

# Consistency Principles for Sequential Abstract Argumentation

Timotheus Kampik

Umeå University, Sweden

## Abstract

This paper presents a principle-based perspective on ensuring consistency in sequential abstract argumentation, in which an abstract argumentation framework is iteratively *resolved* by determining its extensions and then (normally) *expanded* by adding new arguments and attacks (without changing attacks between existing arguments). As a starting point, we take *reference independence* – a key property in microeconomic theory – and derive an abstract argumentation principle from it to (roughly) stipulate that “if no new argument is accepted our conclusion remains the same”. Moreover, we introduce the cautious monotony principle, which can be colloquialized as “if no new argument attacks our conclusion we do not reject any part of this conclusion”. Cautious monotony is satisfied by many admissible set-based semantics and is not well-aligned with naive set-based semantics, whereas reference independence is satisfied by at least one of the naive set-based semantics (CF2 semantics), but is not well-aligned with the notion of admissibility.

## 1 Introduction

In the symbolic artificial intelligence community, formal argumentation has emerged as a popular approach to instill reasoning capabilities into intelligent systems. A foundational method of formal argumentation is *abstract argumentation* [Dung, 1995]. An abstract argumentation framework is a tuple of a set of atomic arguments and a binary relation (*attacks*) on these arguments. For example, when

we construct the argumentation framework  $AF = (AR, AT) = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, b)\})$ , we have the arguments  $a$  and  $b$ , and argument  $b$  is attacked by argument  $a$ . Arguments can be, for example, epistemic (let  $a$  denote the fact that it rains) or utilitarian (let  $b$  denote the action of leaving the house without an umbrella). To determine which sets of arguments in an argumentation framework can be considered valid conclusions, argumentation semantics have been defined. While it is clear that the only set of conclusions that results from the argumentation framework  $AF$  is  $\{a\}$ , determining conclusions is not trivial for cyclic argumentation frameworks. For example, in the argumentation framework  $AF' = (AR', AT') = (\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\})$ , either no arguments ( $\{\}$ ), or any of the sets  $\{a\}$ ,  $\{b\}$ , or  $\{c\}$  can be considered conclusions (depending on the semantics). Consequently, an argumentation semantics can return several argument sets that can potentially be considered valid for a given framework. Note that  $AF'$  is a *normal expansion* of  $AF$  (denoted by  $AF \preceq_N AF'$ ), i.e.,  $AR \subseteq AR', AT \subseteq AT', \forall (a, b) \in AT' \setminus AT, a \in AR' \setminus AR \vee b \in AR' \setminus AR$ . Given an argumentation framework  $AF = (AR, AT)$ , a set  $S \subseteq AR$  is conflict-free, iff there is no attack between any arguments  $a, b \in S$ . A set  $S \subseteq AR$  is admissible iff it is conflict-free and its arguments attack all arguments in  $AR$  that attack  $S$ ; a set is naive iff it is  $\subseteq$ -maximal among conflict-free subsets of  $AR$ . A set  $S \subseteq AR$  is a preferred extension of  $AF$  iff it is  $\subseteq$ -maximal among all admissible sets in  $AF$ . Preferred semantics determines the preferred *extensions* of  $AF$ . Let us denote all preferred extensions of  $AF$  by  $\sigma_{pref}(AF)$ . Given the two example frameworks above, we have

$\sigma_{pref}(AF) = \{\{a\}\}$  and  $\sigma_{pref}(AF') = \{\{\}\}$ .

Many argumentation semantics exist, and it is often not clear which semantics is the most suitable one for a specific application scenario. Consequently, an important line of research on abstract argumentation is the identification of *argumentation principles* – formal properties of argumentation semantics – and the evaluation of argumentation semantics w.r.t. these principles [van der Torre and Vesic, 2017]. In our line of research, we add a new perspective to principle-based evaluation by introducing the *reference independence* principle, which serves as the point of departure for more research at the intersection of abstract argumentation and formal models of economic rationality. We derive this principle from the property of the same name that is a cornerstone of the *rational man* paradigm in microeconomic theory (see [Rubinstein, 1998]). Roughly speaking, when choosing items from a set  $S$ , a rational-decision maker’s choice  $A^* \subseteq S$  implies that the decision-maker prefers  $A^*$  over all other sets in  $2^S$ . When choosing from another set that potentially intersects with  $S$ , the implied preferences must be consistent.

**Example 1.** For instance, when we have an agent who can choose to consume items from a set containing tea and juice ( $\{t, j\}$ ), her choice of juice ( $\{j\}$ ) implies  $\{j\}$  is preferred over all other sets in  $2^{\{t, j\}}$ . Let us assume that on another occasion, a third item – a donut – is present in the set, all other things being the same as before. Our agent chooses tea and a donut ( $\{t, d\}$  from  $\{t, j, d\}$ ). The choice implies that  $\{t, d\}$  is preferred over all other sets in  $2^{\{t, j, d\}}$ , which is consistent with the previous choice. However, were she to choose tea ( $\{t\}$  from  $\{t, j, d\}$ ), the preference  $\{t\}$  over  $\{j\}$  would be inconsistent with the previously established preference  $\{j\}$  over  $\{t\}$ .

Note that in our interpretation of the rational man model, the set of choice items does not necessarily need to refer to physical goods, but can also model courses of action, or beliefs that can be adopted or discarded. Our ambition to better integrate abstract argumentation and formal models of economic decision-making can be considered a natural continuation of work presented in the initial seminal paper on abstract argumentation, which applies argumen-

tation to the stable marriage problem of cooperative game theory [Dung, 1995].

Let us introduce and motivate the concept of reference independence in abstract argumentation with the help of a simple example.

**Example 2.** Let us assume the role of a strategy advisor (human or IT system) in a large corporation. We propose the launch of new products to a decision-maker who has the final say. At the moment, we are considering the launch of the products  $a'$  or  $b'$ .  $a'$  and  $b'$  are similar; however, studies show that  $a'$  is expected to outperform  $b'$ . We model this assessment as an argumentation framework  $AF = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, b)\})$ , where  $a$  means “launch  $a'$ ” and  $b$  means “launch  $b'$ ”. Let us assume we resolve  $AF$  using preferred semantics  $\sigma_{pref}$ , i.e.,  $\sigma_{pref}(AF) = \{\{a\}\}$ . Consequently, we tell the decision-maker that she can launch  $a'$ .

Now, let us assume the decision-maker postpones her decision and asks us to come back some time later with an updated analysis. In the meantime, a new product  $c'$  is prototyped and evaluated in terms of market fit by our R&D department. According to the evaluation, the target consumer group typically prefers buying  $c'$  over  $a'$ , while they typically prefer  $b'$  over  $c'$ :  $AF' = (\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\})$ . We again use preferred semantics, i.e.,  $\sigma_{pref}(AF') = \{\{\}\}$ . However, it is clear that the decision-maker will question our sanity if we recommend her to launch no product now that more potential options are on the table<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, the adjustment of our decision outcome from “ $a'$ ” to “nothing” ( $\{\}$ ) is inconsistent with the reference independence principle in microeconomic theory: the addition of the irrelevant alternatives  $2^{AR'} \setminus 2^{AR}$  of argument sets we can potentially consider as acceptable makes us switch from accepting  $\{a\}$  ( $\{a\}$  is preferred over  $\{\}$ ) to accepting  $\{\}$  ( $\{\}$  is preferred over  $\{a\}$ ). Figure 1 depicts the example’s argumentation frameworks.

In this line of research we aim to address the problem the example highlights, while also exploring alternative ways to ensure consistency.

<sup>1</sup>A better recommendation would be to delay the decision until more intelligence is gathered. Still, it makes sense to be able to make a somewhat reasonable decision at any point.




Figure 1: Reference dependence:  $\sigma_{pref}(AF) = \{\{a\}\}$  and  $\sigma_{pref}(AF') = \{\{\}\}$ . The addition of the rejected argument  $c$  makes us discard the extension  $\{a\}$  in favor of  $\{\}$ .

## 2 Consistency Principles

The motivation of the reference independence principle is to assess whether a decision-making outcome can be considered “reasonable”. In the domain of non-monotonic reasoning, the cautious monotony principle has been defined with a similar objective [Gabbay, 1985], but without making the connection to economic decision theory. In our work, we introduce these principles to abstract argumentation. We define *strong* and *weak* cautious monotony properties, similarly to the way C yras and Toni have defined cautious monotony in the context of *assumption-based argumentation* [C yras and Toni, 2015]. Let us have an argumentation semantics  $\sigma$ , two argumentation frameworks  $AF = (AR, AT)$  and  $AF' = (AR', AT')$ ,  $AF \preceq_N AF'$ , and their extensions  $\sigma(AF)$  and  $\sigma(AF')$ . We can colloquially describe cautious monotony as follows. For each extension  $E$  in  $\sigma(AF)$ , we “adjust”  $AF'$  and get an  $AF''$  in which all “new” attacks (that are in  $AF'$ , but not in  $AF$ ) to  $E$  are removed.

- $\sigma$  is **strongly cautiously monotonous** iff all extensions  $E'' \in \sigma(AF'')$  contain  $E$ .
- $\sigma$  is **(weakly) cautiously monotonous** iff there exists an extension  $E'' \in \sigma(AF'')$  that contains  $E$ .

Let us highlight that other notions of *relaxed* monotony can be defined according to the same

scheme: “if condition  $c$  holds true then our inference is monotonic”. Somewhat analogously, we can describe reference independence as follows. Again, we have an argumentation semantics  $\sigma$ , two argumentation frameworks  $AF = (AR, AT)$  and  $AF' = (AR', AT')$ ,  $AF \preceq_N AF'$ , and their extensions  $\sigma(AF)$  and  $\sigma(AF')$ .

- **Strong reference independence.** For each extension  $E$  in  $\sigma(AF)$ , the preferences over the argument sets in  $2^{AR \cap AR'}$  implied by all extensions in  $\sigma(AF')$  are consistent with the preferences implied by  $E$ .
- **(Weak) reference independence.** For each extension  $E$  in  $\sigma(AF)$ , the preferences over the argument sets in  $2^{AR \cap AR'}$  implied by at least one extension in  $\sigma(AF')$  are consistent with the preferences implied by  $E$ .

In [Kampik and Nieves, 2021a], we provide a comprehensive formal comparison of reference independence and other non-monotonic reasoning properties in the context of abstract argumentation. We also show that most (but not all) argumentation semantics are not weakly reference independent; a notable semantics that satisfies weak reference independence is CF2 semantics [Baroni et al., 2005]. By considering the argumentation frameworks  $AF = (\{a\}, \{\})$  and  $AF' = (\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\})$  it is clear that any admissible set-based semantics  $\sigma_{adm}$  does not satisfy weak reference independence, assuming every  $\sigma_{adm}$ -extension always contains all unattacked arguments, from which it follows that  $\sigma(AF) = \{\{a\}\}$  and  $\sigma(AF') = \{\{\}\}$ . In contrast, any naive set-based semantics  $\sigma_n$  whose extensions always contain all unattacked arguments do not satisfy weak cautious monotony, consider  $AF'$  and  $AF'' = (\{a, b, c, d\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (d, a)\})$  and consequently  $\sigma_n(AF') = \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}\}$  and  $\sigma_n(AF'') = \{\{d, b\}\}$ . Table 1 gives an overview of semantics that satisfy/violate weak reference independence and/or cautious monotony. See [Baroni et al., 2018] for the semantics definitions.

Table 1: Satisfaction of Weak Reference Independence (WRI) and Weak Cautious Monotony (WCM) by different argumentation semantics.

	WRI	WCM
<b>Complete</b>	X	✓
<b>Preferred</b>	X	✓
<b>Stable</b>	X	X
<b>Grounded</b>	X	✓
<b>Semi-stable</b>	X	✓
<b>Ideal</b>	X	✓
<b>Eager</b>	X	✓
<b>Naive</b>	✓	✓
<b>Stage</b>	X	X
<b>CF2</b>	✓	X
<b>Stage2</b>	X	X

### 3 Ensuring Consistency Principles

Strong reference independence is a property that is unrealistic to obtain, using only abstract argumentation. However, in *sequential* argumentation scenarios, we can draw inferences that resemble strong reference independence (*i.e.*, economically rational behavior) by making use of concepts introduced by Gabbay for the purpose of *loop-busting* [Gabbay, 2014]. We go back to Example 2, starting with  $AF = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, b)\})$ , which we resolve using preferred semantics as  $\sigma_{pref}(AF) = \{\{a\}\}$ . Because we have exactly one extension, we decide that  $\{a\}$  is the set of valid arguments (*i.e.*, we recommend launching product  $a'$ ). When resolving the expanded framework  $AF' = (\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\})$ ,  $\sigma_{pref}(AF')$  returns  $\{\{\}\}$ . This implies inconsistent preferences with regards to how we have resolved  $AF$  (as explained in Example 1). Hence, we create an argumentation framework  $AF'_{an}$ , in which an *annihilator argument* is added to  $AF'$ , such that we have exactly one extension  $E \in \sigma(AF'_{an})$  and  $E \setminus \{an\}$  is an extension of  $AF'$  that implies consistent preferences with the extension  $\{a\}$  we have previously determined for  $AF$ . For example, we can define  $AF'_{an}$  as  $(\{a, b, c, an\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (an, c)\})$  so that  $\sigma_{pref}(AF'_{an}) = \{\{a, an\}\}$ . Given the only extension  $E = \{a, an\}$ , we have  $E \setminus \{an\} = \{a\}$ .




Figure 2:  $AF'_{an}$ . Solving the problem depicted in Figure 1. The annihilator approach enables us to achieve reference independence.

$E \setminus \{an\}$  is our final extension of  $AF'$ . Figure 2 depicts the argumentation  $AF'_{an}$ . In ongoing research, we work on defining formal approaches to ensure reference independence, as well as other non-monotonic reasoning principles, when resolving *sequences* of argumentation frameworks for semantics that do not fulfill these principles in general. We present an implementation of an argumentation reasoner that allows to ensure reference independence (and cautious monotony) in [Kampik and Gabbay, 2020]. In [Kampik and Nieves, 2021b], we provide an overview of how cautious monotony and reference independence can facilitate approximate agreements in argumentation scenarios, in which different agents may use different argumentation semantics.

### 4 Conclusion and Future Work

Future research can apply the reference independence principle to the proposed *ordering-based* semantics that intend to establish a preorder on the arguments in an argumentation framework [Skiba, 2020] and devise additional relaxed monotony principles, for example based on the notion of the *burden of persuasion* in legal reasoning [Calegari et al., 2021]. On another research frontier, this line of work can potentially enable the introduction of formal argumentation as a model of economic decision-making to the microeconomics community.

#### Acknowledgements

This paper is a revision of *Economic Rationality and Abstract Argumentation* as presented in OHAAI Vol. 1. Thanks to D. Gabbay and J.C. Nieves. The work is supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

## References

- [Baroni et al., 2018] Baroni, P., Caminada, M., and Giacomin, M. (2018). Abstract argumentation frameworks and their semantics. In Baroni, P., Gabbay, D., Massimiliano, G., and van der Torre, L., editors, *Handbook of Formal Argumentation. College Publications*, chapter 4, pages 159–236.
- [Baroni et al., 2005] Baroni, P., Giacomin, M., and Guida, G. (2005). Scc-recursiveness: a general schema for argumentation semantics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 168(1):162 – 210.
- [Calegari et al., 2021] Calegari, R., Riveret, R., and Sartor, G. (2021). The burden of persuasion in structured argumentation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law, ICAIL '21*, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Čyras and Toni, 2015] Čyras, K. and Toni, F. (2015). Non-monotonic inference properties for assumption-based argumentation. In Black, E., Modgil, S., and Oren, N., editors, *Theory and Applications of Formal Argumentation*, pages 92–111, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- [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.
- [Gabbay, 2014] Gabbay, D. (2014). The handling of loops in argumentation networks. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 26(4):1065–1147.
- [Gabbay, 1985] Gabbay, D. M. (1985). Theoretical foundations for non-monotonic reasoning in expert systems. In Apt, K. R., editor, *Logics and Models of Concurrent Systems*, pages 439–457, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Kampik and Gabbay, 2020] Kampik, T. and Gabbay, D. (2020). Towards diarg: An argumentation-based dialogue reasoning engine. In *SAFA@ COMMA*.
- [Kampik and Nieves, 2021a] Kampik, T. and Nieves, J. C. (2021a). Abstract argumentation and the rational man. *Journal of Logic and Computation*. exab003.
- [Kampik and Nieves, 2021b] Kampik, T. and Nieves, J. C. (2021b). *Toward Consistent Agreement Approximation in Abstract Argumentation and Beyond*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC.
- [Rubinstein, 1998] Rubinstein, A. (1998). *Modeling bounded rationality*. MIT Press.
- [Skiba, 2020] Skiba, K. (2020). Towards ordering sets of arguments. In *SSA@ COMMA*, page 16.
- [van der Torre and Vesic, 2017] van der Torre, L. and Vesic, S. (2017). The principle-based approach to abstract argumentation semantics. *If-CoLog Journal of Logics and Their Applications*, 4(8).