

# Towards Eliciting Attacks in Abstract Argumentation Frameworks

Isabelle Kuhlmann

University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany

## Abstract

We introduce the problem of argumentation framework elicitation by considering a scenario which involves an agent that possesses an argumentation framework that we aim to uncover. More precisely, we assume that the set of arguments is known, but the set of attacks between the arguments is not. Hence, we focus on the problem of eliciting attack relations in argumentation frameworks by means of asking the agent certain questions about the framework. This raises the question whether it is at all possible to gather enough information to find a solution. If this is indeed the case, the follow-up question involves the development of algorithms which can find solutions by utilizing as few questions as possible. This paper provides an overview of this new line of research and presents some preliminary insights.

## 1 Introduction

*Argumentation* is a concept that is deeply rooted in human nature and that can be considered a central element of our intelligence. As Phan Minh Dung stated in his seminal paper [Dung, 1995]: “The ability to engage in arguments is essential for humans to understand new problems, to perform scientific reasoning, to express, clarify and defend their opinions [...]” Consequently, a lot of research has been concerned with various approaches to model this concept in artificial intelligence as well. In the field of *abstract argumentation*, which this paper focuses on, most works are aimed at drawing meaningful conclusions from a given argumentation framework (AF).

However, the inverse problem of (re-)constructing an AF from given conclusions received only little attention (see e.g., [Niskanen et al., 2019, Riveret and Governatori, 2016, Kido and Liao, 2019]).

Consider a scenario where an agent possesses an AF and we want to *elicit* the attack relation of this framework by asking the agent a number of questions, given that the set of arguments is known. There is a multitude of questions which could be posed, however we first concentrate on the question whether a set of arguments is an extension of the AF wrt. a certain semantics. This scenario raises the question whether it is possible at all to elicit an argumentation framework and—if this is indeed the case—which questions need to be asked in order to do so. More precisely, the question regarding the possibility of AF elicitation leads to the task of developing practical algorithms. A possible application area regarding the previously described research is the field of *strategic argumentation* [Oren and Norman, 2009, Rienstra et al., 2013], where an agent aims at discovering an opponent’s knowledge.

Another field that is related to the problem of eliciting AFs is *preference elicitation* (see [Chen and Pu, 2004] for an overview). In preference elicitation, the aim is to uncover an agent’s preferences—this bears similarity to the goal of uncovering an agent’s AF in our scenario. Moreover, the problem of eliciting AFs is related to the problem of *learning* AFs [Niskanen et al., 2019, Riveret and Governatori, 2016], which is again related to the inverse argumentation problem [Kido and Liao, 2019]. However, the interactivity of




Figure 1: Example of an abstract argumentation framework.

choosing which information is asked for, i.e., which information the elicitation process is based on, is unique to our scenario.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In the subsequent section, we will provide a brief overview of the required preliminaries. Some research questions arising from the previously described problem and how we plan to approach them are explained as well. In the third section, the planned methodologies as well as some existing results from the literature that are related to our problem of eliciting AFs are discussed. Section 4 concludes this work by giving a short summary.

## 2 Method

We consider abstract argumentation frameworks in the sense of Dung [Dung, 1995]. The general idea behind such frameworks is to model the relation between arguments as a graph. More specifically, arguments are represented as nodes and conflicts between arguments are represented as edges. In classical Dung-style AFs the edges are directed and indicate an attack relation. Thus, if there is an edge from argument  $a$  to argument  $b$  it means that  $a$  attacks  $b$ .

**Definition 1.** Formally, an abstract argumentation framework is a pair  $F = (\text{Args}, R)$  with  $\text{Args}$  being a set of arguments and  $R \subseteq \text{Args} \times \text{Args}$  an attack relation.

Figure 1 shows an exemplary AF,  $F_1$ . Let  $E \subseteq \text{Args}$ .  $E$  is called *conflict-free* if there are no arguments  $a, b \in E$  such that  $(a, b) \in R$ . We say  $E \in \text{cf}(F)$  if  $E$  is conflict-free wrt. an AF  $F$ . Further, an argument  $a \in \text{Args}$  is *defended* by  $E$  if  $\forall b \in \text{Args}$  with  $(b, a) \in R$ ,  $\exists c \in E$  with  $(c, b) \in R$ . Semantics of an AF can be expressed by means of *extensions*.

**Definition 2.** Let  $F = (\text{Args}, R)$  be an AF and  $E \subseteq \text{Args}$ .

- $E$  is an *admissible* extension (i.e.,  $E \in \text{ad}(F)$ ) if  $E \in \text{cf}(F)$  and each  $a \in E$  is defended by  $E$  in  $F$ . With regard to the AF  $F_1$  (see Figure 1), the admissible extensions are  $\{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}\}$ .
- $E$  is a *complete* extension (i.e.,  $E \in \text{co}(F)$ ) if  $E \in \text{ad}(F)$  and for each  $a \in \text{Args}$  defended by  $E$  in  $F$ , it holds that  $a \in E$ . The complete extensions of  $F_1$  are  $\{\emptyset, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}\}$ .
- $E$  is a *grounded* extension (i.e.,  $E \in \text{gr}(F)$ ) if  $E \in \text{co}(F)$  and for each  $E' \in \text{co}(F)$ ,  $E' \not\subseteq E$ . An AF always possesses one uniquely defined grounded extension. The grounded extension of  $F_1$  is the empty set.
- $E$  is a *preferred* extension (i.e.,  $E \in \text{pr}(F)$ ) if  $E \in \text{ad}(F)$  and for each  $E' \in \text{ad}(F)$ ,  $E \not\subseteq E'$ . The preferred extensions of  $F_1$  are  $\{\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}\}$ .
- $E$  is a *stable* extension (i.e.,  $E \in \text{st}(F)$ ) if  $E \in \text{cf}(F)$  and for each  $a \in \text{Args} \setminus E$ ,  $\exists b \in E$  with  $(b, a) \in R$ . It is possible that an AF does not possess any stable extensions. The stable extensions of  $F_1$  are  $\{b, d\}$  and  $\{c, d\}$ .

Although conflict-freeness is not commonly referred to as a semantics, we do so in order to simplify presentation.

In order to elicit an AF  $F = (\text{Args}, R)$  known to the agent, we require information. We gather information by posing questions that the agent, acting as an oracle, answers. A first research goal is to find out whether it is even possible to uncover the attack relation in an AF in this manner or what the limitations are. Naturally, this raises the question what pieces of information we require (i.e., which questions we need to ask) to do so. An additional task is the development of algorithms for the elicitation process. Such algorithms should output a correct answer while ideally utilizing only a minimal number of questions.

We make the assumption that the set of arguments  $\text{Args}$  is known. There is a number of possible questions which are of syntactic nature, for instance “Are there self-attacks?”, “How many (odd) cycles does  $F$  contain?”, or “How many attacks does  $F$  contain in total?”. However, eliciting the exact AF is a rather challenging task. As the following example illustrates, asking a single question or a combination of two questions may significantly reduce the number of possible solutions, but may not yield a unique solution.

**Example 1.** Let  $F_A = (\text{Args}_A, R_A)$  be the agent’s AF with  $\text{Args}_A = \{a, b, c\}$ . The first question we pose is: *Does  $F_A$  contain any self-attacks?* The agent answers *no*. From the possible range of AFs we can construct from  $\text{Args}_A$  we can now exclude all frameworks which comprise self-attacks. However, we are obviously not able to reconstruct  $F_A$  exactly, because there are various self-attack-free AFs that can be constructed from  $\text{Args}_A$ .

We now ask the additional question: *How many odd cycles does  $F_A$  contain?* The agent answers: 1. This answer allows us to further limit the range of possible solutions, because we learned that there must be an odd cycle which is not a self-attack. Thus, there must be a cycle involving all arguments  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$ . Nevertheless, we cannot determine  $F_A$  exactly, since we have no knowledge about the direction of the cycle nor about any additional attacks.

As a consequence, we defer the aim of finding an exact solution and aim at finding an *equivalent* solution instead. More precisely, we search for a solution that is equivalent to the original AF wrt. a semantics  $\sigma$ , as defined below.

**Definition 3.** Let  $\sigma \in \{\text{ad}, \text{cf}, \text{co}, \text{gr}, \text{pr}, \text{st}\}$ . Two AFs  $F = (\text{Args}, R)$ ,  $F' = (\text{Args}', R')$  are  $\sigma$ -equivalent if they possess the same  $\sigma$ -extensions, i.e.,  $\sigma(F) = \sigma(F')$ .

Hence, as a first step in eliciting an equivalent AF, we focus on questions regarding an AF’s semantics. More specifically, we examine the question whether a set  $E \in \text{Args}$  is an extension of  $F$  wrt. a semantics  $\sigma \in \{\text{ad}, \text{cf}, \text{co}, \text{gr}, \text{pr}, \text{st}\}$ . Posing this question wrt. an

individual semantics  $\sigma$  yields sufficient information to construct a  $\sigma$ -equivalent AF. The following naive procedure demonstrates how to construct a  $\sigma$ -equivalent AF  $F'$  from an original AF  $F$ :

1. We ask “Is  $E \subseteq \text{Args}$  a  $\sigma$ -extension of  $F$ ?” wrt. every possible subset of arguments. As a result, we know all  $\sigma$ -extensions of  $F$ .
2. We construct all possible AFs from  $\text{Args}$ . For each possible AF  $G$ , we compute  $\sigma(G)$  and check whether  $\sigma(F) = \sigma(G)$ . If this is the case, we found a solution and return the equivalent AF  $F' := G$ .

Consequently, by asking only one type of question, we can already elicit an equivalent AF. On the other hand, it is easy to see that the proposed algorithm is very inefficient and thus not practically applicable for bigger AFs. Our goal is to find more practical algorithms that do not only take the number of different questions into account, but also the number of times an individual question has to be asked. To achieve this, we require deeper insights into the characteristics of the different semantics. Existing literature on such characteristics [Besnard and Doutre, 2004] and on realizability [Dunne et al., 2015] provide a reasonable starting point for this. Furthermore, it is relevant to concentrate on the interplay between different semantics. For instance, if we find an  $\text{ad}$ -equivalent AF  $F'$  wrt. an original AF  $F$ , we also know that the two frameworks are  $\text{pr}$ -equivalent, because if  $\text{ad}(F) = \text{ad}(F')$  then  $\text{pr}(F) = \text{pr}(F')$  [Oikarinen and Woltran, 2011].

### 3 Discussion

The previous sections describe a new line of research which is concerned with the elicitation of attacks in argumentation frameworks. We introduce an interactive scenario in which the set of questions the elicitation procedure is based on underlies a selection process. Although we were able to gain some first insights, no work has been published yet.

To begin with, we examine the elicitation of  $\sigma$ -equivalent AFs. This problem can be solved, for in-

stance by the naive algorithm explained above. However, the problem of developing a practical procedure remains. To tackle this issue, we examine which questions we need to ask and how many times we need to ask them. Therefore, it is relevant how the different semantics are related to each other and which characteristics they possess in general.

Another point that should be considered when examining the  $\sigma$ -equivalence of AFs is the restriction to a subset of AFs. For instance, self-attack-free or (odd-)cycle-free AFs could exhibit some interesting properties in the context of elicitation.

In terms of future work, when equivalent AFs have been sufficiently studied and corresponding algorithms have been developed, the next logical step would be to tackle more challenging problems. In particular, we can study the elicitation of strongly equivalent AFs [Oikarinen and Woltran, 2011] or even the elicitation of the exact original framework.

## 4 Conclusion

In the course of this paper, we introduced the problem of eliciting attacks in argumentation frameworks. We regard a scenario with an agent who “knows” an AF and we want to uncover it by asking the agent a number of questions. Similar to the field of preference elicitation, where the goal is to uncover an agent’s preferences, the goal in AF elicitation is to uncover an agent’s AF. As the reconstruction of the exact AF is highly challenging, we first focus on eliciting frameworks that are equivalent wrt. a semantics  $\sigma$ . It should be emphasized that we consider an interactive scenario in which we can choose which questions about an existing AF should be asked, i.e., which pieces of information are taken into account when constructing an equivalent AF.

The newly introduced elicitation scenario raises the question whether it is possible at all to construct a  $\sigma$ -equivalent AF, given a set of questions. We showed that this is in fact possible by providing a naive algorithm. However, the need for practical algorithms to elicit  $\sigma$ -equivalent AFs remains. Thus, we research the characteristics of the different semantics and the connections between them in order to develop algo-

rithms which only require a minimal amount of questions.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Tjitze Rienstra for the inspiration for this line of research.

## References

- [Besnard and Doutre, 2004] Besnard, P. and Doutre, S. (2004). Characterization of semantics for argument systems. In *KR*, pages 183–193.
- [Chen and Pu, 2004] Chen, L. and Pu, P. (2004). Survey of preference elicitation methods. Technical report. EPFL-REPORT-52659.
- [Dung, 1995] 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.
- [Dunne et al., 2015] Dunne, P. E., Dvořák, W., Linsbichler, T., and Woltran, S. (2015). Characteristics of multiple viewpoints in abstract argumentation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 228:153–178.
- [Kido and Liao, 2019] Kido, H. and Liao, B. (2019). A bayesian approach to direct and inverse abstract argumentation problems. *CoRR*, abs/1909.04319.
- [Niskanen et al., 2019] Niskanen, A., Wallner, J., and Järvisalo, M. (2019). Synthesizing argumentation frameworks from examples. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 66:503–554.
- [Oikarinen and Woltran, 2011] Oikarinen, E. and Woltran, S. (2011). Characterizing strong equivalence for argumentation frameworks. *Artificial intelligence*, 175(14-15):1985–2009.
- [Oren and Norman, 2009] Oren, N. and Norman, T. J. (2009). Arguing using opponent models. In *International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems*, pages 160–174. Springer.

- [Rienstra et al., 2013] Rienstra, T., Thimm, M., and Oren, N. (2013). Opponent models with uncertainty for strategic argumentation. In *IJCAI 2013, Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Beijing, China, August 3-9, 2013*, pages 332–338.
- [Riveret and Governatori, 2016] Riveret, R. and Governatori, G. (2016). On learning attacks in probabilistic abstract argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Autonomous Agents & Multiagent Systems*, pages 653–661.