GUIDELINES FOR THE ANNOTATION OF RELATIONS

\*\*With the label “premise” we intend what you annotated as either logos/pathos ot ethos

PREMISES/CLAIMS (same comment)

Support: the premise supports the truth of the claim

*<claim> Global stability is a myth grown out of a population that has gotten good at balancing acts. </claim> <relation\_support> <premise> The supports necessary for real stability simply don't exist </premise> <relation\_support>*

!!!Note that some premises support the claim only if considered together---LINKED PREMISES---in such cases annotate the two premises together as instantiating one support relation

*Example*

*<claim> Health insurance companies should naturally cover alternative medical treatments. </claim><relation\_support> <premise> Many general practioners offer these parallel treatments in parallel anyway</premise><premise> and who would want to question their broad expertise? </premise> <relation\_support>*

CLAIM/CLAIM (across comments)

Agreement: the claim of one user expresses agreement/positive evaluation with the claim of another user

*Example*:

*USER A:*

*<claim> The only constant is change. </claim> <claim> Global stability is a myth grown out of a population that has gotten good at balancing acts. </claim> <premise> The supports necessary for real stability simply don't exist </premise>*

*USER B:*

*<relation\_agreement> <claim> Good arguments</claim> <relation\_agreement>*

Attack: the claim of one user expresses disagreement with the claim of another user.

There can be two types of attack:

* Rebuttal: the claim directly challenges the truth of the other claim:

Example:

<quote> I think some of the biggest threats to global stability comes from the political fringes. </quote>

*<relation\_rebuttal\_attack>* <claim> The only constant is change. </claim> *</relation\_rebuttal\_attack>*

* Undercutter: the claim challenges the reasonings connecting the other claim to premise that supports it:

<quote> I think some of the biggest threats to global stability comes from the political fringes. It has always been like that in the past</quote>

*<relation\_ undercutter>* <claim> What happened in the past has nothing to do with the present</claim> *</relation\_ undercutter>*

Partial Agreement/Attack: there are cases where one user, commenting on the claim of another user, states two claims that which express different stances (agreement/attack). In such cases, annotate the two claims together as instantiating one relation of partial agreement---if you think that this is the main stance--- or partial attack ---- if you think that this is the main stance.

Example

*<quote> There are many things we used to consider extreme that are now fundamental principles of our society </quote>*

*While <relation\_partial\_attack> <claim> this may be true </claim>, <claim>, hasn't the killing of innocents (and murder or rape, or destruction of property) always been considered deeply immoral (outside of wars)?</claim> </relation\_partial\_attack>*