Knowledge Representation

Lecture 8: Abstract Argumentation
Introduction to Formal Argumentation
*slides adapted from Stefan Woltran's lecture on Abstract Argumentation

Atefeh Keshavarzi

20, November 2023

Outline

Argumentation in History

Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Semantics

    Admissible semantics

    Preferred semantics

    Grounded semantics

    Complete semantics

    Stable semantics

Argumentation in History

Plato's Dialectic
The dialectical method is discourse between two or more people
holding different points of view about a subject, who wish to establish
the truth of the matter guided by reasoned arguments.

Argumentation in History

Leibniz's Dream
The only way to rectify our reasonings is to make them as tangible as those of the Mathematicians, so that we can find our error at a glance, and when there are disputes among persons, we can simply say: Let us calculate [calculemus], without further ado, to see who is right.

▶ Developing automated methods: is an old, ambitious, and ongoing research goal
▶ One could say that Leibniz was thinking about a machine
   1. arguing as a human
   2. reasoning automatically and finding a correct conclusion, in the presence of conflicts among arguments

Argumentation Nowadays

- **Internal Argumentation**
- **Human-Human Argumentation**

Argumentation Nowadays

- **Internal Argumentation**
- **Human-Human Argumentation**
- **Human-Machine Argumentation**:
  - Purpose: Combining human and machine reasoning.
  - Example: AI-assisted decision-making, expert systems, AI recommendations.

TO PROVE YOU'RE A HUMAN, CLICK ON ALL THE PHOTOS THAT SHOW PLACES YOU WOULD RUN FOR SHELTER DURING A ROBOT UPRISING.

Argumentation Nowadays

- **Internal Argumentation**

- **Human-Human Argumentation**

- **Human-Machine Argumentation**:
  - Purpose: Combining human and machine reasoning.
  - Example: AI-assisted decision-making, expert systems, AI recommendations.

How should the process of arguing occur among automated systems?
Solid formalisms are required for modeling and evaluating argumentation

TO PROVE YOU'RE A HUMAN, CLICK ON ALL THE PHOTOS THAT SHOW PLACES YOU WOULD RUN FOR SHELTER DURING A ROBOT UPRISING.

Example: Human-Human Argumentation

- ▶ *a*: Menzis is the best insurance

Example: Human-Human Argumentation

▶ *a*: Menzis is the best insurance


▶ *b*: Univé is cheaper per month

Example: Human-Human Argumentation

- a: Menzis is the best insurance
- c: You have to pay Univé from 1th Feb. You arrived 1th March. Right?!

- b: Univé is cheaper per month

Example: Human-Human Argumentation

- a: Menzis is the best insurance
- c: You have to pay Univé from 1th Feb. You arrived 1th March. Right?!

- b: Univé is cheaper per month

Example: Human-Human Argumentation

- *a*: Menzis is the best insurance
- *c*: You have to pay Univé from 1th Feb. You arrived 1th March. Right?!

- **The one who has the last word laughs best**

- *b*: Univé is cheaper per month

Overview on Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Formal Models of Argumentation are concerned with

1. representation of an argument
2. representation of the relationship between arguments
3. solving conflicts between the arguments (*acceptability*)

Overview on Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Formal Models of Argumentation are concerned with

1. representation of an argument
2. representation of the relationship between arguments
3. solving conflicts between the arguments (*acceptability*)

Example

1. **Form abstract arguments**: $\{a, b, c\}$
2. **Identify conflicts**: c attacks b, and b attacks a.

Overview on Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Formal Models of Argumentation are concerned with

1. representation of an argument
2. representation of the relationship between arguments
3. solving conflicts between the arguments (*acceptability*)

Example

1. **Form abstract arguments**: $\{a, b, c\}$
2. **Identify conflicts**: c attacks b, and b attacks a.
3. **Resolve conflicts**: a is acceptable when considered together with c.

Overview on Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Formal Models of Argumentation are concerned with

1. representation of an argument
2. representation of the relationship between arguments
3. solving conflicts between the arguments (*acceptability*)

Example

1. **Form abstract arguments**: $\{a, b, c\}$
2. **Identify conflicts**: c attacks b, and b attacks a.
3. **Resolve conflicts**: a is acceptable when considered together with c.

What conclusions can be draw?

Overview on Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Formal Models of Argumentation are concerned with

1. representation of an argument
2. representation of the relationship between arguments
3. solving conflicts between the arguments (*acceptability*)

Example

1. **Form abstract arguments**: $\{a, b, c\}$
2. **Identify conflicts**: c attacks b, and b attacks a.
3. **Resolve conflicts**: a is acceptable when considered together with c.

What conclusions can be draw? Menzis is the best option for them.

The Overall Process

Steps

- ▶ Starting point: knowledge-base

- ▶ Form arguments

- ▶ Identify conflicts

- ▶ Abstract from internal structure

- ▶ Resolve conflicts

- ▶ Draw conclusions

The Overall Process

Steps

- **Starting point: knowledge-base**
- ▶ Form arguments
- ▶ Identify conflicts
- ▶ Abstract from internal structure
- ▶ Resolve conflicts
- ▶ Draw conclusions

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \rightarrow \neg r, r \rightarrow \neg w, w \rightarrow \neg s\}$$

The Overall Process

Steps

- ▶ Starting point: knowledge-base
- ▶ **Form arguments**
- ▶ Identify conflicts
- ▶ Abstract from internal structure
- ▶ Resolve conflicts
- ▶ Draw conclusions

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \to \neg r, r \to \neg w, w \to \neg s\}$$

$$\langle \{w, w \to \neg s\}, \neg s \rangle$$

$$\langle \{s, s \to \neg r\}, \neg r \rangle \qquad \langle \{r, r \to \neg w\}, \neg w \rangle$$

The Overall Process

Steps

- Starting point: knowledge-base
- Form arguments
- **Identify conflicts**
- Abstract from internal structure
- Resolve conflicts
- Draw conclusions

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \to \neg r, r \to \neg w, w \to \neg s\}$$

The Overall Process

Steps

▶ Starting point: knowledge-base

▶ Form arguments

▶ Identify conflicts

▶ **Abstract from internal structure**

▶ Resolve conflicts

▶ Draw conclusions

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \to \neg r, r \to \neg w, w \to \neg s\}$$

$\mathrm{AF}_\Delta :$

The Overall Process

Steps

- Starting point: knowledge-base
- Form arguments
- Identify conflicts
- Abstract from internal structure
- **Resolve conflicts**
- Draw conclusions

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \rightarrow \neg r, r \rightarrow \neg w, w \rightarrow \neg s\}$$

$\mathrm{AF}_\Delta:$

$$\mathit{pref}(\mathrm{AF}_\Delta) = \{\emptyset\}$$
$$\mathit{stage}(\mathrm{AF}_\Delta) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \{\gamma\}\}$$

The Overall Process

Steps

- Starting point: knowledge-base
- Form arguments
- Identify conflicts
- Abstract from internal structure
- Resolve conflicts
- **Draw conclusions**

Example

$$\Delta = \{s, r, w, s \rightarrow \neg r, r \rightarrow \neg w, w \rightarrow \neg s\}$$

$$Cn_{pref}(\mathrm{AF}_\Delta) = Cn(\top)$$
$$Cn_{stage}(\mathrm{AF}_\Delta) = Cn(\neg r \vee \neg w \vee \neg s)$$

Approaches to Form Arguments

Classical Arguments [Besnard & Hunter, 2001]

- ▶ Given is a KB (a set of propositions) Δ
- ▶ argument is a pair (Φ, α), such that $\Phi \subseteq \Delta$ is consistent, $\Phi \models \alpha$ and for no $\Psi \subset \Phi$, $\Psi \models \alpha$
- ▶ conflicts between arguments (Φ, α) and (Φ', α') arise if Φ and α' are contradicting.

Approaches to Form Arguments

Classical Arguments [Besnard & Hunter, 2001]

- ▶ Given is a KB (a set of propositions) Δ
- ▶ argument is a pair (Φ, α), such that $\Phi \subseteq \Delta$ is consistent, $\Phi \models \alpha$ and for no $\Psi \subset \Phi$, $\Psi \models \alpha$
- ▶ conflicts between arguments (Φ, α) and (Φ', α') arise if Φ and α' are contradicting.

Example

$$\langle \{s, s \rightarrow \neg r\}, \neg r \rangle \qquad \langle \{r, r \rightarrow \neg w\}, \neg w \rangle$$

Approaches to Form Arguments

Classical Arguments [Besnard & Hunter, 2001]

- ▶ Given is a KB (a set of propositions) Δ
- ▶ argument is a pair (Φ, α), such that $\Phi \subseteq \Delta$ is consistent, $\Phi \models \alpha$ and for no $\Psi \subset \Phi$, $\Psi \models \alpha$
- ▶ conflicts between arguments (Φ, α) and (Φ', α') arise if Φ and α' are contradicting.

Example

$$\langle \{s, s \rightarrow \neg r\}, \neg r \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \{r, r \rightarrow \neg w\}, \neg w \rangle$$

Approaches to Form Arguments

Classical Arguments [Besnard & Hunter, 2001]

- ▶ Given is a KB (a set of propositions) Δ
- ▶ argument is a pair (Φ, α), such that $\Phi \subseteq \Delta$ is consistent, $\Phi \models \alpha$ and for no $\Psi \subset \Phi$, $\Psi \models \alpha$
- ▶ conflicts between arguments (Φ, α) and (Φ', α') arise if Φ and α' are contradicting.

Example

$$\langle \{s, s \rightarrow \neg r\}, \neg r \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \{r, r \rightarrow \neg w\}, \neg w \rangle$$

Other Approaches

- ▶ Arguments are trees of statements
- ▶ claims are obtained via strict and defeasible rules
- ▶ different notions of conflict: rebuttal, undercut, etc.

Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Example

Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Example

Main Properties

▶ Abstract from the concrete content of arguments but only consider the relation between them

▶ Semantics select subsets of arguments respecting certain criteria

▶ Simple, yet powerful, formalism

▶ Most active research area in the field of argumentation.

  ▶ "plethora of semantics"

Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Seminal Paper by *Phan Minh Dung*:
On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games.
Artif. Intell., 77(2):321–358, 1995.

Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Seminal Paper by *Phan Minh Dung*:
On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games.
Artif. Intell., 77(2):321–358, 1995.

▶ Based on Google Scholar there are more than 5000 citations to [Dung, 1995]

▶ AFs have become a base for formal and computational argumentation [Baroni et al., 2020]

▶ AFs capture the essence of different non-monotonic formalisms, such as, Reiter's default logic [Reiter, 1980].

▶ Special issue of *Argument and Computation*, Vol. 11(1–2), 2020, dedicated to celebrate the 25 years anniversary

Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Definition
An argumentation framework (AF) is a pair (A, R) where

- A is a set of arguments
- $R \subseteq A \times A$ is a relation representing the conflicts ("attacks")

# Dung's Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Definition
An argumentation framework (AF) is a pair (A, R) where

- A is a set of arguments
- $R \subseteq A \times A$ is a relation representing the conflicts ("attacks")

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

The main Objection

How can we assess the credibility of an argument in an abstract argumentation framework?

The main Objection

How can we assess the credibility of an argument in an abstract argumentation framework?

An argument is believable if it can be argued successfully against the counterarguments.

The main Objection

How can we assess the credibility of an argument in an abstract argumentation framework?

An argument is believable if it can be argued successfully against the counterarguments.

▶ Semantics: Methods used to clarify the acceptance of arguments
  ▶ Extension-based semantics
  ▶ Labelling-based semantics

How Can We Deal with Conflict in a Loop?

Example

- ▶ a: Let's go to Norway for Christmas holiday to see the northern lights.
- ▶ b: Let's go to Spain for Christmas holiday to enjoy warm weather.

How Can We Deal with Conflict in a Loop?

Example

▶ a: Let's go to Norway for Christmas holiday to see the northern lights.

▶ b: Let's go to Spain for Christmas holiday to enjoy warm weather.

# How Can We Deal with Conflict in a Loop?

Example

▶ a: Let's go to Norway for Christmas holiday to see the northern lights.

▶ b: Let's go to Spain for Christmas holiday to enjoy warm weather.

▶ We do not accept arguments that have conflicts, do we?

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$cf(F) = \big\{\{a, c\},$

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$cf(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\} \big\}$

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$cf(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, d\} \big\}$

Basic Properties

Definition
Given $F = (A, R)$.
A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free*
($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$cf(F) = \big\{\{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, d\}, \{a\}$

Basic Properties

Definition

Given $F = (A, R)$.

A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* if there is no attack/conflict within S. A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* ($S \in cf(F)$) if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$

▶ What are the conflict-free sets of F?

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$cf(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, d\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{\} \big\}$

Acceptability within a Set

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let $S \subseteq A$.

An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Acceptability within a Set

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let $S \subseteq A$.
An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

- ▶ Is c acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is c defended by any set?

Acceptability within a Set

Definition
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let $S \subseteq A$.
An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

▶ Is c acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is c defended by any set?
  ▶ c is acceptable w.r.t. (defended by) $\{c\}, \{a, c\}$

Acceptability within a Set

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let $S \subseteq A$.

An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

- Is c acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is c defended by any set?
  - c is acceptable w.r.t. (defended by) $\{c\}, \{a, c\}$
- Is b acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is d defended by any set?

Acceptability within a Set

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let $S \subseteq A$.

An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

- Is c acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is c defended by any set?
  - c is acceptable w.r.t. (defended by) $\{c\}, \{a, c\}$
- Is b acceptable w.r.t. any set? Is d defended by any set?
  - No, because $(a, b) \in R$ and a is not attacked.

Characteristic Operator

Given $F = (A, R)$

- $S \subseteq A$ is conflict-free if, for each $a, b \in S$, $(a, b) \notin R$
- An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Definition

Characteristic operator $\Gamma_F(S)$ is a function that take set $S \subseteq A$ and returns the set of all arguments that are defended by S.

$$\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$$

Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What are the outputs of $\Gamma_F(S)$ for any of the following sets?

Recall: $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$. $a \in A$ is defended by S, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- ▶ $S = \{\}$
- ▶ $S = \{a\}$
- ▶ $S = \{c\}$
- ▶ $S = \{a, b\}$

menti
.com
8174
6329

Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What are the outputs of $\Gamma_F(S)$ for any of the following sets?

Recall: $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$. $a \in A$ is defended by S, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- $S = \{\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- $S = \{a\}$
- $S = \{c\}$
- $S = \{a, b\}$

Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What are the outputs of $\Gamma_F(S)$ for any of the following sets?

Recall: $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$. $a \in A$ is defended by S, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- $S = \{\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- $S = \{a\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- $S = \{c\}$
- $S = \{a, b\}$

Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What are the outputs of $\Gamma_F(S)$ for any of the following sets?

Recall: $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$. $a \in A$ is defended by S, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- $S = \{\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- $S = \{a\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- $S = \{c\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a, c\}$
- $S = \{a, b\}$

Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What are the outputs of $\Gamma_F(S)$ for any of the following sets?

Recall: $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$. $a \in A$ is defended by S, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, s.t. $(c, b) \in R$.

- ▶ $S = \{\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- ▶ $S = \{a\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$
- ▶ $S = \{c\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a, c\}$
- ▶ $S = \{a, b\}$ $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a\}$

Properties of the Characteristic Operator

Let F be a function, and let S and S' be inputs of F :

- A function F is a monotonic function: if $S \subseteq S'$ then $F(S) \subseteq F(S')$.

Properties of the Characteristic Operator

Let F be a function, and let S and S' be inputs of F:

- A function F is a monotonic function: if $S \subseteq S'$ then $F(S) \subseteq F(S')$.

Theorem

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let Γ_F be the characteristic operator of F. Γ_F is a monotonic function. That is, if $S \subseteq S'$ then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

Properties of the Characteristic Operator

Let F be a function, and let S and S' be inputs of F:

- A function F is a monotonic function: if $S \subseteq S'$ then $F(S) \subseteq F(S')$.

Theorem
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Let Γ_F be the characteristic operator of F. Γ_F is a monotonic function. That is, if $S \subseteq S'$ then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

proof
$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_F(S') &= \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S' \text{ in } F\} \\
&= \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \cup (S' \setminus S) \text{ in } F\} \\
&= \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\} \cup \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } (S' \setminus S) \text{ in } F\} \\
&= \Gamma_F(S) \cup \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S' \setminus S \text{ in } F\}
\end{aligned}$$

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
    - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
    - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
  - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$
  - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
    - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
    - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$$adm(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\},$$

Admissible Semantics

Definition
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
    - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$
    - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$adm(F) = \big\{\{a, c\}, \{a, d\}\big\}$

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
    - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
    - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$adm(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \cancel{\{b, d\}}, $

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
  - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
  - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$adm(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \cancel{\{b, d\}}, \{a\} \big\}$

Admissible Semantics

Definition
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
  - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
  - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$adm(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \cancel{\{b, d\}}, \{a\}, \cancel{\{b\}},$

Admissible Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is *admissible* ($S \in adm(F)$) in F, if

- S is conflict-free in F
- $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
  - $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$
  - $a \in A$ is *defended* by $S \subseteq A$ in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$adm(F) = \big\{\{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \cancel{\{b, d\}}, \{a\}, \cancel{\{b\}}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{\}\big\}$

Properties of Admissible Extensions

Theorem

Every AF has at least one admissible extension.

Proof

In any AF empty set is an admissible extension.

Properties of Admissible Extensions

Theorem
Every AF has at least one admissible extension.

$$adm(F) = \big\{\{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{\}\big\}$$

Properties of Admissible Extensions

Theorem
Every AF has at least one admissible extension.

$$adm(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{\} \big\}$$

The relation between admissible extensions of F with respect to the subset relation.

Preferred Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is a *preferred extension* ($S \in \text{pref}(F)$) in F if

- S is $\subseteq$-maximal admissible in F, that is, for each $T \subseteq A$ admissible in F, $S \not\subset T$. .

Preferred Semantics

Definition
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is a *preferred extension* ($S \in pref(F)$) in F if

- S is $\subseteq$-maximal admissible in F, that is, for each $T \subseteq A$ admissible in F, $S \not\subset T$. .

Example
Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

- What are the preferred extensions for F?

Preferred Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A set S is a *preferred extension* ($S \in pref(F)$) in F if

▶ S is $\subseteq$-maximal admissible in F, that is, for each $T \subseteq A$ admissible in F, $S \not\subset T$. .

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$pref(F) = \big\{ \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \cancel{\{a\}}, \cancel{\{c\}}, \cancel{\{d\}}, \cancel{\emptyset} \big\}$

Characterize of Semantics of AFs

Theorem
Any AF has at least a preferred extension.

Proof
Let F be an AF. Every AF has at least an admissible extension. For each admissible set S of AF, there exists a preferred extension E of AF such that $S \subseteq E$.

Characterize of Semantics of AFs

Theorem
Any AF has at least a preferred extension.

Proof
Let F be an AF. Every AF has at least an admissible extension. For each admissible set S of AF, there exists a preferred extension E of AF such that $S \subseteq E$.

Properties of Semantics of AFs

▶ Any admissible extension is a conflict-free set.

▶ In any AF empty set is an admissible extension.

▶ Every AF has at least one admissible extension.

▶ Every AF has at least one preferred extension.

▶ . . .

Properties of the Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Flashback

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$, and $S \subseteq A$. The characteristic operator is
$\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$.

- ▶ Characteristic operator is monotonic, that is, if $S \subseteq S'$, then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

Properties of the Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Flashback

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$, and $S \subseteq A$. The characteristic operator is
$\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$.

- ▶ Characteristic operator is monotonic, that is, if $S \subseteq S'$, then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

Definition

S is termed the least fixed point of Γ_F if:

- ▶ $S = \Gamma_F(S)$,
- ▶ for each $S' \subseteq A$, if $\Gamma_F(S') = S'$, then $S \subseteq S'$.

Properties of the Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Flashback

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$, and $S \subseteq A$. The characteristic operator is
$\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$.

- ▶ Characteristic operator is monotonic, that is, if $S \subseteq S'$, then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

Definition

S is termed the least fixed point of Γ_F if:

- ▶ $S = \Gamma_F(S)$,
- ▶ for each $S' \subseteq A$, if $\Gamma_F(S') = S'$, then $S \subseteq S'$.

Theorem

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Γ_F has the least fixed point.

Properties of the Characteristic Operator (ctd.)

Flashback

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$, and $S \subseteq A$. The characteristic operator is
$\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a \text{ is defended by } S \text{ in } F\}$.

- Characteristic operator is monotonic, that is, if $S \subseteq S'$, then $\Gamma_F(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F(S')$.

Definition

S is termed the least fixed point of Γ_F if:

- $S = \Gamma_F(S)$,
- for each $S' \subseteq A$, if $\Gamma_F(S') = S'$, then $S \subseteq S'$.

Theorem

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. Γ_F has the least fixed point.

Proof.

Let $S = \emptyset$, and let $S' = \Gamma_F(\emptyset)$. clearly, $S \subseteq S'$
Since Γ_F is a monotonic function, $\Gamma_F^n(S) \subseteq \Gamma_F^{n+1}(S')$, where . $\Gamma_F^{n+1} = \Gamma_F(\Gamma_F^n)$. Since A is countable, there exists m s.t. $\Gamma_F^m(S) = \Gamma_F^{m+1}(S')$ $\qquad \square$

Grounded Semantics

Definition
Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A conflict set $S \subseteq A$ is the *grounded extension* ($S \in grd(F)$) if S is the $\subseteq$-least fixed point of $\Gamma_F(S)$.

Grounded Semantics

Definition

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A conflict set $S \subseteq A$ is the *grounded extension* ($S \in grd(F)$) if S is the $\subseteq$-least fixed point of $\Gamma_F(S)$.

Grounded Extension [Dung, 1995]

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. The unique grounded extension of F is defined as the outcome S of the following "algorithm":

1. put each argument $a \in A$ which is not attacked in F into S; if no such argument exists, return S;

2. remove from F all (new) arguments in S and all arguments attacked by them (together with all adjacent attacks); and continue with Step 1.

Grounded Semantics (ctd.)

Recall: S is the grounded extension of F if it is the $\subseteq$-least fixed point of $\Gamma_F(S)$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

What is the grounded extension of F?

1. $grd(F) = \{\{\}\}$
2. $grd(F) = \{\{a\}\}$
3. $grd(F) = \{\{a, c\}\}$
4. $grd(F) = \{\{a, d\}\}$
5. $grd(F) = \{\{a, c\}, \{a, d\}\}$

menti
.com
1344
1043

Grounded Semantics (ctd.)

Recall: S is the grounded extension of F if it is the $\subseteq$-least fixed point of $\Gamma_F(S)$.

Example

Given $F = (A, R)$ s.t. $A = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $R = \{(a, b), (c, b), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, e)\}$

$grd(F) = \big\{\{a\}\big\}$

Semantics in Summery

- $S \subseteq A$ is conflict-free if, for each $a, b \in S$ $(a, b) \notin R$
- An argument $a \in A$ is defended by S (or, it is *acceptable* w.r.t. S) in F, if for each $b \in A$ with $(b, a) \in R$ then there exists a $c \in S$, such that $(c, b) \in R$.
- $\Gamma_F(S) = \{a \in A \mid a$ is defended by S in $F\}$

Semantics of AFs

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$. A conflict-free set S is

- *admissible* $(S \in adm(F))$ if $S \subseteq \Gamma_F(S)$
- *preferred* $(S \in pref(F))$ if S is $\subseteq$-maximal admissible
- *grounded* $(S \in grd(F))$ if S is the $\subseteq$-least fixed point of $\Gamma_F(S)$

Summery

We have seen
- ▶ Abstract Argumentation Frameworks
- ▶ Conflict-free sets
- ▶ Admissible semantics
- ▶ Preferred semantics
- ▶ Grounded semantics

Next
- ▶ Complete semantics
- ▶ Stable semantics
- ▶ Decision problems in AFs

References

Baroni, P., Toni, F., and Verheij, B. (2020).
On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games: 25 years later.
Argument & Computation, 11(1-2):1–14.

Dung, P. M. (1995).
On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games.
Artificial Intelligence, 77(2):321–357.

Reiter, R. (1980).
A logic for default reasoning.
Artificial intelligence, 13(1-2):81–132.