Behavior Trees and Reactive Planning

Peter Mawhorter

October 8, 2010

- A tree:
 - Leaf nodes are primitive behaviors ("throw grenade").
 - Internal nodes are abstract behaviors ("attack").
- This tree is evaluated to decide on a behavior.



- In a finite state machine, state transitions are explicit
- In a behavior tree, state preconditions are explicit
- A simple FSM corresponds to a behavior list, a behavior tree is the equivalent of an HFSM
- Preconditions are less numerous than transitions

- Each behavior has preconditions which determine which can be selected
- Starting with the root, each behavior picks one of its available children to run
- This choice can be random or prioritized, or may use some other scheme
- Once a leaf is chosen, that concrete behavior is activated
- When a behavior finishes, behavior selection starts over again at the root

- Primitive behaviors may succeed or fail
- Higher-level behaviors depend on their children to succeed
- Failure may cause the parent to select an alternate child instead of failing immediately



```
behavior Engage {
  preconditions (
    health > 10\%
  and
    have_weapon
  )
  children (
    Attack
    Covering_Fire
}
```

behavior Retreat { preconditions (health < 50%or outnumbered) children (Take_Cover Flee

health: 90%, weapon: rifle, outnumbered: false



health: 90%, weapon: rifle, outnumbered: false



```
behavior Attack {
   preconditions (
      have_weapon
   )
   children (
      Ranged_Attack
      Melee_Attack
      Throw_Grenade
   )
}
```

```
behavior Covering_Fire {
   preconditions (
       have_ranged_weapon
   and
       ally_under_fire
   )
   action (
       Covering_Fire_Action
   )
}
```

weapon: rifle, ally_under_fire: false



weapon: rifle, ally_under_fire: false



```
behavior Ranged_Attack {
   preconditions (
       have_ranged_weapon
   and
       opponent_in_range
   )
   action (
       Ranged_Attack_Action
   )
}
```

behavior Melee_Attack {
 preconditions (
 have_melee_weapon
 and
 opponent_in_melee
)
 action (
 Melee_Attack_Action
)
}

weapon: rifle, opponent_range: 20m



weapon: rifle, opponent_range: 20m



- Rather than selecting a single child behavior, a node might run its children sequentially or in parallel
- Besides preconditions, a behavior might have context conditions
- High-priority behaviors might preempt low-priority ones
- In some systems, multiple behaviors might run at the same time
- Behavior selection can happen in response to an event

Behavior Priorities

```
behavior Engage {
  preconditions (
    health > 10\%
  and
    have_weapon
  priority (
    10
  children (
    Attack
    Covering_Fire
}
```

behavior Retreat { preconditions (health < 50%or outnumbered priority (5 + (.5 - health%) * 20 +(outnumbered ? 10 : 0) children (Take_Cover Flee }

Behavior Priorities

- health: 20%, weapon: rifle, outnumbered: false
- Priorities: Engage: 10, Retreat: 11



Behavior Priorities

- health: 20%, weapon: rifle, outnumbered: false
- Priorities: Engage: 10, Retreat: 11



- Prioritized child selection drives most choices
- Impulse behaviors add some dynamic links to the tree
- Precondition checks are optimized using behavior tags
- Event-driven impulses allow more dynamic behavior
- Behavior options are limited via styles

- Dynamic selection of child behaviors
- Uses case-based reasoning to select behavior candidates at runtime
- Selection is based largely on the variables used within the behaviors
- This is equivalent to making all of the cases children of each query node and performing prioritized selection at the query node using the case similarity metric

- Corresponds to a behavior tree that uses asynchronous selection, with all sorts of details thrown in
- While traditional planning uses an algorithm to search the space of all possible plans, reactive planning relies on the architect to describe the space of all permitted plans
- A reactive planner then selects eagerly and randomly from actions within this plan space, and tries something different whenever anything fails

```
sequential behavior vultureAttack(PlayerUnitWME vulture)
{
  int vultureID, ex, ey;
  with (success test {
    (vulture.getHasTask()==false &&
     vulture.getOrder()==PlayerGuard)
    query = (UnitQueryWME fresh==true)
    (query.setIsEnemy(true))
    (query.setLocationUnit(vulture.getID()))
    (query.setIsGround(true))
    (UnitQueryWME nearest::enemyID)
    (EnemyUnitWME ID==enemyID realX::ex realY::ey)
  }) wait;
```

. . .

Reactive Planning Example (continued)

```
mental_act {
   vulture.hasTask();
   vultureID = vulture.getID();
}
```

```
// attack and wait for the command to be issued
  act attackMovePixel(vultureID, ex, ey);
  subgoal WaitFrames(1);
}
```

. . .

- Practical and intuitive
- More scalable than finite state machines
- Afford fine-grained and dynamic control over behavior

- Coordination of multiple agents can be difficult
- Control is implicit, so bugs can be hard to understand and to fix
- Require some optimizations to fit into modern games
 - This is why full reactive planning for game agents would be difficult

Discussion Topics

Questions?

- Are there 'tradeoffs' between behavior trees and reactive planning? What would you need to consider if you were building a game and deciding between them?
- Compared to FSMs, what do BTs make easy? What do they make hard?
- What dictates the structure of a behavior tree? In terms of design, what are the driving concerns?
- Are there other ways to solve the problems brought up by the query-enabled BTs paper?