

SOLID SEMANTICS AND EXTENSION AGGREGATION USING QUOTA RULES UNDER INTEGRITY CONSTRAINTS

Xiaolong Liu[†], Weiwei Chen[†]

[†]Institute of Logic and Cognition and Department of Philosophy, Sun Yat-sen University

Introduction

In this paper, we propose solid admissibility that is a strengthened version of Dung's admissibility [4] to obtain the most acceptable set of arguments. Besides, other solid extensions based on solid admissibility are defined. Such extensions not only include all defenders of its elements but also exclude all arguments indirectly attacked and indirectly defended by some argument(s). We also aggregate solid extensions by using approaches from judgment aggregation. Especially, although no quota rule preserves Dung's admissibility for any argumentation framework [2], we show that there exist quota rules preserve solid admissibility for any argumentation framework.

Basic Definitions

Argumentation Framework. An argumentation framework AF is a pair $\langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$, where Arg is a finite and non-empty set of arguments, and \rightarrow is a binary relation on Arg . For any $A, B \in Arg$, $A \rightarrow B$ (or A attacks B) denotes that $(A, B) \in \rightarrow$.

Indirect attack and defense. An argument A indirectly defends an argument B iff there exists a finite sequence A_0, \dots, A_{2n} such that (i) $B = A_0$ and $A = A_{2n}$, and (ii) for each i , $0 \leq i < 2n$, $A_{i+1} \rightarrow A_i$. An argument A is controversial w.r.t. an argument B iff A indirectly attacks and indirectly defends B . Note that direct attackers (resp. defenders) are also indirect attackers (resp. defenders).

Defense Function and Neutrality Function. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. The defense function $d: 2^{Arg} \rightarrow 2^{Arg}$ of AF is defined as:

$$d(\Delta) = \{C \in Arg \mid \Delta \text{ defends } C\}. \quad (1)$$

The neutrality function $n: 2^{Arg} \rightarrow 2^{Arg}$ of AF is defined as:

$$n(\Delta) = \{B \in Arg \mid \text{NOT } \Delta \rightarrow B\}. \quad (2)$$

Dung's Semantics. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. For any $\Delta \subseteq Arg$, (i) Δ is a conflict-free extension iff $\Delta \subseteq n(\Delta)$; (ii) Δ is a self-defending extension iff $\Delta \subseteq d(\Delta)$; (iii) Δ is an admissible extension iff $\Delta \subseteq n(\Delta)$ and $\Delta \subseteq d(\Delta)$; (iv) Δ is a complete extension iff $\Delta \subseteq n(\Delta)$ and $\Delta = d(\Delta)$; (v) Δ is a preferred extension iff Δ is a maximal admissible extension; (vi) Δ is a stable extension iff $\Delta = n(\Delta)$; (vii) Δ is the grounded extension iff Δ is the least fixed point of the defense function d .

Aggregation Model. A property σ of extensions can be regarded as a subset of 2^{Arg} , namely, $\sigma \subseteq 2^{Arg}$. Then the set of the extensions under a semantics is a property, e.g., completeness is the set of the complete extensions of AF . For any formula φ in \mathcal{L}_{AF} , we let $\text{Mod}(\varphi) = \{\Delta \subseteq Arg \mid \Delta \models \varphi\}$, namely, $\text{Mod}(\varphi)$ denotes the set of all models of φ . Obviously, $\sigma = \text{Mod}(\varphi)$ is a property. When using a formula φ to characterize such a property, φ is referred to as an integrity constraint.

Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a finite set of agents. Suppose that each agent $i \in N$ reports an extension $\Delta_i \subseteq Arg$. Then $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n)$ is referred to as a profile of extensions. An aggregation rule is a function $F: (2^{Arg})^n \rightarrow 2^{Arg}$, mapping any given profile of extensions to a subset of Arg .

Quota rules. Let N be a finite set of n agents, and let $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The quota rule with quota q is defined as the aggregation rule mapping any given profile $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n) \in (2^{Arg})^n$ of extensions to the set including exactly those arguments accepted by at least q agents:

$$F_q(\Delta) = \{A \in Arg \mid \#\{i \in N \mid A \in \Delta_i\} \geq q\}. \quad (3)$$

Preservation. Let $\sigma \subseteq 2^{Arg}$ be a property of extensions of AF . Then an aggregation rule $F: (2^{Arg})^n \rightarrow 2^{Arg}$ for n agents is said to preserve σ if $F(\Delta) \in \sigma$ for every profile $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n) \in \sigma^n$.

Solid Semantics

To obtain the most acceptable arguments, we formally introduce solid admissibility in this section. We argue that the most acceptable arguments should satisfy two criteria: (i) they should have defenders as many as possible, and (ii) they should avoid the undesirable interference of some arguments. We will show that arguments in admissible extensions satisfy the criteria. Firstly, we strengthen Dung's defense. A set of arguments solidly defends an argument iff this set defends (in Dung's sense) this argument and contains all the defenders of each element of this set.

Solid defense. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. $\Delta \subseteq Arg$ solidly defends (or s -defends) $C \in Arg$ iff for any $B \in Arg$, if $B \rightarrow C$, then $\Delta \rightarrow B$ and $\bar{B} \subseteq \Delta$.

Solid defense function. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. The solid defense function $d_s: 2^{Arg} \rightarrow 2^{Arg}$ of AF is defined as follows. For any $\Delta \subseteq Arg$:

$$d_s(\Delta) = \{C \in Arg \mid \Delta \text{ s-defends } C\} \quad (4)$$

Dung's Fundamental Lemma has a counterpart in solid semantics. The following lemma states that when we have a s-admissible extension, if we put into this extension an argument that is s-defended by this extension, then the new set is still a s-admissible extension.

S-Fundamental Lemma. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$, a s-admissible extension $\Delta \subseteq Arg$, and two arguments $C, C' \in Arg$ which are s-defended by Δ . Then (i) $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \{C\}$ is s-admissible and (ii) Δ' s-defends C' .

Solid admissibility. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. $\Delta \subseteq Arg$ is a s -admissible extension iff $\Delta \subseteq n(\Delta)$ and $\Delta \subseteq d_s(\Delta)$.

The definition above states that a set of arguments is a s-admissible extension iff the set is conflict-free and s-defends each of its elements.

We develop some solid semantics based on solid admissibility. These semantics strengthen Dung's semantics in the sense that for a solid extension Δ , there exists a Dung's extension Γ such that Δ is a subset of Γ .

Solid semantics. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. For any $\Delta \subseteq Arg$:

- (i) Δ is a s -complete extension iff $\Delta \subseteq n(\Delta)$ and $\Delta = d_s(\Delta)$;
- (ii) Δ is a s -preferred extension iff Δ is a maximal s-admissible extension;
- (iii) Δ is a s -stable extension iff $\Delta = n(\Delta)$ and for any argument $A \notin \Delta$, $\bar{A} \subseteq \Delta$;
- (iv) Δ is the s -grounded extension iff Δ is the least fixed point of d_s .

Characterization for Solid Semantics

We can capture solid semantics by using propositional formulas with the techniques in [1]. These formula are used for aggregation in the next section. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. For any $\Delta \subseteq Arg$,

- Δ is s-self-defending iff $\Delta \models IC_{SS}$ where $IC_{SS} \equiv \bigwedge_{C \in Arg} [C \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\substack{B \in Arg \\ B \rightarrow C}} ((\bigvee_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} A) \wedge (\bigwedge_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} \bar{A}))]$;
- Δ is s-reinstating iff $\Delta \models IC_{SR}$ where $IC_{SR} \equiv \bigwedge_{C \in Arg} [\bigwedge_{\substack{B \in Arg \\ B \rightarrow C}} ((\bigvee_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} A) \wedge (\bigwedge_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} \bar{A})) \rightarrow C]$;
- Δ is s-stable iff $\Delta \models IC_{SST}$ where $IC_{SST} \equiv \bigwedge_{B \in Arg} [(B \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} \bar{A}) \wedge (\bar{B} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\substack{A \in Arg \\ A \rightarrow B}} A)]$;
- Δ is s-admissible iff $\Delta \models IC_{SA}$ where $IC_{SA} \equiv IC_{CF} \wedge IC_{SS}$;
- Δ is s-complete iff $\Delta \models IC_{SC}$ where $IC_{SC} \equiv IC_{SA} \wedge IC_{SR}$;
- Δ is s-preferred iff Δ is a maximal model of IC_{SA} ;
- Δ is s-grounded iff Δ is the least model of IC_{SC} .

Main Results

From a skeptical view, it is not cautious to accept an argument that is indirectly attacked and indirectly defended by some argument. But such arguments may be acceptable in Dung's semantics. Theorem 1 states that they never occur in s-admissible extensions. Interestingly, this theorem also guarantees that any argument in any odd-length cycle never occur in s-admissible extensions.

Theorem 1. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$ and a s-admissible extension $\Delta \subseteq Arg$. If an argument $A \in Arg$ is controversial w.r.t. an argument $B \in Arg$, then $B \notin \Delta$.

Although no quota rule preserves Dung's admissibility for any argumentation framework [2], we show that there exist quota rules (e.g. the strict majority rule) preserve solid admissibility for any argumentation framework.

Theorem 2. Given $AF = \langle Arg, \rightarrow \rangle$. Any quota rule F_q for n agents with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ preserves solid admissibility for AF .

Comparison




Fig. 1: An overview of solid semantics and Dung's semantics

We can tune the parameters for attackers and defenders to obtain defenses with different levels of strength in graded semantics [5]. But it is impossible to characterize solid semantics by tuning the parameters since different attackers may have different numbers of counter-attackers. In prudent semantics [3], whenever an argument A is controversial w.r.t. an argument B , both prudent semantics and solid semantics can prevent A and B from occurring in the same extension. But there is a difference between these two types of semantics. Both A and B can occur in a prudent extension separately. However, B is excluded from any s-admissible extension, while A might occur in some s-admissible extension.

References

- [1] Philippe Besnard and Sylvie Doutre. "Checking the acceptability of a set of arguments." In: *NMR*. Vol. 4. Citeseer. 2004, pp. 59–64.
- [2] Weiwei Chen and Ulle Endriss. "Aggregating Alternative Extensions of Abstract Argumentation Frameworks: Preservation Results for Quota Rules." In: *COMMA*. 2018, pp. 425–436.
- [3] Sylvie Coste-Marquis, Caroline Devred, and Pierre Marquis. "Prudent semantics for argumentation frameworks". In: *17th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI'05)*. IEEE. 2005, 5–pp.
- [4] Phan Minh Dung. "On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games". In: *Artificial Intelligence* 77.2 (1995), pp. 321–357.
- [5] Davide Grossi and Sanjay Modgil. "On the graded acceptability of arguments in abstract and instantiated argumentation". In: *Artificial Intelligence* 275 (2019), pp. 138–173.