

Approximate Solutions to Argumentation Frameworks with Graph Neural Networks

Lars Malmqvist

Department of Computer Science, University of York

Abstract

The research project presented in this article focuses on applying methods from Graph Neural Network research to the approximation of classic decision problems in Abstract Argumentation. It takes as its basis the four semantics described originally by Dung and other well-known semantics from the literature on Abstract Argumentation. The research addresses the problems of credulous and sceptical acceptance by applying a range of methods in the Graph Neural Network space to achieve up to 97% accuracy on the approximation of argument acceptability using a dataset taken from past ICCMA competitions. Further research is ongoing to improve these results and expand on their applicability.

1 Introduction

Abstract Argumentation is a formalism for non-monotonic reasoning that bases its representation on the modelling of conflict. It is typically represented in the form of a directed graph in which vertices represent arguments and edges a relation of attack. This gives rise to a range of reasoning problems that determine the acceptability of arguments or the joint acceptability of sets of arguments. The majority of these reasoning problems are known to be NP-hard [Charwat et al., 2015, Woltran, 2014].

The research's core problem is to merge particular research strands within deep learning with research on Abstract Argumentation. In particular, Graph

Neural Networks [Wu et al., 2020] of various types (e.g. Graph Convolutional Networks) are well suited to addressing the graph-structured problems encountered in Abstract Argumentation. That means finding ways of solving frameworks and queries that because of their size or graph topology are challenging for existing solvers to address. Finding an efficient way of learning to solve argumentation problems via machine learning is itself an unsolved problem.

The vast majority of solution approaches in Abstract Argumentation are exact and complete, often using reduction to some other formalism such as SAT [Cerutti et al., 2014] or ASP [Cerutti et al., 2017] to solve the problem. In general, SAT-based approaches have achieved the best solver performance, but this type of approach does not necessarily provide the easiest fit with real-world deployment scenarios and very large scale datasets. There has been some research into probabilistic methods [Thimm, 2018], which unfortunately is not directly comparable to this research because of differences in evaluation criteria and datasets, and a single feasibility study into using Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN) [Kuhlmann and Thimm, 2019] that had mixed results depending on the dataset under consideration.

There are, however, major benefits to approximate approaches such as Graph Neural Networks in this area that makes them worth considering in some cases. In particular, they have greatly superior run-time performance and are more easily integrated into heavily parallelised Cloud-based architectures, although this comes at the cost of large memory consumption and GPU support. The major contribu-

tion of this research is to show the viability of an approximate approach based on Graph Neural Networks. First, by showing that such an approach can achieve a reasonable degree of accuracy in predicting the acceptability status of arguments, and, second, by detailing a usable architecture for training deep learning models to solve problems in abstract argumentation that can serve as the starting point for further research.

2 Method

The research has so far focused on developing an approximate solver using an extension of Convolutional Graph Neural Networks [Wu et al., 2020]. Convolutional graph neural networks (CGNNs) draw on the popularity and success of traditional CNNs in particular in computer vision. However, there are different ways of defining the convolutional operation when applied to graphs, which gives rise to different types of CGNNs. The most common approach bases itself on the digital signal processing, where convolution is seen effectively as a noise removal operation. The difference between most variants in this approach including the seminal GCN architecture by Kipf and Welling [Kipf and Welling, 2019], ChebNet [Monti et al., 2017], and CaleyNet [Levie et al., 2019] consists mainly in how they represent, approximate and simplify the filter operations used in the convolution of the graph to achieve computational improvements. The second primary approach to CGNNs stays closer to the conventional CNN definition by considering convolution based on a node's spatial relationships [Wu et al., 2020]. That means spatial based methods in some way aggregates information from a node's neighbourhood. This approach can be seen, for instance, in the Message Passing Neural Network [Riba et al., 2018] that explicitly defines a framework for looking at graph convolution as a message-passing process.

The most successful architecture used to date in this research project builds and extends on the seminal approach introduced by Kipf and Welling [Kipf and Welling, 2019], but extends it in several areas. In the original formulation, the GCN consisted

of an input layer, two hidden layers with RELU nonlinearities inserted in between, and ending with an output layer. Node embeddings were generated using a propagation rule following a first-order approximation of spectral graph convolutions. The core components of the GCN architecture used in the paper summarising current results [Malmqvist et al., 2020] included the following elements, both incorporating and extending Kipf and Welling's method:

1. Graph Embeddings generated using DeepWalk [Perozzi et al., 2014], a random walk based method, fed as input features along with the adjacency matrix of the argumentation framework
2. An input layer receiving these inputs
3. 4 to 6 repeating blocks of a GCN layer [Kipf and Welling, 2019] and a Dropout layer [Srivastava et al., 2014]
4. Residual connections feeding the original features and the normalised adjacency matrix as additional input at each block
5. A Sigmoid output layer generating a probability for the acceptability of each argument in the framework

The model was trained using Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2015] with Binary Cross-Entropy as the loss function. The training regime used a combination of randomised training batches, dynamic rebalancing of the training data, and automated outlier exclusion to prevent overfitting and reach a high degree of accuracy.

3 Discussion

So far results have been published in a single article presented at SAFA2020 [Malmqvist et al., 2020]. The experiments in this paper were run against a dataset consisting of 900 argumentation frameworks selected from the ICCMA 2017¹ Benchmark datasets. The selection included frameworks from benchmark

¹<http://argumentationcompetition.org/2017/>




Figure 1: GCN Architecture Overview.

sets A, B, and C, including all five difficulty categories. Input frameworks contained up to 15,605 arguments and 6,250,500 attacks with an average number of arguments of 1,595 and an average number of attacks of 187,542. The dataset was divided into nine folds to facilitate the training process, and the neural net was trained sequentially on each fold. Training and validation sets were generated using a random mask, and 10% of graphs were held out as a test set for final evaluation.

The GCN model was evaluated using two separate tasks: credulous acceptability and sceptical acceptability under the preferred semantic. For an argument to be credulously acceptable in the context of a given argumentation framework, it must belong to one of the extensions of that argumentation framework; to be sceptically acceptable, it must belong to all. To be able to frame the problem for supervised learning, we generated ground truth solutions using the Pyglaf argumentation solver [Alviano, 2018] for all argumentation frameworks in the dataset. The models have only at this time been evaluated using the accuracy metric and other metrics would also be interesting to explore in the future.

All in all five different models were trained using different combinations of methods shown in Table 1.

The results for Credulous acceptability shown in Table 2 demonstrated the viability of a CGNN based

solver, although some improvement would be required in performance to make it usable in practice. The research also underlined that for approximate solvers the key problem is to find a way of achieving balanced performance between positive and negative instances of the decision problem. The great disparity in negative and positive instances in the training data, means that great care has to be taken during training to achieve this goal. The key contributions to GCN architecture that have been made so far in this research project have all been related to this goal. The same patterns were present to an even greater extent for sceptical acceptance as can be seen from Table 3.

Future work will focus on two strands of extension. First, it will be necessary to improve the solver's overall performance, in particular, to address the balancing problem better. Second, the approach here has only been applied to the preferred semantic. Extending this to all the semantics covered by the ICCMA competition is ongoing work in progress. It is possible that incorporating more semantic specific features into the machine learning approach will be required to achieve good results across all semantics.

Table 1: Models Trained

Model	Layers	Balanced	Randomised	Residuals
4-Layers Modified GCN	4	No	Yes	Yes
5-Layers Modified GCN	5	No	Yes	Yes
6-Layers Modified GCN	6	No	Yes	Yes
Mod GCN with Balanced Data	4	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mod GCN with Fixed Batches	4	No	No	Yes

Table 2: Results - Credulous Acceptability

Model	Accuracy		
	Overall	Yes	No
4-Layers Modified GCN	92,68%	69,33%	93,54%
5-Layers Modified GCN	92,26%	73,56%	92,95%
6-Layers Modified GCN	91,63%	71,81%	92,37%
Modified GCN with Balanced Data	81,20%	91,20%	71,00%
Modified GCN with Fixed Batches	96,40%	7,00%	99,70%
Kuhlmann and Thimm 2019 - Unbalanced	62,00%	10,00%	97,00%
Kuhlmann and Thimm 2019 - Balanced	63,00%	17,00%	93,00%

Table 3: Results - Sceptical Acceptability

Model	Accuracy		
	Overall	Yes	No
4-Layers Modified GCN	96,21%	24,04%	97,10%
5-Layers Modified GCN	96,20%	22,92%	97,11%
6-Layers Modified GCN	96,24%	22,69%	97,15%
Modified GCN with Balanced Data	97,15%	46,35%	94,39%
Modified GCN with Fixed Batches	98,44%	0,33%	99,66%

4 Conclusion

The research described here is part of an ongoing project that seeks to apply Deep Neural Network methods to Abstract Argumentation. Several other avenues are being explored including combining GNNs with Deep Reinforcement Learning, using approaches such as SATNet, and combining the outputs of the approximate solver with a classic SAT approach for verification or as an input heuristic. However, Graph Neural Networks is likely to remain the core method in any of these extended or augmented solution approaches.

References

- [Alviano, 2018] Alviano, M. (2018). The pyglaf argumentation reasoner. *OpenAccess Series in Informatics*, 58:2–5.
- [Cerutti et al., 2014] Cerutti, F., Dunne, P. E., Giacomini, M., and Vallati, M. (2014). Computing preferred extensions in abstract argumentation: A SAT-based approach. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, volume 8306 LNAI, pages 176–193.
- [Cerutti et al., 2017] Cerutti, F., Gaggl, S., Thimm, M., and Wallner, J. (2017). Foundations of implementations for formal argumentation. *If-CoLog Journal of Logics and their Applications*, 4(8):2623–2705.
- [Charwat et al., 2015] Charwat, G., Dvořák, W., Gaggl, S. A., Wallner, J. P., and Woltran, S. (2015). Methods for solving reasoning problems in abstract argumentation - A survey. *Artificial Intelligence*, 220:28–63.
- [Kingma and Ba, 2015] Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. L. (2015). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR 2015*, pages 1–15.
- [Kipf and Welling, 2019] Kipf, T. N. and Welling, M. (2019). Semi-supervised classification with graph

- convolutional networks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017 - Conference Track Proceedings*.
- [Kuhlmann and Thimm, 2019] Kuhlmann, I. and Thimm, M. (2019). Using Graph Convolutional Networks for Approximate Reasoning with Abstract Argumentation Frameworks: A Feasibility Study. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 11940 LNAI:24–37.
- [Levie et al., 2019] Levie, R., Monti, F., Bresson, X., and Bronstein, M. M. (2019). CayleyNets: Graph Convolutional Neural Networks with Complex Rational Spectral Filters. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(1):97–109.
- [Malmqvist et al., 2020] Malmqvist, L., Yuan, T., Nightingale, P., and Manandhar, S. (2020). Determining the acceptability of abstract arguments with graph convolutional networks. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 2672:47–56.
- [Monti et al., 2017] Monti, F., Boscaini, D., Masci, J., Rodolà, E., Svoboda, J., and Bronstein, M. M. (2017). Geometric deep learning on graphs and manifolds using mixture model CNNs. In *Proceedings - 30th IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017*, volume 2017-Janua, pages 5425–5434.
- [Perozzi et al., 2014] Perozzi, B., Al-Rfou, R., and Skiena, S. (2014). DeepWalk: Online learning of social representations. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 701–710.
- [Riba et al., 2018] Riba, P., Fischer, A., Lladós, J., and Fornés, A. (2018). Learning Graph Distances with Message Passing Neural Networks. In *Proceedings - International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, volume 2018-Augus, pages 2239–2244. IEEE.
- [Srivastava et al., 2014] Srivastava, N., Hinton, G., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Salakhutdinov, R. (2014). Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(56):1929–1958.
- [Thimm, 2018] Thimm, M. (2018). Stochastic local search algorithms for abstract argumentation under stable semantics. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 305:169–180.
- [Woltran, 2014] Woltran, S. (2014). Abstract Argumentation – All Problems Solved ? In *ECAI 2014*, pages 1–93.
- [Wu et al., 2020] Wu, Z., Pan, S., Chen, F., Long, G., Zhang, C., and Yu, P. S. (2020). A Comprehensive Survey on Graph Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pages 1–21.