

Coalition Formability Semantics with Conflict-Eliminable Sets of Arguments

Ryuta Arisaka¹ and Ken Satoh²

Abstract. We consider abstract-argumentation-theoretic coalition formability in this work. Taking a model in political alliance among political parties, we will contemplate profitability, and then formability, of a coalition. As is commonly understood, a group forms a coalition with another group for a greater good, the goodness measured against some criteria. As is also commonly understood, however, a coalition may deliver benefits to a group X at the sacrifice of something that X was able to do before coalition formation, which X may be no longer able to do under the coalition. Use of the typical conflict-free sets of arguments is not very fitting for this aspect of coalition, which prompts us to turn to a weaker notion, conflict-eliminability, as a property that a set of arguments should primarily satisfy. We require numerical quantification of attack strengths as well as of argument strengths for its characterisation. We will first analyse semantics of profitability of a given conflict-eliminable set forming a coalition with another conflict-eliminable set, and will then provide four coalition formability semantics, each of which formalises certain utility postulate(s) taking the coalition profitability into account.

1 Introduction

Coalition formation among agents is an important topic in many domains including economics, political science, and computer science. Two groups of agents, by teaming up together, could achieve a task which they cannot otherwise do on their own. Exploring abstract argumentation theory for finding an apt characterisation of coalition formability looks specially rewarding since it is reasonable that we regard a coalition as a set of arguments its members express. There are already a few papers in the literature looking at this subject matter: with preference-based argumentation frameworks and task allocations [1]; with a cooperative goal generation and fulfilling [11], respecting the property of reciprocity, i.e. agents give to the coalition they are in and benefit from it; and with dialogue games and pay-offs [30]. Shared by them is the theme of identifying a group of individual agents who optimise benefits (or social welfare) to themselves by being in the group. The optimal group thus formed is free of internal conflicts, and the participating agents do not have to give up anything by being a part. We consider this kind of a coalition supportive.

The sort of coalition formation we have in mind, on the other hand, is one that may be found in political alliance among political parties. Such alliance is motivated if, for example, political parties want to reach the voting threshold of passing certain bills or want to win

national elections. A political-alliance-like coalition exhibits the following unique characteristics:

More organisational than individual It is not possible to freely move agents across multiple political parties such as to connect those having close interests together for optimal political party formation. A participant to a political party is often expected to stay in the party during the parliament term. The assumption of self-interested agents as studied in [30] does not fit very well here. There are repercussions to profitability of a coalition, too, in that it is primarily for a party's, or parties', benefits than the participants' benefits that a political alliance is formed.

Partial internal conflicts Agents in a political party should support the party's agendas and policies. Hence they do not defeat each other about them, broadly spoken. It is common, however, that there are smaller factions within a political party arguing against one another over details. As a consequence, some participating agents may be unable to proclaim their opinions on certain policies as the party's opinions. Put another way, some individual opinions may be suppressed for the party.

Asymmetry in attacks to and from a coalition For a political alliance to retain any credibility of the arguments it expresses, it must argue only by the conflict-free, i.e. self-contradiction-free, portion of the arguments of the party's participants. But the other political parties not in the alliance are unhindered by the personal circumstance of the alliance. If a political party A is in alliance with another political party B, then an external party C can argue against any argument of the individual participants in A or in B in order to criticise not just the individuals but the coalition.

Better larger than smaller In [1], the rate of defections is associated to the number of agents in a coalition, thus a smaller set preferred. That does not carry over here: if one single political party or one single political alliance dominates the parliament, it has total freedom in policy making, which is clearly desirable. While not primarily on abstract argumentation, there is a work [12] on alternating-temporal logic incorporating the framework of [1]. In the logic, a larger set is better.

Example 1 The Liberal Democratic Party of Japan (LDP) is traditionally the most influential but also a complex party of multiple factions. Its goals are: rapid, export-based economic growth; close cooperation with the U.S. in foreign and defence policies; simplification and streaming of government bureaucracy; privatization of state-owned enterprises; and adoption of measures such as tax reform for the ageing society. There are three major factions in the LDP:

Heisei Kenkyukai(A)'s promises include international cooperation with China and Korea, construction of highways, a Gasoline tax, and protection of small farmers and discriminated peoples.

¹ National Institute of Informatics, Japan, email: ryutaarisaka@gmail.com

² National Institute of Informatics, Japan, email: ksatoh@nii.ac.jp

Kouchi Kai(B) promises international cooperation with China and Korea, a government bond and consumption tax for national medical care and national banks which financially support small firms, and free trade policy.

Seiwa Seisaku Kenkyukai(C) promises tax reduction for high income taxpayers and large companies, a strong military relationship with the U.S. for national defence issues, visits to Yasukuni Shrine, reduction of road and railway construction, free trade for car exports, lesser medical care and removal of protection of small farmers.

Infighting is evident. The argument of A's and B's for a close cooperation with China and Korea is dampened by C's visits to Yasukuni Shrine, A's argument for protecting small farmers and construction of highways is in direct conflict with promises of C's to remove that protection and to reduce public construction, and B's free trade policy is not wholeheartedly welcomed by C which promises free trade chiefly for car exports. With all these discordance, they are still united in the LDP because the number matters in politics: losing out in national elections and in bill-passing as the result of forming an independent - and less dominant - political party is the greater harm to them. Now, the LDP as a whole does not (and obviously cannot) express the visit to Yasukuni Shrine as the LDP's policy due to the internal conflict. However, such a circumstance means little to other political parties. To give evidence, the Japanese Communist Party has long criticised the Yasukuni Shrine visit by some individual members of the LDP as a way of criticising the LDP itself. There indeed is asymmetry in attacks.

In this work, we contemplate abstract-argumentation-theoretic characterisations of profitability, and then formability, of a coalition of this kind. To be more specific, we consider the following two questions: (1) suppose a set of arguments that may contain partial internal conflicts (as an abstract representation of a political party) and suppose also rational criteria of coalition profitability, with which other (disjoint) sets of arguments that may also contain partial internal conflicts (i.e. representations of other political parties) can it profit from forming a coalition?; and (2) suppose the profitability relation, suppose some rational principles to judge the goodness of a coalition, and suppose such a set of arguments, with which other (disjoint) such sets of arguments can it actually form a coalition?

The following are particularly interesting technicalities of these semantics. First and foremost, the above-described coalition formability is not simply about whether the resulting coalition is acceptable, which could be handled by adapting the standard acceptability semantics in abstract argumentation theory, but about whether a set of arguments potentially having partial internal conflicts can form a coalition with another similar set. The former concerns the state of the resulting set, while the latter must be parametrised by coalition profitabilities of both sets. Secondly, because of the presence of partial internal conflicts and of the asymmetry in attacks to and from a coalition, we have to: (1) accommodate a weaker notion than conflict-freeness as a property that a set of arguments should primarily satisfy - *conflict-eliminability* as we term it, which permits members of a set to attack other members of the same set so long as none of them is completely defeated; (2) obtain *intrinsic arguments* of a conflict-eliminable set, which are the arguments that would remain if any partial internal conflicts within the set were resolved away³;

³ This should not be confused. We are not meaning that some arguments would disappear as the result. The internal conflicts are assumed non-defeating. We rather mean that some arguments may be weakened of their

and (3) use the intrinsic arguments to determine which external arguments are being attacked by the conflict-eliminable set, while still keeping the original arguments of the set in order to determine if it is being attacked by external arguments (see **Asymmetry in attacks to and from a coalition** above). Here again, our task is not just whether some set of arguments satisfies conflict-eliminability: we must consider if any attacks are strong enough to defeat an argument, and, in case an argument is attacked but not defeated, how much it would be weakened/compromised by the attacks. To cope with these, we attach *argument capacity*, a numerical value, to each argument, and an attack strength, again a numerical value, to each attack. The idea is: a set of arguments is conflict-eliminable just when none of the members of the set attack an argument of the same set with a greater numerical value than the argument's capacity. As the argument capacities and attack strengths are both numerical, it is easy to derive its intrinsic arguments and their attacks on external arguments.

1.1 Related work

We are not aware of other works in the literature of abstract argumentation theory dealing with this kind of political-alliance-like coalition formation, although an earlier draft of this work has been already cited in [5] for a more specific, logic-oriented instantiation with classical logic sentences and belief contraction. Also, to the best of our knowledge, the previous approaches proposed in the abstract argumentation literature are not self-sufficient for dealing with the two above-mentioned technicalities. We have already mentioned the key works on coalition formation [1, 11, 30]. They apply Dung's acceptability semantics [18] for characterising acceptability of a coalition that is individual-benefit-oriented, that is conflict-free, and that generally prefers a smaller set. In Section 4 of [1] and in [11], a coalition is associated with a set of tasks/goals, and conflicts between coalitions are measured such as by competition which occurs when two coalitions share the same tasks/goals. We, however, focus on the described political-alliance-like coalition profitability/formability semantics with conflict-eliminable sets of arguments. We do not consider the meta-knowledge of tasks or goals. Instead, we measure profitability of a coalition for a conflict-eliminable set of arguments by three criteria: (1) the size of the coalition; (2) whether the number of attackers to the conflict-eliminable set of arguments increases or decreases in the coalition; and (3) how defended the coalition is from external arguments. Coalition formability is relativised to profitabilities of two conflict-eliminable sets. A rather different perspective of coalition formation: calculation of probabilistic likelihood of a coalition formation capable of achieving some task, given the prior probability of agents' joining in a coalition and of preventing other members from joining in the coalition, was highlighted in probabilistic argumentation frameworks [24]. Such quantitative judgement is out of the scope of this work.

We mention other works relevant to ours.

Attack-tolerant abstract argumentation Characterisation of acceptability semantics for a non-conflict-free set of arguments is gaining attention. The 2-valued semantics [27] makes use of reductio ad absurdum to resolve inconsistency. Conflict-tolerant semantics [4] relaxes conflict-freeness by using four values (accept, reject, no opinion, and mixed feeling) to label arguments for paraconsistent abstract argumentation. However, these approaches do

potency. See **Partial internal conflicts**. What would remain are then those arguments unaffected by the partial internal conflicts and those weakened arguments.

not incorporate numerical values, which makes it difficult to reason about the strength of attacks. Weighted argument systems [20] attach numerical values to attack relations. There is also a system-wide numerical value called the inconsistency budget. In their systems, conflicts in a set of arguments are quantified as the sum of numerical values given to the attack relations appearing in the set. If the sum does not exceed the given inconsistency budget, then the set is considered para-conflict-free. Their acceptability semantics is relative to the global inconsistency budget. In our setting, having numerical attack strengths alone is not sufficient, as we must know intrinsic arguments of a conflict-eliminable set, which relies both on attack strengths and on argument strengths. We do not use any global and uniform budget. Further, substantively we do not tolerate any inconsistency: intrinsic arguments must be conflict-free. Social abstract argumentation frameworks [23], to which an equational approach [21] also relates, attach numerical values to arguments in the form of *for* votes and *against* votes. They allow for fine-grained para-consistency. We could potentially adapt their approach to characterise our conflict-eliminability. However, their numerical attack characterisations by votes are quite specific. We choose more abstract, axiomatic characterisations. In the literature, axiomatic approaches have been considered to, for instance, ensure logical consistency of an argumentation framework [2, 3, 13]. Classifications of attack relations by axioms they satisfy have been also done [22]. The axiomatic approaches help regulate an abstract argumentation system from a general standpoint.

Dynamic abstract argumentation Our framework possesses a certain kind of dynamic nature. So far dynamic changes have been considered within the literature of abstract argumentation to: assume structural argumentation [8, 14, 19, 28, 29] and modify non-falsifiable facts [31]; add a new argument [6, 15, 26]; revise attack relations [17]; revise an argumentation framework by encoding it into propositional logic [16]; and revise an argumentation framework with an argumentation framework, see [7].⁴ Given an argumentation framework, these works calculate a revised argumentation framework. That is, they derive a post-state from a pre-state given some input. We, however, require interactions between the initial set of arguments (the pre-state) and intrinsic arguments of a conflict-eliminable set (post-states) due to the asymmetry in attacks to and from a coalition. The pre-state/post-state coordinations are, as far as we are able to fathom, not dealt with in the above-mentioned studies. Meanwhile, one of the works on coalition formation as mentioned earlier, namely [11], admits coalitional and non-coalitional views of agents. From a non-coalitional view of agents, a number of coalitional views may be derived. Still, what they consider are conflicts among coalitional views (for goal fulfillment), which is a problem possessing a different nature.

In the rest, we will: recall Nielsen-Parsons' argumentation frameworks [25] that generalise Dung's ones with group attacks (Section 2); introduce our argumentation frameworks for conflict-eliminable sets of arguments and find a link to Nielsen-Parsons' frameworks as a side contribution (Section 3); and develop semantics for profitability, and then formability, of coalition formation, at the same time presenting theoretical results (Section 4), before drawing conclusions.

⁴ There are also analysis on mutability of acceptable arguments by adding or removing an argument and/or an attack [9, 10].

2 Preliminaries

While Dung's argumentation frameworks [18] are the most important in the abstract argumentation literature, Nielsen-Parsons' generalised versions with group attacks are probably closer to our own. Let us recall the key definitions of their frameworks.

An *argument* is an abstract entity, and the class of all arguments is \mathcal{A} . An *argumentation framework* is a tuple (A, G) where $A \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \mathcal{A}$ and $G : (2^A \setminus \emptyset) \times \mathcal{A}$. A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ is said to *attack* an argument $a \in A$ if and only if, or simply iff, $(A', a) \in G$ for some $A' \subseteq A_1$. We say that $(A', a) \in G$ is *minimal* iff for every $A'' \subset A'$, $(A'', a) \notin G$. A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* iff there exists no $a \in A_1$ such that A_1 attacks a . A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ *defends* $a \in A$ iff if $(A_x, a) \in G$ for $A_x \subseteq A$ is minimal, then A_1 attacks some $a_x \in A_x$. A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ *accepts* $a \in A$ iff A_1 defends a . A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ is *admissible* iff A_1 accepts all its members. A set $A_1 \subseteq A$ is a *preferred set (extension)* iff A_1 is admissible and there exists no $A_1 \subset A_2 \subseteq A$ such that A_2 is admissible. There are other notions such as complete sets (extensions), stable sets (extensions), and the grounded set (extension). An interested reader will find more information in [18, 25].

3 Argumentation Frameworks for Conflict-Eliminable Sets of Arguments

Let \mathbb{N} be the class of natural numbers including 0, and let \mathcal{S} be $\mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{N}$. We refer to any element of \mathcal{S} by s with or without a subscript. In our development, members of \mathcal{S} (not of \mathcal{A}) are arguments. Not just any set of arguments will we be interested in, however.

Definition 1 (Coherent sets of arguments) Let S_1 be a subset of \mathcal{S} . We say that S_1 is *coherent* iff S_1 satisfies the following conditions.

1. S_1 is a finite subset of \mathcal{S} .
2. For any $(a, n) \in S_1$, it holds that $n > 0$.
3. For any $(a, n) \in S_1$, there is no $m \neq n$ such that $(a, m) \in S_1$.

An argumentation framework usually satisfies the first condition. To explain the second condition, we mention that each argument has *argument capacity*. For $(a, n) \in \mathcal{S}$, a is its *identifier*, and n is its *capacity*. The greater the capacity of an argument is, the more information it contains. That an argument has argument capacity of 0 basically means that it has no utility. The third property is to ensure that each argument identity is used by at most one argument in a chosen subset of \mathcal{S} . From here on, by S with or without a subscript we denote a coherent set of arguments.

Example 2 Consider four arguments:

1. a_1 : I support cooperation with China and Korea. I support construction of highways. I support protection of small farmers. I support a Gasoline tax.
2. a_2 : I support cooperation with China and Korea. I support free trade. I support consumption tax for national medical care and national banks.
3. a_3 : I support visits to Yasukuni Shrine. I am against construction of highways. I support a close military relationship with the U.S. I support free trade, but only for car exports. I am against protection of small farmers.
4. a_4 : I denounce visits to Yasukuni Shrine.

We could (though do not have to) treat the number of sub-arguments of each argument as its argument capacity so that we have $(a_1, 4)$, $(a_2, 3)$, $(a_3, 5)$, $(a_4, 1)$.

Now, let R be a partial function $2^S \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies the following conditions (or axioms). Informally, $R(S, s)$ represents the attack strength of S 's attack on s . In the below, ' R is defined for (S, s) ' is synonymous to ' $R(S, s)$ is defined'.

1. R is undefined for (\emptyset, s) for any $s \in S$ [**Coherence**].
2. For any $S_1 \subseteq S \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and for any $s \in S$, if R is defined for (S_1, s) , then R is defined for any (S_2, s) for $\emptyset \subset S_2 \subseteq S_1$. [**Quasi-closure by subset relation**].
3. For any $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and for any $s \in S$, if R is defined both for (S_1, s) and for (S_2, s) , then R is defined also for $(S_1 \cup S_2, s)$ [**Closure by set union**].
4. For any $S_1 \subseteq S \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and for any $s \in S$ such that R is defined for (S_1, s) , it holds that $R(S_1, s) > 0$ [**Attack with a positive strength**].
5. For any $(a, n), (a, m) \in S$ such that $n \leq m$, the following holds true: if $R(S_1, s)$ for some $s \in S$ and for some $S_1 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ such that $(a, n) \in S_1$ is defined, then $R(S_2, s)$ for $S_2 = (S_1 \setminus (a, n)) \cup (a, m)$ is defined and is such that $R(S_1, s) \leq R(S_2, s)$ [**Attack monotonicity 1 (source)**].
6. For any $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and for any $s \in S$, if R is defined for (S_1, s) , (S_2, s) and $(S_1 \cap S_2, s)$, then $R(S_1 \cap S_2, s) \leq R(S_i, s)$ for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ [**Attack monotonicity 2 (source)**].
7. For any $(a, n), (a, m) \in S$ such that $n \leq m$, it holds that if R is defined for $(S_1, (a, n))$ for some $S_1 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ such that $S_1 \cap \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \{(a, l)\} = \emptyset$, then it is defined for $(S_1, (a, m))$, and, moreover, $R(S_1, (a, n)) \leq R(S_1, (a, m))$ [**Attack monotonicity 3 (target)**].
8. For any $S_1 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and for any $s \in S$, R is undefined for (S_1, s) if $s \in S_1$. [**No self attacks**].

[**Coherence**] ensures that an attack must come from some argument(s). [**Quasi-closure by subset relation**] ensures that there is a group attack from a set of arguments on an argument just because each member of the set is attacking the argument. This can be contrasted with the group attacks in Nielsen-Parsons' argumentation frameworks. But it must be noted, as we are to mention shortly, that that there is an attack of an argument (a_1, n_1) on another argument (a_2, n_2) does not mean that (a_1, n_1) defeats (a_2, n_2) in our framework. [**Closure by set union**] is the reverse of [**Quasi-closure by subset relation**]. The purpose of [**Attack with a positive strength**] is as follows: we mentioned earlier that $R(S_1, s)$ is the strength of attack by S_1 on s , measured in \mathbb{N} . The value being positive signals S_1 's attack on s . The value being 0 would mean that S_1 is not attacking s . The purpose of an attack relation in abstract argumentation frameworks is to know which arguments attack which arguments. It is for this reason that we only consider positive values for R . [**Attack monotonicity 1**] expresses the following reasonable property: an attack may be occurring from some $S_1 \subseteq S \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ on some $s \in S$; now, increase the attack capacity of just one argument $s_1 \in S_1$, keeping all else equal; then the attack which occurred before the capacity increase should still occur. [**Attack monotonicity 2**] expresses the property that if an attack occurs from a set of arguments on an argument with some strength, then any superset does not decrease the attack strength. To explain [**Attack monotonicity 3**], let us say that a set of arguments is attacking an argument with certain argument capacity. This intuitively means that the set intends to suppress the argument. Now, if the argument capacity of the argument increases, the set still intends to suppress the argument just as strongly or even more strongly, but not less strongly, for there are more materials in the argument that the set could attack. This is the direct reading of the condition. In the technical development to follow, the converse

reading will be more useful: if the argument capacity of the argument on the other hand decreases, the set may no longer intend to suppress it further (because an argument with no content ceases to be any argument in an ordinary sense). Finally, [**No self attacks**] prevents self-contradictory arguments from being present.

Additivity of attack strengths is not postulated for R : if an argument s_1 is attacked by s_2 and s_3 such that $R(\{s_2\}, s_1) = n_1$ and that $R(\{s_3\}, s_1) = n_2$, it is not necessary that $R(\{s_2, s_3\}, s_1) = n_1 + n_2$. The additivity holds good when each attack can be assumed independent, but may not in other cases. A generalised version of [**Attack monotonicity 1**] holds good. Let π be a projection function that takes a natural number and an ordered tuple Γ (not the particular symbol Γ but any ordered tuple) and that outputs a set member, such that $\pi(n, \Gamma) = \{\text{the } n\text{-th member of } \Gamma\}$. It is undefined if n is greater than the size of the ordered set.

Proposition 1 (Generalised attack monotonicity 1) *Let $S_1 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ and $s \in S$ be such that $R(S_1, s)$ is defined. Then if $S_2 \subseteq_{\text{fin}} S$ is such that: (1) $\bigcup_{s_x \in S_1} \pi(1, s_x) = \bigcup_{s_x \in S_2} \pi(1, s_x)$; and that (2) $(a, n) \in S_1$ materially implies $(a, m) \in S_2$ for $n \leq m$, then $R(S_2, s)$ is defined.*

Proof. By induction on the number of arguments $s_1 \in S_1$ and $s_2 \in S_2$ for which $\pi(1, s_1) = \pi(2, s_2)$ and $\pi(2, s_1) < \pi(2, s_2)$. Here and everywhere, we may make use of **and** (having the semantics of classical logic conjunction), distinguishing 'and' in formal contexts from 'and' in natural contexts for greater clarity. The base case is vacuous. Use [**Attack relation monotonicity**] for inductive cases.

Our argumentation framework is (S, R) for some coherent set of arguments S and for some R .

3.1 Attacks

We distinguish complete attacks (defeats) from partial attacks (attacks).

Definition 2 (Attacks and defeats) We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ attacks $s \in S$ iff there exists $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ such that R is defined for (S_2, s) . We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ defeats $s \in S$ iff S_1 attacks s and there exists some $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ such that: (1) R is defined for (S_2, s) ; and (2) if R is defined for (S_x, s) for $S_x \subseteq S_1$, then $\pi(2, s) \leq R(S_2, s)$.⁵

Informally, an attack defeats its target when the attack strength surpasses the target's argument capacity.

Definition 3 (Maximum attack strengths) We define $V^{\max}(S_1, s)$ to be: 0 if S_1 does not attack s ; otherwise, $R(S_2, s)$ for some $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ such that: (1) R is defined for (S_2, s) ; and (2) if R is defined for (S_x, s) for $S_x \subseteq S_1$, then $R(S_x, s) \leq R(S_2, s)$.

Example 3 Let us build on Example 2. Notice that $(a_1, 4)$ disagrees with $(a_3, 5)$ on 3 points. We can model the attacks between them via $R(\{(a_1, 4)\}, \{(a_3, 5)\}) = R(\{(a_3, 5)\}, (a_1, 4)) = 3$, meaning that both of the attacks weaken the attacked argument by 3 sub-arguments.

3.2 Conflict-eliminable sets

Definition 4 (Conflict-eliminable sets of arguments) We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ is conflict-eliminable iff there exists no $s \in S_1$ such that S_1 defeats s .

⁵ See in the proof of Proposition 1 for what and is.

Conflict-eliminability is a weaker notion of the usual conflict-freeness which is the property that there exists no $s \in S_1$ such that S_1 attacks s . For the rationale behind obtaining this definition and using it as a primitive entity in our argumentation framework, we point back to Example 1 where infighting was evident and where the LDP political policy did not contain any internally conflicting arguments.

Definition 5 (Intrinsic arguments) Let $\alpha : 2^S \rightarrow 2^S$ be such that it is defined for $S_1 \subseteq S$ iff S_1 is conflict-eliminable. If α is defined for $S_1 \subseteq S$, then we define that $\alpha(S_1) = \{(\pi(1, s), n) \mid s \in S_1 \text{ and } n = \pi(2, s) - V^{\max}(S_1, s)\}$. We say that $\alpha(S_1)$ are intrinsic arguments of S_1 .

Intrinsic arguments of $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ in Example 2 are $\{(a_1, 1), (a_3, 2)\}$.


Proposition 2 (Well-definedness) For any $S_1 \subseteq S$, if α is defined for S_1 , then every member of $\alpha(S_1)$ is a member of S : in particular, there exists no $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and no $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(a, -n) \in \alpha(S_1)$.

Intrinsic arguments of a conflict-eliminable set must be substantively conflict-free.

Definition 6 (The view of intrinsic arguments) Let $\text{Del}_R(S, S_x)$ be $\{(S_y, s) \mid s \in S_x \subseteq S \text{ and } S_y \subseteq S_x \text{ and } R(S_y, s) \text{ is defined}\}$, which is the set of attack relations within S_x . Now, let S_1 be a subset of S . If α is defined for S_1 , then we say that $((S \setminus S_1) \cup \alpha(S_1), R \setminus \text{Del}(S, S_1))$ is the view that S_1 has about S , or simply S_1 's view of S . We denote S_1 's view of S by $\text{View}_R(S, S_1)$.

Proposition 3 Let S_1 be a subset of S . If $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined, then $\alpha(S_1)$ is conflict-free in $\text{View}_R(S, S_1)$.

Example 4



The left drawing shows the arguments and attacks in our running example when none of the arguments are in a coalition with others. The middle and the right drawings show the views that $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ and $\{(a_1, 4), (a_2, 3), (a_3, 5)\}$ have about them.⁶ Consider the middle figure. As we described earlier, three subarguments are in conflict between $(a_1, 4)$ and $(a_3, 5)$, and the intrinsic arguments of $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ are $\{(a_1, 1), (a_3, 2)\}$. $(a_1, 1)$ represents just one sub-argument (X) for a Gasoline tax. $(a_3, 2)$ represents just two sub-arguments (Y) for military relationship with the U.S. and (Z) for free trade for car exports. By Definition 6 and the monotonicity conditions of R , there cannot be attacks between $(a_1, 1)$ and $(a_3, 2)$ in the middle drawing. There is a conflict between (Z) and a sub-argument of $(a_2, 3)$ on free trade, and so we put attack arrows between them in the middle drawing. But none of (X), (Y) and (Z) are in conflict with $(a_4, 1)$, which explains why we do not put attack arrows between them in the middle drawing. Similarly for the right drawing, intrinsic arguments are as shown in the figure. Note that the subargument (Z) of $(a_3, 5)$ is also not in agreement with one subargument of

⁶ These are not uniquely determined by the left drawing. We are deriving all the three drawings from the actual arguments found in Example 2 with the 8 conditions and Definition 6 as constraints.

$(a_2, 3)$ in addition to those that are in conflict with subarguments of $(a_1, 4)$. Consequently the intrinsic arguments contain $(a_3, 1)$ instead of $(a_3, 2)$. Meanwhile for $(a_2, 3)$, in addition to the policy on free trade, the policy on international relation is also in conflict with that of $(a_3, 5)$. Consequently, the intrinsic arguments contain $(a_2, 1)$.

3.3 Coalition attacks, c-admissible sets and c-preferred sets

A coalition may attack external arguments only by its intrinsic arguments.

Definition 7 (C-attacks and c-defeats) We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-attacks $s \in S$ iff α is defined for S_1 and there exists some $S_2 \subseteq \alpha(S_1)$ such that $\pi(2, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$ is defined for (S_2, s) . We say that S_1 c-defeats $s \in S$ iff S_1 c-attacks s and $\pi(2, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))(S_3, s) \geq \pi(2, s)$ for some $S_3 \subseteq \alpha(S_1)$.

An example of c-defeat in our running example is by $\{(a_3, 5)\}$ on $(a_4, 1)$, and an example of c-attack is by $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ on $(a_2, 3)$. There are no self c-attacks; Cf. Proposition 3.

Proposition 4 The following are equivalent.

1. $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-attacks $s \in S$.
2. $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-attacks $s \in \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$.

Also, the following are equivalent.

1. $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-defeats $s \in S$.
2. $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-defeats $s \in \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$.

Proof. By definition, $\pi(2, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))(S_x, s)$ is undefined for any $S_x \subseteq S_1 \cup \alpha(S_1)$ and for any $s \in S_1 \cup \alpha(S_1)$. Hence if $S_1 \subseteq S$ c-attacks $s \in S$, then $s \notin S_1$ and $s \notin \alpha(S_1)$. Meanwhile, $(S \setminus S_1) = (\pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1)) \setminus \alpha(S_1))$.

We now define the notions of c-admissible and c-preferred sets, which are analogous to admissible and preferred sets we touched upon in Section 2, but which are for conflict-eliminable sets. One part in the definition could appear difficult at first. We italicise the part, and elaborate it later.

Definition 8 (C-admissible/c-preferred sets)

We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ is c-admissible iff α is defined for S_1 and if $S_2 \subseteq \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$ attacks $s \in S_1$ and if, for any $S_x \subseteq S_2$ such that $R(S_x, s)$ is defined, there exists some $S_3 \subseteq \alpha(S_1)$ such that S_3 c-defeat some $s_x \in S_x$. We say that $S_1 \subseteq S$ is c-preferred iff S_1 is c-admissible and there exists no $S_1 \subset S_y \subseteq S$ such that S_y is c-admissible.

We explain why in the italicised part in the above definition it is $S_2 \subseteq \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$ and not $S_2 \subseteq S$; and why it is $s \in S_1$ and not $s \in \alpha(S_1)$. The notion of c-admissibility is intuitively the same as that of admissibility in Section 2: subsets of S_2 are attacking a conflict-eliminable set S_1 ; and so S_1 is not admissible unless some member of S_1 defeat all the attacking subsets of S_2 . Now, because we are presuming that S_1 is conflict-eliminable and not necessarily conflict-free, $S_2 \subseteq S$ would include any partial conflict in S_1 as an attack. However, c-admissibility, which is the admissibility of a conflict-eliminable set in the view of the set, should not be defined to defeat it. This explains why $S_2 \subseteq \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$ where all those purely internal partial conflicts are compiled away. On the other hand, the reason that it should be $s \in S_1$ and not

$s \in \alpha(S_1)$ is due to the asymmetry in attacks to and from a conflict-eliminable set. Recall **Asymmetry in attacks to and from a coalition** in Section 1. As a consequence, $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ (and also $\{(a_1, 4), (a_2, 3), (a_3, 5)\}$) in Example 4 is not c-admissible because the coalition $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\}$ cannot c-attack $(a_4, 1)$ while $(a_4, 1)$ attacks $(a_3, 5)$.

3.4 Reduction to Nielsen-Parsons' argumentation frameworks

Theorem 1 (Restricted (S, R) as Nielsen-Parsons') *Let R^\perp be such that it satisfies all but [Quasi-closure by subset relation] and [Closure by set union]. Let S be such that for any $S_1 \subseteq S$ and for any $s \in S$, if R^\perp is defined for (S_2, s) for some $S_2 \subseteq S_1$, then S_1 defeats s . Then (S, R^\perp) is Nielsen-Parsons' argumentation framework, and the following all hold good.*

1. Any conflict-eliminable set in S is a conflict-free set.
2. If α is defined for $S_1 \subseteq S$, then $\alpha(S_1) = S_1$ and $\pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1)) = S$.
3. A c-attack by $S_1 \subseteq S$ on $s \in S$ is an attack by S_1 on s .
4. A c-attack is a c-defeat.
5. A c-admissible set is an admissible set, and a c-preferred set is a preferred set.

Proof.

1. By definition, if R^\perp is defined for (S_1, s) , then S_1 defeats s . Hence it is necessary that a conflict-eliminable set be a conflict-free set.
2. By 1., it is vacuous that $\alpha(S_1) = S_1$. $\text{Del}(S, S_1) = \emptyset$, and $\pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1)) = S$.
3. By 2., both are trivial.
4. By definition of (S, R^\perp) .
5. By 2., both are trivial.

With these, it is straightforward to see that (S, R^\perp) is Nielsen-Parsons' argumentation framework.

The three monotonicity conditions may be dropped, too. They are not relevant to Nielsen-Parsons' frameworks.

4 Coalition profitability and formability Semantics

It is of interest to learn meaningful conflict-eliminable sets of arguments. In this section we show semantic characterisations of coalition formability out of conflict-eliminable sets. Since coalition formation presupposes at least two groups of arguments, what we are characterising is not whether a set of arguments is admissible and how good an admissible set over other admissible sets is, but whether a conflict-eliminable set can form a coalition with another conflict-eliminable set, and how good a coalition over other coalitions is. We presume some conflict-eliminable set at front, and will talk of coalition formability semantics relative to the conflict-eliminable set. We will first discuss profitability relation of a coalition, will show its theoretical properties, and will then present four coalition formability semantics, each of which formalises certain utility postulate(s) taking the profitability into account. We assume the following notations.

Definition 9 (One-directional attacks) Let $S_1 \subseteq S$ be such that $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined. We say that S_1 is one-directionally attacked iff there exists $S_x \subseteq \pi(1, \text{View}_R(S, S_1))$ such that S_x attacks $s \in S_1$ and S_1 does not c-attack any $s_x \in S_x$.

$\{(a_1, 4), (a_2, 3), (a_3, 5)\}$ in the running example in the previous section is one-directionally attacked (by $(a_4, 1)$).

Definition 10 (States of a conflict-eliminable set) Let $\preceq: 2^S \times 2^S$ be a binary relation such that $(S_1, S_2) \in \preceq$, written also $S_1 \preceq S_2$, iff α is defined both for S_1 and S_2 and any of the three conditions below is satisfied:

1. S_2 is c-admissible.
2. S_1 is one-directionally attacked.
3. neither S_1 nor S_2 is c-admissible or one-directionally attacked.

Informally, if $S_x \subseteq S$ is c-admissible, then it is fully defended from external attacks and is good. If S_x is one-directionally attacked, then S_x does not have any answer to external attacks, which is bad. Any conflict-eliminable set that does not belong to either of them is better than being one-directionally attacked but is worse than being c-admissible. Consequently, if $S_1 \preceq S_2$, then S_2 is in a better state or in at least as good a state as S_1 .

Definition 11 (Coalition permission) We say that coalition is permitted between $S_1 \subseteq S$ and $S_2 \subseteq S$ iff $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ and α is defined for $S_1 \cup S_2$.

The following results tell that this definition of coalition permission is not underspecified.

Lemma 1 (Defeats are unresolvable) *Let S_1 and s be such that $S_1 \subseteq S$ and $s \in S_1$. If S_1 defeats s , then for all S_2 such that $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq S$ it holds that S_2 defeats s .*

Proof. By [Attack strength monotonicity] of R .

Proposition 5 (Coalition and conflict-eliminability) *If coalition is permitted between S_1 and S_2 , then α is necessarily defined for S_1 and S_2 .*

Proof. Suppose otherwise, then by conflict-eliminability of a set, there must be an argument in S_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$, such that S_i defeats $s \in S_i$. Apply Lemma 1.

We make one notion formally explicit for convenience, and then define coalition profitability.

Definition 12 (Attackers) Let $\text{Attacker}: 2^S \rightarrow 2^S$ be such that $\text{Attacker}(S_1) = \{s \in S \mid \text{there exists some } s_1 \in S_1 \text{ such that } s \text{ attacks } s_1.\}$ We say that $\text{Attacker}(S_1)$ is the set of attackers to S_1 .

Definition 13 (Coalition profitability) Let $\trianglelefteq: 2^S \times 2^S$ be such that if $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$ (or $(S_1, S_2) \in \trianglelefteq$), then three axioms below are all satisfied.


1. $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ (larger set).⁷
2. $S_1 \preceq S_2$ (better state).
3. $|\{s \in \text{Attacker}(S_1) \mid S_1 \text{ does not c-defeat } s \text{ and } s \notin S_1\}| \geq |\{s \in \text{Attacker}(S_1) \mid S_2 \text{ does not c-defeat } s \text{ and } s \notin S_2\}|$ (fewer attackers).

We say that S_2 is profitable for S_1 iff $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$. Due to (better state), $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$ implies that α is defined both for S_1 and S_2 . By (larger set), a set that contains more arguments is a better set. By (better state), a set that is in a better state is a better set. Finally, by (fewer attackers), a set that is attacked by a smaller number of arguments is a better set. The S_1 in $\text{Attacker}(S_1)$ on the second line is not a typo: this criterion is for measuring the profits of coalition formation for S_1 . We have $\{(a_1, 4), (a_3, 5)\} \trianglelefteq \{(a_1, 4), (a_2, 3), (a_3, 5)\}$ in Example 4.

⁷ As illustrated in Introduction, our coalition scenario has this property.

Proposition 6 A (S, R) can be chosen in such a way that a pair of $S_1 \subseteq S$ and $S_2 \subseteq S$ do not satisfy more than one axioms of \trianglelefteq .

Proof. (larger set)



Let S be $\{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2), s_3\}$, and let R be such that it is defined only for any combination that matches the attack arrows in the two drawings above. Let us define that $R(\{(a_1, 2)\}, (a_2, 2)) = R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, (a_1, 2)) = R(\{s_3\}, (a_1, 2)) = R(\{s_3\}, (a_2, 1)) = R(\{(a_2, 2), s_3\}, (a_1, 2)) = 1$, and that $R(\{(a_1, 2)\}, s_3) \geq \pi(2, s_3)$ (among others implicit by the conditions of R). Then the left and the right drawings represent (S, R) and respectively $\text{View}_R(S, \{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2)\})$. Now, let S_1 be $\{(a_1, 2)\}$ and let S_2 be $\{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2)\}$. Then clearly $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. However, it does not satisfy (better state): S_1 is neither c-admissible nor one-directionally attacked but S_2 is one-directionally attacked. It does not satisfy (fewer attackers), either: $\text{Attacker}(S_1) = \{s_3\}$, S_1 c-defeats s_3 , and S_2 c-defeats none.

(better state)



Let S be $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, and let R be such that it is defined only mutually for s_1 and s_2 as shown above, and such that $R(\{s_1\}, s_2) \geq \pi(2, s_2)$ and $R(\{s_2\}, s_1) \geq \pi(2, s_1)$. Now, let S_1 be $\{s_1\}$ and let S_2 be $\{s_3\}$. Then $S_1 \preceq S_2$ because S_2 is c-admissible. However, clearly it is not the case that $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. Also, $\text{Attacker}(S_1) = \{s_2\}$, S_1 c-defeats s_2 , but S_2 does not c-defeat it.

(fewer attackers) Let S be $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, and let R be such that it is defined as is previously, and such that $R(\{s_1\}, s_2) < \pi(2, s_2)$ and $R(\{s_2\}, s_1) < \pi(2, s_1)$. Now, let S_1 be $\{s_3\}$, and let S_2 be $\{s_2\}$. Then $\text{Attacker}(S_1) = \emptyset$, and so (fewer attackers) is satisfied trivially. However, clearly it is not the case that $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. And it is not the case that $S_1 \preceq S_2$, because S_1 is c-admissible, while S_2 is neither c-admissible nor one-directionally attacked.

4.1 Theoretical results around profitability

It is easy to see that there exists some (S, R) and some $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S$ such that $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$. We state other results.

Theorem 2 Let $S_1 \subseteq S$ be such that $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined, and let $S_x \subseteq S$ be a c-admissible set. If $S_1 \subset S_x$, then the following all hold good.

1. α is defined for $S_2 = S_x \setminus S_1$.
2. Coalition is permitted between S_1 and S_2 .
3. $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_x$.

Proof.

1. Suppose otherwise, then S_2 would defeat at least one $s \in S_2$ if S_2 defeats s . By lemma 1, S_x would then defeat s , for $S_2 \subseteq S_x$. But S_x , being c-admissible, does not defeat s .

2. α is defined for S_x by definition; and $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, also by definition.
3. $S_1 \subseteq S_x$, S_x is a c-admissible set, and $|\{s \in \text{Attacker}(S_1) \mid S_x \text{ does not c-defeat } s \text{ and } s \notin S_x\}| = 0$.

Theorem 3 (Existence theorem) If, for any $S_1 \subseteq S$, there exists some $S_2 \subseteq S$ such that coalition is permitted between S_1 and S_2 and $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$ and $S_1 \cup S_2$ is c-admissible, then there exists some $S_3 \subseteq S$ such that coalition is permitted between S_1 and S_3 and $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_3$ and $S_1 \cup S_3$ is c-preferred and $S_2 \subseteq S_3$.


Proof. As S is of a finite size, it is straightforward to see that if $S_1 \cup S_2$ is c-admissible, then there must exist some c-preferred set S_x such that $S_1 \cup S_2 \subseteq S_x$. We show that the choice of $S_x \setminus S_1$ for S_3 ensures the requirement to be fulfilled. By Theorem 2 coalition is permitted between S_1 and S_3 and $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_3$. By assumption, $S_1 \cup S_3 = S_x$ is c-preferred and $S_2 \subseteq S_3$.

Theorem 4 (Mutually maximal coalition) Let $S_1 \subseteq S$ be such that $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined, and let $\text{Pref}(S_1)$ be the set of all c-preferred sets that contain S_1 as their subset. If $\text{Pref}(S_1) \neq \emptyset$, then the following holds good: for any $S_x \in \text{Pref}(S_1)$, $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_x$ and $(S_x \setminus S_1) \trianglelefteq S_x$ and there exists no $S_x \subset S_y \subseteq S$ such that $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_y$ or such that $(S_x \setminus S_1) \trianglelefteq S_y$.

Proof. By Theorem 2 and by the definition of a set being c-preferable.

In general, though, the mutual profitability is not a guaranteed property.

Theorem 5 (Asymmetry of profitabilities) There exists an argumentation framework (S, R) with disjoint subsets: S_1 and S_2 , of S satisfying $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$ but not satisfying $S_2 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$.



Proof. Let S be $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_3, s_4, s_5\}$, and let R be defined only for any combination that matches the attack arrows in the drawings above, satisfying: $R(\{s_1\}, (a_2, 2)) = 1$; $R(\{s_1, (a_2, 1)\}, s_3) \geq \pi(2, s_3)$; $R(\{s_1\}, s_3) < \pi(2, s_3)$; $R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_3) < \pi(2, s_3)$; $R(\{(a_2, 1)\}, s_4) < \pi(2, s_4)$; $R(\{(a_2, 1)\}, s_5) < \pi(2, s_5)$; $R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_4) \geq \pi(2, s_4)$; $R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_5) \geq \pi(2, s_5)$; $R(\{s_3\}, s_1) \geq 2$; $R(\{s_4\}, (a_2, 1)) \geq 2$; and $R(\{s_5\}, (a_2, 1)) \geq 2$, among others.

Now, let S_1 be $\{s_1\}$, and let S_2 be $\{(a_2, 2)\}$. Then $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$, for S_1 and $S_1 \cup S_2$ are both neither c-admissible nor one-directionally attacked. The axiom (fewer attackers) is also satisfied. However, it is not the case that $S_2 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$, for it does not satisfy (fewer attackers).


Moreover, \trianglelefteq does not satisfy what we may at first expect to hold good, i.e. the following continuation property.

Definition 14 (Continuation property of \trianglelefteq) Let $S_1 \subseteq S$ be such that $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined, and let $\text{Max}(S_1)$ be the set of all $S_x \subseteq S$

such that $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_x$ and such that if $S_x \subset S_y \subseteq S$, then not $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_y$. We say that \trianglelefteq is weakly continuous for S_1 iff there exists some $S_z \in \text{Max}(S_1)$ such that, for any $S_w \subseteq S_z$, if coalition is permitted between S_1 and $S_w \setminus S_1$, then $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_w$. We say that \trianglelefteq is continuous for S_1 iff it is weakly continuous for S_1 for any $S_z \in \text{Max}(S_1)$.

Theorem 6 (Profitability discontinuation theorem) *There exist $S_1, S_2, S_x \subseteq S$ such that: (1) α is defined for S_1, S_2 and S_x ; (2) $S_x \in \text{Max}(S_1)$; and (3) $S_2 \subseteq S_x$, but such that $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$ does not hold good. Moreover, $\text{Max}(S_1) = \text{Pref}(S_1)$ would not change this result.*

Proof. It suffices to consider the case where $\text{Max}(S_1) = \text{Pref}(S_1)$.



Let S be $\{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2), s_3, s_4, s_5\}$, and let R be such that it is defined only for any combination that matches the attack arrows in the drawings above, and: $R(\{(a_1, 2)\}, s_4) \geq \pi(2, s_4)$; $R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_5) \geq \pi(2, s_5)$; $R(\{(a_1, 2)\}, (a_2, 2)) = 1$; $R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, (a_1, 2)) = 1$; $R(\{s_3\}, s_4) \geq \pi(2, s_4)$; $R(\{(a_2, 1), s_3\}, s_5) \geq \pi(2, s_5)$; $R(\{s_4\}, (a_1, 1)) \geq 2$; and $R(\{s_5\}, (a_2, 1)) \geq 2$, among others. Clearly α is defined for $S_1 = \{(a_1, 2)\}$, $S_a = \{(a_2, 2)\}$, $S_2 = S_1 \cup S_a$, and $S_x = \{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2), s_3\}$, among others. Further, S_x is c-preferable. However, it is not the case that $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$. In fact, it is also not the case that $S_a \trianglelefteq S_2$, since S_2 is one-directionally attacked (see the right drawing for the attacks in $\text{View}_R(S, \{(a_1, 2), (a_2, 2)\})$), whereas S_1 and S_a are neither c-admissible nor one-directionally attacked (see the left drawing).

Coalition profitability continuation property holds good in certain special cases, however.

Theorem 7 (Profitability continuation theorem) *Let $S_x \subseteq S$ be a c-preferred set. Then \trianglelefteq is weakly continuous for any $S_1 \subset S_x$ iff any disjoint pair S_y, S_z of subsets of S_x satisfy $S_y \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_z$.*

Proof. If: Suppose, by way of showing contradiction, there are three disjoint subsets of S_x : S_a, S_b and S_c , such that $S_a \trianglelefteq S_a \cup S_b \not\trianglelefteq (S_a \cup S_b) \cup S_c$. By assumption we have $(S_a \cup S_b) \trianglelefteq (S_a \cup S_b) \cup S_c$, contradiction.

Only if: By definition of weak continuation property of \trianglelefteq .

4.2 Coalition formability semantics

We use the profitability relation to express our coalition formability semantics. We set forth three rational utility postulates:

- I Coalition is good when it is profitable at least to one party.
- II Coalition is good when it is profitable to both parties.
- III Coalition is good when maximal potential future profits are expected from it.

Of these, the first two can be understood immediately with the profitability relation. Say there are two sets S_1 and S_2 between which coalition is permitted. For I, at least either $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$ or $S_2 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2$

must hold good. In comparison, both of them must hold good for II. Our interpretation of the last postulate is as follows. Suppose a party, some conflict-eliminable set $S_1 \subseteq S$ in our context, considers coalition formation with another conflict-eliminable set S_2 . We know that S_2 is some subset of $S_1 \subseteq S \setminus S_1$. Before S_1 forms a coalition with S_2 , we have $\text{Max}(S_1)$ as the set of maximal coalitions possible for S_1 . Once the coalition is formed, we have $\text{Max}(S_1 \cup S_2)$ as the set of maximal coalitions possible for the coalition. Here clearly $\text{Max}(S_1 \cup S_2) \subseteq \text{Max}(S_1)$. What this means is that a particular choice of S_2 blocks any possibilities in $\text{Max}(S_1) \setminus \text{Max}(S_1 \cup S_2)$: they become unrealisable from $S_1 \cup S_2$. Hence S_1 has an incentive not to form a coalition with a S_2 if all the members of $\text{Max}(S_1 \cup S_2)$ are strictly and comparatively less profitable than some member of $\text{Max}(S_1)$. We reflect this intuition.

Definition 15 (Maximal profitability relation)

Let $\leq_l, \leq_b, \leq_f: 2^S \times 2^S$ be such that they satisfy all the following:

1. $S_1 \leq_l S_2$ iff $|S_1| \leq |S_2|$.
2. $S_1 \leq_b S_2$ iff S_2 is at least as good by (better state) as S_1 .
3. $S_1 \leq_f S_2$ iff S_2 is at least as good by (fewer attackers) as S_1 .

We write $S_1 <_\beta S_2$ for each $\beta \in \{l, b, f\}$ just when $S_1 \leq_\beta S_2$ and not $S_2 \leq_\beta S_1$. Then we define $\trianglelefteq_m: 2^S \times 2^S$ to be such that if $S_1 \trianglelefteq_m S_2$, then both of the following conditions satisfy:

1. $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$.
2. Some $S_x \in \text{Max}(S_2)$ is such that, for all $S_y \in \text{Max}(S_1)$, if $S_x <_\beta S_y$ for some $\beta \in \{l, b, f\}$, then there exists $\gamma \in \{\{l, b, f\} \setminus \beta\}$ such that $S_y <_\gamma S_x$.

Intuitively, if $S_1 \trianglelefteq_m S_2$, then at least one set in $\text{Max}(S_1)$ maximal in the three criteria: the set size, the state quality and the number of external attackers, is reachable from S_2 . The maximality here is judged by the principle that if $S_2, S_3 \in \text{Max}(S_1)$ are equal by two criteria, then S_3 is better if it is better than S_2 by the remaining criterion.

We define four formability semantics: **W** which respects I, **M** which respects II (and implicitly also I), **WS** which respects I and III, and **S** which respects II and III.

Definition 16 (Coalition formability semantics)

$$\mathbf{W}(S_1) = \{S_2 \subseteq S \mid S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2 \text{ or } S_2 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2\}.$$

$$\mathbf{M}(S_1) = \{S_2 \subseteq S \mid S_1 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2 \text{ and } S_2 \trianglelefteq S_1 \cup S_2\}.$$

$$\mathbf{WS}(S_1) = \{S_2 \subseteq S \mid S_1 \trianglelefteq_m S_1 \cup S_2 \text{ or } S_2 \trianglelefteq_m S_1 \cup S_2\}.$$

$$\mathbf{S}(S_1) = \{S_2 \subseteq S \mid S_1 \trianglelefteq_m S_1 \cup S_2 \text{ and } S_2 \trianglelefteq_m S_1 \cup S_2\}.$$

Here, ρ has the semantics of classical logic disjunction. Intuitively, $\rho(S_1)$ for $\rho \in \{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{WS}, \mathbf{S}\}$ means that S_1 is comfortable with forming a coalition with $S_2 \in \rho(S_1)$ under the given criteria.

Theorem 8 *Let $S_1 \subseteq S$ be such that $\alpha(S_1)$ is defined. The following all hold good. (1) $\mathbf{M}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{W}(S_1)$. (2) $\mathbf{WS}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{W}(S_1)$. (3) $\mathbf{S}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{M}(S_1)$. (4) $\mathbf{S}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{WS}(S_1)$. Meanwhile, neither $\mathbf{WS}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{M}(S_1)$ nor $\mathbf{M}(S_1) \subseteq \mathbf{WS}(S_1)$ is necessary.*


We provide one example to illustrate the semantic differences. Let $S = \{s_1, (a_2, 2), (a_3, 2), s_4, s_5, s_6, s_7\}$, and let R be such that it is defined only for any combination that matches the attack arrows in the above drawings, and such that:

$$R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, (a_3, 2)) = 1; R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_4) \geq \pi(2, s_4);$$

$$R(\{(a_2, 2)\}, s_5) \geq \pi(2, s_5); R(\{(a_2, 1), s_1\}, (a_3, 2)) \geq 2;$$

$$R(\{(a_2, 1)\}, s_4) < \pi(2, s_4); R(\{(a_2, 1)\}, s_5) < \pi(2, s_5);$$

$R(\{s_1\}, (a_3, 2)) = 1$; $R(\{(a_3, 1)\}, s_1) \geq \pi(2, s_1)$;
 $R(\{(a_3, 1)\}, s_6) \geq \pi(2, s_6)$; $R(\{s_6\}, (a_3, 1)) = 2$;
 $R(\{s_6\}, s_7) \geq \pi(2, s_7)$; $R(\{s_7\}, s_6) \geq \pi(2, s_6)$;
 $R(\{s_7\}, s_5) \geq \pi(2, s_5)$; $R(\{s_7\}, s_4) \geq \pi(2, s_4)$;
 $R(\{s_4\}, s_7) < \pi(2, s_7)$; $R(\{s_4\}, (a_2, 1)) = 2$;
 $R(\{s_5\}, (a_2, 1)) = 2$; $R(\{s_5\}, s_7) < \pi(2, s_7)$;
 $R(\{s_4, s_5\}, s_7) \geq \pi(2, s_7)$, among others that are implicit
 by the conditions of R .



We have:

$$W(\{(a_2, 2)\}) = \{\{(a_3, 2)\}, \{s_1\}, \{s_6\}, \{s_7\}, \{s_1, s_6\}, \{s_1, s_7\}, \{(a_3, 2), s_7\}\}.$$

$$M(\{(a_2, 2)\}) = \{\{(a_3, 2)\}, \{s_7\}, \{s_1, s_6\}, \{s_1, s_7\}, \{(a_3, 2), s_7\}\}.$$

$$WS(\{(a_2, 2)\}) = \{\{(a_3, 2)\}, \{s_1\}, \{s_7\}, \{s_1, s_7\}, \{(a_3, 2), s_7\}\}.$$

$$S(\{(a_2, 2)\}) = WS(\{(a_2, 2)\}).$$

The above drawings from (b) to (h) correspond to $\text{View}_R(S, \{(a_2, 2)\} \cup S_i)$ where S_i is the i th element in the set on the right hand side of the first equation. The first two equalities can be checked one by one. For $WS(\{(a_2, 2)\})$, we note that $\{s_1, s_6\}$ (see (f)) is excluded because: (1) for $\{(a_2, 2)\}, \{(a_2, 2), (a_3, 2), s_7\}$ and $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_7\}$ (see (g) and (h)) are both strictly better in \leq_m than $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_6\}$ by (fewer attackers), and $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_6\}$ would block the better coalitions; and (2) for $\{s_1, s_6\}, \{s_1, s_6, s_4, s_5\}$ is strictly better in \leq_m than $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_6\}$. Similarly $\{s_6\}$ is excluded. Finally, in this particular example, both $\{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_7\}$ and $\{(a_2, 2), (a_3, 2), s_7\}$ are c-preferred, and, moreover, we have: $\{(a_3, 2)\} \leq_m \{(a_2, 2), (a_3, 2), s_7\}$; $\{s_1\} \leq_m \{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_7\}$; $\{s_7\} \leq_m \{s_1, (a_2, 2), s_7\}$; and $\{s_7\} \leq_m \{(a_2, 2), (a_3, 2), s_7\}$. By these together with the subsumption of $S(\{(a_2, 2)\})$ in $WS(\{(a_2, 2)\})$ (Theorem 8), the last equality for $S(\{(a_2, 2)\})$ follows.

5 Conclusion

We proposed abstract-argumentation-theoretic coalition profitability and formability semantics, and showed theoretical results. Our work has a connection to several important subfields of abstract argumentation theory such as postulate-based abstract argumentation, attack-tolerant abstract argumentation and dynamic abstract argumentation. It is our hope that this study will further aid in linking the rich knowledge that is being accumulated in the literature.

REFERENCES

- [1] Leila Amgoud, ‘An argumentation-based model for reasoning about coalition structures’, in *Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems*, pp. 217–228, (2005).
- [2] Leila Amgoud and Jonathan Ben-Naim, ‘Axiomatic Foundations of Acceptability Semantics’, in *KR*, pp. 2–11, (2016).
- [3] Leila Amgoud and Philippe Besnard, ‘Bridging the Gap between Abstract Argumentation Systems and Logic’, in *SUM*, pp. 12–27, (2009).
- [4] Ofer Arieli, ‘Conflict-Tolerant Semantics for Argumentation Frameworks’, in *JELIA*, pp. 28–40, (2012).
- [5] Ryuta Arisaka and Ken Satoh, ‘Balancing Rationality and Utility in Logic-Based Argumentation with Classical Logic Sentences and Belief Contraction’, in *PRIMA*, pp. 168–180, (2016).
- [6] Ringo Baumann and Gerhard Brewka, ‘Expanding Argumentation Frameworks: Enforcing and Monotonicity Results’, in *COMMA*, pp. 75–86, (2010).
- [7] Ringo Baumann and Gerhard Brewka, ‘AGM Meets Abstract Argumentation: Expansion and Revision for Dung Frameworks’, in *IJCAI*, pp. 2734–2740, (2015).
- [8] Floris Bex, Henry Prakken, Chris Reed, and Douglas Walton, ‘Towards a Formal Account of Reasoning about Evidence: Argumentation Schemes and Generalisations’, *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, **11**(2), 125–165, (2003).
- [9] Guido Boella, Souhila Kaci, and Leendert van der Torre, ‘Dynamics in Argumentation with Single Extensions: Abstraction Principles and the Grounded Extension’, in *ECSQARU*, pp. 107–118, (2009).
- [10] Guido Boella, Souhila Kaci, and Leendert van der Torre, ‘Dynamics in Argumentation with Single Extensions: Attack Refinement and the Grounded Extension’, in *AAMAS*, pp. 1213–1214, (2009).
- [11] Guido Boella, Leendert van der Torre, and Serena Villata, ‘Social Viewpoints for Arguing about Coalitions’, in *PRIMA*, pp. 66–77, (2008).
- [12] Nils Bulling, Jürgen Dix, and Carlos I. Chesñevar, ‘Modelling Coalitions: ATL + Argumentation’, in *AAMAS*, pp. 681–688, (2008).
- [13] Martin Caminada and Leila Amgoud, ‘An Axiomatic Account of Formal Argumentation’, in *AAAI*, pp. 608–613, (2005).
- [14] Martin Caminada and Leila Amgoud, ‘On the evaluation of argumentation formalisms’, *Artificial Intelligence*, **171**(5-6), 286–310, (2007).
- [15] Claudette Cayrol, Florence Dupin de Saint-Cyr, and Marie-Christine Lagasque-Schiex, ‘Change in Abstract Argumentation Frameworks: Adding an Argument’, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, **38**, 49–84, (2010).
- [16] Sylvie Coste-Marquis and Sébastien Konieczny, ‘A Translation-Based Approach for Revision of Argumentation Frameworks’, in *JELIA*, pp. 397–411, (2014).
- [17] Sylvie Coste-Marquis, Sébastien Konieczny, Jean-Guy Mailly, and Pierre Marquis, ‘On the Revision of Argumentation Systems: Minimal Change of arguments Statuses’, in *KR*, (2014).
- [18] Phan M. Dung, ‘On the Acceptability of Arguments and Its Fundamental Role in Nonmonotonic Reasoning, Logic Programming, and n-Person Games’, *Artificial Intelligence*, **77**(2), 321–357, (1995).
- [19] Phan M. Dung, ‘Assumption-based argumentation’, in *Argumentation in AI*, pp. 25–44. Springer, (2009).
- [20] Paul E. Dunne, Anthony Hunter, Peter McBurney, Simon Parsons, and Michael Wooldridge, ‘Weighted argument systems: Basic definitions, algorithms, and complexity results’, *Artificial Intelligence*, **175**(2), 457–486, (2011).
- [21] Dov M. Gabbay and Odinaldo Rodrigues, ‘An equational approach to the merging of argumentation networks’, *Journal of Logic and Computation*, **24**(6), 1253–1277, (2014).
- [22] Nikos Gorogiannis and Anthony Hunter, ‘Instantiating abstract argumentation with classical logic arguments: Postulates and properties’, *Artificial Intelligence*, **175**(9-10), 1479–1497, (2011).
- [23] João Leite and João Martins, ‘Social Abstract Argumentation’, in *IJCAI*, pp. 2287–2292, (2011).
- [24] Hengfei Li, Nir Oren, and Timothy J. Norman, ‘Probabilistic Argumentation Frameworks’, in *TAF*, pp. 1–16, (2012).
- [25] Søren Holbech Nielsen and Simon Parsons, ‘A generalization of Dung’s Abstract Framework for Argumentation’, in *ArgMAS*, pp. 54–73, (2006).
- [26] Emilia Oikarinen and Stefan Woltran, ‘Characterizing Strong Equivalence for Argumentation Frameworks’, *Artificial Intelligence*, **175**(14-15), 1985–2009, (2011).

- [27] Luís Moniz Pereira and Alexandre Miguel Pinto, 'Approved Models for Normal Logic Programs', in *LPAR*, pp. 454–468, (2007).
- [28] Henry Prakken, 'Analysing reasoning about evidence with formal models of argumentation', *Law, Probability & Risk*, **3**(1), 33–50, (2004).
- [29] Henry Prakken, 'An abstract framework for argumentation with structured arguments', *Argument and Computation*, **1**, 93–124, (2010).
- [30] Luke Riley, Katie Atkinson, and Terry Payne, 'A Dialogue Game for Coalition Structure Generation with Self-Interested Agents', in *COMMA*, pp. 229–236, (2012).
- [31] Nicolás Rotstein, Martín O. Moguillansky, Alejandro J. García, and Guillermo R. Simari, 'An abstract Argumentation Framework for Handling Dynamics', in *Proceedings of the Argument, Dialogue and Decision Workshop in NMR 2008*, pp. 131–139, (2008).