

Behavior Trees with Dataflow: Coordinating Reactive Tasks in Lingua Franca

Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten
Akash Ahmad
Malte Clement
Reinhard von Hanxleden
{als,stu222517,mac,rvh}
@informatik.uni-kiel.de
Kiel University
Kiel, Germany

Benjamin Asch
Marten Lohstroh
Edward A. Lee
{benjaminsch,marten,eal}
@berkeley.edu
UC Berkeley
Berkeley, USA

Gustavo Quiros Araya
Ankit Shukla
{gustavo.quiros,ankit.shukla}
@siemens.com
Siemens Technology
USA

ABSTRACT

Behavior Trees (BTs) provide a lean set of control flow elements that are easily composable in a modular tree structure. They are well established for modeling the high-level behavior of non-player characters in computer games and recently gained popularity in other areas such as industrial automation.

While BTs nicely express control, data handling aspects so far must be provided separately, e. g. in the form of blackboards. This may hamper reusability and can be a source of nondeterminism.

We here present a dataflow extension to BTs that explicitly models data relations and communication. We provide a combined textual/graphical approach in line with modern, productivity-enhancing pragmatics-aware modeling techniques. We realize and validate that approach in the recently introduced polyglot coordination language Lingua Franca (LF).

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Model-driven software engineering**; *Abstraction, modeling and modularity*; *Visual languages*; **Orchestration languages**.

KEYWORDS

Behavior trees, reactive systems, coordination languages, Lingua Franca

1 INTRODUCTION

BTs originated in the gaming industry, where they are used to program non-player characters [11, 23]. They express complex behavior with highly reactive and modular software components coordinating agents in groups. Their simplicity and modularity has made them increasingly popular in real-world applications as well, such as industrial automation, where BTs control machines and robots in automated factories. BTs use a model-based approach with a simple and intuitive tree structure and a lean set of control flow elements. BTs are a high-level composition mechanism that supports the engineering of complex software systems by hierarchically composing atomic behaviors.

We generally believe that BTs with their largely non-academic heritage deserve more attention in computer science research than they have received so far. There is some existing related work but, overall, the coverage does not seem adequate in light of the practical utility of BTs in software engineering.

1.1 Motivation

While the simplicity of BTs is attractive, its minimalist notation leaves the aspect of *handling data* unaddressed. This aspect, however, is crucial when using BTs for implementing behaviors that need to adapt based on data. In cyber-physical systems, such as robots or of vehicles, data may originate from sensors that inform the software about the state of its environment. A common solution is to use a *blackboard* [22] that introduces a global set of variables to a BT. However, in combination with a parallel composition in a BT, unconstrained access to shared variables can easily lead to race conditions and non-deterministic behavior. This hampers reproducibility, robustness, and debugging, and may be fatal when designing safety-critical software.

Furthermore, as discussed further in Sec. 7, existing BT frameworks tend to be graphics-first, where users manually draw BT diagrams disconnected from their actual realization, or text-only, where BTs are realized, e. g., as C++ library. Both approaches do not fully use the potential of integrating graphics and text.

1.2 Approach

To address the handling of data, we propose to adopt a dataflow notation, already exemplified by various modeling languages, such as SCADE [8] or actors [1], which breaks down the program into smaller blocks with streams of data flowing between them. Dataflow, unlike blackboards, explicitly models data interfaces and communication, thus supporting modularity. Dataflow nodes, or *actors*, have explicit inputs and outputs, which define the way instances of these nodes need to be interconnected with their surrounding context. BTs provide a modular design, and instantiating a node or entire BT as a child seems rather straightforward, which facilitates reusability. However, if such a node or BT relies on access to a blackboard and may base its behavior on data written by other nodes to these variables, this constitutes a rather brittle interface. There is typically no indication which variables are considered inputs, outputs, or only local, and how to separate and address multiple instantiations and their memory. One solution could be to utilize *decorator nodes*, to attach these mappings to the BT [10, 11]. Instead, we propose to treat communication as a first-class citizen, as modeling it explicitly facilitates formal analyses and program comprehension.

To address the sound integration of text and graphics, we propose a pragmatics-aware modeling approach [30]. Here, all the details and business logic of a model are specified in a textual file, and

automatically generated customizable diagrams provide a graphical view to browse and explore the model interactively.

In this paper, we will use *Lingua Franca (LF)* [20] as general setting, since we consider LF and its open-source infrastructure a good match to address the aforementioned problems. LF is rooted in *reactors* [19], a reactive, event-based, timed-sensitive, and concurrent model of computation with deterministic semantics. LF is a polyglot coordination language in which reactors encapsulate reactive tasks specified in verbatim code. Reactors provide a high-level *coordination layer* to orchestrate the execution of complex software systems, similar to BTs coordinating the execution of nodes. This coordination layer follows a dataflow notation, interconnecting reactor instances. LF supports various platforms and target languages for specifying the low-level business logic, currently including C, C++, Python, TypeScript, and Rust. The applicability of LF ranges from bare metal embedded systems to distributed systems.

The LF framework also provides advanced modeling capabilities and tooling for automatically generating customized graphics from a textual file. E.g., all the LF diagrams provided in this paper have been synthesized automatically this way.

1.3 Contributions and Outline

- We provide an industrial use case developed with Siemens Technology that poses realistic requirements for a distributed reactive software system, involving the modeling and coordination of autonomous behavior (Sec. 2).
- We present a textual and graphical syntax extension of LF that seamlessly integrates the BTs notation into LF and employs a pragmatics-aware modeling approach utilizing interactive diagrams (Sec. 3).
- We illustrate the structural translation of BTs nodes into LF’s reactors, inspired by an approach by Colledanchise and Ögren [11] (Sec. 4).
- We propose and discuss a notation and semantics for explicitly expressing data relations and deterministic communication in BTs. This is inspired by and compatible to LF’s dataflow and improves the modularity and reusability of data-dependent BTs (Sec. 5).

Sec. 6 discusses implications of our design and compares it to other approaches in BTs. Sec. 7 presents further related work. We conclude in Sec. 8 and provide a brief outlook on future work.

2 USE CASE: AUTOMATED WORKPLACE

To illustrate what we are aiming for with our proposal for BTs in LF, we first present a use case from an industrial context to motivate our solution and introduce BTs and LF in the process.

2.1 The Scenario

We consider an abstraction of a manufacturing plant where *buffers* store resources and intermediate products, *machines* process the goods, and Automated Guided Vehicles (AGVs) deliver products between buffers and machines. Human *workers* perform non-automated tasks and introduce an aspect of safety-criticality to the scenario. The configuration of number of machines, buffers, and AGVs may vary for different plants, as do the processing times and steps and their composition. Fig. 1 shows a screenshot of our simulation of




Figure 1: A screenshot of the visualization of a plant simulating the model presented in Fig. 3

such a plant with three machines, two buffers, two AGVs, and two workers.

The behavior of each machine is to request delivery of the required resources, process them, which may vary in time based on the type of machine and product, and finally issue the transportation of the produced good to another buffer. Based on the configuration of the resource requirements of each machine, a sequential manufacturing process can be set up. A plant may have special input and output buffers which receive resources from outside the plant or ship final products. For the system itself such goods simply disappear from or emerge in these buffers. To ensure safety, a machine must stop if a human is in its vicinity, which is detected by sensors on each machine.

The AGVs handle the transportation of goods, they can load and unload products in both buffers and machines. As mobile units, they must fulfill certain safety properties, namely stopping if in the vicinity of humans, and avoiding crashes with other AGVs. Their behavior further plays a critical role for the effectiveness of the plant. Deliveries should be coordinated between AGVs, such that two robots do not fulfill the same task redundantly. Another aspect is prioritization of machines, which may drastically affect throughput of the entire plant, if machines require different delivery rates. However, this aspect is not in the focus of this paper.

The task at hand is to create a software system that coordinates the behavior of the entire plant. As a first attempt, we will model the system as a plain BT. In the following, we use this model for a brief review of BT basics.

2.2 Behavior Tree Basics

Fig. 2 illustrates a BT that coordinates the different tasks in a plant setup similar to Fig. 1. A BT consists of *nodes*, usually visualized as labeled rectangles. Leaf nodes are *tasks*, such as Robot: Pick up raw product, that execute business logic. After completion, every node returns either SUCCESS, FAILURE, or RUNNING to its parent node. A *condition* is a special kind of task that only returns SUCCESS or FAILURE and is rendered as an elliptic node.

BTs offer three types of compound nodes, *sequence*, *fallback*, and *parallel*, which control the execution of their children. In a sequence node, if a child returns SUCCESS, the next child is executed. If there is no further child to execute, the sequence node returns SUCCESS. If a child returns RUNNING or FAILURE, the sequence stops there and




Figure 2: A BT that controls an entire plant with a hard-coded processing sequence.

immediately returns RUNNING or FAILURE. As illustrated in Fig. 2, sequence nodes are indicated by the single arrow label (→) and start subsequent tasks upon SUCCESS of previous ones. Fallback, labeled with a question mark (?), is symmetric by sequentially executing child nodes iff the previous node returns FAILURE. In a parallel composition, children are executed concurrently, represented by a node with a double arrow (⇨). The return value of the parallel node is based on the child responses and a threshold M specified for the node. It returns SUCCESS if M children return SUCCESS, it returns FAILURE if $N - M + 1$ children return FAILURE, with N as the number of children, and otherwise it returns RUNNING.

2.3 Discussion of the Plain Behavior Tree Solution

The BT in Fig. 2 uses sequential composition to define the processing sequence in a plant. It first orders the delivery of raw resources to Machine A and then supplies Machine B while Machine A is concurrently processing. Picking up final products is structured analogously.

This BT only implements a reduced processing scenario with one robot and two machines. Furthermore, we simplified this model a bit and left out conditions that check if a tasks in the sequence already finished. The model shows only one production run for two goods in parallel and assumes that the BT is restarted when finished.

While this solution provides the desired overall behavior for our plant example, it hard-codes the overall processing sequence, including AGV deliveries, in its structure. This makes it only applicable to this specific plant setup and impedes attempts for re-configuring for different products or scaling up the number of AGVs.

Hence, let us design a system where we model the behavior of machines and robots individually and more generically, independent of the plant configuration. Given the physical separation of AGVs and machines, this constitutes a distributed embedded system that requires some form of communication between the different devices, e.g. over a wireless network. One could use parallel nodes to model the distributed nature in BTs, and there are solutions that implement event-driven communication inside BTs [2]. However, we propose to utilize a dedicated coordination machinery for this task, one that is specifically tailored to model distribution and communication, in our case Lingua Franca. Again, we will first review the basics of LF, before discussing our running example in detail.




Figure 3: The top-level reactor representing the entire program.

2.4 Reactor-Oriented Programming

Fig. 3 illustrates the top-level structure of the system as an LF program. The rounded-rectangles represent *reactors* [19, 20]. LF employs the reactor-oriented programming paradigm that is based largely on well-established principles, such as object orientation [29], actors [17], event-driven systems [13], flow-based concepts [12]. Reactors declare input and output *ports* that are connected to pass events between them. These event messages are timestamped and may carry a payload. The reactor semantics uses a notion of logical time [21] where event processing happens instantaneously on this logical timeline while physical time progresses normally. In combination with explicit data dependencies, this allows LF to provide deterministic and time-sensitive program execution in single-threaded, multi-threaded, or distributed modes.

In this example, the program contains four interconnected reactors. An Arbiter acts as a broker that collects requests from machines, assigns jobs to robots, and handles the signaling for loading and unloading. The Machine, AGV, and Buffer reactors are instantiated as banks [25], meaning that there is an array of multiple instances. In the diagram they are rendered as stacks with the size of the bank in the left bottom corner.

This model now effectively represents the general structure of the system and the messaging channels between the different components. Next, we will take a closer look at the AGV reactor to inspect how the behavior of each of the robots is modeled.

Fig. 4 shows the contents of the AGV reactor. It instantiates three inner reactors, HumanDetector, AGVDetector, and AGVBehavior, as well as a *timer* (the clock figure) and a *reaction* (the gray flag). Reactions are event-handlers that contain code written in the target language of an LF program, e.g. C or Python. They declare triggers,




Figure 4: The AGV reactor including the inner BT specifying its behavior.

which will invoke their execution if an event occurs, sources to read additional data from, and effects in the form of new events. This reaction is triggered by the various input ports of the reactor, the results from the two detector reactors, and the timer that will periodically create events every 250 ms with an initial offset of 0. Its purpose is to issue a reevaluation of the AGV’s behavior by sending a start signal to the AGVBehavior reactor instance.

2.5 Discussion of the Reactor-Oriented Solution

The HumanDetector and AGVDetector reactors have to analyze sensors data and derive a decision whether a human or AGV is nearby, e. g. by utilizing a neural network implemented via a library in the target language. Thus, a classical dataflow design with “pure” LF is suitable for them.

The AGVBehavior reactor is more behavior-focused, thus there is a good motivation for expressing it as BT. Note that technically, we can also express AGVBehavior in pure LF, as also the translation in Sec. 4 will illustrate. However, that derived dataflow-only version is considerably more involved and less abstract than the BT variant.

The BT rendered in the AGVBehavior coordinates tasks similar to reactions in a reactor, but instead of event handling, it uses the execution structure of BTs.¹ The root of the tree is a sequence node. Its first (top-most) child is a fallback node with a condition that checks if the AGV has currently a job assigned. This condition also reads the input newJob to accept new jobs from the Arbiter, but this data handling aspect will be discussed in more detail later on. If the AGV has no job, the fallback will start the task moving the robot to an waiting position in the plant. Otherwise, it will return SUCCESS and the sequences continues by checking if any humans or other AGVs are nearby, with a FAILURE resulting in stopping the AGVs. The next two subtrees handle picking up and delivering a product and are structured similarly. First a condition node checks if this part of the job was already finished. Otherwise the AGV will

move to the (un)loading destination and request a transfer from the machine or buffer. In the end the BT signals the completion of the job to the Arbiter. Similar to the structure in the AGV reactor, the Machine reactor is also specified using BTs, but omitted here for brevity.

With this design, AGVs are realized as autonomous agents with their own individual behavior trees. This allows to easily scale the number of instances of machines. Also, with the modular nature of BTs, more complex systems can be represented using existing behavior trees as building blocks. Therefore, BTs present an elegant solution for modeling such use cases.

3 BEHAVIOR TREES IN LINGUA FRANCA

The basic idea of BTs in LF is that a BT should be a new kind of reactor, whose inner behavior is coordinated by a BT structure instead of a classical reactor composition. A BT reactor should be admissible wherever a normal reactor can be used in an LF program.

This integration was already illustrated by the LF diagrams in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. In LF interactive diagrams are provided to the user to perceive and explore the model. The model itself is specified in a textual source language, as envisioned by the underlying pragmatics-aware modeling approach [30]. Consequently, our integration of BTs covers both textual and graphical notations.

3.1 Diagrams

LF uses automatically generated interactive diagrams to illustrate the structural aspects of programs and reactors. BTs are integrated into this graphical notation in the form of classical tree structures, as depicted in Fig. 4. In both LF and BTs, this graphical depiction abstracts from the actual program definition. For example, LF’s reactions (by default) do not show the code that will be executed when triggering such a reaction. Likewise, the task node of a BT only depicts a label that describes the task rather than the actual code. However, diagrams in LF can be interactively configured to show different levels of detail or alternatives variants of certain aspects. For BT reactors, a user can switch to the transformed reactor

¹Our automatic diagram synthesis allows to switch freely between horizontal and vertical layouts. In this example, a traditional top-down representation of the BTs would be rather space consuming. Thus, we here chose to render the BT in left-to-right direction, where child nodes are accordingly ordered top to bottom.

```

1 behaviortree AGVBehavior {
2   input newJob
3   ... further IO ports ...
4
5   sequence {
6     channel loadingDest
7     channel unloadingDest
8
9     fallback {
10    condition "Has job?" {
11      state currentJob
12      reaction newJob -> loadingDest, unloadingDest {= ... code ... =}
13    }
14    task "Move to waiting position" {= ... code ... =}
15  }
16  fallback {
17    condition "No human or AGV nearby?" humanDetected, agvDetected
18    {= ... code ... =}
19    task "Stop" {= ... code ... =}
20  }
21  ... remaining BT nodes ...
22 }
23 }

```

Listing 1: Shortened excerpt of the textual definition for the AGVBehavior BT in Fig. 4

implementation of a BT, described later in Sec. 4, or can chose between horizontal or vertical layout direction of BTs, as illustrated in Fig. 4.

3.2 Textual Syntax

Lst. 1 shows an excerpt of the textual source code for the AGVBehavior reactor in Fig. 4. Instead of a classical reactor, it is declared as behaviortree that switches the admissible syntax to BTs. As a regular reactor, it declares input and output ports for communication with other reactors. We will elaborate on the aspects of communication and data handling in Sec. 5. Additionally, each BT reactor has an implicit input port *start* which will trigger the execution of its behavior, as well as *SUCCESS*, *FAILURE*, and *RUNNING* output ports that do not need to be declared explicitly either. Fig. 4 shows these implicit ports, Sec. 4 will provide more details on their role in the execution.

For control nodes, such as sequence or fallback, we use a simple and common nested block notation to encapsulate the child nodes in these control flow structures, see line 5 and 9. The leaf nodes represent the tasks that are executed. As such, they correspond to reactions in classical LF. The BT notation itself is relatively agnostic to implementation aspects, hence we can reuse many of the syntactic elements and concepts of LF’s reactions. A task node, as in line 14, is declared via **task** "*<label/>*" *<sources*>* -> *<effects*>* {=*code*>=}. While in classical reactions a label is optional and defined with a slightly different syntax, the main difference is that tasks do not declare a list of triggers that would issue the execution of a reaction. Instead, tasks will be executed based on the semantics of the enclosing control node, see Sec. 4. The list of none to many data sources this task may read from and the optional list of effects corresponds directly to the *causality interface* of reactions [19].

LF uses a language-independent way of integrating with its target language that separates the coordination layer from the implementation. It allows the user to write target code directly inside the {=*code*}=

brackets but will not further analyze this code and handle it under a black-box abstraction. In turn, this enables *polyglot* designs [20]. To ensure determinism in the LF execution and to provide the code with access to relevant data communicated on the reactor level, the reactions have causality interfaces that declare the access to ports and other data sources, as well as define potential effects the code may emit during execution. Our task syntax uses the same handling of target code in combination with causality interfaces. In fact, as Sec. 4 will describe, tasks will be transformed into classical reactions, which benefits from this correspondence.

We further support the definition of a condition, which is essentially a task but not expected to yield a *RUNNING* response. Primarily, this affects the graphical representation, switching to an elliptic rather than rectangular node shape, but otherwise conditions are handled like regular tasks. The conditions in lines 10 and 18 illustrate a few more variations of the available syntax. Line 18 is similar to the task in line 14 but declare *humanDetected* as data source that may be accessed at execution. The condition in 10 uses an extended syntax for tasks and conditions that allows defining additional elements. These will go into the reactor that later represents the node, see Sec. 4. Instead of directly defining the causality interface and target code for the conditions, a new code block is opened in which a state variable, here *currentJob*, is defined. The reaction keyword then starts the definition of the business logic for the condition. As the causality interface reflects, it will check whether the Arbiter assigns the AGV a new job, given that it is idle at the moment, and it will have two effects that specify the target for picking up the cargo and the destination for delivery. These two effects are special communications channels inside the BT that we introduce alongside our proposed concept. Sec. 5.2 will describe their functionality in more detail, but in this example it allows the *Has Job?* condition to supply the tasks that later move the AGV with the job-specific destinations. Its stateful nature allows to store the job, while the communication to the Arbiter only happens upon changes, as an event-driven nature would suggest.

While in this case the condition only introduces a single state variable that its reactor will carry, our proposed syntax permits to define any additional reactor contents, including instantiating reactors. This approach results in a hybrid design combining the BT notation and LF.

3.3 Target Language Interface

In accordance to the design of LF, our task nodes allow the implementation of a task’s behavior in a desired target language, directly inside the task declaration. Of course, the programmer can also call externally defined functions and does not need to implement everything directly in an LF file. LF automatically generates a target language interface that provides access to sources and effects, declared in the interface of a reaction, or in this case tasks. For BT tasks, however, there are two effects that do not need to be specified explicitly: *SUCCESS* and *FAILURE*. These correspond to the general interface of BT nodes and are implicitly present. A task implementation is expected to produce these effects to influence the way the reaction of a BT is executed. In our implementation for BTs in LF, we use this simplified interface, omitting the *RUNNING* response. We consider the absence of *SUCCESS* and *FAILURE* as *RUNNING*. This




Figure 5: General structure of a FSM translation of a BT, adapted from Colledanchise and Ögren [11]

is enabled by the deterministic semantics of LF, which ensures a clearly defined state for all inputs before computing any results based on these inputs. This simplification also eases the transformation described in Sec. 4. Nonetheless, our concept does not rely on this design and could easily be extended to explicitly use `RUNNING`.

The polyglot approach of LF makes our proposed concept for BTs in LF available to a variety of target languages, currently C, C++, Python, Typescript, and Rust. However, the aforementioned black-box perspective of target code makes it the responsibility of the programmer to adhere to the correct usage of the `SUCCESS-FAILURE-RUNNING`-protocol. For example, the code must not produce both the `SUCCESS` and `FAILURE` output in the same tick. We will revisit this issue as room for future work in Sec. 8.

4 STRUCTURAL TRANSLATION

So far we only illustrated the syntactic elements of our BT extension to LF. Now we take a look at how to implement the new constructs. We could utilize existing libraries for BTs, e. g. Py Trees, and use the target language integration of LF to translate a BT into executable code. However, then the entire BT would be represented by a single reaction that in case of using parallel nodes could not benefit from LF’s existing capabilities for parallel execution. We also considered different pattern-based schemata that would utilize LF’s modes or represent BTs by various reactions in a reactor. However, we here propose a concept inspired by the “Finite State Machine (FSM) translation” for BTs by Colledanchise and Ögren [11].

Fig. 5 illustrates their general idea. A `Tick Source` starts the execution of a reaction. Then the system transitions to the `In` state of the root behavior tree node. Afterwards it switches to the inner behavior, which is either the execution of an action (in case of a task node) or transitions to an `In` state of an inner node. If the inner composition is a sequence, the `SUCCESS` state of the first child will lead to the `In` state of the second child modeling the semantics of executing children sequentially. After transitioning through the inner nodes the system will end up in either the `S`, `R`, or `F` state, reflecting the return value of the node.

As a first observation, while this node/edge diagram syntactically resembles an FSM representation, we argue that it actually does not represent an FSM, at least not at the abstraction level of BTs. Even if we would consider the nodes as “states” (rather than actors), these would represent the steps of the execution *within* a tick, rather than the states of the system that persist across ticks. Thus, we do not follow the argument presented in [11] that this construction shows, roughly, the conceptual equivalence of BTs and FSMs.




Figure 6: Patterns of the BT translations into reactors.

However, putting aside the original FSM interpretation of this construction, it quite closely resembles a dataflow composition, which opens the door to the mapping we propose here. If a token travels across the pathways of the “transitions” (connections) and triggers reactions that execute tasks, it corresponds well to LF. This constitutes the basic principle for our structural translation approach.

We translate each node into a reactor individually. Hierarchical nesting and connections then result in a structure that will coordinate the tasks in the correct way. Fig. 6 provides an overview on the resulting reactors for each node type.

4.1 General Structure

Fig. 6a depicts the reactor for the entire BT to illustrate the general structure, in addition to the task translation. Each reactor resulting from a node has a `start` input port and `success` and `failure` output ports. As illustrated here, we also expose them on the top level. Hence, compared to Fig. 5, we locate the `Tick Source` outside the BT reactor in the event-driven domain of LF. Fig. 4 is an example where the BT reaction is, among others, triggered by another reactor for detecting humans via hardware sensors. The further execution of the BT is coordinated by forwarding this start event correctly. Note

that in the LF semantics, this happens (in the absence of explicit delays) instantaneously, i. e. without advancing logical time.

4.2 Task & Condition

Fig. 6a shows the translation of a single task. The body of the task is converted into a reaction that is triggered by start. This will execute the embedded code and produce a new output at either the success or failure port of the task’s reactor. If no such output is produced, we consider the output `RUNNING`. The effect of a running task is that no subsequent tasks should be executed, except in a parallel execution, see below. This perfectly matches the situation where none of the ports can trigger further behavior.

Condition nodes are handled exactly the same.

4.3 Sequence & Fallback

A sequence composes two or more nodes, which can be task nodes or composite nodes representing an entire subtree. Fig. 6b shows the reactor for a sequence of two nodes of any kind. The start port of the Sequence reactor will immediately start the NodeA. However, NodeB will only start if NodeA returns `SUCCESS`, implemented by connecting the success output of NodeA to the start of NodeB. The Sequence reactor itself will only return `SUCCESS` based on NodeB but will yield a `FAILURE` as soon as any of the nodes indicated this result. Again, the absence of `SUCCESS` or `FAILURE`, i. e. `RUNNING`, will stop the triggering of downstream reactors.

Fig. 6c uses a similar structure, but starts subsequent reactors when previous ones return `FAILURE`. The dataflow notation of LF very clearly illustrates the semantics of BTs in this case.

4.4 Parallel

In a parallel composition, as depicted in Fig. 6d, the start event is broadcast to all children. Their `SUCCESS` and `FAILURE` responses, however, are jointly handled by a special reaction. This response of the parallel node is subject to some logic that is generated by the compiler during translation. A parallel node specifies a threshold M that defines how many of its children must return `SUCCESS` in order to yield `SUCCESS` itself. The code in the reaction collects the responses from the child nodes, checks whether the threshold M is met or not, and produces the corresponding output.

As the diagram illustrates, LF reactors can quite naturally express a parallel composition. If the program is compiled with the multi-threaded runtime support enabled, LF will also parallelize the execution of these reactors. While this concurrent compositions is a common feature in dataflow languages, the design by Colledanchise and Ögren did not include a translation for parallel nodes because the classical model of FSMs cannot express this behavior.

5 COMMUNICATION

Sec. 4 illustrates the general patterns of our translation approach. However, it does not show the connections that are necessary to convey data between reactors, as these are application specific. Moreover, as discussed, the aspect of communication and data handling is in general not included in the BT notation at all, and usually handled via additional concepts, such as a blackboard [22]. In contrast to that, this aspect is central to a dataflow notation. We argue that with a combination of both notations, as proposed

here, we can improve the way data is handled in BTs and indirectly also improve their modularity and reusability. At the same time dataflow-oriented languages, such as LF, are enhanced by a more compact and effective control flow notation.

5.1 Input & Output

Each reactor in LF has a clear input output interface, manifested in its ports. In the same spirit, we add ports to the BT syntax in LF, as discussed in Sec. 3.2, and allow tasks to specify additional sources and effects that will access and communicate through these ports.

On the language design side, we do not require the user to repeat this interface at each level of hierarchy (node nesting), as our example in Lst. 1 shows, but allow tasks to directly access the port defined on the behavior tree. Yet, the reactors we create during translation require port declarations for each of them. Hence, this task is automated in the compiler. If nested tasks require access to some input or output port, each level of reactor will have the necessary ports and connections to forward the data.

5.2 Internal Communication via Channels

In addition to communication with the environment, it is also common to share data between nodes of the same BT. As already mentioned, globally shared variables, e. g. via a blackboard, can be a source of nondeterminism. Moreover, they can decrease modularity if data-dependencies are only modeled implicitly and moving nodes or factoring out a subtree leads to unnoticed breaks in data relations.

Hence, we propose to use communication *channels*, which is an established dataflow concept, to address this issue. In LF, we realize channels with ports and connections. Similar to the approach with inputs and outputs in BTs (Sec. 5.1), we want to relieve the user from the burden of specifying these communication interfaces at each level of hierarchy, as it is required for reactors. Instead, we introduce a channel syntax for control nodes in our BTs, see lines 6 and 7 in Lst. 1. This can be referenced by any task or condition inside this node as either source or effect. The transformation will automatically create the necessary input or output port, depending on the access type in the causality interface, and establishes the connections between readers and writers, also across hierarchies. With these channels, users can now send messages between nodes in a BT, while LF’s semantics will reject any nondeterministic outcome in parallel composition. Additionally, the correspondence to input output ports makes it easy to convert a channel into one of these, if one decided to factor out a subtree into a reusable standalone BT. Furthermore, the efficient implementation of LF will usually detect cases where reactors communicate in the absence of concurrency or networks and optimize this case such that there is no real overhead for instantaneously passing messages. Sec. 6.2 discusses sending messages for shared variables.

Regarding the implementation, there are two main cases when creating communication channels inside a BT: *forward* and *backward* communication.


Forward Communication. The simple case for communication is that a task reads the value on a channel after it was written by a previous task, e. g. in a sequence. Lst. 7a illustrates this pattern. In the source code, the first task declares the channel x as an effect

```

1 target Python
2 behaviortree Forward {
3   sequence {
4     channel x
5     task Writer -> x {= x.set(42)
6       success.set_present() =}
7     task Reader x {= if x.is_present: print(x.value)
8       success.set_present() =}
9   }
10 }

```

(a) Textual BT syntax




(b) Transformed reactors

```

1 target Python
2 behaviortree Backward {
3   sequence {
4     channel x
5     task Reader x {= if x.is_present: print(x.value)
6       success.set_present() =}
7     task Writer -> x {= x.set(42)
8       success.set_present() =}
9   }
10 }

```

(c) Textual BT syntax



(d) Transformed reactors

Figure 7: Examples of forward and backward communication patterns.

and sets its value, while the Reader task reads it. In the resulting reactors, shown in Fig. 7b, the Writer reactor has x as an output port directly connected to Reader where x is an input. Since these two tasks will be executed sequentially at the same tick of the BT, the value is passed instantaneously (with the same tag) between the two reactors. In case of multiple preceding writers, a reader will only receive the latest value written to this channel. Such a sequential overriding is always possible, while parallel writers will be generally rejected by the LF compiler.

Backward Communication. Cases of backward communication occur when a reader is located sequentially before a writing task, as illustrated in Lst. 7c. One could argue that such a reader cannot receive a message sent by a subsequent task, but in a repetitive reactive setting, it makes sense to allow influencing tasks in a future reaction. Hence, we also establish backward connections from writers and preceding readers. However, during execution of such a BT, the preceding task was potentially already executed, and immediately executing this tasks again and out-of-order does not make much sense. Additionally, LF does not support executing reactions multiple times at the same tag either and would consider such a direct backward connection a causality cycle. Therefore, we delay these messages that are sent upstream in execution order by one tick. This is a common concept, also present in synchronous languages, where the user has access to values of the previous tick.

Since the execution ticks of a BT depend in our case on the start input and not some fixed timing delay, as otherwise common in LF, we introduce an automatically generated Pre reactor, as shown in Fig. 7d, to store the value that was written to x in the current tick and reintroduce it with the next triggering via start to reach the reader preceding the writer. Again, multiple writers are subject to sequential overriding, and instantaneous sequential writers (forward communication) will supersede receiving a previous value.

5.3 Communication in the AGV Behavior

While the BT in AGVBehavior does not reflect all communication patterns, inspecting it in its transformed form in Fig. 8 reveals a more detailed picture on how the data is flowing through the nodes of the original BT. The diagram only shows the reactor for the top-level sequence in its expanded form, while subtrees, such as Fallback1, are still collapsed and do not expose their inner elements. The inputs and outputs cross the hierarchy level of the sequence to reach their tasks or are further forwarded into subtrees representations. Likewise, the channel connections are established from the Has Job? task inside Fallback0 to the two respective subtrees that move to the load and unload destination.

While this illustration only implicitly represents the tree structure of the BT, it exposed both the actual implementation and the data connections between the nodes, representing an alternative *dataflow view* for the BT.

6 DISCUSSION

6.1 Further Behavior Tree Node Types

In our proposed concept, we focused on the basic nodes of BTs: sequence, fallback and parallel. However, the BT notation also includes sequence and fallback variants with *memory*. These nodes behave like their non-memory counterparts but save the execution progress of their children and continue their executions sequence in the next tick. More specifically, they save the results returned by their children and do not re-tick the subtrees in subsequent ticks until the node evaluates to SUCCESS or FAILURE and resets the memory. Hence, memory nodes are syntactic sugar for non-memory nodes, with additional conditional nodes that track progress and skip children that have already returned SUCCESS for sequence, or FAILURE for fallback, respectively.




Figure 8: The BT of AGVBehavior (Fig. 4) after its translation into reactors. The diagram only has the top-level sequence expanded, while sub-trees, such as the fallback nodes, are still collapsed. While this is not the recommended default to illustrate a BT, it exposes both the actual implementation and the data connections between the nodes, representing a dataflow view for the BT.

While we, for now, skipped these two node type in our proposal, we expect that their addition to our proposed transformation into reactors would be rather straightforward. Specifically, one might combine state variables in reactors with automatically generated reactions that track the execution progress of a memory sequence or fallback, to control which of the child nodes, or resulting reactors, should be started in a tick. Alternatively, reactors also feature a mode notation [27] that could be used to model the execution sequence as a state machine.

Another type of nodes that is commonly used in BTs are *decorators*. These customizable nodes can be used to manipulate the return values and execution of other nodes. The BT notation does not prescribe specific decorators and refrains from restricting their functionality in any way. Nonetheless, there are a few commonly used decorators. For example, invert that flips the SUCCESS and FAILURE response of a node, max-N-tries that lets a child fail a fixed number of times until it returns FAILURE without ticking the subtree, and repeat-N-times, which executed a subtree multiple times. While we did not include decorators in our current realization for BTs, LF offers the capabilities to implement such decorators. For example, invert could be added by inserting a single reaction that flips the return messages, while max-N-tries and repeat-N-times would require stateful reactors for counting execution runs.

6.2 Data Handling in Classical Behavior Trees

As previously described, we realize communication between tasks as channels rather than shared variables, which are commonly used via blackboards. This slightly changes the way a programmer has to handle data in a BT. While blackboards introduce a set of variables that are implicitly shared between all nodes of a BT, we require the explicit declaration of data access in the causality interface of tasks. With a clear input output interface for each task, we are able to ensure determinism in concurrency through the semantics of LF.

Another core difference is that we shift the notion of a state, reflected by variables that keep their values across ticks, from the level of the BT to the nodes itself. Our channels then fill the gap and enable sparse event-based communication between nodes to share data during a tick (or partially reaching into the next tick, in case of backwards communication). Admittedly, this might appear as an inconvenient overhead to the programmer, especially in small use-cases. Yet, most software eventually grows large and at least then requires the established principles of software engineering to keep

a system maintainable. In this aspect we argue that our approach improves over blackboards because we fundamentally embrace modularity, which is also a core idea of BTs [5, 11]. The explicit use of interfaces and the node-local notion of state facilitates testability of individual nodes or subtrees, and likewise enables factoring out these subtrees as reusable components. In particular, the existence of clear interfaces plays a key role when instantiating BTs inside other BTs, since it allows a well-defined interaction between the instantiating and instantiated BT. Blackboards would require some form of mapping in order to establish a connection and prevent name clashes in the presence of multiple instances of the same BT. Yet, the role of each variable would remain informal.

Similar considerations for modularity, testability, and reusability also influenced the design of reactors [19] and resulted in the current LF language that has state variables completely local to reactors not shared with inner reactors, and ports for event-driven communication. With our approach of implementing BT nodes as reactors, we subjected our concept to the restrictions of LF. Nonetheless, we also investigated introducing a shared state concept to LF, which would enable a syntax closer to blackboards. Yet, the results showed similar problems as blackboards. Hence, we consider our proposed solution to be an adequate compromise for a notation that combines the core benefits of dataflow-oriented designs with BTs.

A potential drawback of our approach is found in the overhead for communicating data via channels. While simple cases of one-to-one communication are usually optimized by the LF compiler to efficiently access data, e.g. via a pointer, more complex channel setups require the introduction of additional reactions, as described in Sec. 5.2. The reason is that in LF, the default case is a concurrent composition of reactors. Hence, for sequence and fallback, these additional reactions have to transfer the sequential notion of the node’s semantics to the event system of LF. While this aspect also makes the graphical view of the generated reactor more complex, our pragmatics-aware modeling approach still allows to switch to the more lean BT view to effectively communicate and expose the different aspects in the model to the user. We also plan to further investigate refinements of these views, for example, by optionally filtering out automatically generated aspects in the reactor diagram or introducing data-flow aspects to the BT.

7 RELATED WORK

The basic notation and first implementations of BTs are presented in the context of non-player characters for video games [23]. BTs have since been adapted for a variety of tasks over multiple domains [11]. Biggar et al. [6] developed a formal framework to compare the expressive power of BTs, Finite State Machines, Teleo-reactive Programs [26], and Decision Trees [11]. They also proposed a formalization of the notions of reactivity and modularity and introduced k -BTs as a natural generalization of BTs [5]. These k -behavior trees have k different return values instead of SUCCESS and FAILURE, which benefits intuitive failure handling.

As discussed, some BT realizations use blackboards to store shared data and to create stateful behavior [11, 18]. Agis et al. [2] use an event-driven BT semantics which combines blackboards with listeners and task priorities, such that tasks can be aborted or re-evaluated by other nodes. In their setting, multiple autonomous robots have to communicate with each other to organize into groups and solve a task together. In our approach, the event-driven communication inside a BT has a more explicit representation in the syntax, and a well-formed semantical foundation in dataflow.

There are also approaches to mitigate or circumvent the drawbacks of blackboards. Shoulson et al. proposed an extension for behavior trees with parametrized interfaces [28]. We naturally embed these parametrized interfaces in the form of input output interfaces. Colledanchise and Natale investigated the potential problems with concurrency caused by parallel nodes [9, 10] and introduced concurrent BTs. Concurrent BTs use special decorators such as the ProgressSynchronizationDecorator and the RessourceSynchronizationDecorator to synchronize concurrent tasks.

There are established programming models that avoid race conditions on concurrently accessed data, for example in Rust [24] or synchronous languages [4]. The synchronous model of computation appears quite compatible with the execution semantics of reactive BTs [31]. Several languages already combine dataflow aspects with more control-flow-oriented states machines or modes, such as SCADE [7], SCCharts [16], or as already mentioned LF [27].

In the field of requirements engineering there is also a BT notation used in the Genetic Software Engineering approach [14], where the goal is to construct a design out of a set of functional requirements by integrating behavior trees for individual functional requirements, one-at-a-time, into an evolving design behavior tree. Despite the same name, the notation is not directly related to the coordination/programming notation [11] discussed in this paper.

There is work by Ghzouli et al. also using a robotic use case to evaluate the capabilities of BTs in terms of safety [15].

Concerning the textual/graphical aspects of BTs, game engines typically represent BTs graphically, e.g. Unity [3] and Unreal Engine². This usually works with a palette-based workflow, where nodes are partially predefined by the tool. However, embedded devices often require a more low-level implementation with specific hardware libraries. There are also BT libraries, such as Py Trees³, that provide an API to programmatically compose BTs and execute them. Yet, these usually lack the support for graphical visualization.

²<https://docs.unrealengine.com/5.0/en-US/behavior-trees-in-unreal-engine/>

³<https://py-trees.readthedocs.io>

8 CONCLUSION

Our proposal on augmenting BTs with dataflow is, to our knowledge, the first attempt to do so systematically at the level of a coordination language. The aim is to combine the best of two worlds that, so far, have seen little interaction through the involved research communities or in actual practice. We argue that these concepts can be of mutual benefit. Compared to ordinary BTs, our approach improves modularity and ensures determinism by replacing rather unstructured blackboards with a clean dataflow notation. One might argue that this requires some additional modeling effort, but we consider that a matter of sound software engineering that is very likely to pay off, in particular for real-world, complex systems. Conversely, dataflow formalisms can harness the intuitive, compact BT machinery that by now is proven in practice in a large and still growing community of users in game development, robotics control, industrial automation, etc.

With LF as the basis for a concrete realization of our proposal, we leverage its deterministic semantics for concurrent, distributed real-time systems. Moreover, LF's polyglot nature makes our proposal compatible with a wide range of target languages. The combination of BTs with their simple and intuitive structure and LF with its advanced capabilities in designing complex software systems, including robust and analyzable timing properties, facilitates the engineering of reliable software. Furthermore, we harness LF's pragmatics capabilities, which allow text-first modeling together with automatically generated, customized graphical views. In particular, a user can choose between the abstract BT view, which illustrates the behavioral logic very compactly, and the more detailed dataflow view of the LF model, which is synthesized according to the rules presented in Sec. 4. First feedback from our industrial partners at Siemens Technology indicates that this combination of sound engineering and customizable, automatically synthesized and always up-to-date graphical views is particularly appealing.

8.1 Future Work

As explained in more detail in Sec. 3.3, a known issue is that target code may use the BT incorrectly. In future work, the transformation, detailed in Sec. 4 could be extended to synthesize additional checks to detect ambiguous output from malformed code and raise an error, or sanitize the output by prioritizing only one of the two states. As a static solution, the code could be formally verified to adhere to the desired protocol. Possible language extensions include decorators and memory nodes, as discussed in Sec. 6.1. One may also support arbitrary return values in the form of k -BTs. Finally, we plan to refine the different graphical views on the model and to further extend the expressiveness of the diagrams.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gul Agha, Ian A. Mason, Scott F. Smith, and Carolyn Talcott. 1997. A Foundation for Actor Computation. *Journal of Functional Programming* 7, 1 (1997), 1–72.
- [2] Ramiro Agis, Sebastian Gottifredi, and Alejandro Garcia. 2020. An event-driven behavior trees extension to facilitate non-player multi-agent coordination in video games. *Expert Systems with Applications* 155 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113457>
- [3] Raymundo Barrera. 2018. *Unity 2017 Game AI Programming - Third Edition*. Packt Publishing Ltd.
- [4] Albert Benveniste, Paul Caspi, Stephen A. Edwards, Nicolas Halbwachs, Paul Le Guernic, and Robert de Simone. 2003. *The Synchronous Languages Twelve Years*

- Later. In *Proc. IEEE, Special Issue on Embedded Systems*, Vol. 91. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 64–83. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2002.805826>
- [5] Oliver Biggar, Mohammad Zamani, and Iman Shames. 2020. A principled analysis of Behavior Trees and their generalisations. *CoRR abs/2008.11906* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2008.11906>
 - [6] Oliver Biggar, Mohammad Zamani, and Iman Shames. 2021. An expressiveness hierarchy of Behavior Trees and related architectures. *CoRR abs/2104.07919* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2104.07919>
 - [7] Jean-Louis Colaço, Grégoire Hamon, and Marc Pouzet. 2006. Mixing Signals and Modes in Synchronous Data-flow Systems. In *ACM International Conference on Embedded Software (EMSOFT'06)*. ACM, Seoul, South Korea, 73–82.
 - [8] Jean-Louis Colaço, Bruno Pagano, and Marc Pouzet. 2017. SCADE 6: A formal language for embedded critical software development (invited paper). In *11th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Software Engineering TASE*. Sophia Antipolis, France, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASE.2017.8285623>
 - [9] Michele Colledanchise and Lorenzo Natale. 2018. Improving the Parallel Execution of Behavior Trees. In *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. 7103–7110. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2018.8593504>
 - [10] Michele Colledanchise and Lorenzo Natale. 2022. Handling Concurrency in Behavior Trees. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 38, 4 (2022), 2557–2576. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2021.3125863>
 - [11] Michele Colledanchise and Petter Ögren. 2018. *Behavior Trees in Robotics and AI: An Introduction*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429489105>
 - [12] Melvin E. Conway. 1963. Design of a separable transition-diagram compiler. *Commun. ACM* 6, 7 (1963), 396–408. <https://doi.org/10.1145/366663.366704>
 - [13] Frank Dabek, Nickolai Zeldovich, Frans Kaashoek, David Mazières, and Robert Morris. 2002. Event-Driven Programming for Robust Software. In *Proceedings of the 10th Workshop on ACM SIGOPS European Workshop (Saint-Emilion, France) (EW'10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 186–189. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1133373.1133410>
 - [14] R. Geoff Dromey. 2003. From Requirements to Design: Formalizing the Key Steps. In *1st International Conference on Software Engineering and Formal Methods (SEFM 2003), 22-27 September 2003, Brisbane, Australia*. IEEE Computer Society, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SEFM.2003.1236202>
 - [15] Razan Ghzouli, Thorsten Berger, Einar Broch Johnsen, Swaib Dragule, and Andrzej Waśowski. 2020. Behavior Trees in Action: A Study of Robotics Applications. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering (Virtual, USA) (SLE 2020)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3426425.3426942>
 - [16] Lena Grimm, Steven Smyth, Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten, Reinhard von Hanxleden, and Marc Pouzet. 2020. From Lustre to Graphical Models and SC-Charts. In *Proc. Forum on Specification and Design Languages (FDL '20)*. Kiel, Germany.
 - [17] Carl Hewitt. 1977. Viewing Control Structures as Patterns of Passing Messages. *Artif. Intell.* 8, 3 (1977), 323–364.
 - [18] Matteo Iovino, Edvards Scukins, Jonathan Styrud, Petter Ögren, and Christian Smith. 2022. A survey of Behavior Trees in robotics and AI. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 154 (2022), 104096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.robot.2022.104096>
 - [19] Marten Lohstroh, Íñigo Íncor Romeo, Andrés Goens, Patricia Derler, Jeronimo Castrillon, Edward A. Lee, and Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli. 2019. Reactors: A Deterministic Model for Composable Reactive Systems. In *8th International Workshop on Model-Based Design of Cyber Physical Systems (CyPhy'19)*, Vol. LNCS 11971. Springer-Verlag, 27.
 - [20] Marten Lohstroh, Christian Menard, Soroush Bateni, and Edward A. Lee. 2021. Toward a Lingua Franca for Deterministic Concurrent Systems. *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)* 20, 4 (May 2021), Article 36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448128>
 - [21] Marten Lohstroh, Christian Menard, Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten, Matthew Weber, Jeronimo Castrillon, and Edward A. Lee. 2020. A Language for Deterministic Coordination Across Multiple Timelines. In *Proc. Forum on Specification and Design Languages (FDL '20)*. Kiel, Germany. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FDL50818.2020.9232939>
 - [22] Alejandro Marzinotto, Michele Colledanchise, Christian Smith, and Peter Ögren. 2014. Towards a unified framework for robot control. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. 5420–5427. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2014.6907656>
 - [23] Michael Mateas and Andrew Stern. 2002. A behavior language for story-based believable agents. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 17, 4 (2002), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2002.1024751>
 - [24] Nicholas D. Matsakis and Felix S. Klock. 2014. The rust language. *ACM SIGAda Ada Letters* 34, 3 (2014), 103–104. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2692956.2663188>
 - [25] Christian Menard, Marten Lohstroh, Soroush Bateni, Matthew Chorlian, Arthur Deng, Peter Donovan, Clément Fournier, Shaokai Lin, Felix Suchert, Tassilo Tanneberger, Hokeun Kim, Jeronimo Castrillon, and Edward A. Lee. 2023. High-Performance Deterministic Concurrency using Lingua Franca. *CoRR abs/2301.02444* (January 2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.02444> [cs.PL]
 - [26] Nils Nilsson. 1993. Teleo-Reactive Programs for Agent Control. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 1 (1993), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.30>
 - [27] Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten, Reinhard von Hanxleden, Marten Lohstroh, Soroush Bateni, and Edward A. Lee. 2023. Modal Reactors. *CoRR abs/2301.09597* (January 2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2301.09597> arXiv:2301.09597
 - [28] Alexander Shoulson, Francisco M. Garcia, Matthew Jones, Robert Mead, and Norman I. Badler. 2011. Parameterizing Behavior Trees. In *Motion in Games*, Jan M. Allbeck and Petros Faloutsos (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 144–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25090-3_13
 - [29] Bjarne Stroustrup. 1987. What is “Object-Oriented Programming”? In *ECOOP'87 European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming*, Jean Bézivin, Jean-Marie Hullot, Pierre Cointe, and Henry Lieberman (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 51–70.
 - [30] Reinhard von Hanxleden, Edward A. Lee, Hauke Fuhrmann, Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten, Sören Domrös, Marten Lohstroh, Soroush Bateni, and Christian Menard. 2022. Pragmatics twelve years later: a report on Lingua Franca. In *11th International Symposium on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation (ISoLA) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 13702)*. Springer, Rhodes, Greece, 60–89. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19756-7_5
 - [31] Reinhard von Hanxleden, Alexander Schulz-Rosengarten, Benjamin Asch, Soroush Bateni, Marten Lohstroh, and Edward Lee. 2022. A Synchronous View on Behavior Trees. Presentation at the 29th International Open Workshop on Synchronous Programming (SYNCHRON '22), Fréjus, France. <https://rtsys.informatik.uni-kiel.de/~biblio/downloads/papers/synchron22.pdf>