

Learning defeat relations from data using Neural Argumentation Networks (NANs)

Jack Mumford

Department of Informatics, King's College London, UK
E-mail: jack.mumford@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

Neural Argumentation Networks (NANs) are artificial neural networks that learn according to abstract argumentation semantics to address the inverse argumentation problem. This paper describes the theory and application of translating complete argumentation semantics to NAN architectures and compares two distinct forms: 2-valued acceptability, and 3-valued acceptability. The σ -consistency problem is formally defined as a specific case of the inverse argumentation problem, where a solution defeat relation must be wholly consistent with a particular argumentation semantics and with a given input of argument labellings, with theoretical and experimental results described for both 2-valued and 3-valued variants of the problem. Attention is given to the more general noisy case of the inverse argumentation problem, with experimental results also provided for the 2-valued and 3-valued data types. Future work will extend to an array of argument relations including support and weighted approaches that could align with wider data sets and reasoning problems.

1 Introduction

Neural argumentation networks (NANs) [Mumford, 2020] are artificial neural networks (ANNs) that learn according to argumentation semantics. Argumentation, as a field within artificial intelligence, is highly relevant for researchers interested in symbolic representations of knowledge and defeasible reasoning [Bench-Capon and Dunne, 2007,

Rahwan and Simari, 2009]. Abstract argumentation frameworks (AFs) [Dung, 1995] are comprised of three components: {arguments, defeat relation, labellings}. The vast majority of related research has focused on what is termed the forward argumentation problem, which takes arguments and a defeat relation as input and produces argument acceptability labellings as output. However, this work is focused on the inverse argumentation problem [Kido and Liao, 2019], which takes arguments and labellings as input and produces a defeat relation as output. The inverse problem captures an inductive process that enables the calculation of a defeat relation without examination of structure or context, which would be particularly problematic for enthymemes — arguments with missing structure in the form of unstated premises or claims.

AFs offer a graph-based approach that determines logically consistent argument positions solely via defeat relations between the arguments. The shared graphical nature of AFs and ANNs make their union a sensible choice when looking to automate the processing of the inverse argumentation problem. There exists a one-one mapping between NANs and AFs in which attacks in the framework are represented by weights in the network (and vice versa). When a NAN learns and adjusts its weights according to input argument acceptability data, it learns a defeat relation. Argument acceptability data is formed of a set of labellings T , with each argument labelled according to its acceptability within each labelling $L_i \in T$.

Let us consider an example application of case law, which provides a potential context where arguments and

their acceptability labels for any given case may be known but the relation between them is undefined.

Example 1. A toy case law example using six arguments is shown in Table 1. Look closer at arguments a and b , there is an intuitive conflict but nothing in the structures of the arguments allows an attack to be inferred. However, a data driven approach may provide labellings in which the acceptability statuses of a and b will reveal a conflict and corresponding attack direction (guaranteed if relevant key labellings [Riveret and Governatori, 2016] are input).

Node	Argument
a	Forensics link suspect to murder weapon
b	Crime scene contaminated
c	Suspect convicted
d	Forensics link suspect to victim
e	Property recovered from suspect
f	Suspect has alibi

Table 1: Toy example arguments for use within different cases that form argument labellings.

Figure 1 portrays a suggested solution defeat relation for the arguments listed in Table 1. It is the objective of the inverse argumentation problem to seek out such a solution defeat relation, or some approximate solution if learning under noisy conditions. Note that a symmetric solution defeat relation is depicted in Figure 1 but this is purely due to the predilections of the author, and a conceptual asymmetric solution could have been proffered with all the NAN theory applying just as well.




Figure 1: Conceptual AF representing the solution defeat relation between arguments $\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$.

To date, all the work on NANs has used complete labelling semantics as the basis of the learning process, due to its superset relation with respect to the traditional major semantics [Baroni et al., 2011] and the intuition of representing the range of reasonable positions that are deterministic consequences of the defeat relation (which admissibility semantics does not guarantee).

In [Mumford, 2020], the broad theoretical and experimental contributions for the 2-valued and 3-valued attack

learning problems were outlined. The contribution of this paper is in outlining the advancements made:

1. Defining the σ -consistency problem.
2. Overhauling the experimental analysis to allow for partial labellings as input.

The remainder of the paper will outline these two contributions before discussing their relevance.

2 The σ -consistency problem

A special case of the inverse problem, the σ -consistency problem is only satisfied by a solution defeat relation R that is wholly consistent with input acceptability data for a given semantics σ . This special case is useful as a check that a given semantics is capable of expressing a defeat relation that would explain a set of extensions or labellings. The complexity of a σ -consistency problem with complete semantics (throughout the paper the ‘ σ -consistency problem’ refers only to complete semantics) depends on the type of input acceptability data, where 2-valued data is NP-complete and the 3-valued data can be processed within polynomial time complexity (both are solvable within quadratic space complexity). Note that it is beyond the scope of this paper to formally prove the complexities of the 2-valued and 3-valued σ -consistency problems. Definition 1 formalises the problems according to the reinstatement approach adopted in [Caminada, 2006], as well as the concept of a signature Σ_σ of a semantics σ in which Σ_σ gives the collection of all possible sets of extensions an AF can possess under semantics σ [Dunne et al., 2015].

Definition 1. (σ -consistency problem) Given a set of arguments A , a semantics σ , and a set of labellings T such that for each $L \in T$, $L : A \rightarrow \{\text{IN}, \text{NOTIN}, \text{OFF}\}$ for 2-valued data or for each $L \in T$, $L : A \rightarrow \{\text{IN}, \text{OUT}, \text{UNDEC}, \text{OFF}\}$ for 3-valued data; is there a defeat relation $R \subseteq A \times A$ consistent with T such that $\forall L : (L \in \Sigma_\sigma(S, R))$, where $S = A \setminus X$, and where X is the set of arguments labelled OFF?

An argument will be labelled OFF if it possesses no valid 2-valued or 3-valued label and does not affect the labelling of any other argument $a \in S : S \subset A$. In Example 1, it could be that $L(a) = \text{OFF}$ in a labelling that corresponds to a case without any murder, since there would

be no murder weapon. Hence a would not be a relevant argument to the case and would not affect the label of any other argument, and clearly cannot be labelled according to reinstatement principles as IN, UNDEC, or OUT. The OFF label allows us to build a corpus of arguments that will not generally be relevant to every labelling, but may be important in certain labellings within the wider data set.

3 Experimental results

Beyond theory, an experimental study of all relevant 3-valued and 2-valued NAN algorithms was performed with the use of data from the ICCMA2017 competition, which provided examples of AF s and associated argument extensions. The algorithms were trained on the argument labellings pertaining to the extension sets and the output defeat relations were compared to the ‘actual’ defeat relations from the original data to measure the defeat relation fidelity. Previous analysis had focused on extension-based data sets so that preferred, complete and grounded semantics could be compared as input types. The new analysis instead focused purely on complete semantics and adjusted the size and shape of the data set in terms of number of labellings and the proportion of arguments labelled OFF. Whilst the specifics of the various NAN algorithms are beyond the scope of this paper, online and offline algorithms were designed for 2-valued and 3-valued data types. The 3-valued input was also further divided in two types of algorithms: bulk algorithms where updates according to any given error are applied universally to all candidate weights in the NAN; gradualism algorithms that either incrementally update candidate weights, or select a candidate weight to update randomly or based on the shape of the data. The algorithms designed for noisy data were adapted from the 3-valued gradualism algorithms and the basic 2-valued algorithms.

It is possible to identify trends in defeat relation fidelity, measured by the Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) score, across 2-valued vs 3-valued data types for the σ -consistency problem (Figure 2) and the alternative noisy data problem (Figure 4), as well as across different partial labelling proportions. Figure 3 indicates the trends in defeat relation fidelity as the number of labellings within a data set is increased. Due to space, in




Figure 2: MCC score mean values over fixed-size input labellings varied by reinstatement labelling proportions (where the x-axis value represents the proportion of arguments in the labelling not labelled OFF). Left: 2-valued algorithms (benchmark: argumentation synthesis), right: 3-valued gradualism algorithms (benchmark: best result from bulk algorithms).




Figure 3: MCC score mean values over various-sized input labellings fixed at 0.5 proportion not labelled OFF (where the x-axis value represents the number of labellings in the data set). Left: 2-valued algorithms (benchmark: argumentation synthesis), right: 3-valued gradualism algorithms (benchmark: best result from bulk algorithms).

this paper, the analysis of the 3-valued bulk algorithms is omitted as their performance was superseded by that of the gradualism algorithms. Across all the plots a benchmark horizontal line provides context for the relative performances. Whilst time results were obtained, they are not included here, again for reasons of space. However, the benchmark argumentation synthesis implementation consistently required orders of magnitude higher time in order to derive a solution that could not be plotted alongside the 3-valued bulk and gradualism algorithms without losing perspective of the relative performances of the algorithms to one another. The 2-valued variants were more comparable to the argumentation synthesis benchmark, reflecting the NP-complete complexity of the associated σ -consistency problem. This trend continued for noisy data, with the 3-valued noisy algorithms being orders of magnitude quicker than the argumentation synthesis benchmark and the 2-valued noisy algorithms frequently requiring timeout stopping conditions. However, the timeouts of the benchmark were unable to result in intermediate solutions even after many hours of runtime, whereas even the 2-valued noisy algorithms could produce results after any arbitrary amount of runtime.




Figure 4: MCC score mean values over fixed-size input labellings fixed at 0.5 proportion not labelled OFF and varied by noise (where the x-axis value represents the proportion of noise in the argument labels). Left: 2-valued algorithms (benchmark: argumentation synthesis), right: 3-valued gradualism algorithms (benchmark: argumentation synthesis).

4 Discussion

The complexity of the σ -consistency problem, as portrayed in Table 2, is of particular interest when one considers the alternative complexity of solutions for noisy data, which in the case of argumentation synthesis [Niskanen et al., 2019] for complete semantics is conjectured to be NP-hard, regardless of whether the data input is 3-valued or 2-valued. This indicates that the nature of the σ -consistency problem is very different than for noisy alternatives. If one wants to ask whether a rational position exists that can fully capture a set of acceptability labellings, then algorithms and data aligned with the 3-valued σ -consistency problem should be sought.

Problem	Time complexity	Space complexity
3-valued	$O(n^2 T)$	$O(n^2)$
2-valued	NP-complete	$O(n^2)$

Table 2: Best-case complexities for the 3-valued and 2-valued σ -consistency problems, where n is the number of arguments and $|T|$ is the number of labellings. Proofs for these complexities is beyond the scope of this paper.

The experimental results further corroborate the intuition that 3-valued data is more desirable than the 2-valued variant. The MCC scores indicate that the 3-valued algorithms are able to conspicuously outperform the 2-valued algorithms in terms of defeat relation fidelity.

Of particular interest is the indication of an optimal size of partial labelling proportion, where around half of the arguments have a valid label. This observation appears to apply for 3-valued and 2-valued data, and across different data sets. Very high MCC scores were obtainable at these proportions, further increasing as the number of labellings in the data sets was able to grow. Combined with the relatively low time requirements, particularly when compared with the frequent timeout failures of the argumentation synthesis benchmark, these results are very promising for

the scalability of the approach for σ consistent as well as noisy solutions.

When compared with the benchmark, the advantages of the 3-valued data and associated algorithms in terms of efficiency and defeat relation fidelity were plain to see. However, the evaluation is limited since the benchmark was restricted to 2-valued data and could not process partial labellings, so a like-for-like comparison was not possible. Nonetheless, for the σ -consistency problem algorithms and the noisy variants, the limited like-for-like comparison strongly suggested the merits of the NAN approach, especially for 3-valued data.

5 Conclusion

This paper has expanded on the concept of neural argumentation networks (NANs) [Mumford, 2020] that address the problem of calculating a defeat relation based on consistency with input argument acceptability data. Two salient expansions were addressed:

1. Defined the σ -consistency problem, where an exactly consistent defeat relation is necessary.
2. Overhauled the experimental analysis to allow for partial labellings as input.

The advantages of reduced complexity and superior defeat relation fidelity derived from using 3-valued data, as opposed to 2-valued data, are apparent from theoretical and empirical results for the σ -consistency problem and for noisy solutions. The scalability and quality of the NAN approach is highlighted by the favourable comparison to the Max-Sat argumentation synthesis benchmark implementation.

The research is relevant in the scope that defeat relations are essential for the construction of argumentation frameworks. The NAN algorithms are proffered as a means of calculating such defeat relations when prior knowledge and extraction from the argument structure is not reliable. Further research is needed to examine the impact of the algorithms with real domains and to evaluate the effects of enriching the algorithms with alternative mechanisms such as support and weighted argumentation.

Acknowledgements

The research described by this short paper could not have been possible without their influence and/or contribution: E. Black, K. Mumford, S. Parsons and I. Sassoon.

[Riveret and Governatori, 2016] Riveret, R. and Governatori, G. (2016). On learning attacks in probabilistic abstract argumentation. In *AAMAS*, pages 653–661.

References

- [Baroni et al., 2011] Baroni, P., Caminada, M., and Giacomin, M. (2011). An introduction to argumentation semantics. *Knowledge Engineering Review*, 26(4):365.
- [Bench-Capon and Dunne, 2007] Bench-Capon, T. J. and Dunne, P. E. (2007). Argumentation in artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(10-15):619–641.
- [Caminada, 2006] Caminada, M. (2006). On the issue of reinstatement in argumentation. In *European Workshop on Logics in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 111–123.
- [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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04319*.
- [Mumford, 2020] Mumford, J. (2020). Crafting neural argumentation networks. *Online Handbook of Argumentation for AI*, page 22.
- [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.
- [Rahwan and Simari, 2009] Rahwan, I. and Simari, G. R. (2009). *Argumentation in artificial intelligence*, volume 47. Springer.