CS551K Assessment - Notes

Running the scripts

The main folder structure is presented below.

```
README.pdf
-argsolver
    setup.py
    argsolverdd
        __init__.py
            extension_plotter.py
            ground_extensor.py
            parser_abstract.py
            stable_extensor.py
            __init__.py
        common
            atom.py
            misc.py
            rule.py
             _init__.py
        -structured
            argument.py
            parser.py
             _init__.py
    aaf_analyser.py
    task1a.py
    task1b.py
    __init__.py
    examples
task2
    attacks.py
    task2a.py
    task2b.py
    task2c.py
    task2d.py
    task2e.py
    __init__.py
    -examples
```

Solutions to the assessment questions can be found in folders task1 and task2.

Auxiliary files for the assessment have been put into a package called argsolverdd (to avoid name clashes). Before running the solution scripts, please install the package as follows:

1) Navigate into folder argsolver (which holds the argsolverdd package):

```
cd <path-to-the-main-folder>/argsolver
```

2) Install the package:

```
python setup.py install
```

(adjusting the command to the system, e.g. swapping python for python3 if needed).

After the installation, please navigate back to the main folder and then to respective solution folders.

Notes for the solutions

Task 1

The solution for task 1b was designed for a 64-bit Python version. 32-bit versions are likely to fail for larger inputs owing to memory issues.

Task 2

The recursive definition of an argument as presented in the lecture slides only allowed arguments to be constructed using other arguments. However, nothing was mentioned regarding arguments with no sub-arguments. In publications on the ASPIC framework, however, there is also a *zero-level* case for the *initial* arguments which do not rely on any other ones [1]. As the latter approach provides a clear starting point for constructing arguments, it was the one implemented in solutions to task 2. For this reason, the script outputs might slightly differ from the expected; e.g. the aforementioned approach results in 9 arguments being defined for the tandem problem, while the lecture slides defined 6 (and additional 3 implicitly). In general, the number of arguments corresponds to the number of rules in the system).

References

[1] S. Modgil and H. Prakken, Abstract rule-based argumentation. In P. Baroni, D. Gabbay, M. Giacomin & L. van der Torre (eds.): *Handbook of Formal Argumentation*, Vol. 1, pp. 286-361. London: College Publications, 2018. [PDF: http://www.cs.uu.nl/groups/IS/archive/henry/rba.pdf] (version July 4th, 2017)