thirdly, observe that all conditions $i \in C$ such that they are not a postcondition of any actions, $A_i = \emptyset$, will be in the failure pathway $i \in \mathfrak{F}$. This is because all conditions that are not a postcondition for any action do not have any right uncles whose parents are fallbacks, see (18) and Fig. 11. Thus, the success and failure pathways for a BC-BT are given by $\mathfrak{S} = \{i \in A \mid \lambda_i = \emptyset\}$ and $\mathfrak{F} = A \cup \{j \in C \mid A_j = \emptyset\}$.

According to (19), we then have that $\Omega_i \cap S_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in A$ such that $\lambda_i \neq \emptyset$. Additionally, since $\Omega_i \subseteq \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j$ and $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j = B_i$, we have that $\Omega_i \cap F_i = \emptyset$ because $B_i \subseteq R_i \cup S_i$ (despite $i \in \mathfrak{F}$). According to (19), we have that $\Omega_i \cap S_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in C$. We also know that $R_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in C$ by Def. 15, thus $\Omega_i \cap R_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in C$. Lastly, Assumption 3 implies $\Omega_i \cap F_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in C$. Thus, $\Omega_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in C$. \square

Since we have just shown that operating regions of conditions are empty, we can now compute the operating regions of actions explicitly (ignoring the conditions). To do so, we first need to compute the influence regions I_i of such actions, following (15). The set of nodes that determine an action's influence region can be partitioned by type: postconditions of the actions C_i^{Post} (when they return success, the action is done), conditions that come before such postconditions C_i^{ACC} (known as action-condition constraints (ACCs) in [8]), and preconditions of the action itself C_i . In the following definition, we compute C_i^{Post} and C_i^{ACC} .

Definition 18 (Related conditions). The indices of conditions ($j \in C_i^{\text{Post}}$) that need to fail for an action $\mathcal{T}_i: i \in A$ to execute are

$$C_i^{\text{Post}} = \bigcup_{(a,b,c) \in \lambda_i} \{j \in C \mid j = b\}. \quad (53)$$

The indices of conditions ($j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}$) other than preconditions that need to succeed for an action ($\mathcal{T}_i: i \in A$) to execute are

$$C_i^{\text{ACC}} = \bigcup_{(a,b,c) \in \lambda_i} \{j \in C \mid j <_{C_c} b\}. \quad (54)$$

With the related actions, C_i^{Post} and C_i^{ACC} , we are now ready to compute the influence regions, following (15).

Lemma 7. An action's ($i \in A$) influence region is

$$I_i = \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}} S_j \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{Post}}} F_j. \quad (55)$$

Proof. The left uncles of actions $i \in A$ that have a fallback as their parent are given by postconditions C_i^{Post} . Thus, \mathcal{T}_j for all $j \in C_i^{\text{Post}}$ need to return failure for \mathcal{T}_i to execute.

The left uncles of actions $i \in A$ that have a sequence as their parents are given by the preconditions C_i and the parents of ACCs C_i^{ACC} . According to (41), the success region of condition sub-BTs is equal to the success region of the conditions themselves. Thus, we have that $S_{p(j)} = S_j$ for all $j \in C$. Thus, \mathcal{T}_j for all $j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}} \cup C_i$ need to return success for \mathcal{T}_i to execute.

The above completes the computation of (15), thus we have (55). \square

We will now give an example of computing the influence regions based on the mobile manipulator BC-BT in Fig. 11.

Example 7. For the BC-BT in Fig 11, the influence regions of the actions are given by

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
 \hline
 & \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}} S_j & \bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j & \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{Post}}} F_j \\
 \hline
 I_9 & = \mathbb{R}^n & \cap S_2 & \cap F_1 \\
 I_{10} & = S_1 & \cap S_6 & \cap F_3 \cap F_4 \cap F_5 \\
 I_{11} & = S_1 & \cap S_5 & \cap F_3 \cap F_4 \\
 I_{12} & = S_1 \cap S_4 & \cap S_8 & \cap F_3 \cap F_7 \\
 I_{13} & = S_1 & \cap S_4 \cap S_7 & \cap F_3 \\
 I_{14} & = \mathbb{R}^n & \cap S_1 \cap S_3 & \cap \mathbb{R}^n. \\
 \hline
 \end{array} \quad (56)$$

Based on Lemma 6, we have that $\Omega_i = I_i \cap R_i$ for all $i \in \{9, 10, 11, 12, 13\}$ and $\Omega_i = I_i \cap (R_i \cup S_i)$ for $i = 14$. Note that $C_i^{\text{Post}} \cap (C_j^{\text{ACC}} \cup C_j)$ is non-empty when $i < j$ and empty when $i \geq j$.

In the above example, we noticed that there is a pattern in the condition indices. Namely, when the actions in a BC-BT are labeled with depth-first preorder traversal, we have that $C_i^{\text{Post}} \cap (C_j^{\text{ACC}} \cup C_j) \neq \emptyset \iff i < j$. This is because the job of each action is to bring the state to the success region of the action's postcondition, which serves as either a precondition or ACC for some further action. By design, this behavior is acyclical (see Corollary 2) and fits Corollary 5, as we show in the following corollary.

Corollary 6 (Backchained BTs [8, Theorem 1, p.7]). A BC-BT satisfies Corollary 5 with

$$\leq \Omega \subseteq \{(i, j) \in A^2 \mid C_i^{\text{Post}} \cap (C_j^{\text{ACC}} \cup C_j) \neq \emptyset\}, \quad (57)$$

if $B_i \subseteq \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}} S_j$ for all $i \in A$.

Proof. For all actions $i \in A$, we have that $\Omega_i \subseteq B_i$ because $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j = B_i$. Thus, if $x \in \Omega_i$ then $x \in B_i$. We know that B_i is positively invariant under (3), (4). Thus, since $B_i \subseteq \bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}} S_j$, the state will never leave $\bigcap_{j \in C_i^{\text{ACC}}} S_j$ (and $\bigcap_{j \in C_i} S_j$) as long as it is in Ω_i .

However, B_i can intersect S_j for any $j \in C_i^{\text{Post}}$. Thus, from a given operating region Ω_i , the state can only transition to another operating region Ω_j such that $C_i^{\text{Post}} \cap (C_j^{\text{ACC}} \cup C_j) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, we must have (57) in the context of Corollary 5. \square

D. Including data-driven controllers without harming convergence guarantees

In this section, we will show how Theorem 1 captures the main result in [11]. The problem addressed in [11] is how we can add a controller with unknown performance (e.g. [26], [27]) to an existing BT with convergence guarantees, without destroying those guarantees.

The key idea is illustrated in Fig. 13. Imagine that the data-driven controller is designed to perform the same task as an existing model-based controller, in an existing BT, satisfying Theorem 1. Now, we think that the data-driven controller is




Fig. 13: To include a data-driven controller in a BT where an already existing model-based controller provides performance guarantees you can replace the left subtree with the right one.

more efficient in most cases, but perhaps not all. Thus, we replace the subtree on the left of Fig.13 with the larger subtree on the right of Fig.13. There are two new conditions, *Time OK* and *Risk OK*. *Time OK* returns success if the amount of time spent executing the new controller is still smaller than some designated upper bound (how long we are willing to let the new controller execute before reverting to the old one we know will do the job). *Risk OK* is a bit more complex and connected to the additional controller *Reduce risk*. These two are making sure that the *Data-Driven Controller* does not mess anything up by creating a transition to an operating region that was not possible from the operating region of the model-based controller in the old design.

Imagine the original subtree had operating region Ω_{old} and the new subtree has operating region Ω_{new} . If we can show that: $\Omega_{\text{new}} = \Omega_{\text{old}}$, any transitions out of Ω_{new} for the new BT was also possible for the old BT, and a transition out of Ω_{new} will happen in finite-time; then we are done.

Assumption 4. Given a BT that satisfies the conditions stated in Theorem 1, let Ω_i be the operating region of some subtree of the BT of the form of the left of Fig.13, and $\Omega_{i,\text{next}} := \bigcup \{\Omega_j \mid (i, j) \in E\}$, i.e., the union of the nodes in the prepares graph Γ (Def. 11) that have an incoming edge from i .

A new BT is created by replacing the left subtree by the one on the right of Fig.13, with three controllers, the original Model-Based controller (MB), the Data-Driven controller (DD), and the Reduce Risk controller (RR), with conditions Time OK, Risk OK, and Task Done abbreviated as TOK, ROK, and TD, respectively.

Assumption 5. If Assumption 4 holds, assume that the resulting prepares graph Γ_{new} is identical to the previous one Γ_{old} , except that the subgraph on the left of Fig. 14 is replaced by the subgraph on the right of Fig. 14.

Furthermore assume that the state is guaranteed not to be in either $v_a(\text{DD})$ or $v_b(\text{RR})$ after some finite time and that R_i, S_i, F_i are the same before and after changing the subtrees.

Lemma 8. If Assumptions 4 and 5 hold, the new BT is also convergent.

Proof. We start by noting that Ω_i is the same before and after the change, since I_i only depends on the Left-uncles of the subtree, see (15), and R_i, S_i, F_i are the same by Assumption 5.

Thus, since the operating region of a node is the union of the operating regions of its children [10, Lemma 3] we have




Fig. 14: Parts of the two prepares graphs Γ corresponding to the two BTs in Fig. 13. Note that when Time OK returns Failure a transition away from $v_a(DD)$ and $v_b(RR)$ has to happen.

that $\Omega_{new} = \Omega_{DD} \cup \Omega_{RR} \cup \Omega_{MB}$.

By Assumption 5 the prepares graph Γ_{new} is identical, with the same transitions, except for the new subgraph. The new subgraph has a loop, but again by Assumption 5, this loop will be left in finite time.

Thus, the argument that was made to prove that the original BT was convergent can be applied to the new BT. \square

Lemma 9. *If Assumption 4 holds, then Assumption 5 also holds if the following is true.*

The success region of MB is inside TD, the running region of DD is the state space, the success region of RR is inside ROK, and the model-based controller does not fail inside F_{TD} i.e.,

$$S_{MB} \subset S_{TD} \quad (58)$$

$$R_{DD} = \mathbb{R}^n \quad (59)$$

$$S_{RR} \subset S_{ROK} \quad (60)$$

$$F_{TD} \cap F_{MB} = \emptyset. \quad (61)$$

The condition Time OK stops returning success after some time t' . Note that this condition can be created as a function of state by e.g., letting some component of the state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ have the dynamics $\dot{x}_k = 1$, $x_k(0) = 0$ and checking $x_k(t) < t'$.

The ROK condition is designed such that $v_b(RR)$ surrounds most of $v_a(DD)$, and the only neighbors, in the sense of Definition 10, to $v_a(DD)$ are $v_b(RR)$, $v_b(MB)$ and $v_b(i, next)$.

Finally, the MB and RR controllers are well-behaved, in the sense that $v_b(RR) = \Omega_{RR}$ and $v_b(MB) = \Omega_{MB}$.

Proof. We start by showing that the metadata regions are the same for the new and old subtrees.

The success region of the old BT is given by

$$S_{old} = S_{TD} \cup (F_{TD} \cap S_{MB}). \quad (62)$$

The assumption that $S_{MB} \subset S_{TD}$ and metadata regions are pairwise disjoint implies $S_{MB} \cap F_{TD} = \emptyset$, and thus $S_{old} = S_{TD}$.

The success region of the new BT is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{new} = & S_{TD} \\ & \cup (F_{TD} \cap S_{DD} \cap S_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}) \\ & \cup (F_{TD} \cap S_{MB} \cap (F_{TOK} \cup (F_{RR} \cap S_{TOK}))) \\ & \quad \cap (F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}) \cup (F_{DD} \cap S_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}))) \\ & \cup (F_{TD} \cap S_{RR} \cap S_{TOK} \cap (F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}))) \\ & \quad \cup (F_{DD} \cap S_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK})). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The assumption $R_{DD} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and the definition that metadata regions are pairwise disjoint implies $S_{DD} = \emptyset$ and therefore the second unioned term can be eliminated. The assumption $S_{MB} \subset S_{TD}$ implies that the third unioned term can be eliminated. Now consider the distributed terms of the intersection $F_{TD} \cap S_{RR} \cap S_{TOK}$ in the fourth unioned term. The definition that metadata regions are pairwise disjoint, so that $S_{TOK} \cap F_{TOK} = \emptyset$, implies that the first distributed term is empty. The assumption $S_{RR} \subset S_{ROK}$ implies that S_{ROK} can be eliminated in the third distributed term. This assumption in addition to the definition that metadata regions are pairwise disjoint implies $S_{RR} \cap F_{ROK} = \emptyset$, so that the second distributed term is empty. Lastly, $R_{DD} = \mathbb{R}^n$ implies $F_{DD} = \emptyset$, so we end up with $S_{new} = S_{TD}$. Thus $S_{old} = S_{new}$.

The failure region of the old BT is given by

$$F_{old} = F_{TD} \cap F_{MB}. \quad (64)$$

The assumption $F_{TD} \cap F_{MB}$ immediately implies $F_{old} = \emptyset$. The failure region of the BT is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_{new} = & F_{MB} \cap F_{TD} \cap (F_{TOK} \cup (F_{RR} \cap S_{TOK})) \\ & \cap (F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}) \cup (F_{DD} \cap S_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK})). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

The assumption $F_{TD} \cap F_{MB}$ immediately implies $F_{new} = \emptyset$, as before. Thus $F_{old} = F_{new}$.

Lastly, the definition that metadata regions are pairwise disjoint immediately implies $R_{new} = R_{old} = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (S_{old} \cup F_{old})$. Thus, the metadata regions of the old and new BT are equal.

Now we show that the state is guaranteed not to be in either $v_a(DD)$ or $v_b(RR)$ after time t' . This is clear as Time OK returns failure of $t > t'$, and is a precondition of those corresponding actions in the BT of Fig. 13.

Finally, we show that the prepares graph Γ_{new} has the transitions shown in Fig. 14.

Transitions can only happen between neighboring operating regions, see Definition 10, so even though we have no control of the vector field of the *Data Driven controller* we know that the only neighbors to $v_a(DD)$ are $v_b(RR)$, $v_b(MB)$, $v_b(i, next)$, so the transitions out of $v_a(DD)$ are as in the figure.

Furthermore, we know that $S_{RR} \subset S_{ROK}$ so the transition out of $v_b(RR)$ is to either $v_a(DD)$ if Time OK or to $v_b(MB)$ if Time is not ok. Similarly, we know that $S_{MB} \subset S_{TD}$ so the transition out of $v_b(MB)$ is to $v_b(i, next)$. \square

Remark 3. *Let i be the root index of the old and new BT, equivalently. The new BT has the following regions of*

influence:

$$I_{DD} = I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap S_{ROK} \quad (66)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{RR} &= I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap \\ &\quad [F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}) \cup (F_{DD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap S_{ROK})] \\ &= I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap [F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cup F_{DD})] \\ &= I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap (F_{ROK} \cup F_{DD}) \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{MB} &= I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap [F_{TOK} \cup (F_{RR} \cap S_{TOK})] \cap \\ &\quad [F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cap S_{TOK}) \cup (F_{DD} \cap S_{TOK} \cap S_{ROK})] \\ &= I_i \cap F_{TD} \cap (F_{TOK} \cup F_{RR}) \cap [F_{TOK} \cup (F_{ROK} \cup F_{DD})] \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where I_i is given, and we have used $S_{TOK} \cap F_{TOK} = \emptyset$ and $S_{ROK} \cup F_{ROK} = \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. metadata regions are pairwise disjoint and cover \mathbb{R}^n , and conditions have empty running regions.

Given that $S_i = S_{TD}$ and $F_i = \emptyset$, this makes the corresponding operating regions

$$\Omega_{DD} = I_{DD} \cap R_{DD} \quad (69)$$

$$\Omega_{RR} = I_{RR} \cap R_{RR} \quad (70)$$

$$\Omega_{MB} = I_{MB} \cap R_{MB}. \quad (71)$$

If we want to introduce hysteresis in the switching between the *Data Driven controller* and *Reduce Risk*, to avoid chattering and provide a better starting state for the *Data Driven controller*, we can make use of the following result

Lemma 10. *If we replace the Risk OK condition with the conjunction (Risk OK and Risk OK for T seconds). The result above still holds.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that the state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ includes a component that enables us to evaluate the condition *Risk OK for T seconds*, see Remark 4 below. This change will only affect Ω_{DD} and Ω_{RR} , making the former smaller and the latter bigger, but leaving all other operating regions, as well as $\Omega_{DD} \cup \Omega_{RR}$ unchanged.

Given this observation, it is clear that the requirements in Lemma 8 still hold. \square

Remark 4. *In order to create an approximation of the condition: Risk OK for T seconds that is accessible by a simple state check, we can extend the state with an extra component as follows. Then $x_{n+1} \geq 1$ approximately corresponds to Risk OK for T seconds.*

$$x_{n+1}(t+1) = \begin{cases} x_{n+1}(t) + \Delta t/T, & \text{if } x \in S_{ROK} \wedge x_{n+1} < 1 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

For the continuous-time case, we get an approximation through

$$\dot{x}_{n+1} = \begin{cases} (1 - x_{n+1})e^T & \text{if } x_{n+1} \in S_{ROK} \\ -Kx_{n+1} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for some large constant K .

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we presented a general convergence theorem (Theorem 1) that goes beyond earlier results in that it allows

cycles in the execution of sub-BTs and the execution of sub-BTs outside their DOA. We also showed how this theorem generalizes earlier proofs in [3], [8], [10]. In detail, [3, Lemma 2, p.7] is covered by Corollary 3, [3, Lemma 3, p.8] is covered by Corollary 4, [10, Theorem 4, p.6] is covered by Corollary 5, and [8, Theorem 1, p.7] is covered by Corollary 6. Finally, the main theorem also captures the result of combining data-driven and model-based controllers without sacrificing performance guarantees, from [11]. Thus, this paper provides a unified and extended analysis of behavior tree convergence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by SSF through the Swedish Maritime Robotics Centre (SMaRC) (IRC15-0046), and FOI project 7135.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Isla, "Handling Complexity in the Halo 2 AI," *Game Developers Conference (GDC)*, 2005.
- [2] L. Brunke, M. Greff, A. W. Hall, Z. Yuan, S. Zhou, J. Panerati, and A. P. Schoellig, "Safe learning in robotics: From learning-based control to safe reinforcement learning," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 5, 2021.
- [3] M. Colledanchise and P. Ögren, "How behavior trees modularize hybrid control systems and generalize sequential behavior compositions, the subsumption architecture, and decision trees," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 372–389, 2017.
- [4] O. Biggar, M. Zamani, and I. Shames, "On modularity in reactive control architectures, with an application to formal verification," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2008.12515, 2020.
- [5] —, "An expressiveness hierarchy of behavior trees and related architectures," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 5397–5404, 2021.
- [6] M. Iovino, E. Scukins, J. Styrd, P. Ögren, and C. Smith, "A survey of behavior trees in robotics and AI," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 154, 2022.
- [7] M. Colledanchise, D. Almeida, and P. Ögren, "Towards blended reactive planning and acting using behavior trees," in *International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 20-24, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 8839–8845.
- [8] P. Ögren, "Convergence analysis of hybrid control systems in the form of backward chained behavior trees," *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 6073–6080, 2020.
- [9] R. R. Burridge, A. A. Rizzi, and D. E. Koditschek, "Sequential composition of dynamically dexterous robot behaviors," *Int. J. Robotics Res.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 534–555, 1999.
- [10] C. I. Sprague and P. Ögren, "Continuous-time behavior trees as discontinuous dynamical systems," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 1891–1896, 2021.
- [11] C. I. Sprague and P. Ögren, "Adding neural network controllers to behavior trees without destroying performance guarantees," in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 3989–3996.
- [12] P. Ögren, "Increasing modularity of uav control systems using computer game behavior trees," in *AIAA Guid. Navig. Control Conf.*, 2012, p. 4458.
- [13] A. Marzinotto, M. Colledanchise, C. Smith, and P. Ögren, "Towards a unified behavior trees framework for robot control," in *2014 IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom., ICRA 2014, Hong Kong, China, May 31 - June 7, 2014*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 5420–5427.
- [14] D. C. Conner, H. Choset, and A. Rizzi, "Integrated planning and control for convex-bodied nonholonomic systems using local feedback," in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS '06)*. Philadelphia, PA: MIT Press, August 2006, pp. 57 – 64.
- [15] R. Tedrake, I. R. Manchester, M. Tobenkin, and J. W. Roberts, "Lqr-trees: Feedback motion planning via sums-of-squares verification," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 1038–1052, 2010.

- [16] G. D. Konidaris, S. Kuindersma, R. A. Grupen, and A. G. Barto, "Robot learning from demonstration by constructing skill trees," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 31, pp. 360 – 375, 2012.
- [17] J. Lygeros, K. H. Johansson, S. N. Simic, J. Zhang, and S. S. Sastry, "Dynamical properties of hybrid automata," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 2–17, 2003.
- [18] J. Cortes, "Discontinuous dynamical systems," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 36–73, 2008.
- [19] C. Paxton, N. D. Ratliff, C. Eppner, and D. Fox, "Representing robot task plans as robust logical-dynamical systems," in *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, IROS 2019, Macau, SAR, China, November 3-8, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5588–5595.
- [20] M. S. Branicky, "Multiple lyapunov functions and other analysis tools for switched and hybrid systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 475–482, 1998.
- [21] H. Ye, A. N. Michel, and L. Hou, "Stability theory for hybrid dynamical systems," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 461–474, 1998.
- [22] D. Liberzon, *Switching in Systems and Control*, ser. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser, 2003.
- [23] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel, "Hybrid dynamical systems," in *Hybrid dynamical systems*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [24] F. Rovida, B. Grossmann, and V. Krüger, "Extended behavior trees for quick definition of flexible robotic tasks," in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 6793–6800.
- [25] T. Kuboyama, "Matching and learning in trees," *Doctoral Thesis, University of Tokyo*, 2007.
- [26] C. I. Sprague, D. Izzo, and P. Ögren, "Learning dynamic-objective policies from a class of optimal trajectories," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 597–602.
- [27] C. I. Sprague and P. Ögren, "Learning how to learn bathymetry," in *2020 IEEE/OES Autonomous Underwater Vehicles Symposium (AUV)*, 2020, pp. 1–2.